

TRANSPAC Transportation Partnership and Cooperation

Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek and Contra Costa County
2300 Contra Costa Boulevard, Ste. 360, Pleasant Hill, CA 94523 (925) 969-0841

TRANSPAC TAC MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA THURSDAY, February 26, 2009 9 AM TO 11:30 AM in the COMMUNITY ROOM PLEASANT HILL CITY HALL 100 GREGORY LANE PLEASANT HILL (925) 969-0841

1. Central County Action Plan (latest version may be downloaded at www.transpac.us).

Consideration of Joint TRANSPAC/TRANSPLAN TAC meeting recommendation re: SR 4. RTPC staff has crafted the following language to be inserted into the Action Plan in Chapter 4 under SR 4. A recommendation to TRANSPAC is requested for action at the March 12, 2009 meeting.

Please note that WCCTAC staff has expressed interest in participating in the development of the SR 4 Corridor Management Plan. The proposal was presented to the WCCTAC TAC on February 12, 2009. Participation was recommended to the WCCTAC Board for consideration at its February 27, 2009 meeting. If the WCCTAC Board's response is affirmative, approval is requested to revise the language accordingly as shown below for TRANSPAC's consideration at its March 12, 2009 meeting.

"Partner with TRANSPLAN to develop a Corridor Management Plan for SR 4 from East County through Central County (boundaries to be defined) including connecting and/or supporting arterials. This process will identify an MTSO(s) for SR 4, actions, projects and define an approach to managing arterials in the corridor. TRANSPAC and TRANSPLAN jointly will seek funding for the Corridor Management Plan from CCTA and other available sources."

In addition, it is suggested that the **SR 4 MTSO** would be annotated as follows: "Upon acceptance of this recommendation by TRANSPAC and TRANSPLAN, current SR 4 MTSOs in the two respective Action Plans will be annotated to indicate that the current MTSOs are expected to be revised upon completion and adoption of the Corridor Management Plan by TRANSPAC and TRANSPLAN."

2. City of Pleasant Hill Request for a Letter of Support for a Caltrans Planning Grant (attachment). The City of Pleasant Hill is submitting an application for a Caltrans Planning Grant. Please see attached Caltrans postcard for grant information and the City's draft grant application. A recommendation to TRANSPAC is requested.

- 3. 2009 and 2012 TRANSPAC Bond Lists (attachment).** The City of Pleasant Hill has requested that the Buskirk Avenue Realignment project be moved from the 2012 Measure J Bond List to the 2009 Bond List. All other projects on the Bond List also need to be reviewed for placement. The City of Pleasant Hill's letter requesting the change, CCTA staff reports on the bond sale and the Measure J Strategic Plan (see information below), the 1/18/08 City of Concord letter on the deferment of the Waterworld Parkway project, the original TRANSPAC Bond list and a very draft beginning of a revised Bond List is in the packet for information.

Measure J Bond Financing. The report of CCTA's financial advisor, Public Financial Management, may be downloaded from www.ccta.net, Administration and Projects Committee Agenda, 2/5/09, item 16 for those who are interested. The short version of the report is that CCTA intends to proceed with the bond sale although other financial mechanisms may be used as part of the overall construct of the sale.

Measure J Strategic Plan. The CCTA staff is seeking approval to initiate an update to the Measure J Strategic Plan in preparation for the September bond sale.

The TAC is requested to bring available updated project information (cost, scope, etc.) and status information on 2009 and 2012 (if available) Bond List projects. This is the beginning of an update process in anticipation of the September bond sale. A recommendation to TRANSPAC on any Bond List revisions may be developed at this or a future TAC meeting.

- 4. East County Fee Report – information (attachment).** The CCTA staff report is attached. The complete report on the East County Fee Program may be downloaded at www.ccta.net, Administration and Projects Committee Agenda, 2/5/09, at the end of item 14.

- 5. CCTA Revisions to Measure J re: Bus and Paratransit allocations (attachment)**

CCTA staff proposed a policy action or a Measure J Expenditure Plan amendment which would allow the use Express Bus, Bus Services, and Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities (line items 16, 19 and 20 on the attached Measure J Expenditure Plan Allocations Chart) for the funding of existing services should funding shortfall threaten those services. Line items 19 and 20 are to be allocated by TRANSPAC and WCCTAC which are the only two RTPCs with subregional funds in those categories in Measure J. The CCTA action is to provide flexibility to the involved RTPCs for allocations from these line items.

- 6. Contra Costa Priority Projects for Development of Project Study Reports (PSR) by Caltrans for 2009-10 (attachment).**
- 7. Growth Management Plan Task Force (GMP TF).** Task Force update on deliberations.
- 8. Electric Charging Station and California Safe Routes to School Grants – Lynn Overcashier (attachment)**
- 9. Other and unfinished business** as well as updates on ongoing plans, studies and programs. The next TAC meeting is scheduled for March 26, 2009 unless otherwise determined.



**CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING GRANTS
FISCAL YEAR 2009-2010
NEW APPLICATION AND WORKSHOPS**

- Environmental Justice: Context-Sensitive Planning
- Community-Based Transportation Planning
- Partnership Planning (FHWA)
- Transit Planning (FTA Section 5304)
 - Statewide Transit Planning Studies
 - Transit Technical Planning Assistance
 - Transit Professional Development

**Application
Deadline
April 1, 2009**

The Fiscal Year 2009-2010 Transportation Planning Grant application package and a list of workshops in your area is now available on the California Department of Transportation, Division of Transportation Planning's website at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html>

To request a grant application by mail, please call *Suzanne De Foor* at (916) 653-8697 or email her at *Suzanne_De_Foor@dot.ca.gov*.

FY 2009-10 COMMUNITY-BASED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING APPLICATION

An electronic version of this application is available at the following web site:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html>

- ✓ Application length – 20 page maximum – includes all documents **except** letters of support
- ✓ Double spaced, 12 pitch font
- ✓ No binding, use one staple

Required documents

- Signed Application, Scope of Work (See Question 8, on page 30), Project Timeline, Local Resolution, map of project area, digital photographs of project area (when applicable). Failure to include any of these required documents may result in a reduced application score.

Submit five signed hard copies and one electronic copy on a CD (Microsoft Word and Excel) of the entire Application and all documents, including the Required Documents listed above.

PROJECT TITLE	Contra Costa Boulevard Corridor Concept Study
PROJECT LOCATION (city(ies) and county(ies))	City of Pleasant Hill and City of Concord, Contra Costa County

	APPLICANT	SUB-RECIPIENT(S)*								
Organization	City of Pleasant Hill									
Contact Person (include salutation and title)	Mr. Troy Fujimoto, Senior Planner									
Mailing Address	100 Gregory Lane									
City	Pleasant Hill									
Zip Code	94523									
E-mail Address	tfujimoto@ci.pleasant-hill.ca.us									
Telephone Number	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">Area Code</td> <td style="width: 10%;">925</td> <td style="width: 10%;">Number</td> <td style="width: 10%;">671-5224</td> </tr> </table>	Area Code	925	Number	671-5224	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%;">Area Code</td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%;">Number</td> <td style="width: 10%;"></td> </tr> </table>	Area Code		Number	
Area Code	925	Number	671-5224							
Area Code		Number								

FUNDING INFORMATION	
Grant Funds Requested	\$180,000
Local Match (See sample calculation on Page 24)	
Cash	\$18,000
In-Kind	\$18,000
Source of Local Match	City of Pleasant Hill
Other Funding	\$
Total Project Cost	\$216,000

LEGISLATORS IN PROJECT AREA	
State Senator(s) (name and district)	Assembly Member(s) (name and district)
Mark DeSaulnier, District 7	Nancy Skinner, District 14

* For assistance with determining the legislators for the project area,
visit:http://www.legislature.ca.gov/legislators_and_districts/legislators/your_legislator.html

Attach additional pages if necessary (this attachment will not be included in the 20 page maximum).

Enter answers in the area provided below each question

Points that will be used for scoring are included as part of the question (100 points possible)

1. Project Summary (maximum of 60 words) (5 points)

A. Briefly summarize project.

The Contra Costa Boulevard Corridor Concept Study will encompass a study of Contra Costa Boulevard and ultimately provide recommendations related to transportation improvements that will improve the appearance, mobility, sustainability and livability of the corridor. Recommendations will be related to landscape and lighting improvements, improving pedestrian, bicycle and handicap (ADA) facilities, traffic light synchronization, revised lane configuration, and other related corridor improvements.

2. Project Description (maximum of 1 page) (15 points)

A. Define the project (5 points)

B. Briefly describe the project area (e.g. urban/rural/suburban setting, geographic characteristics, location, etc. (5 points)

C. List the project's anticipated accomplishments and final deliverables. (5 points)

Project Definition

The project will include the creation of a Contra Costa Boulevard Corridor Concept Study. The study will include roadway improvements (lane configuration), landscape improvements (median and sidewalk), gateway improvements, traffic light improvements, intersection improvements, sidewalk and handicap (ADA) improvements and transit improvements include potential new bus turnouts. The document will also include specific recommendations including intersection layout, roadway cross-sections including lane, median and landscape widths. The goals of the study will be to improve flow and mobility through the corridor, provide alternative modes of transportation access, and improve the appearance of the corridor through landscape, gateway and lighting improvements.

Project Area

Contra Costa Boulevard is approximately 3.5 miles long and runs north to south from Oak Park Boulevard at the south end to Second Avenue at the north end. The general area of Contra Costa Boulevard is in the eastern portion of the City of Pleasant Hill. The area is relatively flat without any outstanding physical formations.

The boulevard extends through Downtown Pleasant Hill and mostly encompasses commercial areas; however, it does abut residential areas including the neighborhoods of Gregory Gardens, College Park and West Sherman Acres. These residential areas contain mostly single family homes. In general the City is a suburban city and the area has this suburban feel with low rise development consisting to commercial areas abutting the boulevard with single-family residential behind.

Project's Anticipated Accomplishments and Final Deliverables

The major accomplishments can be broken up into three different components. The first component is public outreach and input. The second component includes analyzing the public input and data received and the last component is preparation of the Corridor Concept Study for subsequent adoption. Deliverables include a summary of the public input that was received as part of the public outreach process. Another deliverable will be the Corridor Concept Study that will include a traffic analysis of the corridor.

3. Project Justification (maximum of 1 page) (10 points)

- A. List and describe the problems and/or deficiencies that the project is attempting to address. (5 points)
- B. Describe how the project will address the identified problems and/or efficiencies. (5 points)

Existing Condition – Problems/Deficiencies

Contra Costa Boulevard is currently a 4 to 6 lane arterial street that bisects the City of Pleasant Hill in a north to south direction. It is an important travel corridor for the City, and also carries flow from adjacent cities and areas (Pacheco, Walnut Creek, Concord). The street is in most of its original built state and what was once a two lane road has over the years turned into a major arterial that is often used as an alternative to Interstate 680, especially during times of heavy congestion on the freeway.

The street is currently not pedestrian or transit friendly and often does not facilitate free-flowing traffic. Portions of the street do not have sidewalks, meaning pedestrian are not able to walk the entire stretch from south to north and are often forced to walk in landscape areas or cross the street to where there may be a sidewalk to use. Bicycle lanes are not present along the street and portions of the boulevard are narrow and would make bicycle use difficult.

