

# **TRANSPAC Transportation Partnership and Cooperation**

Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek and Contra Costa County  
2300 Contra Costa Boulevard, Suite 110, Pleasant Hill, CA 94523 (925) 969-0841 FAX (925) 969-9135

## **TRANSPAC TAC MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA**

**THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 2013**

**NOTE DATE CHANGE**

**9:00 A.M. to 11:00 A.M.**

**COMMUNITY ROOM**

**CITY OF PLEASANT HILL CITY HALL**

**100 GREGORY LANE**

**PLEASANT HILL**

**(925) 969-0841**

1. **Continued discussion of Action Plan Update including comments on the 2009 Actions and revisions to match actions, goals, and to identify new projects.**

In addition, an Action Plan review process by TRANSPAC jurisdictions needs to be defined.

**Attachments:** 2009 Actions and Projects for TAC review/use (**electronic**), and Minutes of the October 24, 2013 TAC meeting.

**ACTION: As determined**

2. **Preliminary Review of the Calendar Year 2012 & 2013 Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP) Biennial Compliance Checklist.** The next GMP compliance reporting period will cover Calendar Years (CY) 2012 & 2013. The full Measure J Checklist will be released to local jurisdictions in early 2014. The Planning Committee delegated the detailed discussion of the Measure J Checklist to the Growth Management Program Task Force and the Authority's Citizens' Advisory Committee will also review the Checklist. The current changes to the Checklist are the dates.

**Attachment 1:** 10/2/2013 CCTA Planning Committee Staff report "Preliminary Review of the Calendar 2012 & 2013 Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP) Biennial Compliance Checklist."

**Attachment 2:** Please see the recommended edits to the Calendar Year 2012 & 2013 Measure J Growth Management Biennial Compliance Checklist provided by Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager.

**ACTION:** The TAC is requested to review the draft Checklist and comments proposed by Ms. Overcashier and comments offered by TAC members for review by TRANSPAC and/or as determined.

**Attachment 3:** Draft Model Transportation Demand Management Ordinance/Resolution developed to support updating of the CCTA Draft Model TDM Ordinance.

**ACTION:** The TAC is requested to review/discuss the updated Ordinance and forward comments/actions to TRANSPAC, CCTA, and /or as determined.

3. **Continued discussion on development of a TRANSPAC Measure J Line 28a utilization process.**
4. **Update on 511 Contra Costa and TRANSPAC Joint Powers Authority (JPA) formation to establish a JPA as the administrative construct for the two entities if there is any new information.**

### **Update on TAC Meetings Schedule**

5. **The Holidays are fast approaching.** Please note that the December TAC meeting is scheduled for December 19, 2013. If there are no pressing items, this meeting may be canceled. If so, the first TAC meeting in 2014 is scheduled for February 13, 2014.

**Given the Action Plan schedule,** please also note that the TAC is requested to schedule additional Action Plan “just in case” meetings for January 23, 2014 and January 30, 2014.

2009 Actions and Projects for TAC Review

# **CENTRAL COUNTY ACTION PLAN**

**for**

**Routes of Regional Significance**

**Adopted July 9, 2009**



Figure 1-1

<b>GOAL 1</b>	Encourage land use decisions that manage the increase of overall traffic demand
<b>ACTIONS</b>	1-A: Continue to support implementation of the Measure C/J Growth Management Program.
	1-B: Continue to support higher-density development around transit hubs and downtowns.
	1-C: Continue to require each jurisdiction to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Notice the initiation of the environmental review process for projects generating more than 100 net-new peak-hour vehicle trips.</li> <li>b) For projects that require a General Plan Amendment, identify any conflicts with Action Plan MTSOs and then, if requested, present the analysis results and possible mitigation strategies to TRANSPAC for review and comment.</li> </ul>
	1-D: Include the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists in the design, construction, and maintenance of development projects.
	1-E: Continue to implement the TRANSPAC Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.

<b>GOAL 2</b>	Increase HOV lane usage
<b>ACTIONS</b>	2-A: Support the completion of a continuous HOV system on I-680.
	2-B: Support consistent occupancy requirements for toll-free HOV lanes on the Benicia-Martinez Bridge and I-680.
	2-C: Support additional incentives for HOV users.
	2-D: Provide additional park-and-ride lots.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC will continue to advocate for funding and phasing to complete the HOV lane system and to encourage incentives.
<b>TIMELINE</b>	Depending on funding availability, Action 2-A in the southbound direction is intended to be completed by 2014. Other actions are ongoing.

<b>GOAL 3</b>	Work to improve freeway flow
<b>ACTIONS</b>	3-A: Continue to monitor and evaluate operational improvements at freeway interchanges on I-680, SR-242, SR-24, and SR-4.
	3-B: Continue to support the completion of the fourth bore of the Caldecott Tunnel (SR-24).
	3-C: Support the study and implementation of potential regional freeway management strategies.
	3-D: Consider a multi-agency approach to freeway ramp metering.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing. Depending on funding availability, target completion of the Caldecott Tunnel fourth bore is 2014.

<b>GOAL 4</b>	Manage arterial traffic flow
<b>ACTIONS</b>	4-A: Seek funding for traffic and transit improvements along Regional Routes.
	4-B: Continue to implement the Central Contra Costa Traffic Management Program.
	4-C: Where feasible and appropriate, address the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists along Regional Routes.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.

<b>GOAL 5</b>	Support an efficient and effective transit system
<b>ACTIONS</b>	<p>5-A: Support the development of real-time information and better connectivity for regional transit and local and feeder bus service.</p> <p>5-B: Promote coordination of transfer times among Express bus, feeder bus, BART, and park-and-ride lots.</p> <p>5-C: Support the expansion of BART service and BART station and parking facilities.</p> <p>5-D: Support the construction and maintenance of accessible bus stops, park-and-ride lots, and transit hubs.</p> <p>5-E: Support improvements that increase the efficiency of local transit on Regional Routes.</p> <p>5-F: Support increased access to BART stations for buses and other alternative modes.</p> <p>5-G: Support innovative approaches to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of transit services for seniors and disabled persons through the allocation of Central County's Measure J \$10 million for Additional Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities. These funds are in addition to Measure J Other Countywide Programs and total \$35 million in Central County.</p> <p>5-H: Support expansion and use of park-and-ride facilities using Express and local buses.</p>
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.



