Authority Board Meeting AGENDA
(Full packet with attachments available at www.ccta.net)
This meeting is scheduled to be audiocast live on the CCTA website.
Visit the Public Meetings page under “Get Involved” to tune in.

DATE: Wednesday, September 16, 2015
TIME: 6:00 pm
PLACE: Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 110
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

A. CONVENE MEETING: Julie Pierce, Chair

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

C. PUBLIC COMMENT: Members of the public are invited to address the Authority regarding any item that is not listed on the agenda. Please complete one of the speaker cards in advance of the meeting and hand it to a member of the staff.

1.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Authority Minutes of July 15, 2015. (Attachment – Action)

2.0 CONSENT CALENDAR:

2.A Administration & Projects Committee:

2.A.1. Accept Monthly Accounts Payable Invoice Report for June and July 2015. The accompanying report provides a listing of invoices paid in alphabetical order by vendor or payee name for the months of June and July 2015. Staff Contact: Randall Carlton (No Attachment – Information in APC Packet – Action)

2.A.2. Listing of Contract Change Orders (CCOs) Greater than $25k for Contracts Less than $15M, and Greater than $50k for Contracts Greater than $15M. Authority policy requires that this list be submitted to the APC for information. Staff Contact: Ivan Ramirez (No Attachment – Information in APC Packet)
2.A.3 Accept Quarterly Cash and Investment Report for the Period Ended June 30, 2015. The Authority’s Investment Policy calls for a quarterly report on investment activity to be prepared and submitted to the Executive Director, APC, and the Authority Board. The accompanying report covers transactions from April 1 through June 30, 2015. Staff Contact: Randall Carlton (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.A.4 Accept Quarterly Sales Tax Revenue Report for the Period Ended June 30, 2015. This report contains a summary of sales tax revenues, including analysis and comparisons against prior monthly and quarterly periods. Staff Contact: Randall Carlton (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.A.5 I-80/San Pablo Dam Road Interchange Reconstruction, Phase 1 (Project 7002) – Authorization to Execute Agreement No. 415 with The Hanna Group for Construction Management (CM) Services.* Staff seeks authorization for the Chair to execute Agreement No. 415 with The Hanna Group in the amount of $2,869,102, to provide CM Services through December 31, 2017. Staff Contact: Ivan Ramirez (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.A.6 City of Concord – Farm Bureau Road Safe Route to School (SR2S)/Complete Streets Improvements, Phase 2 (Project 24012) – Request for Appropriation of Measure J Funds for Design. Staff seeks approval of Resolution 15-45-P which will appropriate $519,360 in Measure J Funds for Phase 2 of the Farm Bureau Road SR2S/Complete Streets Improvements Project. Resolution 15-45-P. Staff Contact: Hisham Noeimi (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.A.7 City of San Ramon – Alcosta Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation (Project 24021) – Request for Appropriation of Measure J Funds for Construction. Staff seeks approval of Resolution 15-47-P which will appropriate $2,000,000 in Measure J Funds for construction. The City of San Ramon also requests that reimbursement of construction costs be retroactive to the Notice to Proceed (NTP) date of July 16, 2015. Resolution 15-47-P. Staff Contact: Hisham Noeimi (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.A.8 Authorization to Execute Amendment No. 3 to Agreement No. 359 with Keystone Public Affairs, LLC (Keystone) for Federal Lobbying/Consultation Services.* Staff seeks authorization for the Chair to execute Amendment No. 3 to Agreement No. 359 with Keystone to provide Federal Lobbying/Consultation Services. This amendment will extend the agreement termination date through June 30, 2016. Staff Contact: Linsey Willis (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.A.10 Update on Financing Plan Related to the Remarketing of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority Series 2012A Bonds and a Proposed Cost Saving Modification. Staff will provide an update on the Authority’s financing plan related to the Series 2012A Bonds. The plan was approved on May 20th to remarket the bonds on or before a mandatory tender date of December 15th.
The update will introduce a cost effective modification to the plan that has recently materialized for consideration by the APC. Staff Contact: Randall Carlton (Attachment – Action)

2.A.12 I-680 Carpool Lane Completion/Express Lanes Project – Northbound (NB)
Segment Design Alternatives Analysis (Project 8001) - Authorization to Execute Agreement No. 08C.01 with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for the Design Alternative Assessment. The Authority is partnering with MTC to implement express lanes along the full length of the I-680 corridor in Contra Costa County. As planned, there will be a gap in the NB express lane through the I-680/State Route 24 (SR24) interchange which would create an operational bottleneck. Congestion levels on NB I-680 have worsened over the past few years, partly due to the bottleneck through the interchange. Authority staff have been working with MTC to develop a scope for a consultant contract to assess various design alternatives and operational strategies that could be employed to address current and forecast congestion in the NB direction of I-680. Addressing this congestion is a priority for the Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) and the Transportation Partnership and Cooperation (TRANSPAC) from possible new funding sources including a potential new sales tax measure. MTC has released a Request for Proposal (RFP) with the intent to develop scope for a project or series of projects to include in the next Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and has asked the Authority to partner in funding the study. Staff Contact: Ross Chittenden (Attachment – Action)

2.1 NEW ITEM: Approval of Chief Deputy Executive Director Position. On July 15\textsuperscript{th} the Board directed staff to establish the classification of Chief Deputy Executive director. The “Chief” designation will recognize the expanded role of the existing Deputy Executive Director of Projects. Staff seeks approval of establishing the classification and salary range of Chief Deputy Executive Director. The overall number of Authority positions will remain at 20. Resolution 15-06-A, Revision 2. Staff Contact: Randall Carlton (Attachment – Action)

Planning Committee:

2.B.1. Approval of the City of Hercules’ Calendar Years (CY) 2012 & 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist. The City of Hercules has submitted its Calendar Years 2012 & 2013 GMP Checklist. An estimated $337,299 in 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds will be paid out for FY 2013-14 subject to the Authority making a findings of compliance with the Measure J GMP. Staff Contact: Martin Engelmann (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.B.2 Approval of the City of Martinez’s Calendar Years (CY) 2012 & 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist. The City of Martinez has submitted its Calendar Years 2012 & 2013 GMP Checklist. An estimated
$491,543 in 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds will be paid out for FY 2013-14 subject to the Authority making a findings of compliance with the Measure J GMP. Staff Contact: Martin Engelmann (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.B.3 Approval of the City of San Pablo’s Calendar Years (CY) 2012 & 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist. The City of San Pablo has submitted its Calendar Years 2012 & 2013 GMP Checklist. An estimated $341,707 in 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds will be paid out for FY 2013-14 subject to the Authority making a findings of compliance with the Measure J GMP. Staff Contact: Martin Engelmann (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.B.4 Approval of the City of Pinole’s Calendar Years (CY) 2012 & 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist. The City of Pinole has submitted its Calendar Years 2012 & 2013 GMP Checklist. An estimated $294,810 in 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds will be paid out for FY 2013-14 subject to the Authority making a findings of compliance with the Measure J GMP. Staff Contact: Martin Engelmann (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.B.5 Approval of the City of Richmond’s Calendar Years (CY) 2012 & 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist. The City of Richmond has submitted its Calendar Years 2012 & 2013 GMP Checklist. An estimated $1,142,519 in 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds will be paid out for FY 2013-14 subject to the Authority making a findings of compliance with the Measure J GMP. Staff Contact: Martin Engelmann (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.B.6 Proposed Actions to Funding Resolutions. Consistent with Authority policy, funding appropriation resolutions may be modified to extend their expiration date, to revise the scope of services or to terminate the resolution when the activity funded has been completed. Recommended changes are summarized. Staff Contact: Brad Beck (Attachment – Action)

2.B.7 Approval of FY 2015-16 Measure J Allocation for the West County Additional Bus Service Enhancements Program (Sub-Regional Program 19b). The 2011 Measure J Strategic Plan establishes the West County Additional Bus Service Enhancements Program (Program 19b) at 2.16 percent of sales tax revenues. As a sub-regional program the funds are programmed by WCCTAC. At its July 24, 2015 meeting WCCTAC took action to program the funds to AC Transit and WestCAT. Resolution 15-35-G. Staff Contact: Peter Engel (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.B.8 Approval of Resolution 15-44-G Allocating Measure J Funds from Program 20a Central County Additional Transportation Programs for Seniors and People
with Disabilities. At its February 12, 2015 meeting TRANSPAC approved a recommendation to allocate $43,000 from the Measure J subregional Program 20a – Central County Additional Transportation Programs for Seniors and People with Disabilities for support of the Walnut Creek Senior Van service. At its September 10, 2015 meeting TRANSPAC approved a recommendation to allocate $249,943 to four not for profit programs in central County which have been previously funded using Program 20a funds. Resolution 15-44-G. Staff Contact: Peter Engel (Attachment – Action)

2.B.9 Approval of Resolution 15-48-G for the 2015 Iron Horse Trail Rehabilitation Project. Measure J allocates 0.5 percent of revenues to the East Bay Regional Park District for the maintenance and improvement of paved regional trails. The District must apply these funds equally among the four sub-regions in Contra Costa and receive approval from the relevant RTPC for the program of improvements to be funded. The District has submitted a funding appropriation request for $494,000 in Measure J Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities (PBTF) (Program 13) funds for the 2015 Iron Horse Trail Rehabilitation Project in Southwest County. SWAT reviewed and approved the proposed request on July 16, 2015. Resolution 15-48-G. Staff Contact: Brad Beck (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.B.10 Authorize the Authority Chair to Sign Agreement 19C.01 with the City of Concord to Oversee the Operation of the Monument Community Shuttle. Approval would authorize the Authority’s Chair to sign cooperative agreement 19C.01 with the City of Concord. The funding agreement defines the parties’ obligations with respect to the payment of Measure J funds for the operation and oversight of the Monument Community Shuttle which will be operated by Monument Impact. The project was previously approved as a Lifeline Transportation Program project and funding was previously approved under previously approved Resolutions 13-21-G, 13-34-G, 14-25-G and 15-32-G. Staff Contact: Peter Engel (Summary Attachment – Action)

2.B.13 Approval of Amendment No. 2 to Gray-Bowen-Scott Agreement No. 366*. Staff recommends that the Authority approve a $1.7 million amendment to Agreement No. 366 with Gray-Bowen-Scott to carry out the Public Education and Outreach Plan for the 2014 Countrywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update and the Transportation Expenditure Program (TEP) during Fiscal Year 2015-16. This amendment would increase the existing agreement value from $1.8 million $3.5 million. Staff Contact: Martin Engelmann (Summary Attachment – Action) CMA Function

2.B.14 Approval of Amendment No. 1 to Agreement 422 and Agreement No. 438 with Arup for Consultant Support for PDA Planning Grants*. On March 18, 2015, the Authority approved Agreement 422 with Arup to provide consultant support for PDA Planning Grants. To allow Arup to begin work on these grants, the Authority issued a notice to proceed (NTP) on March 24, 2015 for $50,000. Because the
total amount of the agreement was more than $1 million in federal funds, however, Caltrans required a review of the agreement by its Audits & Investigations section to ensure the agreement complied with Caltrans requirements. While Caltrans approved the agreement with some modifications, it also disallowed reimbursement under the agreement for work done before July 13, 2015. Staff proposes funding the work completed under the NTP using Measure J funds through new Agreement No. 438 and reducing the amount of Agreement No. 422 by a corresponding amount. Staff Contact: Brad Beck

END OF CONSENT CALENDAR

3.0 MAJOR DISCUSSION ITEMS: Development of a Transportation Sales Tax Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)

3.1 NEW ITEM: Summary of Public Opinion Polling. Between the dates of August 26 and September 3, 2015, EMC Research (sub-consultant to Gray-Bowen-Scott) conducted a survey of 800 Contra Costa County likely November 2016 voters. Respondents were split into four sample groups with each receiving one of four sample potential sales tax measures. The sample sales tax measures tested were a 1/2 cent Contra Costa County specific tax; a 1/4 cent Contra Costa County specific tax; a 1/2 cent Authority sponsored transportation tax and a 1/4 cent Authority sponsored transportation tax. The survey also studied the effect of a potential BART bond measure sharing the November 2016 ballot. The survey has a margin of error of ± 3.5%. Results will be presented at the Authority Board meeting. Staff Contact: Ross Chittenden (No Attachment – Information)

3.2 NEW ITEM: Approval of Appointment of Members to the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC). Staff recommends the Authority appoint additional members to the EPAC to represent the public health category and a member representing the John Muir Trust. In additional, alternate members have been identified for Transform and Northern Waterfront Economic Development Initiative and are recommended for appointment. The Authority has approved the formation of the EPAC and appointed individuals to serve on the Committee. The committee membership represents a balance of stakeholders that reflect the broad range of issues and interests in Contra Costa. Staff recommends that the Authority close further nominations of membership to the EPAC. Certain alternate members positions remain vacant. Staff Contact: Ross Chittenden (Attachment - Action)

3.3 NEW ITEM: Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) July 1, 2015 and August 10, 2015 Meeting Minutes. Staff recommends the Authority review the EPAC July 1, 2015 meeting summary and approved meeting minutes. In additional, the EPAC will meet on September 14, 2015. Staff will provide the August 10, 2015 summary and meeting minutes as a handout if approved by the EPAC on September 14, 2015. The EPAC will continue to meet through
December 2015 to discuss a wide range of issues associated with the creation of a TEP. Staff Contact: Ross Chittenden (Attachment – Information)

3.4 NEW ITEM: Summary of Regional Transportation Planning Committees’ Submittals for a draft Transportation Expenditure Plan. In response to the call for projects issued by the Authority on May 22, 2015, the four Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) submitted a list of candidate projects and programs to be included in a draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP). Later this year, the Authority will consider input from RTPCs, the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC), and the general public in developing a draft TEP for a possible new sales tax measure. Staff Contact: Hisham Noeimi (Attachment – Information)

4.0 REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

4.A Administration & Projects Committee:

4.A.9 Legislation Update. This is an update on relevant developments in policy, legislation and finance that are of interest to the Authority. The Authority may take action on any item presented in the attachment or any State or federal legislation pertaining to the Authority’s legislative program. Staff Contact: Linsey Willis (Summary Attachment – Action to be Determined)

4.A.11 Authorizing the Issuance of up to $190 Million Aggregate Principal Amount of Contra Costa Transportation Authority Sales Tax Revenue Bonds for the Purpose of Financing Measure J Projects, Authorizing a Partial Refunding of the Series 2012B Bonds, Authorizing the Execution and Delivery of Related Documents, and Authorizing Taking All Required Actions. Staff seeks approval of Resolution 15-46-A which will provide for the issuance of the Series 2015 Bonds in the amount not to exceed $190 million. Resolution 15-46-A. Staff Contact: Randall Carlton (Summary Attachment – Action)

4.B Planning Committee:

4.B.11 Transmittal of Recommended Project Lists to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for Inclusion in the 2017 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In response to the 2017 RTP Call for Projects issued by MTC on April 29, 2015, Authority staff has worked with the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and project proponents to develop a comprehensive list of projects for submittal to MTC. To receive future State or federal funding, a project must first be included in the RTP. Projects that impact the capacity of the transportation system must be listed individually in the RTP. The RTP also includes programmatic categories for projects that do not impact the capacity of the transportation system (e.g. pavement rehabilitation, safety projects, pedestrian/bicycle enhancement projects, etc.). Local jurisdictions, the RTPCs, and transit agencies submitted 211 projects/programs with a total cost of $15.3
In addition, BART also submitted five region-wide projects with a cost of $9.7 billion. The Authority’s Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) reviewed the proposed list at its August 27th meeting and recommended approval. Staff Contact: Hisham Noeimi *(Attachment – Action)* CMA Function

**4.8.12 Recommended Transportation Investment Options for Analysis in the Updated Draft of the 2014 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and the Recirculated Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR).** Authority staff is developing an updated Draft of the 2014 CTP and intends to publish the Draft CTP and recirculate a Draft SEIR for public review and comment in early 2016. The first 2014 Draft CTP was released in August 2014, and a Draft SEIR was released in September 2014. The previous Draft SEIR essentially evaluated the CTP, including the Comprehensive Transportation Project List (CTPL), which is a financially unconstrained list of projects and programs, and a “No Project” Alternative that would limit the plan to projects and programs with assured funding commitments. The scope of the recirculated Draft SEIR will include three financially constrained Transportation Investment Options. The updated SEIR will be developed in parallel with a potential Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) that the Authority could adopt in May 2016. Using the Authority’s Countywide Travel Demand Forecasting Model, preliminary analysis of the three options will begin in September 2015, while analysis of the Draft TEP will begin in November, after the Authority releases it for review. Staff Contact: Martin Engelmann *(Attachment – Action)* CMA Function

**5.0 CORRESPONDENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS:**

5.1 Letter to CCTA Board dated July 30, 2015 from the San Francisco Bay Chapter of the Sierra Club RE: Equity and Climate Expenditure Plan Scenario *(Attachment – Information)*

5.2 Letter to the US Department of Transportation dated July 29, 2015 from the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors RE: Support for CCTA’s Connected Vehicle Pilot Deployment Program application *(Attachment – Information)*

5.3 Letter of thanks to CCTA Executive Director Iwasaki dated August 21, 2015 from the East Bay Division of the League of California Cities for July Division meeting presentation RE: Autonomous Vehicles and Future of Transportation *(Attachment – Information)*

5.4 Letter to CCTA Executive Director Iwasaki dated August 21, 2015 from the US Department of Transportation RE: TIGER Funding for the Kirker Pass Road Northbound Truck Lanes Project *(Attachment – Information)*
5.5 Message to CCTA dated August 25, 2015 from Gerald Cauthen on behalf of the Bay Area Transportation Working Group RE: TEP Development *(Attachment – Information)*

5.6 Letter to CCTA dated August 28, 2015 from Bishop Ranch RE: Interstate 680 Congestion Relief *(Attachment – Information)*

5.7 Letter to CCTA Board dated September 2, 2015 from East Bay Leadership Council RE: Potential New Sales Tax Measure *(Attachment – Information)*

5.8 Invitation to the Hercules San Francisco Bay Trail Segment Opening Ceremony and Healthy Lifestyle and Mobility Expo scheduled for September 19, 2015 *(Attachment – Information)*

6.0 **ASSOCIATED COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

6.1 Central County (TRANSPAC): Report of September 10, 2015 *(Meeting handout if available)*

6.2 East County (TRANSPLAN): (Note: Meeting of September 10, 2015 canceled)


6.4 West County (WCCTAC): Report of July 24, 2015 *(Meeting handout if available)*

7.0 **COMMISSIONER AND STAFF COMMENTS:**

7.1 Chair's Comments and Reports

7.2 Commissioners' Comments and Reports on Activities and Meetings

7.3 Executive Staff Comments *(Attachment – Information)*

8.0 **CALENDAR**

8.1 October/November/December 2015 *(Attachment – Information)*

8.2 Calendar of Upcoming Events *(Attachment – Information)*

8.3 Focus on the Future Conference, November 15-17, 2015, Newport Beach, CA. Commissioners interested in attending should notify Danice Rosenbohm. *(No Attachment – Information)*

9.0 **ADJOURNMENT** to Wednesday, October 21, 2015 at 6:00 p.m.

*Footnote:* In accordance with Government Code Section 84308, no Commissioner shall accept, solicit, or direct a contribution of more than two hundred fifty dollars ($250) from any party, or his or her agent, or from any...
participant, or his or her agent, while a proceeding involving a license, permit, or other entitlement for use is pending before the agency and for three months following the date a final decision is rendered in the proceeding if the officer knows or has reason to know that the participant has a financial interest, as that term is used in Article 1 (commencing with Section 87100) of Chapter 7. Any Commissioner who received a contribution within the preceding 12 months in an amount of more than two hundred fifty dollars ($250) from a party or from any participant shall disclose that fact on the record of the proceeding and the Commissioner shall not make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use his or her official position to influence the decision.

A party to a proceeding before the Authority shall disclose on the record of the proceeding any contribution in an amount of more than two hundred fifty dollars ($250) made within the preceding 12 months by the party, or his or her agent, to any Commissioner. No party, or his or her agent, shall make a contribution of more than two hundred fifty dollars ($250) to any Commissioner during the proceeding and for three months following the date a final decision is rendered by the agency in the proceeding. The foregoing statements are limited in their entirety by the provisions of Section 84308 and parties are urged to consult with their own legal counsel regarding the requirements of the law.

ANY WRITINGS OR DOCUMENTS pertaining to an open session item provided to a majority of the Authority less than 72 hours prior to the meeting shall be made available for public inspection at 2999 Oak Road, Suite 100, Walnut Creek, California, during normal business hours.

PUBLIC COMMENT: The public may comment on any matter on the agenda, or related matters not on the agenda, by completing a speaker card (available in meeting room), which should be provided to a CCTA staff member. Public comment may be limited to three minutes (or other such time period as determined by the Chair), in accordance with CCTA’s Administrative Code, Section 103.4(b).

TRANSLATION SERVICES: If you require a translator to facilitate testimony to the Authority, please contact Danice Rosenbohm at (925) 256-4722 no later than 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting. Si usted requiere a un traductor para facilitar testimonio a la Authority, por favor llame Danice Rosenbohm al (925) 256-4722, 48 horas antes de la asamblea.

ADA Compliance: This Agenda shall be made available upon request in alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132) and the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal. Govt. Code Sec. 54954.2). Persons requesting a disability-related modification or accommodation should contact Danice Rosenbohm (925-256-4722) during regular business hours, at least 24 hours prior to the time of the meeting.
Authority Board Meeting MINUTES

MEETING DATE: July 15, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: Janet Abelson, Newell Arnerich, Tom Butt, Candace Andersen (Alternate for Federal Glover), Dave Hudson, Ron Leone (for David Durant), Karen Mitchoff, Julie Pierce, Kevin Romick, Don Tatzin, Robert Taylor

Ex-Officio Representatives: Gail Murray, Chris Peeples

STAFF PRESENT: Randell Iwasaki, Brad Beck, Randall Carlton, Ross Chittenden, Peter Engel, Martin Engelmann, Jack Hall, Stephanie Hu, Brian Kelleher, Matt Kelly, Susan Miller, Hisham Noeimi, Ivan Ramirez, Linsey Willis, Danice Rosenbohm, Mala Subramanian, Authority Counsel

MINUTES PREPARED BY: Danice Rosenbohm

A. CONVENE MEETING: Chair Pierce convened the meeting at 6:02 p.m.

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

C. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Ralph Hoffmann, representing the Citizens’ Climate Lobby and the Sierra Club, stated that the Law Enforcement Torch Run ceremony was held in at Civic Park in Walnut Creek on July 14, 2015 in preparation for the Special Olympics World Games to be held in Los Angeles July 25 – August 2, 2015. He said that Bay Area law enforcement agencies were carrying the Flame of Hope Special Olympics torch along the final leg of its 4,648-mile journey in the U.S. to the World Games in Los Angeles this week. Mr. Hoffmann encouraged support for the Special Olympics.

1.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Authority Minutes of June 17, 2015

ACTION: Commissioner Tatzin moved to approve the Minutes of June 17, 2015, seconded by Commissioner Romick. The motion passed unanimously, 10-0. (Commissioner Arnerich had not yet arrived.)

2.0 CONSENT CALENDAR
ACTION: Commissioner Tatzin moved to approve the Consent Calendar, seconded by Commissioner Hudson. The motion passed unanimously, 10-0. (Commissioner Arnerich had not yet arrived.)

Chair Pierce noted that updated versions of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) No. 50.05.01 and Utility Agreement No. 420 with the State Route 4 Bypass Authority (SR4 Bypass Authority) and SFPP, L.P. (Kinder Morgan) related to Agenda Item 2.A.9.3 had been distributed as meeting handouts.

2.A Administration & Projects Committee:

2.A.1. Accept Monthly Accounts Payable Invoice Report for May 2015. The accompanying report provides a listing of invoices paid in alphabetical order by vendor or payee name for the month of May 2015. Staff Contact: Randall Carlton

2.A.2 Listing of Contract Change Orders (CCOs) Greater than $25k for Contracts Less than $15M, and Greater than $50k for Contracts Greater than $15M. Authority policy requires that this list be submitted to the APC for information. Staff Contact: Ivan Ramirez

2.A.3 Adopt Proposed Actions to Various Funding Resolutions. Consistent with Authority policy, appropriation resolutions may be modified to extend their expiration date, correct appropriation amounts or reflect actual costs, or be closed if the activity has been completed. Staff Contact: Susan Miller

2.A.4 State Route (SR242)/Clayton Road Ramps (Project 6002/6004) – Authorization to Execute Amendment No. 2 to Agreement No. 321 with WMH Corporation (WMH) for Project Approval and Environmental Documentation Services. Staff seeks authorization for the Chair to execute Amendment No. 2 to Agreement No. 321 with WMH to provide additional Project Approval and Environmental Documentation services. This amendment will extend the agreement termination date from August 31, 2015 to September 30, 2016 with no increase in budget. Staff Contact: Susan Miller

2.A.5 Amendment No. 4 to the 2011 Measure C Strategic Plan. Staff seeks approval of Resolution 15-39-P which adopts Amendment No. 4 to the 2011 Measure C Strategic Plan. Amendment No. 4 reprograms $1,223,000 from I-680 Auxiliary Lanes, Segment 2 (Project 1106 S2) to new projects titled Diablo Road Circulation Improvements (New Project 1721) and Santa Maria Park and Ride Lot Slide Repair (New Project 1722). Resolution 15-39-P. Staff Contact: Stephanie Hu
2.A.6 City of Lafayette – Olympic Boulevard/Reliez Station Road Corridor Improvements (Project 24010), Authorization to Execute Cooperative Agreement No. 24SW.04 and Request for Appropriation of Measure J Funds for Design. Staff seeks authorization for the Chair to execute Cooperative Agreement No. 24SW.04 and approve Resolution 15-40-P which will appropriate $350,000 in Measure J funds for the design phase of the Olympic Blvd/Reliez Station Road Corridor Improvements project. Resolution 15-40-P. Staff Contact: Stephanie Hu

2.A.8 Legislation Update. This is an update on relevant developments in policy, legislation and finance that are of interest to the Authority. The Authority may take action on any item presented in the attachment or any State or Federal legislation pertaining to the Authority’s legislative program. Staff Contact: Linsey Willis

2.A.9 State Route 4 (SR4)/Balfour Road Interchange (Project 5005)

2.A.9.1 Authorization to Execute Amendment No. 1 to Utility Agreement No. 410 with Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) for a Joint Utility Trench Relocation Services. Staff seeks authorization for the Chair to execute Amendment No. 1 to Utility Agreement No. 410 with PG&E in the amount of $500,000, for a new total agreement value of $1,674,223, to provide for the required temporary aerial shoofly for the joint utility trench relocation services. Staff Contact: Susan Miller

2.A.9.2 Authorization to Execute Utility Agreement No. 436 with AT&T for Utility Relocation Services. Staff seeks authorization for the Chair to execute Utility Agreement No. 436 with AT&T in the amount of $372,908 to provide utility relocation services. Staff Contact: Susan Miller

2.A.9.3 Authorization to Execute Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) No. 50.05.01 and Utility Agreement No. 420 with the State Route 4 Bypass Authority (SR4 Bypass Authority) and SFPP, L.P. (Kinder Morgan) for Utility Relocation Services. Staff seeks authorization for the Chair to execute MOU 50.05.01 with the SR4 Bypass Authority and Kinder Morgan which outlines the process for the acquisition of the replacement parcel to relocate the Kinder Morgan facility from the interchange parcel and the MOU includes, as executable attachments, five right-of-way (ROW) agreements, which will be executed by the SR4 Bypass Authority and Kinder Morgan; and Utility Agreement No. 420 with Kinder Morgan in the amount of $5,412,000 to provide relocation for the pump station and pipeline. Staff Contact: Susan Miller
2.A.10 I-80/San Pablo Dam Road Interchange Reconstruction Project, Phase 1 (Project 7002) – Authorization for the Executive Director to Approve the Plans, Specifications, and Estimate (PS&E) for Construction and to Advertise for Bids. Staff seeks approval of Resolution 15-41-P which will give authorization for the Executive Director to approve the PS&E for construction and to advertise for bids. **Resolution 15-41-P.** Staff Contact: Ivan Ramirez

2.A.11 Authorization for the Executive Director to Approve Plans, Specifications and Designs on Authority Administered Construction Projects. Staff seeks approval of Resolution 15-45-P which authorizes the Executive Director to review and exercise discretionary authority to approve or reject plans, specifications and designs on Authority construction projects to promote contracting efficiency. **Resolution 15-45-P.** Staff Contact: Ivan Ramirez

2.A.12 City of Hercules (Hercules) – Hercules Intermodal Transit Center (ITC), Approval of Resolution 12-08-P, Revision 2 to Increase the Appropriation of Measure J Funds from Hercules Rail Station (Project 4001), for Capital Costs of Construction and Construction Support; Resolution 15-42-G to Appropriate Funds from Program 12, Transportation for Livable Communities (CC-TLC), Bay Trail Gap Closure, Hercules ITC (Project 120007), for Capital Costs of Construction; Resolution 15-43-G to Appropriate Funds from Program 13, Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities (PBTF), Creekside Trail Gap Closure (Project 130010), for Capital Costs of Construction; and Resolution 12-06-P, Revision 2 to Modify Conditions. Hercules, as sponsor of the Hercules ITC project, requests an appropriation of $2,000,000 from Project 4001 funds, $1,240,000 from Program 12 CC-TLC funds, and $600,000 from Program 13 PBTF funds for Capital Costs of Construction and Construction Support of the Phase 1A, San Francisco Bay Trail (SF Bay Trail) - East and Phase 1A, Path to Transit elements of the Hercules ITC project. Hercules further requests that Resolution 12-06-P be revised to modify the date whereby construction of the Hercules Rail Station Building, Phase 1C, must begin. Staff Contact: Ross Chittenden

2.A.13 Quarterly Project Status Report. This report outlines the status of current Measure projects. It also lists all completed projects. Previously, the Authority received monthly project status reports on all active Measure C and J projects. In addition, quarterly project funding plans were provided for all projects on the state highway system. In March 2015, the Authority approved staff’s recommendation to streamline the process and reduce paper by implementing a new format that combines information from both reports, and provides for an easier way to identify updates on a quarterly basis. Staff Contact: Hisham Noeimi
2.1 **NEW ITEM: Revision to Annual Measure J Compliance Audit Plan for FY 2014-15.** On May 20th the Authority confirmed the selection of two contractors and one public agency for annual compliance audits. Upon examination of the funding sources, one contractor did not expend Measure J funds in excess of the audit category for expenditures greater than $500,000. The proposed action will replace the contractor with a more suitable recipient of Measure J funds. Staff Contact: Randall Carlton

2.2 **Planning Committee:**

2.2.1 **Approval of the City of Antioch’s Calendar Years (CY) 2012 & 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist.** The City of Antioch has submitted its Calendar Years 2012 & 2013 GMP Checklist. An estimated allocation of $1,075,766 in 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds will be paid out for FY 2013-14 subject to the Authority making a findings of compliance with the Measure J GMP. Staff Contact: Martin Engelmann

2.2.2 **Approval of the City of Pleasant Hill’s Calendar Years (CY) 2012 & 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist.** The City of Pleasant Hill has submitted its Calendar Years 2012 & 2013 GMP Checklist. An estimated allocation of $501,700 in 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds will be paid out for FY 2013-14 subject to the Authority making a findings of compliance with the Measure J GMP. Staff Contact: Martin Engelmann

2.2.3 **Proposed Actions to Funding Resolutions.** Consistent with Authority policy, funding appropriation resolutions may be modified to extend their expiration date, to revise the scope of services or to terminate the resolution when the activity funded has been completed. Recommended changes are summarized. Staff Contact: Brad Beck

2.2.4 **Release of the Draft 2015 Congestion Management Program (CMP).** As the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Contra Costa County, the Authority is responsible for preparing a CMP and updating it every other year. The Authority adopted its first CMP in 1991 and the 2015 CMP will be the Authority’s twelfth. Based on the scope approved by the TCC in April, staff has prepared a draft 2015 CMP for circulation, review and comment by Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs), Technical Advisory Committees (TACs), adjacent CMAs, and other interested parties. Comments will be incorporated into a second draft CMP to be forwarded to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in October. Staff Contact: Matt Kelly
2.B.5 Status of GMP Checklist Approvals and Statements of Progress. The Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP) requires that every two years local jurisdictions report GMP compliance activities to the Authority by submittal of a Compliance Checklist. The deadline for submittal of the Calendar Year 2012 & 2013 GMP Checklist is June 30, 2015. At present, 15 of the 20 local jurisdictions have submitted a Checklist. The remaining five jurisdictions must either submit a completed Checklist by July 1, 2015, or submit a “Statement of Progress” indicating the schedule for submittal. Failure to submit a Checklist or “Statement of Progress” constitutes non-compliance with the GMP and potential withholding of Measure J Local Street Maintenance and Improvement funds (18 percent). Staff Contact: Martin Engelmann

2.B.6 City of Hercules (Hercules) – Hercules Intermodal Transit Center (ITC), Approval of Resolution 12-08-P, Revision 2, to Increase the Appropriation of Measure J Funds from Hercules Rail Station (Project 4001), for Capital Costs of Construction; Resolution 15-42-G to Appropriate Funds from Program 12, Transportation for Livable Communities (CC-TLC), Bay Trail Gap Closure, Hercules ITC (Project 120007), for Capital Costs of Construction; Resolution 15-43-G to Appropriate Funds from Program 13, Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities (PBTF), Creekside Trail Gap Closure (Project 130010), for Capital Costs of Construction; and Resolution 12-06-P, Revision 2, to Modify Conditions.

End of Consent Calendar

3.0 MAJOR DISCUSSION ITEMS:

Commissioner Arnerich arrived at 6:10 p.m.

3.1 NEW ITEM: BART Update. BART Assistant General Manager for Budget and Administration Carter Mau will present BART’s current state of the system, its plan for funding its needs, and collaboration with the Authority.

ACTION: None taken – information only

DISCUSSION: Representative Murray introduced Carter Mau, BART’s Assistant General Manager for Administration and Budget. Mr. Mau gave a PowerPoint presentation on BART’s Critical Capital Needs. The presentation included an overview of BART in Contra Costa County, BART’s FY15-FY24 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) needs, funding sources, CIP baseline funding scenario, potential bond measure and sources for BART’s $1.8 funding shortfall, and a summary of Contra Costa County improvements. The presentation was distributed as a meeting handout.
Mr. Mau stated that BART was a critical transit service in Contra Costa County which improves mobility and quality of life. He noted that the Pittsburg/Bay Point to San Francisco route was the busiest route in the BART system, and that 26 percent of all BART trips begin or end in Contra Costa County. Mr. Mau noted that the average length for a BART trip was 14 miles, however for Contra Costa BART riders the average trip length was 30 miles. He said that BART carries more people in the westbound direction through the Caldecott tunnel during the AM peak hours than the number of vehicles which pass through the tunnel.

Mr. Mau stated that BART had been focused over the last 4-5 years on asset management and that the current estimate for replacing all assets in the BART system was approximately $30 billion. He said that BART had projected its total need over the next ten years at $9.6 billion, of which $4.88 in total funding had been identified and a shortfall of $4.8 remained. Mr. Mau stated that 75 percent of the $9.6 billion need is for reinvestment in the existing system, as much of the infrastructure is nearing 40 years and has reached the end of its useful life; approximately 18 percent is for additional capacity and service. Mr. Mau explained that BART’s ridership was growing rapidly, and that average weekday ridership had grown by 5 percent over the previous year. He stated that the biggest investments in the CIP included new rail cars and a new train control system, and an updated and more efficient maintenance complex, which is located in Hayward. Mr. Mau stated that the biggest source of CIP funding would continue to be the federal government at approximately $2.2 billion, which is followed by BART’s operating budget allocations of approximately $1.68 billion. He noted that over the last 10 years, BART had contributed in excess of $500 million of its own operating funds, including fares, sales and property taxes, into capital improvements.

Mr. Mau reviewed a graphic that depicted funding sources and needs for the various components of BART’s CIP. He noted that while 775 BART cars are funded, 306 additional cars are not. He also highlighted the need for funding for system reinvestment, station access and security, and capacity expansion. Mr. Mau emphasized that BART was under stress and that funding was needed to maintain efficient and reliable service.

To address the $4.8 billion funding shortfall, Mr. Mau said that the BART Board was discussing a potential $3 billion bond measure for consideration by voters in BART counties in 2016, and that a decision would be made later in the year. If the Board decides to move forward with such a measure, Mr. Mau said that funding would be utilized for fixed existing infrastructure first. Potential sources for the remaining $1.8 billion shortfall (the $4.8 billion shortfall less the $3 billion potential bond measure) include a federal core capacity grant, State cap and trade funds, a potential Regional
Measure 3 bridge toll increase through MTC, possible sales tax measures in the three counties in which BART operates, as well as other local sources.

Mr. Mau stated that BART was interested in working collaboratively with the Authority to address BART’s need for CIP funding which could result in more service, longer trains and shorter waits in Contra Costa.

Several Authority members expressed their appreciation for Mr. Mau’s comprehensive presentation, after which a lengthy question and answer period and discussion of BART’s and CCTA’s potential revenue measures ensued.

3.2 Development of a Transportation Sales Tax Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)

3.2.1 NEW ITEM: Approval of Appointment of Members to the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC). Staff recommends the Authority appoint additional members to the EPAC to represent the business park membership category. The Authority has approved the formation of the EPAC and appointed individuals to serve on the Committee. The committee membership represents a balance of stakeholders that reflect the broad range of issues and interests in Contra Costa. Staff will continue to identify potential members for vacant positions. Interested individuals may be considered for interim appointment by the Chair to allow participation at the next EPAC meeting, and for confirmed appointment at future meetings of the Authority. Staff Contact: Ross Chittenden

ACTION: Commissioner Hudson moved to appoint additional members to the EPAC as discussed, seconded by Commissioner Arnerich. The motion passed unanimously, 11-0.

DISCUSSION: Ross Chittenden, Deputy Executive Director for Projects, stated that at the request of the Authority in June, a Business Parks category had been added to the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC). He said that staff was requesting that Alex Mehran Sr. from Sunset Development/Bishop Ranch be appointed as the primary representative, and that Chris Truebridge, also from Sunset Development/Bishop Ranch, be appointed as the alternate.

Mr. Chittenden reported that staff had been working diligently to fill the Public Health category however was not ready yet to identify recommended representatives.

3.2.2 NEW ITEM: Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) June 3, 2015 Meeting Minutes. Review of the June 3, 2015 Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) Meeting (#1) Summary/Minutes. Staff recommends the Authority review the EPAC Meeting (#1) Summary/Minutes. The Authority has approved the formation of the
EPAC, one component of a comprehensive stakeholder outreach program necessary to
gain consensus on a Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) for a potential 2016 sales tax
ballot measure. The EPAC is scheduled to meet through December 2015 to discuss a
wide range of issues associated with the creation of a TEP. Staff Contact:
Ross Chittenden

**ACTION:** None taken – information only

**DISCUSSION:** Ross Chittenden, Deputy Executive Director for Projects, stated that staff
had brought forward a summary of the June 3, 2015 EPAC meeting as requested by the
Authority for information only, as well as the draft schedule of agenda topics and EPAC
meeting calendar, which he reviewed. Mr. Chittenden noted that meetings would
continue to be held at the Embassy Suites Walnut Creek due to the large number of
meeting participants, and that the next meeting, scheduled for August 10, 2015, would
include eleven presentations and would last approximately 3.5 hours.

Mr. Chittenden said there seemed to be a misperception that the EPAC was driving the
TEP process. He said that staff would make clear that the objective is to maintain a
balanced approach and that the Authority would be accepting input from three main
channels – the Regional Transportation Planning Committees, the EPAC, and directly
from the public.