Traffic flow through Contra Costa Boulevard is relatively congested, especially during peak travel period. The street does not have consistent vehicular flow through the boulevard and the fact that traffic lights are not synchronized well does not help to facilitate traffic flow. Also contributing to the congestion is bus use and the fact that there are very few bus turnouts in the street, which means that buses are forced to at least partially block travel lanes which contribute to congestion of the area. The number of lanes of traffic varies in size from 4 lanes to 6 lanes and often creates confusion and congestion because of the changes in lane sizes. There are multiple locations where lanes go from 4 to 6 and then back to 4 and then back to 6.

Because of the age of the boulevard, landscaping is not consistent or even provided in certain areas of the corridor. The lack of landscaping helps to discourage pedestrians from using the corridor. Lastly, there are areas of the corridor that could benefit from ADA improvements.

Project Fixes

It is the expectation of the concept study to address all of the issues mentioned above. The study would include roadway sections that would improve landscaping and sidewalk improvements. The roadway sections would be appropriate for different portions of the corridor. The study would also include intersection improvements that would provide recommendations to improve the interface of vehicles and pedestrians.

The study would also include a comprehensive landscape treatment for the entire corridor that would help to improve the overall appearance of the corridor and will encourage pedestrian use. The study will also identify areas that need pedestrian and handicap improvements and provide conceptual design solutions.

The study would also identify areas suitable for bus turnouts, and bicycle lanes or routes. The concept study would be a comprehensive document that could be used when development is proposed throughout the corridor and would help to ensure that improvement of the corridor occurs in a coordinated fashion.

The concept study would include a traffic analysis/study that would help to identify potential improvements that would help to improve traffic flow through the corridor. This will also promote the efficient movement of people, goods and services. Based on recommendations/conclusions of the study proper improvements can be identified to address congestion, deficient traffic flow and traffic movement.

4. Grant Program Objective (maximum of 1 page) (20 points)

A. How does the proposal involve conceptual-level plans or study activities that encourage community-based stakeholder collaboration, partnership, and consensus building through active public engagement? What is the coordinated transportation land/use or mobility objective? How does the proposal support livable/sustainable community concepts and promote community identity and quality of life?

Encourage Community Collaboration and Consensus Building

The Corridor Concept Study includes components that encourage community participation including surveys and workshops. The early stages of the project include meetings with various stakeholders and brings them into one room where it can encourage consensus building. Having a workshop where people can talk freely and others can hear issues that may not be specific to every stakeholder group will help to begin building understanding between potential competing interests. Multiple meetings will allow time for the right and appropriate solution regarding any conflicts that are identified. In addition, having extensive and early public outreach and input, will ultimately create a larger sense of ownership of the final corridor concept study by those that participated in the early stages.

Coordinated Transportation Lane Use or Mobility Objective

The coordinated transportation mobility objective will be to improve vehicle, pedestrian, bicycle and transit mobility through the corridor. By improving flow and connectivity in the corridor, it will also have the ancillary impact of improving flow in adjacent streets and connections. The study will also ensure that all different components of modes of transportation are analyzed in coordination with each other and not a piece-meal fashion that often lends importance to the vehicle.

Livable/Sustainable Community Concepts and Promote Community Identity and Quality of Life

The Contra Costa Boulevard Corridor Concept Study will support livable/sustainable community concepts by providing improved pedestrian and bicycle access where currently there is none or where it is unconnected. Encouraging alternative modes of transportation, supports a more livable and sustainable community that encourages a reduction of use of fossil fuels.

The new landscape treatment will also help to offset some greenhouse gases and will turn the otherwise unattractive corridor into an improved, attractive corridor that will instill pride from the community. The improvements will contrast with the adjacent portions of the corridor that are outside the City and will provide identification of arrival into the City of Pleasant Hill. The study will also incorporate special gateway treatments that will also help to identify the City of Pleasant Hill.

The improvements will improve the quality of life for residents that live adjacent to the corridor and those that use the corridor. Different landscape themes can be used throughout the corridor which can help to provide identity to different areas of the City that the street passes through, while still maintaining an overall coordinated theme.

5. California Transportation Plan (CTP) Goals (maximum of 2 pages) (10 points)

Address two or more of the following CTP Goals:

- A. Improve Mobility and Accessibility: Expanding the system and enhancing modal choices and connectivity to meet the State's future transportation demands—

The Corridor Concept Study will help to expand the usability of Contra Costa Boulevard. Currently the corridor is mainly used by vehicles and transit. The study will help to encourage other modes of transportation including pedestrian and bicycle use. These other improvements will expand the use of corridor to other users besides vehicles.

In addition, improving capacity of the street through improving flow through the corridor will help to enhance the life of the current facility without requiring costly expansion. The improvements identified in the study will increase accessibility and use of the corridor, thus, reaping the best and highest use of the corridor. The improvements identified in the corridor concept study may also provide additional vehicle capacity to the existing boulevard by improving the traffic flow and reducing congestion in the corridor.

- B. Preserve the Transportation System: Maintaining, managing, and efficiently utilizing California's existing transportation system—

The Corridor Concept Study will increase the utility of the corridor by providing enhances pedestrian, bicycle facilities and provide improved flow through the corridor which could over the long-term accommodate additional vehicles through the corridor. This will help to maximize the use of the corridor without requiring costly expansion of the street. Other improvements identified as part of the study will improve the appearance of the corridor and potentially include improvements that will cost less over the long-term to maintain.

- E. Reflect Community Values: Finding transportation solutions that balance and integrate community values with transportation safety and performance, and encourage public involvement in transportation decisions—

The Corridor Concept Study process will have a public involvement and outreach component that will encourage participation. The process will include surveys, workshops and meetings that will be used to receive public input into the creation of a concept study. The public input will be reflected in the creation of the study and incorporate community desires and preferences into the recommendations/conclusions. Having these outreach solutions will encourage public involvement as we will be proactive in having the public and stakeholders participate in the process.

The study will analyze and recommend solutions that will enhance safety regarding interaction between vehicle and bicycle or pedestrian uses (such as having landscape buffers to separate the uses). The study will also include recommendations to improve the performance of the street to help accommodate increased transportation usage within the corridor while improving mobility and congestion, thus, decreasing travel times.

6. Public Participation (maximum of 2 pages), (20 points)

- A. Identify the project stakeholders (i.e. low-income and minority communities, Native American Tribal Governments, other underrepresented groups, community-based organizations, and businesses affected by the project). (10 points).
- B. Describe the outreach methods that will be used to reach the public and the project stakeholders with an emphasis of engaging traditionally under-represented communities. (10 points).

Project Stakeholders

Project stakeholders include the property owners adjacent to the corridor, which includes businesses and residential property owners. Other stakeholders include affected agencies, including adjacent cities, Caltrans, the local transit agency, and utility companies that use the corridor.

Other community stakeholders include residents of the City, including neighborhoods such as the Gregory Gardens, College Park and West Sherman neighborhoods. The local Pleasant Hill Chamber of Commerce will also be a stakeholder, especially with its connection to the affected businesses.

Outreach Methods

Public involvement and outreach will include surveys, public meetings, and public workshops to gather input in both a formal and informal setting. The survey, meetings and workshops will be used to have stakeholder and public input as early in the process as possible. One of the benefits of a survey will be to allow people that cannot or choose not to attend public meetings/workshops to provide their input even if they are not as active as those that do attend the meetings.

The workshop will allow the public to participate more intensely in the actual “planning” process and help to instill a sense of ownership in the project. It will also allow business and property owners to actively participate in the plan that will directly impact their business and property. The ideas and suggestions shared during these processes will be used to help create the overall goals and policies of the Specific Plan. This input will also be used to directly affect the recommendations/conclusions of the study.

The initial outreach will then be followed up with periodic updates and will move to the formal adoption phase. Outreach will include posting on the internet, in the city newsletter, newspaper, mailouts and posting on large signs throughout the City. All public meetings before various Commissions will be noticed above and beyond minimum requirements as noted above.

Using the varying notification processes (street signage, internet, etc.) will help to spread information to those that may not normally know about various City processes or events. Notification will also be provided at and through the Senior Center, which will provide information to a population that may also be impacted by the Study, including pedestrian, transit and handicap improvements.

7. Project Implementation (maximum of 1 page), (10 points)

- A. Explain how the project and its deliverables will be applied (or carried forward) to the next stage/phase.

Once the Corridor Concept Study is completed and adopted by the City, it will be the guiding and reference document that will be utilized as part of the City development review process. It will be used when a new development, or major rehabilitation, project is proposed for properties adjacent to Contra Costa Boulevard. The improvements identified in the study will be required to be implemented and incorporated as part of the project review and approval. This will ensure that even

piecemeal development along the corridor will follow a larger design concept, and over time, when enough properties along the corridor have been redeveloped the corridor will represent the concept study approved.

In addition, the City is making an application for stimulus package funds to improve portions of the Contra Costa Boulevard. If the funds are received, this study will be incorporated into the improvements completed by the City. Even if the funds are not received, the City will incorporate and follow the recommendations of the study into any future capital improvement projects that are proposed and completed along Contra Costa Boulevard.

At the next City General Plan update, the concept study will become referenced in the document and will further require that improvements along the corridor comply with the concept study. This will better ensure compliance/conformance with the corridor concept study.

8. Project Management (10 points)

A. List the Scope of Work (see page 32 for an example Scope of Work). The Scope of Work must include:

-What work is to be done: Provide an outline or general picture of services. List project tasks and identify any specific project deliverables. Also, list milestones for major tasks that mark the completion of a work package or phase.

-Who is responsible for what tasks: Discuss the roles and responsibilities of agency staff and consultant contractors.

-When the work is to be done: Provide schedule information for the services that will be required.

See Attachment

If selected, your application will become the foundation of the contract with the Department.

To the best of my knowledge, all information contained in this proposal is true and correct. If awarded a grant with the Department, I agree that I will adhere to the requirements and guidelines specified in this grant application.

Signature of Authorized Official (Applicant)

Print Name

Title

Date

Signature of Authorized Official (Sub-recipient)

Print Name

Title

Date

REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

- ✓ Signed Application
- ✓ Scope of Work (see sample of required format on Page 32)
- ✓ Project Timeline (see sample of required format on Pages 35 and blank on Page 36)
- ✓ Local Resolution (see Page 24)
- ✓ Map of Project Area
- ✓ Digital Photographs of Project Area (when applicable)
- ✓ Five signed hard copies and one electronic copy on a CD of the entire Application and all documents

Note: Failure to include any of these required documents may result in a reduced application score.

**CITY OF PLEASANT HILL – CONTRA COSTA BOULEVARD CORRIDOR
CONCEPT STUDY
Scope of Work**

Task 1: Project Startup

Task 1.1: Meet with Caltrans to review the approved application and discuss expectations.

Task 1.2: Prepare RFP for a traffic study

Task 1.3: Conduct a kick-off meeting with the consultant and other stakeholders in order to refine final details of the project.

Deliverable	Documentation
Signed contract between Traffic Consultant and City	Copy of signed contract
Conduct kick-off meeting	Meeting notes

Task 2: Ongoing Community and Stakeholder Outreach

Task 2.1: Promote/Advertise public workshops and meetings through a multi media campaign (including use of newspaper and website) and through the Traffic Safety Commission, Civic Action Commission and other stakeholders.