<b>GOAL 6</b>	Increase participation in the 511 Contra Costa Program to improve multi-modal mobility and decrease single-occupant vehicle use in Central County
<b>ACTIONS</b>	<p>6-A: Support the 511 Contra Costa Program to educate and encourage Contra Costa residents, students and commuters to use multi-modal alternatives by promoting transit, shuttles, carpooling, vanpooling, walking, bicycling, alternative work schedules, and telecommuting.</p> <p>6-B: Develop TDM programs at K-12 schools and colleges to encourage carpooling, transit ridership, walking, and bicycling.</p> <p>6-C: Promote alternative work opportunities including employer pre-tax benefit programs, compressed work-week schedules, flex schedules, and telework.</p> <p>6-D: Encourage commuters to make local trips or trips linked to transit by walking, bicycling, or carpooling instead of driving alone.</p> <p>6-E: Promote park-and-ride lot use to potential carpoolers, vanpoolers, and transit riders, including shuttle services, where applicable.</p> <p>6-F: In cooperation with Central County jurisdictions, develop TDM plans and provide consultations to improve mobility and decrease parking demand for new development and redevelopment.</p> <p>6-G: Explore innovative new technologies to improve mobility and reduce SOV trips.</p> <p>6-H: Seek funding to provide bicycle parking infrastructure at employment sites and activity centers throughout Central County.</p> <p>6-I: Encourage "green" commuting, including ZEV and NEV vehicles, clean fuel infrastructure, and car sharing.</p>
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	511 Contra Costa, TRANSPAC, and TRANSPAC jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.

## Interstate 680

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<p>I-680 is a north-south eight- to twelve-lane divided freeway. It begins north of the TRANSPAC area at the I-80–Cordelia interchange and travels south through Solano County, entering TRANSPAC’s region after it crosses the Benicia-Martinez Bridge. From the bridge, it extends south through the SR-4 and SR-242 interchanges. The I-680/SR-24 interchange is near TRANSPAC’s southern boundary in Walnut Creek. I-680 continues south through the Southwest Regional Transportation Planning Committee (SWAT) area.</p> <p>I-680 is a major commute route for Solano County and for Central and East Contra Costa County travelers. The Walnut Creek, Pleasant Hill, and Concord BART Stations; the Martinez Intermodal Facility; and the soon-to-be-built Pacheco Transit Hub are accessed from I-680.</p>
<b>ISSUE STATEMENT</b>	<p>The 1995 Action Plan projected that from 1990 to 2010 traffic growth on I-680 south of SR-242 would increase from 175,000 to 303,600 vehicles per day. By 2006, Caltrans data indicated that volumes on I-680 just south of Treat Boulevard/Geary Road had reached 296,000 vehicles per day.</p> <p>Between years 2007 and 2030, traffic volumes on I-680 are projected to increase by approximately 30 percent, reaching 400,000 vehicles per day.</p> <p>TRANSPAC’s tenets support completion of an HOV-lane system in Central County for carpoolers and buses to bypass peak-period congestion.</p>

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO: 4.0 Delay Index

- Continue to support investment in and implementation of HOV lanes on I-680.
- Continue to support planned improvements to the I-680/SR-4 interchange and to SR-4.
- Continue to work with Solano County to manage traffic in the I-680 corridor.
- Complete the I-680 HOV Express bus access study funded through Regional Measure 2.

## Interstate 680

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Southbound HOV Lane Gap Closure from North Main to Livorna Road
- Improvements to I-680/SR-4 freeway interchange
- Improvements to SR-4 (see subsequent section on SR-4)

## State Route 242

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	State Route 242 is a four-mile north-south freeway that connects SR-4 west of Port Chicago Highway to I-680 just south of Willow Pass Road. It is a three-lane road in each direction.
<b>ISSUE STATEMENT</b>	As a connector between I-680 and SR-4, SR-242 is a link between East and Central County. SR-242 is anticipated to experience a 30 percent increase in traffic volumes during the peak hours by 2030. Today, traffic on southbound SR-242 in the AM peak period backs up from the I-680 Interchange to north of Clayton Road.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO: 3.0 Delay Index

- Support the study and design of Clayton Road interchange improvements.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Construction and modification of southbound ramps at the Clayton Road interchange
- Construction of northbound Clayton Road on-ramp
- Construction of the third lane of the southbound Commerce Avenue off-ramp

## State Route 4

### DESCRIPTION

State Route 4 is an east-west freeway that runs from East Contra Costa and San Joaquin County to I-80 in West Contra Costa through Central Contra Costa. West of the SR-242 Interchange in Concord, it has four to six lanes; east of the interchange, it has eight to ten lanes, including an HOV lane in each direction. SR-4 provides access to the North Concord/Martinez BART Station, the Martinez Intermodal Facility, and the soon-to-be-constructed Pacheco Transit Hub.

### ISSUE STATEMENT<sup>1</sup>

By 2030, traffic volumes are projected to increase between 40 and 80 percent, depending on the segment, during the AM and PM peak hours. In addition, congestion at the westbound SR-4/SR-242 Interchange will increase because carpools and buses must transition from the westbound HOV lane to the mixed-flow lanes on both SR-4 and SR-242.

The highest volume segment of SR-4 is on the Willow Pass grade. Traffic at this location is projected to increase by 40 percent with no planned widening at this location. Additionally, SR-4 experiences delay at the I-680/SR-4 Interchange because of short weaving sections.

The cost of the phased reconstruction of the I-680/SR-4 interchange is estimated at more than \$320 million in 2007 dollars. To accelerate the reconstruction, TRANSPAC is working with CCTA to re-phase the project, including the completion of the third travel lanes on SR-4 from Solano Way/Port Chicago Highway on the east to Morello Avenue on the west.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

**MTSO: 5.0 Delay Index from Cummings Skyway (WCCTAC boundary) to Willow Pass (TRANSPLAN boundary)** This MTSO is expected to be revised upon completion and adoption of the Corridor Management Plan by TRANSPAC, TRANSPLAN and WCCTAC (see Action below).

#### ACTIONS

- Partner with TRANSPLAN and WCCTAC to develop a Corridor Management Plan for SR4 from East County through Central County

---

<sup>1</sup>As of July 2008, the City of Concord is planning for the development at the Concord Naval Weapons Station but has not yet incorporated these plans into its General Plan. As a result, development on that site is not assumed in this Action Plan.

## State Route 4

(boundaries to be defined) including connecting and/or supporting arterials. This process will identify an MTSO(s) for SR4, actions, projects and define an approach to managing arterials in the corridor. TRANSPAC, TRANSPLAN and WCCTAC jointly will seek funding for the Corridor Management Plan from CCTA and other available sources.

- Support improvements to the I-680/SR-4 interchange

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Improvements to the I-680/SR-4 interchange, including construction of a third lane between Solano Way/Port Chicago Highway to Morello Avenue
- Construction of the Pacheco Transit Hub

## Alhambra Avenue

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	Alhambra Avenue is a north-south roadway that extends from downtown Martinez south, under SR-4, to Taylor Boulevard in Pleasant Hill, where its name changes to Pleasant Hill Road. It is generally a four-lane roadway. Only the portion south of Arch Street is designated as a Regional Route. It serves as a parallel route to I-680 and a shortcut around the I-680/SR-24 Interchange.
<b>ISSUE STATEMENT</b>	By 2030, traffic volumes are projected to increase approximately 5 percent during the AM peak hour and 10 percent during the PM peak hour. Proposed improvements along the I-680 corridor are necessary to manage the traffic on this roadway.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO:

- Martinez: 15 MPH Average Speed for both directions during AM and PM peak hours
- Pleasant Hill: 15 MPH Average Speed for both directions during AM and PM peak hours

#### ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Pursue planning and funding for Alhambra Avenue improvements and widening.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Construction of a second southbound lane on Alhambra Avenue from Walnut Avenue to Franklin Canyon Road with other necessary signal, ramp, and median modifications
- Completion of the Alhambra Avenue Widening Phase III project

## Clayton Road

### DESCRIPTION

Clayton Road is a four- to six-lane, east-west roadway that connects Marsh Creek Road east of Clayton to SR-242 in Concord. Between Ygnacio Valley Road/Kirker Pass Road and Treat Boulevard, it is a Regional Route. It is the east-west traffic spine for Central Contra Costa and provides direct access to the Concord BART station and connection to the Pleasant Hill and Walnut Creek BART stations.