3.2.3 **NEW ITEM: Proposed Public Education and Outreach Plan to Support
Development of a TEP.** At this time, the Authority Board has indicated that a
Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) may be put before voters in 2016 and has
directed staff to proceed with development of a plan. Staff has prepared a draft scope
and budget for public education and outreach activities designed to lay the groundwork
for a successful and inclusive TEP development process. Staff Contact: Linsey Willis

**ACTION:** Commissioner Tatzin moved to approve the proposed public education and
outreach plan and associated costs for activities through December 2015, seconded by
Commissioner Hudson. The motion passed unanimously, 11-0.

**DISCUSSION:** Linsey Willis, Director of External Affairs, gave a PowerPoint presentation
on the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) public engagement plan for the July
through December 2015 period. The presentation included an overview of the
Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) public outreach effort, what was heard, and what
is next. The presentation was distributed as a meeting handout.

Ms. Willis stated that during the CTP public outreach effort, which occurred August
through November 2014, nearly 7,000 people provided input on their transportation
priorities and bright ideas through participation in the online tool, a telephone town hall meeting, paper surveys and in-person workshops. She said that the objective for the July through December 2015 period was to continue to engage and educate the public about the TEP process and why CCTA is developing a plan, to solicit opinions on future transportation investments in Contra Costa, and to expand efforts to reach more members of the community. Ms. Willis noted that she hoped to double the number of direct participants.

Ms. Willis stated that staff planned to continue online engagement utilizing an update to the KeepContraCostaMoving.net website, and that a mobile version of the online tool would be made available. She said that staff was looking closely at ways to ensure that the public is made aware of the different opportunities for providing their feedback, and that a series of telephone town hall meetings would be held to facilitate a conversation between CCTA, the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and the public. She explained that the telephone town hall meetings were a highly effective tool for obtaining direct input from a large group, however they were not currently covered under the Gray-Bowen-Scott contract, which would require a contract amendment.

Ms. Willis said that staff was planning a postage-paid printed survey, and noted that all materials would be made available in both English and Spanish. She stated that a stakeholder toolkit would be prepared to assist Authority members and others in spreading the word that CCTA is seeking input on transportation priorities, and that the toolkit would include talking points, social media posts, newsletter articles, flyers, paper surveys (if requested) and handouts to encourage public participation in the process. Ms. Willis noted that the TEP Ad Hoc Committee would have the opportunity to review all materials before they were released to the public.

Lastly, Ms. Willis stated that the proposed Public Education and Outreach Plan included an optional year-end report (which could later be approved by the Authority), to provide the public with an update on the activities CCTA has undertaken, feedback received, and to inform them of upcoming key milestones and additional opportunities for input.

Commissioner Mitchoff said that she supported the proposed Public Education and Outreach Plan but asked about the funding for the outlined activities. Ms. Willis responded that all elements of the proposed plan, with the exception of the telephone town hall meetings and the optional year-end report, were included in the existing Gray-Bowen-Scott contract. Mr. Chittenden added that staff planned to return to the Authority in September with final communication costs, currently being funded by federal planning dollars.
Commissioner Arnerich thanked Ms. Willis for her excellent work, and noted that the public’s education regarding CCTA was important. He urged caution and said that he was concerned that the Authority was hearing only from a small percentage of those it serves and not from the majority who use automobiles.

Public Comment
Ralph Hoffmann, representing the Citizens’ Climate Lobby and the Sierra Club, stated that mobile communication caused distracted driving, and as a senior citizen he did not like the idea of encouraging mobile engagement in surveys due to the hazards to people in traffic.

Chair Pierce clarified that the mobile online tool was intended to allow people to participate in the online survey from any electronic device and was not intended to be used by people when they are driving a vehicle.

4.0 REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

4.A Administration & Projects Committee:

4.A.7 Authorization to Issue Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 15-3 for Information Technology Management Services (ITMS). Staff seeks authorization to issue RFP No. 15-3 to obtain proposals to provide comprehensive technology support for the Authority’s computing, network, multimedia and communication systems. The scope of services includes technology strategic planning, systems analysis and process improvement, technology procurement, network and systems administration, data security and storage, and desktop user support for computers and mobile devices. Staff Contact: Randall Carlton

ACTION: Commissioner Arnerich moved to authorize staff to issue RFP No. 15-3 for ITMS to provide comprehensive technology support, seconded by Commissioner Hudson. The motion passed unanimously, 11-0.

DISCUSSION: Randy Carlton, Chief Financial Officer, stated that staff was seeing authorization to issue Request for Proposal (RFP) 15-3 for information technology management services (ITMS) to address all of the Authority’s current and future technology support needs. He noted that due to the Authority small staff size, outsourcing ITMS made sense. Mr. Carlton explained that changes over the last ten years included the acquisition of CCTA’s own financial system and in-house processing of payables, live audio streaming and archiving, video conferencing, increased social media presence, and facilitation of the discussion of autonomous vehicle technology. Mr. Carlton said that RFP 15-3 would
facilitate a technology assessment of where the agency is, where it is going, and a comprehensive technology support plan to improve integration, management and support for all of the Authority’s office applications, systems, and attain other technology objectives.

Commissioner Mitchoff asked if the Authority’s RFP would include a specific amount for the ITMS. She also noted that the lowest bidder was not always the best option. Mr. Carlton responded that the Authority was spending approximately $60,000 per year for network administration and support, and that staff was working with a consultant to perform a complete inventory for inclusion in the RFP, from which a budget would be developed for comparison to the proposals when they are received.

Commissioner Romick said that he thought staff’s approach was good.

4.B Planning Committee: None

5.0 CORRESPONDENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS:

5.1 Memorandum dated June 26, 2015 to RTPC Managers, EPAC and interested parties RE: Transmittal of Qualitative Project Performance Assessment

6.0 ASSOCIATED COMMITTEE REPORTS:

6.1 Central County (TRANSPAC): The report of July 9, 2015 was distributed as a meeting handout.

6.2 East County (TRANSPLAN): Report of June 11, 2015; The report of July 9, 2015 was distributed as a meeting handout.

6.3 Southwest County (SWAT): Report of July 16, 2015 (Meeting handout if available)

6.4 West County (WCCTAC): Report of June 26, 2015

7.0 COMMISSIONER AND STAFF COMMENTS:

7.1 Chair’s Comments and Reports

Chair Pierce said that she recently chaired the CALCOG Board meeting. She said that there was good representation and that they would be doing some very good work.

7.2 Commissioners’ Comments and Reports on Activities and Meetings
7.3 Executive Staff Comments and Reports

Randy Iwasaki reported that Jack Hall had attended the Concord City Council Meeting at which the MOU outlining how CCTA and the City will conduct business with respect to the Gomentum Station at the Concord Naval Weapons Station was unanimously approved.

Randy Iwasaki then reviewed his Executive Director’s report, highlighting the call with Senator Maria Cantwell’s staff in which he and Linsey Willis participated regarding the Senator’s freight legislation, the strategic forum to be hosted by the U.S. Government Accountability Office in Washington D.C., a presentation he gave to the NEXCO East Executive team, and a KGO radio interview that Linsey Willis gave to KGO regarding the MOU which was approved by the Concord City Council for the GoMentum Station.

8.0 CALENDAR:

8.1 Meeting Calendar: August/September/October 2015

8.2 Calendar of Upcoming Events

9.0 CLOSED SESSION: Conference with Labor Negotiators pursuant to Government Code §54957.6. Agency Designated Representatives: Julie Pierce, Chair, Don Tatzin, APC Chair. Unrepresented Employees: Executive Director, Deputy Executive Director, Projects. (No Attachment – Action to be Determined)

10.0 RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION – Report on Action Taken in Closed Session

The meeting was reconvened in open session and there was no action to report. Direction was provided to staff during the closed session.

11.0 ADJOURNMENT to Wednesday, September 16, 2015

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m. to Wednesday, September 16, 2015.
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## Administration and Projects Committee STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 3, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Accept Quarterly Cash and Investment Report for the Period Ended June 30, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Issues</td>
<td>The Authority’s Investment Policy calls for a quarterly report on investment activity to be prepared and submitted to the Executive Director, APC, and the Authority Board. The accompanying report covers transactions from April 1 through June 30, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Staff seeks acceptance of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td>A summary of balances and transactions is provided in the text below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Investment Detail for Quarter Ended June 30, 2015  
C. Investment Transactions for Quarter Ended June 30, 2015  
D. Compliance Report for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2015 |
| Changes from Committee | None |

### Background

The Authority’s Investment Policy calls for a quarterly report to be submitted to the Executive Director, APC, and the Authority Board. The report summarizes investment balances, transactions, returns, and other pertinent investment matters. The Authority’s cash and securities are invested in separate portfolios depending upon the objectives for the assets being managed. As of June 30, 2015, the combined total market value for all cash and investments was $182,398,239.
Checking Account - $1,908,854

This is the Authority’s commercial banking account for accounts payable, payroll, deposits and electronic activity. Unencumbered funds at the end of each business day are invested in an interest bearing account with Wells Fargo Bank.

Portfolio Cash Account - $17,408,242

The Investment Portfolio’s balance is invested in the Wells Fargo Investment Government Money Market fund while cash is in transition for the purchase of investment securities.

Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) - $17,034,931

LAIF is a pooled investment fund managed by the State Treasurer’s Office for the investment of public agency funds. LAIF is a short term investment alternative for the Authority. The LAIF return was 0.29% for the quarter.

Investment Portfolio - $103,133,302

The Investment Portfolio includes individual securities, such as Treasury Notes, Federal Agency Securities, high quality corporate notes and other securities permitted by the Authority’s Investment Policy. The portfolio is actively managed by PFM Asset Management (PFM), the Authority’s independent investment advisor. The investment strategy is to manage total return consistent with 1 to 3 year maturity treasuries as benchmarks for performance and maturity duration. Annualized returns for the portfolio and the benchmarks are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annualized Returns as of June 30, 2015</th>
<th>CCTA</th>
<th>1-3 Year UST Index*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Year</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past 2 Years</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Duration (Years)</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This index is the Bank of America Merrill Lynch 1 – 3 years U.S. Treasury Note Index. This is a commonly used total return index of all U.S. Treasuries with a maturity between 1 and 3 years.

The figures above represent total return numbers. Total return is a period-to-period performance measurement that includes income, realized and unrealized gains and losses. Total return is an industry standard method of measuring performance. This differs from yield, which is simply a snapshot projection of the income to be earned for the coming year, and
includes no principal value changes. Total return for the twelve months ended June 30, 2015 was 0.98%. Cash received on the portfolio totaled $246,031. Summary and detail information regarding securities within the portfolio can be found in the accompanying reports from PFM.

**PFM Portfolio Manager Commentary:**

- The economy continued to rebound nicely from the first quarter’s weather-related slowdown. Data released in June showed stronger retail sales, consumer credit, consumer sentiment, small business optimism, and both new and existing home sales.

- The U.S. unemployment rate dropped to 5.3% in June as the economy continued its pace of adding more than 200,000 new jobs per month. However, hourly earnings barely rose and the labor force participation rate declined, dampening enthusiasm over the strength of the job market.

- The situation in Europe grew tense as negotiations between Greece and its creditors broke down. Greek citizens voted overwhelmingly against creditor demands, leaving the possibility open that Greece would abandon the euro and even leave the Eurozone. Volatility shook European markets and threatened to affect U.S. markets.

- While the Federal Reserve (Fed) seemed inclined to raise short-term rates later this year, the unsettled global situation could delay this action until 2016 even if labor markets and inflation trends support monetary tightening.

**Bond Markets**

- U.S. Treasury yields ended a volatile month higher across the curve, with longer maturities rising the most. The month of June closed with two and 10-year Treasury yields increasing by 0.04% and 0.23%, resulting in a steeper yield curve.

- Rising rates led to negative returns on all but the shortest fixed-income market indices. Corporates and mortgage-backed securities (MBS) also suffered from spread widening, in large part due to heightened volatility and concern regarding the end game for Greece.

- Agency yield spreads narrowed modestly for shorter maturities, but widened for longer maturities. As a result, Agency indices outperformed their Treasury counterparts for shorter maturities and underperformed for longer maturities.
• While demand for high-quality corporate securities remained strong, corporate yield spreads increased due to Greek related weakness in credit markets, resulting in underperformance for the month.

• The Federal Open Market Committee’s (FOMC’s) patient stance on policy normalization helped to stabilize money market yields. Three-month London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR) and commercial paper yields were relatively unchanged in June.

PFMAM Outlook

• The volatile Greek situation has pushed talk of a tighter Fed policy to the sidelines at least temporarily, and put global investors in a defensive mode. As long as the situation in Europe remains unsettled, investors will bid up prices of U.S. Treasuries (and German bonds) and avoid nearly every other asset. A week ago, this seemed like a temporary matter, but there is nothing in the behavior of European leaders to suggest that the situation will be resolved soon.

• We expect the forward momentum of the U.S. economy to continue, ultimately leading the Fed to begin tightening credit, but global volatility could delay this move, and the demand for U.S. Treasury securities should temporarily push interest rates down from recent levels.

• Our current outlook continues to support investing short and intermediate duration portfolios in a duration neutral manner. This effort should help reduce risk from volatile short-term rate moves, and portfolios should benefit from roll-down as the higher yields of investments beyond the cash space insulate against potential market value erosion.

• The corporate sector is well supported by the growing U.S. economy, and the Greek related spread widening presents an opportunity to add corporates at attractive yields.

• We continue to see value in money-market-type securities that mature beyond the natural investment horizon of money-market mutual funds, with the possible delay in Fed tightening adding to the attractiveness of these maturities.

2012 Series B Bonds - $35,827,324

This portfolio contains Measure J construction bond proceeds from the 2012 Series B Sales Tax Revenue Bonds issued on December 18, 2012. The bond proceeds are invested in a local agency investment fund, the Capital Asset Management Program (CAMP), and drawn down on a
monthly basis as needed to fund invoices related to expenditures for Measure J projects. CAMP’s return was 0.09% for the month of June 2015.

Securities Held in Escrow - $7,085,586

The Authority has an Interest Rate Swap contract with Bank of America as a tool to hedge against variable interest rate exposure on the Authority’s $201.5 million Floating Rate Notes (FRNs). The Swap’s market value changes as long term interest rates change. As interest rates decline, the market value of the Swap declines. For the past 6 months, long term interest rates have been declining due to concerns over a weakening global economy. As rates decline, the Swap value has declined to a negative $43.7 million as of June 30th; a change from a negative $53.3 million the prior quarter end. The Authority is required to post collateral in the form of cash or securities for amounts below a negative $40 million. Bank of America currently holds $7 million (par value) of Authority securities as collateral. While held by Bank of America, all interest generated from these securities passes through to the Authority. The securities will be returned to the Authority’s custody bank when long term interest rates rise and the value is greater than a negative $40 million.

Certification: The investment portfolio is in compliance with the Authority’s adopted investment policy. Furthermore, as required by State regulation, it is certified that the Authority has sufficient cash liquidity to meet expected expenditure requirements over the next six months for fiscal operations. This information has been reviewed and approved by the Authority’s Chief Financial Officer.

Randall O. Carlton
Chief Financial Officer
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Subject | Accept Quarterly Sales Tax Revenue Report for the Period Ended June 30, 2015
--- | ---
Summary of Issues | This report contains a summary of sales tax revenues, including analysis and comparisons against prior monthly and quarterly periods.
Recommendations | Staff seeks acceptance of these reports.
Financial Implications | None
Options | N/A
Attachments (See APC Packet dated 9/3/15) | A. Sales Tax Revenues, Monthly Comparison
B. Sales Tax Revenues, Quarterly Comparison
Changes from Committee | None

Background

Sales tax revenues are collected by the State Board of Equalization (SBOE), and distributed to the jurisdictions in monthly installments (advances) based on quarterly estimates for taxable sales for the county. Actual sales tax revenues are accounted for in a “cleanup payment” four times a year. The months of March, June, September and December include cleanup payments for the prior respective quarters. For example, the March payment includes the cleanup payment to adjust for actual receipts of the prior period October, November and December. Therefore the timing and amount of advances and cleanup payments do not directly correlate to the point-of-sale transactions.

Sales Tax Revenues

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2015, the Authority’s sales tax revenues totaled $79.5 million (98.9%) of the $80.4 million budget. Compared to the prior fiscal year, this is an increase of $3.6 million (4.7%). The Authority has budgeted $82.4 million (2.5% Increase) in sales tax revenues for Fiscal Year 2015-16.
Overall, the continued improvement in sectors including the construction and heavy equipment, new auto sales, retail and restaurants revenue resulted in sales tax revenue increase of 4.7% over the prior year. Below is a brief analysis by quarter:

- Calendar year 2014 Third Quarter (July through September) – The clean-up payment of $2.0 million for this quarter was received in December. Comparing point-of-sale transactions for this quarter in 2014 vs. 2013, sales tax revenues increased $1.1 million or 5.54% compared to the prior year period. The third quarter shows continued improvement in the construction and heavy equipment and new auto sales sectors which increased $288 thousand (12.6%) and $245 thousand (10.9%), respectively.

- Calendar year 2014 Fourth Quarter (October through December sales) – Sales tax receipts for this quarter increased $646,985 or 3.13% compared to the prior year period. Continued improvement was shown in the construction and heavy equipment, auto, retail stores and restaurant sectors, with sales increases of $210,358 (8.99%), $154,268 (7.02%), $180,091 (4.01%) and $101,468 (5.68%) respectively. However, the reduction in gas prices resulted in a loss of $163,422 (8.42%) in comparison to the same period a year ago. Year to date sales tax receipts for gas July through December 2014 compared to the same period in 2013 decreased by $61,367 (1.53%).

- Calendar year 2015 First Quarter (January through March sales) – Sales tax receipts increased $453,790 or 2.49% compared to the prior year period. The first quarter shows continued improvement in the auto, retail stores, construction and heavy equipment and restaurant sectors, with sales increases of $212,000 (9.9%), $231,000 (7.3%), $200,000 (9.3%) and $156,000 (8.5%) respectively. However, sales tax receipts for gas saw a decrease of $483,000 (23.8%) over the prior year, and a fiscal year to date decrease of $545,000 (9.00%) compared to the same period in 2014.

- Calendar 2015 Second Quarter (April through June) – Sales tax receipts increased $255,940 or 1.29% compared to the prior year period. Final sales tax receipts and point-of-sale transactions for the second quarter are unknown until late September, but the advances received for the months of July and August are based on the State Department of Finance estimated increase or decrease (Statewide) over the prior year amount. A final true-up payment on the prior advances will be received in September 2015.

Staff continues to monitor sales tax receipts and will keep the APC and Authority Board apprised.
# Administration and Projects Committee STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 3, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>I-80/San Pablo Dam Road Interchange Reconstruction, Phase 1 (Project 7002) – Authorization to Execute Agreement No. 415 with The Hanna Group for Construction Management (CM) Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Summary of Issues | The Hanna Group was selected as the most qualified consultant to provide CM Services under RFP 15-2 for the I-80/San Pablo Dam Road Reconstruction, Phase 1 Project.  
At the Board meeting on May 7, 2015, approval was given for staff to begin negotiations on scope and fee, and once completed, to issue a Notice to Proceed (NTP) in an amount not to exceed $100,000.  
Staff has successfully concluded its negotiations with the Hanna Group on scope and fee. The NTP was issued on July 13, 2015. |
| Recommendations | Staff seeks authorization for the Chair to execute Agreement No. 415 with The Hanna Group in the amount of $2,869,102, to provide CM Services through December 31, 2017. |
| Financial Implications | I-80/San Pablo Dam Road Interchange Reconstruction, Phase 1 Project is fully funded. Adequate funding for CM Services is included in the budget for the project. The CM contract will be funded by a mix of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Measure J and the City of San Pablo local funds. |
| Options | The Authority could elect not to approve this request. However, CM Services are needed to advertise and award the construction contract. |
| Attachments (See APC Packet dated 9/3/15) | A. Agreement No. 415 |
| Changes from Committee | None |
Background

Based on the evaluation performed under RFP 15-2 for CM Services for the San Pablo Dam Road Reconstruction, Phase 1 Project, The Hanna Group was selected as the most qualified to perform the services.

At the Board meeting on May 20, 2015, approval was given to begin negotiations with The Hanna Group on scope and fee, and once negotiated, issue a NTP in an amount not to exceed $100,000. The NTP was issued on July 13, 2015.

The Hanna Group has developed a scope and fee proposal for the project which is included in the agreement provided in Attachment A of this staff report.

Schedule

The tentative schedule for this project is as follows:

- **Advertise**: 8/15
- **Open Bids**: 9/15
- **Award**: 11/15
- **Begin Con.**: 2/16
- **Completion**: 11/17
**Subject**
City of Concord – Farm Bureau Road Safe Route to School (SR2S)/Complete Streets Improvements – Phase 2 (Project 24012) – Request for Appropriation of Measure J Funds for Design

**Summary of Issues**
The City of Concord is requesting an appropriation of $519,360 of Measure J funds for Phase 2 of Farm Bureau Road SR2S/Complete Streets Improvements Project. This appropriation is for the design phase of the project.

Phase 2 of this project will provide complete streets improvements on Farm Bureau Road between Wren Avenue and Walnut Avenue.

**Recommendations**
Staff seeks approval of Resolution 15-45-P which will appropriate $519,360 in Measure J Funds for the design phase of Farm Bureau Road SR2S/Complete Streets Improvements – Phase 2 Project.

**Financial Implications**

**Options**
The Authority could choose to alter this request.

**Attachments (See APC Packet dated 9/3/15)**
A. Letter from the City of Concord dated August 6, 2015
B. Resolution 15-45-P
C. Project Fact Sheet

**Changes from Committee**
None

**Background**
Phase 2 of the Farm Bureau Road SR2S/Complete Streets Improvements Project will construct complete streets features between Wren Avenue and Walnut Avenue. The project will create...
safer access for all modes of users, including pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists. Improvements include new sidewalks, street lighting, on-street parking, Class 2 bicycle lanes, shortened crosswalks and access compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

The project is ready to start the design phase. The requested appropriation will cover the costs of public outreach, environmental services, design administration, right-of-way (ROW) assessment and design services.

The project, totaling $3,800,000, is fully funded with Measure J funds.
# Administration and Projects Committee STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 3, 2015

## Subject

City of San Ramon – Alcosta Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation (Project 24021) – Request for Appropriation of Measure J Funds for Construction

## Summary of Issues

The City of San Ramon (City) is requesting an appropriation of $2,000,000 of Measure J funds for the Alcosta Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation Project construction.

Due to a misunderstanding of Measure J appropriation procedures, the City did not submit a request for appropriation before the start of project construction in July 2015. The City requests that reimbursement of construction costs be retroactive to the Notice to Proceed (NTP) date of July 16, 2015.

The project will rehabilitate the existing pavement on Alcosta Boulevard, replace sidewalks and reconstruct curb ramps that will be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). A peer review was completed on February 24, 2015.

## Recommendations

Staff seeks approval of Resolution 15-47-P which will appropriate $2,000,000 in Measure J Funds for construction. The City also seeks approval of reimbursement of construction costs retroactive to the NTP date of July 16, 2015.

## Financial Implications

The 2013 Measure J Strategic Plan contains sufficient funds in the Major Street: Traffic Flow, Safety and Capacity Improvements funding category.

## Options

The Authority could choose to alter this request.

## Attachments (See APC Packet dated 9/3/15)

A. Letter from the City of San Ramon dated August 11, 2015
B. Resolution 15-47-P
C. Project Fact Sheet
Changes from Committee | None

Background

The Alcosta Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation Project will rehabilitate the existing pavement on Alcosta Boulevard, replace sidewalks and reconstruct curb ramps that will be compliant with ADA requirements.

According to the Measure J Local Agency Coordination Guide, the Authority is not responsible for, and will not reimburse, any project expenses incurred prior to the approval date of the funding resolution for each phase of the project. Because of a misunderstanding of the procedures, the City did not request a funding resolution for construction prior to beginning of the project construction in July 2015. The City learned about the necessity of a Measure J funding request for the construction phase in a recent communication with CCTA staff. Therefore, the City requests that reimbursement of construction cost be retroactive to the NTP date of July 16, 2015.

The total project cost is $2,650,000 and is fully funded with Measure J and local funds. The construction is expected to be complete in December 2015.
### Administration and Projects Committee STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 3, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Authorization to Execute Amendment No. 3 to Agreement No. 359 with Keystone Public Affairs, LLC (Keystone) for Federal Lobbying/Consultation Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Issues</td>
<td>This item concerns the proposed extension of Agreement No. 359 between the Authority and Keystone through June 30, 2016 at the current rate of $2,200 per month, after which the Authority may, at its discretion, extend the agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Staff seeks authorization for the Chair to execute Amendment No. 3 to Agreement No. 359 with Keystone at a rate of $2,200 per month, for a total agreement value of $26,400, to provide Federal Lobbying/Consultation Services and to extend the agreement termination date through June 30, 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td>Payment for FY 2015-16 will total $26,400. This amount has been included in the Authority’s adopted FY 2015-16 Budget. Renewal of this agreement beyond June 30, 2016 will be subject to future approval by the Authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Options | 1. Approve Amendment No. 3 to Agreement No. 359 for six months, and direct staff to conduct a competitive selection process.  
2. Discontinue advocacy efforts at the Federal level. |
| Attachments (See APC Packet dated 9/3/15) | A. Proposed Scope of Work for FY 2015-16 |
| Changes from Committee | None |
Background

In August 2012, the Executive Director, on behalf of the Authority, entered into Agreement No. 359 with Keystone to provide consulting services and advocacy with respect to transportation and related issues on the federal level. This decision was made in light of the passage of long-awaited legislation reauthorizing the federal surface transportation program (MAP-21), which marked a significant change in the way federal funding is allocated. At the time, Authority members wanted assurance that they would be kept up-to-date as to changes in federal rules and policies, alerted to funding opportunities for transportation projects, and receive solid advice as to how best to navigate the new processes. The agreement was to be effective for five months (through January 31, 2013), at which time staff was directed to provide a status report on this effort and offer recommendations going forward.

In January 2013, the Authority executed Amendment No. 1 which extended the agreement termination date from February 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014 at a rate of $2,000 per month for a total agreement value of $34,000. This amendment also included a 30-day cancellation clause and the option to renew the agreement for an additional two years at a rate to be negotiated.

In July 2014, the Authority executed Amendment No. 2 which extended the agreement termination date from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015 at a rate of $2,200 per month for a total agreement value of $26,400.

As facilitated by Keystone, members of the Authority Board along with senior staff have made three advocacy trips to Washington, DC under previous contracts during which they met with senior leaders of the Department of Transportation and related agencies, members of Congress, senior staff of both the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, as well as relevant trade associations.

In addition to facilitating meetings and access for staff and Authority Board members, Keystone prepares a recommended federal advocacy platform annually, provides analysis and monthly updates to senior staff which include notification of pressing issues in Washington. Most recently, Keystone has been assisting with securing letters of support for the Authority’s Connected Vehicle Pilot Deployment Program grant application. As both the Senate and potential House reauthorization proposals move forward, it is important for the Authority to remain updated on the progress of the reauthorization, as well as the implications of the new legislative language.
At this time, staff recommends that the Authority approve Amendment No. 3 to Agreement No. 359 with Keystone, which includes the regular tasks as outlined in the attached scope of work, extending the agreement termination date through June 30, 2016 at a rate of $2,200 per month for a total agreement value of $26,400.
Administration and Projects Committee STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: September 3, 2015

Subject
Update on Financing Plan Related to the Remarketing of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority Series 2012A Bonds and a Proposed Cost Saving Modification

Summary of Issues
On May 20th the Authority approved a financing plan to remarket the Series 2012A Bonds on or before a mandatory tender date that occurs on December 15, 2015. Staff will provide an update on this plan, including current market conditions and discuss a proposed cost-savings modification to the bond approach.

Recommendation
Staff recommends that the APC receive the update, direct staff to modify the financing plan to achieve cost savings and return to the Board for final approval.

Financial Implications
The proposed modification is estimated to reduce the Authority’s borrowing cost by approximately $1 million over the next 3 years.

Options
1. Provide direction to modify the financing plan.
2. Other direction as may be determined.

Attachments
None

Changes from Committee
Staff provided verbal clarification that floating rate notes are necessary due to requirements associated with the Authority’s existing interest rate SWAP contract. There really is no practical alternative.

Background

On May 20, 2015, the Authority approved Resolution 15-16-A authorizing a remarketing of the Authority’s $201 million Series 2012A Bonds. In general, a remarketing is a transaction that will establish a new interest rate when the existing terms expire. Over the past several months the Authority has been working with its financing team to prepare the remarketing transaction consistent with the provisions of the Resolution. During that timeframe, however, interest rates have risen and an alternative form of borrowing has emerged as a more cost effective solution.
The APC will receive an update on the current conditions and be asked to consider a modification to the financing plan that meets the same objective of completing the remarketing on or before December 15, 2015.

The Series 2012A Bonds are specifically called Floating Rate Notes (FRNs) and mature in March 2034. FRNs are a form of debt similar in concept to how an adjustable rate mortgage loan works, based on a predetermined market index, plus a fixed spread and for a set number of years. The existing terms of Series 2012A call for a monthly interest rate reset based on 67% of the current 1-month London Interbank Offered Rate (LIBOR) plus a fixed spread of 0.37%. The interest rate for the month of August 2015 (including the fixed spread) was 0.4963%. The fixed spread of 0.37% was established in 2012 for a 3-year period that ends on December 15, 2015 (the mandatory tender date).

**Why Floating Rate Notes?**

Approximately 60% of the Authority’s $366.3 million outstanding debt is FRNs. Conventional wisdom would suggest that in a low interest rate environment issuing long term fixed rate bonds is the most cost effective, predictable and the risk adverse path. That is generally true. The Authority, like other large public agency issuers, utilizes both types of debt (floating and fixed) to diversify liability and meet certain objectives. The FRNs address an important purpose that calls for a floating rate form of debt to integrate with the Authority’s $200 million interest rate swap contract with Bank of America. The FRNs and the swap are based on the same 1-month LIBOR index. In summary, the Authority pays FRN interest to bondholders and receives funds from Bank of America simultaneously based on the same 1-month LIBOR index. The swap therefore mitigates (“hedges”) the Authority’s interest rate exposure.

The Series 2012A Bonds were preceded by FRNs issued in 2010 (the “2010 FRNs). Before the 3-year term ended on the 2010 FRNs the Authority exercised its option to take out the 2010 FRNs with the Series 2012A Bonds. This strategic decision captured a more favorable fixed spread of 0.37% compared to the 0.75% fixed spread on the 2010 FRNs. This transaction reduced the Authority’s borrowing cost by 0.38% or approximately $750,000 over the 3-year period from 2010 to 2013. The 2010 FRNs were issued as a direct purchase by a single bank investor following a Request for Proposal (RFP) process; a generally new alternative at that time for debt financing. The attractiveness of FRNs has since grown to become public debt offerings conducted through conventional bond underwritings with high net worth and institution investors. There now exists two mature methods of issuing FRNs, including direct bank purchase FRNs (the 2010 FRNs) and publicly offered FRNs (the Series 2012A Bonds).
The Authority’s overall debt objective is to execute the most cost effective form of borrowing to preserve maximum purchasing power for capital projects. The most cost effective alternative at the time the May 20th financing plan was approved called for publicly offered FRNs. Staff and the financing team has continued to monitor both the public and direct bank purchase FRN markets. The analysis clearly indicates that interest rates for publicly offered FRNs has increased and become more expensive than the direct bank purchase alternative. For instance, a 3-year fixed rate spread in May was approximately 0.35% and has since risen to about 0.70%, an increase of approximately $700,000 in debt service costs annually. The level of interest rates for direct bank purchase FRNs has not been subjected to the same market factors that have driven rates higher for a public offering. Fixed spreads for the direct purchase alternative remain at approximately 0.45%.

There are two forms of FRNs being discussed: a direct purchase by a bank and a public offering via a bond underwriter that resales the FRNs to individuals and institutions. The most cost effective alternative currently is a direct bank purchase as was done with the 2010 FRNs. The amount of savings is approximately $1 million over the next 3-years. The Authority’s financial advisory firm, Public Financial Management, has assisted staff with analyzing the direct purchase method. The primary benefit is the estimated $1 million savings. The other main difference with the direct purchase is a typical provision by the banks that if the Authority fails to remarket the FRNs by the next mandatory tender date (likely to be December 2018), the Authority would be required to repay the entire principal amount over the following 3-years, including interest at a stepped up level. That risk is usual and customary in variable rate transactions and mitigated by the Authority’s strong credit rating and capacity to remarket or refinance the FRNs on or before the mandatory tender date.

**Next Steps**

If the APC and Authority Board provide direction to modify the financing plan as recommended by staff, the next step will be for Public Financial Management (PFM) to issue an RFP on behalf of the Authority to obtain direct purchase proposals from qualified banks. PFM and staff will evaluate proposed terms and return to the APC and Authority Board meetings in November with the most cost responsive and effective recommendation for final approval. Board approval in November will provide staff and the financing team with sufficient time to close the transaction on or before the mandatory tender date of December 15, 2015.
### Administration and Projects Committee STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 3, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>I-680 Carpool Lane Completion/Express Lanes Project – Northbound (NB) Segment Design Alternatives Analysis (Project 8001) - Approval of Authorization to Execute Cooperative Agreement No. 08C.01 with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for the Contra Costa I-680 (North) Northbound (NB)-Design Alternative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Issues</strong></td>
<td>The Authority is partnering with MTC to implement express lanes along the full length of the I-680 corridor in Contra Costa County. As planned, there will be a gap in the NB express lane through the I-680/State Route 24 (SR24) interchange which would create an operational bottleneck. Congestion levels on NB I-680 have worsened over the past few years, partly due to the bottleneck through the interchange. Authority staff have been working with MTC to develop a scope for a consultant contract to assess various design alternatives and operational strategies that could be employed to address current and forecast congestion in the NB direction of I-680. Addressing this congestion is a priority for the Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) and the Transportation Partnership and Cooperation (TRANSPAC) from possible new funding sources including a potential new sales tax measure. MTC has released a Request for Proposal (RFP) with the intent to develop scope for a project or series of projects to include in the next Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and has asked the Authority to partner in funding the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>No action is needed at this time. Staff is working with MTC to develop an agreement to be considered by the Authority on September 16, 2015. Staff seeks authorization for the Chair to execute Cooperative Agreement No. 08C.01 with MTC in the amount of $150,000 for MTC reimbursed services to perform a Design Alternatives Analysis for NB I-680 improvements leading up to and through the SR24 interchange, and authorize the Executive Director to make non-substantive changes as needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study, if approved, would be funded from contingencies on the I-680 (North) Express Lane Project. There are sufficient funds in the 2013 Strategic Plan under the I-680 Carpool Lane Completion/Express Lanes (Project 8001) to fund this request.

Options

1. **N/A** Reduce the contribution or elect not to contribute, which would require MTC to down scope the work and potentially not be able to draw sufficiently informed conclusions in support of ideas for future improvements in the corridor.

2. Pursue a similar study without participation from MTC.

Attachments (Note New Attachment A)

A. None

Draft Agreement No. 08C.01 (New Attachment)

Changes from Committee

None

Background

The Authority is partnering with MTC to implement express lanes along the full length of the I-680 corridor in Contra Costa County. MTC obtained the authority to develop the Bay Area Regional Express Lane Network under an application approved in 2011 by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The approved express lane network indicated that there would be a gap in the I-680 NB express lane through Walnut Creek due to geometric constraints in the I-680/SR24 interchange. The approved express lane application indicated that operational strategies would be implemented to address the gap in the express lane network.

Over the past few years, congestion throughout the Bay Area has increased with NB I-680 corridor experiencing the fifth highest amount of commuter delay. The SWAT and TRANSPAC have each proposed funding to address this congestion in their proposals for potential new sales tax revenues. MTC is initiating its new "Columbus Day Initiative" and proposes to include I-680 in the next RTP as one of three corridors to assess for operational and technology strategies to address congestion. MTC has released an RFP with the intent to develop scope for a project or series of projects to include in the next RTP and has asked the Authority to partner in funding the study.
Additional information will be provided in an updated staff report for the September 16, 2015 Authority Meeting. Mutual interest in potential future projects to address this NB bottleneck has lead staff to work with MTC staff to determine what options exist and which of these would possibly serve as the first step toward a future solution. Through a combined scoping effort, MTC has released a Request for Qualification (RFQ) to their on-call list for Transportation Engineering and Planning Services with the intent to develop preliminary scope and costs for possible improvements in the I-680 corridor from north of Livorna Road to north of the SR242 interchange. The consultant, under joint direction of MTC and CCTA staff, would then assess these alternatives to identify the best series of projects to include in the next RTP. To accomplish this work, MTC has asked the Authority to partner with funding and to provide staff input into the Design Alternatives Analysis.
FUNDING AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
AND
THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
FOR THE NORTHBOUND I-680 DESIGN ALTERNATIVES ASSESSMENT STUDY

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into as of the ___ day of _____, 2015, by and between the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (herein called "CCTA"), and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, a regional transportation planning agency established pursuant to California Government Code § 66500 et seq., (herein called “MTC”), collectively referred to as “the Parties.”

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, northbound Interstate 680 (I-680) in Contra Costa County from the Alameda County line to Livorna Road and from State Route 242, includes an High Occupancy Vehicle Lane important for the peak hour commutes; and

WHEREAS, the Parties wish to study the alternatives to complete the existing northbound I-680 HOV/express lane through Walnut Creek through a Design Alternatives Analysis (herein called the “Study”); and

WHEREAS, MTC has agreed to engage a Consultant to perform the Study tasks as specified in Attachment A, Scope of Work, attached hereto and incorporated by reference;

WHEREAS, the Parties have agreed to share in the cost of Study and CCTA has agreed to reimburse MTC for such Study activities with Measure J funds; and

WHEREAS, the Study will be led by MTC, in consultation and partnership with CCTA. MTC agrees to provide a Project Manager that will be responsible for ensuring that all objectives are met, coordination and facilitation of meetings, and the administration of this agreement; and CCTA agrees to be a funding contributor and member of the Project Management Team that provides support and direction to MTC’s Project Manager;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Parties hereto agree as follows:

1. SCOPE OF WORK

MTC agrees to engage a consultant to perform the Study activities outlined in Attachment A, Scope of Work, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as though set forth in full.
1.1 STAFF ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Kevin Chen, MTC Senior Transportation Engineer (herein “Project Manager”) will be responsible for the overall administration of the consultant agreement, including approving deliverables listed in Attachment A in conjunction with the other stakeholders, invoices, and day-to-day technical direction. Technical advice will be provided by Ashley Nguyen, MTC Principal and Susan Miller, CCTA Director of Projects (herein "Project Management Team"). Susan Miller will also serve as CCTA’s Project Manager.

2. TIME OF PERFORMANCE

The activities funded by this Agreement shall commence on or after September 16, 2015 and MTC shall complete them by June 30, 2016, unless the agreement is extended by duly executed amendment or earlier terminated as hereinafter provided.

3. FUNDING AND METHOD OF PAYMENT

A. CCTA agrees to reimburse MTC up to one hundred fifty thousand dollars ($150,000) from Measure J funds for the purpose of funding the Study activities described in Attachment A.

B. MTC may submit invoices to CCTA after MTC pays invoices from its consultant. Payment shall be made within thirty (30) days after receipt by CCTA of an acceptable invoice consistent with Attachment B, Sample Invoice, including all supporting details, proof of payment, and certification that the invoice is accurate and not the subject of a prior billing. The invoice shall be subject to the review and approval of CCTA’s Project Manager. MTC shall deliver or mail invoice to CCTA, as follows:

Attn: Accounting Department  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

C. Subject only to duly executed amendments, it is expressly understood and agreed that in no event will the total reimbursement to be paid by CCTA under this Agreement exceed the sum of one hundred fifty thousand dollars ($150,000).