Task 2.2: Create a Technical Subcommittee of various stakeholders.

Task 2.3: Conduct at least 2 workshops to gain public involvement and refine concepts to incorporate into the draft document.

Deliverable	Documentation
Promote and advertise workshops	Copies of advertisements and promotional materials
Conduct workshops	Meeting notes and/or summary of outcomes

Task 3: Develop Study Components

Task 3.1: Develop Circulation Concepts

- Analyze data and opportunities for circulation improvements.
- Consider safety and connectivity of bicycle, transit and pedestrian network in relation to circulation.
- Identify improvements from a range of concepts/options developed by the community to best meet community goals to improve circulation.
- Formulate preferred concepts based on input and technical analysis.

Task 3.2: Develop Streetscape Concepts

- Analyze and evaluate the non-motorized circulation network connecting Contra Costa Boulevard and connecting streets.
- Select improvements for specific locations and corridors to best meet the goals of the community and create a cohesive downtown area.
- Provide graphic representations and basic specifications of specific improvements recommended.

Task 3.3: Develop Funding Strategy

- Develop basic preliminary cost estimates for recommended improvements.
- Identify potential funding sources for recommended improvements.
- Recommend strategy for obtaining funding.

Task 3.4: Provide draft plans to Subcommittee and present to community at public meetings.

Deliverable	Documentation
Develop Circulation Component	Copy of draft Circulation Concepts
Develop Streetscape Component	Copy of draft Streetscape Concepts
Develop Funding Strategy	Copy of draft Funding Strategy
Present draft study at workshops	Workshop notes and Subcommittee recommendations

Task 4: Final Study Preparation & Hearings

Task 4.1: Prepare final study based on Subcommittee and public input.

Task 4.2: Present the draft study at a public hearing before the Traffic Safety Commission for acceptance. Incorporate comments into document.

Task 4.3: Present the draft study at a public hearing before the Architectural Review Commission for acceptance. Incorporate comments into document.

Task 4.2: Present final study at a public hearing before the City Council for acceptance.

Deliverable	Documentation
Presentation of study to Traffic Safety Commission	Meeting minutes
Presentation of study to Architectural Review Commission	Meeting minutes
Presentation of study to City Council	Adopted Resolution and Final Document

Task 5: Administration


Task 5.1: Monitor ongoing progress of project and prepare and provide quarterly reports as required. Oversee ongoing contract management.

Task 5.2: Act as fiscal manager for project, including providing invoicing and ensuring proper documentation of expenditures and timely use of funds. Report quarterly on milestone completion to District project manager.

Deliverable	Documentation
Monitoring of project and contract management	Provide complete quarterly reports to District project manager
Act as fiscal manager	Copies of invoices

Task 5.3: Report quarterly on milestone completion to District project manager.





City of Pleasant Hill

February 11, 2009

Mr. David Durant, Chair
TRANSPAC
2300 Contra Costa Boulevard, Ste. 360
Pleasant Hill, California 94523

Dear Chair Durant:


The City of Pleasant Hill is requesting the Buskirk Avenue Widening Project – Phase II, identified in the approved Measure J Strategic Plan be reprogrammed from TRANSPAC's 2012 Measure J Bond list to the currently planned 2009 Measure J Bond sale in September 2009.

In May 2007, TRANSPAC submitted its 2009 and 2012 bond lists to CCTA. The Buskirk Widening Project was submitted for \$8.95 million. That amount was reduced by \$1 million to \$7.95 million to balance the bonds funds allocated to Central County (\$172.0 million). At the time, the \$1.0 million shortfall was envisioned to be funded by STIP funds. However, since then TRANSPAC and other RTPCs have agreed to a third bond issue and STIP funds for TRANSPAC'S SR4 East project. STIP funds, if available, may not be requested by TRANSPAC jurisdictions until 2014. To move this project forward, the City is requesting that the original \$8.95 million cost be included in the request for 2009 bond funds.

This is a high priority project for the City of Pleasant Hill and the region. In September 2008, the City Council of the City of Pleasant Hill authorized the execution of a design services agreement to develop the necessary construction plans for this project. These plans are on schedule to be completed by the end of 2009. It is also anticipated that all necessary acquisition of right of way and site abatement will be performed by late 2009. If the funds are made available as requested, the project could begin construction in 2010.

The City of Pleasant Hill looks forward to implementing this important Measure J project and appreciates TRANSPAC assistance securing the necessary funding.

Sincerely,



June Catalano
City Manager

cc: City Council
Steve Wallace, Director of Public Works and Community Development
Robert Stewart, Redevelopment Administrator
Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager 296 Jayne Avenue, Oakland, CA 94610

Subject	Bond Financing Update and 2009 Strategies
Summary	The Authority’s financial advisor, Public Finance Management (PFM) will present an update on the financial markets, the Authority’s current financing program and new strategies for 2009.
Recommendations	It is recommended that the APC receive the presentation and ask any questions concerning the information or the status of the Authority’s financing program and potential strategies for 2009.
Financial Implications	Conditions in the financial sector continue to adversely impact the economy and access to capital markets. Financing programs historically relied upon by public agencies are particularly constrained and more expensive. The presentation of the attached information will cover these areas of risk and potential options for 2009.
Options	Not applicable.
Attachments	A. Market Update and Debt Portfolio Review by Public Financial Management. (Included for Commissioners only. Available at www.ccta.net)
Changes from Committee	

Background

In October the APC received a briefing of the Authority’s investment and bond financing programs. This update included the status of the financial turbulence and related impacts on banks, bond insurers, and public agencies. Of particular concern is the Authority’s 2005 commitment to a \$300 million swap contract which begins in September 2009. The APC expressed interest in monitoring the situation and directed staff to return with periodic updates. The attached information has been prepared in coordination with the Authority’s financial advisor, Public Financial Management (PFM). This information will be discussed with the APC.

In November 2005, the Authority authorized the issuance of \$300 million of Sales Tax Revenue Bonds to occur on or about September 23, 2009. This authorization also included a financial instrument called a Forward Interest Rate Swap as a hedge against rising interest rates. The overall objective of this financial plan was to secure a low long-term fixed cost of borrowing. Swap transactions are complex and contain interest rate and credit market risks. PFM worked very closely with Authority staff, the APC and Board to formulate the bond and related swap strategy. The swap variables, however, began to change in January 2008 when AMBAC (bond insurer) suffered a credit rating downgrade stemming from subprime mortgage liabilities.

The 2005 financial plan sought to achieve a fixed cost of borrowing of approximately 3.95% for 25 years beginning in 2009. The cost of borrowing, based on current market conditions, is approximately 5.10% or an additional annual cost of \$1.14 million for each \$100 million of bonds issued. The primary factors for the increase are higher letter of credit fees and a combination of lower cash flow from swap counterparties and higher interest rates for municipal bonds. The attached information addresses this situation and presents options for consideration. The option preferred by staff is a two year “wait and see” strategy that accomplishes the objective of raising \$300 million in 2009 and mitigates the variable rate exposure of the 2005 swap. Pros and cons of all options will be discussed.

<p>Subject</p>	<p>2009 Update to the Measure J Strategic Plan: Revenue Projections and Development Schedule</p>
<p>Summary of Issues</p>	<p>The 2009 <i>Update</i> to the first Measure J <i>Strategic Plan</i> comes during a significant downturn in the economy which is adversely affecting Measure J revenues and potentially increasing debt service on proposed bonds.</p> <p>To expedite high priority projects throughout Contra Costa, the Authority has already committed to a bond issue of \$300M in September 2009. Two other bond issues of \$150M and \$138M could follow in 2012 and 2015. Staff is proposing to initiate the <i>Update</i> now in order to complete it prior to the first issuance in September. The 2009 <i>Update</i> will cover the first six years of Measure J (April 1, 2009 to June 30, 2015) and have four major components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sales Tax Revenue Projections • A “Program of Projects” committing funding schedule for specific projects through FY2015. • Cashflow projections to ensure funding needs are met • A Policy section to guide the <i>Update</i> and the implementation of Measure J projects and programs. <p>It is now estimated that between \$444 million and \$455 million would be generated through June 30, 2015, a significant reduction of approximately 23% from the \$583 million estimate in the 2007 <i>Plan</i>.</p> <p>The reduction in revenues, combined with the projected increase in bond debt service lessens the amount of funding available for capital projects in the first six years. Because the Measure J Expenditure Plan does not contain a contingency for economic downturns, the Authority will need to consider delaying some projects, tightening the funding caps on <i>Capital Projects</i>, or both. The Authority’s decision to infuse State Local Partnership funds over the next five years (~ \$25 million) into Measure J <i>Capital Projects</i> will soften the impact.</p>
<p>Recommendations</p>	<p>Staff recommends approval of the overall approach and seeks input on which revenue projection scenario to carry forward in the 2009 <i>Update</i>.</p>
<p>Financial Implications</p>	<p>Measure J sales tax revenues are now estimated to total \$1.59 - \$1.65 billion over 25 years (April 1, 2009 through March 31, 2034), down from the \$2 billion estimated in 2004 when the Measure passed.</p>
<p>Options</p>	<p>The Authority could defer any action pending further deliberations</p>
<p>Attachments</p>	<p>A. Sales Tax Projections (Scenario 1) B. Sales Tax Projections (Scenario 2)</p>
<p>Changes from Committee</p>	

Background

Measure J – a continuation of a half-percent countywide sales tax for transportation – was passed by Contra Costa voters in November 2004. The Measure will be in effect for 25 years after Measure C expires on April 1, 2009. The first Measure J *Strategic Plan* was adopted in December 2007, covering the period FY2008 through FY2015. While no Measure J revenues will be collected until April 1, 2009, FY2008 was included since several *Projects* are being advanced prior to the beginning of Measure J.

Recognizing that there will be economic cycles and that project development might falter, the Authority committed to update the *Strategic Plan* approximately every two years committing to specific projects only for a specified period (5 to 7 years). Updates to the *Strategic Plan* are necessary to revisit assumptions relative to revenue growth and inflation, and to ensure that project commitments do not exceed projected Measure J revenues.

This *Update* to the 2007 *Strategic Plan* comes during a significant downturn in the economy that is adversely affecting Measure J revenue projections and potentially increasing estimated debt service on proposed bonds. To expedite high priority projects throughout Contra Costa, the Authority has already committed to a \$300 million bond issue in September 2009. Two other bond issues of \$150 million and \$138 million could follow in 2012 and 2015. Staff is proposing to initiate the *Update* now in order to complete it prior to the first bond issue in September 2009.

Sales Tax Revenue Projections Update

The 2007 *Strategic Plan* projected revenues of \$583 million in escalated dollars (or \$449 million in constant 2004 dollars) for the six years: April 1, 2009 through June 30, 2015. Of the total amount, approximately 59% or \$344 million (escalated) was set aside for *Programs*, leaving approximately \$239 million (escalated) for *Capital Projects* and *debt service*. A real growth rate of 1% was used to develop the estimate.

Given the current downturn in the economy, staff has revised the revenue projections based on actual data for FY2008 and new estimates for FY2009 revenues. Two scenarios were examined:

- Scenario 1 assumes a prolonged recession with the economy continuing to deteriorate through FY2012, and flattening in FY2013. Economic recovery is assumed to start in FY2014.
- Scenario 2 assumes a shorter recession with the economy continuing to deteriorate in FY2010, but flattening in FY2011. Economic recovery is assumed to start in FY2012.