### ISSUE STATEMENT

By 2030, AM peak-hour traffic volume is projected to increase 6 percent with the percentage of traffic with East County origins projected to increase to 19 percent of total volume. For the PM peak hour, total traffic volume is projected to increase 8 percent, with the percentage of traffic with East County destinations projected to increase to 16 percent of total volume. TRANSPAC and TRANSPLAN must continue to work together on the East-Central Traffic Management Program.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO:

- Clayton: 15 MPH Average Speed for both directions during AM and PM peak hours
- Concord: Average Stopped Delays for the following intersections:
  - Kirker Pass Road/Ygnacio Valley Road: 3
  - Treat Boulevard/Denkinger Road: 3

#### ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Complete Clayton Road/Treat Boulevard/Denkinger Road intersection capacity improvements.
- Work with TRANSPLAN on Clayton Road/Marsh Creek Road corridor operation and management.
- Seek funding to improve vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access at the Concord BART Station.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Clayton Road /Treat Boulevard/Denkinger Road intersection capacity improvements
- Implementation of various vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access improvements at the Concord BART Station



## Contra Costa Boulevard

**DESCRIPTION** Contra Costa Boulevard is a north-south roadway that begins at 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue in Pleasant Hill as an extension of Pacheco Boulevard. It runs south through Pleasant Hill to become North Main Street at Oak Park in Walnut Creek. It runs parallel, to the west, to I-680 and varies in width from four to six lanes and serves as a bypass to I-680.

**ISSUE STATEMENT** By 2030, traffic volumes on Contra Costa Boulevard are projected to increase by 15 percent during the AM peak hour and by 10 percent during the PM peak hour. System-efficiency improvements are underway.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

**MTSO:**

- Average Speed, AM Peak Hour: 15 MPH northbound and 12 MPH southbound
- Average Speed, PM Peak Hour: 10 MPH in both directions

**ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:**

- Complete Contra Costa Boulevard improvement project.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Between 2nd Avenue and Monument Boulevard, construction of additional right and left turn lanes, modification of intersection lane alignments, and addition of a new class II bike lane
- Improvement of traffic operations throughout corridor

## Geary Road

### DESCRIPTION

Geary Road runs east-west, connecting North Main Street at I-680 to Pleasant Hill Road to the west. East of I-680, Geary Road becomes Treat Boulevard. Over half its length, Geary Road is two lanes with center turn lanes. It serves as an access route to the Pleasant Hill BART station.

### ISSUE STATEMENT

As traffic volumes increase on Treat Boulevard, traffic volumes are likely to increase on Geary Road, because it serves as an alternate route to SR-24 in Lafayette.

Completion of the Phase III widening project and bus, bike and pedestrian improvements will improve access for the Pleasant Hill BART Station.

### MTSOs, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO:

- LOS F at North Main Street intersection

#### ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Complete widening.
- Seek funding to improve vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access at the Pleasant Hill BART Station.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Geary Road Widening Phase III
- Implementation of various vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access improvements at the Pleasant Hill BART Station

## North Main Street

**DESCRIPTION** North Main Street is a north-south roadway in Walnut Creek that is the continuation of Contra Costa Boulevard. It is a four-lane roadway that is a Regional Route from Oak Park to San Luis Road. It runs parallel to I-680 and provides access to the interstate at both Treat Boulevard/Geary Road and San Luis Road. It connects two BART stations and serves local traffic.

**ISSUE STATEMENT** By 2030, peak-hour traffic volumes are projected to increase by 5 to 10 percent.

### MTSOs, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

**MTSO:**

- LOS F at Treat Boulevard/Geary Road intersection

**ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:**

- Assess possible application of the Central Contra Costa Traffic Management Program.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- None

## Pacheco Boulevard

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	Pacheco Boulevard is a two- to four-lane north-south roadway connecting Pine Street south of downtown Martinez, under SR-4 and along I-680, to 2 <sup>nd</sup> street in Pleasant Hill, where it becomes Contra Costa Boulevard.
<b>ISSUE STATEMENT</b>	Peak-hour traffic volumes on Pacheco Boulevard are projected to increase by 10 percent in the AM and 15 percent in the PM by 2030. Widening for a portion of Pacheco Boulevard is currently programmed, which will improve traffic flow and vehicle, bus and bicycle access to the Pacheco Transit Hub at the I-680/SR-4 interchange.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO:

- Martinez: 15 MPH Average Speed in both directions in the AM and PM peak hours
- Contra Costa County: 1.5 V/C for all intersections

#### ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Assess possible applications of the Central Contra Costa Traffic Management Program.
- Complete Pacheco Transit Hub.
- Seek funding to widen Pacheco Boulevard to four lanes and make related improvements.
- Coordinate proposed improvements to the I-680/SR-4 interchange with surrounding arterials and local streets.
- Assess the need for improvements at the Pacheco Boulevard/Arnold Drive intersection.
- Work with Contra Costa County staff on coordination of the implementation of the Buchanan Airport Master Plan.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Construction of Pacheco Transit Hub
- Widening of road segments to four lanes and construction of a new railroad over-crossing for Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (likely to occur in phases)

## Pleasant Hill Road

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	Within TRANSPAC's region, Pleasant Hill Road is a north-south, two- to four-lane roadway that connects Geary Road and Taylor Boulevard into Lafayette and, through SWAT's region, to SR-24.
<b>ISSUE STATEMENT</b>	Pleasant Hill Road and Taylor Boulevard currently serve as a parallel route for drivers through Central County to SR-24. The CCTA model indicates that there will be an increase in peak-hour traffic on Pleasant Hill Road.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO:

- Pleasant Hill: 15 MPH Average Speed in both directions in the AM and PM peak hours
- Contra Costa County: 1.5 V/C for all intersections

#### ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Work with SWAT/City of Lafayette on corridor issues and, if feasible, consider development of a traffic management plan and other operational strategies for Pleasant Hill Road.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- As may be determined in concert with SWAT/City of Lafayette

## Taylor Boulevard

**DESCRIPTION** Taylor Boulevard is a four-lane, north-south roadway that connects Contra Costa Boulevard to Pleasant Hill Road and, effectively, SR-4 to SR-24. Local traffic travels this route as a bypass to I-680 and the I-680/SR-24 interchange.