4. AMENDMENTS

Any changes in the activities to be performed under this Agreement shall be incorporated in written amendments, which shall specify the changes in work performed and any adjustments in work payment and schedule. All amendments shall be executed by the CCTA Executive Director, or a designated representative and MTC Executive Director, or a designated
representative. No claim for additional compensation or extension of time shall be recognized unless contained in a duly executed amendment.

5. **TERMINATION**

   Either party may terminate this Agreement without cause upon ten (10) days prior written notice. If CCTA terminates this Agreement without cause, MTC will be entitled to those amounts necessary to reimburse MTC’s consultant for payment for costs incurred for authorized but incomplete deliverables, up to the maximum amount payable for such deliverables. If MTC fails to perform as specified in this Agreement, CCTA may terminate this Agreement for cause by written notice and MTC will be entitled only to those amounts necessary to reimburse MTC’s consultant for costs incurred for work that did not contribute to the default, not to exceed the maximum amount payable under this Agreement for such work.

6. **RETENTION OF RECORDS**

   MTC agrees to keep all records pertaining to the project being funded for audit purposes in accordance with generally accepted accounting practices for a minimum of four (4) years following the fiscal year of the last expenditure under this Agreement.

7. **AUDITS**

   MTC agrees to grant CCTA, and its authorized representatives access to MTC’s books and records for the purpose of verifying that funds are properly accounted for and proceeds are expended in accordance with the terms of this Agreement. All documents shall be available for inspection during normal business hours at any time during the term of this Agreement and for the retention period specified in Article 6, Retention of Records.

8. **INDEMNIFICATION**

   MTC shall indemnify and hold harmless CCTA, its commissioners, directors, officers, agents and employees from any and all claims, demands, suits, loss, damages, injury and/or liability (including any and all costs and expenses in connection therewith), incurred by reason of any negligent or otherwise wrongful act or omission of MTC, its officers, commissioners, directors, employees, and agents, or any of them, under or in connection with this Agreement; and MTC agrees at its own cost, expense and risk to defend any and all claims, actions, suits, or other legal proceedings brought or instituted against CCTA, its commissioners, directors, officers, agents, and employees, or any of them, arising out of such act or omission, and to pay and satisfy any resulting judgments.
MTC agrees to add CCTA as an additional indemnitee in contract provisions providing indemnification to MTC under its consultant agreement.

CCTA shall indemnify and hold harmless MTC, its commissioners, directors, officers, agents and employees from any and all claims, demands, suits, loss, damages, injury and/or liability (including any and all costs and expenses in connection therewith), incurred by reason of any negligent or otherwise wrongful act or omission of CCTA, its officers, directors, employees, and agents, or any of them, under or in connection with this Agreement; and CCTA agrees at its own cost, expense and risk to defend any and all claims, actions, suits, or other legal proceedings brought or instituted against MTC, its commissioners, directors, officers, agents, and employees, or any of them, arising out of such act or omission, and to pay and satisfy any resulting judgments.

9. MEETINGS

MTC agrees to notify CCTA at least three days in advance and invite CCTA to participate in all meetings held in connection with this Study.

10. NOTICES

All notices or other communications to either party by the other shall be deemed given when made in writing and delivered or mailed to such party at their respective addresses as follows:

To MTC: Attention: Kevin Chen
Senior Transportation Engineer
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
Email: kchen@mtc.ca.gov
Fax: (510) 817-5848

To CCTA: Attention: Ross Chittenden
Deputy Executive Director, Projects
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597
Email: rchittenden@ccta.net
Fax: (925) 256-4701
11. **INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR**

The parties agree and understand that the work/services performed by MTC, or its agents, contractors or other Project partners, under this Agreement are performed as independent contractors and not as employees or agents of CCTA. Nothing herein shall be deemed to create any joint venture or partnership arrangement between CCTA and MTC.

12. **ASSIGNMENT**

Neither party shall assign, transfer or otherwise substitute its interest or obligations in this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other party.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement has been executed by the parties hereto as of the day and year first written above.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

__________________________________  
Julie Pierce, Chair

Steve Heminger, Executive Director  
Randall H. Iwasaki, Executive Director

Approved as to form:

__________________________________  
Legal Counsel
ATTACHMENT A
SCOPE OF WORK

TASK 1: MEETINGS, ADMINISTRATION, AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Meetings: There will be six (6) meetings with individual staff from MTC and CCTA, and meetings with the Project Manager and CCTA and the Consultant throughout the Study along with information meetings with stakeholders. The MTC Project Manager will prepare and distribute the agenda and associated materials in advance of each meeting, and prepare action item minutes following each meeting.

Administration: MTC will prepare and review all necessary legal documents, insurance certificates, correspondence, invoices, and associated materials necessary for the successful execution of the Consultant contract.

Project Management: The MTC Project Manager will monitor and report on project progress, and notify the Project Management Team (PMT) of any scope, schedule, or budget issues as they arise. Issues that may affect the Consultant contract shall be noted in the next report to the PMT. For the purposes of this work, the MTC Project Manager will maintain a detailed schedule, risk register, and an action log along with any other project controls tools agreed upon by the PMT.

TASK 2: DESIGN ALTERNATIVES ASSESSMENT (DAA)

This DAA will assess the value of different alternatives from congestion relief, system performance, safety, design feasibility, and cost perspectives. This DAA will identify and evaluate a range of operational strategies to help improve both regional mobility and interchange access.

Based upon the prior project traffic analyses from the current express lanes projects, it is anticipated that the extension of the northbound HOV lane to south of the North Main Street Interchange would reduce congestion. This DAA needs to confirm or modify that understanding and determine what other operational improvement alternatives merit inclusion in the PA/ED phase. Operational strategies to be considered include, but are not limited to:

- converting an existing general purpose lane to express lane;
- implementing a moveable barrier contra flow lane on the southbound express lane to operate as a northbound express lane during the PM peak period;
- adaptive ramp metering;
- a collector distributor road from the North Main St. off-ramp through the Treat Boulevard Interchange with and without braided ramps;
- an HOV direct connector ramp from the Lawrence Way on-ramp into the median;
- removal of the northbound truck scale at the Treat Boulevard off-ramp;
- and widening in selected locations.

The study limits shall be defined to fully capture potential effects of these operational strategies. The appropriate phasing of the recommended design concepts, and packaging of the individual elements where appropriate, will then be carried into the PA&ED phase.
The data collection for this DAA effort should consist of the appropriate use of MTC’s INRIX data along with information from and the recently completed and on-going studies in the vicinity, including the I-680 Northern Segment Express Lanes TOAR, I-680 Southern Segment Express Lanes TOAR, the I-680 HOV Lane Completion Project TOAR, the I-680 Southern Segment Express Lanes Before Study, and the Bay Area Managed Lanes Implementation Plan. Additional new data collection efforts shall be identified, if needed, after an assessment of available information.

Consultant shall recommend the appropriate level of operational analysis to conduct the assessment as described and propose specific tool(s) with which to conduct it. VISSIM microsimulation models have been developed and calibrated for the I-680 express lanes studies in the area. The current CCTA travel demand forecasting model shall be used to develop 2040 traffic forecast. The analysis that is performed is to make possible a comparison of the various alternatives in terms of congestion relief, system performance, safety, design feasibility, revenue potential (an investment grade revenue forecast is not needed), and cost.

Consultant shall meet regularly with staff from both CCTA and MTC who will provide direction to the effort. There will be an in-person kick-off meeting and monthly Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings with CCTA, MTC and stakeholders. Weekly phone meetings will be held with the project manager. In addition, Consultant should recommend a number of focused meetings in order to review deliverables and make decisions over the course of the assessment.

Deliverable(s):
- Traffic data assessment memo
- Design concepts/alternative development scoping memo that defines each concept to be assessed
- Traffic forecast and traffic analysis memo
- Revenue potential assessment memo
- Alternatives assessment matrix including congestion relief, system performance, safety, design feasibility, revenue potential and cost to implement
- Draft and Final Design Alternatives Assessment Technical Memorandum
ATTACHMENT B
SAMPLE INVOICE

MTC LETTER HEAD

INVOICE SUMMARY
Project: XXXX
Project Description

Invoice Number: XXXX
Invoice Amount: YYY

Coop. Agreement:
XXXXXX
Purchase Order No. XXXX

Certification
We hereby certify that the funds requested by are for reimbursement for project costs already incurred and reimbursed and have not been included in a previous invoice request."
This Page Intentionally Blank
## Contra Costa Transportation Authority STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 16, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Approval of Chief Deputy Executive Director Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Issues</strong></td>
<td>On July 15th the Board directed staff to establish the classification of Chief Deputy Executive Director. The “Chief” designation will recognize the expanded role of the existing Deputy Executive Director of Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>Staff seeks approval of Resolution 15-06-A Revision 2 establishing the classification and salary range of Chief Deputy Executive Director. The overall number of Authority positions will remain at 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Implications</strong></td>
<td>The salary range for the proposed classification is $14,815 to $20,000 per month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachments</strong></td>
<td>A. Job Description Addendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Resolution 15-06-A Revision 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes from Committee</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

The Executive Director is requesting approval to add the classification of Chief Deputy Executive Director to the Authority’s list of authorized positions. The new classification will add additional duties to the existing Deputy Executive Director position as noted in Attachment A. The salary range is based on a review of similar positions at other transportation authorities.
The attached position description represents the responsibilities and requirements for fulfillment of the above named Position with the Contra Costa Transportation Authority. It is understood that additional assignments may be added as reasonably required to fulfill the Authority’s mission and goals. In addition to the duties undertaken within the designated position of Deputy Executive Director, the incumbent shall also assume the title of Chief Deputy Executive Director and additional responsibilities as follows:

**Specific Functions and Responsibilities**

- Oversee overall functions of the Authority in the absence of the Executive Director.
- To the extent delegated by the Executive Director, oversee and direct internal operations of the Authority staff including, but not limited to:
  - Day-to-day management of all internal operations;
  - Coordination of policy issues among the Directors and Program Manager; and
  - Conducting periodic meetings of the Directors to address strategic planning, coordination, internal operations, and policy issues.
- Working with the Chief Financial Officer to prepare recommendations regarding staffing, compensation, and other personnel issues.
- Provide counsel and guidance to the Executive Director regarding authority strategic direction, staffing, workload, internal operations, public and governmental relations, and other matters as appropriate.
- Oversee all functions pertaining to the development and consensus building of the Transportation Expenditure Plan and related Ordinance, including, but not limited to:
  - Staff the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC).
  - Develop new sales tax measure ordinance with coordination from stakeholders, including EPAC, other legislative bodies, public agencies, community groups, etc.
  - Travel and attend evening meetings as necessary to fulfill these responsibilities.
• Commensurate with the additional responsibilities the salary range for the Chief Deputy Executive Director designation is adjusted by resolution of the Authority Board.

The signatures below confirm agreement and understanding of the additional position requirements and are contingent upon Authority Board approval of Resolution 15-06-A, Rev 2 and mutual agreement between the parties on the placement point within the range established by the Board in the Resolution.

Ross Chittenden  
Employee Signature  Date  Employee

Randell H. Iwasaki  
Executive Director Signature  Date  Executive Director
RESOLUTION 15-06-A, Revision 2

RE: AUTHORITY SALARIES, BENEFITS AND COMPENSATION PLAN FOR JULY 1, 2015 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2018

WHEREAS, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority ("Authority"), is responsible for administering the sales tax proceeds authorized by the imposition of a one half percent sales tax, pursuant to the Local Transportation Authority and Improvement Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 180000 and following, and Measure C Sales Tax Renewal Ordinance (88-01 as amended by 04-02) hereinafter referred to as “Measure J”, was approved by the voters of Contra Costa County on November 2, 2004;

WHEREAS, the Authority is permitted, pursuant to Public Utilities Code, Section 180106, to hire an independent staff of its employees in order to carry out its objectives;

WHEREAS, the Authority is required, pursuant to Public Utilities Code, Section 180107, to fix the compensation of its employees;

WHEREAS, the Authority is required, pursuant to Public Utilities Code, Section 180109 (b) to limit administrative expenses for salaries and benefits covering the portion of its program funded by the sales tax to no more than one percent of annual revenues;

WHEREAS, the Authority’s Administrative Code, Chapter 6, Article 10, Section 1, calls for the Executive Director to develop an annual Salary Ranges and Benefits Resolution for the upcoming fiscal year or multiple fiscal years beginning July 1 with proposed salary ranges and employee benefits for review and adjustment consideration by the Authority Board;

WHEREAS, prior Authority Salary Ranges and Benefits resolutions have periodically adjusted salary ranges of Authority positions when market conditions warrant (as measured by the salary ranges of comparable agencies and positions) or by the 12-month December ended percent change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all urban wage earners of the San Francisco – Oakland – San Jose, California region;

WHEREAS, on April 15, 2015, the Executive Director proposed a compensation plan inclusive of Authority positions, salary ranges, benefits and other compensation terms for the next fiscal years beginning on July 1, 2015, July 1, 2016 and July 1, 2017, and the Authority approved such terms in Resolution 15-06-A;

WHEREAS, on May 20, 2015, the Authority approved a revision to Resolution 15-06-A, Revision 1 to correct a typographical error in Attachments A-1, A-2 and A-3 of Resolution 15-06-A pertaining to the salary range of the Deputy Executive Director, Projects and corrected the error;
WHEREAS, on September 16, 2015, the Authority approves a subsequent revision to Resolution 15-06-A, Revision 2 to add the classification and salary range of Chief Deputy Executive Director in Attachments A-1, A-2 and A-3 of Resolution 15-06-A; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Resolution 15-06-A, Revision 2 and accompanying Attachments A-1, A-2 and A-3 as revised are hereby adopted.

_________________________________________________________________

Julie K. Pierce, Chair

This RESOLUTION was entered into at the
Meeting of the Contra Costa Transportation
Authority held September 16, 2015 in Walnut Creek, CA.

Attest: ________________________________

Danice J. Rosenbohm, Executive Secretary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Classification</th>
<th>FLSA*</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,333</td>
<td>$29,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Deputy Executive Director</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$14,815</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Executive Director, Projects</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$12,611</td>
<td>$17,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Projects</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$10,704</td>
<td>$14,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Manager</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$10,256</td>
<td>$13,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$8,231</td>
<td>$11,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Engineer</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$7,377</td>
<td>$9,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Transportation Analyst</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$7,097</td>
<td>$9,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$4,437</td>
<td>$5,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Executive Director, Planning</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$11,361</td>
<td>$15,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Transportation Planner</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$7,937</td>
<td>$10,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Transportation Planner</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$6,796</td>
<td>$9,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$4,437</td>
<td>$5,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$11,361</td>
<td>$15,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$8,094</td>
<td>$10,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Accountant</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$6,418</td>
<td>$8,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Specialist</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$5,096</td>
<td>$6,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$5,350</td>
<td>$7,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$4,437</td>
<td>$5,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs and Governmental Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of External Affairs</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$10,213</td>
<td>$13,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs Manager</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$8,745</td>
<td>$11,813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fair Labor Standards Act (E-Exempt, NE-Nonexempt)
## Salary Schedule (Revised September 16, 2015)

**Fiscal Year July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Classification</th>
<th>FLSA*</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$23,333</td>
<td>$29,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Deputy Executive Director</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$14,815</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects Section</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Executive Director, Projects</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$12,611</td>
<td>$17,026</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Projects</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$10,704</td>
<td>$14,452</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Manager</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$10,256</td>
<td>$13,849</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$8,231</td>
<td>$11,112</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Engineer</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$7,377</td>
<td>$9,962</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Transportation Analyst</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$7,097</td>
<td>$9,584</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$4,437</td>
<td>$5,999</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Section</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Executive Director, Planning</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$11,361</td>
<td>$15,346</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Transportation Planner</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$7,937</td>
<td>$10,715</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Transportation Planner</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$6,796</td>
<td>$9,174</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$4,437</td>
<td>$5,999</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance and Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$11,361</td>
<td>$15,346</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$8,094</td>
<td>$10,926</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Accountant</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$6,418</td>
<td>$8,669</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Specialist</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$5,096</td>
<td>$6,890</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$5,350</td>
<td>$7,233</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$4,437</td>
<td>$5,999</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programs and Governmental Affairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of External Affairs</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$10,213</td>
<td>$13,798</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs Manager</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$8,745</td>
<td>$11,813</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fair Labor Standards Act (E-Exempt, NE-Nonexempt)
"C" range increased for cost of living adjustment to be determined December 2015. Cap of 3.5%
## Salary Schedule (Revised September 16, 2015)

**Fiscal Year July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Classification</th>
<th>FLSA*</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$23,333</td>
<td>$29,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief Deputy Executive Director</strong></td>
<td>E</td>
<td><strong>$14,815</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,000</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Executive Director, Projects</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$12,611</td>
<td>$17,026</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Projects</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$10,704</td>
<td>$14,452</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Manager</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$10,256</td>
<td>$13,849</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Engineer</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$8,231</td>
<td>$11,112</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Engineer</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$7,377</td>
<td>$9,962</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Transportation Analyst</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$7,097</td>
<td>$9,584</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$4,437</td>
<td>$5,999</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Executive Director, Planning</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$11,361</td>
<td>$15,346</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Transportation Planner</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$7,937</td>
<td>$10,715</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Transportation Planner</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$6,796</td>
<td>$9,174</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$4,437</td>
<td>$5,999</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$11,361</td>
<td>$15,346</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Manager</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$8,094</td>
<td>$10,926</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Accountant</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$6,418</td>
<td>$8,669</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Specialist</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$5,096</td>
<td>$6,890</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$5,350</td>
<td>$7,233</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>$4,437</td>
<td>$5,999</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs and Governmental Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of External Affairs</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$10,213</td>
<td>$13,798</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs Manager</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>$8,745</td>
<td>$11,813</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fair Labor Standards Act (E-Exempt, NE-Nonexempt)

"C" range increased for cost of living adjustment to be determined December 2016. Cap of 3.5%.
## Planning Committee STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 2, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Approval of the City of Hercules’ Calendar Years (CY) 2012 &amp; 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Issues</td>
<td>The City of Hercules has submitted its Calendar Years 2012 &amp; 2013 GMP Checklist. An estimated allocation of $337,299 in 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds will be paid out for FY 2013-14 subject to the Authority making a findings of compliance with the Measure J GMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Staff recommends approval of the City of Hercules’ GMP Compliance Checklist and payment of $337,299 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013-14 Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds to the City of Hercules, with a second (off-year) payment of FY 2014-15 funds on the one-year anniversary of the first payment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td>A total of $13,662,000 is estimated to be available for Local Street Maintenance and Improvement funds in FY 2013-14, based on actual sales tax receipts to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>The Authority has the option to disapprove a checklist, request additional information, such as an audit of a specific checklist question, grant conditional approval, or otherwise apply flexibility to individual circumstances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Attachments (See PC Packet dated 9/2/15) | A. Acknowledgement letter from CCTA’s Deputy Executive Director, Planning, Martin Engelmann, to Holly Smyth, Planning Director, July 14, 2015  
B. City of Hercules’ CY 2012 & 2013 GMP Compliance Checklist. (abridged – full version available at [www.ccta.net](http://www.ccta.net)) |
| Changes from Committee | None |
Background

The Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP), as amended, requires that every two years the Authority review local compliance with the GMP and allocate funds to cities, towns, and the County, subject to submission of a Statement of Compliance by the local jurisdiction and findings made by the Authority.

The Biennial Compliance Checklist provides a vehicle for measuring local jurisdictions’ fulfillment of the requirements of the Measure J Growth Management Program. The Measure J Checklist for this reporting period covers CY 2012 & 2013. Jurisdictions found to be in compliance with the GMP will receive FY 2013-14 funds for local street maintenance and improvements. The second-year’s funding also known as the “off year” (in this case, FY 2014-15) will be allocated automatically on the one-year anniversary of the current year’s allocation, without requiring any further checklist submittals from local jurisdictions.

A summary of the completed checklist submitted by the subject jurisdiction is attached. Staff recommends approval of the jurisdiction’s Checklist and allocation of funds.

Citizens Advisory Committee Review

The full Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) reviewed the City of Hercules’ Checklist on July 22, 2015 and recommended approval.
According to the jurisdiction’s Checklist, the following findings have been made:

1. **Action Plans: Complies**  
The jurisdiction has implemented the actions and followed procedures as called for in its Action Plan. The jurisdiction has followed procedures outlined in the Authority’s *Implementation Guide* and applicable Action Plan.

2. **Transportation Mitigation Program: Complies**  
The jurisdiction has implemented a local and is participating in a regional mitigation program.

3. **Housing Options and Job Opportunities: Complies**  
The jurisdiction has submitted the required report demonstrating reasonable progress in providing housing opportunities for all income levels.

4. **Traffic Impact Studies: Complies**  
Where applicable, the jurisdiction has, in accordance with the Authority’s *Technical Procedures*, prepared traffic impact studies for projects generating more than 100 net new peak-hour vehicle trips.

5. **Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning: Complies**  
The jurisdiction regularly participated in RTPC meetings; the jurisdiction’s representative to the RTPC regularly reported to the council on RTPC activities; and the jurisdiction made land use and traffic data available for the countywide model.

6. **Five-Year Capital Improvement Program: Complies**  
The jurisdiction has an adopted CIP that meets Measure J requirements: Resolution 14-043, June 24, 2014.

7. **Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Program: Complies**  
The jurisdiction has an adopted TSM Resolution or Ordinance that conforms with the Authority’s Model TSM Resolution: Resolution 85-164, November 13, 1985.
8. **Maintenance of Effort (MoE): Complies.**
The MoE requirement for the City of Hercules is $338,152.

9. **Posting of Signs: Complies.**
Where applicable, the jurisdiction posted signs for all projects exceeding $250,000 that were funded in whole or in part with J funds.

10. **Adoption of the Measure J Growth Management Element (GME): Complies**
The jurisdiction has adopted a GME to its General Plan that substantially complies with the intent of the Authority’s adopted Measure J Model GME. The jurisdiction Measure J GME was adopted by the City of Hercules’ Council on November 12, 2013, Resolution 13-118.

11. **Adoption of a voter-approved Urban Limit Line (ULL): Complies**
The jurisdiction has continuously complied with the County’s voter approved Measure J ULL. Adopted January 13, 2009, Resolution No. 09-007.

12. **Other Considerations: N/A**

    **Certified By:** Sherry McCoy, Mayor  
    **Date:** June 24, 2015

    **Date Received by CCTA:** June 25, 2015
### Subject
Approval of the City of Martinez’s Calendar Years (CY) 2012 & 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist

### Summary of Issues
The City of Martinez has submitted its Calendar Years 2012 & 2013 GMP Checklist. An estimated allocation of $491,543 in 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds will be paid out for FY 2013-14 subject to the Authority making a findings of compliance with the Measure J GMP.

### Recommendations
Staff recommends approval of the City of Martinez’s GMP Compliance Checklist and payment of $491,543 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013-14 Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds to the City of Martinez, with a second (off-year) payment of FY 2014-15 funds on the one-year anniversary of the first payment.

### Financial Implications
A total of $13,662,000 is estimated to be available for Local Street Maintenance and Improvement funds in FY 2013-14, based on actual sales tax receipts to date.

### Options
The Authority has the option to disapprove a checklist, request additional information, such as an audit of a specific checklist question, grant conditional approval, or otherwise apply flexibility to individual circumstances.

### Attachments (See PC Packet dated 9/2/15)

| A. | Acknowledgement letter from CCTA’s Deputy Executive Director, Planning, Martin Engelmann, to Dina Tasini, Planning Manager, July 15, 2015 |
| B. | City of Martinez’s CY 2012 & 2013 GMP Compliance Checklist. (abridged – full version available at [www.ccta.net](http://www.ccta.net)) |

### Changes from Committee
None
Background

The Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP), as amended, requires that every two years the Authority review local compliance with the GMP and allocate funds to cities, towns, and the County, subject to submission of a Statement of Compliance by the local jurisdiction and findings made by the Authority.

The *Biennial Compliance Checklist* provides a vehicle for measuring local jurisdictions’ fulfillment of the requirements of the Measure J Growth Management Program. The Measure J Checklist for this reporting period covers CY 2012 & 2013. Jurisdictions found to be in compliance with the GMP will receive FY 2013-14 funds for local street maintenance and improvements. The second-year’s funding also known as the “off year” (in this case, FY 2014-15) will be allocated automatically on the one-year anniversary of the current year’s allocation, without requiring any further checklist submittals from local jurisdictions.

A summary of the completed checklist submitted by the subject jurisdiction is attached. Staff recommends approval of the jurisdiction’s Checklist and allocation of funds.

Citizens Advisory Committee Review

The full Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) reviewed the City of Martinez’s Checklist on July 22, 2015 and recommended approval.
City of Martinez
BIENNIAL COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST SUMMARY Calendar Years 2012 & 2013
OVERALL FINDING: Complies

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

1. **Action Plans: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has implemented the actions and followed procedures as called for in its Action Plan. The jurisdiction has followed procedures outlined in the Authority’s *Implementation Guide* and applicable Action Plan.

2. **Transportation Mitigation Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has implemented a local and is participating in a regional mitigation program.

3. **Housing Options and Job Opportunities: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has submitted the required report demonstrating reasonable progress in providing housing opportunities for all income levels.

4. **Traffic Impact Studies: Complies**
   Where applicable, the jurisdiction has, in accordance with the Authority’s *Technical Procedures*, prepared traffic impact studies for projects generating more than 100 net new peak-hour vehicle trips.

5. **Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning: Complies**
   The jurisdiction regularly participated in RTPC meetings; the jurisdiction's representative to the RTPC regularly reported to the council on RTPC activities; and the jurisdiction made land use and traffic data available for the countywide model.

6. **Five-Year Capital Improvement Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has an adopted CIP that meets Measure J requirements: Resolution 060-15, May 6, 2015.

7. **Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has an adopted TSM Resolution or Ordinance that conforms with the Authority’s Model TSM Resolution: Ordinance 1253 C.S., April 1, 1998.
8. **Maintenance of Effort (MoE): Complies.**
   The MoE requirement for the City of Martinez is $614,915.
   The MoE expenditure for FY 2011-12 is: $1,526,824, and $1,551,563 for FY 2012-13.

9. **Posting of Signs: Complies.**
   Where applicable, the jurisdiction posted signs for all projects exceeding $250,000 that were funded in whole or in part with J funds.

10. **Adoption of the Measure J Growth Management Element (GME): Complies**
    The jurisdiction has adopted a GME to its General Plan that substantially complies with the intent of the Authority’s adopted Measure J Model GME. The jurisdiction Measure J GME was adopted by the City of Martinez on September 4, 2013, Resolution 091-13.

11. **Adoption of a voter-approved Urban Limit Line (ULL): Complies**
    The jurisdiction has continuously complied with the County’s voter approved Measure J ULL. Adopted May 2, 2007, Resolution No. 096-06 & 029-07.

12. **Other Considerations: N/A**

    **Certified By:** Rob Schroder, Mayor
    **Date:** June 23, 2015

    **Date Received by CCTA:** June 25, 2015
### Planning Committee STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 2, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Approval of the City of San Pablo’s Calendar Years (CY) 2012 &amp; 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Issues</td>
<td>The City of San Pablo has submitted its Calendar Years 2012 &amp; 2013 GMP Checklist. An estimated allocation of $341,707 in 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds will be paid out for FY 2013-14 subject to the Authority making a findings of compliance with the Measure J GMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Staff recommends approval of the City of San Pablo’s GMP Compliance Checklist and payment of $341,707 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013-14 Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds to the City of San Pablo, with a second (off-year) payment of FY 2014-15 funds on the one-year anniversary of the first payment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td>A total of $13,662,000 is estimated to be available for Local Street Maintenance and Improvement funds in FY 2013-14, based on actual sales tax receipts to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>The Authority has the option to disapprove a checklist, request additional information, such as an audit of a specific checklist question, grant conditional approval, or otherwise apply flexibility to individual circumstances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Attachments (See PC Packet dated 9/2/15) | A. Acknowledgement letter from CCTA’s Deputy Executive Director, Planning, Martin Engelmann, to Barbara Hawkins, City Engineer, July 15, 2015  
B. City of San Pablo’s CY 2012 & 2013 GMP Compliance Checklist. (abridged – full version available at [www.ccta.net](http://www.ccta.net)) |
| Changes from Committee | None |
Background

The Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP), as amended, requires that every two years the Authority review local compliance with the GMP and allocate funds to cities, towns, and the County, subject to submission of a Statement of Compliance by the local jurisdiction and findings made by the Authority.

The *Biennial Compliance Checklist* provides a vehicle for measuring local jurisdictions’ fulfillment of the requirements of the Measure J Growth Management Program. The Measure J Checklist for this reporting period covers CY 2012 & 2013. Jurisdictions found to be in compliance with the GMP will receive FY 2013-14 funds for local street maintenance and improvements. The second-year’s funding also known as the “off year” (in this case, FY 2014-15) will be allocated automatically on the one-year anniversary of the current year’s allocation, without requiring any further checklist submittals from local jurisdictions.

A summary of the completed checklist submitted by the subject jurisdiction is attached. Staff recommends approval of the jurisdiction’s Checklist and allocation of funds.

Citizens Advisory Committee Review

The full Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) reviewed the City of San Pablo’s Checklist on July 22, 2015 and recommended approval.
City of San Pablo
BIENNIAL COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST SUMMARY Calendar Years 2012 & 2013
OVERALL FINDING: Complies

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

1. **Action Plans: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has implemented the actions and followed procedures as called for in its Action Plan. The jurisdiction has followed procedures outlined in the Authority’s *Implementation Guide* and applicable Action Plan.

2. **Transportation Mitigation Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has implemented a local and is participating in a regional mitigation program.

3. **Housing Options and Job Opportunities: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has submitted the required report demonstrating reasonable progress in providing housing opportunities for all income levels.

4. **Traffic Impact Studies: Complies**
   Where applicable, the jurisdiction has, in accordance with the Authority’s *Technical Procedures*, prepared traffic impact studies for projects generating more than 100 net new peak-hour vehicle trips.

5. **Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning: Complies**
   The jurisdiction regularly participated in RTPC meetings; the jurisdiction's representative to the RTPC regularly reported to the council on RTPC activities; and the jurisdiction made land use and traffic data available for the countywide model.

6. **Five-Year Capital Improvement Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has an adopted CIP that meets Measure J requirements: Resolution 2015-100, June 22, 2015.

7. **Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has an adopted TSM Resolution or Ordinance that conforms with the Authority’s Model TSM Resolution: Resolution: 94-008, July 5, 1994.
8. **Maintenance of Effort (MoE): Complies.**  
The MoE requirement for the City of San Pablo is $377,316.  
The MoE expenditure for FY 2011-12 is: $7,447,687, and $8,064,981 for FY 2012-13.

9. **Posting of Signs: Complies.**  
Where applicable, the jurisdiction posted signs for all projects exceeding $250,000 that were funded in whole or in part with J funds.

10. **Adoption of the Measure J Growth Management Element (GME): Complies**  
The jurisdiction has adopted a GME to its General Plan that substantially complies with the intent of the Authority’s adopted Measure J Model GME. The jurisdiction Measure J GME was adopted by the City of San Pablo on April 18, 2011.

11. **Adoption of a voter-approved Urban Limit Line (ULL): Complies**  
The jurisdiction has continuously complied with the County’s voter approved Measure J ULL. Adopted December 18, 2006, Resolution No. 2006-167.

12. **Other Considerations: N/A**

   **Certified By:** Rich Kinney, Vice Mayor  
   **Date:** June 24, 2015

   **Date Received by CCTA:** June 29, 2015
### Subject
Approval of the City of Pinole’s Calendar Years (CY) 2012 & 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist

### Summary of Issues
The City of Pinole has submitted its Calendar Years 2012 & 2013 GMP Checklist. An estimated allocation of $294,810 in 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds will be paid out for FY 2013-14 subject to the Authority making a findings of compliance with the Measure J GMP.

### Recommendations
Staff recommends approval of the City of Pinole’s GMP Compliance Checklist and payment of $294,810 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013-14 Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds to the City of Pinole, with a second (off-year) payment of FY 2014-15 funds on the one-year anniversary of the first payment.

### Financial Implications
A total of $13,662,000 is estimated to be available for Local Street Maintenance and Improvement funds in FY 2013-14, based on actual sales tax receipts to date.

### Options
The Authority has the option to disapprove a checklist, request additional information, such as an audit of a specific checklist question, grant conditional approval, or otherwise apply flexibility to individual circumstances.

### Attachments (See PC Packet dated 9/2/15)

**A.** Acknowledgement letter from CCTA’s Deputy Executive Director, Planning, Martin Engelmann, to Winston Rhodes, Planning Manager, July 15, 2015

**B.** City of Pinole’s CY 2012 & 2013 GMP Compliance Checklist. (abridged – full version available at [www.ccta.net](http://www.ccta.net))

### Changes from Committee
None
Background

The Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP), as amended, requires that every two years the Authority review local compliance with the GMP and allocate funds to cities, towns, and the County, subject to submission of a Statement of Compliance by the local jurisdiction and findings made by the Authority.

The Biennial Compliance Checklist provides a vehicle for measuring local jurisdictions’ fulfillment of the requirements of the Measure J Growth Management Program. The Measure J Checklist for this reporting period covers CY 2012 & 2013. Jurisdictions found to be in compliance with the GMP will receive FY 2013-14 funds for local street maintenance and improvements. The second-year’s funding also known as the “off year” (in this case, FY 2014-15) will be allocated automatically on the one-year anniversary of the current year’s allocation, without requiring any further checklist submittals from local jurisdictions.

A summary of the completed checklist submitted by the subject jurisdiction is attached. Staff recommends approval of the jurisdiction’s Checklist and allocation of funds.

Citizens Advisory Committee Review

The full Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) reviewed the City of Pinole’s Checklist on July 22, 2015 and recommended approval.
City of Pinole
BIENNIAL COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST SUMMARY Calendar Years 2012 & 2013
OVERALL FINDING: Complies

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

1. **Action Plans: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has implemented the actions and followed procedures as called for in its Action Plan. The jurisdiction has followed procedures outlined in the Authority’s *Implementation Guide* and applicable Action Plan.

2. **Transportation Mitigation Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has implemented a local and is participating in a regional mitigation program.

3. **Housing Options and Job Opportunities: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has submitted the required report demonstrating reasonable progress in providing housing opportunities for all income levels.

4. **Traffic Impact Studies: Complies**
   Where applicable, the jurisdiction has, in accordance with the Authority’s *Technical Procedures*, prepared traffic impact studies for projects generating more than 100 net new peak-hour vehicle trips.

5. **Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning: Complies**
   The jurisdiction regularly participated in RTPC meetings; the jurisdiction's representative to the RTPC regularly reported to the council on RTPC activities; and the jurisdiction made land use and traffic data available for the countywide model.

6. **Five-Year Capital Improvement Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has an adopted CIP that meets Measure J requirements: Resolution 2011-74, October 4, 2011.

7. **Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has an adopted TSM Resolution or Ordinance that conforms with the Authority’s Model TSM Resolution: Resolution: 97-102, July 15, 1997.
8. **Maintenance of Effort (MoE): Complies.**
The MoE requirement for the City of Pinole is $338,288.  
The MoE expenditure for FY 2011-12 is: $1,010,225.10, and $1,241,943.38 for FY 2012-13.

9. **Posting of Signs: Complies.**
Where applicable, the jurisdiction posted signs for all projects exceeding $250,000 that were funded in whole or in par with J funds.

10. **Adoption of the Measure J Growth Management Element (GME): Complies**
The jurisdiction has adopted a GME to its General Plan that substantially complies with the intent of the Authority’s adopted Measure J Model GME. The jurisdiction Measure J GME was adopted by the City of Pinole on October 10, 2010, Resolution 2010-89.

11. **Adoption of a voter-approved Urban Limit Line (ULL): Complies**
The jurisdiction has continuously complied with the County’s voter approved Measure J ULL. Adopted February 6, 2007, Resolution No. 2007-12.

12. **Other Considerations: N/A**

Certified By: Peter Murray, Mayor  
Date: July 7, 2015

Date Received by CCTA: July 16, 2015
## Planning Committee STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 2, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subject</strong></th>
<th>Approval of the City of Richmond’s Calendar Years (CY) 2012 &amp; 2013 Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| **Summary of Issues** | The City of Richmond has submitted its Calendar Years 2012 & 2013 GMP Checklist. An estimated allocation of $1,142,519 in 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds will be paid out for FY 2013-14 subject to the Authority making a findings of compliance with the Measure J GMP. |

| **Recommendations** | Staff recommends approval of the City of Richmond’s GMP Compliance Checklist and payment of $1,142,519 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013-14 Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds to the City of Richmond, with a second (off-year) payment of FY 2014-15 funds on the one-year anniversary of the first payment. |

| **Financial Implications** | A total of $13,662,000 is estimated to be available for Local Street Maintenance and Improvement funds in FY 2013-14, based on actual sales tax receipts to date. |

| **Options** | The Authority has the option to disapprove a checklist, request additional information, such as an audit of a specific checklist question, grant conditional approval, or otherwise apply flexibility to individual circumstances. |

| **Attachments (See PC Packet dated 9/2/15)** | A. Acknowledgement letter from CCTA’s Deputy Executive Director, Planning, Martin Engelmann, to Jonelyn Whales, Senior Planner, July 22, 2015 |

| **Changes from Committee** | None |

| **B.** City of Richmond’s CY 2012 & 2013 GMP Compliance Checklist. (abridged – full version available at [www.ccta.net](http://www.ccta.net)) |
Background

The Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP), as amended, requires that every two years the Authority review local compliance with the GMP and allocate funds to cities, towns, and the County, subject to submission of a Statement of Compliance by the local jurisdiction and findings made by the Authority.

The **Biennial Compliance Checklist** provides a vehicle for measuring local jurisdictions’ fulfillment of the requirements of the Measure J Growth Management Program. The Measure J Checklist for this reporting period covers CY 2012 & 2013. Jurisdictions found to be in compliance with the GMP will receive FY 2013-14 funds for local street maintenance and improvements. The second-year’s funding also known as the “off year” (in this case, FY 2014-15) will be allocated automatically on the one-year anniversary of the current year’s allocation, without requiring any further checklist submittals from local jurisdictions.

A summary of the completed checklist submitted by the subject jurisdiction is attached. Staff recommends approval of the jurisdiction’s Checklist and allocation of funds.

**Citizens Advisory Committee Review**

The full Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) reviewed the City of Richmond’s Checklist on July 22, 2015 and recommended approval.
City of Richmond
BIENNIAL COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST SUMMARY Calendar Years 2012 & 2013
OVERALL FINDING: Complies

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

1. **Action Plans: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has implemented the actions and followed procedures as called for in its Action Plan. The jurisdiction has followed procedures outlined in the Authority’s *Implementation Guide* and applicable Action Plan.

2. **Transportation Mitigation Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has implemented a local and is participating in a regional mitigation program.

3. **Housing Options and Job Opportunities: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has submitted the required report demonstrating reasonable progress in providing housing opportunities for all income levels.

4. **Traffic Impact Studies: Complies**
   Where applicable, the jurisdiction has, in accordance with the Authority’s *Technical Procedures*, prepared traffic impact studies for projects generating more than 100 net new peak-hour vehicle trips.

5. **Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning: Complies**
   The jurisdiction regularly participated in RTPC meetings; the jurisdiction's representative to the RTPC regularly reported to the council on RTPC activities; and the jurisdiction made land use and traffic data available for the countywide model.

6. **Five-Year Capital Improvement Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has an adopted CIP that meets Measure J requirements: Resolution 82-12, July 1, 2012.