Under Scenarios 1 and 2, it is estimated that through June 30, 2015, Measure J would generate, \$444 million and \$455 million (escalated), respectively. Of that total, approximately 59% (\$262 - \$268 million) is assumed to be set aside for *Programs* leaving approximately 41% (\$182 - \$186 million) for *Capital Projects* and *debt service*. The new projections represent a significant reduction - approximately 23% - from the \$583 million estimate in the 2007 *Plan*. A reduction of \$53 - \$57 million (escalated) in revenues available for *Capital Projects* and *debt service* during the first six years of Measure J is estimated. (This does not reflect the infusion of State Local Partnership Program (SLPP) Funds).

Policy Issues to be addressed in the 2009 Measure J Strategic Plan

The projected reduction in sales tax revenues presents several policy issues for the Authority:

Financial Capacity to Issue Bonds – To expedite high priority projects throughout Contra Costa, the Authority has already committed to a \$300 million bond issue in September 2009. Two other bond issuances of \$150 million and \$138 million could follow in FY2012 and FY2015, respectively. For its \$300 million bond issuance, the Authority secured a low interest rate in May 2005 by entering into a forward starting swap agreement. The objective of the swap has been to achieve a cost of borrowing with

an effective rate of 3.653 percent. Financial conditions, however, since 2005 have significantly deteriorated and the Authority has been reassessing other strategies to achieve the most effective borrowing cost available in the current market. The Authority's financial advisor, Public Financial Management (PFM), has briefed the APC on the financial situation and provided an overview of the options and timeline leading up to the planned September 2009 bond issuance. PFM will provide a status update on the bond strategies following the discussion on the Strategic Plan.

Tightening of Funding Caps – As a first step in implementing Measure J, the Authority adopted a financial framework in May 2006 that segregates Measure J annual revenues earmarked for *Capital Projects* from those dedicated to *Programs*. By committing an “off-the-top” percentage of annual revenues to each *Program*, the on-going needs of operating programs are addressed. On the other hand, for *Capital Projects* the need for Measure J funding is essentially dictated by the project delivery schedule and ability to secure other funding sources.

With this adopted framework, *Programs* will receive an annual distribution of the Measure J revenue stream based on percentages set in the Expenditure Plan. Fluctuations in sales tax revenues on a year to year basis will be reflected in the annual *Program* distributions. On the other hand, *Project Categories* will receive a fixed amount in 2004 dollars that will escalate based on the Bay Area Consumer Price Index (CPI).

In the absence of an unallocated contingency or a set-aside to recover the cost of bonding in Measure J Expenditure Plan, the Authority imposed a 90% “Expenditure Cap” on all Measure J *Capital Project Categories* in the first *Measure J Strategic Plan*. The “Expenditure Caps” allows the Authority to pay for estimated debt service and bond issuance costs, pay for Overall Program Management consultant costs (1.5%), provide a contingency against reduced revenues, and pay for staff project management costs. The BART Extension to East County (eBART) category has a reduced cap of 95% in return for that project incurring all debt service and issuance costs for the third bond issue which is slated to be dedicated exclusively to eBART.

The combined effect of diminished sales tax revenues and increased debt service reduces the amount of funding available for *Capital Projects* during the first six years. In the *2009 Strategic Plan*, the Authority will likely need to delay some projects, tighten the funding caps on some *Capital Project Categories*, or do both. The Authority's decision to infuse State Local Partnership funds over the next five years (~ \$25 million) into Measure J capital projects will soften the impact.

Measure J Commitments to Major Capital Projects – With the passage of Proposition 1B in November 2006, the Authority successfully applied for funding from the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) for three Measure J projects:

- \$175 million for the Caldecott Tunnel 4th bore.
- \$85 million for State Route 4 East Widening from Somersville to SR160.
- \$55.3 million for the I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM) project (along with \$21.4 million in the Traffic Light Synchronization Program)

In addition, both MTC and BART agreed to contribute \$20 million each from their Proposition 1B transit funds to the eBART project.

The Authority's ability to secure the CMIA funds is contingent upon its ability to deliver promised Measure J funds, and upon its partners' ability to deliver other local funding sources. This overriding need to deliver the CMIA- funded projects may limit our ability to tighten the funding “cap” on these projects. The Authority's current Measure J commitments to the CMIA projects are:

- Caldecott Tunnel: \$125 million (Measure J)

- SR4 East (Somerville to SR160): \$132 million (Measure J), \$80 million (ECCRFFA), \$15 million (Measure C)
- I-80 ICM: \$4.9 million (Measure J)

Given the downturn in the housing market, the Authority and TRANSPLAN also need to consider different priorities in project delivery, or reallocate funding to secure the \$80 million in east county sub-regional transportation mitigation fees (ECCRFFA) for State Route 4 East Widening.

Subregional Equity – During the development of the Measure J Expenditure Plan, different sub-regions placed different emphasis on *Programs* versus *Project Categories*. In West County, for example, greater emphasis was placed on *Programs*, while in East County the emphasis was placed on *Capital Projects*. During the development of the 2007 Measure J *Strategic Plan*, each RTPC was requested to provide its *Capital Project* priorities within a funding target. The funding target was based on each sub-region's proportional share of *Capital Project Categories* in Measure J Expenditure Plan:

Central County (TRANSPAC): 29.7%

East County (TRANSPLAN): 48.5%

West County (WCCTAC): 9.0%

Southwest County (SWAT): 12.8%

In return for dedicating the third bond issue to eBART, which skewed the above percentages in favor of East County, the Authority adopted a policy to focus programming in the next five STIPs (FY 2014 through FY 2023) primarily on Measure C and Measure J projects completion in west, central and Southwest County.

Due to the lower revenue projections, sub-regions will likely need to re-assess their priorities in the 2009 *Strategic Plan*.

Proposed Schedule for the Development of the 2009 Strategic Plan

- Feb 09: Approve overall approach and revenue projections
- Mar – Apr 09: Work with RTPCs/Sponsors to determine project priorities and cashflow needs for projects through FY2015
- May 09: Discuss policies for 2009 Measure J Strategic Plan.
- June 09: Present draft 2009 Measure J Strategic Plan.
- July 09: Finalize Strategic Plan

**CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY - SALES TAX FORECAST
MEASURE J (starts April 1, 2009)**

SCENARIO 2

Fiscal Year July 1 - June 30	Real Growth	Projected Sales Tax Rev. (2004 \$ x 1000)	Inflation	Inflation Factor	Total Inflated Sales Tax Rev. (\$ x 1000)
2004		\$65,684 *	0.94%	-	\$65,684
2005	6.31%	\$69,828 *	1.70%	1.70%	\$71,014
2006	2.27%	\$71,411 *	2.83%	4.57%	\$74,676
2007	-1.78%	\$70,140 *	3.26%	7.98%	\$75,738
2008	-4.52%	\$66,969 *	3.27%	11.51%	\$74,680
2009	-7.67%	\$61,836 ***	1.51%	13.20%	\$70,000 ***
2010	-4.50%	\$59,053	2.00%	15.47%	\$68,187
2011	0.00%	\$59,053	2.00%	17.78%	\$69,550
2012	1.00%	\$59,644	2.00%	20.13%	\$71,651
2013	1.00%	\$60,240	2.00%	22.53%	\$73,815
2014	1.00%	\$60,843	2.00%	24.98%	\$76,044
2015	1.00%	\$61,451	2.00%	27.48%	\$78,340
2016	1.00%	\$62,065	3.00%	31.31%	\$81,498
2017	1.00%	\$62,686	3.00%	35.25%	\$84,782
2018	1.00%	\$63,313	3.00%	39.31%	\$88,199
2019	1.00%	\$63,946	3.00%	43.48%	\$91,753
2020	1.00%	\$64,586	3.00%	47.79%	\$95,451
2021	1.00%	\$65,231	3.00%	52.22%	\$99,297
2022	1.00%	\$65,884	3.00%	56.79%	\$103,299
2023	1.00%	\$66,543	3.00%	61.49%	\$107,462
2024	1.00%	\$67,208	3.00%	66.34%	\$111,793
2025	1.00%	\$67,880	3.50%	72.16%	\$116,862
2026	1.00%	\$68,559	3.50%	78.19%	\$122,162
2027	1.00%	\$69,245	3.50%	84.42%	\$127,702
2028	1.00%	\$69,937	3.50%	90.88%	\$133,494
2029	1.00%	\$70,636	3.50%	97.56%	\$139,547
2030	1.00%	\$71,343	3.50%	104.47%	\$145,876
2031	1.00%	\$72,056	3.50%	111.63%	\$152,491
2032	1.00%	\$72,777	3.50%	119.04%	\$159,407
2033	1.00%	\$73,504	3.50%	126.70%	\$166,636
2034	1.00%	\$55,680	3.50%	134.64%	\$130,645
MEASURE J TOTAL		\$1,648,821 **			\$2,713,443

* Based on Actual Receipts.

** Includes fourth quarter of 2009

*** Revised Projected 2009 Sales Tax Revenues - Budgeted Amount is \$73.85 million

Measure J Revenues Through FY2015

In 2004 \$ **\$375,743**
Inflated **\$455,087**

City of Concord
1950 Parkside Drive MS/40
Concord, California 94519-2578
Tel. (925) 798-9692

Telephone: (925) 671-3361



City Council
William D. Shim, Mayor
Helen M. Allen, Vice Mayor
Guy S. Bjerke
Laura M. Hoffmeister
Mark A. Peterson

Mary Rae Lehman, City Clerk
Thomas J. Wentling, City Treasurer
Edward R. James, Interim City Manager

January 14, 2008

TRANSPAC
Julie Pierce, Chair
2300 Contra Costa Blvd., Suite 360
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

SUBJECT: Deferment of Implementation of the Waterworld Parkway Bridge

Dear Ms. Pierce:

Waterworld Parkway Bridge over Walnut Creek, a City of Concord project, has a \$9 million Measure J allocation under the TRANSPAC list of Measure J Bond (Major Streets) funded projects. The City of Concord recognized that the project will be needed in the future as the area develop or redevelops. The recent slowdown in housing development has further delayed the need for implementing this project.

In the meantime, the City of Concord is now faced with new projects that are of higher priority or of more urgent nature. Therefore, the City of Concord proposes to defer implementation of the Waterworld Parkway Bridge project and proposes to use the \$9 million as follows:

- Ygnacio Valley Road Permanent Restoration (Phase 2) between Cowell Road and City of Walnut Creek Limit (\$3.5 million)
- Ygnacio Valley Road Landslide Repair @ Galindo Creek (\$0.5 million)
- Clayton Road/Treat Blvd./Denkinger Road Intersection Capacity Improvements (\$2.0 million)
- Waterworld Parkway Bridge over Walnut Creek (\$3.0 million)

Ygnacio Valley Road Permanent Restoration (Phase 2) between Cowell Road and City of Walnut Creek Limit (\$3.5 million)

As you may know already, in March 2006, a segment of Ygnacio Valley Road between Cowell Road and the City of Concord's jurisdictional limit with the City of Walnut Creek experienced a landslide. One eastbound lane was closed. Concord received an emergency relief funding for the temporary repair that constructed an auxiliary lane in June 2006, thus restoring two eastbound lanes. About a month ago, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approved

emergency relief funding for the \$2.7 million permanent restoration of Ygnacio Valley Road. The work mainly consists of constructing a pier wall with tieback system (protective feature) and repair of the damaged roadway. Construction for the permanent restoration will begin in spring 2008 with completion slated for late summer or early fall.