**ISSUE STATEMENT** By 2030, peak-hour traffic volumes are projected to increase by 5 to 10 percent.

### MTSOs, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

**MTSO:**

- Pleasant Hill: 15 MPH Average Speed in both directions in the AM and PM peak hours
- Contra Costa County: 1.5 V/C for all intersections

**ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:**

- Assess possible application of the Central Contra Costa Traffic Management Program.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Improvement of traffic operations through the corridor

## Treat Boulevard

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	Treat Boulevard is a divided four- to eight-lane arterial that serves as a main commuter route from Clayton Road in Concord to I-680 and the Pleasant Hill Bart Station. It runs parallel to Ygnacio Valley Road.
<b>ISSUE STATEMENT</b>	By 2030, peak-hour traffic volumes are projected to increase between 15 and 25 percent. Improving vehicle, bus, bike and pedestrian access for the Pleasant Hill BART Station will be necessary.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO:

- Concord: Average Stopped Delays (signal cycles to clear) at the following intersections:
  - Clayton Road/Denkinger Road: 3
  - Cowell Road: 5
  - Oak Grove Road: 5
- Walnut Creek: LOS F at Bancroft Road intersection
- Contra Costa County: 1.5 V/C for all intersections

#### ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Seek funding to improve vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access at the Pleasant Hill BART Station.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Implementation of various vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access improvements at the Pleasant Hill BART Station

## Ygnacio Valley Road/Kirker Pass Road

### DESCRIPTION

Ygnacio Valley Road is a four- to six-lane divided roadway that extends from I-680 in Walnut Creek to Clayton Road. Beyond Clayton Road, Ygnacio Valley Road becomes Kirker Pass Road, a four- to six-lane roadway that then becomes Railroad Avenue in Pittsburg and connects to SR-4. It is a primary alternate route for SR-4 commute traffic to and from East County.

### ISSUE STATEMENT

Commute traffic flow is bi-directional but primarily westbound in the morning and eastbound in the evening. Peak-hour traffic volumes on the route generally have been stable over the last decade, in part because TRANSPAC and TRANSPLAN adopted the East-Central Traffic Management Plan.

In the future, Ygnacio Valley Road peak-period and daily traffic volumes are expected to increase modestly. In contrast, peak-hour peak-direction traffic volumes on Kirker Pass Road are projected to increase by 36 percent during the AM peak hour and 57 percent during the PM peak hour.

The Walnut Creek BART station is adjacent to I-680 in the downtown area. The station parking area will be reconfigured as part of the Walnut Creek BART Station transit village project.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO:

- Concord: Average Stopped Delays as follows:
  - Clayton Road/Kirker Pass Road: 3
  - Alberta Way/Pine Hollow Drive: 4
  - Cowell Road: 4
- Walnut Creek: LOS F at both Bancroft Road and Civic Drive intersections
- Contra Costa County: 1.5 V/C for all intersections

#### ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Continue to support implementation of the East-Central Traffic Management Plan.
- Seek funding from Measure J/STIP for a truck-climbing lane on Kirker Pass Road toward East County.
- Seek funding to improve vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access at the Walnut Creek BART Station.



## Ygnacio Valley Road/Kirker Pass Road

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Widening of Ygnacio Valley Road to six lanes between Cowell Road and Michigan Road
- Continued implementation of the East-Central Traffic Management Plan
- Construction of a truck-climbing lane on Kirker Pass Road from Concord toward Pittsburg
- Implementation of various vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access improvements at the Walnut Creek BART Station

TABLE 5-1 2008 ACTION PLAN PROJECT LIST				
	CENTRAL COUNTY PROJECTS	Project	Secured	Prospective
Agency	Project Name	Cost (2007\$)	Funding	STIP Requests (estimate)
<b>FREEWAY PROJECTS</b>				
CCTA/CALTRANS	Caldecott Tunnel 4th Bore	\$420,000,00	TRANSPAC Measure J:\$62M	
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680 SB HOV Lane Restriping; Extend the Southbound HOV lane from north of Rudgear to Livorna Rd .	\$3,000,000	Measure J: \$3M	
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680 SB HOV Lane Gap Closure: Close the HOV gap between N. Main and Livorna.	\$44,000,000	Measure J: \$29M RM2: \$15M	
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680 NB HOV Lane Extension: N. Main to SR242	\$44,000,000	Measure J: \$4M	
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR4 Phase 3: Complete SR 4 missing lane	\$52,000,000	STIP-RIP: \$1.3M, Measure J: \$35.7	\$15M
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR 4 NB to WB	\$76,200,000		\$5M
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR4 EB to SB	\$44,000,000		\$2.5M
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR4 SB to EB	\$40,500,000		
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR4 WB to NB	\$26,000,000		
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR4 HOV Flyover	\$82,000,000		
Martinez	I-680/Marina Vista Interchange Modifications	\$6,000,000	Measure J: \$1.3M	\$4.7M
Concord	SR242/Clayton Road On- and Off-ramps	\$31,000,000	Measure J: \$4.5M	\$26.5M
Concord	SR4/Willow Pass	\$32,800,000	Measure J: 2.8M:Developer Fees: \$20M	\$10M
Concord	SR4/Port Chicago Highway Interchange Improvements	\$35,000,000		
<b>ROAD PROJECTS</b>				
Clayton	Marsh Creek Road Upgrade	\$1,000,000		
Clayton	Pine Hollow Road Upgrade	\$300,000		
Concord	Waterworld Pkwy Bridge, to connect to Meridian Park Blvd.	\$12,500,000	Measure J: \$3M; Local: \$6.1M	\$3.4M
Concord	Clayton Rd. /Treat Blvd./Denkinger Rd. Intersection Capacity Improvements		Measure J: \$2M	
Concord	Commerce Avenue Roadway Extension and Bridge at Pine Creek	\$6,887,668	Measure C I-680: \$3.92M; TE Bill:\$1.36M; Local:\$1.60M	
Concord	Panoramic Dr. Extension	\$18,000,000		
Concord	Galaxy Way Bridge over Walnut Creek	\$11,000,000		
Concord	Ygnacio Valley Road Lane Ext. (Cowell to Michigan Widening)	\$11,000,000		
Concord	Bailey Road Traffic Improvements	\$4,790,026	Developer Fees: \$.123M; Local ROW:\$.039M	
County/Martinez	Pacheco Blvd: Widen to 4 lanes, construct new RR overcrossing for Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway. Can be phased	\$35,000,000	Measure J: \$4.9M; Measure C: \$3M; City Fees: \$1.5 M; TOSCO/Solano Fund \$3.6M	\$22M
County	Alhambra Valley Road realignment and safety projects to straighten curves and improve operational and safety characteristics	\$5,080,000	Martinez AOB: \$0.7M, Local \$1.5M	\$3M
County	Kirker Pass Rd Northbound Truck Climbing Lanes from Concord to Pittsburg . Note southbound truck lanes are not planned at this time.	\$8,500,000	Measure J: \$5.8M; Prop. 42: \$1.2M	\$1.5 M
County	Arnold Drive Extension	\$15,000,000		