7. **Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Program: Complies**
   The jurisdiction has an adopted TSM Resolution or Ordinance that conforms with the Authority’s Model TSM Resolution: Ordinance: 23-98, June 9, 1998.
8. **Maintenance of Effort (MoE): Complies.**
The MoE requirement for the City of Richmond is $1,649,140.
The MoE expenditure for FY 2011-12 is: $10,015,050.03, and $9,641,473.70 for FY 2012-13.

9. **Posting of Signs: Complies.**
Where applicable, the jurisdiction posted signs for all projects exceeding $250,000 that were funded in whole or in par with J funds.

10. **Adoption of the Measure J Growth Management Element (GME): Complies**
The jurisdiction has adopted a GME to its General Plan that substantially complies with the intent of the Authority’s adopted Measure J Model GME. The jurisdiction Measure J GME was adopted by the City of Richmond on April 25, 2012.

11. **Adoption of a voter-approved Urban Limit Line (ULL): Complies**
The jurisdiction has continuously complied with the County’s voter approved Measure J ULL. Adopted October 21, 2008, Resolution No. 117-08.

12. **Other Considerations: N/A**

    **Certified By:** Tom Butt, Mayor          **Date:** July 16, 2015

    **Date Received by CCTA:** July 16, 2015
Subject | Proposed Actions to Funding Resolutions
---|---
Summary of Issues | Consistent with Authority policy, funding appropriation resolutions may be modified to extend their expiration date, to revise the scope of services or to terminate the resolution when the activity funded has been completed. Recommended changes are summarized.
Recommendations | Approve the resolution modifications
Financial Implications | None. Unspent funds remain available to the project, or if the project is complete, to the funding category.
Options | Direct staff to take alternative actions on the resolutions
Attachments | None
Changes from Committee | None

| Resolution Number: | 12-60-G |
| Revise: | 2 |
| Coop Number: | 13CO.03 |
| PO: | 2013-00000080 |
| Proponent: | Bay Area Rapid Transit District |
| Project: | Orinda-Lafayette BART Wayfinding & Lighting |
| Adoption Date: | October 17, 2012 |
| Funds Appropriated: | $243,000 |
| Proposed Action: | Extend expiration date to June 17, 2016 |
| Justification: | Construction of the project is underway but final completion will not occur before the expiration of the resolution |
This Page Intentionally Blank
# Planning Committee STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 2, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Approval of FY 2015-16 Measure J Allocation for the West County Additional Bus Service Enhancements Program (Sub-Regional Program 19b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Issues</td>
<td>The 2011 Measure J Strategic Plan establishes the West County Additional Bus Service Enhancements Program (Program 19b) at 2.16 percent of sales tax revenues. As a sub-regional program the funds are programmed by WCCTAC. At its July 24, 2015 meeting WCCTAC took action to program the funds to AC Transit and WestCAT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Approve Resolution No. 15-35-G, the allocation of Measure J West County Additional Bus Service Enhancements Program funds for FY 2015-16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td>The FY 2015-16 allocation, coupled with adjustments for previous allocations, would allow for payments up to $1,790,954 to operators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>1. Not approve the allocation at this time; 2. Direct staff to investigate other allocation options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments <em>(See PC Packet dated 9/2/15)</em></td>
<td>A. Resolution No. 15-35-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes from Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Background

The Measure J Expenditure Plan designates that the West County Sub-Regional Additional Bus Services Program (Program 19b) shall receive 2.2 percent of annual transportation sales tax revenues. Because the bus operators chose to “capitalize” a portion of the program in accordance with the Authority adopted Measure J Financial Framework regarding hybrid programs, the annual operating percentage was reduced to compensate for the capital portion. The new percentage of 2.16 percent is captured in the 2009 Measure J Strategic Plan.
At its meeting on July 24, 2015, WCCTAC took action to program funding through its Additional Bus Service Enhancements program (Program 19b) to AC Transit and WestCAT. The operators agreed to split the funds in the short term with 80 percent going to AC Transit and 20 percent going to WestCAT. Funding under the allocation will support existing services. Support of existing services was enabled by Ordinance 11-1, which amended the Measure J Expenditure Plan. WCCTAC has reviewed the request for supporting existing services by each operator and has justified use of the funds for that purpose.

There is no reserve requirement with respect to this sub-regional program.
# Planning Committee STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 2, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Approval of Resolution 15-44-G Allocating Measure J Funds from Program 20a Central County Additional Transportation Programs for Seniors and People with Disabilities to the City of Walnut Creek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Issues</td>
<td>At its February 12, 2015 meeting TRANSPAC approved a recommendation to allocate $43,000 from the Measure J subregional Program 20a – Central County Additional Transportation Programs for Seniors and People with Disabilities for support of the Walnut Creek Senior Van service. At its September 10, 2015 meeting TRANSPAC approved a recommendation to allocate $249,943 to four not for profit programs in central County which have been previously funded using Program 20a funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Recommendations | 1. Approve Resolution No. 15-44-G, the allocation of Central County Additional Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities program (Program 20a) funds.  
2. Authorize the Chair to enter into cooperative agreement with the City of Walnut Creek for amounts not to exceed $43,000.  
3. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into cooperative agreement amendments with the program recipients for amounts not to exceed those listed in Resolution 15-44-G, Attachment 1. |
| Financial Implications | The Measure J allocation for this program is $43,000, 292,943 |
| Options | 1. Not approve the allocation at this time.  
2. Direct staff to investigate other allocation options. |
| Attachments (Attachment A is Revised; see PC Packet dated 9/2/15 for Attachment B) | A. Resolution No. 15-44-G (Revised)  
B. TRANSPAC request for programming program 20a funds |
| Changes from Committee | After the Planning Committee meeting TRANSPAC took action to allocate additional funding from Program 20a. Staff has incorporated the TRANSPAC recommendation into this item. |
Background

On February 12, 2015, TRANSPAC took action to program sub-regional program 20a – Central County Additional Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities funding to provide support to the City of Walnut Creek Senior Mini Bus program.

The Walnut Creek Mini Bus provides free transportation to seniors aged 60+ who live independently yet need transportation assistance. Rides are provided either on a regular schedule for seniors who participate in the one-on-one match program or on an “as needed” basis to seniors in the Transportation Program. The service provides approximately 3,000 trips per year.

On September 10, 2015 TRANSPAC took action to program sub-regional program 20a – Central County Additional Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities funding to provide grants to four separate programs in Central County.

The projects were selected as extensions for programs funded in FY 2014-15. Grantees showed successful implementation of projects using the Program 20a funding last year and presented findings to TRANSPAC with a request for continued funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT REQUESTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring Hands Volunteer Caregivers Program</td>
<td>Free transportation to seniors aged 60+ who live independently yet need transportation assistance. Rides are provided either on a regular schedule for seniors who participate in the one-on-one match program or on an “as needed” basis to seniors in the Transportation Program. Caring Hands allows 225 seniors who no longer drive to remain independent and continue living in their own homes within Central County. The transportation provided postpones the need to move into costly assisted living or institutionalized settings.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Rain Foundation</td>
<td>Bus service from Rossmoor to downtown Walnut Creek service area for both ambulatory and disabled passengers. The service will fill a gap resulting from</td>
<td>$62,883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the discontinuation of a County Connection route.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rehabilitation Services of Northern California</th>
<th>The Mt Diablo Mobilizer service provides paratransit door-through-door to adult day health care participants who need additional assistance and shorter trip times than County Connection Link can provide. The service also provides mid-day shopping trips for frail, low income residents of two senior housing locations in Concord. The service benefits County Connection Link by taking paratransit trips off the public service freeing up seats for others who need it.</th>
<th>$42,560</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Helpline Services</td>
<td>Rides for Seniors is a free one-on-one, door-through-door, escorted rides program provided for seniors aged 60+ by screened and trained volunteer drivers. The service allows seniors who cannot drive or take public transit to continue to live in their own homes.</td>
<td>$94,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$249,943</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recognizing the need for service in Central County and the potential for service efficiencies which can be provided by non-public operators, TRANSPAC is developing a longer term policy which will better guide future allocations from this program category and anticipates future calls for projects for grants.

There is no reserve requirement with respect to this sub-regional program.
RESOLUTION NO. 15-44-G

RE: Central County Additional Transportation Services For Seniors and People with Disabilities Program (Sub-Regional Program 20a) Allocations of Measure J Funds for FY 2015-16

WHEREAS, the Contra Costa Transit Coordinating Council (hereafter "Council"), consistent with Measure C Sales Tax Renewal Ordinance (#88-01 as amended by #04-02, #06-01, and #06-02), hereinafter referred to as Measure J, and Measure J Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan, has recommended allocations for specific services for Fiscal Year 2014-15 under the Central County Additional Transportation Services For Seniors and People with Disabilities Program (Sub-Regional Program 20a) Program – Programs 20a (hereafter "Program"); and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Measure J Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan TRANSPAC has recommended services for funding under Program 20a, and

WHEREAS, the funding level of $292,943 programmed for Fiscal Year 2015-16 is available in the program category, consistent with the allocation methodology specified for Program 20a in the Measure J Expenditure Plan, and

WHEREAS, prior to receiving any funds under this resolution, eligible recipients under this Program will enter into cooperative agreements with the AUTHORITY for the purpose of using these funds for eligible services; and

WHEREAS, these cooperative agreements recognize that any cost overruns will be the sole responsibility of the recipient of these funds; and any cost savings shall be returned to the Authority or applied to the recipient’s next allocation, unless specified otherwise;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the AUTHORITY does hereby approve the allocation of $292,943 in Measure J Central County Additional Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities Program (Sub-Regional Program 20a) funds for Fiscal Year 2015-16 in the amounts and for the services as specified in Attachment 1, attached and incorporated herein by reference.

Julie K. Pierce, Chair

This RESOLUTION was entered into at the regular Meeting of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority held September 16, 2015 in Walnut Creek, California.

Attest: _________________________________

Danice J. Rosenbohm, Executive Secretary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Coop #</th>
<th>Amount*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Walnut Creek Senior Van</td>
<td></td>
<td>$43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Hands Volunteer Caregivers Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Rain Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$62,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Services of Northern California</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Helpline Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>$94,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$292,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Amounts are not-to-exceed and will be payable upon invoice from the respective jurisdictions with appropriate back-up documentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Walnut Creek Senior Van</td>
<td>Free transportation to seniors aged 60+ who live independently yet need transportation assistance. Rides are provided either on a regular schedule for seniors who participate in the one-on-one match program or on an “as needed” basis to seniors in the Transportation Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Hands Volunteer Caregivers Program</td>
<td>Free transportation to seniors aged 60+ who live independently yet need transportation assistance. Rides are provided either on a regular schedule for seniors who participate in the one-on-one match program or on an “as needed” basis to seniors in the Transportation Program. Caring Hands allows 225 seniors who no longer drive to remain independent and continue living in their own homes within Central County. The transportation provided postpones the need to move into costly assisted living or institutionalized settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Rain Foundation</td>
<td>Bus service from Rossmoor to downtown Walnut Creek service area for both ambulatory and disabled passengers. The service will fill a gap resulting from the discontinuation of a County Connection route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Services of Northern California</td>
<td>The Mt Diablo Mobilizer service provides paratransit door-through-door to adult day health care participants who need additional assistance and shorter trip times than County Connection Link can provide. The service also provides mid-day shopping trips for frail, low income residents of two senior housing locations in Concord. The service benefits County Connection Link by taking paratransit trips off the public service freeing up seats for others who need it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Helpline Services</td>
<td>Rides for Seniors is a free one-on-one, door-through-door, escorted rides program provided for seniors aged 60+ by screened and trained volunteer drivers. The service allows seniors who cannot drive or take public transit to continue to live in their own homes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Planning Committee STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 2, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Approval of Resolution 15-48-G for the 2015 Iron Horse Trail Rehabilitation Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Issues</td>
<td>Measure J allocates 0.5 percent of revenues to the East Bay Regional Park District for the maintenance and improvement of paved regional trails. The District must apply these funds equally among the four sub-regions in Contra Costa and receive approval from the relevant RTPC for the program of improvements to be funded. The District has submitted a funding appropriation request for $494,000 in Measure J Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities (PBTF) (Program 13) funds for the 2015 Iron Horse Trail Rehabilitation Project in Southwest County. SWAT reviewed and approved the proposed request on July 16, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Approve Resolution 15-48-G appropriating $494,000 in Measure J PBTF funds for the 2015 Iron Horse Trail Rehabilitation Project in Southwest County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td>The Measure J Program 12 and 13 Programming Plan programmed sufficient funding for this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Options | 1. Deny the request for funding  
2. Modify the request for funding |
| Attachments (See PC Packet dated 9/2/15) | A. Request for funding allocation, Jeff Rasmussen, East Bay Regional Park District, August 14, 2015  
B. SWAT Board Meeting Summary, July 16, 2015  
C. Resolution 15-48-G |
| Changes from Committee | None |
Background

Measure J allocates one third of the funds set aside for Program 13, PBTF — or one-half percent of Measure J revenues — to the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) for the development and rehabilitation of paved regional trails. EBRPD is to spend its allocation equally in each subregion, subject to the review and approval of the applicable subregional committee, prior to funding allocation by the Authority.

The appropriated funds will be used to finance the construction phases of the project as outlined in the attached funding allocation request form. The ultimate project will rehabilitate approximately 590,000 square feet of the Iron Horse Regional Trail from Rudgear Road in Walnut Creek to the Alameda County line in Dublin as described in the attached scope of work. EBRPD is currently in the process of finalizing the project plans and construction documents.

The Authority previously approved funding resolutions for similar maintenance or rehabilitation projects in West, Central and East County.
## Planning Committee STAFF REPORT

### Meeting Date:
September 2, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Authorize the Authority Chair to Sign Agreement 19C.01 with the City of Concord to Oversee the Operation of the Monument Community Shuttle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Issues</td>
<td>Approval would authorize the Authority’s Chair to sign cooperative agreement 19C.01 with the City of Concord. The funding agreement defines the parties’ obligations with respect to the payment of Measure J funds for the operation and oversight of the Monument Community Shuttle which will be operated by Monument Impact. The project was previously approved as a Lifeline Transportation Program project and funding was previously approved under Resolutions 13-21-G, 13-34-G, 14-25-G and 15-32-G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Authorize CCTA’s Chair to execute Cooperative Agreement 19C.01 with the City of Concord for the oversight and funding of the Monument Community Shuttle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td>The funding agreement is for a total of $471,841. The funding comes from Subregional programs in Central county including Program 19 (Additional Bus) and Program 20 (Additional Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Not approve at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments (See PC Packet dated 9/2/15)</td>
<td>A. Cooperative Agreement 19C.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes from Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background

Approval of Cooperative Agreement 19C.01 would facilitate reimbursement to the City of Concord using Measure J funds for the implementation and operation of the Monument Community Shuttle.
Community Shuttle by Monument Impact. The funding allocations were previously approved by the Authority at the request of TRANSPAC over a period of a few years in response to unanticipated funding issues associated MTC’s Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP) Cycle 3 funding.

LTP Cycle 3 spanned a three year period from FY12 through FY14. FY12 and FY13 federal funding was governed by Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and FY14 funding was governed by Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). Federal Transit Administration (FTA) program changes initiated in MAP-21 eliminated the funding source, Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC), which was identified for the Monument Community Shuttle. In practice, this change made the City of Concord ineligible to receive the funds for the project.

To compound the funding issue, the grant submitted by MTC to the FTA for the FY12 and FY13 JARC funding, was held up by the Department of Labor (DOL) (as were all grants from California), because it alleged that provisions in the Public Employee Pension Reform Act (PEPRA) were in violation Federal transit labor protection laws. By the time the issue was settled with the DOL, the funding had expired and the region lost the funding.

To save the project, CCTA and MTC staff worked with County Connection and TRANSPAC to use subregional Measure J funding from Program 19a (Additional Bus Services) to fund the project while County Connection received an equal allocation of additional State Transit Assistance (STA) and FTA funds from MTC.

The resulting allocations of Measure J funds from TRANSPAC were approved by the Authority as presented in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>TRANSPAC Approval</th>
<th>Authority Approved</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Measure J Program (All Central County)</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-21-G</td>
<td>4/11/2013</td>
<td>6/19/2013</td>
<td>$85,111</td>
<td>19a</td>
<td>Replace elimination of JARC in MAP-21 (1 of 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-34-G</td>
<td>11/8/2012</td>
<td>7/17/2013</td>
<td>$160,138</td>
<td>20a</td>
<td>Matching Funds for LTP Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-25-G</td>
<td>4/11/2013</td>
<td>6/18/2014</td>
<td>$64,944</td>
<td>19a</td>
<td>Replace elimination of JARC in MAP-21 (2 of 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$471,841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now that the project funding has been finalized and fully allocated, the Cooperative Agreement needs to be executed so that the project can begin implementation.

Under the agreement CCTA would reimburse the City of Concord for costs incurred for the operation of the Monument Community Shuttle. Concord has a Memorandum of Understanding with Monument Impact which will be the service coordinator and provider. CCTA will participate with the City and Monument Impact in planning and evaluating the service.
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Planning Committee **STAFF REPORT**  

**Meeting Date:** September 2, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Approval of Amendment No. 2 to Gray-Bowen-Scott Agreement No. 366</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Issues</strong></td>
<td>Staff recommends that the Authority approve a $1.7 million amendment to Agreement No. 366 with Gray-Bowen-Scott to carry out the Public Education and Outreach Plan for the 2014 Countrywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update and the Transportation Expenditure Program (TEP) during Fiscal Year 2015-16. This amendment would increase the existing Agreement value from $1.8 million to $3.5 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>Approve Amendment No. 2 to Agreement No. 366 with Gray-Bowen-Scott, to increase the total agreement amount by $1.7 million from $1.8 million to $3.5 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Implications</strong></td>
<td>Funds would be drawn from federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) sources, with an 11.46 percent local match coming from Measure J Regional Planning funds. The FY 2015-16 Authority budget includes $1.2 million in Regional Planning funds (Org OCP 18a) for the Gray-Bowen-Scott Agreement. While the total agreement value will increase by $1.7 million, the initial budget allocation for this Amendment No. 2 will be limited to $1.0 million. Additional budget capacity will be needed to complete the proposed scope of work and will need to be addressed as part of the Authority’s mid-year FY 2015-16 budget review. Full funding of the $1.7 million amendment will require borrowing from the Measure C reserves, now estimated at $4 million. Repayment of the borrowed funds is anticipated to take two-to-three years, using Measure J Program 18, Congestion Management, Transportation Planning, Facilities and Services (3 percent) fund category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td>1. Modify or decline the proposed amendment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Attachments (See PC Packet dated 9/2/15)** | A. Proposed Gray-Bowen-Scott Amendment No. 2 to Agreement No. 366  
B. Track Changes version of Scope of Services |
Background

In January 2013, the Authority approved entering into an agreement with the Gray-Bowen-Scott Consultant Team (GBS) to conduct public outreach, polling, and strategic planning in support of the 2014 CTP. At that time, the GBS team included the following subconsultants: Zell and Associates; Smith, Watts & Martinez, LLC; EMC Research; Circlepoint; the Next Generation (TNG); and Barnes, Mosher, Whitehurst, Lauter, and Partners (BMWL).

The initial consultant agreement contained a broadly-stated scope of services with a not-to-exceed contract value of $600,000. In July 2013, the Authority approved a work program that the GBS team undertook during FY 2013-14. It included the following tasks:

- **Focus Groups**: Conduct focus group meetings to evaluate public knowledge of and attitudes about the Authority, Caltrans, and other regional agencies’ efforts to improve Contra Costa’s transportation infrastructure, and attitudes about various transportation needs.

- **Stakeholder Interviews**: Conduct stakeholder interviews with community, elected, business, labor, environmental, and other organizational opinion leaders to gauge attitudes and opinions regarding prospective transportation investments, funding mechanisms, land use/growth management issues, and other issues to be determined.

- **Polling**: Design and conduct public opinion surveys of Contra Costa residents to assist the Authority in identifying projects and programs most likely to accomplish public objectives and improve transportation and growth management, while sustaining the quality of life in Contra Costa.

- **Coordinated Communications Plan**: Assist in development of a coordinated communication plan to bring together all aspects of the Authority’s public outreach, media relations, and messaging.

Concurrently, the GBS team attended ‘Roundtable’ Discussions with Authority staff, and participated in various committee meetings.
At the conclusion of this effort, the Authority agreed to consider amending the GPS agreement to expand and extend the scope of services to cover the Public Education and Outreach Plan for the 2014 CTP.

**Amendment No. 1 – Approved by CCTA on July 16, 2014**

Amendment No. 1 involved an increase in the agreement value of $1.2 million, such that the total agreement value increased from $600,000 to $1.8 million. The scope of services for Amendment No. 1 included adequate funding to carry out, during FY 2014-15, the Public Education and Outreach Plan that had been approved for the 2014 CTP Update. This amendment, which included funding for the subsequent development of a possible Transportation Expenditure Program (TEP), covered the following activities:

- On-line CTP engagement tool (went online in Fall 2014)
- Four Community CTP Workshops (one in each subarea)
- One Telephone Town Hall
- Stakeholder tool kits
- Additional outreach using targeted mail to promote the workshops and encourage participation in the online engagement tool
- Additional focus groups and public opinion polls

In March 2015, the Authority Board expressed interest in considering a possible November 2016 ballot measure. Such a measure could generate an additional $2.3 billion (2014 constant dollars) to address Contra Costa’s transportation needs. During Spring of 2015, the Authority developed a set of principles and established a process for developing a Draft TEP by November 2015, a Draft Final TEP in January 2016, and a Final TEP in May 2016. Concurrently, the schedule for the 2014 CTP Update and accompanying environmental review document was extended out to a May 2016 adoption date, to coincide with adoption of the Final TEP.

To support this effort, in April 2015 the Authority established an Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC). The EPAC is one component of a comprehensive stakeholder outreach program necessary to gain consensus on a TEP for a potential 2016 sales tax ballot measure. The EPAC represents a broad range of stakeholders in Contra Costa and helps fill the need for outreach and ongoing contact with key groups that have a stake in development of a TEP and subsequent transportation sales tax measure.
During May/June, Authority staff approved a budget re-allocation under Amendment No. 1 to accomplish the following:

- Increased level of professional services to support stakeholder outreach, strategic planning, and communications;
- The addition of a new subconsultant – Placeworks – to facilitate the EPAC meetings (EPAC held its first meeting on June 3rd, 2015. Additional meetings were held on July 1 and August 10);
- Approval for EMC to carry out focus group research on technology in transportation; and
- Authorization to conduct an additional telephone survey to understand the public’s regional priorities, and gauge awareness of measure proposals by other agencies, such as the County and BART.

As of August 31, GBS will have fully expended the $1.2 million in funding that was approved under Amendment No. 1.

**Proposed Amendment No. 2 – For Consideration by CCTA on September 16, 2015**

For FY 2015-16, GBS proposes a $1.7 million augmentation to Agreement No. 366, to a total agreement value of $3.5 million. This would provide sufficient resources to allow continued ongoing professional services and support to CCTA through August 2016. The future work will also involve coordination between the efforts to finalize a CTP document concurrently with the focus of GPS’ efforts turning to the development and strategic planning related to the TEP.

The scope of the amendment is oriented to support the efforts to develop a TEP for consideration by the Authority for a possible November 2016 ballot measure. The scope of services for Amendment No. 2 includes:

- Increased professional services (strategic planning, stakeholder outreach, public opinion research, communications, meeting facilitation, etc.) oriented at the development of a consensus based draft TEP,
- Continued (albeit at a reduced level) professional services (strategic planning and communications, etc.) in support to finalize and adopt an update to the CTP
- Facilitation and support for the four remaining scheduled EPAC meetings with sub-consultant Placeworks to continue in the role of facilitation, meeting preparation, and coordination.
- Public Opinion Research (i.e. polls and/or focus groups)
• Stakeholder Interviews/Outreach
• Public Meetings, Workshops, and Outreach (i.e. telephone townhalls, public workshops, online engagement tools, and/or direct mailing)

The Amendment No.2 proposed scope of services is included in Attachment A. It encompasses all past and future work for the entire $3.5 million in services. To see how the scope of services is changed through Amendment No. 2, please go to Attachment B, which shows the scope in “track changes.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Budget for Agreement No. 366</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Agreement Amount (January 2013)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amendment No.1 (July 2014)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal: Agreement Value Including Amendment No.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount Expended through August 31, 2015 (estimated)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Remaining as of August 31, 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Amendment No. 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Work:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extra Work (Contingency)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Value of Amendment 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Agreement Value Including Amendment No. 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Agreement Value</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INITIAL BUDGET ALLOCATION

As noted above, the Authority’s adopted FY 2015-16 budget has capacity for $1.2 million in additional services for GBS. Since the amount of proposed Amendment No. 2 exceeds the budget, and initial budget cap must be established. The initial budget allocation under Amendment No. 2 will therefore be limited to $1,000,000, with a total expenditure cap of $2.8 million. This will be adequate to cover tasks through December 2015, and will allow time for preparation of a mid-year budget amendment for the Authority FY 2015-16 budget, to create adequate capacity for additional expenditures to the total agreement value of $3.5 million.
Subject: Approval of Amendment No. 1 to Agreement No. 422 and Agreement No. 438 with Arup for Consultant Support for PDA Planning Grants

Summary of Issues:
On March 18, 2015, the Authority approved Agreement No. 422 with Arup in an amount of $1,162,300 to provide consultant support for PDA Planning Grants. To allow Arup to begin work on these grants, the Authority issued a notice to proceed (NTP) on March 24, 2015 for $50,000. Because the total amount of the agreement was more than $1 million in federal funds, Caltrans required an audit of the agreement by its Audits & Investigations section to ensure the agreement complied with Caltrans requirements. The review process, which took more than two months to complete, resulted in Caltrans approving the agreement with modifications, including a provision that disallowed reimbursement under the agreement for work done before July 13, 2015. Consequently, the initial $50,000 authorized under the NTP was rendered ineligible for federal funding. Because the work completed by ARUP under the NTP was performed in good faith and in accordance with the contract provisions, staff proposes to use Measure J funds to cover costs incurred under the NTP. The mechanics of doing this involve amending Agreement No. 422 to reduce the contract value by $43,871, and by entering into a new Letter Agreement (No. 438) to pay out the corresponding amount using Measure J funds.

Recommendations:
Approve Amendment 1 to Agreement No. 422, reducing the agreement amount by $43,871 from $1,162,300 to $1,118,429 and approve new Agreement No. 438 with Arup in an amount of $43,871 to fund the work completed under the NTP, and prior to the effective date of Agreement No. 422 (July 13, 2015).

Financial Implications:
The proposed changes would not affect the total amount of funding for Arup to provide consultant support for the PDA Planning Grants. It would draw on local funds in the amount of $43,871, by applying Measure J Congestion Management/Transportation Planning funds (Org. OCP 18A) for work completed under the NTP. The remaining amount of the contract ($1,118,429) would be funded using federal.
funds. The local funds expended under the NTP would be applied as part of the local match on Federal funds, and the $43,871 in federal funds removed from Agreement No. 422 could be applied to other work within the $2.745 million PDA Planning Grant effort.

Options

1. Revise the amendment amount and scope

Attachments (See PC Packet dated 9/2/15)

A. Amendment No. 1 to Agreement No. 422 with Arup, to reduce the amount of the agreement by $43,871

B. New Letter Agreement No. 438 with Arup, for payment in the amount of $43,871 using local (Measure J) funds.

Changes from Committee

None

Background

In November 2012, MTC amended Resolution 4035, Revised, regarding Project Selection Policies and Programming for Federal Surface Transportation Authorization for FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16. The amendment provided $20 million to county congestion management agencies for the Priority Development Area (PDA) planning grant program. Through that program, the CCTA received $2.745 million from MTC in Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. To use these funds, the Authority had to obtain federal authorization from Caltrans local assistance. Caltrans issued authorization (through an “E-76”) on June 27, 2014.

On September 3, 2014, the Authority approved 10 PDA Planning Grants and five consultant teams to provide support for those planning projects using the $2.745 million in STP funds. Arup led one of the five selected consultant teams.

Over the following several months, project sponsors reviewed the qualifications of the teams to select the team they wanted to provide support for their projects. Arup was selected for four projects:

1. San Pablo Avenue Complete Streets (Contra Costa County)
2. Grant, Salvio and Oak Street Corridor Plan (Concord)
3. Downtown Congestion Study for Implementing Lafayette’s PDA (Lafayette)
4. Iron Horse Trail Overcrossing Environmental Clearance (San Ramon)
In March 2015, the Authority approved cooperative agreements with the sponsors and consultant agreements with the consultant teams, including Agreement No. 422 with Arup. The total amount of Agreement No. 422 was $1,162,300.

To allow work to begin while contracts were being reviewed and signed, on March 24, 2015, the Authority issued notices to proceed (NTPs) to the consultant teams in the amount of $50,000.

Because Agreement No. 422 was more than $1 million, Caltrans required review by its Audits & Investigations section to ensure the agreement complied with Caltrans requirements. The Caltrans local review process took more than two months to complete, beginning on April 29, and ending on July 10, 2015, when the Authority received a letter from Caltrans stating that, once several modifications were made, the agreement would conform to Caltrans requirements. Caltrans also noted that no work completed prior to the signing of the conformance letter could be funded under the agreement.

Between March 24 and July 10, when the Authority issued the NTP for Arup and the date of Caltrans conformance letter, when Caltrans issued the conformance letter, Arup has, in good faith and in accordance with all federal contract requirements, incurred $43,871 in eligible costs, which cannot be funded through Agreement No. 422. To compensate for that unforeseen impact, staff proposes the following:

1. Execute Amendment 1 to Agreement No. 422 with Arup, to reduce the total agreement amount by $43,871, and
2. Approve new Agreement No. 438 with Arup, to fund the $43,871 that was incurred under the NTP using Measure J planning funds.
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## Contra Costa Transportation Authority STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 16, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Development of a Transportation Sales Tax Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) – Approval of Appointment of Members to the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Issues</strong></td>
<td>At its meeting on May 20, 2015, the Authority approved the formation of the EPAC and appointed an initial membership to serve on the Committee. The EPAC is one component of a comprehensive stakeholder outreach program necessary to gain consensus on a TEP for a potential 2016 sales tax ballot measure. The committee has been expanded to include 29 members that represent a balance of stakeholders (defined by stakeholder categories) that reflect the broad range of issues and interests in Contra Costa. Through the delegated authority provided to the Chair, interim appointments have been identified since the last meeting of the Authority. Proposed members have been identified to fill the remaining two vacant positions (a public health category and a member representing the John Muir Trust) and two alternate members have been identified (for the Transform member and the Northern Waterfront Economic Development Initiative member) and are recommended for appointment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>Staff recommends the Authority appoint the additional members to the EPAC and to close the committee to further nominations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Implications</strong></td>
<td>There is no additional cost to appoint new members to the EPAC over and above the costs associated with EPAC formation and facilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td>The Authority could choose to not approve the appointments and maintain the existing EPAC membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachments</strong></td>
<td>A. EPAC - Membership Approved by the Authority (through July 15, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes from Committee</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background

The EPAC held its first four meetings (June through September). There are two meetings scheduled in September and two additional meetings in October as the group approaches the task of creating a TEP recommendation to the Authority Board. Through the delegated authority provided to the Chair, the members recommended for appointment have been able to participate in the recent EPAC meetings. With the addition of the two new members, the EPAC now includes 29 positions.

Individuals have been identified and the Authority is recommended to appoint the primary and alternate members for the following categories/members:

- Public Health Member – Primary – Rebecca Rozen
- John Muir Trust – Primary – Linus Eukel
- Transform – Alternate – Geoffrey Johnson (alternate to primary member Joel Ramos)
- Northern Waterfront Economic Development Initiative – Alternate - Jamar Stamps (alternate to primary member Rich Seithel)

Upon approval of the appointments, all 29 EPAC positions have an appointed primary member. With the approval of appointments to all the primary membership, staff also recommends the Authority close the committee to further nominations. With this action, five of the EPAC membership positions would not have an alternate member identified.
EPAC – Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee

Membership Approved by the Authority (through July 15, 2015)

1. Bay Area Council
   - Mike Cunningham
   - Emily Loper (A)
2. Bike East Bay
   - Dave Campbell
   - Kenji Yamada (A)
3. Building and Construction Trades Council
   - Bob Lilley
   - Alternate to be determined
4. Building Industry Association
   - Lisa Vorderbrueggen
   - Bob Glover (A)
5. California Alliance for Jobs
   - Andy Fields
   - Michael Quigley (A)
6. Central Labor Council
   - Margaret Hanlon-Gradie
   - Cheryl Brown (A)
7. Contra Costa Community College District
   - Tim Leong
   - Alternate to be determined
8. Contra Costa County Taxpayers Association
   - Jack Weir
   - Mike McGill (A)
9. Contra Costa County Office of Education
   - Bruce Burns
   - Terry Koehne (A)
10. East Bay Economic Development Alliance
    - Dennis Freeman
    - Anne O (A)
11. East Bay Leadership Council
    - Kristin Connelly
    - Steve Van Wart (A)
12. East Bay Regional Park District
   - Sean Dougan
   - Erich Pfuehler (A)
13. Genesis
   - Reverend Hubert Ivery
   - Mary Lim-Lampe (A)
14. Greenbelt Alliance
   - Joel Devalcourt
   - Tom Brickley (A)
15. Paratransit
   - Rita Xavier
   - Shirley Cressey (A)
16. Rehabilitation Services of Northern California
   - Debbie Toth
   - Tighe Boyle (A)
17. Save Mount Diablo
   - Ron Brown;
   - Seth Adams (A)
18. TRANSFORM
   - Joel Ramos
   - Geoffrey Johnson (A) *
19. United Contractors
   - Emily Cohen
   - Man-Li Lin Kelly (A)
20. Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment (ACCE)
   - David Sharples
   - Jovana Fajardo (A)
21. Northern Waterfront Economic Development Initiative
   - Rich Seithel
   - Jamar Stamps (A) *
22. Sierra Club
   - Patrisha Piras
   - Matt Williams (A)
23. TRANSDEF
   - Peter Lydon
   - David Schonbrunn (A)
24. Urban Habitat
   • Bob Allen
   • Ellen Wu (A)

25. California Trucking Association
   • Eric Sauer
   • Chris Shimoda (A)

26. Brentwood Agricultural Land Trust
   • Kathryn Lyddan
   • To be determined (A)

27. Business Parks
   • Alex Mehran
   • Chris Truebridge (A)

28. Public Health
   • Rebecca Rozen *
   • Alternate to be determined

29. John Muir Trust
   • Linus Eukel *
   • Alternate to be determined

* Interim appointment by CCTA Chair
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## Contra Costa Transportation Authority STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 16, 2015

### Subject

Development of a Transportation Sales Tax Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) – Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) July 1, 2015 and August 10, 2015 Meeting Minutes

### Summary of Issues

The Authority has approved the formation of the EPAC, one component of a comprehensive stakeholder outreach program necessary to gain consensus on a TEP for a potential 2016 sales tax ballot measure. The EPAC is scheduled to meet through December 2015 to discuss a wide range of issues associated with the creation of a TEP. The committee membership represents a balance of stakeholders that reflect the broad range of issues and interests in Contra Costa. On August 10, 2015, the EPAC unanimously approved the meeting minutes of the July 1, 2015 meeting, with the proviso of the correction of two spelling errors which has occurred. The next EPAC meeting is scheduled for September 14, 2015. If approved by EPAC, the meeting minutes of August 10, 2015 will be available as a handout at the September 16, 2015 Authority meeting.

### Recommendations

None – Information Only

### Financial Implications

N/A

### Options

N/A

### Attachments

A. EPAC Meeting Minutes – July 1, 2015

### Changes from Committee

N/A
Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee Meeting MINUTES

MEETING DATE: July 1, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: See attached Meeting Attendance Log, Page 8

MINUTES PREPARED BY: Joanna Winter

A. CONVENE MEETING: Facilitator David Early convened the meeting at 10:02 am.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes of June 3, 2015.

ACTION: Member Xavier moved to approve the EPAC Meeting Minutes of June 3, 2015, seconded by Member Connelly. The motion passed with one abstention. Member Piras abstained.

DISCUSSION: Member Piras suggested that June 3 EPAC member introductions be captured as a substantive list rather than a summary. Facilitator David Early noted that staff would be providing meeting summaries, and recordings of the EPAC meetings are available on the CCTA website.

D. GENERAL BUSINESS:

D.1 EPAC Meeting Calendar.

ACTION: None taken – information only.

DISCUSSION: Facilitator David Early presented EPAC members with the EPAC meeting calendar through December 2015.

D.2 EPAC Roster.

ACTION: None taken – information only.

DISCUSSION: David Early presented EPAC members with the updated EPAC member roster, which includes new members who did not attend the June 3, 2015 EPAC meeting.

D.3 Action Item Log.
ACTION: None taken – information only.

DISCUSSION: David Early presented EPAC members with a log showing the updated status of action items assigned to staff at the June 3, 2015 EPAC meeting.

**D.4 EPAC Meeting Materials.**

ACTION: None taken – information only.

DISCUSSION: David Early presented EPAC members with a guide to accessing EPAC meeting materials on the Internet. Members with questions were referred to Linsey Willis of the CCTA, and to Andrew Hill or Joanna Winter of PlaceWorks.

**REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS**

1.0 **Introduction of New Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) Members.**

ACTION: None taken – information only.

DISCUSSION: New EPAC members who were not at the June 3rd meeting introduced themselves, their organizations, and the key issues they hope to see addressed in the process. The new member organizations attending were the Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment (ACCE), the Brentwood Area Land Trust, representing agriculture; and the California Trucking Association, representing goods movement. Bishop Ranch staff, representing the business park association, will attend future meetings, and EPAC staff are working to identify representatives from health organization(s). Key issues for new members included small business development, getting the workforce to work and out of their cars, inclusion of low and moderate income families and minorities.

2.0 **Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) Scope and Function.**

ACTION: None taken – information only.

DISCUSSION: David Early described the role of the EPAC, which is to advise the CCTA Board, who will receive the EPAC’s input in addition to input from other committees, the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs), and the public. The role of EPAC members is important, as the main forum for discussion among diverse stakeholders, but the CCTA will make the final decision on the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP). The EPAC were presented with a graphic that explains the public process by which the TEP is developed (attached). Mr. Early also presented the EPAC with a schedule clarifying the relationship between the TEP, the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and accompanying Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The EPAC will not advise directly on the CTP or RTP, but is welcome to provide input at those meetings.
Member Brown asked for clarity regarding the EPAC’s role vis a vis policies that may be included in a new sales tax measure. Mr. Early confirmed that these policies will be within the EPAC’s realm.

3.0 Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) Ground Rules.

ACTION: None taken – information only.

DISCUSSION: David Early reviewed the EPAC Ground Rules. These rules will apply to the organization and conduct of EPAC business. Mr. Early explained that the EPAC is subject to the Brown Act, which requires that a quorum of 13 or more EPAC members not attend the same event at the same time or discuss EPAC issues serially.

Member Campbell expressed concern that the Brown Act might keep members from working with their partners on the EPAC. Mr. Early responded that partners can continue working together so long as there is not a quorum, and clarified that EPAC members are encouraged to discuss EPAC issues within their organizations and with their constituents.

4.0 Presentation on Results of Project Performance Evaluation.

ACTION: None taken – information only.

DISCUSSION: Martin Engelmann, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Deputy Executive Director, presented the results of a qualitative evaluation of major projects in relation to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) performance criteria. The information is being provided to the EPAC as context for use in developing a Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) recommendation. He answered questions from EPAC members about the criteria and methodology by which these projects were evaluated.

Member Fields asked whether the EPAC would see quantitative analysis of each project. Martin Engelmann responded that not all projects are evaluated this way, but if EPAC members have questions about a specific project, staff can provide them with any available specific studies.

Member Piras asked about the number of projects evaluated. Martin Engelmann clarified that there are 79 projects, one of which combines two other projects.