The City's Geotechnical Engineering Consultant and Caltrans' Geotechnical Engineers have determined that currently, about 800 to 1,000 feet of the hillside is marginally stable. The Geotechnical Engineers indicated that a wet or extremely wet season would likely trigger the landslide, which could cause closure of Ygnacio Valley Road. Due to the restrictions in the use of the federal emergency relief fund, the length of the planned protective feature is limited to that length that would protect the damaged roadway. Unfortunately, this translates to 420 feet, far less than the identified 800 to 1,000 feet. It is necessary to fund and construct in a timely manner the final protective feature for this segment of Ygnacio Valley Road. The City of Concord proposes to implement this repair in 2009 as the second phase (final phase) of the permanent restoration, following the completion of the federally funded project in 2008.

Ygnacio Valley Road Landslide Repair @ Galindo Creek (\$0.5 million)

In 2007, the old landslide along Ygnacio Valley Road west of Alberta Way (west of Cowell Road) reactivated causing pavement distress along a segment of westbound Ygnacio Valley Road (No. 2 lane) at Galindo Creek. Last Fall 2007, the City of Concord planned on awarding a construction contract for a Trail Gap Closure project at Galindo Creek. Due to the reactivation of the old landslide uphill of the Trail Gap Closure project, the City rejected the bids. To protect the trail, it is necessary to repair the landslide before constructing the trail.

The City of Concord proposes to combine the Landslide Repair project with the Trail Gap Closure project to avail of the potential lower cost due to the increased size of project. It is important to repair the landslide in a timely manner due to the potential for losing one of the two westbound traffic lanes.

Clayton Road/Treat Blvd./Denkinger Road Intersection Capacity Improvements

The Clayton Road-Treat Boulevard corridor is designated in the Central Contra Costa Action Plan as a Route of Regional Significance, which carries heavy volumes of regional traffic on a daily basis, connecting to I-680. The intersection is located at a critical junction point along this vital Regional Route.

The proposed project will increase the handling capacity of this intersection to accommodate the heavy traffic flows on Clayton Road during the peak commute periods. The project will upgrade the signal phasing at this intersection to an 8-phase design for increased vehicle capacity and improved operating efficiency, by widening the eastbound Treat Boulevard approach to include two exclusive left-turn lanes, two through lanes and one right-turn lane. These improvements will allow the opposing left-turn movements from Treat Boulevard and from Denkinger Road to be serviced simultaneously, hence enabling the City to shorten the signal cycle length at this


intersection and improve the system-wide signal coordination along Clayton Road during the peak periods.

Waterworld Parkway Bridge over Walnut Creek (\$3.0 million)

The remaining \$3.0 million could be used as seed money for the Waterworld Parkway Bridge project. This could fund the needed preliminary studies and analyses to properly scope the project. This project has been proposed for \$3.4 million STIP funding, which would be available in 2014 at the earliest. The City of Concord plans on fully funding the project with a combination of traffic mitigation funds, Redevelopment Agency funds, and may include developer contributions.

Please consider this letter as the City of Concord's request for TRANSPAC to recommend to CCTA the amendment of its Strategic Plan as described above.

Sincerely,



Alex Pascual, P.E.
Director of Building, Engineering and Neighborhood Services

cc: Mayor Shinn, Concord TRANSPAC Member
Councilmember Guy Bjerke, Concord TRANSPAC Alternate Member
Edward R. James, City Manager
Qamar Khan, Director of Public Works
Ray Kuzbari, Transportation Manager
Danea Gemmill, Senior Civil Engineer

ORIGINAL LIST

DRAFT - TRANSPAC MEASURE J STRATEGIC PLAN 2009-2015 PROGRAMMING				Notes
2006 \$	2009 Bond \$	2012 Bond \$	2012 Alt. Project	
	62.50			On State Bond List
Caldecott Tunnel - 4th Bore				
Martinez Capitol Corridor Impts Total	10.00			+ \$400k Meas. C & \$5.5M 2006-07 STIP \$6M Measure J advance request
I-680/SR 4/SR 242 Improvements				
I-680/SR 4 Phase 1	27.40			No CMA funds
242 Concord Ave. I/C SB off	3.00			Proj. Dev.; Bond \$s may not be required
Marina Vista I/C SB off	1.30			Proj. Dev.; Bond \$s may not be required
242 Clayton Rd. I/C NB on	1.50			Proj. Dev.; Bond \$s may not be required
SR4/Willow Pass	2.80			Proj. Dev.; Bond \$s may not be required
Subtotal	30.40	5.60		Total = \$36M
I-680 Carpool Lane Gap Closure		3.50	71.50	SB RM2 \$1M Study plus \$14 capital; NB Measure J
BART Parking, Access, Other Imprvts	8.40	3.60		Total = \$12M
Major Streets	PROJECTS NOT LISTED IN PRIORITY ORDER			
Marsh Creek Road Upgrade		1.30		STIP \$s
Pine Hollow Road Upgrade		0.3		Request
Pacheco Blvd CCo/Martinez	4.93		4.90	\$35M total; \$27M Measure J for all phases + local contributions
Ph 1 Widen btwn Blum Rd. & so. Mtz limit			7.00	+ local contributions
Ph 2 Widen btwn so. & no. Mtz limits		5.80		+ Prop. 42 \$1.2M
Kirker Pass truck lanes	9.70		1.00	Ph. 1 emerg. veh/bike/pec; Ph. 2 auto
North Court/UPRR Overpass		7.95		+ PHill \$1M City Traffic Mitigation Fee
Buskirk Avenue Realignment	9.00			+ WC \$1M
Geary Rd. Phase 3 in WC/PHill	9.02		4.40	+ CND \$75K planning + \$2.980M project
Waterworld Parkway				+ Ph 1 Mtz AOB \$700k; Ph 2+ Mtz AOB \$10K
Alhambra Valley Rd.				
Subtotal	32.95	15.05	17.30	ASK CCTA FOR ADVANCE STIP
				COMMITMENT FOR CENTRAL COUNTY
Proposed Bond List Total	144.25	27.75	172.0	ARTERIALS AT \$20M
2009 + 2012 Bond List Target			172.0	
E: Measure J draft Strategic Plan revision TKS approved 5 10 07				

Beginning
of a
Revised
List

DRAFT TRANSPAC MEASURE J STRATEGIC PLAN 2009-2015 PROGRAMMING					
2006 \$ UPDATE estimates??	2009 Bond \$s	2012 Bond \$s	2012 Alt. Project	Notes	
Caldecott Tunnel - 4th Bore	62.50			On State Bond List	
Martinez Capitol Corridor Impts Total	4.00			Spent?	+\$400k Meas.C & \$5.5M 2006-07 STIP \$6M Measure J advance request
I-680/SR 4/SR 242 Improvements				Interim Phase III? \$30M?	No CMIA funds
I-680/SR 4 Phase 1	27.40				
242 Concord Ave. I/C SB off	3.00			?	
Marina Vista I/C SB off		1.30			Proj. Dev.; Bond \$s may not be required
242 Clayton Rd. I/C NB on		1.50			Proj. Dev.; Bond \$s may not be required
SR4/Willow Pass		2.80			Proj. Dev.; Bond \$s may not be required
Subtotal	96.90	5.60			
I-680 Carpool Lane Gap Closure		3.50	71.50	change?	SB RM2 \$1M Study plus \$14 capital; NB Measure J
BART Parking, Access, Other Imprvts	8.40	3.60			Total \$12M
Major Streets	PROJECTS NOT LISTED IN PRIORITY ORDER				
Marsh Creek Road Upgrade		1.30		STIP \$s	
Pine Hollow Road Upgrade	0.3			Request	
Pacheco Blvd CCo/Martinez					\$35M total; \$27M Measure J for all phases
Ph 1 Widen btwn Blum Rd. & so. Mtz limit	4.93				+ local contributions
Ph 2 Widen btwn so.& no. Mtz limits			4-99		+ local contributions
Kirker Pass truck lanes		5.80	7-00		+ Prop. 42 \$1.2M
North Court/UPRR Overpass to 2012		9.70			Ph. 1 emerg. veh/bike/ped; Ph. 2 auto
Buskirk Avenue Realignment Request	8.95				+ PHill \$1M City Traffic Mitigation Fee
Geary Rd. Phase 3 in WC/PHill	9.00				+ WC \$1M
Waterworld Parkway deferred @ 9.02M					+ CND \$75K planning + \$2.980M project
Alhambra Valley Rd.			4-40		+ Ph 1 Mtz AOB \$700k; Ph 2 + Mtz AOB \$10K
Subtotal	31.58				
			16-30		ASK CCTA FOR ADVANCE STIP
Proposed Bond List Total	129.48	29.50	158.98		COMMITMENT FOR CENTRAL COUNTY
Original 2009 + 2012 Bond List Target			172.0		ARTERIALS AT \$20M
E: Measure J revised bond list Feb 2009					

Subject	East Contra Costa County Subregional Transportation Fee Projections Report
Summary	Transportation impact fees are collected in East County as a funding source for several projects, including Route 4 and the East County Corridor. Fees are collected when building permits are issued for new residential and commercial development. Due to the economic downturn fee revenues have declined, adversely impacting the cash flow requirements of planned projects. The Authority entered into a contract with Economic & Planning Systems (EPS) to prepare a report evaluating how the economic situation impacts fee projections. EPS will provide the APC with an overview of the study and the comments received.
Recommendation	It is recommended that the APC receive the report from EPS and provide any final comments regarding the forecast assumptions.
Financial Implications	Route 4 Widening from Somersville to State Route 160 (Project 3001) anticipates \$80 million in subregional transportation fees. Receipt of these funds in FY 2012 through FY 2014 is critical to the construction schedule.
Options	The APC may wish to provide other direction to staff based on the discussion of the study results.
Attachments	A. East County Development Forecast/Fee Projection Synopsis, by Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. B. East Contra Costa County Regional Transportation Fee Projections by Economic & Planning Systems, Inc dated October 2008. <i>(APC members only. Available to other interested parties by request or online at www.ccta.net).</i>
Changes from Committee	

Background

On June 18, 2008, the Authority approved a contract with the consulting firm Economic & Planning Systems (EPS) to evaluate and forecast transportation impact fees collected in East Contra Costa County. The fee has been collected since 1994 and is designed to provide a significant funding source towards a series of regional transportation improvements, such as Route 4 Bypass and the widening of Route 4 through Pittsburg and Antioch. The financing plan for such improvements relies on this impact fee and Measure J funds. To assist with the cash flow requirements of the Route 4 Bypass project, Measure J funds have already been advanced with the expectation of repayment from the impact fees.

On November 19, 2008, the Authority authorized a release of the draft EPS study for review and comment by interested parties, including TRANSPLAN and the East Contra Costa Regional Fee and Financing Authority (ECCRFFA). Comments have been received from the TRANSPLAN Technical Advisory Committee and from a joint session of TRANSPLAN and ECCRFFA boards. In summary, comments received suggested that the forecasts be revised to use more conservative assumptions for the timing of an economic recovery. The draft report includes a range of fee revenue projections dependent upon the timing of the anticipated economic turnaround. The report assumptions and related projections will be discussed with the APC.