	CENTRAL COUNTY PROJECTS	Project	Secured	Prospective
Agency	Project Name	Cost (2007\$)	Funding	STIP Requests (estimate)
Martinez	Alhambra Avenue Safety Improvements, Walnut Avenue to Franklin Canyon Rd; Construct a second southbound lane on Alhambra Ave from Walnut Ave to Franklin Canyon Rd with other necessary signal, ramp, and median modifications.	\$1,750,000	Local: \$.25M	\$1.5M
Martinez	North Court/UPRR Overpass	\$19,000,000		
Martinez	Alhambra Avenue Widening (Phase 3)	\$6,000,000	Other: \$1M	
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Blvd Improvement; Between 2nd Ave and Monument Blvd, construct additional right and left turn lanes at various intersections, modify intersection lane alignments, add new class II bike lane, improve traffic operations throughout corridor.	\$8,248,000	Local: \$1M, STP: \$.54M	\$7M
Pleasant Hill	Buskirk Avenue Realignment, Phase 2	\$10,000,00	Measure J: \$8M; City: \$1M	\$1M
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill Road Improvement project - phases iii,iv,v	\$1,800,000		
Pleasant Hill	Monument Boulevard Widening	\$12,000,000		
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Boulevard Widening at Gregory Gardens , Doris to Doray	\$425,000		
Pleasant Hill	Gregory lane right turn lane at I-680 off-ramp	\$275,000		
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Boulevard at Oak Park Blvd. south bridge connector	\$200,000		
Pleasant Hill	Mayhew Way Widening	\$562,000		
Pleasant Hill	Mayhew Way Frontage Improvements	\$88,000		
Pleasant Hill	Paso Nogal Improvements	\$200,000		
Pleasant Hill	Cleaveland Road widening and sidewalk improvements	\$325,000		\$1M
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill Road installation of new pedestrian and bicycle facilities, drainage improvements, traffic calming measures , and intersection improvements			
Pleasant Hill	Taylor Boulevard extend signal interconnect Pleasant Hill Road to Grayson Road			
Pleasant Hill	Taylor Boulevard eliminate free right turn lanes at Taylor Boulevard/Pleasant Hill Road intersection			
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road (YVR) Rehabilitation - Phase 1; Overlay YVR from California Blvd to Civic Drive, including ADA upgrades, safety, intersection and traffic operations improvements.	\$2,849,000	Local: \$.4M	
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road (YVR) Rehabilitation - Phase 2: I-680-California; Phase 3: Civic to Bancroft; Phase 4: Bancroft to Oak Grove; Phase 5: Oak Grove to City Limits	\$20,500,00		
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road @ Walnut Blvd. Left Turn Extension	\$400,000		
Walnut Creek	Bancroft/Ygnacio Valley Road New Eastbound Right Turn Lane	\$4,500,000		
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road @ Homestead Ave. Left Turn Extension (350 feet)	\$350,000		
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road @ Oak Grove Road Southbound Left Turn Lane	\$2,500,000		
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road @ Marchbanks/Tampico Left Turn Extension	\$300,000		
Walnut Creek	Parkside/Buena Vista Ave Intersection Improvements	\$1,150,000		
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road @ San Carlos Left Turn Extension	\$500,000		
<b>TRANSIT PROJECTS</b>				
BART	BART Walnut Creek Station Capacity Expansion - includes new paid area, platform expansion, new vertical circulation, additional fare gates, and fare collection equipment. etc.	\$30,000,000		
BART	BART Pleasant Hill Station Capacity Expansion - includes expansion of existing paid area, new paid area, platform expansion, new vertical circulation, additional fare gates and fare collection equipment, etc.	\$50,000,000		

	CENTRAL COUNTY PROJECTS	Project	Secured	Prospective
Agency	Project Name	Cost (2007\$)	Funding	STIP Requests (estimate)
County Connection	Pacheco Transit Hub	\$2,031,922	PTMISEA:\$800k; Measure C: \$550k;RM2: \$1.089M; TFCA:\$92,922	
County Connection	DVC Transit Center	\$4,318,530	PTMISEA: \$2,231,030; T-Plus:\$350k; \$253k;FTA 5303:\$1,237,500; RM2:\$500k	
County Connection	Trunkline Transit service capital improvements from Pacheco Boulevard (Martinez) to Main Street (Walnut Creek) - Buses:	\$2,100,000		
County Connection	Infrastructure Improvements (bulb outs, queue jump lanes, passenger shelters, signage)	\$6,000,000		
County Connection	IT: (real time information, signal priority)	\$3,900,000		\$3.9M
Martinez	Martinez Intermodal Station (Phase 3)	\$12,600,000	Measure J: \$2.6M	
Martinez	Martinez Ferry Terminal	\$5,000,000		
511 CC/TRANSPAC	Clean Fuel Vehicle infrastructure	\$10,000,000		
<b>BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN AND TRAIL PROJECTS</b>				
Clayton	Concord-Clayton Bikeway Clayton Town Center to Treat Boulevard in Concord	\$362,000		
Clayton	Mitchell Canyon Road, Pine Hollow to Clayton Road & South of Pine Hollow Road -Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$100,000		
Clayton	Oak Street , south of High Street, Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$50,000		
Clayton	Pine Hollow Road, West of Pine Hollow Estates Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$300,000		
Concord	Concord Boulevard Sidewalk Gap Closure Phase II	\$1,270,000	Bike/Ped Grant: \$0.82M; Local:\$0.45M	
Concord	Port Chicago Highway Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$270,000		
Concord	Treat Blvd Sidewalk - Coco's Restaurant to Cobblestone Drive Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$125,000		
Concord	Treat Boulevard-Cobblestone Drive to Cowell Road Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$800,000		
Concord	Monument Blvd & Meadow Ln Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements	\$4,044,000	TLC:\$2.2M; CDBG:\$0.275M; Local: \$1.569M	
County	Pleasant Hill BART Shortcut Pedestrian Path	\$2,169,000	CCCO: \$600K; SRTS:\$300K; TLC:\$25K	
County	Pleasant Hill BART Station Bicycle and Pedestrian Access	\$1,000,000		
County	Alhambra Valley Road Shoulder Widening. East of Castro Ranch	\$2,000,000	Prop1B:\$1.05M; HRS:\$900K; Briones AOB: \$25K	
County	Delta-De Anza Class I Trail from Evora Road to Port Chicago Hwy	\$500,000		
County	Delta-De Anza Class I Trail from Port Chicago Hwy to Iron Horse Trail			
County	Delta-De Anza Class I Trail from Port Chicago Hwy to Iron Horse Trail			
County	Iron Horse Trail Overcrossing at Treat Blvd. /Jones Road	\$12,200,000	TEA21 CMAQ:\$500K; Meas C Reg:\$887K;MeasC CCTA:\$400K;Trans. Impact Fees (SAP Fees) \$2.26M;RDA \$605K;MTC HIP:\$2.5M;MeasC TLC County:\$1M	Unfunded: \$401k