Member Fields stated that he would like to get more data behind the reason for the thumbs up and thumbs down evaluation. For example, economic vitality and climate protection. He gave the example of Pacheco Blvd. widening, assuming that it was considered neutral because of its bicycle and pedestrian improvements, not the road widening.
Mr. Engelmann confirmed that any project that increases auto capacity is not considered “supportive” of climate, unless it contains bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

*Member Lyddan* asked whether the evaluation is based on the MTC model, and expressed interest in linking infill and Priority Development Area (PDA) sites with Priority Conservation Areas (PCA).

*Member Brown* asked what the evaluation means for adequate housing and low-income displacement; whether the thumbs-up evaluation means that a project without housing receives a positive evaluation regardless of its impacts on affordable housing upstream or downstream.

Mr. Engelmann responded that the housing criteria correspond to MTC guidance, and is based on the past performance of the jurisdiction in which the project is located in meeting their housing need. Because East County did extraordinarily well in this respect, while West County did not due to the recession, to be fair CCTA staff gave a positive evaluation to projects in jurisdictions that have an approved housing element for the next cycle.

*Member Cunningham* asked whether there were background documents on each project available. He also asked about the intersection between these projects and local and county housing opportunities, congested areas, commute corridors, etc.

Mr. Engelmann responded that not every project has a fact sheet; staff will provide the EPAC with those that they have. He will engage the CCTA’s Geographic Information Systems (GIS) staff to find out if they can overlay information about existing housing densities, future housing production, etc.

*Member Connelly* asked whether the criteria addresses the goal of increasing Gross Regional Product (GRP), improving goods movement, removing cars from roads, and providing construction jobs. *Member Fields* seconded this issue.

Mr. Engelmann responded that any investment in transportation increases GRP by creating jobs and selling goods. Projects that reduce the delay are considered positive; any project that would increase the delay would not support the GRP.

*Member Ramos* expressed concern about level of priority addressing impacts on the maintenance of existing system, and made a formal request to address the maintenance issue. He is apprehensive that if the public is displeased with the current state of maintenance on transportation infrastructure, a measure supporting new investments will not be popular. *Member Ramos* suggested that the CCTA exceed rather than conform to MTC guidance, including addressing cost per Vehicle Mile Traveled.
Member Devalcourt expressed concern that this may be the only assessment being done between this point and the EIR, given the EPAC’s interest in exploring a whole range of issues with the evaluation.

Member Seifel seconded the interest in connecting Priority Conservation Areas to the evaluation, as well as Priority Industrial Areas, which are very relevant for goods movement and economic vitality.

5.0 Schedule and Topics of Future Meetings.

ACTION: The EPAC voted 15-5 to extend the August meeting to four hours.

DISCUSSION: David Early outlined the schedule of future EPAC meetings, which includes meetings four, five, and six in September and October at which the EPAC will discuss the projects they would like to see move forward, meeting 7, at which staff will present a package that represents the EPAC’s direction, and meetings 8 and 9, at which the EPAC will hear feedback from others and fine tune the package. Mr. Early also presented a list of potential topics for future meetings, inviting EPAC members to comment on items to add; the order in which to address the topics; and information needed from staff. He described the presentations planned for the August 10th meeting, including presentations from the RTPCs and transit agencies.

In addition to these, EPAC members requested presentations on the following topics:

- Caltrans 2040 Transportation Plan
- Communications plan and polling strategy
- Past performance of TEP investments: what worked and what missed the mark
- History and successes with Alameda and/or Contra Costa Counties’ previous ballot measures

Member Devalcourt requested that the EPAC take a look at future polling results to ensure that respondents are giving the CCTA realistic priorities, not a “pie-in-the-sky” wish list.

Ross Chittenden, CCTA Deputy Executive Director, Projects, noted that a discussion of the communication plan and public outreach plan for the remainder of 2015 is on the July 15th CCTA Board agenda. Mr. Early added that polling could be added to the agenda for the August EPAC meeting, with EPAC members deciding whether they have time to address it.

Member Connelly expressed concern that a two hour meeting in August would not be enough to hear presentations and also have time for a meaningful discussion.
Mr. Early clarified that it is possible to add meetings or extend the meeting time, but not possible to defer any of the content to the September meeting and stay on deadline.

Member Lydon requested a briefing on Caltrans Sacramento on the transportation plan for 2040, as it is a transforming document and the State is part of the County’s environment.

Member Allen stated that he wants to look at the TEP from an investment package point of view, having several scenarios to look at, as is being done at the regional and countywide (CTP) level, rather than individual projects, to show how a different set of packages of investments perform across a range of metrics.

Mr. Early noted that this is a suggestion for the September and October meetings.

Member Allen clarified that he would like to see the EPAC give information on scenarios and what the process should be before the September meeting, because if it doesn’t happen until the September meeting, he is concerned there will not be enough time.

Member Brown requested to hear what the promises, expectations, and actual performance on issues such as growth and congestion management were on the investments made using funds from the previous ballot measure.

Member Ramos mentioned that several EPAC members worked on the Alameda County measure that failed the first time, and suggested that if they had taken the polling more seriously, it might have won the first time. He requested to discuss current maintenance needs and the maintenance impact of proposed TEP projects.

Member Piras asked why there will not be presentations in August from all transit operators, and requested that the presenters give their priorities. Mr. Early explained that the transit presentations would be consolidated to save time, and confirmed that the presenters will discuss their priorities.

Member Connelly requested that the transit agencies and RTPCs present their priority projects with a focus on projects that would be most likely to gain support for a ballot measure.

Member Lampe expressed a desire to discuss how actual transit riders will be impacted, Member Lampe further suggested that EPAC members engage in discussions, rather than just being talked at, and requested that materials arrive sooner than three days in advance.

Mr. Early reminded the EPAC that this is a several month process, there will be time for in-depth discussion in future meetings, and that before the discussion they need to hear the information. He asked forbearance that the EPAC will need to listen to the presentations at the August meeting, but he noted that meetings starting in September will involve detailed discussions about the TEP, and that the August meeting will include EPAC discussion to prepare
for the TEP discussions in September and beyond. Mr. Early offered to provide the EPAC with links to the RTPC proposals/packages when they become publicly available.

*Member Allen* asked when scenarios would be able to be discussed, i.e. at the August meeting, or later. Mr. Early said that there will likely not be time to discuss scenarios at the August meeting, but scenarios and packages may be one of the options for addressing the September meeting.

*Member Weir* requested staff sum up the total cost of projects to evaluate it in terms of overall schedule and scale, and requested that meetings always start and stop on time.

Mr. Early referred Member Weir to the cost figures in Martin Engelmann’s presentation. Alternative scenarios will also include summed project and program costs.

Mr. Early asked the EPAC whether they wanted more time at the August meeting. There was general consensus among EPAC members that more time should be allotted in August to these presentations. A 15-5 vote was made to extend the August meeting to three or four hours rather than to add an extra meeting, with the understanding that the EPAC may need to talk in August about extending the September meetings, as well as additional data needs. Mr. Early noted that he had also heard a desire to discuss at the August meeting principles and packages by which the projects might be evaluated, as well as discussion of policy issues and programs. The August 10 meeting was set for 11:30am-4:00pm.

Mr. Early proposed that EPAC members think about what principles they would like to emphasize, and come to the first meeting in September ready to discuss project packages based on principles and kinds of projects rather than specific individual projects. He stated that staff and consultants could create alternative scenarios as a starting point for discussion. There as apparent consensus in favor of this suggestion.

*Member Fields* requested information about the economic and job creation aspect of projects to use as criteria for evaluation of projects/packages.

*Member Campbell* requested a presentation about how to come up with a great plan and how to take it and turn it into a campaign that goes on the ballot (and wins). He would like to hear from the Regional Transportation Planning Councils (RTPC) why their priority projects will help win a ballot measure, not just how they will help the RTPCs. He suggested Member Fields give this presentation.

*Member Fields* offered to give the presentation, and also suggested Art Dao or Tess Lengyel at ACTC as alternative presenters.

### 6.0 Adjournment to Next meeting:

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 am to the next meeting of August 10, 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Mtg 1</th>
<th>Mtg 2</th>
<th>Mtg 3</th>
<th>Mtg 4</th>
<th>Mtg 5</th>
<th>Mtg 6</th>
<th>Mtg 7</th>
<th>Mtg 8</th>
<th>Mtg 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment (ACCE)</td>
<td>David Sharples</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Council</td>
<td>Mike Cunningham</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike East Bay</td>
<td>Dave Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Construction Trades Council</td>
<td>Bob Lilley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Industry Association</td>
<td>Lisa Vorderbrueggen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood Agricultural Trust</td>
<td>Kathryn Lyddan</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Alliance for Jobs</td>
<td>Andy Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Trucking Association</td>
<td>Eric Sauer</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Labor Council</td>
<td>Margaret Hanlon-Gradie</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College District</td>
<td>Tim Leong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa County Taxpayers Association</td>
<td>Jack Weir</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Office of Education</td>
<td>Bruce Burns</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Economic Development Alliance</td>
<td>Dennis Freeman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Leadership Council</td>
<td>Kristin Connelly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay Regional Park District</td>
<td>Sean Dougan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Rev. Hubert Ivery</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt Alliance</td>
<td>Joel Devalcourt</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Council</td>
<td>Rebecca Rozen</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Waterfront Economic Development Initiative</td>
<td>Rich Seithel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Coordinating Council</td>
<td>Rita Xavier</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Services of Northern California</td>
<td>Debbie Toth</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save Mount Diablo</td>
<td>Ron Brown</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Patrisha Piras</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSDEF</td>
<td>Peter Lydon</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFORM</td>
<td>Joel Ramos</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Contractors</td>
<td>Emily Cohen</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Habitat</td>
<td>Bob Allen</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Regional Transportation Planning Committees’ (RTPCs) Submittals for a Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)

#### Summary of Issues

In response to the Call for Projects issued by the Authority on May 22, 2015, the four RTPCs submitted a list of candidate projects and programs to be included in a draft TEP.

Later this year, the Authority will consider input from RTPCs, the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC), and the general public in developing a draft TEP for a possible new sales tax measure.

Attachment A summarizes input received from the RTPCs.

#### Recommendations

None – Information Only

#### Financial Implications

A new half-cent sales tax would generate approximately $2.3 billion in current dollars over a 25-year period.

#### Options

N/A

#### Attachments

- **A.** Summary of RTPCs Submittals
- **B.** Letter from WCCTAC dated July 27, 2015
- **C.** Letter from SWAT dated August 27, 2015
- **D.** Letter from TRANSPAC dated July 9, 2015
- **E.** Letter from TRANSPLAN dated July 13, 2015

#### Changes from Committee

N/A

### Background

At its meeting of March 18, 2015, the Authority directed staff to undertake tasks to develop a TEP for possible consideration of a new sales tax ballot as early as November 2016. The
Authority asked staff to engage and seek input from all affected stakeholders, including the RTPCs, EPAC, and the general public on the development of a draft TEP.

To start the discussion, the Authority is assuming similar terms to Measure J where, if passed in November 2016, the new measure would increase the sales tax by ½ percent for 25 years, starting on April 1, 2017 and ending on March 31, 2042. Such a measure would be estimated to raise approximately $2.3 billion in constant dollars.

Under Measure J, each RTPC’s share of projected revenues was based on its population at the midpoint of the measure. For a new 25-year measure starting in 2017 and ending in 2042, year 2030 represents the midpoint of the new measure. Table 1 shows each RTPC’s share of revenues from a new 25-year measure based on the Association of Bay Area Government’s (ABAG’s) population forecast for 2030.

**Table 1: Revenue Targets By Subregion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subregion (RTPC)</th>
<th>2030 Percentages POPULATION</th>
<th>25-year New Sales Tax Measure REVENUE ESTIMATE (x 1,000 in constant $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPLAN</td>
<td>28.25%</td>
<td>$ 660,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPAC</td>
<td>29.36%</td>
<td>$ 686,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCCTAC</td>
<td>23.26%</td>
<td>$ 544,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAT</td>
<td>19.13%</td>
<td>$ 447,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,339,083</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* may not add up due to rounding

**Call for Projects**

On May 22, 2015, the Authority issued the Call for Projects to develop a list of candidate projects and programs for consideration in a draft TEP. Input was sought by July 24, 2015 to allow for sufficient time to summarize the results and provide the information to EPAC and the Authority.

Information about current allocations to Measure J programs, funding targets by RTPC, known shortfalls on ongoing and upcoming Measure J projects, along with polling results were included in the Call for Projects. In addition, Authority staff attended RTPC meetings to provide background information on projects and existing programs.
## NEW TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX MEASURE
### SUMMARY OF SUBMITTALS BY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Highways/Interchanges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 Transit Corridor and Congestion Relief</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly Transit Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 Transit Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 Northbound Carpool Lane Completion (Livorna to N. Main)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 Direct Access Ramps for Buses and Carpools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride Expansions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR24/Camino Pablo Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Rail/Ferry Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eBART (Antioch to Brentwood)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Service - Central County (Martinez)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Service - West County (Hercules and Richmond)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Service - East County (Antioch)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Parking, Access, Safety, Reliability, Car Replacement and Other Improvements</td>
<td>10.15 or 12.35</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>28 or 50</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td><strong>WCCAC</strong>: Priority for funding is for 80/SPDR and 80/Central Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules Intermodal Transit Center</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Capacity Transit Improvements in West County</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>456.5</td>
<td>146.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Rail/Ferry Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eBART (Antioch to Brentwood)</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Service - Central County (Martinez)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Service - West County (Hercules and Richmond)</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Service - East County (Antioch)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Parking, Access, Safety, Reliability, Car Replacement and Other Improvements</td>
<td>10.15 or 12.35</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>28 or 50</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td><strong>WCCAC</strong>: Priority for funding is for 80/SPDR and 80/Central Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules Intermodal Transit Center</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Capacity Transit Improvements in West County</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>288.6 or 330.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>28 or 50</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Bus Transit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Service Improvements</td>
<td>205.3</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express Bus</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>219.2</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities</td>
<td>305.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>WCCTAC: Can be used for capital or operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>305.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Local Streets &amp; Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements</td>
<td>690.6 or 688.6</td>
<td>206.1</td>
<td>134 or 112</td>
<td>152.3</td>
<td>198.2</td>
<td>WCCTAC: Local Streets and Sidewalks (Maintenance, Improvements, and Complete Streets). TRANSPAC: Local Streets Maintenance and Multi-modal Improvements (Vehicle, Bike, Ped &amp; Transit). TRANSPLAN: Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements. SWAT: Local Streets and Roads. Note that SWAT entertained two options for this category depending on amount to BART: 30% and 25%. A final recommendation for this category was not made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Roads, Bridges, Grade Separations, and Intersections</td>
<td>201.1</td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasco Road Improvements</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Parkway Maintenance</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette Downtown Congestion Relief</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>970.3 or 948.3</td>
<td>357.6</td>
<td>175 - 153</td>
<td>179.5</td>
<td>258.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pedestrian/Bicycle/Trail Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Pedestrian/Regional Trails enhancement and maintenance</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>SWAT: Includes TUC. Projects to be funded include Olympic Corridor (Contra Costa), Diablo Rd Circulation (Danville), Iron Horse Recreation Pathway (San Ramon), Acqueduct Trail (Lafayette). WCCTAC: No carve out for EBRPD but can still compete. WCTAC: Program was replaced by adding “Complete Streets” to Local Streets and Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation for Livable Communities (Bike, Pedestrian &amp; Transit Enhancements)</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>138.3</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Student Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus Programs</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SWAT: Expands Traffic and Lomirinda School Bus Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Bus Pass Program</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to Schools</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Transportation for Children/“Street Smarts”</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Commute Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Transportation</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>SWT: Signal coordination, signal preemption, integrated corridor management, incident management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Displacement from Priority Development Areas</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>WCCTAC: For development, preservation and operation of low-income affordable housing to ensure high-probability transit riders can live near transit stops, and to combat poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional Transportation Needs</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>WCCTAC/TRANSPLAN: Can be used on any project/program identified in expenditure plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Transportation</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>SWT: Signal coordination, signal preemption, integrated corridor management, incident management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Displacement from Priority Development Areas</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>WCCTAC: For development, preservation and operation of low-income affordable housing to ensure high-probability transit riders can live near transit stops, and to combat poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional Transportation Needs</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>WCCTAC/TRANSPLAN: Can be used on any project/program identified in expenditure plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>2339.0</td>
<td>687.0</td>
<td>448.0</td>
<td>544.0</td>
<td>660.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NEW TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX MEASURE

**SUMMARY OF SUBMITTALS BY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEES**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways/Interchanges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-60 Transit Corridor and Congestion Relief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-60 Transit Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-60 Northbound Carpool Lane Completion (Livorna to N. Main)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-60 Direct Access Ramps for Buses and Carpo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and Ride Expansions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR24/Camino Pablo Interchange Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-60/SR242/SR4 Corridor Congestion Relief and Traffic Smoothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-60/SR4 Interchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR242/Clayton Road Off- and On-Ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR4 Operational Improvements (SR242 and Port Chicago)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-60/Contra Costa Blvd/Concord Avenue Interchange Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interchange Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80/San Pablo Dam Road Interchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80/Central Avenue Interchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80/Pinole Valley Road ramp extensions and widening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR4 and Willow Avenue eastbound on and off-ramps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR239 - Brentwood to Tracy Expressway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Notes | | | | |
| Mostly Transit Infrastructure | | | | |
| WCCTAC: Priority for funding is for 80/SPDR and 80/Central Avenue | | | | |
| WCCTAC: Can be used for capital and/or operations to be split equally between Richmond and Hercules. | | | | |
| 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. | | | | |
| 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. | | | | |

| **Bus Transit** | | | | | |
| Bus Service Improvements | | | | | |
| Express Bus | | | | | |
| **Subtotal** | | | | | |

| Notes | | | | |
| 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. | | | | |
### Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities</strong></td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Local Streets &amp; Roads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements</td>
<td>29.5% or 28.6%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30% or 25%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Roads, Bridges, Grade Separations, and Intersections</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Pedestrian/Bicycle/Trail Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Pedestrian/Regional Trails enhancement and maintenance</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation for Livable Communities (Bike, Pedestrian &amp; Transit Enhancements)</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Student Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bus Programs</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Bus Pass Program</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to Schools</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Transportation for Children/&quot;Street Smarts&quot;</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Commute Alternatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Transportation</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Displacement from Priority Development Areas</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional Transportation Needs</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

- **WCTAC**: Can be used for capital or operations
- **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.
- **WCCTAC**: Can be used for any project/program identified in expenditure plan.
- **TRANSPLAN**: Can be used on any project/program identified in expenditure plan.
- **TRANSAC**: Can be used for any project/program identified in expenditure plan.
July 27, 2015

Mr. Randell Iwasaki, Executive Director
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek CA 94597

RE: Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)

Dear Randy:

We are responding to your letter of May 22, 2015 requesting that Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) provide recommendations on projects and programs to be funded in a Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP).

To address this request, WCCTAC brought this subject to its Board twice, took the issue to its Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and also formed an Advisory Ad Hoc Subcommittee which met on four occasions. A set of recommendations was approved by the WCCTAC Board at its July 24, 2015 meeting, and is attached as a chart.

Per your request, WCCTAC will provide forms under separate cover about specific capital projects that are being called out in the Expenditure Plan. In addition, while we have provided notes that describe project and program details, it’s our expectation that these can be refined further in the future. It’s also our expectation that there will be additional opportunities in the future for the WCCTAC Board to propose adjustments to the current recommendations.

Please contact me if you would like to discuss the attached chart or if you have any questions about WCCTAC’s recommendations. We thank you for the opportunity to provide input from our sub-region and look forward to continuing to participate in the TEP development process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John Nemeth
Executive Director
## WCCTAC July 24, 2015 Recommendation on the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT AND PROGRAM CATEGORIES</th>
<th>Current Measure J (West County)</th>
<th>New TEP Proposal %</th>
<th>New TEP Proposal $</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>$59,843,520</td>
<td>These project funds would prioritize the San Pablo Dam Road/I-80 and Central Avenue/I-80 interchange projects. Other eligible projects include: Pinole Valley Road/I-80 eastbound on-ramp lengthening, Pinole Valley Rd widening at the I-80 on-ramps, and the State Route 4/Willow Avenue eastbound on-and off-ramp project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Roads, Bridges, Grade Separations, Intersections</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>$13,600,800</td>
<td>These project funds would be spent on major road improvements, bridges, rail safety/quiet zone improvements, and intersections/grade separations (including any combination of roadway, rail, bike-ped pathway).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Capacity Transit Improvements</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$54,403,200</td>
<td>These funds would support the development, advancement, or implementation of high capacity transit improvements in West County. Examples could include, but are not limited to: A BART extension, Bus Rapid Transit, improvements to Rapid Bus corridors, expanded or new express bus service, improvements to passenger rail service, new or innovate rail services, and ferry service. These funds could also be spent on transit operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules Intermodal Transit Center (ITC)</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>$10,880,640</td>
<td>These project funds would be spend on improvements related to the Hercules Intermodal Transit Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART (Station, Capacity, Safety, Reliability, and Other Improvements)</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>$43,522,560</td>
<td>These project funds would be dedicated to capital improvements and not operations. The specific eligibility requirements are TBD, but the focus should be on improvements that clearly and directly benefit West Contra Costa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets and Sidewalks (Maintenance, Improvements, and Complete Streets)</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>$152,328,960</td>
<td>These program funds would be returned to local jurisdictions and could be used for any transportation purpose. A portion of these funds should be required to be spent on bicycle, pedestrian or complete streets improvements. A minimum portion should also be required to be spent in Priority Development Area (PDAs). Additional details TBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Parkway Maintenance</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>$13,600,800</td>
<td>These program funds would be available annually to offset the operations and maintenance cost of the Richmond Parkway which are currently borne by the City of Richmond and the County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>Current Measure J (West County)</td>
<td>New TEP Proposal %</td>
<td>New TEP Proposal $</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation for Livable Communities</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>This program was replaced by a Complete Streets/Bike/Ped requirement incorporated above into the Streets and Roads category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>$5,440,320</td>
<td>These program funds could supplement the County’s Safe Routes to School planning and outreach program in West Contra Costa. They could also be used for capital improvements to improve pedestrian and bicycle access to schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped, Bike, Trails</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>$27,201,600</td>
<td>These project funds would support pedestrian, bicycle and trail facilities. Unlike Measure J, there would not be a special carve-out for the EBRPD, although they could still compete for funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Service in West County</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>$27,201,600</td>
<td>These funds could be used either for capital improvement or ongoing operations. Half of these funds are intended for Richmond and the other half for Hercules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Service Improvements</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$54,403,200</td>
<td>These program funds could be used for either capital or operations. 50% of the funds would need to be spent on improvements in Priority Development Areas. Other program details TBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Bus Pass Program</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>$27,201,600</td>
<td>These program funds would expand the student bus pass program in two ways. First, passes would be available to middle school students. Secondly, passes would be available to students (high school and middle school) regardless of income level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation for Seniors &amp; People with Disabilities</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>$27,201,600</td>
<td>These program funds could be used for either capital or operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Transportation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>$10,880,640</td>
<td>These programs funds could be used for programs or small-scale projects that have an air quality or GHG reduction benefit. Potential examples include: car-sharing, bike-sharing, electric vehicle infrastructure, alternative fuel vehicles, and non-motorized (bike and ped) improvements. More specific program details TBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Displacement from Priority Development Area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>$10,880,640</td>
<td>These funds could be used for the development, preservation or operation of housing affordable to lower-income households, to ensure that high-propensity transit riders can live near transit stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute Alternatives (TDM)</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>$2,720,160</td>
<td>These program funds would promote alternatives to commuting in SOVs. Eligible projects may include, but are not limited to: park and ride facilities, carpooling, vanpooling, transit incentives, bicycle and pedestrian facilities (including sidewalks, lockers, racks, etc.), Guaranteed Ride Home, congestion mitigation programs, and employer outreach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional Transportation Needs</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>$2,720,160</td>
<td>These program funds could be used for any project or program identified in the expenditure plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$544,632,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 21, 2015

Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

RE: SWAT Meeting Summary Report for August 2015

Dear Mr. Iwasaki:

At the August 3 Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) meeting, the following items were discussed and/or approved that may be of interest to the Authority:

- **Approved** Request to Repurpose Contra Costa Transportation for Livable Communities (CC-TLC) Program Funds for City of San Ramon and Town of Danville (staff report attached);

- **Accepted** Revised 511 Contra Costa FY 2015-16 SWAT Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program and Budget; and

- **Approved** Draft Proposal Transportation Expenditure Plan for the SWAT Sub-region (attached).

The next SWAT meeting is scheduled for **Monday, September 14 2015**, at Supervisor Andersen’s Lamorinda Office, 3338 Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Lafayette. Please contact me at (925) 973-2651 or email at lbobadilla@sanramon.ca.gov, if you should have any questions.

Sincerely,

Lisa Bobadilla  
City of San Ramon  
SWAT Administrative Staff

Cc: SWAT; SWAT TAC; Jamar Stamps, TRANSPLAN; John Nemeth, WCCTAC; Anita Tucci-Smith, TRANSPAC; Danice Rosenbohm, CCTA; Martin Engelmann, CCTA
### Preliminary TEP Projects & Programs Proposal (SWAT Sub-region)
(SWAT Revision 2 - as discussed at SWAT meeting of 8/3/15)

#### PROPOSED NEW CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (SWAT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Exx/TEP (Southwest target share - $447M)</th>
<th>$ millions</th>
<th>SWAT target</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1-680 Transit Congestion Relief</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>SR Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1-680 Transit Investment Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1-680 NB HOV Gap Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MTC Study will look at project options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1-680 Direct Access Ramps (DAR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EIR in progress for DAR in San Ramon-location TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Park &amp; Ride Expansions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Major Streets (some marque projects listed below - not a complete list)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>SWAT (all jurisdictions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moraga Intersection Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Alamo Intersection Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lafayette Downtown Area Corridor/Intersection Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SR24 Interchange Ops Improvements (Camino Pablo, Orinda)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>Orinda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lafayette Downtown Congestion Relief</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expanded BART Service (Consists of new vehicles and upgraded capacity controllers to increase level of service)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3% OR 11.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Exx/TEP (Southwest target share - $447M)</th>
<th>$ millions</th>
<th>SWAT target</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Local Streets &amp; Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td>134.0</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>25% OR 30% Includes Complete Streets component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not a complete list</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>SWAT (all jurisdictions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Olympic Ped/Bike Corridor (County)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Diablo Road Circulation Improvements (Danville)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Iron Horse Trail Overcrossings (San Ramon)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aqueduct Trail (Lafayette)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Expanded Transit Access to BART</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>Includes 15-minute headways to BART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Technology Upgrades (signal coordination, transit preemption, ICM/Incident Management)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Safe Transportation for Children (Lamorinda School Bus and SRV TRAFFIX Programs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>Includes Park &amp; Ride lot expansions and/or new facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Commute Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Transportation for Seniors</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Exx/TEP (Southwest target share - $447M)</th>
<th>$ millions</th>
<th>SWAT target</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>448.0</td>
<td>100.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SWAT TARGET</strong></td>
<td>447.0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items for further SWAT Discussion:

1. BART asked to come back to SWAT with hard costs for train expansions and capacity controller for purposes of further evaluation/refinement of proposed allocation for Project #5 - Expanded BART Service. Consider other RTPC proposals in order to evaluate overall level of support/effort. Info Provided at 8/3/15 meeting.

2. Local Streets & Roads. 3-3 split among SWAT to allocate 25% or 30%

3. Expanded BART Service consensus not reached on funding allocation of 6.3% OR 11.3%
July 9, 2015

Randell H. Iwasaki  
Executive Director  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Re: Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) Development

Dear Mr. Iwasaki:

The Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) was considered by the TRANSPAC Technical Advisory Commission (TAC) at a special meeting on June 4, 2015, and again at its regular meeting on June 25, 2015, when the TAC had developed a proposal for consideration by the TRANSPAC Board of Directors.

The TRANSPAC Board considered the TAC’s recommended proposal at its meeting on July 9, 2015, and concurred on a TEP proposal, authorizing transmission of TRANSPAC’s 2016 TEP to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority for consideration in its deliberations for the placement of a new transportation sales tax measure on the ballot as early as November 2016.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Loella Haskew  
TRANSPAC Chair

Attachment: 2016 Ballot Measure TEP

CC: Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, CCTA
# 2016 Ballot Measure TEP

## Potential Capital Project Categories in Central County - TRANSPAC PROPOSAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Categories</th>
<th>$ millions</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> I-680/SR4/SR242 Corridor Congestion Relief/Traffic Smoothing</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>CCTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680/SR4 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR242/Clayton Road Off- and On-Ramps</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>CCTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR4 Operational Improvements</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>CCTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCB/Concord Avenue Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>CCTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>131.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Transit Corridor Improvements</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>CCTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 Operational Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> BART Parking, Access and Other Improvements</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>BART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add New Cars to the Fleet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Ferry Transportation</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>County/Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Major Streets: Traffic Flow, Safety and Capacity Improvements</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton Rd/Treat Blvd Intersection Capacity Improvements</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ygnacio Valley Rd Traffic Smoothing &amp; Complete Streets</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concord Blvd Complete Streets for Pedestrian/Bike Safety</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Pass Rd Capacity and Complete Streets Improvements</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galindo Street Corridor Efficiency Improvements</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa Blvd Complete Streets Project - Phase 5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>Pleasant Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Lane Complete Street Project</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>Pleasant Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Hill Rd Complete Streets Project - Phase 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>Pleasant Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic Corridor Bike/Trail Connector</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>County/Walnut Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Downtown Public Improvements</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>Walnut Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacheco Blvd Widening</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>Martinez/County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra Avenue Widening</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>316.2</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2016 Ballot Measure TEP

## Potential Programs in Central County - TRANSPAC PROPOSAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Categories</th>
<th>$ millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Local Streets Maintenance &amp; Multi-Modal Improvements (Vehicle, Bike, Ped &amp; Transit)</td>
<td>206.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Technology Upgrades</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Transportation for Livable Communities (Bike, Ped &amp; Transit Enhancements)</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Safe Routes to Schools</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Increased Transit Bus Frequency to BART</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Transportation for Senior &amp; People with Disabilities</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bike/ped regional trails enhancement and maintenance</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Commute Alternatives</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 370.7 54.0%

---

**Grand Total**

(Capital Project Categories & Programs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$686.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>$686.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 13, 2015

Hisham Noceimi, P.E, Engineering Manager
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

RE: 2017 Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP") and DRAFT Transportation Expenditure Plan ("TEP")

Dear Hisham:

In response to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority’s ("CCTA") Call for Projects for the RTP and TEP, the TRANSPLAN Committee took the following actions at their Thursday, July 9, 2015 meeting:

1. **APPROVE the East County 2017 Draft Regional Transportation Plan ("RTP") project list.** TRANSPLAN staff delivered a presentation on the TRANSPLAN Technical Advisory Committee’s ("TAC") DRAFT RTP project lists. The TRANSPLAN Committee ("Committee") upheld the TAC’s recommendation unanimously approving the DRAFT RTP project lists and authorized TRANSPLAN staff to forward the DRAFT RTP project lists to CCTA for consideration.

2. **APPROVE Draft East County Transportation Expenditure Plan ("TEP").** TRANSPLAN staff delivered a presentation on the TRANSPLAN TAC’s DRAFT TEP for East County. The Committee made specific changes to the projected capital and program funding allocations. Following the discussion, the Committee upheld the TAC’s recommendation unanimously approving the DRAFT TEP, with changes, and authorized TRANSPLAN staff to forward the DRAFT TEP to CCTA for consideration.

All requested documents are enclosed with this letter. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the subject items. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (925) 674-7832 or email at jamar.stamps@dcd.cccounty.us.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jamar Stamps
TRANSPLAN staff

Enclosures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BART - East County Extension</th>
<th>Measure J Total</th>
<th>Funding Shortfall</th>
<th>New Proj/Prog Cost</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 eBART</td>
<td>$137,702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Pittsburg Center Station</td>
<td>$2,904</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,000 ($300mil est)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW eBART (Antioch to Brentwood)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$140,606</strong></td>
<td><strong>$80,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Route 4 Widening</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3001 Sommersville Rd to SR160</td>
<td>$94,105</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW SR4 Operational Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3003 Loveridge Rd to Somersville Rd</td>
<td>$30,720</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$124,825</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East County Corridors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5002 SR4: Widen to 4 Lanes - Laurel to Sandcreek</td>
<td>$4,269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5003 SR4: Sand Creek Int - Phase 1</td>
<td>$13,647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5005 SR4: Balfour Rd Int - Phase 1</td>
<td>$38,000 $13,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5006 Vasco Rd Safety Improvements - Phase 1</td>
<td>$647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5010 SR4: Segments 1 and 3</td>
<td>$25,001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5011 East County Reserve</td>
<td>$19,645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW Vasco Rd Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW SR239 - Brentwood to Tracy Expressway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$101,209</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$160,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BART Parking/Access/Other Improvements</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10004 East County</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BART Safety and System Reliability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10004 East County</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Streets: Traffic Flow, Safety, Capacity Improv.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24025 Major Streets in East County</td>
<td>$19,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Projects                                      | **$310,000**  |                  |                    |       |

| Measure J Programs (Existing and Proposed)           |               |                  |                    |       |
| Local Streets Maint. & Improv.                      | $198,227      |                  | 30.00%             |       |
| TLC                                                   | $16,519       |                  | 2.50%              |       |
| Ped/Bike                                             | $9,911        |                  | 1.50%              |       |
| Bus Service                                          | $33,038       |                  | 5.00%              |       |
| Transp. For Seniors/Ppl with Disabilities            | $46,914       |                  | 7.10%              |       |
| Express Bus                                          | $13,876       |                  | 2.10%              |       |
| Commute Alternatives                                 | $6,608        |                  | 1.00%              |       |
| **NEW Safe Transp. for Children/"Street Smarts"**   | $8,259        |                  | 1.25%              |       |
| **Subregional Transp. Needs**                       | $10,110       |                  | 1.53%              |       |
| **NEW Ferry Service in East County**                | $6,608        |                  | 1.00%              |       |
| **Total Programs**                                  | **$0**        |                  | **$350,069**       |       |

| Grand Total                                          | **$388,040**  | **$660,069**     |                    |       |

Projected 25-year Measure Revenue (TRANSPLAN)          |                  | **$660,756**     |                    |       |

Remaining Projected Revenue                            | **$687**        |                  |                    |       |
Administration and Projects Committee STAFF REPORT  
Meeting Date: September 3, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Legislation Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Issues</td>
<td>This is an update on relevant developments in policy, legislation and finance that are of interest to the Authority. Mark Watts of Smith, Watts &amp; Company, LLC will discuss current State legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Discussion and action to be determined on proposed legislation on an individual basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments (Revised-</td>
<td>A. Federal Legislative Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC Meeting Handout)</td>
<td>B. State Legislative Update – Revised (APC Meeting Handout)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachment B, See APC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packet dated 9/3/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for Attachment A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes from Committee</td>
<td>The APC authorized CCTA staff, in consultation with Mr. Watts, to prepare and send support letters as needed for legislative items in the special session.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background

This report contains updates on relevant developments in policy, legislation and finance that are of interest to the Authority both at the State and Federal levels of government.

Mark Watts of Smith, Watts & Company, LLC will be in attendance to discuss current legislative activities that may affect the Authority. This discussion may consist of an overview of current bills, and may also include recommendations for positions/actions by the Authority pertaining to specific bills.
September 2, 2015

MEMORANDUM

To: Linsey Willis
From: Mark Watts
Subject: Legislative Report

Special Session On Transportation and Infrastructure

Following the Legislature return from its Summer Recess on August 17th, the focus in the transportation community has been on transportation funding (Special Session #1). The Senate has conducted two policy hearings in the Special Session to address key bills while the Assembly focused on conducting a series of three Roundtable Workshops around the state to enlighten their membership and targeted communities on transportation funding issues.

In addition, over the Summer Legislative Recess, a broad-based coalition of transportation stakeholders was formed to push for a resolution to the transportation funding issue at the heart of the Special Session.

Fix Our Roads Coalition

Funded by CSAC, the League of Cities and the Alliance for Jobs, this group was founded around seven key principles:

- Make a significant investment in transportation infrastructure.
- Focus on maintaining and rehabilitating the current system.
- Invest a portion of diesel tax and/or cap & trade revenue to high-priority goods movement projects.
- Raise revenues across a broad range of options.
- Equal split between state and local projects.
- Strong accountability requirements to protect the taxpayers’ investment.
- Provide Consistent Annual Funding Levels.

After delivering the coalition principles in letter form to the Governor and legislators, a press briefing was conducted in August to provide a deeper background understanding of the transportation funding situation and the coalition’s suggested approach to the media. Additional activities executed by the Coalition include:
• In district meetings. Over the recess, in district meetings with key legislators have been conducted with local government, business and labor and asking that the coalition principles guide legislative negotiations.
• Online & Digital Advertising. Also to correspond with the principles launch, they initiated a website and posted banner advertising on the most frequented political web sites.
• Op-eds. Beginning in August, the coalition targeted placement of localized op-eds highlighting specific regional needs.
• Local government/third party support. The League and CSAC worked with their members to pass resolutions in support of coalition principles. They also reached out to local organizations, such as local chambers, to join the Fix Our Roads coalition.

In addition, Fix Our Roads was deeply involved in assisting the Speaker’s Office in implementing the 3 Roundtable Workshops. The first was conducted at CCTA Offices on August 19 and featured a local government panel that included CCTA Commissioner, Pierce, Supervisor Anderson among others. Two other successful Roundtable workshops were conducted in Los Angeles and in Fresno.

**Legislative Activity – Special Session**

**Senate**

*August 19 hearing:*

The Senate Special Session Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure conducted its first policy bill hearing on August 19 on Special Session bills, starting with the Chair Beall’s centerpiece measure, SBX1 1, which is largely based on his regular session bill, SB 16.

The revised version of SBX1 1 bill increases the amount of funding raised to the $4 billion level and not only proposes new higher gas and diesel taxes, but frames a new charge on vehicles to be collected in the manner of the Registration Fee. Additionally, the bill provides a new process to replace the annual Board of Equalization Tax Swap adjustment; in its place, the bill resets the Tax Swap increment, currently at 12 cents per gallon (CPG) since July 1st, to 17 CPG, and adds a triennial CPI adjustment. The bill passed.

The remainder of the bills heard on August 19th comprises key elements of Senate Republican Caucus reform measures:

• **SB X1 3 (Vidak) HSR Bonds.** Amends HSR bond funding initiative (and requires a general vote) to redirect HSR Bond funds to repair or construct highways and local streets and roads. **FAILED PASSAGE.**
• **SB X1 9 (Moorlach) Department of Transportation.** Prohibits Caltrans from using temporary funding (e.g., bonds) to support permanent positions; mandates increased contracting for engineering services. **FAILED PASSAGE.**
• **SB X1 12 (Runner) Transportation Commission.** Makes the CTC independent and authorizes CTC to approve the Department’s individual repair and maintenance projects. **PASSED.**
• **SB X1 13 (Vidak) Inspector General.** Creates an Inspector to assure that Caltrans and HSRA operate efficiently, effectively, and in compliance with federal and state laws. **PASSED.**
• **SCA X1 1 (Huff).** Guarantees that transportation taxes are used for transportation purposes. **TESTIMONY ONLY; VOTE AT LATER HEARING.**

*September 1 Hearing:*

Additionally, on September 1\textsuperscript{st}, the committee conducted a second hearing on Republican reform proposals and two bills seeking to supplement current levels of transit funding.