East County Development Forecast/ Fee Projection Synopsis

Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.
February 5, 2009

Report Background

- Regional transportation fee first implemented in 1994
- Contribution from new development for regional transportation improvements
 - SR 4 bypass
 - SR 4 widening through Pittsburg/Antioch
- Fee revenue projections given housing market/credit/economic challenges


Report Timeline

- Started in July
- Technical work in July/Aug. 08
- Meetings with staff in Aug. 08
- Admin. Draft in Sept. 08
- Draft Report in Oct. 08
- TRANSPLAN TAC meeting in Nov. 08
- TRANSPLAN/ ECCRFFA in Jan. 09



Weighted Average of Median Home Prices in East Contra Costa County, 1988-2008 [1]


Sources: DataQuick; Economic and Planning Systems, Inc.



[1] Weighted average of median home prices in Antioch, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, Oakley, and Pittsburg.



Home Sales in East Contra Costa County, 1988-2008 [1] Sources: DataQuick; Economic and Planning Systems, Inc.



[1] Includes home sale transactions in Antioch, Brentwood, Discovery Bay, Oakley, and Pittsburg.

Three Scenarios

- **Baseline**
- **Optimistic**
- **Conservative**





Key Factors

- **Timing**
 - Pre-recovery trends
 - Start of recovery
 - Trajectory of recovery
- **Growth Levels**
 - Short term growth
 - Stabilized growth

Timing of Recovery



Phase	Baseline	Optimistic	Conservative
Short Term - Flat Until	2 nd half 2010	1 st half 2010	1 st half 2011
Long Term - Stabilized	1 st half 2012	1 st half 2011	2 nd half 2013

Annual Residential Development (Units)




Phase	Baseline	Optimistic	Conservative
Short Term	575	750	450
Long Term	1,450	1,900	1,100



Residential Development Scenarios

Source: Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.




Note: Half year development expressed as annual development rate.



East County Historical and Projected Residential Development

Source: CIRB Building Permit Statistics; Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.





Growth Comparisons

Period	Avg. Annual Permits Issued	Baseline as %**	Conservative as %**
2000-2005*	2,750	50%	35%
1990-1992	1,200	110%	85%
1990-1999	1,440	90%	70%
1990-2007*	1,900	70%	50%

*Includes City of Oakley

** Excludes unincorporated County growth to be consistent with the permit issuance data: Baseline = 1,300 units/year; Conservative = 1,000 units/year (w/o unincorp. County)




Fee Revenue Projections

	FY08/09- FY11/12	FY12/13- FY19/20	Total
Baseline			
Constant \$	\$57,326,000	\$184,906,700	\$242,232,700
Nominal \$	\$60,483,648	\$231,327,586	\$291,811,234
Optimistic			
Constant \$	\$88,850,965	\$243,024,911	\$331,875,876
Nominal \$	\$93,801,940	\$304,036,393	\$397,838,333
Conservative			
Constant \$	\$36,444,516	\$137,857,930	\$174,302,446
Nominal \$	\$38,239,823	\$172,780,085	\$211,019,907



Annual Fee Projections by Development Scenario


Source: Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.





Cumulative Fee Projections by Development Scenario

Source: Economic & Planning Systems, Inc.



◆ Baseline ■ Optimistic ▲ Conservative

TAC Comments

- Recommend use of conservative scenario for fee projections because of:
- Worsening economic conditions and deeper housing market impact in E. County
 - Expectation that new stabilized pace of development will be below 1990's levels
 - Effects of AB 32, AB 375, and other regulations

TAC Comments, cont'd

- Adjust fee revenue projections to account for large increase in construction cost index in 2008:
- Historical increase of about 3 percent
 - 2008 increase of 8.5 percent



TRANSPLAN/ ECCRFFA Comments

Joint Boards accepted TAC
recommodation to use conservative
growth and revenue projections
scenario

<p>Subject</p>	<p>Consideration of Measure J Enhancement Funding to Support Existing Transit and Paratransit Services.</p>
<p>Summary of Issues</p>	<p>The Bus Transit Coordinating Committee (BTCC) and the Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) have requested that the Authority consider a Measure J Expenditure Plan amendment or policy action that would, under limited circumstances and with appropriate RTPC support, allow flexibility with regard to the eligible use of Measure J fund sources pertaining to bus and paratransit operations. Such funds originally intended to supplement or enhance services, could be then programmed to existing services when threatened by funding shortfalls. The programming of funds to existing services would be at the discretion of the programming body as identified in the expenditure plan on a collaborative basis.</p>
<p>Recommendations</p>	<p>That the Authority develop mechanisms that would allow flexibility regarding Measure J bus and paratransit funding intended for enhanced services to be available for existing services that are threatened by funding shortfalls. The means by which these mechanisms would be developed would be as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) For Program 16 - Countywide Express Bus Program - To work collaboratively with the BTCC to program funding for existing express bus routes and facilities which meet the eligibility criteria in the expenditure plan, and 2) For sub-regional Programs 19 and 20 – Additional Bus Service Enhancements and Additional Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities - If a request for such flexibility is made by the RTPC, to work collaboratively with the respective RTPC (and as necessary the BTCC) to program funds to maintain existing services.
<p>Financial Implications</p>	<p>Approval will not affect funding to the programs but only eligible uses within each program.</p>
<p>Options</p>	
<p>Attachments (<i>New Attachment A</i>)</p>	<p><i>A. Bus Service Program Historical and Projected Sales Tax Allocations.</i></p>
<p>Changes from Committee</p>	<p><i>Revise recommendation to recognize development of mechanism through the RTPCs and clarify intent that RTPCs will retain programming of sub-regional fund sources.</i></p>


Background

Declines in local, state and federal revenues have resulted in significant operating fund losses to transit and paratransit operators statewide. Many Contra Costa transit and paratransit operators have considered or are considering significant service reductions and fare increases in an effort to balance budgets. The County Connection Board has already taken action to restructure its fixed route service with a resulting 23% reduction in service hours. AC Transit, WestCAT and Tri Delta are also looking at service reductions at some level. Paratransit services operated by the Cities of Richmond, San Pablo and El Cerrito are almost entirely dependent on Measure J sales tax revenue so significant drops in funding could result in service cuts to non-ADA required services without being able to use “enhancement” funding to back-fill operating budgets.

The bus operators through the BTCC and paratransit providers through the PCC have stated that it would be difficult for them to explain to the riding public why they are starting new services at the same time they are eliminating core existing service.

All of the operators recognize that some of their services are less efficient than others and are first looking to efficiencies in their service. Several operators have noted that they are trying to combine two or more routes into one route serving a similar area. This scenario would provide a new route but technically would not “enhance” service and therefore not meet the intent of the program as developed.

Bus Service Program Historical and Projected Sales Tax Allocations



Subject	Contra Costa's Priority Projects for Development of Project Study Reports (PSR) by Caltrans for FY 2009-10.
Summary of Issues	<p>Caltrans and MTC work cooperatively through a 1999 Memorandum of Understanding to identify project priorities for preparation of PSRs for future STIP projects and for work on State Highways. Caltrans and MTC have recently requested that the Authority provide Contra Costa's priorities for PSR development or oversight by Caltrans on State Highways for FY2009-10.</p> <p>The updated list (Attachment C) includes a summary of currently active PSRs and other PSRs proposed for FY2009-10 and future work:</p> <p>Projects Currently Active:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SR-4/Phillips Lane Interchange (new Interchange) • I-680/New interchange at 680/Norris Canyon Road O/C for HOV Ramps • I-680/SB HOV gap closure from Treat Blvd to Livorna Rd. • I-580, Chevron Bike and Pedestrian Trail Gap Closure <p>Projects Proposed for FY2009/10 and future work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SR-4/SR-4 Bypass to San Joaquin County Line • I-80/Pinole Valley Road Ramp Modifications • SR-239, Construct New Route, Brentwood to Tracy • SR-242/New on and off ramps at Clayton Rd • I-680/Interchange modification at Marina Vista Rd • I-680, Operational improvements from N. Main St. to SR-242
Recommendations	Staff recommends approval to submit the list of projects listed above.
Financial Implications	Projects without a PSR will not qualify for future STIP funding. PSRs performed by Caltrans are prepared at no cost to the Authority, and are not counted towards the county share of available funding.
Options	Add other to or delete some from the PSR project list
Attachments	<p>A. Letter from Caltrans and MTC dated January 27, 2009.</p> <p>B. Draft Letter of PSR priority projects to Caltrans, w/ Attachment</p> <p>C. Draft PSR Priority Project List</p>
Changes from Committee	

Background

Projects may not be included in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), unless they have a Project Study Report (PSR) or equivalent. Projects on State highways should also have a PSR or equivalent prepared or overseen by Caltrans. The intent of this requirement is to ensure that the project scope, cost, and schedule have been adequately defined and justified.

Caltrans and MTC are working cooperatively through a 1999 Memorandum of Understanding to identify project priorities for the preparation of Caltrans PSRs for future RTIP projects and for early information sharing of Caltrans priorities for preparation of PSRs for future ITIP projects. Caltrans and MTC have requested that the Authority provide Contra Costa's priorities for PSR development or oversight by Caltrans on State Highways. The Authority expects project sponsors to develop a PSR- equivalent for non-state highway projects for projects to be added to the STIP.

Caltrans staff has indicated in the past that due to limited resources, they have the ability to complete only one PSR per year and to provide oversight on another. Staff has updated last year's project list to be submitted to Caltrans for this FY 2009/10. Last year's PSR workplan for Contra Costa (*Updated as highlighted for this year*) included the following projects:

Tier 1, Active Projects

- SR-4/ Willow Ramps I/C Modification from I-80 to Willow Ave. OC in Hercules (*Now Complete*)
- SR-4/ Transit Hub / Park & Ride at I-680/SR-4 I/C (*Now Complete*)
- SR-4/ New Interchange at SR-4/Phillips Lane
- SR-4/ Relinquish from SR-4/SR-160 junction to Marsh Creek Road; Adopt from one mile east of SR-4/Hillcrest Ave I/C to SR-4/Marsh Cr Rd intersection. (*Now Complete*)
- I-80/ Central Ave. I/C improvements (*Work to be Completed by June 30 2009*)
- SR-123/ Streetscape improvement San Pablo Ave. (*Now Complete*)
- I-680/ New interchange at 680/Norris Canyon Road O/C for HOV Ramps
- I-680/ SB HOV gap closure from Treat Blvd to Livorna Rd.
- I-680/ Restripe SB interim HOV extension (*Now Complete*)
- I-580, Chevron Bike and Pedestrian Trail Gap Closure

Tier 2, Proposed for future work (not in a priority order):

- SR-4/ SR-4 Bypass to San Joaquin County Line
- I-80/Pinole Valley Road Ramp Modifications
- SR-239, Construct new route, Brentwood to Tracy
- SR-242/ New on and off-ramps at Clayton Rd
- I-680/ HOV lane gap closure between I-580 and Alcosta Blvd (*Deleted*)
- I-680/ Interchange modification at Marina Vista Rd
- I-680/ Operational improvements from N. Main St. to SR-242
- Richmond Parkway upgrade (*to be Deleted*)

Current Year's Studies workplan include:

- I-680 Express Bus Access Study, HOV Ln Connector/Gap Closure Study in Pleasant Hill & Walnut Creek
- SR-239 "Reconnaissance Study"
- Regional HOT Lane Study Phase 3
- I-80 Smarter Growth Study

Staff seeks feedback from the TCC on any other PSR request that should be added to the list at this point. Recommended projects must be in the MTC Regional Transportation Plan.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

111 GRAND AVENUE
P. O. BOX 23660
OAKLAND, CA 94623-0660
PHONE (510) 286-5908
FAX (510) 286-6301
TTY 711



*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

January 27, 2009

Attachment A

Mr. Robert McCleary, Executive Director
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
3478 Buskirk Avenue, Suite 100
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Dear Mr. McCleary:

Pursuant to the attached Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the State of California Department of Transportation (Department) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) concerning the development of the regional priority list for preparing Project Study Reports (PSRs), the Contra Costa Transportation Authority is requested to provide a comprehensive, prioritized list of PSRs to be worked on during FY 09/10. To assure timely identification of PSR priorities and resource allocation, please submit your project list on the attached form to the address shown below no later than March 1, 2008.