	CENTRAL COUNTY PROJECTS	Project	Secured	Prospective
Agency	Project Name	Cost (2007\$)	Funding	STIP Requests (estimate)
County	Carquinez Scenic Trail design/construction between Port Costa & Martinez	\$4,00,000	SAFETEA-LU: \$1M	
County	Clyde Union Pacific Right of Way Trail	\$1,500,000	Navy Mit. Funds \$1.5M	
County	Reliez Valley Road Pedestrian Path	\$1,400,000	STIP:\$342K Reliez Valley SP Fund: \$1.06M	
County	Alhambra Valley Road Realignment and Shoulder widening Bear Creek Road to 2,200 feet east	\$1,512,000	HR3:\$810k; Briones AOB	Unfunded: \$702k
County	Marsh Creek Road Curve Realignment between Aspara Drive and Deer Valley Road	\$3,630,000	Marsh Creek AOB: \$350K	
County	Marsh Creek Road Widening - 1 mi. East of Russelmann Park Road	\$2,210,000	HR3:\$810K; Prop1BL \$1.4M	
County	Rudgear Road/San Miguel Drive/Walnut Boulevard/Mountain View Boulevard Safety Improvements	\$350,000	Central Co. AOB	
County	Willow Pass Road Widening to 4 lanes / Gap Closure from Bailey Road to Pittsburg City limits	?		
County	Marsh Drive Widening	\$2,471,000	West Concord Fees:\$2,472,000	
County	Center Avenue Widening: Pacheco Boulevard to Blackwood Drive	\$5,300,000	West Concord Fees:\$588,000	
County	Evora Road/Willow Pass Road Intersection - West	\$1,700,000	Navy Mit Funds: \$1.3M	Unfunded: \$400k
County	Boulevard Way Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$62,000		
County	Mayhew Way Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$80,000		
County	Pacheco Boulevard (from 3785 to 3795) Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$335,000		
County	Pacheco Boulevard Sidewalk Gap Closure - Camino Del Sol to Windhover Way	\$589,000	SRTS: \$311k; TDA \$70k	
County	Pacheco Boulevard Sidewalk Gap Closure - Windhover way to Goree Court	\$621,500		
County	Arnold Industrial Way Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$80,000		
County	Springbrook Road Sidewalk Gap Closure			
County	Pacheco Blvd. (from 4101 to 4285 ) Sidewalk Gap Closure			
County	Alhambra Valley Road Pedestrian Bridge	\$500,000	Prop 1B: \$400K; Alhambra Valley Fees: \$60K	
County	Treat Boulevard Reconstruction	\$2,500,000		
Martinez	Bay Trail (all unconstructed Phases)	\$1,000,000		
Martinez	Contra Costa Canal Trail: Extend, Muir Rd. to Martinez Reservoir			
Martinez	Howe Street Bicycle Lanes			
Martinez	Marina Vista Bike Lanes: Extend	\$500,000		
Martinez	Morello Avenue Bicycle Lanes Gap Closure , Pacheco Boulevard top Petit Lane	\$265,000		
Martinez	Morello Avenue Bicycle Lanes Gap Closure	\$322,000		
Martinez	Vine Hill Walkway (2 phases)	\$702,000		
Martinez	North Court Street Bicycle Lanes	\$195,000		
Martinez	Pacheco Blvd. Bike Lanes, Arnold Dr. to Muir Rd.	\$75,000		
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill Road Improvement project - phases iii,iv,v	\$1,800,000		
Pleasant Hill	Monument Boulevard Widening	\$12,000,000		
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Boulevard Widening at Gregory Gardens , Doris to Doray	\$425,000		
Pleasant Hill	Gregory Lane right turn lane at I-680 off-ramp	\$275,000		
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Boulevard at Oak Park Blvd. south bridge connector	\$200,000		
Pleasant Hill	Mayhew Way Widening	\$562,000		

	CENTRAL COUNTY PROJECTS	Project	Secured	Prospective
Agency	Project Name	Cost (2007\$)	Funding	STIP Requests (estimate)
Pleasant Hill	Mayhew Way Frontage Improvements	\$88,000		
Pleasant Hill	Paso Nogal Improvements	\$200,000		
Pleasant Hill	Cleaveland Road widening and sidewalk improvements	\$325,000		
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Canal Trail realignment at Taylor Blvd.	\$60,000		
Pleasant Hill	Morello Avenue Bike Lanes	\$60,000		
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill Road Pedestrian Bridge, Diablo View Road to Barnett Terrace	\$200,000		
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill Road Pedestrian Improvements, Boyd Road to Geary Road	\$1,100,000		
Pleasant Hill	Taylor/Morello Pedestrian Improvements			
Pleasant Hill	Grayson Road/Gregory lane Bike Route	\$18,000		
Pleasant Hill	Grayson Road/Gregory Lane Bike Route	\$375,000		
Pleasant Hill	1636 to 1736 Ruth Drive (Ardith Dr. to Taylor Blvd.) Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$33,000		
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Boulevard (Harriet to Ellinwood/Gregory Gardens School) Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$54,000		
Pleasant Hill	Maureen Lane to Strandwood School (1900 Rose Lane) Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$87,000		
Pleasant Hill	2200 Pleasant Hill Road, replace pedestrian bridge near Diablo View Drive	\$196,000		
Pleasant Hill	Brandon Road near Allen Way to Christ the King school Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$91,000		
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill Road to Taylor Boulevard (700 Grayson) Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$318,000		
Pleasant Hill	Chilpancingo Parkway at Oak Creek Court Sidewalk Realignment	\$10,000		
Pleasant Hill	Lucille Drive, Maureen to Taylor Boulevard Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$100,000		
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Valley Drive Neighborhood Sidewalk Installation	\$104,000		
Pleasant Hill	Morello at Paso Nogal Park Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$23,000		
Walnut Creek	Olympic Boulevard Pedestrian Improvements, Bridgefield Road to Boulevard Way			
Walnut Creek	Community School Improvements, various locations in the TRANSPAC area			
Walnut Creek	Buena Vista Pedestrian Improvements, all phases	\$507,000		
Walnut Creek	Parkside Drive Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$200,000		
Walnut Creek	Walnut Boulevard Pedestrian Improvement Project, Ygnacio Valley Road to Homestead Avenue	\$500,000		
Walnut Creek	Ped/Bike Overcrossing of Ygnacio Valley Road at Walnut Creek BART	\$10,000,000		
Walnut Creek	Walnut Blvd./Pedestrian Pathway	\$7,200,000		
Walnut Creek	Mt. Diablo/Iron Horse Trail Crossing	\$250,000		
Walnut Creek	Rudgear/Palmer Pedestrian Improvements	\$300,000		
Walnut Creek	Buena Vista/First St. Pedestrian/Bike Improvements	\$800,000		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$926,480,646</b>	<b>\$247,243,952</b>	<b>\$109,535,000</b>
	<b>Unfunded</b>	<b>\$679,236,694</b>		

## ***TRANSPAC Technical Advisory Commission (TAC) Meeting Summary Minutes***

**MEETING DATE:** October 24, 2013

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Corinne Dutra-Roberts, 511 Contra Costa; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; John McKenzie, Caltrans; Tim Tucker, Martinez; and Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager

**GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill; Matthew Kelly, Associate Transportation Planner, CCTA; Mario Moreno, City Engineer, City of Pleasant Hill; Elena Idell, Dyett and Bhatia

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:** Anita Tucci-Smith

The meeting was convened at 9:03 A.M. Self introduction followed.