Bills heard are as follows:

**SBX1 2 (Huff) Cap and trade funds, reallocated.** Appropriates Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) monies generated from transportation fuels to transportation infrastructure, excluding high-speed rail. **FAILED PASSAGE.**

**SCAX1 1 (Huff) Protects motor vehicle fees and taxes.** This SCA seeks voter approval to protect transportation taxes by requiring that they be used only for transportation purposes. **VOTE DEFERRED.**

**SBX1 6 (Runner) Cap and trade.** Prohibits expenditure of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) monies on the high-speed rail project and appropriates the majority of GGRF monies to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for allocation to high-priority transportation projects. **FAILED PASSAGE**

**SBX1 7 (Allen) Diesel Sales Taxes.** Increases the sales and use tax on diesel fuel and dedicates the increase to transit. **PASSED.**

**SBX1 8 (Hill) Transit funding, Cap and Trade.** Increases the continuous appropriations of GGRF monies from 10% to 20% for the TIRCP and from 5% to 10% for the LCTOP. **PASSED.**

*Assembly*

It is anticipated that the Assembly will follow suit and develop their hearing schedule for their Special Session Committee on Transportation & Infrastructure in the coming week.

Additionally, both houses are taking steps to possibly convene a conference committee as a means to foster a negotiating environment on transportation funding.

**Legislative Activity – Regular Session**

**AB 194 (Frazier):** This bill would provide the statewide authority for Caltrans and Regional agencies to use tolling, HOT Lanes and managed lanes. The Self-help counties negotiated with the Administration on amendments during the Summer Recess. These were inserted into the bill while it was in the Senate Appropriations committee. In the meantime, it appears the Administration has concern over elements of the bill with the Department of Finance authorized to take an Oppose position.
In the immediate past week, the Administration further signaled interest in tying the department more closely to development of corridor expenditure plans, which has been resisted by Self-Help Counties and the author.

*ABX1 9 (Levine)*: Assemblymember Levine introduced this bill to require Caltrans, by September 30, 2015, to temporarily restore the third eastbound lane on State Highway Route 580 from the beginning of the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge in the County of Marin to Marine Street in the County of Contra Costa to automobile traffic and temporarily converts the existing one-way bicycle lane into a bidirectional bicycle and pedestrian lane.
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### Subject
Authorizing the Issuance of up to $190 Million Aggregate Principal Amount of Contra Costa Transportation Authority Sales Tax Revenue Bonds for the Purpose of Financing Measure J Projects, Authorizing a Partial Refunding of the Series 2012B Bonds, Authorizing the Execution and Delivery of Related Documents, and Authorizing Taking All Required Actions

### Summary of Issues
The Authority has been preparing for the next bond issuance (the “Series 2015A Bonds”) to finance the ongoing delivery of Measure J capital projects anticipated in the Strategic Plan. The proposed financing plan calls for issuing up to $190 million of fixed-rate sales tax revenue bonds, including $100 million (“new money”) for ongoing projects and up to $90 million for refinancing Authority Series 2012B Bonds to reduce interest costs. All the documents have been prepared in substantially final form and staff is seeking approval to take the necessary steps to complete the transaction in October.

### Recommendations
Staff seeks approval of Resolution 15-46-A which will provide for the issuance of the Series 2015A Bonds in the amount not to exceed $190 million.

### Financial Implications
The proposed financing plan will require the Authority to pledge future sales tax revenues for bond debt service. The exact debt service amount will not be known until the bonds are underwritten on or about October 1st. Based on the current market, debt service payments are estimated to average approximately $7.7 million through 2034. Transactional costs for legal and financial advisory services and other required fees are included in the debt service and estimated at $400,000.

### Options
1. Defer the timing of the Series 2015A Bonds which may impact interest cost savings and funding availability for Measure J projects.
2. Other direction as may be determined.
**Attachments (See APC Packet dated 9/3/15)**

A. Resolution 15-46-A  
B. Draft Preliminary Official Statement  
C. Draft Fourth Supplemental Indenture (available at www.ccta.net)  
D. Draft 2015A Bond Purchase Agreement (available at www.ccta.net)  
E. Draft Escrow Agreement (available at www.ccta.net)

**Changes from Committee**

No changes except that the APC asked that it be clarified that the $90 million proposed for the refinancing is a partial refinancing of the $188.7 2012B Bonds. The remaining bonds are not cost effective or eligible at this time.

**Background**

The Authority’s Measure J Strategic Plan calls for the periodic issuance of sales tax revenue bonds to finance construction costs and accelerate project delivery. The debt payments, including principle and interest, are repaid semi-annually from future sales tax revenues. As of June 30, 2015, the Authority has $366.3 million of outstanding bonds. The purpose of the accompanying resolution is to authorize the issuance of the Authority’s next installment of bonds (called the “Series 2015A Bonds”), estimated not to exceed $190 million. Approximately $100 million will fund ongoing and planned Measure J projects and approximately $90 million to refinance previously issued bonds for savings.

On December 4, 2012, the Authority raised $427.4 million by issuing bonds in two series, including $201.5 million Series 2012A Bonds to refinance earlier bonds issued in 2010 and Series 2012B Bonds that raised $225.9 million for ongoing Measure J projects. The bonds are rated AA+ from Standard & Poor’s and Fitch Bond Ratings. The interest rate on the Series 2012A Bonds is based the 1-month London Interbank Offered Rates (LIBOR) plus a fixed spread of 0.37% (similar in concept to an adjustable rate mortgage loan). This fixed spread is locked in for 3 years and ends on December 15, 2015. The Board has already approved a plan to reset the interest rate on or before this date.

**Proposed Financing Plan for Series 2015A Bonds**

All necessary documents and preparations have been made for the Authority to move forward with the next installment of Measure J bonds, the Series 2015A Bonds estimated at $190
million. The financing will accomplish the objectives of raising $100 million for ongoing funding of Measure J projects and allocate approximately $90 million to refinance Series 2012B bonds at lower interest rates currently available. The proposed structure calls for conventional sales tax revenue bonds with fixed rates of interest, long term repayment and the ability to call and prepay the bonds in 10 years with no early redemption cost. The bond rating has not yet been received but is expected to be on par with the Authority’s existing AA+ rating.

The Series 2015A Bonds includes authorization for up $90 million to refinance a portion of the $188.7 million outstanding bonds issued by the Authority in 2012. Although the 2012 bonds were issued at low historical interest rates, an analysis of the current market supports carving out approximately 50% (about $90 million) of the Series 2012B Bonds to refinance. The analysis demonstrates that the Authority will save approximately $4.3 million in debt service costs over the remaining years of the 2012 bonds by refinancing. The Authority’s Debt Policy establishes a minimum savings threshold of 3%; meaning the amount of savings on a present value basis must be at least 3% of the par amount of bonds refinanced. Current estimates suggest that the net savings will be approximately 4.4%, inclusive of costs associated with issuing the bonds.

The accompanying resolution will authorize the Authority to execute the bond transaction in early October. All the necessary documents have been prepared and approved as to form by Authority general counsel. The documents however contain many placeholders for dates, dollar amounts, rates, etc. that can only be completed once the transaction has been executed and all terms finalized. The investment banking team includes Citi Group, Wells Fargo Capital, and Alamo Capital. Also assisting the Authority is Public Financial Management as financial advisor, Best, Best & Krieger as bond counsel; Hawkins Delafield & Wood as disclosure counsel; U.S. Bank as the Bond Trustee; and an escrow verification agent.

**Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Authority approve Resolution 15-46-A providing for the issuance of the Series 2015A Bonds in a principal amount not to exceed $190 million, including approximately $100 million for financing ongoing and planned Measure J projects and approximately $90 million to refinance earlier bonds issued in 2012 for cost savings.
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### Planning Committee STAFF REPORT

**Meeting Date:** September 2, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Transmittal of Recommended Project Lists to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for Inclusion in the 2017 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Issues</strong></td>
<td>In response to the 2017 RTP Call for Projects issued by MTC on April 29, 2015, Authority staff has worked with the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and project proponents to develop a comprehensive list of projects for submittal to MTC. To receive future State or federal funding, a project must first be included in the RTP. Projects that impact the capacity of the transportation system must be listed individually in the RTP. The RTP also includes programmatic categories for projects that do not impact the capacity of the transportation system (e.g. pavement rehabilitation, safety projects, pedestrian/bicycle enhancement projects, etc.). Local jurisdictions, the RTPCs, and transit agencies submitted 211 projects/programs with a total cost of $15.3 billion in Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars and funding requests of $8.1 billion. In addition, BART also submitted five region-wide projects with a cost of $9.7 billion. The Authority’s Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) reviewed the proposed list at its August 27th meeting and recommended approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td>Staff requests that the Authority review and comment on the proposed list of projects and programs. The Authority will be asked at its October meeting to approve Resolution 15-49-G and forward its recommendation to MTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Implications</strong></td>
<td>Projects that are not included in the 2017 RTP will be ineligible to receive future State or federal funding. A funding target of $2.3 billion in YOE dollars is being used as a starting point for the project lists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
<td>Refine the project lists as needed or take no action at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A.** Draft Resolution 15-49-G (for Authority adoption in October)
### Attachments *(See PC Packet dated 9/2/15)*

- regarding Submittal of Contra Costa Transportation Authority’s Proposed 2017 RTP Capital Projects List to MTC, transmitting:
  - Exhibit 1: Proposed “Committed” Project List
  - Exhibit 2: Proposed “Financially Constrained” Project List
  - Exhibit 3: Proposed “Vision” Project List

- **B.** TRANSPLAN List of Projects approved on July 9, 2015
- **C.** SWAT List of Projects approved on July 16, 2015
- **D.** TRANSPLAN Letter and List of Projects approved on July 9, 2015
- **E.** WCCTAC Letter and List of Projects approved on July 24, 2015
- **F.** Draft Letter to MTC Regarding Proposed 2017 RTP Capital Project Lists (for transmittal in October)

### Changes from Committee

*None*

### Background

MTC began preparing its 2017 RTP Update earlier this year. As a planning document, the 2017 RTP Update will outline the region’s programmatic and policy objectives for the 24-year time period of 2017 through 2040. Adoption of the Final 2017 RTP is tentatively scheduled for early-to-mid 2017.

State and federal law require that the RTP include the following four elements:

1. Policy;
2. Action;
3. Financial; and,
4. Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)

State and federal law also require that every RTP is “financially constrained”, that is, the total cost of the programs and projects included in the Action Element of the RTP must not exceed the expected revenues forecast in the Financial Element. Any transportation project requiring
future State or federal funding must be included within that element. MTC’s schedule calls for the draft Financial Element to be developed later this year.

State law also requires the RTP to be internally consistent. That is, the projects proposed must fit within the financial constraints identified and must support the land use and development pattern that the SCS will establish.

“Call for Projects” for the 2017 RTP

MTC’s Call for Projects for the 2017 RTP (T-2040) was issued on April 29, 2015. As part of the Call for Projects, each Congestion Management Agency (CMA) was requested to coordinate project submittals from its county and assist with public outreach.

Following the Planning Committee meeting on May 6, 2015, a letter was sent to the RTPCs and transit operators to begin the process with a list of projects from the last RTP. The list included: 1) “committed projects” that are currently fully funded (from local, State or federal sources) or will be fully funded with local funds; 2) a financially constrained list of candidate RTP projects to be funded with existing fund sources such as State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Surface Transportation Program (STP), and others; and 3) a list of additional projects that would require additional funding beyond the 2017 RTP financial constraints, for possible inclusion in a “vision element” of the RTP.

During June and July, Authority staff worked with project sponsors and the RTPCs to respond to the Call for Projects. Core evaluation criteria recommended by the Authority to prioritize projects included completion of Measure J projects and project readiness. Project sponsors were also encouraged to submit projects that support stated 2017 RTP goals.

Based upon the input received, Authority staff has developed three project lists for transmittal to MTC – Committed, Financially Constrained, and Vision. The information contained on these lists must be input electronically to MTC’s database by the end of September, and the Authority Board’s approval (by resolution) of the submittal is due to MTC by the end of October. The TCC reviewed the proposed list at its August 27th meeting and recommended approval.
Funding Target

Draft “discretionary” funding targets for the 2017 RTP are expected to be released by MTC later this year. A funding target similar to the last RTP of approximately $2.3 billion in YOE dollars is being used as a starting point for the financially constrained project list.

Public Outreach Plan

MTC requested that each Bay Area CMA undertake a public outreach effort to complement the broader effort undertaken by the regional agencies. CMA participation was required as part of an interagency agreement between CCTA and MTC enabling receipt of federal funds. The objective of the outreach effort was to encourage all interested stakeholders and transportation constituents to participate in and comment on the RTP/SCS development process.

Initially, for the previous RTP cycle, a comprehensive outreach effort as approved by the Authority in March 2011 was focused on providing opportunities for public input into the 2013 RTP Call for Projects. It was one component of a broader, more comprehensive outreach effort that was conducted later by the regional agencies.

Following this effort, the Authority initiated a comprehensive Public Outreach effort to inform our stakeholders and the general public about the 2014 Countywide CTP, which provides a foundation for the RTP. This effort included the following components:

- Four public workshops, one in each planning area of the County;
- Two public opinion polls to gauge the public’s views on transportation issues and improvements;
- Two sets of focus groups, first to explore the public’s sentiment on various proposed transportation projects and programs, and second to understand the public’s views on transportation innovation and new technologies;
- An online public engagement tool that allowed members of the public to submit their best ideas for improving transportation;
- A telephone town hall that was held countywide and had more than 1,300 participants; and
Printed surveys that enabled citizens who prefer to work with hard copy rather than the internet to share their project ideas.

Complete documentation of the public outreach effort will be submitted to MTC under separate cover.

Following the public outreach effort, Authority staff met with the RTPCs and informed them of the input received. During June and July, the Authority provided the RTPCs with a qualitative evaluation of major projects using MTC’s performance criteria from the 2013 RTP to help the RTPCs develop their submittals.

Public meetings will be held during August and September of 2015 at the Authority offices located at 2999 Oak Road, Ste. 100, Walnut Creek, CA 94597. These meetings will allow members of the public an opportunity to comment on the proposed Draft RTP projects lists. The dates of these meetings are as follows:

- Thursday, August 27\textsuperscript{th}, 2015 at 2:30 p.m. (TCC)
- Wednesday, September 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. (Planning Committee)
- Wednesday, September 16\textsuperscript{th}, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. (Authority Board)

During October, members of the public will have further opportunity to comment as follows:

- Wednesday, October 7\textsuperscript{th}, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. (Planning Committee)
- Wednesday, October 21\textsuperscript{st}, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. (Authority Board)

The proposed Draft 2017 RTP “Committed” and “Financially Constrained” project lists reflect the results of this public outreach and the qualitative assessment of major projects as well as completion of Measure J projects, previous commitments and project readiness. Projects on the “Vision” list generally lack committed funding, or are not yet ready for construction. Even as extensive as these lists are, they are only a subset of the larger list of projects and programs that sponsors are pursuing.

**Summary of Submitted Projects**

There are 211 projects/programs that have been submitted with a total cost of $15.3 billion in YOE dollars and funding requests of $8.1 billion. Of those, 45 projects are on the Committed List with a cost of $2.4 billion. No federal/State funding is sought by committed projects since they are currently fully funded or expected to be fully funded with local sources.
There are 88 projects on the Financially Constrained List with a cost of $7.1 billion and future funding requests of $2.3 billion from discretionary fund sources.

The Vision List contains 78 projects costing $5.8 billion, and is unfunded. In addition, five BART region-wide projects were also submitted with a cost of $9.7 billion. Projects on this list will serve as a backup to be advanced to the Financially Constrained List should new fund sources be assumed in the 2017 RTP.

Authority staff reviewed the submitted lists and cross-checked them with the projects and programs in the Comprehensive Transportation Project List (CTPL).

Project Evaluation

Following the Call for Projects, Authority staff published a qualitative evaluation of all projects with costs greater than $25 million. The evaluation applied MTC’s criteria from the 2013 RTP and was made available to the RTPC’s for use in developing the project lists. For the 2017 RTP, MTC staff intends to develop and apply new criteria to evaluate how projects meet stated 2017 RTP goals. MTC will undertake this project-level performance evaluation to determine which projects to ultimately include in MTC’s financially constrained element of the RTP. The project evaluation phase is tentatively scheduled for September through November 2015. Following the completion of the performance evaluation, MTC will notify the CMAs regarding which projects have performed adequately for inclusion in the RTP.

Projects that are not “committed” will be subject to evaluation using the above-mentioned qualitative assessment. In addition, MTC will conduct quantitative benefit-cost analysis of projects with costs greater than $50 million (in 2015 dollars). For the 2017 RTP, a project is considered “committed” if it is expected to be fully funded with local funds, or if it is fully funded with a mix of local, State, and/or federal funds and expected to have environmental clearance by September 2015.

The three lists compiled by staff (Committed, Financially Constrained, and Vision) will inform MTC of Contra Costa’s priorities during the evaluation process, which take into account delivery of Measure J projects.
### Tentative Schedule

Below is a timeline of upcoming activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 27, 2015</td>
<td>Technical Coordinating Committee reviews the initial proposal for the financially constrained 24-year Project Lists, and reviews the larger proposed comprehensive list of RTP “vision element” projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2, 2015</td>
<td>Planning Committee reviews the financially constrained 24-year Project Lists, and reviews the larger proposed comprehensive list of RTP “vision element” projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 16, 2015</td>
<td>Authority reviews proposed 2017 RTP Project Lists for submittal to MTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17, 2015</td>
<td>TCC has an opportunity to provide further comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 30, 2015</td>
<td>CCTA staff completes the review and submittal of projects into MTCs database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7, 2015</td>
<td>The Planning Committee has an opportunity to review and discuss any proposed changes to the submittal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21, 2015</td>
<td>Authority approves proposed 2017 RTP Project Lists for submittal to MTC through adoption of Resolution 15-49-G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept – Nov 2015</td>
<td>MTC conducts project-level performance assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January – May 2016</td>
<td>MTC Releases Scenario Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2017</td>
<td>MTC Releases Draft 2017 RTP and Draft Environmental Impact report (EIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>MTC adopts final 2017 RTP and EIR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Planning Committee **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: September 2, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Recommended Transportation Investment Options for Analysis in the Updated Draft of the 2014 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and the Recirculated Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Issues</td>
<td>Authority staff is developing an updated Draft of the 2014 CTP and intends to publish the Draft CTP and recirculate a Draft SEIR for public review and comment in early 2016. The first 2014 Draft CTP was released in August 2014, and a Draft SEIR was released in September 2014. The previous Draft SEIR essentially evaluated the CTP, including the Comprehensive Transportation Project List (CTPL), which is a financially unconstrained list of projects and programs, and a “No Project” Alternative that would limit the plan to projects and programs with assured funding commitments. The scope of the recirculated Draft SEIR will include three financially constrained Transportation Investment Options. The updated SEIR will be developed in parallel with a potential Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) that the Authority could adopt in May 2016. Using the Authority’s Countywide Travel Demand Forecasting Model, preliminary analysis of the three options will begin in September 2015, while analysis of the Draft TEP will begin in November, after Authority releases it for review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>Staff requests that the Authority review and comment on the proposed options to be evaluated in the updated Draft CTP and recirculated SEIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Implications</td>
<td>The consultant cost of preparing the first Draft 2014 CTP and Draft SEIR released a year ago was $1,089,000. Re-issuing the Draft 2014 CTP and SEIR is anticipated to cost an additional $700,000. Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Note: the September 2014 Draft SEIR was a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report and was built upon the 2009 CTP EIR. The January 2016 SEIR will be a Subsequent Environmental Impact Report. Both rely on the analysis of a previous or existing EIR. The Supplemental EIR is intended to provide supplemental information to the previous EIR where only minor changes to the project or its impacts have occurred since certification of the previous EIR. The Subsequent EIR is used where the changes to the project and its impacts are more substantial. For further information, go to Sections 15162 and 15163 of the CEQA Guidelines.
The cost of the 2014 CTP and SEIR is therefore estimated at $1,789,000.

Options

Recommend other options for analysis.

Attachments

(A. Description of New Alternatives to be Analyzed in the Recirculated SEIR (Revised)

B. Comment letters received on the Notice of Preparation for the 2014 CTP (New Attachment)

Changes from Committee

The Planning Committee recommended approval of the proposed options for inclusion in the SEIR. Staff noted that eight comment letters on the NOP were received (see new Attachment B). Staff and consultants will consider the comments in the development of the draft CTP SEIR. Also, since the Planning Committee’s last meeting, staff has made some revisions to the project alternatives and the fund estimate.

Background

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines require Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) to consider a reasonable range of alternatives to a proposed project or to the location of the proposed project. These alternatives must “feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126(a)). “Feasible” means that the alternatives “are capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15364). The EIR need not analyze these alternatives at the same level of detail as the project itself.

Section 15126 of the CEQA Guidelines outlines the range of alternatives that the EIR should analyze. All EIRs must assess a “No Project” Alternative. In this case, the No Project Alternative analyzes the effects of not approving the 2014 Countywide CTP, leaving in place only projects and programs previously approved by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) in the 2009 CTP. The range of alternatives is determined by the “rule of reason,” meaning that the EIR needs to analyze those alternatives that will permit a reasoned choice and will foster informed decision making and public participation. The EIR should also focus on alternatives that would avoid or substantially lessen any significant impacts of the proposed project, even if those alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives or would be
more costly. If the alternatives themselves would have significant environmental impacts, the significant effects of the alternative should be discussed.

Finally, the CEQA Guidelines require each EIR to identify the environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives analyzed. If the No Project Alternative is the most environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must then identify the next most environmentally superior alternative among the remaining project alternatives.

EIR Scoping

Prior to releasing the Draft SEIR for the 2014 CTP last September, the CCTA issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on April 25, 2014. The NOP elicited four responses that were considered in preparation of the Draft SEIR published on September 19, 2014.

A second NOP was issued on July 31, 2015 for the proposed recirculated Draft SEIR for the Draft 2014 CTP [see 2014 CTP NOP]. It included a list of alternatives to “the Project – the CTP,” to be analyzed, including the No Project Alternative, the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Alternative, and three different Transportation Investment Options. A public scoping meeting was held at 4:00 p.m. on Monday, August 24, 2015 at the Authority’s offices at 2999 Oak Road, Suite 100 in Walnut Creek, California.

If the CCTA releases a Draft TEP in November 2015, it will be included in the list of alternatives to be analyzed as part of the proposed recirculated Draft SEIR for the Draft 2014 CTP.

Alternatives that were Analyzed in the Previous Draft SEIR

The Draft SEIR issued in September 2014 evaluated the Countywide CTP as the Project. The CTP includes the Authority’s vision, goals, strategies, subarea Action Plans, and the CTPL. The recirculated Draft SEIR will carry forward the Draft 2014 CTP as “the Project— however, the CTPL, which is financially unconstrained, will no longer be included.

The previous Draft SEIR also evaluated the “No Project” Alternative, which limits the plan to existing funding commitments. The “No Project” Alternative will be carried forward in the recirculated Draft SEIR.

The previous SEIR included three Alternatives, each focusing on different areas of emphasis. Each of the Alternatives was developed using the framework of the CTPL, which is financially unconstrained. The recirculated Draft SEIR will shift the analysis of Alternatives to those that
are financially constrained. Therefore, the three alternatives in the previous Draft SEIR will no longer be considered. ²

**New Alternatives to be Analyzed in the Recirculated SEIR**

Each of the new Alternatives will be financially constrained in some fashion. The new Alternatives include the 2013 RTP, three Transportation Investment Options, and a Draft TEP subject to CCTA approval. The financial constraints of the 2013 RTP are well documented in Plan Bay Area, the most recently adopted RTP for the San Francisco Bay region. The three Transportation Investment Options assume that new funding would become available through a 25-year half-percent sales tax measure. If the CCTA releases a Draft TEP in November 2015, that proposal will be analyzed in the recirculated Draft SEIR.

The new Alternatives are described in Attachment A.

**Comment Letters Received on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) [New Subsection]**

The Authority issued a second NOP for the 2014 CTP on July 31, 2015. In response to the NOP, eight comment letters were received (see new Attachment B).

Authority staff will consider these comments in the preparation of the Draft SEIR.

---

² Note: In the previous Draft SEIR, Alternative 1 focused on maximizing freeway performance, Alternative 2 focused on increasing transit ridership, and Alternative 3 focused on reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. With the exception of the No Project, all alternatives included the full CTPL and therefore were financially unconstrained.
Description of New Alternatives to be Analyzed in the Recirculated SEIR

The following new alternatives will be evaluated in the recirculated Draft 2014 CTP SEIR, scheduled for release in early 2016.

THE 2013 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP)

This alternative is a reflection of MTC’s adopted Plan Bay Area (PBA) – the 2013 RTP for the San Francisco Bay Region. It includes the region’s first Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) required under SB 375. PBA assumes an investment in roadway, transit, pedestrian/bike, and trail projects consistent with a set of financial assumptions and performance targets that were used to guide the Plan.

PBA assumes investments of $292 billion (Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars) in committed and discretionary transportation projects and programs. This includes the maintenance and operation of the Bay Region’s transit system. For Contra Costa, the portion of funds invested in new multi-modal transportation projects is approximately $3.4 billion (2014 constant dollars) under the financial constraints of the RTP. This alternative assumes that all projects in PBA with committed or discretionary funding are included. All projects that are currently under construction, and projects that are locally funded, are included in the committed list of projects for the 2013 RTP. The discretionary list of projects in the RTP consists of yet-to-be constructed projects that will require funding from future regional, State and federal revenues.

The PBA list for Contra Costa includes a mix of project types, from freeway and arterial projects to transit improvements and bicycle/pedestrian improvements. The list focuses specifically on named projects. It includes major roadway improvements such as:

- Widening of SR4 from Somersville to SR160
The I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM) Project
- The I-680/SR4 interchange
- HOV and express lanes on I-80 and I-680
- The I-680 Direct Access Ramps in San Ramon
- Arterial improvements throughout Contra Costa, such as
  - the James Donlon Extension in Pittsburg
  - the widening of Bollinger Canyon Road in San Ramon
  - the realignment and widening of Pacheco Boulevard
  - replacing the 2-lane Fitzuren Road with a 4-lane divided arterial in Antioch.
- Major transit project include:
  - eBART from the Pittsburg/Bay Point station to Hillcrest Avenue in Antioch
  - the eBART Pittsburg Center Station
  - the Capitol Corridor station and bus facilities in Hercules
- Funding for unspecified pedestrian, bicycle, safe routes to school, and other similar programs.

These projects serve as a common base for all of the transportation investment options below.

TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT OPTIONS

The recirculated Draft 2014 CTP SEIR will evaluate three Transportation Investment Options, each of which represent a different set of financially-constrained transportation projects and programs intended to emphasize or prioritize different themes. Each option consists of projects and programs that would be feasible to develop should the CCTA decide to place a 25-year, one-half percent sales tax ballot measure before the voters. A new measure could generate approximately $2.3 billion in revenue (2014 constant dollars). Each investment option will be financially constrained to $810.3 billion based upon the following assumptions:

- Revenues would include the $3.4 billion in revenue from the 2013 RTP as outlined above
- Approximately $2.3 billion in potential additional sales tax revenue could be generated by the new sales tax
- For the purpose of establishing a fund estimate, staff has assumed a historic one-for-one across-the-board leveraging factor of two-to-one, where additional funding...
would be available from other sources, potentially generating an additional $2.3 \text{ billion}$. Consequently, each financially constrained Transportation Investment Option in the SEIR will have a total value (projects and programs combined) of $10.3 \text{ billion} (\$3.4 \text{ RTP} + \$2.3 \text{ new sales tax} + \$4.6 \text{ leverage}). The two-to-one leveraging rate reflects the following assumptions:

- Historically, projects have seen leverage rates of three-to-one and higher. Whether this phenomenon will continue into the future is uncertain.
- Leverage rates for programs, while likely to rise, are difficult to ascertain. With the growing list of new programs, such as the Active Transportation Program (ATP), student transportation, clean technology, etc., and given an expected significant increase in OBAG and Cap and Trade funding aimed at similar programs, leveraging is expected to increase significantly on the program side.
- Some programs are packages of many smaller capital projects, each of which can easily be leveraged at the projects rate (three-to-one).
- To address the issue of leveraging of projects and programs in a consistent fashion, without biasing the amount of investments towards one or the other, staff recommends the across-the-board leverage assumption of two-to-one.

Each of the three Transportation Investment Options described below, as well as the proposed Transportation Expenditure Plan, would carry forward the Growth Management Program, with possible amendments. Each option would also include and build on the projects in PBA.

Although each of the three options reflects different policy choices, and therefore different mixes of projects and programs, common ground may be found across all three options. For example, all options would fund local street and road maintenance, although at different levels, and some would require jurisdictions to fund complete streets improvements as part of these maintenance activities. Similarly, enhanced bus operations, increased Capitol Corridor train service, safe routes to schools, and paratransit services are included in all three options. Several projects would be funded in only two of the options but not all three. For example, the eBART extension from Antioch to Brentwood in East County would be funded in Options A and B below, but not Option C.
Transportation Investment Option A — Community-Focus

Transportation Investment Option A would promote safe, efficient and accessible operations for all users to create thriving local communities. Under this alternative, the Authority would prioritize investment in projects and programs that would increase transportation mode share and safety of transit and non-motorized users, and seek to improve community health. Investments under this option would be increased for major transit capital investment projects, and non-auto countywide capital and maintenance programs. For example, the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) program, which includes a collection of smaller projects that would increase mobility for walking, bicycling and transit use, would be emphasized in this option. Other countywide programs that encourage bicycling and walking would receive new funding as well.

Examples of priority-funded improvements under Option A include:

- Supporting expanded transit service through investment in transit capital projects, including BART and rail, as well as the construction of bus stops, shelters and other access improvements, where appropriate and needed;

- New sidewalks, trails and bike paths that help create a connected system of pedestrian and bicycle facilities throughout Contra Costa;

- Promoting walkability; and

- Supporting opportunities to repurpose public and private rights-of-way to enhance connectivity for cyclists, pedestrians, and transit users, particularly to schools, parks, employment centers, and shopping districts.

Transportation Investment Option B — Economic Focus

Under this alternative, the Authority would prioritize investment in projects and programs that enhance job creation and economic development in Contra Costa. This would be done by giving priority to: 1) freeway, roadway and transit projects that serve employment centers or facilitate access to jobs; 2) projects that support and improve urban goods movement; 3) capital
improvement projects that improve inter-county access to housing and jobs through the establishment of new freeway links; and 4) local street maintenance and improvement programs. This option would increase funding for capital improvements and would therefore result in less funding for many of the programs included under Option A.

Examples of priority-funded improvements under Option B include:

- Higher levels of funding for local street maintenance and improvement programs;
- Funding for integrated corridors, including “smart” freeways and major roadways;
- New inter-county roadway connections that would encourage job creation, support goods movement, and promote economic growth;
- Complete Streets improvements within Priority Development Areas (PDAs) that would support increased economic development; and
- Programs that promote accessibility to jobs and facilitate urban goods movement.

**Transportation Investment Option C — Environmental Focus**

Under this alternative, the Authority would not fund highway and roadway capital projects, but instead would invest available funds into projects and programs designed to reduce the generation of greenhouse gases, consistent with regional goals and strategies in PBA. Program investments under Option C are similar to those listed for Option A, but with 1) a shift from major transit capital investment projects to transit operations programs that benefit transit users; 2) numerous countywide programs designed to enhance and improve local streets for pedestrians, bicycles and trails, PDA-related programs, safe transportation for children, programs for seniors and people with disabilities; 3) other programs to provide additional transportation benefits for minority and low-income residents and to communities of concern.

Examples of priority project and programs to be funded under Option C include:
• Countywide transit improvement programs;

• Local street maintenance and improvement programs;

• Improved bus services to and within Priority Development Areas (PDAs);

• Bus passes for students;

• Transportation for seniors and persons with disabilities;

• New revolving funds for programs that address displacement of lower-income households from PDAs and other transit-rich locations;

• Advance mitigation for transportation projects; and

• Complete Streets projects in PDAs.

• NOTE: While all options include the PBA list of projects (2013 RTP), this option would exclude the James Donlon Extension project in Pittsburg.

POTENTIAL DRAFT TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURE PLAN (TEP)

If the CCTA releases a Draft TEP in November 2015, that proposed list of projects and programs will be included as an alternative to be analyzed in the Draft SEIR. A Draft TEP will have the same financial assumptions as the three Transportation Investment Options outlined above. This alternative may be developed by the Authority based upon input received from a wide range of stakeholders, the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs), standing Authority committees, the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC), the Public Managers Association, and the general public.
Notice of Preparation on SEIR on the Draft 2014 CTP

**Comment Letters Received**

By 5:00 pm, September 1, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Signed By</th>
<th>Dated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bay Area Air Quality</td>
<td>Jean Roggenkamp</td>
<td>8/28/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Delta Protection Commission</td>
<td>Erik Vink</td>
<td>8/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Greenbelt Alliance</td>
<td>Joel Devalcourt</td>
<td>8/28/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Public Advocates</td>
<td>Richard A. Marcantonio</td>
<td>8/7/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public Advocates</td>
<td>Sam Tepperman-Gelfant</td>
<td>9/1/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Save Mount Diablo</td>
<td>Juan Pablo Galván</td>
<td>8/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Transportation Solution Defense Education Fund</td>
<td>David Schonbrunn</td>
<td>8/31/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 28, 2015

Brad Beck, AICP, Senior Transportation Plannner
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Dear Mr. Beck,

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (District) staff has reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Recirculated Draft Program Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (RDPSEIR) for the 2014 Update to the Contra Costa Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). We understand that the 2014 CTP updates the visions, goals, and strategies of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA), and includes transportation projects and programs for implementation throughout the entirety of Contra Costa County as well as the Tri-Valley sub-region of Alameda County.

Previous Comment

District staff has commented on the proposed project on May 28, 2014 and recommends that the RDPSEIR address all applicable comments made in the previous comment letter, which is available at: http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/ceqa-comment-letters.

Additional Comments

District staff submits the following additional comments regarding the recommended air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) analysis to be provided in the RDPSEIR:

- Staff recommends the RDPSEIR contain a comparison of the existing baseline GHG emissions, reflecting existing conditions, with projected future emissions under the CTP, including documentation to support the calculations.

- Staff recommends that the RDPSEIR demonstrate the 2014 CTP’s consistency with the GHG reduction targets set forth in the Plan Bay Area sustainable communities strategy, which meet the California Air Resources Board’s (CARB’s) Bay Area regional target of 7 percent per capita reduction in transportation emissions from the 2005 baseline by 2020, and 15 percent per capita reduction from the 2005 baseline by 2035.

- Staff recommends the RDPSEIR mitigate any identified potentially significant air quality and GHG impacts to the maximum extent feasible. The Air District’s CEQA Air Quality Guidelines contain numerous mitigation measures for lead agencies to consider. These guidelines are available on the District’s website at:

The District’s website contains a number of tools and methodologies to assist lead agencies in analyzing environmental impacts. Available documents include guidance on quantifying plan level greenhouse gas emissions, risk and hazard screening for toxic air contaminants, and emissions modeling guidance. View and download available tools and methodologies here: http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines.

We encourage lead agencies to contact District staff with questions during the preparation of the air quality and greenhouse gas emissions analyses. If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Josh Pollak, Environmental Planner at 415-749-8435 or jpollak@baaqmd.gov.

Sincerely,

Jean Roggenkamp
Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer

cc: BAAQMD Board Member John Gioia
    BAAQMD Board Member David Hudson
    BAAQMD Board Member Karen Mitchoff
    BAAQMD Board Member Mark Ross
August 31, 2015

Brad Beck, AICP, Senior Transportation Planner
Contra Costa County Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

RE: Notice of Preparation of Recirculated EIR for 2014 Update to Contra Costa County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (SCH # 2014042045)

Dear Mr. Beck:

The Delta Protection Commission (Commission) staff has reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the 2014 Update to the Contra Costa Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan. In May 2014, I submitted a comment letter on the prior DEIR, a copy of which I have enclosed for your reference. In that letter I noted that the portion of the County’s land area which lies within the Delta’s Primary Zone is subject to consistency requirements with the Commission’s Land Use and Resource Management Plan (LURMP). The LURMP contains policies to protect the Delta environment, including its agricultural, ecological and recreational resources. Projects within the Secondary Zone of the Delta are not subject to the Commission’s jurisdiction, although we encourage local governments to consider mitigating negative impacts of Secondary Zone projects on the resources of the Primary Zone.

In preparing the Recirculated DEIR, I suggest that you identify any and all projects or portions of projects that will occur in the Primary Zone, and evaluate those projects for their consistency with the Commission’s LURMP policies. It would be helpful to include the Primary Zone and Secondary Zone boundaries on the DEIR maps.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NOP. If you have any questions, please contact Jennifer Ruffolo at (916)375-4882 or Jennifer.ruffolo@delta.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Erik Vink
Executive Director

cc: Supervisor Mary N. Piepho, Commission Chair
August 28, 2015

Contra Costa Transportation Authority
Attn: Brad Beck
2999 Oak Rd # 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597
(925) 256-4726

Dear Brad Beck,

Greenbelt Alliance appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Contra Costa Transportation Authority’s (CCTA) Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (dsEIR) of the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). We hope the following comments will help to create a CTP and dsEIR that provides the public with ample information on the projects, programs, and mitigations proposed for Contra Costa County that will help to create a world-class transportation system.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHGs) and Community Health
It is critical that the public understand how the CTP will impact Contra Costa County’s ability to meet the requirements of AB 32 and SB 375, as well as the vision of Plan Bay Area. We were disappointed that the previous drafts of the CTP and dsEIR created more confusion than clarity. Apparently, the previous CTP used outdated data to arrive at conclusions different from the dsEIR. Greenbelt Alliance was also very concerned that no mitigations were provided to address the environmental impacts in the previous dsEIR, in violation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). We expect that the recirculated dsEIR will provide clear and consistent data, as well as carefully considered mitigations. The failure to adequately measure and mitigate GHG and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) will have major ramifications, undermining state, county, and local environmental policies and potentially jeopardizing future transportation funds.

Regional Advance Mitigation Program
One mitigation strategy recommended to CCTA staff by Greenbelt Alliance is the Regional Advance Mitigation Program (RAMP). A RAMP would enhance the effectiveness of transportation-related mitigation activities. This would include bundling and strategically deploying mitigation funds, proactively conserving important natural and agricultural lands and leveraging other conservation investments. In addition, it would expedite the delivery of conservation and transportation projects and programs in Contra Costa County.

The recommendation to use a RAMP as an EIR mitigation strategy has precedence in Plan Bay Area. We recommend that the dsEIR include, at least, similar language as that included in Plan Bay Area: “Compensatory mitigation may also be achieved through Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP) banking, as deemed appropriate by the permitting agencies.”

Multi-modal future for the Concord Naval Weapons Station
The single largest housing and commercial development in Contra Costa County until 2040 will be the reuse of the Concord Naval Weapons Station (CNWS), near the North Concord BART station. How this project comes to fruition will have major implications for Contra Costa County. The U.S. Navy recently released a draft Environmental Impact Statement for the CNWS, which estimates that the project will generate 203,205 additional daily trips on new and

---

existing roads. Regardless of jurisdiction over the CNWS project itself, the CTP and dsEIR should carefully study this expected increase in vehicular traffic and provide greater emphasis on strategies to ensure that the new community is well served by a robust multi-modal transportation system to mitigate expected increases in vehicle use.

Comprehensive “Environmentally Superior” Alternative
Greenbelt Alliance provided comments on the previous dsEIR’s alternatives, recommending that CCTA consider a more comprehensive “environmentally superior alternative.” We recommend that the recirculated dsEIR include the following components to this alternative:

1. Eliminate all projects that would violate Contra Costa County’s Urban Limit Line, including, but not limited to, the James Donlon Extension, Camino Tassajara Expansion, and Highway 239 Expansion
2. Include a Regional Advanced Mitigation Program (RAMP) to enhance the effectiveness of transportation-related mitigation activities
3. Model strong growth management performance measures (similar to OBAG) for all road projects and measure an increased allocation for the Transportation for Livable Communities Program that would incentivize the creation of infill development around transit stations
4. Multi-modal strategies should be considered in all of the alternatives, but a comprehensive “environmentally superior alternative” should focus on providing a coordinated suite of mobility solutions to reduce GHGs and VMT

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the NOP as Contra Costa develops the next iteration of its CTP and dsEIR.