Patrick Pang
Chief, Office of Advance Planning
c/o Caltrans District 4
111 Grand Avenue, Mail Stop 10A
P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

The Department and MTC look forward to working with your agency to allocate available resources to meet project delivery needs throughout the region. If you have questions or need additional information regarding this matter, please contact Patrick Pang, District 4 – Advance Planning, at (510) 286-5566.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Lee Taubeneck in cursive.

LEE TAUBENECK, M.S., P.E.
District Deputy Director
Transportation Planning and Local Assistance

Handwritten signature of Therese W. McMillan in cursive.

THERESE W. MCMILLAN
Deputy Executive Director, Policy
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Attachments



COMMISSIONERS:

Dave Hudson,
Chair

Maria Viramontes,
Vice Chair

Janet Abelson

Ed Balico

Susan Bonilla

David Durant

Federal Glover

Michael Kee

Julie Pierce

Don Tatzin

Robert Taylor

Robert K. McCleary
Executive Director

3478 Buskirk Ave.
Suite 100

Pleasant Hill
CA 94523

PHONE:
925/256-4700

FAX:
925/256-4701

<http://www.ccta.net>

DRAFT

March 5, 2009

Patrick Pang
Chief, Office of Advance Planning
c/o Caltrans-District 4
111 Grand Avenue, Mail Stop #10A
P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

Subject: Contra Costa Priority List for PID/PSR Development (FY2009-10)

Dear Mr. Pang:

In response to Mr. Lee Taubeneck and Ms. Therese McMillan letter dated January 27, 2009, we thank you for giving us the opportunity to provide Contra Costa's priority list for Project Study Report (PSR) development. Please find attached the updated project list as recommended by the Authority (not in priority order). A summary of the list is as follows:

Projects Currently Active:

- SR-4/Phillips Lane Interchange (new Interchange)
- I-680/New interchange at 680/Norris Canyon Road O/C for HOV Ramps
- I-680/SB HOV gap closure from Treat Blvd to Livorna Rd.
- I-580, Chevron Bike and Pedestrian Trail Gap Closure

Projects Proposed for FY2009/10 and future work:

- I-580, Chevron Bike and Pedestrian Trail Gap Closure
- SR-4/SR-4 Bypass to San Joaquin County Line
- I-80/Pinole Valley Road Ramp Modifications
- SR-239, Construct New Route, Brentwood to Tracy
- SR-242/New on and off ramps at Clayton Rd
- I-680/Interchange modification at Marina Vista Rd
- I-680, Operational improvements from N. Main St. to SR-242

If you need any additional information, please contact Hisham Noeimi at (925) 256-4731.

Patrick Pang
March 5, 2009
Page 2

Sincerely,

Paul Maxwell, P.E.
Chief Deputy Executive Director

CC: Lee Taubeneck, Caltrans District 4 Deputy Director
Therese McMillan, MTC Deputy Executive Director, Policy
Jerry Morgan, Caltrans District 4 PID Coordinator - Advance Planning

Current PID Status	LEAD or QAR	County	Route	Begin Postmile	End Postmile	Improvement Description (Type of Work)	Location	K-Phase EA	Estimated Project Cost (\$M)	Estimated PID Completion Date (Month/Year)	% Complete	Type of PID	Type of Environmental Document	Proposed Program Year	Regional Transportation Plan	Project Manager	PID Initiation Date (Month/Day/Year)	CALTRANS Comments	CCTA Comments	
Tier 1 Carryover and Proposed New PIDs and Coops in FY2009/10 Workplan																				
1	Carryover	QA	CC 004	11.50	11.70	Transit Hub / Park & Ride	I-680/SR-4 Interchange	3A620K	1.6	03/2009	80	Coop	CE	2008/09	Y	Hamid Fathollahi	12/9/2007	PSR/PR complete: Coop being prepared		
2	Carryover	QA	CC 004	19.60	29.60	eBART extension	Baypoint BART Sta in Pittsburg to Hillcrest I/C in Antioch	4A930K	650.0	06/2009	60	Coop	EIS	2009/10	Y	Howard Reynolds	12/10/2007			
3	Carryover	QA	CC 004	28.90	31.50	New I/C	Phillips Lane in Antioch	4A960K	40.0	TBD	10	PSR	EIR	2011/2012	Y	Laurie Lau	1/3/2008			
4	Carryover	QA	CC 080	9.00	9.50	I/C modification	Central Av. I/C	3A660K	30.0	06/2009	20	PSR	MD	2010/11	Y	Laura Hamelster	8/3/2006	Considering PEER	PSR not needed; Project folded into I-80 I/C M Project. Project to be closed by June 30, 2009	
5	Carryover	LEA	CC 080	6.75	6.75	Prepare JUA & Maint Agmt	SR-80 Richmond Parkway Transit Center	4A020K	28.7	06/2009	65	PSR	OTHER (explain)	2009/10	Y	Jean Finney	1/8/2007		PSR is complete. Why is this JUA on this list?	
6	Carryover	QA	CC 680	3.60	4.00	New interchange for HOV Ramps	Nomis Canyon O/C in San Ramon	3A860K	80.0	12/2009	20	PSR	FONSI	2013/14	Y	Hamid Fathollahi	3/13/2007			
7	Carryover	LEA	CC 680	11.20	11.90	Extend HOV lane (freeway)	SR-1680 from Rudgegar-to-Livorno Rd	4A710K	4.0	10/28/08	100	PSR/R	CE	2008/09	Y	Hamid Fathollahi	9/11/2007	PID completed	Remove from List	
8	Carryover	LEA	CC 680	11.20	15.70	HOV lane gap closure	SR-1680 from Treat Blvd to Livorno Rd	3A590K	80.0	04/2009	80	PSR/P DS	FONSI	2013/14	Y	Hamid Fathollahi	7/18/2006		CCTA expect project to be completed by June 30, 2009	
9	Proposed New	QA	CC 580	6.1	5.4	gap closure	Chevron bike and pedestrian trail													
Tier 2 Proposed New PIDs to begin future fiscal years																				
10	Proposed New	QA	CC 004	TBD	TBD	County Line Upgrade	SR-4, Bypass to San Joaquin	TBD	TBD	TBD		TBD	TBD	2016/17	N	TBD	TBD		County will check on need	
11	Proposed New	QA	CC 080	TBD	TBD	Deck modification, Crocket approach, Reconnect joints and address "creep" issues	Crocket approach-Crocket-Carquinez-Bridge	TBD	TBD	TBD		TBD	TBD							Talked with Caltrans and this project should be with the BATA projects
12	Proposed New	QA	CC 080	TBD	TBD	Ramp modification	Pinole Valley Rd Brentwood to	TBD	2.0	TBD		TBD	TBD	2008/09	Y	TBD	TBD			
13	Proposed New	QA	CC 239	TBD	TBD	Construct new Route 239	Tracy	TBD	?	TBD		TBD	TBD	2014/15	Y	TBD	TBD			
14	Proposed New	QA	CC 242	TBD	TBD	New on an off-ramps	Clayton Rd in Concord	TBD	41.0	07/2010		TBD	TBD	2012/13	Y	TBD	TBD			
15	Proposed New	QA	CC 880	TBD	TBD	Interchange modification	Manna Vista Rd in Pacheco	TBD	8.0	07/2011		TBD	TBD	2014/15	Y	TBD	TBD			

CCTA FY2009/10 STIP (Non-SHOPP) PID Workplan (as of 2-12-2009)

Current PID Status	LEAD or QA?	County	Route	Begin Postmile	End Postmile	Improvement Description (Type of Work)	Location	K-Phase EA	Estimated Project Cost (\$M)	Estimated PID Completion Date (Month/Year)	% Complete	Type of PID	Type of Environmental Document	Proposed Program Year	Regional Transportation Plan	Project Manager	PID Initiation Date (Month/Day/Year)	CALTRANS Comments	CCTA Comments
Proposed New	QA	CC	680	TBD	TBD	Operational Improvements	From N Main St to SR-242 in Walnut Creek and Concord	TBD	TBD	TBD		TBD	TBD	2012/13	Y	TBD	TBD		
Proposed New	QA	CC	TBD	TBD	TBD	Richmond Parkway Upgrade at Marina Vista	Richmond	TBD	94-0	07/2010		TBD	TBD	2010/10	Y	TBD	TBD		Remove from List
Studies in FY2009/10 Workplan																			
Active	QA	CC	680	12.4	13.7	I-680 Express Bus Access Study (EBAS) - HOV lane connector/gap closure study Toil Bridge RM-2 HOV Lane Connector/Gap Closure Study in Pleasant Hill & Walnut Creek	Pleasant Hill & Walnut Creek	TBD		10/2009		Study	TBD	TBD	N	E Alm	TBD		
Active	QA	ALA CC SJ	TBD	TBD	TBD	SR-239 "Reconnaissance Study/Outreach"		TBD		TBD		Study	TBD	TBD	N	M Gilmour	TBD		
Active	QA	VAR	VAR	VAR	VAR	Regional HOT Lane Study Phase 3	ALA, CC, MRN, NAPA, SCL SF, SM, SOL, SON Counties	TBD		TBD		Study	TBD	TBD	N	E Alm	TBD		
Active	QA	ALA CC SOL	80 80 80	3.2	44.7	I-80 Smarter Growth Study	Corridor extends from the SFOBB through Sacramento County Analyze & Evaluate transportation management issues in corridor such as use of toll lanes, HOV lanes, ped/bike connectivity, and other improvements to increase transit ridership	TBD		TBD		Study			N	E Alm	TBD		
	LEAD	ALA CC	024			SR 24 Corridor Study		TBD	n/a	40148	0	Study	n/a	n/a	n/a	E Alm	TBD		

Subject: Electric charging station grant

From: "Lynn Overcashier" <lynn@511contracosta.org>

Date: Mon, 2 Feb 2009 10:49:15 -0800

To: "John Cunningham" <JCunn@cd.cccounty.us>, <aabually@ci.antioch.ca.us>, <skersevan@ci.brentwood.ca.us>, <vogan@ci.oakley.ca.us>, <preinders@ci.pittsburg.ca.us>, <sgoel@cd.cccounty.us>, <tharais@eccta.org>, <MCarl@pw.cccounty.us>, <vcarniglia@ci.antioch.ca.us>, <jbrandt@ci.antioch.ca.us>, <dwoltering@ci.clayton.ca.us>, "John Greitzer" <jgrei@cd.cccounty.us>, "TIM TUCKER" <TTUCKER@cityofmartinez.org>, "Cindy Dahlgren" <cdahlgren@cccta.org>, <DHeilma@bart.gov>, <rkuzbari@ci.concord.ca.us>, <muzzini@cccta.org>, "John Hall" <Hall@walnut-creek.org>, "Eric Hu" <Ehu@ci.pleasant-hill.ca.us>, <kmajors@cityofmartinez.org>, <lochirco@walnut-creek.org>, "Barbara Neustadter" <bantrans@sbcglobal.net>, "Qamar Kahn" <Qamar@ci.concord.ca.us>

CC: "Corinne Dutra-Roberts" <corinne@511contracosta.org>

Hello TAC members,

Below is information on a federal grant program (see below under Area of Interest 2) which is specifically for electric charging stations, with a 50% match required. I am sending this because we have funds to pay for a grant writer on your behalf, and we also have some funds which could be used for the 50% match if you are interested. We just heard about it, but there is a very quick turn-around on this (the end of February), so if your jurisdiction has any interest, please give me a call. We have another state grant possibility which I'll send you all tomorrow (a state grant for SR2S).