### **1. Continued Discussion of Action Plan Update. Presentation by Deborah Dagang from CH2MHill**

Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill, reported on her meeting with TRANSPAC on October 10, 2013, when the recommendations from the TAC had been presented for the MTSOs along with the recommended values. TRANSPAC had been pleased with the TAC recommendations and had accepted the report.

Jeremy Lochirco raised a concern with the general education of TRANSPAC given that some members did not appear to understand all the factors involved, especially the Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs).

Ms. Dagang acknowledged that an educational session had been discussed given the compressed schedule, although now that the Draft Action Plan would need to be approved by TRANSPAC in February as opposed to December, there could be at least one more meeting in the schedule to address the issue of clarifying and educating TRANSPAC.

Mr. Lochirco expressed a preference to schedule an educational session to serve the mission and goals of the TAC and to provide some context to the discussion.

Matt Kelly suggested the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) could do that.

Ms. Neustadter concurred and noted that Martin Engelmann could do that at the November meeting as part of his presentation of the Vision, Goals, and Current Issues for the 2014 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and Action Plan updates or could do it at the December 12, 2013 meeting.

Ms. Dagang commented that Mr. Kelly's presentation of the Congestion Management Program (CMP) update had also served to help educate TRANSPAC.

John Cunningham agreed that an educational session was much needed, and that staff was still coming to terms with the role of the Action Plan in terms of some of the imperatives and that it would be important to make sure that the elected officials were well educated in the process.

Ms. Neustadter concurred and noted that Action Plans were difficult, and in some ways this one was more difficult, and an educational session would be instructive and helpful.

Ms. Dagang explained that the actions to be included in the Action Plan would be identified and a draft Action Plan would be submitted to the TAC at its November meeting. One of the key next steps would be to come up with the actions themselves. The Action Plan was scheduled to be submitted to TRANSPAC in December with a preliminary draft of the Action Plan for review, and while the document might not be fully flushed out at that time, in January there were some tentative dates for another TAC meeting if there was a need to spend more time on the action list. The completed plan would have to be adopted by TRANSPAC in February 2014.

Ray Kuzbari expressed the need to discuss the 2008 Action Plan Project List.

Ms. Neustadter referred to the issue of identifying major non-motorized routes in the TRANSPAC area as part of the Action Plan and was not interested in establishing MTSOs for non-motorized trips or for the BART system in this Action Plan. She suggested placing it on the list for the future to work on between now and the time of the next Action Plan. She also suggested that non-motorized routes were becoming useful for recreational and trips to work and the question became how to create that in such a way that it is useful to the reader but would not require the establishment of more MTSOs that could not be achieved.

Mr. Cunningham referenced a CCTA CTP meeting on October 23 when that issue had been discussed along with the brief history of non-motorized routes in the context of the Action Plan, particularly since MTSOs were a congestion based issue that would not be appropriate for non-motorized routes. He suggested a good alternative would be to characterize them in the context of the roadway network such as the Iron Horse Trail as an alternative to I-680. Actions that addressed increasing the use of the Iron Horse Trail and the functionality of that trail, or function of access important to the trail, would be actions that would also benefit the north/south corridor.

Ms. Neustadter noted that Leah Greenblatt of Lafayette had raised an issue of safety at the crossing of a trail at a road which is where an MTSO could be identified.

Ms. Dagang agreed that issue could be identified with a future Action Plan update including the routes without calling them Routes of Regional Significance (RORS) label, or identifying the non-motorized routes specifically without depiction on the roadway. She referred to the 2009 Action Plan and actions that did not tie into a specific MTSO and noted there was flexibility to do that.



Tim Tucker asked if that discussion could be isolated in the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP).

Mr. Cunningham suggested that at some point a future work piece to address non-motorized routes more specifically would have to somehow be counted in the Countywide Bike/Ped Plan.

Ms. Dagang reminded the TAC that one of the goals was to *Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities*. Thinking about how the Action Plan had been structured, she suggested there could be a broad mention of support for the Countywide Bike/Ped Plan, which could be a general action although specific actions could be included as a goal even if not a RORS with MTSOs. There was also a goal to *Support the enhancement and expansion of an efficient transit system*, which had incorporated ferries.

Ms. Neustadter commented that the ferry issue had been discussed and needed to be recognized. She wanted to be careful to acknowledge that ferry service was something desired although that was about as far as it had gotten to this point.

Ms. Dagang stated the actions and how tied into the goals needed to be identified.

Mr. Lochirco suggested there needed to be something in the plan that recognized non-motorized and that a project list be included in the action to maintain the existing MTSOs given that some had already failed. He suggested that the difference between the Action Plan, specific bike and ped, and the Countywide Action Plan is that there were broad policies that were not location specific. The Countywide plan had incorporated all the facilities that all local jurisdictions had incorporated. He recognized the opportunity to include non-motorized projects or the importance of helping to maintain the goals established, and recommended the establishment of not only a motorized list but a non-motorized list as well since the non-motorized would increase in the future. Those kinds of general shifts established new MTSO values and maintained existing roadway MTSOs.

Ms. Dagang suggested that was consistent with the 2009 Action Plan. She encouraged TAC members to look through the list to ensure that those projects that had not been identified were included.

Mr. Cunningham suggested that might be the cursory linkage between the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and the Contra Costa County Bike/Ped Plan, that the linkages were the projects that would have to be highlighted to identify what would most benefit the RORS, with potentially other flags in terms of safety improvements.

Mr. Kelly agreed that if there were new projects to support MTSOs on bike projects it would be important to identify those projects.

Mr. Lochirco stated that pedestrians would not affect RORS but incrementally getting people in the mental mode shift not to be so dependent on vehicle trips, which linked indirectly into transit. Technically, he suggested that was motorized and there was value in that form of transportation because there were environmental and other values involved. Whatever could be done to support non-motorized or motorized transit would be important to include as policy.

Ms. Dagang noted that the MTSOs were not meant to be limited; there were goals and tenets, RORS, non-motorized, and the BART system, and as long as goals are supported they could be included.

Mr. Kelly stated that studies could come out to “look at this location and see what best improvements bike, ped, and motorized” things would look like.