Sincerely,

Joel Devalcourt
Regional Representative, East Bay
Greenbelt Alliance
510.306.4203

---

August 7, 2015

BY EMAIL: bbeck@ccta.net

Brad Beck, Senior Transportation Planner
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA, 94597

Re: Preliminary Comments on Notice of Preparation

Dear Mr. Beck:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a recirculated Subsequent EIR (SEIR) for the proposed County Transportation Plan, dated July 31.

We will provide additional comments on the NOP in the near future, but write now to provide preliminary comments on behalf of the Sierra Club, Urban Habitat and Public Advocates because immediate action is required to avert the risk of inconsistency in the CEQA process that the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) has launched.

Specifically, the Board previously – and correctly – decided to integrate the development and environmental review of the County Transportation Plan (CTP) with the development of a sales tax expenditure plan (TEP) for the November 2016 ballot. For the reasons described below, a substantive “down payment” on the draft SEIR must be made available in September and October in order to provide decision makers and advisory committee members with the performance data they need as they develop the draft TEP by mid-November.

On May 20, the Board effectuated a fundamental reorientation of CCTA’s process for adopting its new CTP. A central part of that decision was the Board’s approval of staff’s recommendation to treat “the CTP and the TEP as part of the same overall CEQA ‘project’ and analyze[ing] their impacts together in one CEQA document.” (Staff rep., 5/20/15, p. 1.) Accordingly, the NOP states that the alternatives to be analyzed in the new SEIR “are specifically intended to inform the development of a 2015 Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (Draft TEP).” (NOP, p. 4.)

As we noted in a May 27 letter to Chair Pierce and Planning Committee Chair Abelson, this approach makes good sense, both for ensuring legal compliance and for developing a performance-based and cost-effective
sales tax plan through a process that provides agencies, stakeholders and the broader public with meaningful information about alternative sets of investment priorities. The NOP states this rationale even more pointedly: “[t]he results of this recirculated [SEIR] are also expected to assist the Regional Transportation Planning Committees and the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee in consideration of their development of an upcoming Transportation Expenditure Plan.” (NOP, p. 6.)

The inconsistency is one of timing. On the one hand, the Board approved a schedule under which CCTA will “Release [the] Draft SEIR” in January 2016. (Staff rep., 6/3/15, p. 5.) On the other hand, the Board-approved date for the release of 2015 Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan is November 18, 2015 (Staff rep., 5/20/15, p. 2.).

In order for “the results of” a performance assessment of alternatives to “assist” the RTPCs and the EPAC in “their development of an upcoming Transportation Expenditure Plan,” the substance of that assessment must be made available very soon. The RTPCs have already made their preliminary recommendations without the assistance of any performance assessment of overall investment scenarios (as opposed to individual “large projects”), and the EPAC meeting calendar reflects that its role will be completed by December 7, 2015.

To avert serious issues in both the CEQA process and the adoption of a TEP, a first draft of the performance evaluation of an appropriate range of TEP scenarios should be presented for comment and discussion at the September meeting of the EPAC, and a more refined version at one or both of its October meetings. Failing to complete a preliminary assessment of scenarios on this timetable risks rendering the CEQA process inconsistent with the prior decisions of the Board, as reflected in the NOP.

This preliminary environmental assessment should (a) identify scenarios, and (b) analyze those scenarios against appropriate performance measures, as follows:

Scenarios: The scenarios analyzed should include the Equity and Climate Scenario (attached), which Urban Habitat brought forward, with significant support, at the July 1 EPAC meeting. The rationale for the components of the Equity and Climate Scenario is to include an investment package in the evaluation of alternatives that, in the words of the Court of Appeal in the SANDAG case, “could significantly reduce total vehicle miles traveled” by “significantly reducing vehicle trips.” To do so, any VMT-reduction scenario must (as this scenario does) emphasize transit operating support to increase bus service on existing and new routes, reduce transit fares to boost ridership, and prioritize PDA-focused transit and active transportation improvements, while de-emphasizing road and freeway expansion projects.

---

1 The minutes of the Board meetings of May 20 (item 3.2) and June 17 (item 4.B.12) reflect 11-0 approval of both these items.

Other scenario alternatives could be easily developed for comparison, based on Measure J (see right-hand columns in the attached Equity and Climate Scenario) and on the preliminary recommendations of the RTPCs.

Performance Assessment: At its June 17 meeting, the Board approved the application of MTC’s 2014 Guidelines for County Transportation Plans to this integrated CTP and TEP process. Before doing so, the Board held an explicit discussion about the fact that this would mean incorporating MTC’s performance targets from Plan Bay Area (2013), including equity measures, and performing an Equity/Environmental Justice Analysis. Despite this explicit Board decision, the NOP mentions neither Plan Bay Area’s performance measures nor an Equity/Environmental Justice Analysis, both of which must be incorporated into the new SEIR. Both must also be part of the preliminary assessment of TEP scenarios.

If the process of seeking input into the development of the TEP is to be meaningful, the consequences of alternatives must be made available within the EPAC process, as CCTA has previously committed to doing – a commitment reflected in the NOP. Providing this preliminary performance assessment of TEP scenarios will not only respect the EPAC process, but will ensure that the EIR defines a proper “project” and analyzes a proper set of alternatives, while resulting in a TEP that is truly deserving of the voters’ support next year.

Very truly yours,

Richard A. Marcantonio
Managing Attorney

Cc: Julie Pierce, Chair (JPierce@ci.clayton.ca.us)
Janet Abelson, Chair, Planning Committee (jabelson@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us)
Randell H. Iwasaki, P.E., Executive Director
Martin Engelman, Deputy Executive Director, Planning
Ross Chittenden, Deputy Executive Director, Projects
Danice Rosenbohm, Board Clerk (danice@ccta.net)
Mala Subramanian, Esq. (Malathy.Subramanian@bbklaw.com)

Enclosures: Plan Bay Area Equity Measures
Equity and Climate Scenario for the 2016 Sales Tax

---

See the discussion in Attachment A (“Applying MTC’s 2014 CTP Guidelines”) to the June 3 staff report for item 4.B.12. MTC’s Plan Bay Area performance targets are found in Attachment A to the May 20 staff report (p. 3.2-4). Plan Bay Area’s equity metrics are attached to this letter.
Attachment A: Plan Bay Area Equity Performance Measures

A. **Housing and Transportation Affordability**: % of income spent on housing and transportation by low-income households.

B. **Potential for Displacement**: % of rent-burdened households in high-growth areas.

C. **Healthy Communities**: Average daily vehicle miles traveled per populated square mile within 1,000 feet of heavily used roadways.

D. **Access to Jobs**: Average travel time in minutes for commute trips.

E. **Equitable Mobility**: Average travel time in minutes for non-work-based trips.
September 1, 2015

BY EMAIL: bbeck@ccta.net.
Brad Beck, Senior Transportation Planner
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA, 94597

Re: Notice of Preparation of a Recirculated Environmental Impact Report for the 2014 Contra Costa Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan

Dear Mr. Beck:

We write on behalf of Urban Habitat and the Sierra Club to provide additional input on the preparation of the Revised Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for Contra Costa County’s long-range County Transportation Plan. These comments, which supplement our preliminary comments dated August 7, are offered to assist the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority in undertaking a legally compliant environmental analysis of the CTP, includingremedying shortcomings in the previously circulated Draft and concerns raised by the July 31, 2015 Notice of Preparation.

The Authority’s decision to revise and recirculate provides the opportunity to remedy a number of serious structural flaws in the 2014 Draft SEIR that prevented it from fulfilling the purpose and legal requirements of an environmental impact report: “to identify the significant effects on the environment of a project, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided.” Pub. Res. Code § 21002.1(a).

One issue in particular threatens to undermine multiple core CEQA requirements: an unconstrained and over-broad project description. To ground environmental analysis and inform the public and decision makers, EIRs must rely on an “accurate, stable and finite project description.” County of Inyo v. City of Los Angeles, 71 Cal. App. 3d 185, 192–93 (1977). The NOP, however, describes the project as the full financially unconstrained County Transportation Project List (CTPL). (NOP p. 4.) Among the problems with this approach are 1) that such an unconstrained wish-list fails to satisfy the legal requirements of a County
Transportation Plan, introducing a disconnect between the action being contemplated by the Authority and the environmental review; and 2) that the over-inclusive nature of the project description as the fiscally-unconstrained CTPL is incompatible with the meaningful and legally sufficient analysis of alternatives CEQA requires.

We look forward to a Recirculated Draft SEIR that takes these issues fully into account. We also take this opportunity to note that two important MTC requirements for CTPs – that they be analyzed against Plan Bay Area (2013) performance measures, and that they be subjected to an equity analysis – are appropriately conducted as part of the new EIR, yet not mentioned in the NOP.

1. **The Project and the Project Description**

The nature of the project – in this case, adoption of a CTP – is a critical factor in the sufficiency of an EIR’s Project Description. We describe both in this section.

A. **The Nature of the Project**

The action that is the subject of this programmatic SEIR is the adoption of a County Transportation Plan update. Statutory requirements define the specific purposes a CTP is intended to fulfill and impose requirements to ensure it is capable of meeting those purposes. Most importantly, a CTP, by law, may not be an unconstrained wish list.

Among the most important purposes of a CTP is to guide the selection of program and project investments in the regional transportation plan (RTP) and regional transportation improvement program (RTIP) that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adopts. State law specifically requires that CTPs “shall be the primary basis for [MTC’s] regional transportation plan and shall be considered in the preparation of the regional transportation improvement program.” Gov. Code § 66531 (f).

Both the RTP and the RTIP are financially-constrained documents, not wish lists of investments that could be made with unlimited funding. To be the “primary basis” of a financially-constrained plan, the CTP may not be an unconstrained wish list. Indeed, the statute expressly requires that the CTP “shall include recommended transportation improvements for the succeeding 10- and 20-year periods.” (Id., subd.(e).)

The statute also requires county agencies like CCTA to use MTC’s CTP Guidelines in the preparation of their CTPs (id., subd.(c)), and CCTA’s board voted June 17 to use MTC’s new 2014 Guidelines. Those Guidelines indicate that a CTP must prioritize – out of the potential universe of projects and programs that could be funded with unlimited revenue – an appropriate sub-set of recommended investments that is within a reasonable projection of anticipated revenue. Specifically, the Guidelines indicate that CTPs must estimate future revenue (including
revenue from new sources such as the proposed TEP), and prioritize recommended investments within that estimated envelope of projected revenues.¹

### B. The Proposed Project Description is an Unconstrained Wish List of Investments

The July 31, 2105, Notice of Preparation notes that the “Project” to be studied in the recirculated Draft SEIR is “is essentially the Project as analyzed in the original 2014 Draft SEIR.” (NOP p. 4.) In order to ground a legally sufficient EIR, however, substantial revisions to the 2014 Draft SEIR’s project description will be necessary.

The NOP, like the flawed 2014 Draft it proposes to replace, define the project as the full “Comprehensive Transportation Project List” (CTPL), “a list of planned, in-progress and proposed transportation projects throughout Contra Costa, submitted by the County, cities and various other sponsoring agencies in Contra Costa.” (2014 Draft, p. 1.2-1; NOP p. 4.) “The 2014 CTP . . . incorporates an updated list of recommended and financially unconstrained transportation projects.” (NOP p. 4.) At the time the 2014 Draft was prepared, the CTPL included nearly 850 projects and programs at a cost of more than $26 billion. (2014 Draft SEIR, p. 1.2-16.) This list exceeded anticipated revenues by an estimated $14 billion, or 54% of the total cost of the CTPL. (Id.)

If the project is, as here, the adoption of a CTP that must, by law, be fiscally constrained, CEQA is not satisfied by the analysis of an unconstrained project. To put it differently, certification of an EIR for the CTPL will not constitute legally-valid environmental review of a fiscally-constrained Countywide Transportation Plan that complies with statutory requirements and MTC’s Guidelines.

In addition to violating CEQA’s requirement for an “accurate, stable and finite project description,” the unconstrained breadth of this project description will prevent meaningful environmental review of the CTP. Combining projects and programs likely to be funded and carried out with a host of others that are almost certain never to come to fruition masks the very environmental impacts of the CTP that CEQA requires it to illuminate. Among the hugely diverse set of projects and programs encompassed in the over-inclusive Project Description, some are likely to have substantial environmental benefits while others are likely to have substantial negative environmental impacts. For instance, transit operating programs that provide increased bus service and fare reductions (among other programs identified in the Equity and Climate Scenario) are likely to reduce GHG emissions while new highway construction is likely to increase them. Analyzing the impacts of these investments as an undifferentiated whole has the effect of washing out important impacts, rather than illuminating them.

¹ For instance, the Guidelines state that CTPs should “[p]rioritize transportation investments for consideration in the RTP/SCS development process” (2014 CTP Guidelines, p. 2). In fact, MTC’s Guidelines note that CTP project lists should go further, matching revenue sources and projections to the estimated cost of priority investments. 2014 Guidelines, p. 7 (“[i]ndicate how local, regional, state, and federal revenues are assigned for each project, whenever feasible . . .”).
2. **A Legally Sound Alternatives Analysis Requires Narrowing the Over-Inclusive Project Description and Considering Changes to the Project Based on Alternatives**

An EIR must analyze a “reasonable range of alternatives to the project,” with an emphasis on alternatives which “offer substantial environmental advantages over the project proposal.” *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors*, 52 Cal. 3d 553, 566 (1990) (*emphasis added*); *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz*, 177 Cal. App. 4th 957, 982-83 (2009). The point of analyzing alternatives to the project is to assess options for attaining the basic objectives of the project while avoiding or substantially lessening environmental impacts and to evaluate the comparative merits of each alternative. (Cal. Code Regs § 15126.6.) Specifically, “[t]he range of potential alternatives to the proposed project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects” in order to “permit a reasoned choice.” (Id., subds. (c), (f).)

The NOP describes a number of alternatives to the project. As we understand it from the August 27 staff report, staff proposes that three alternatives will each assume $8 billion in total revenue. This is a step in the right direction from the 2014 Draft, and Public Advocates, Urban Habitat and the Sierra Club look forward to helping to shape both the “environment focus” alternative and others.

However, conducting a legally-sufficient analysis of alternatives will require two modifications. First, the Project Description must be narrowed to focus on an appropriately constrained subset of projects and programs (and to include clear 10- and 20-year prioritization of these projects and programs), as described in Section 1. The “project” should assume the same level of fiscal constraint. This is necessary if the comparison of the Project against the range of equivalently-constrained alternatives is to be an “apples-to-apples” exercise. Second, the Authority should commit now to a clear and inclusive public process for considering modification of the Project based on the results of the alternatives analysis. Among other things, this process should consider substituting investments in the fiscally-constrained CTP “Project” with investments in a higher-performing, more equitable, and/or environmentally-superior alternative. Absent such a commitment, the analysis of alternatives will be an empty exercise, and will be perceived as such by the public.

3. **The Project and Alternatives Must be Analyzed Against Plan Bay Area Performance Measures and Equity Metrics**

As discussed in our preliminary comments on the NOP (attached), the CCTA Board’s appropriate decision to use MTC’s 2014 Guidelines for County Transportation Plans means incorporating MTC’s performance targets from Plan Bay Area (2013), including equity measures, and performing an Equity/Environmental Justice Analysis. Despite this decision, which the Board made with explicit recognition of these MTC requirements, the NOP mentions neither Plan Bay Area’s performance measures nor an Equity/Environmental Justice Analysis. These performance and equity analyses must be completed at about the same time as the new EIR, and should be conducted as a part of it. If, instead, CCTA believes these analyses would
better occur through a separate process, the details of that process should be announced promptly.

The equity analysis, in particular, should analyze separately the equity impacts (benefits and burdens to low-income and minority populations) of the 10- and 20-year recommended investments that state law requires the CTP to identify. Gov. Code § 66531 (e). As the U.S. DOT Order on Environmental Justice, federal law prohibits not only the denial of a fair share of benefits to EJ populations, but also “significant delay in the receipt of” of those benefits. 62 Fed. Reg. 18377-18381 (April 15, 1997).

We would be pleased to meet with you to discuss these issues and your plans for moving forward to develop and analyze a set of meaningful choices in the CTP that can inform the development of your sales tax plan.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Sam Tepperman-Gelfant
Senior Staff Attorney

Richard Marcantonio
Managing Attorney

Cc: Julie Pierce, Chair (JPierce@ci.clayton.ca.us)
Janet Abelson, Chair, Planning Committee (jabelson@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us)
Randell H. Iwasaki, P.E., Executive Director
Martin Engelman, Deputy Executive Director, Planning
Ross Chittenden, Deputy Executive Director, Projects
Danice Rosenbohm, Board Clerk (danice@ccta.net)
Mala Subramanian, Esq. (Malathy.Subramanian@bbklaw.com)

Encl: Public Advocates letters of February 16, March 12, and August 7, 2015
August 31st, 2015

Mr. Brad Beck  
Senior Transportation Planner  
Planning Department, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA)  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

bbeck@ccta.net

RE: Comments on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Recirculated Draft Program Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (rdpsEIR) for the 2014 Update to the Contra Costa County Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) – SCH# 2014042045

Dear Mr. Beck,

Save Mount Diablo (SMD) is a non-profit conservation organization founded in 1971 which acquires land for addition to parks on and around Mount Diablo and monitors land use planning which might affect protected lands. We build trails, restore habitat, and are involved in environmental education. In 1971 there was just one park on Mount Diablo totaling 6,778 acres; today there are almost 50 parks and preserves around Mount Diablo totaling 110,000 acres. We include more than 8,000 donors and supporters.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the NOP for the rdpsEIR for the CTP (Project). We are pleased that the Project will incorporate an analysis of several financially constrained alternative scenarios, as has been suggested in comment letters on the previous iteration of the EIR and in discussions of the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) for the potential November 2016 Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP).

Below we suggest some ways that the rdpsEIR could provide a clearer analysis of alternatives, specifically by including a mechanism that allows a ranked evaluation of how specific projects contribute to goals and targets. In addition, the qualitative performance assessment of capital projects over ≥$25 million that CCTA provided to the EPAC for its June 26th 2015 meeting provides more good reasons why one project in particular, the proposed James Donlon Boulevard Extension (JDBE), should not be included in two of the three Transportation Investment Options (Options) to be analyzed in the rdpsEIR.

Please note that the comment letter SMD submitted on October 31st 2014 on the previous iteration of the CTP and its dsEIR should also be considered for information and analyses relevant to the current rdpsEIR process.
Exclusion of the JDBE from the Community Option

The rdpsEIR proposes to analyze three Options that are financially constrained and take into account new funds that could be generated from the potential revenue that the TEP could produce. Each of these three reflect prioritized investments in either the Community, Economy or Environment.

We feel that this approach is a great improvement from that pursued in the previous iteration of the CTP, and gratefully note that the JDBE is explicitly excluded from the Environment Option. We commend CCTA for this approach. Such an environmentally destructive capital project that not only devastates open space, but also increases greenhouse gases (GHGs) and promotes an outdated decades-old concept of the single-occupant vehicle servicing an ever-expanding suburbia, has no place in a Option focused on reducing GHGs, reducing open space impacts and improving transit.

However, we note that despite the stated focus in the NOP of the Community Option of “projects and programs that would increase transportation mode share and safety of transit and non-motorized users, and seek to improve community health…major transit capital investment projects, and non-auto countywide capital and maintenance programs”, the JDBE is not explicitly excluded from this Option.

The NOP recognizes that the JDBE will be analyzed as a part of the PBA alternative included in the rdpsEIR, but it should not be included in the Community Option. The information contained in the numerous comment letters on the JDBE that SMD and other organizations have submitted to the City of Pittsburg provide clear evidence why it should be excluded from the Community Option. In addition, CCTA’s Performance Assessment of Large Projects (≥$25 million) (Assessment), provided to the EPAC for discussion and evaluation during their meeting on June 26th, 2015, also clearly demonstrates why the JDBE should be excluded.

The purpose of the Assessment was to provide a qualitative evaluation of the most expensive (≥$25 million) capital projects included in the CTP, using the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) performance targets and evaluation criteria from PBA. Out of the 80 projects (79 as shown in the Assessment, since two projects related to SR-239 were bundled together) that were evaluated in the Assessment, the JDBE ranks dead-last in terms of supporting PBA’s targets. No other project fails to support as many targets as the JDBE (specifically, the Assessment specifies the JDBE “does not support” five targets, “has no significant effect” on three targets and “supports” two targets).

The targets that the JDBE fails to support are directly related to goals that the Community Option is focused on encouraging, such as healthy and safe communities (targets: reduce premature deaths, increase daily time walking and biking), and non-auto capital projects (targets: decrease auto VMT and non-auto per-trip travel time). Therefore, the JDBE should be explicitly excluded as a component of the Community Option.

In fact, it is highly questionable whether the JDBE truly supports any PBA targets. For example, 94% of projects in the Assessment, including the JDBE, support PBA’s economic vitality target (and no project fails to support it). This is of course to be expected, since the very essence of transportation is to facilitate the movement of goods, but the fact that almost all projects meet this target makes one wonder why it is included if “support” is such a given, and makes it doubtful whether the JDBE would support the economy in any meaningful way.

What is certain is that the JDBE should not in any way be included in an EIR alternative that emphasizes major transit, non-auto projects and programs, transportation mode share, and the safety of transit and non-motorized users, as the Community Option does. To do so would be to undermine the quality, validity and intent of the rdpsEIR alternatives analysis.
Evaluation of Project Effectiveness in Contributing to Goals and Targets

CCTA’s decision to include an analysis of financially constrained Options is a significant positive step toward determining the impacts and benefits of different transportation investments. We suggest that for each alternative, especially the Options, the rdpsEIR explicitly list each project/program included in the each Option, the funding allocated to the project/program, if the project/program is included in other Options and if its funding allocation changed in other Options, and a simple metric that allows the reader to evaluate how much the project/program contributes to the goals and targets of PBA. The purpose here would be to allow the reader to rank the effectiveness of projects and programs in order to better inform investment scenarios and the impacts these investments may have on the environment.

We realize that the rdpsEIR will provide a quantitative assessment of the performance of each alternative, but will it carry such an assessment down to the project/program level? If some programs and projects are not “modelable”, to use the phrasing of CCTA staff, and therefore hinder a quantitative performance-based analysis, the rdpsEIR should identify them and attempt to qualitatively describe their expected effectiveness and contributions toward stated targets and goals.

If a ranked quantitative assessment for most specific projects and programs is not practical, in addition to a description, we suggest a qualitative assessment similar to the one provided to EPAC members in late June 2015 for large capital projects, discussed above.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Sincerely,

Juan Pablo Galván
Land Use Planner
Julie Pierce, Chair
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Re: Notice of Preparation for Recirculated Draft Program Subsequent EIR for the 2014 Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan

Dear Ms. Pierce:

The Transportation Solutions Defense and Education Fund (“TRANSDEF”) is a non-profit environmental group advocating for the regional perspective in the planning of transportation, land use and air quality. In the past few years, we have focused on reducing the impacts of transportation on climate change.

These comments pertain to the Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) for the Recirculated Draft Program Subsequent EIR for 2014 Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan. Thank you for sending it to us by certified mail, return receipt requested. The proposed environmental document would replace the 2014 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (“DSEIR”) for CCTA’s 2014 Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan (“CTP”).

While we appreciate CCTA’s decision to not proceed with certification of the DSEIR, your agency has traded one set of legal inadequacies for another. Even after we identified a number of obvious CEQA violations in our November 3, 2014 DSEIR comment letter, the NOP continues to reflect disregard for the law. We are amazed at the peculiar legal advice CCTA relies on. The Recirculated Draft EIR section of the NOP carefully avoids using the full title of the 2014 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report, identifying it only as the ”2014 Draft SEIR.” One can only conclude that CCTA was relying on the public to not think too hard about the acronym.

The NOP glosses over the fact that it impossible to recirculate a Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report, when no Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report was ever circulated. It was a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report that was circulated. The NOP is deeply misleading.
We have commented intensively on twenty years of Regional Transportation Plan EIRs. At no point has MTC ever attempted to issue either a Draft Supplemental or Subsequent EIR. We truly do not understand why CCTA is so insistent on not following the obvious legal requirement to proceed along the same lines.

TRANSDEF strongly recommends that CCTA cease its efforts to evade the production of an EIR. By making it appear as if your agency is trying to hide something, these contortions harm CCTA's credibility, and cast doubt on the soundness of its judgment. We urge you to eradicate this source of doubt by stepping fully into transparency. CEQA requires it. Please issue an appropriate NOP and proceed accordingly. We know of no legal justification for the recirculation of a document that was never circulated.

Growth Management Plan
The profound regulatory changes since the last SEIR require an extensive update to the Growth Management Plan. The County will choke in traffic if the 35% increase in VMT projected by the draft CTP is allowed to happen. In addition, the resulting increase in GHG emissions will impede the efforts of both the County and the region to meet state targets for reducing GHG emissions. We recommend the Growth Management Plan be specifically designed to optimize these performance standards:

- Minimize future GHG emissions
- Minimize future VMT
- Minimize agricultural conversion (greenfield development)

To deter VMT growth, Santa Clara County cities have imposed trip caps on major employers, with sizeable penalties as enforcement. We suggest the Growth Management Plan tie sales tax subventions to compliance with trip caps (defined as the number of trips counted while entering the state highway on-ramps within each jurisdiction, during a specified peak period). In Contra Costa, the fiscal consequences of exceeding the cap on a city's trips would provide councils with powerful incentives to avoid making development decisions that generate additional auto trips, and to get involved in development decisions outside city limits that could affect the city's trip count.

Alternatives
We suggest the Community-Focus option and the Environmental Focus Option both be specifically designed to optimize these performance standards:

- Minimize future GHG emissions
- Minimize future VMT
- Maximize the use of alternative modes
- Minimize agricultural conversion (greenfield development)

We offer work we did back in 2004 as a model for how to implement such goals. (See Attachment.) We suggest CCTA take advantage of the Program EIR structure to include a specific approach to program-wide mitigation: a regional advance mitigation program.
Technical Coordinating Committee Staff Report Alternatives

The NOP is incomplete, as it does not contain the alternatives identified in the Staff Report for the August 27th meeting of the Technical Coordinating Committee. The public should have been invited to respond to the specifics of these draft alternatives. A reissued NOP should contain a discussion of these alternatives.

TRANSDEF finds the three Transportation Investment Options to be inadequately differentiated. To provide the maximal information to policymakers, the three options should represent distinctly different approaches to transportation policy. Because there is no contrasting option to "Transportation Investment Option A would promote safe, efficient and accessible operations for all users to create thriving local communities" (no one would favor promoting unsafe, inefficient, inaccessible operations for some users to create non-thriving local communities), this definition is not useful for an alternatives analysis--it does not distinguish what is distinctive about this option.

Options A and C are very similar, with both oriented towards liveable communities and environmental protection. To specifically test the difference between them, they should be renamed the Major Transit Capital Focus Option and the Transit Operations Focus Option. Both options should be designed to optimize the performance standards mentioned above. Option B is misnamed. Option B should be titled the Business as Usual Option, or the RTPC Option. It extends CCTA's past priorities into the present.

We recommend that a common base for the three alternatives be identified, to make the differences between the options readily ascertainable. Each option would add distinctive projects and programs on top of that base, up to the level of fiscal constraint. (We understand that Complete Streets improvements are now a state project requirement, shifting them out of only some options into the base.) To implement our recommendation above, a regional advance mitigation program should be included in the shared base, and not just in Option C.

We believe that Title VI will require the TEP to not discriminate against lower income groups in delivering benefits. For that reason, we suggest that the equity features of Option C need to be shifted over to the base, so they are part of each option.

Being familiar with this scenario process, we recognize that a meaningful policy analysis requires that each capacity-expanding RTP project that is not already under construction be reconsidered. The CTP and TEP cannot respond effectively to the profound changes that have occurred in transportation policy and law if major resources continue to flow to projects that are now seen as harmful in this new policy perspective.

The funding previously committed to these RTP projects is so large as to swamp the differences between options. That could mask the success of policy alternatives, thereby preventing the options process from being a valid alternatives analysis. We urge that all road and highway capacity projects and BART extensions not already under construction be excluded from the shared base, and be placed in Option B.
Specific Projects
The long-range implications of sea level rise suggest that it would be unwise to invest further in Capitol Corridor improvements on the UP right-of-way along San Pablo Bay. This route, although beautiful, is both excessively slow and will eventually be underwater. A smarter strategy would be to plan to shift the Capitol Corridor to the BNSF line between Martinez and Richmond. Consistent with the concern we articulated above and in our vision document, it is critical that any rail extension to Brentwood be specifically conditioned on dense station area development. Continuing BART’s pattern of suburban parking lots will induce more sprawl and unacceptable traffic congestion.

Environmental Baseline
TRANSDEF incorporates by reference our November 3, 2014 DSEIR comment letter. In issuing a replacement NOP, it would be appropriate to announce that the document will contain an analysis based on an existing conditions baseline.

Substantial Evidence
A Subsequent EIR carries the same evidentiary burden as a full EIR. It must support its conclusions with substantial evidence. A full set of tables of VMT projections and GHG emissions projections is mandatory, to adequately inform the public. County-level emissions reductions resulting from the implementation of the CTP must be separately reported from the emissions reductions resulting from statewide measures. It is critical for the integrity of the analysis that the EIR not give the CTP credit for emissions reductions that do not result from the plan. The legislative intent for SB 375 called for emissions reductions from regional transportation and land use in addition to those of statewide measures. Technical appendices are needed to document where the numbers come from.

Impact Thresholds
Proper impact analysis requires the selection of proper impact thresholds. It would be unacceptable to use "Significant Cumulative Impact, Project Contribution Not Cumulatively Considerable" as the threshold for a Net Increase in GHG Emissions. No countywide transportation plan could ever be found to make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a global problem. This threshold is especially egregious given California's accumulated body of policy, law and regulation that sets the absolute reduction of GHG emissions (and not the mere slowing of the rate of increase) as a state priority. It would be deeply violative of state policy to conclude that the CTP will result in an increase in GHG emissions, and then conclude that the increase isn't significant enough on a global scale to warrant mitigation.

The significance thresholds should be 1). an increase over existing emissions levels, 2). a level that impedes the attainment of the state's 2020 GHG target, 3). a level that impedes the attainment of the state's 2030 GHG target, and 4). a level that impedes the attainment of the state's 2050 GHG target.
Regulatory Changes
In addition to the list of regulatory changes we provided in our DSEIR comment letter, the recent Executive Order B-30-15 and the USEPA’s 2015 Clean Power Plan indicate a significant increase in governmental seriousness about climate change.

TRANSDEF appreciates this opportunity to comment on the NOP. We recognize that the level of change taking place in transportation policy is difficult. We stand ready to assist in the transition to a more sustainable transportation system.

Sincerely,

/s/ DAVID SCHONBRUNN

David Schonbrunn,
President

Attachment
2005 TRANSDEF Smart Growth RTP FEIR Alternative
2005 TRANSDEF Smart Growth RTP FEIR Alternative
TRANSDEF coordinated the development and submission of the Smart Growth Alternative ("Alternative") to MTC's 2005 RTP FEIR. The Alternative outperformed the adopted RTP on critical environmental and equity measures. Because it integrated transportation and land use in an RTP EIR, we believe it to be the first Sustainable Communities Strategy, long before SB 375. A complete write-up is available at transdef.org/RTP/RTP.html

In the Alternative, central Contra Costa County cities are served by a looping Rapid Bus system, connecting Walnut Creek, Concord, Pleasant Hill and Martinez. (The GIS files identifying all routes are available.) All BART stations are served, along with a major new urban center developed on and around the Sun Valley Mall. Smaller community centers develop at existing strip malls and along underdeveloped arterials.

The Delta cities of Contra Costa County are tied into the region with a new Delta DMU rail system running between North Concord BART and Brentwood. (Please note that this was designed prior to eBART.) Development in the eastern part of the county would be focused on this line. Clyde and Port Chicago, retired from military use, will support thousands of units of new transit-oriented development, with the potential to demonstrate sustainable development on a large scale. Under-utilized commercial and industrial land along the line will also see redevelopment, reducing the pressure to sprawl across the prime agricultural lands around Oakley and Brentwood.

Recognizing that CCTA's planning needs to coordinate with the Tri-Valley, the Alternative has three new Rapid Bus lines that serve Livermore, Pleasanton, Dublin, and San Ramon. Connections are made to all BART stations and new ACE stations on Isabel Avenue in Livermore and at Vasco Road. (The ACE reference is an early version of our 2015 proposal for a major investment in ACE between Tracy and Fremont, creating a fast passenger-only line.) All major employment centers are connected, including Bishop Ranch, Hacienda, and Lawrence Livermore National Labs. New development densifies formerly underused retail and commercial sites, and the excess parking facilities at many business parks are redeveloped for housing.

We attach to these comments the modified MTC transit headway spreadsheet we submitted back then, which reduced headways on hundreds of bus routes while eliminating BART extensions and highway widenings. To simplify looking at the spreadsheet, we show only the agencies operating in Contra Costa.

To provide a sense of our vision for development, we attach the 2030 Land Use spreadsheet. We matched the control levels of the adopted RTP, but did not convert any greenfield land or existing single-family neighborhoods. We relied instead on intensive multi-family development of greyfields--old shopping centers that were no longer economically productive. We recognize that the numbers will not be applicable to the CTP, but the pattern of development should be instructive. It is unknown to us whether MTC has changed the TAZ numbers and zone boundaries since then.
July 30, 2015

Chairwoman Julie Pierce and Members
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek CA 94597

via email to danice@ccta.net

Re: Equity and Climate Expenditure Plan Scenario

Dear Chairwoman Pierce and Board Members:

The Sierra Club has been following your efforts to develop a transportation sales tax expenditure plan (“TEP”) for consideration by voters at the General Election of 2016.

At the last meeting of the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee, Bob Allen, a staff member from Urban Habitat, distributed a memo to CCTA’s consultant/facilitator entitled “Comparison of Proposed Equity and Climate Scenario with Measure J”. The Sierra Club helped in developing the Scenario. The complete Scenario document is attached to this letter.

Mr Allen requested that the CCTA analyze the Equity and Climate Scenario “to inform the development of the Discussion Draft TEP.” The cover page of the memo reminds the reader of the SANDAG case (in which the Sierra Club is involved), and lays out the rationale in asking for an analysis to inform the CCTA both about improving equity and reducing vehicle miles traveled as outcomes from the County’s potential sales tax measure:

(The) scenario would emphasize transit operating support to increase bus service on existing and new routes, fund an expanded youth bus pass program and reduce adult fares to boost ridership, and prioritize PDA-focused transit and active transportation improvements, while de-emphasizing road and freeway expansion projects.
The Equity and Climate Scenario is modeled on the reasoning of the draft California Transportation Plan 2040—achieving the state’s 2050 GHG target means there can be no additions to existing highway capacity, and that transit service must double and be low-cost relative to operating a car.

The Sierra Club supports Urban Habitat’s request that the CCTA analyze several sales tax scenarios, including the Equity and Climate Scenario, against Plan Bay Area’s “performance measures.” Doing so in a timely manner will enable the EPAC, the public and CCTA’s board to develop an equitable and environmentally sound TEP.

Thank you for your consideration.

I may be contacted at mwillia@mac.com.

Sincerely,

Matt Williams
Chair, San Francisco Bay Chapter Transportation and Compact Growth Committee

attachment: Equity and Climate Scenario memo

cc: Chair, Chapter Executive Committee
    Chapter Delta Group
    Chapter Mount Diablo Group
    Chapter West Contra Costa County Group
    Urban Habitat
    Public Advocates
Comparison of proposed Equity and Climate Scenario with Measure J

We propose that CCTA analyze the following two investment packages as alternative “scenarios” against Plan Bay Area and other appropriate performance measures (including equity measures) and make the results available in time to inform the development of the Discussion Draft TEP.

Note that the revenues from the new sales tax, when it is adopted, will be cumulative with Measure J. (As staff notes, A new half-cent sales tax would generate approximately $2.3 billion in current dollars over a 25-year period,” and “Together, the two measures will generate more than $3.8 billion in local sales tax funds.”) That means that where a percentage of funds is indicated in both the Equity and Climate Scenario and in Measure J, those funds would be additive. E.g., 4.3% of the 2016 measure’s funds for “Express bus/BRT” would be added to 4.3% of Measure J funds for the same purpose.

The purpose of identifying the 2004 Measure J as a “scenario” is to have a baseline for comparison purposes. The rationale for the components of the Equity and Climate Scenario is to include one that, in the words of the Court of Appeal in the SANDAG case, “could significantly reduce total vehicle miles traveled” by “significantly reducing vehicle trips.” As the Court noted, a vehicle-trip-reduction alternative is distinct from a congestion-relief alternative, given the well-known phenomenon of “induced demand (sometimes called the rebound effect) in transportation” by which reduced congestion can lead to “increased vehicle miles traveled.” Thus, a VMT-reduction scenario would emphasize transit operating support to increase bus service on existing and new routes, fund an expanded youth bus pass program and reduce adult fares to boost ridership, and prioritize PDA-focused transit and active transportation improvements, while de-emphasizing road and freeway expansion projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015 Contra Costa Equity and Climate Scenario</th>
<th>Baseline Scenario (2004 Measure J)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway/Freeway Expansions</td>
<td>Highway/Freeway Expansions [1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Corridors (Smart Freeways/Traffic smoothing) [New category]</td>
<td>Integrated Corridors (Smart Freeways/Traffic smoothing) 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Expansion/Parking</td>
<td>BART Expansion/Parking [2, 10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART stations improvements [New category]</td>
<td>BART stations improvements 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Capacity Transit Improvements (Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit)</td>
<td>High-Capacity Transit Improvements (Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit) [16] 4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street Maintenance</td>
<td>Local Street Maintenance [11, 23] 20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation for Livable Communities</td>
<td>Transportation for Livable Communities [12, 25] 5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/Bike/Trail</td>
<td>Pedestrian/Bike/Trail [13, 26] 1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Numbers in square brackets refer to line items in Measure J expenditure plan, pp. 4-5.
³ Essentially, “smart freeways”: makes the traffic more predictable and is a substitute for building new lanes.
⁴ This would be akin to the funding in Alameda County’s Measure BB, which states: “These investments target immediate term opportunities for enhancing access, improving safety and creating new infrastructure and supporting construction at BART stations, as well as station area development and transit oriented development at sites identified for early implementation throughout the County. Funds in this category may be spent on project development, design, and environmental clearance, as well as construction, operations and maintenance of new infrastructure in these areas.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBAG: Complete Streets in Priority Development Areas &amp; TPPs(^5) [New category]</th>
<th>5.0%</th>
<th>OBAG: Complete Streets in Priority Development Areas &amp; TPPs</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commute Alternatives</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>Commute Alternatives(^6) [17]</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Displacement from Priority Development Areas(^7) [New category]</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>No Displacement from Priority Development Areas</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Transportation for Children/Bus Pass</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>Safe Transportation for Children/Bus Pass [21]</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Corridor</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>Capitol Corridor [4, 27]</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Ferry [22]</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Pass for Middle School &amp; High School Students and Fare reduction [New category]</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>Bus Pass for Middle School &amp; High School Students</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation for Seniors &amp; People with Disabilities</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>Transportation for Seniors &amp; People with Disabilities [15, 20]</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Operations</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>Bus Operations [14, 19]</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Services in or to Priority Development Areas</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>Bus Services in or to Priority Development Areas</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^5\) This funding would supplement regional OBAG funding, and be available to jurisdictions that met housing element certification, affordable housing production, and anti-displacement protection requirements. First priority to go to PDAs. TPPs, or “Transit Priority Projects,” are places within ½ mile of high-quality transit service that are subject to CEQA exemption under SB 375. See Pub. Res. Code, §21155(b).