Our plan is to at the very least, determine if there is interest in installation of electric charging stations which may need more development and research/education among our central and east county jurisdictions, in which case we can do that work over the next several months and submit a similar grant next year, should the opportunity still be available. If any of you think you are ready to apply in this cycle though, please call ASAP.

All the best,
Lynn Overcashier
511 Contra Costa

The link below will take you to the complete guidelines:

[https://e-center.doe.gov/iips/faopor.nsf/UNID/B887A59C072559488525754500506169/\\$file/Clean+Cities+FY09+FOA+Modifir](https://e-center.doe.gov/iips/faopor.nsf/UNID/B887A59C072559488525754500506169/$file/Clean+Cities+FY09+FOA+Modifir)

Grant Name: Clean Cities Petroleum Reduction Technologies Projects for the Transportation Sector FY2009

Grant Type: Federal

Grant Authority: Department of Energy (DOE)

Program Description: Area of Interest 1 (DE-PS26-09NT01236-01) Refueling Infrastructure for Alternative Fuels
Under this Area of Interest, the Department is seeking applications for cost-shared projects that expand altern infrastructure for alternative fuels to help decrease the nation's dependence on petroleum by helping to grow t Projects are sought that will contribute to a sustainable alternative fuel market with a potential for future growth Federal funding. Only projects that increase the use of Energy Policy Act recognized alternative fuels are eligil alternative fuels please see http://www1.eere.energy.gov/vehiclesandfuels/epact/about/epact_fuels.html.

Area of Interest 2 (DE-PS26-09NT01236-02): Incremental Cost of Dedicated Alternative Fuel Vehicles
Under this Area of Interest, applications are being sought for projects to decrease the nation's dependence on use of dedicated AFVs. These funds can be used to help reduce the incremental cost for the purchase of new retrofit/conversion/repower of new and/or used conventional vehicles (i.e., vehicles originally designed to oper to run on authorized alternative fuels. Only on-road, highway-certified vehicles that operate exclusively on alte considered for funding under this area of interest. DOE has particular interest in funding medium- and heavy-c as well as light-duty vehicles used in high fuel-use fleet applications. Vehicles with hybrid-electric or hydraulic-powered exclusively by alternative fuels are also of interest. Vehicle retrofits/conversion systems must be certi Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and/or the California Air Resources Board (CARB) in order to be eligi category. Only vehicles that will operate on Energy Policy Act recognized alternative fuels are eligible (for a lis fuels please see http://www1.eere.energy.gov/vehiclesandfuels/epact/about/epact_fuels.html).

Teaming arrangements under Area of Interest 2 are strongly encouraged, especially those that include one or approved-for-designation Clean Cities Coalition(s) (http://www.eere.energy.gov/cleancities/progs/coalition_loc

agencies (e.g. state energy offices) and local agencies and organizations. Other team members of high interest suppliers, auto dealerships, fuel retailers, public or private fleets, equipment manufacturers, energy marketers Teams may span more than one region or state. Teaming arrangements of this sort help contribute to a sustained and provide the potential for future growth without additional Federal funding while increasing awareness and among target sectors in the local community including, but not limited to, current stakeholders, fleet operators, public.

Area of Interest 3 (DE-PS26-09NT01236-03): Education and Outreach Workshops for Petroleum Reduction Fund Under this Area of Interest applications are being sought for projects that will raise awareness and foster a greener alternative fuels and advanced vehicle technologies through a targeted outreach and education effort. Education developed under this award will be used to establish a special Clean Cities learning program. This effort will help the alternative fuels market and decrease the nation's dependence on petroleum. In addition, it will help to provide the necessary education necessary to ensure that these vehicles and related fueling equipment are installed, maintained, and operated in a proper manner. This could include training for first responders, public safety officers, and construction permitting. Alternative fuels are being introduced, among other target audiences. Projects are sought that will contribute to the market by raising awareness of alternative fuels and related technologies and that exhibit the potential for future Federal funding. Although applications will be considered that address individual subject areas of interest, it is expected that lead applicant(s) represent a partnership among appropriate industry and trade groups that can adequately address subject areas of interest in a single application. Only projects that are related to the use of Energy Policy Act of 1992 are eligible (for a listing of authorized alternative fuels please see <http://www1.eere.energy.gov/vehiclesandfuels/e-fuels/>) Projects that can be replicated across all Clean Cities coalitions are highly encouraged

Matching Funds Requirements : The non-federal cost share must be at least 50% of the total allowable costs of the project, for Area of Interest 3. The Government share, including FFRDS contractor costs if applicable, and the recipient share of allowable costs of the projects) and must come from non-Federal sources unless otherwise allowed by law. No cost share is required for Area of Interest 3.

Eligible Applicants : All types of entities are eligible to apply, except other Federal agencies, Federally Funded Research and Development Contractors, and nonprofit organizations described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and activities after December 31, 1995.

Number and Size of Awards : The Funding Profile consists of approximately \$6 MIL Total Federal Funding anticipated for awards under this profile.

Special Note : Full RFP:
[https://e-center.doe.gov/iips/faopor.nsf/UNID/B887A59C072559488525754500506169/\\$file/Clean+Cities+FYC](https://e-center.doe.gov/iips/faopor.nsf/UNID/B887A59C072559488525754500506169/$file/Clean+Cities+FYC)

Due Date : Definite
2/27/09

CFDA Number(15 chars): DE-PS26-09NT01236-00



Lynn Osborn Overcashier
Program Manager, 511 Contra Costa
2300 Contra Costa Blvd. Suite 360
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523
Direct line: (925) 969-1566
FAX: (925) 969-9135
www.511contracosta.org

Subject: CA SR2S grant

From: "Lynn Overcashier" <lynn@511contracosta.org>

Date: Tue, 3 Feb 2009 09:59:30 -0800

To: "Lynn Overcashier" <lynn@511contracosta.org>, "John Cunningham" <JCunn@cd.cccounty.us>, <aabualy@ci.antioch.ca.us>, <skersevan@ci.brentwood.ca.us>, <vogan@ci.oakley.ca.us>, <preinders@ci.pittsburg.ca.us>, <sgoet@cd.cccounty.us>, <tharais@eccta.org>, <MCarl@pw.cccounty.us>, <vcarniglia@ci.antioch.ca.us>, <jbrandt@ci.antioch.ca.us>, <dwooltering@ci.clayton.ca.us>, "John Greitzer" <jgrei@cd.cccounty.us>, "TIM TUCKER" <TTUCKER@cityofmartinez.org>, "Cindy Dahlgren" <cdahlgren@cccta.org>, <DHeitma@bart.gov>, <rkuzbari@ci.concord.ca.us>, <muzzini@cccta.org>, "John Hall" <Hall@walnut-creek.org>, "Eric Hu" <Ehu@ci.pleasant-hill.ca.us>, <kmajors@cityofmartinez.org>, <lochirco@walnut-creek.org>, "Barbara Neustadter" <bantrans@sbcglobal.net>, "Qamar Kahn" <Qamar@ci.concord.ca.us>

CC: "Corinne Dutra-Roberts" <corinne@511contracosta.org>

Hello TAC members,

Below is information on the CA Safe Routes To Schools grant cycle, not to be confused with the Federal SR2S grant. We have a grant writer who can assist any of you

with a submittal for this grant in the event that you have a project in proximity to a K-12 school. There are many sidewalk gap closure projects in the TRANSPAC

Measure J expenditure list, however I don't know which might be near any schools to qualify for this. Let me know if we can help, or forward this to others in your agency.

This grant app is due in April, so we can talk about it at the next TAC meeting if you'd like.

All the best,

Lynn Overcashier

511 Contra Costa

(925) 969-1566

Copy of the Guidelines:

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/DLA%20OB/Cycle_8_SR2S_guidelines.pdf

Grant Name: CA Safe Routes to School Cycle 8 FY2009

Grant Type: State

Grant Authority: California Department of Transportation (DOT)

Program Description: The goals of the program are to reduce injuries and fatalities to school children and to encourage increased walking and bicycling among students. The program achieves these goals by constructing facilities that enhance safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, primarily students in grades K-12 who walk or bicycle to school. By enhancing the safety of the pathways, trails, sidewalks, and crossings, the likelihood of attracting and encouraging other students to walk and bike increases.

This California SR2S program should not be confused with the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program authorized under SAFETEA-LU. Although both programs have similar goals and objectives, their funding source, local funding match requirements and other program requirements are different.

The SR2S program is primarily a construction program. Projects funded by the program are intended to improve the safety of students who walk or bike to school. Construction improvements must be made on public property. Improvements can be made on public school grounds providing the cost is incidental to the overall cost of the project.

Costs for programs or activities related to education, enforcement or encouragement activities are eligible for reimbursement but must be incidental to the overall cost of the project. Incidental costs shall not exceed ten percent of the construction costs. These activities may include, but are not limited to: preparing and distributing safety and health awareness materials, coordinating "walking school bus" efforts, developing education programs for school personnel, students, parents, and other partners and stakeholders, etc. Requests to increase project reimbursement costs will not be granted except in unusual circumstances and subject to the availability of funds.

Matching Funds Requirements :	The maximum reimbursement percentage for any SR2S project is ninety percent.
Eligible Applicants :	The applicant, or project sponsor, is the agency that assumes responsibility and accountability for the use and expenditure of SR2S funds. The applicant must be an incorporated city or a county within the State of California.
Number and Size of Awards :	The maximum amount of SR2S funds that will be allocated to any single project is \$900,000. If the total cost for a project exceeds \$1,000,000 (\$900,000 reimbursable), the applicant must fund the balance of the project cost with other funds.
Special Note :	Copy of the Guidelines: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/DLA%20OB/Cycle_8_SR2S_guidelines.pdf
Due Date :	Definite 4/15/09



Lynn Osborn Overcashier
Program Manager, 511 Contra Costa
2300 Contra Costa Blvd. Suite 360
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523
Direct line: (925) 969-1566
FAX: (925) 969-9135
www.511contracosta.org

Please consider the environment before printing this email.