\(^6\) “Provide and promote alternatives to commuting in single-occupant vehicles, including carpools, vanpools and transit. Eligible types of projects may include but are not limited to: parking facilities, carpooling, vanpooling, transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities (including sidewalks, lockers, racks, etc.), Guaranteed Ride Home, congestion mitigation programs, SchoolPool, and clean fuel vehicle projects. Program and project recommendations shall be made by each subregion for consideration and funding by the Authority.” Meas. J, page 18.

\(^7\) Funds could be used for the development, preservation or operation of housing affordable to lower-income households, to ensure that high-propensity transit riders can live near transit stops, and to combat suburban poverty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Regional Advanced Mitigation Program</th>
<th>Regional Advanced Mitigation Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Advanced Mitigation Program</td>
<td>??%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Management/Planning</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>Congestion Management/Planning [18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subregional Needs</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>Subregional Needs [28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>Administration [29]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 [Need explanatory FN]
July 29, 2015

The Honorable Anthony Foxx, Secretary
U.S. Department of Transportation
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Secretary Foxx:

I am writing in support of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority’s (CCTA) application in response to the Broad Agency Announcement No. DTFH6115R00003 for the Connected Vehicle Pilot Deployment Program. In addition to successfully delivering the projects and programs in our Measure J transportation sales tax to Contra Costa County voters, CCTA is also leading a new initiative to redefine mobility by implementing technology to make our transportation network safer, smoother, and stronger.

At the heart of this effort is the Contra Costa Transportation Authority’s GoMentum Station program – a collaborative partnership among local jurisdictions; automobile manufacturers; original equipment manufacturers and Tier 1 suppliers; communications suppliers; technology companies; researchers and academia; public agencies and other partners. This unique partnership network ensures a multi-year, sustainable business model and provides an avenue for Federal investments to complement partner commitments and financial contributions in a program aligned with the Federal Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Strategic Plan.

The GoMentum Station serves as a hub for Connected Vehicle and Autonomous Vehicle transportation innovation in Contra Costa County, creating a place where technology, innovation and commercialization can converge. In addition to being the largest secure test facility in the United States with 2,100 acres of usable space and 20 miles of paved roadway, the facility is inclusive of all modes and technologies with a goal of testing multi-modal and interoperable systems. From city grids to curved country roads, the GoMentum Station provides an impressive range of testing grounds to advance both Connected Vehicle and Autonomous Vehicle technologies.

Partnership with the Federal Government will not only enable us to achieve our vision of transforming mobility in Contra Costa, but also brings together both private and public sector initiatives and investments to drive economic growth and vitality in Contra Costa County. This, in turn, is creating ladders of opportunity in some of our most disadvantaged communities, including the City of Concord, where the GoMentum Station test facility is located.
CCTA’s proposal meets the requirements of the Broad Agency Announcement regarding the Connected Vehicle initiative. This effort is poised to protect and extend the investment the United States Department of Transportation is making in technology that addresses the transportation challenges that face our nation today, and in the years ahead.

Sincerely,

John M. Gioia, Chair
Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors
Supervisor, District I

c: Honorable Members of the Contra Costa County Federal Legislative Delegation
   David Twa, County Administrator
   Julie K. Pierce, Chair – Contra Costa Transportation Authority
August 21, 2015

Randy Iwaski  
Executive Director  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Dear Mr. Iwaski:

I write today to express gratitude on behalf of the East Bay Division of the League of California Cities for speaking about autonomous vehicles and the exciting future of transportation at our July Division meeting in El Cerrito. Our members truly appreciated hearing your perspective and the exciting work that is happening here in our backyard of the East Bay Area. We can tell it was a successful event by the amount of discussion and curiosity that you generated. Thank you for sharing your expertise - it is contributors like you who bring tremendous value in educating our members.

Thank you again, and we look forward to working with you in the future.

Sincerely,

Janet Abelson  
President, East Bay Division  
Council Member, City of El Cerrito
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Mr. Randell H. Iwasaki  
Executive Director  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Dear Director Iwasaki:

Thank you for your letter supporting funding for the Contra Costa County’s Kirker Pass Road Northbound Truck Lanes Project under the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Discretionary Grant Program. Secretary Foxx has asked me to respond on his behalf.

Over the last 6 years, the TIGER program has allowed the Department to award more than $4.1 billion to support critical road, rail, transit, port, and multimodal projects. The competitive nature of the program encourages innovation and collaboration, and the broad eligibility criteria allow the program to fund complex multimodal and multijurisdictional projects that are difficult to finance using traditional formula funds.

A Federal Register notice, published on April 3rd, announced the availability of funding for a seventh round of TIGER discretionary grants, and included the relevant project selection criteria and application requirements. The deadline for submitting final applications was June 5th and we plan to announce selected projects this fall.

TIGER has been authorized and funded only on a year-to-year basis through the annual appropriations process, creating uncertainty for the Department as well as communities who could benefit from the program. The Department has proposed to rectify this problem through its surface transportation reauthorization proposal, the GROW AMERICA Act. The Act would more than double the size of TIGER funding and provide multi-year authorization that would help meet the overwhelming demand for innovative infrastructure projects across the country. Congress is currently considering this legislation.

The Department welcomes the opportunity to fund innovative transportation projects through the TIGER Discretionary Grant Program, and I assure you that the application for this project will receive full and careful consideration. If I can provide further information or assistance, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Peter M. Rogoff  
Under Secretary
Dear Mr. Beck:

The Bay Area Transportation Working Group (BATWG) has been following your efforts to develop a transportation sales tax expenditure plan for consideration by the CCC voters in 2016.

Below are some responses developed by BATWG members. Please consider them, and pass them on to Ms. Pierce and other members of your Board. Thank you.

Regards,

Gerald Cauthen
for the Bay Area Transportation Working Group
510 208 5441; 510 708 7880 cell

**Contra Costa County at a Crossroads**

1.) BATWG strongly recommends that instead of re-adopting the highway-expanding policies of the past, the CCTA direct its efforts toward a forward-looking plan that:

   o conserves energy

   o reduces vehicle trips, vehicle miles and greenhouse gas emissions

   o improves the livability of towns and cities

2.) The CCTA should avoid allocating transportation funds to so-called "Transit-Oriented Developments (TOD's), sometimes called "Planned Development Areas (PDA's) unless they incorporate enough first rate rail and
bus service to significantly reduce the need of their occupants to go virtually everywhere by automobile. Special care should be taken to ensure that transportation funds are not diverted to land use or other non-transportation purposes.

3.) Instead the focus should be on projects that really do allow travelers to sometimes leave their cars at home such as:

- a cost-effective regional bus system planned and laid out in cooperation other transit properties to serve the parts of CCC and surrounding counties that not well served by BART

- significantly upgrading the under-utilized Capitol Corridor trains to better serve I-80 Corridor travel needs

- paying less attention to "street beautification and enhancement" and more to developing cost-effective transit improvements geared to increasing transit ridership

4.) It is projected that BART will reach its transbay carrying capacity limit within 10 years. The Bay Bridge is already at capacity during many hours of the day. It is therefore necessary to take immediate action to head off what will otherwise almost certainly be a major constraint on the economies of the Central Bay Area. The following are essential first steps:

- AC Transit's 29-line transbay service currently attracts only an anemic 15,000 riders a day. This is unacceptable! AC's transbay operation must be reorganized as necessary to increase transbay bus ridership to at least 80,000 a day.

- Serious consideration should be given to significantly speeding up and beefing up the Altamont Commuter Express rail service from Stockton and providing it with a San Francisco branch as well as the existing South Bay branch.

- All non-automotive transbay modes must be expanded and improved. Included for consideration would be regional and local bus lines, car pooling, vanpooling, peak period transit-only lanes, congestion pricing where required to avoid gridlock, higher bridge tolls and increased roadway
use fees. MTC's HOT lanes (which do little but expand freeways while providing the Affluent with a Gridlock Bypass Card) are NOT the answer.

5.) Personal mobility is one of the blessings of a free society. But it is no longer practical in large metropolitan areas for 95% of the people to dragging 3 to 5 tons of steel, glass and plastic around with them wherever they go. A better way of balancing mobility with environmental sustainability must be devised.

Contra Costa County is in an excellent position to play a leading roll in bringing the Bay Area into the modern world. Please take advantage of it. If you have questions or wish to discuss any of these matters with us please feel free to call.

Gerald Cauthen
for BATWG
510 208 5441
August 28, 2015

Mr. Randall H. Iwasaki
Executive Director
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Dear Randy:

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the efforts the Contra Costa Transportation Authority is taking to transform our transportation network with modern technologies and practices. As a long-time resident and business owner, I am an avid supporter of any efforts that preserve the unique character of our county, expand mobility and contribute to the growth of a vibrant and resilient business community in Contra Costa. Interstate 680 is a critical corridor for the companies and employees my business supports in San Ramon, but it’s also a main artery for many who live, work and play in our community.

We have been fortunate that the rebounding economy and the availability of affordable housing in our county has supported an increase in discretionary spending, which in turn has contributed to an increase in sales tax revenue that can be used to solve our most vexing transportation problems. I would like to go on record as saying that I believe the most vital issue we need to address is the crippling traffic on Interstate 680. Time spent in traffic is wasted time stolen from families, friendships and employers. Traffic congestion and travel time has now become an important factor for many members of the millennial generation when deciding whether to apply or accept a new position or employment offer.

Although there has been a steady progression of modest improvements to Interstate 680 throughout the past 25 years, I would like to see the Contra Costa Transportation Authority develop a bold, comprehensive and forward-
looking plan to improve traffic congestion on Interstate 680 and invest in new and innovative technology to help move both people and goods through our region. As the owner of a business park, I have been doing my part to support transportation by investing in transportation solutions and helping to raise the resources I feel are needed to complete the transportation projects most important to my business and community, including expanded bus service, installing electric vehicle charging stations, and offering bike share, car share, and carpool options for Bishop Ranch workers.

In spite of these many options, a majority of workers choose to drive for personal reasons, and instead of trying to intrude on an individual’s transportation choices, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority should respect individual decision and focus on offering a multitude of choices so travelers can choose the option that works best for their own life, including driving. Trying to find a balance between reducing greenhouse gas emissions and enabling economic growth is not going to be easy – but building a bold vision for the future means accepting the reality that the transportation options we’ll need in the future may look drastically different than today. New ridesharing services, self-driving cars, and personal pods will likely revolutionize personal travel, and I hope that your agency will embrace innovation and preserve the flexibility needed to be responsive to tomorrow’s transportation technologies.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Alexander R. Mehran
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer

ARM:klr/b/f

cc: Julie Pierce, Contra Costa Transportation Authority
September 2, 2015

Julie Pierce  
Chair, Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
Via Email

Dear Chair Pierce:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the East Bay Leadership Council (EBLC), we are pleased that Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) understands the vital role our transportation system plays in Contra Costa’s economy and quality of life. Thank you for your leadership in planning for a potential new sales tax measure to continue the successful track record of improving our roads, transit, and pedestrian facilities.

EBLC recognizes that CCTA has not yet decided to pursue a sales tax measure, nor has the size of a potential sales tax measure been determined. Approval by the voters will hinge largely on their comfort that new revenue will result in meaningful improvements to traffic flow and economic conditions in Contra Costa County. The purpose of this letter is to outline EBLC’s views on how new funding would best be spent and leaves the question of how best to fund needed improvements for future discussion.

EBLC continues to pursue housing and economic policies that offer the best opportunity for sustained, healthy growth within the county. Consistent with EBLC’s mission to provide advocacy on public policy issues affecting the economic vitality and quality of life in the East Bay, EBLC envisions that the emerging Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) to be included in a possible new sales tax measure will:

- Provide effective growth management that helps protect open space while facilitating creation and preservation of a robust housing stock;
- Develop plans that include near-term improvements within a long-range vision;
- Connect transportation funds to infill and high-density housing;
- Create and/or improve critical transportation link between housing and jobs;
- Promote efficient and effective movement of goods to improve the business climate;
- Coordinate with other agencies to facilitate regional connectivity;
- Utilize multiple modes of transportation to maximize the value of the system;
- Make strategic capital improvements that increase the capacity of the system;
- Deploy technology to optimize system performance and improve safety;
- Encourage deployment of broadband infrastructure in the public right-of-way to stimulate economic development and maintain our economic competitiveness; and
- Hold grantees accountable for effective and efficient use of funds.

To make these priorities a reality, EBLC anticipates recommending funding allocations that will address the following improvements:

- Enhanced transit along the I-680 corridor connecting Central Contra Costa to the Tri-Valley. Broad support exists within the business community for multiple travel modes along the I-680 corridor. This corridor is a critical link between many communities and employment centers, and the ever-increasing congestion along the corridor has widespread negative effects that must be addressed.
• Enhanced connections between residential portions of Eastern Contra Costa and job-centers in the Tri-Valley
• Additional parking at BART stations.
• Improved BART capacity along the Highway 24 corridor including extensions to the system and operational improvements.
• Traffic signal coordination and other improvements that address ever-increasing congestion on interregional thoroughfares such as Ygnacio Valley Road, Treat Boulevard, and Vasco Road.
• A program to support “driver-assist” and “vehicle-to-vehicle” features that enable cars to communicate with other cars as well as with roadside sensors.
• Creation of high capacity transit along the I-80 corridor.
• Increased broadband capacity and speed that is necessary to stimulate economic development and maintain our region’s economic competitiveness.
• Investments which stimulate highest and best use of the Byron Airport, the Port of Richmond, the Concord Naval Weapons Station, and the Northern Waterfront.

As the leading private sector business advocacy organization in the East Bay, EBLC values CCTA’s membership and looks forward to engaging with your board and staff regarding the perspective of business leaders on the critical infrastructure needs throughout Contra Costa County. The EBLC is making transportation a key focus of our policy efforts in 2015 and 2016, and we look forward to continued participation in the process of developing the TEP.

Sincerely,

Kristin Connelly
President & CEO

CC: Ross Chittenden, CCTA
You are invited to the Hercules San Francisco Bay Trail Segment Opening Ceremony, and Healthy Lifestyle and Mobility Expo

Saturday, September 19, 2015

Ribbon-cutting ceremony: 9 to 9:30 a.m.
Expo: 9:30 a.m. to noon

Location: Shoreline Park, 1000 Tug Boat Lane, Hercules, CA (see directions on back)

Please join the City of Hercules and the East Bay Regional Park District at a ribbon-cutting ceremony to open the Hercules San Francisco Bay Trail Segment, a new 2/3-mile segment of the SF Bay Trail with spectacular views of San Pablo Bay. Celebrate with special guests the completion of the first phase of the Regional Intermodal Transportation Center in Hercules. Following the ceremony, we invite you to explore the Healthy Lifestyle and Mobility Expo, and stroll along the new trail segment where exhibitors will share information on services, programs, and activities promoting healthy lifestyles in the region. Light refreshments will be provided at Shoreline Park.

Funding for this project was provided by the City of Hercules, Contra Costa Transportation Authority, East Bay Regional Park District’s Measure AA and EBRPD’s pass-through of the Federal Highway Administration TIGER II Grant, and the Association of Bay Area Governments.

RSVP: Cathleen Slaga at cslaga@ci.hercules.ca.us

East Bay Regional Park District
www.ebparks.org

City of Hercules
California

5.8-1
Driving Directions

Directions from I-80 in Pinole/Hercules:
Take the Willow Avenue exit. Turn right on Willow Avenue, and continue 0.4 miles. Turn left on San Pablo Avenue, then right on Victoria Crescent West and continue 0.4 miles. Turn right on Victoria Park, then right onto Tug Boat Lane. Guides will be on hand to direct you to the ceremony site.
July 23, 2015

Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

RE: SWAT Meeting Summary Report for July 2015

Dear Mr. Iwasaki:

At the July 16 Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) meeting, the following items were discussed and/or approved that may be of interest to the Authority:

Approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with City of San Ramon for SWAT Administrative Services for FY 2015-16. In May, SWAT approved a proposal from the City of San Ramon to provide SWAT administrative service beginning July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. The Committee approved the MOU and authorized SWAT Chair and SWAT Vice Chair to execute the MOU between SWAT and City of San Ramon for SWAT Administrative Services.

Approved Request from East Bay Regional Parks District for Measure J Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trails Facilities Program Funds from the SWAT subregion. The Committee approved the request from the East Bay Regional Parks District for SWAT sub-regional funding to rehabilitate approximately 590,000 square feet of the Iron Horse Trail from Rudgear Road in Walnut Creek to the Alameda County line in Dublin.

Approved State Transportation Improvement (STIP) project applications from Town of Moraga and Contra Costa County. The Committee approved request from the Town of Moraga for St. Mary’s Road/Rheem/Bollinger Canyon Roundabouts and for Contra Costa County Camino Tassajara Bike Lane Gap Closure Projects and to forward STIP project applications to CCTA for consideration.

Approved SWAT sub-regional TDM programs and budget for FY 2015-16. The Committee approved the SWAT sub-regional TDM programs and budget for FY 2015-16 with the caveat that the funds totaling $5,000 ($2,500 for each) be reallocated to the Lamorinda School Bus and San Ramon Valley TRAFFIX programs.

Approved the 2017 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Project List for the SWAT sub-region and forward the Project List to CCTA for consideration (RTP Project List attached).
Considered a Preliminary Draft Proposal Transportation Expenditure Plan for the SWAT sub-region. The Committee received a preliminary proposal from SWAT TAC and agreed to review and approve a final draft at the August 3, 2015 SWAT meeting.

The next SWAT meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 3, 2015, at Supervisor Andersen’s Lamorinda Office, 3338 Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Lafayette. Please contact me at (925) 973-2651 or email at lbobadilla@sanramon.ca.gov, if you should have any questions.

Sincerely,

Lisa Bobadilla
City of San Ramon
SWAT Administrative Staff

Cc: SWAT, SWAT TAC, Jamar Stamps, TRANSPLAN; John Nemeth, WCCTAC; Anita Tucci-Smith, TRANSPAC; Danice Rosenbohm, CCTA; Martin Engelmann, CCTA
August 21, 2015

Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

RE: SWAT Meeting Summary Report for August 2015

Dear Mr. Iwasaki:

At the August 3 Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) meeting, the following items were discussed and/or approved that may be of interest to the Authority:

- **Approved** Request to Repurpose Contra Costa Transportation for Livable Communities (CC-TLC) Program Funds for City of San Ramon and Town of Danville (staff report attached);

- **Accepted** Revised 511 Contra Costa FY 2015-16 SWAT Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program and Budget; and

- **Approved** Draft Proposal Transportation Expenditure Plan for the SWAT Sub-region (attached).

The next SWAT meeting is scheduled for **Monday, September 14 2015**, at Supervisor Andersen’s Lamorinda Office, 3338 Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Lafayette. Please contact me at (925) 973-2651 or email at lbobadilla@sanramon.ca.gov, if you should have any questions.

Sincerely,

Lisa Bobadilla
City of San Ramon
SWAT Administrative Staff

Cc: SWAT; SWAT TAC; Jamar Stamps, TRANSPLAN; John Nemeth, WCCTAC; Anita Tucci-Smith, TRANSPAC; Danice Rosenbohm, CCTA; Martin Engelmann, CCTA
DATE: August 3, 2015
TO: SWAT
FROM: SWAT TAC
SUBJECT: Request to Repurpose Contra Costa Transportation for Livable Communities (CC-TLC) Program Funds

BACKGROUND

At its meeting of February 6, 2012, SWAT approved the allocation of Contra Costa Transportation for Livable Communities (CC-TLC) Program Funds for the SWAT subregion. Countywide there was an estimated $14.92 million available for the program, of which approximately $3.58 million was allocated to the SWAT subregion. A total of nine project applications were submitted from the subregion requesting a total of $3.96 million ($0.38 million in excess of available funding). Ultimately, SWAT recommended approval and forwarded to the Authority CC-TLC allocations as described in Table 1:

Table 1 – Approved CC-TLC Funding Allocations for SWAT Subregion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moraga</td>
<td>Livable Moraga Road</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ramon</td>
<td>Iron Horse Trail Improvements</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART/Orinda</td>
<td>Orinda/Lafayette BART Wayfinding and Lighting</td>
<td>$394,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>East End Ped/Bike &amp; Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ramon</td>
<td>San Ramon Valley Iron Horse Trail Bike/Ped Overcrossings (Design)</td>
<td>$543,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>Downtown Multimodal Access Improvements</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC County</td>
<td>Stone Valley Road Bike Lane Gap Closure</td>
<td>$593,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC County</td>
<td>Olympic Corridor Trail Connector Study</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ramon/</td>
<td>San Ramon Valley Transit Access/Connectivity Study</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SWAT PROJECTS - TOTAL: $3,582,500
DISCUSSION

The City of San Ramon and Town of Danville are requesting to repurpose $150,000 in CC-TLC funding, initially allocated for the San Ramon Valley Transit Access/Connectivity Study, to two new projects within the San Ramon Valley. With the recent launch of the Contra Costa Express Bus Study and the I-680 Transit Investment and Congestion Relief Study, at this time there is not a need for an additional transit study for the San Ramon Valley. As such, San Ramon and Danville requests that the previously allocated CC-TLC funds be repurposed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Approved Allocation</th>
<th>Requested Allocation Repurpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Ramon/Danville</td>
<td>San Ramon Valley Transit Access/Connectivity Study</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ramon</td>
<td>Citywide Bicycle Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville</td>
<td>Diablo Road Circulation Improvements (design)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The San Ramon Citywide Bicycle Masterplan and the Diablo Road Circulation Improvements both meet the criteria and goals of the CC-TLC Program. SWAT is required to approve the allocation repurposing request prior to it moving forward to the Authority for consideration.

RECOMMENDATION

Consider forwarding a recommendation to CCTA for the repurposing of $150,000 in CC-TLC Program funds from the San Ramon Valley Transit Access/Connectivity Study to the San Ramon Citywide Bike Masterplan ($75,000) and to the Town of Danville Diablo Road Circulation Improvements ($75,000).

Staff Contact:

Lisa Bobadilla, City of San Ramon  
Phone: (925) 973-2651  
Email: lbobadilla@sanramon.ca.gov  
Web: www.CCTA-SWAT.net
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EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT  
September 16, 2015

**Pedestrian Bridge for Hillcrest BART Station:** July 10, 2015
A steel truss bridge was erected over the future westbound Highway 4. The 145-foot long bridge will allow BART users access to the train platform in the median of Highway 4 from the entry house located to the north of Highway 4. BART director Joel Keller, Antioch Mayor Pro Tem Lori Ogorchock, and CCTA staff attended the event which was covered by the media.

**Contra Costa Economic Partnership (CCEP) Board Meeting:** July 13, 2015
I was nominated and approved as a CCEP board member. The board is comprised of City Managers, County Administrator, and private sector representatives. The partnership is dedicated to promoting economic vitality and an excellent quality of life in the East Bay region. The Partnership works collaboratively to support and expand existing businesses, and to attract high-wage, high-skill jobs and emerging technology companies to the region. Concord City Manager Valerie Barone and I presented the CCEP board with an update on the progress of GoMentum Station Program.

**V2IDC Technical Working Group 1:** July 13, 2015
I am the Institute of Transportation Engineer’s representative on the Vehicle to Infrastructure Deployment Coalition’s (V2IDC) Executive Committee. I also agreed to participate on the V2IDC Working Group 1 which focuses on V2I deployment opportunities. This was the first teleconference. Jack Hall and Ross Chittenden are participating as members of several V2I Technical Working Groups.

**Danville Town Council Study Session:** July 14, 2015
Ross Chittenden attended the Town of Danville Council meeting to discuss the process for development of a Transportation Expenditure Plan for a possible 2016 sales tax ballot measure. The Town Council also discussed and provided comments on the I-680 corridor transit study.

**Presentation to the Oakley City Council - Future of Transportation:** July 14, 2015
I presented “Redefining Mobility” to the Oakley City Council at the request of a member of the Citizen’s Advisory Committee. Jack Hall attended the Council meeting with me.

**Contra Costa Leadership Academy Graduation:** July 16, 2015
Hisham Noemi attended the Contra Costa Leadership Academy. He graduated on July 16, 2015. Ross Chittenden, Linsey Willis and I attended the ceremony. On August 13, 2015, the Public Manages Association received a presentation from Hisham and his team on how to increase public participation using social media and new technologies.
Congressman Lipinski’s Transportation Technology Roundtable/Reauthorization: July 17, 2015
I was invited to participate in Congressman Daniel Lipinski’s transportation roundtable. He is a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. The topic was “Government Involvement in Transportation Tech – Help or Hindrance?” There were almost 20 speakers including representatives from government and the private sector. Each speaker was allocated 3 minutes. However, when it was my turn, Dave Cobb, the moderator from HDR, allowed me 5 minutes. I almost finished my 20 slide presentation. Following the roundtable, Congressman Lipinski sent a letter of support for our connected vehicle application.

We hosted a kickoff meeting for the IDTO project with representatives from UC Berkeley, Tri-Delta Transit, Caltrans and CCTA. This project will focus on connection protection, dynamic dispatch, and real time ridesharing. This is an exciting project.

Automated Vehicles Symposium: July 21, 2015
Jack Hall represented CCTA at the Transportation Research Board/Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International Automated Vehicle Symposium held in Ann Arbor, Michigan. This symposium brought together leading researchers, regulators, technologists and decisions makers representing many different countries to discuss the future of automated vehicles.

City of Antioch Meeting: July 21, 2015
Ross Chittenden, Linsey Willis, Martin Engelmann and I met with Antioch City Manager Steve Duran, Ron Bernal, and Jim Jakel to review our program. We discussed federal and State legislation, the potential measure, project delivery, and the countywide transportation plan. Jim Jakel is working part time for the Federal Advocates as a public affairs consultant. We have asked Jim to talk about our connected vehicle application in Washington DC.

Honda: July 22, 2015
Jack Hall met with Yusuke Hasegawa, Honda’s Managing Officer and Director/Chief Operating Officer, Advanced Research Division, for an update on GoMentum Station’s development progress. Hasegawa san toured GoMentum Station along with other Honda senior executives after receiving the presentation update.

SHCC Board Meeting: July 22, 2015
Linsey Willis, Ross Chittenden and I attended the Self Help Counties Coalition’s board meeting, which was held in San Diego. We discussed the various pieces of proposed legislation in the Special Session of the legislature. We were given an update on the various Caltrans initiatives. Will Kempton provided an update on the activities of the California Transportation Commission. The next Self Help Counties Coalition’s Focus on the Future Conference will be held on November 16-17, 2015 in Newport Beach.

Gannett Fleming: July 23, 2015
John Derr, Eric Rensel and Larry Russell from Gannett Fleming set up a meeting to understand what we are trying to accomplish at GoMentum Station and how they could participate in the program. Jack Hall has been working with Eric. Gannett Fleming is both a contractor and a consulting firm.
Mark Harris: July 23, 2015
Mark Harris is a freelance journalist that was writing a story about self-driving cars for IEEE’s Spectrum magazine. He scheduled a teleconference to ask questions about California’s role in the development of self-driving cars. I provided him with information about the GoMentum Station Program and why it is important to California, and more importantly, to Contra Costa. I also provide Mark with a brief overview of the Automated Highway System program of the early 90’s.

East Bay League of Cities: July 23, 2015
I presented “Driving the Future: Autonomous Vehicles” presentation to the East Bay Division of the League of California Cities meeting in El Cerrito. There were elected officials and staff from both Alameda and Contra Costa counties at the meeting. There were a lot of questions from the audience, which I was told was a good sign. After the meeting, I was invited to make a shortened version of the presentation at a future Conference of Mayors meeting and a Walnut Creek Rotary meeting. There was also a request for the presentation to be given at an Albany Rotary meeting.

Honda Silicon Valley Grand Opening: July 23, 2015
Jack Hall attended the Honda Research Institute grand opening in Mountain View. While there he met several senior executives for Honda and learned more about Honda’s latest innovations. The highlight of the evening was sharing the Honda GoMentum Station video with Honda President Koichi Fukuo.

Samsung: July 24, 2015
Jack Hall and I met with Amar Parmar from Samsung. Jim Helmer, the former Director of Transportation for the City of San Jose, made the introductions. Samsung is building devices to help facilitate vehicle-to-vehicle and vehicle-to-infrastructure communication. They are developing a communication device that will be attached to street lights. The device is a little larger than a lady bug. We want to work closely with members of the Samsung team as they get closer to deployment. This technology will help with the connected city vision.

Carlyn Obringer: July 24, 2015
Jack Hall and I met with Carlyn Obringer to discuss the GoMentum Station Program. Ms. Obringer is on the Concord Planning Commission and she had questions about the program. She left with a better understanding of the program and was pleased to see that we are trying to use technology to help create smart jobs in Concord and the surrounding area.

CALCOG Meeting: July 28, 2015
I attended the CALCOG Directors meeting in Sacramento. The first action item was to appoint Mark Baza as the Vice Chair. The next item was to discuss the proposed legislation that would raise revenue for transportation. Jim Earp participated in this session. He was looking for letters of support for the proposed legislation. Concerns about the proposed legislation were brought up by a small number of agency representatives. We discussed the status of the federal reauthorization bill. There was a discussion of the revision of the Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities guidelines and what if any new directory language will be included in the Resources Trailer Bill that the legislature had not passed in connection with the Budget.
Presentation to Antioch City Council:  July 28, 2015
I presented an update on Highway 4, our efforts toward a potential 2016 measure and a view of the future in transportation at the Antioch City Council meeting. Prior to my report, BART Director Keller gave the City Council an update on their funding needs. Peter Engel and Susan Miller attended the meeting with me.

Transportation Research Board (TRB) Managed Lanes Committee Meeting:  July 28 - 30, 2015
Ross Chittenden attended the mid-year meeting of the TRB Managed Lanes Committee in Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Ross is the secretary for the committee. The focus of the mid-year meeting was to finalize research proposals focusing on the benefits, effectiveness and equity of tolled managed lanes. The total cost of the trip was $2,098.48.

Partnering Meeting:  July 29, 2015
Randy Carlton, Linsey Willis and I attended a construction partnering meeting to discuss progress on State Route 4. The contractors were very appreciative about the prompt payment program.

Contra Costa TV:  July 30, 2015
Linsey Willis and Irene Ortega toured the Contra Costa TV studios in Martinez and met with County staff to discuss opportunities for our agency to utilize CCTV.

First Aid/CPR/AED Training:  July 31, 2015
CCTA recently installed an AED device in our office and staff needed training on how to properly operate the device. We added first aid and CPR training/certification and made it a team building exercise. A majority of CCTA staff attended the first aid, CPR, and AED training session.

ITE Annual Conference:  August 2 - 4, 2015
Hisham Noeimi attended the 4-day ITE Annual Conference in Hollywood, Florida starting on August 2, 2015. Hisham attended sessions related to technology fixes for traffic operations, mobility hubs, and autonomous vehicle continuum impacts. The keynote speaker at the conference was Manny Diaz, former mayor of Miami, credited for the transformation of Miami into a livable and thriving community. Hisham will earn continuing education credits for attending the conference. The total cost of the trip was $2,457.01.

ITS America Board Meeting:  August 5 - 6, 2015
ITS America hired Regina Hopper as the new President and CEO. The board scheduled a meeting to discuss any modifications or changes to the organization’s strategic direction. A professional strategic facilitator provided direction and helped keep the meeting focused.

Transportation Roundtable:  August 11, 2015
I was invited to speak at a transportation roundtable sponsored by Congressman Eric Swalwell and Assemblywoman Catharine Baker. There were nine panel members including me. We were given a few minutes to talk about what our agencies needed – from regulation reform to funding. I talked about CCTA, regulation reform, alternative procurement tools, funding, environmental streamlining, State and Local Partnership Programs, letter of no prejudice, research and technology deployment and freight.
**Presentation to Brentwood City Council:** August 11, 2015
I presented an update on Highway 4, our efforts toward a potential 2016 transportation sales tax ballot measure and a view of the future in transportation at the Brentwood City Council meeting. After my report, BART Director Keller gave the City Council an update on BART’s funding needs. Ross Chittenden and Linsey Willis attended the meeting with me.

**Mary Jo Rossi:** August 12, 2015
Linsey Willis met with Mary Jo Rossi to discuss the GoMentum Station Program. Ms. Rossi owns a local communications firm and was interested in learning more about the program.

**Dougherty Valley/San Ramon Rotary Club:** August 12, 2015
I was invited to speak at the DV/SR Rotary Club about how transportation funding works – federal, State and local. They asked about what projects and programs are funded by Measure J. Finally they wanted to know about future transportation initiatives for Contra Costa.

**City of Orinda:** August 12, 2015
Ross Chittenden, Linsey Willis, Martin Engelmann and I met with Walnut Creek City Manager Janet Keeter and Charles Swanson to review our program. We discussed federal and State legislation, the potential measure, project delivery, and the countywide transportation plan.

**Mark Harris:** August 14, 2015
Jack Hall and I answered Mark’s questions for a story he was writing for the Guardian concerning high tech companies and the development of self-driving cars. Mark’s questions were follow-up to correspondence he obtained in response to a public records act request. He was trying to tie a request for a meeting to a confirmation of a company building an electric car. We finished the interview at 8:30 am, the article was published at approximately noon, and we were both inundated with phone calls from numerous news agencies within minutes thereafter.

**Government Transformation 2016:** August 18, 2015
I was invited to participate in a teleconference to prepare for the upcoming Government Transportation 2016 Forum in Sacramento. Secretary Marybel Batjer of the California Government Operations Agency sponsors the conference. The forum is designed to serve as a discussion starter by bringing expertise and experience together with motivated leaders in government to examine the challenges and issues, gather information, and network on solutions.

**KCBS Radio Interview:** August 19, 2015
Jack Hall gave a radio interview to Stan Bunger and Susan Leigh Taylor with KCBS radio news about GoMentum Station. CCTA’s ITS CV/AV program was discussed along with the amazing opportunities for advancement of CV/AV technologies on a global scale.

**Speaker’s Roundtable:** August 19, 2015
At the request of the Speaker of the Assembly, CCTA hosted a “Fix the Roads” Roundtable event in our offices. Chaired by Assemblymember Frazier, this event was designed to provide Assembly Members with additional information about transportation from the State and local government.
perspective and the business community’s perspective. Chair Julie Pierce and Supervisor Anderson represented CCTA and Contra Costa on the roundtable.

HELP, Inc.: August 20, 2015
I was asked to provide the HELP, Inc. Executive Committee a National Freight Advisory Committee update. I was also asked to report on what is in the various proposed surface transportation bills with respect to freight. The presentation included items from the Administration’s GROW America bill and the Senate’s DRIVE Act.

Mobility 21: August 28, 2015
I was asked to participate on a panel at the Mobility 21 annual conference. They wanted to hear about “Redefining Mobility”. The audience was made up of elected officials, consultants and State and local agency officials.

Kate Galbraith/CALmatters: September 1, 2015
I gave an interview to Kate Galbraith with CALmatters, a startup news organization that covers state policy issues on transportation funding in California. I discussed the importance of maintenance, pavement preservation and the challenges associated with transportation projects in metropolitan areas.

DMV: September 1, 2015
Linsey Willis and I spoke with Tim Corcoran with the DMV regarding current licensing regulations for autonomous vehicles. There is interest in purchasing a Connected Shared Autonomous Vehicle and we need to know the requirements for driving it on a public road.

Presentation to Orinda City Council: September 1, 2015
Ross Chittenden attended the Orinda City Council meeting to discuss the process for development of a Transportation Expenditure Plan for a possible 2016 transportation sales tax ballot measure.

National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP): September 2, 2015
As Chair of the NCHRP project panel – Policy and Planning Actions to Internalize Societal Impacts of CV and AV Systems into Market Decisions – I hosted a meeting to finalize the project vision and scope of work at CCTA’s office. Fourteen transportation experts from all over the country traveled to CCTA for the meeting and a tour of GoMentum Station. Jack Hall organized and guided the tour for the attendees.

State Route 4 Integrated Corridor Management: September 2, 2015
$200,000 in federal planning grant funds were secured as we received our E-76, or formally called an "Authorization to Proceed". The competitive grant we won was one of 13 grants issued by US DOT from over 40 applications nationwide. We competed with DOTs, Caltrans, MPOs, and other local agencies. Jack Hall is leading this project that will use state-of-the-practice Intelligent Transportation System technologies to enhance the effectiveness of the existing transportation along State Route 4 between State Route 160 and Interstate 80.
GoMentum Station: September 3, 2015
Honda Research Institute received agreement on their autonomous vehicle testing sub-license with the City of Concord. Honda plans to begin testing twice a week at GoMentum Station beginning September 21st through October.

City of Walnut Creek: September 3, 3015
Ross Chittenden, Linsey Willis, Martin Engelmann met with City Manager Ken Nordhoff and key staff to provide an update on the legislative issues both in Sacramento and Washington, DC. We also talked about the status of the CTP update, strategic plan and the potential 2016 ballot measure.

Tech Series - Information Display Company: September 4, 2015
Laura Knutson and Ken Martin from Information Display Company gave a presentation on their various Intelligent Transportation Systems devices and signs. There was a lot of interest in their products. Information Display Company offers signs that provide predictive travel times on local roads. They also have advisory speed signs for specific applications.

Lennar Urban: September 4, 2015
Jack Hall and I met with Kofi Bonner, President of the Bay Area Division of Lennar Urban. He was interested in our test facility at the CNWS. We also talked about City 5.0. He is working on several projects throughout the Bay Area.

V2I Consortium Meeting: September 10, 2015
The Executive Committee of the V2I Consortium met to get an update from the Chairs of the six technical working groups. There have been many meetings to begin formulating a rollout plan for the connected vehicles in the United States.

EasyMile Company: September 11, 2015
Jack Hall and I met with the CEO of the EasyMile Company. They build the Connected Shared Autonomous Vehicle. The product is working in the Netherlands, Italy, and France. They are located in France.
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### MEETING SCHEDULE

Meetings are held in CCTA’s Board Room (Suite 110) unless otherwise noted.

2999 Oak Road, Suite 100, Walnut Creek, CA 94597

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Authority Board (CCTA)</td>
<td>October 21, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Wednesday</strong> of the month</td>
<td>November 18, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 6:00 PM</td>
<td>December 16, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Projects Committee (APC)</td>
<td>October 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Thursday</strong> of the month</td>
<td>November 5, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 8:30 AM</td>
<td>December 3, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Committee (PC)</td>
<td>October 7, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Wednesday</strong> of the month</td>
<td>November 4, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 6:00 PM</td>
<td>December 2, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)</td>
<td>October 28, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth Wednesday</strong> of the month (generally)</td>
<td>November – No Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 6:00 PM</td>
<td>December 9, 2015 * Note Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC)</td>
<td>October 15, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Thursday</strong> of the month</td>
<td>November 19, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 2:30 PM</td>
<td>December 17, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)</td>
<td>October – No Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Monday</strong> of every other month</td>
<td>November 16, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 2:30 PM</td>
<td>December – No Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC)</td>
<td>October – No Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth Monday</strong> of every other month</td>
<td>November 23, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at 11:00 AM (generally)</td>
<td>December – No Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please note special November/December CAC meeting date.
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## Calendar of Upcoming Events

### September 16, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2015</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 18, 2015</td>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority (SJJPA) Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fall 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Pittsburg Center e-BART Station Groundbreaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>West County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2015</td>
<td>Hercules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21-22, 2015</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 23, 2015</td>
<td>tbd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15-17, 2015</td>
<td>Newport Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9-10, 2015</td>
<td>tbd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Winter 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early 2016</td>
<td>West County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spring 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Brentwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Antioch / Oakley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>Antioch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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