Mr. Lochirco suggested it was a huge impediment to get around and within jurisdictions a bike lane would not be put on a RORS, such as Ygnacio Valley Road. He suggested the question was what other options were available and the need to do a study to support wholesale changes.

In terms of both BART and the major non-motorized routes, Ms. Dagang suggested inclusion in the graphics with the understanding that there were goals that addressed the area and actions to reflect those goals which could also be included because they supported roadway RORS. There was no TAC disagreement to that statement. With respect to actions, she explained that she had created all the pages that mentioned actions in a couple of ways that had been mentioned in the Action Plan. There were actions that were called proposed improvements that were linked to RORS and proposed improvements were broadly described, and at the end of the packet there were specific projects. She urged each member to go through the project list to update the list. She emphasized that what had been implemented should be crossed off, or projects no longer desired to be pursued should be eliminated, and projects could be added. She emphasized that the list was not financially constrained and it was always good to identify projects.

Mr. Kuzbari presented his modifications to the list at this time.

Mario Moreno verified that there was not a defined pot of money for the Action Plan Project List.

Ms. Dagang explained that the Action Plan Project List was intended to be a wish list and there was no prioritization of projects on that list.

Mr. Kelly concurred and stated that while not tied to specific funding it would poise a project for funding as part of the CTP, which would move projects forward.

Ms. Neustadter raised another element of the discussion in that whether or not the CCTA pursued a renewal of Measure J, which would mean more money, there was a need for Central County to get attention if there was a renewal; and while there is currently no available money, there could be money in the future and the jurisdictions needed to be in a position to identify and forward projects of interest in a potential renewal of Measure J. The question of what would sell in a ballot measure also needed to be part of the discussion in order to formulate a measure that voters would support and adopt. While Contra Costa County voters had approved Measures C and J, she urged caution of what to include in the future to be able to speak to the voters and listen to the voters in terms of what is needed and wanted.

Mr. Kuzbari summarized the changes that he had made to the project list, which included the SR4/Willow Pass Road project that had been replaced by the more recent SR4 Integrated Corridor Analysis Project with a \$260 million preliminary cost estimate, and potentially securing \$4.2 million in Measure J funding by shifting funds from the old Willow Pass Road Project to the Marina Vista Interchange Project. Given that Phase 3 of the I-680/SR4 Interchange Improvement project was now fully funded, he identified the effort to move funds from other projects to the SR4 Integrated Corridor Analysis Project. He sought any updates from other jurisdictions that may impact his recommended changes to the Action Plan Project List.

Tim Tucker referred to a seismic upgrade project currently under discussion.

Ms. Dagang referenced that as a good example of moving forward and asked Mr. Tucker to identify the project that had not yet been funded, which would be kept as a placeholder. She recommended focusing on the actions and the project cost, with a separate conversation of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) request.

Mr. Lochirco recommended a deadline for changes to the project list, with a return of the updated list to be able to line up with the new actions in the Action Plan.

Ms. Dagang requested comments no later than November 8, to allow her time to put it all together and send it out by November 14, to be able to discuss it at the next TAC meeting on November 21, 2013.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that any projects on the list should go to the Comprehensive Transportation Project Listing (CTPL) first, which was still open.

Since there was a master list, Mr. Lochirco asked if it would be easier for the CCTA to pull the list together, which Mr. Kelly stated could be done. Mr. Lochirco wanted to make sure that everyone was on the same page. He emphasized the regional effort and the need to look at the regional list, which was not limited to RORS and allow every jurisdiction to position itself for a potential renewal of Measure J in the future.

There were no objections.

John McKenzie noted that there would be scenarios but most would be previous plans, specifications, and estimate (PS&E) efforts and include projects at the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) and regional level. There could be some ideas there building upon previous efforts and studies.

Mr. Kuzbari stated it was not a programming list and if a project was to be listed as a prospective STIP request there would be no limit to what could be requested. He suggested there may be a project on the CTPL and there may be an opportunity to add to the CTPL, although that would only be for capital projects. He verified that the list did not include transit projects.

Ms. Neustadter commented that there were lists with different purposes and the same project might be on a number of lists; different lists for different purposes.

Mr. Kelly explained that the CTPL should include projects that had been included in other documents. He verified the request for a list of Central County projects for RORS with just capital projects.

Mr. Lochirco suggested that could also capture other agency improvements, such as County Connection bus stops, and there may be other capital projects that supported the actions.

Ms. Dagang urged jurisdictions to make changes to the list prior to the November 8, 2013 deadline.

Ms. Neustadter moved to Item 3 at this time.

### **3. Update on the Contra Costa Boulevard Improvement Project, Eric Hu, City of Pleasant Hill**

Eric Hu referenced a number of projects on Contra Costa Boulevard including one at Chilpancingo Parkway to Viking Road on the Measure J Local Streets and Major Streets and Roads Project List, with \$1.15 million in Measure J funds and \$1.2 million in federal grants towards that project, which had a completed design and which had gone out to bid. He reported that the bids had come in \$800,000 over the Engineer's Estimate and he sought additional funds to readvertise and start construction on the project. He explained that the project was now being value engineered to bring down the cost although the project was still \$750,000 short in terms of project funding.

Mr. Hu reported that he had approached the CCTA, had spoken with Hisham Noeimi, had been advised that Line 28a under Measure J *Subregional Transportation Needs* represented a "contingency fund" for Central County, and had learned that TRANSPAC had the ability to decide how to spend the money which had to be toward a Measure J eligible project or new projects to add to a list. Based on the time when the measure started from 2009 to the end of the 2012-13 fiscal year, there was \$2 to \$3 million accumulated in that fund, although over the life of the measure it was expected to accumulate \$16.2 million. He requested to be able to use some of that fund to cover the shortfall. He noted that he and Mario Moreno had approached most of the jurisdictions and wanted to start the conversation of how to utilize the funds in the future. He sought a collective discussion for the use of the Line 28a funds, and specifically requested \$750,000 from Line 28a to fully fund the shortfall in the Chilpancingo Parkway to Viking Road project. He explained that the final project cost numbers should be available in two weeks and would try to get that information available to TRANSPAC prior to its meeting on November 14, 2013. If not able to get the numbers by that time, he would return to the November 21, 2013 TAC meeting and to TRANSPAC on December 12, 2013. He emphasized the desire to have the request approved by the TAC by its November meeting to be able to go to the CCTA Board in December and readvertise the project by December 2013.

Mr. Moreno explained that the project was tied to two other grants, one of which expired in December, and he wanted to accelerate the process to avoid losing \$800,000. He expected that a \$750,000 allotment would be enough to fully fund the project.

Mr. Kuzbari urged the City of Pleasant Hill to get the information on a funding plan and schedule by next week to help accelerate the process. He did not see a problem concurring with the request but needed more information that would be submitted to TRANSPAC.

Mr. Cunningham referenced a conversation at the Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) where there was a similar situation where a jurisdiction needed funding and had come to the TAC and to the Board, and he too requested project specific information as to the need. He was willing to help accelerate the project but also wanted to address how to program the funds in the future, how it would be split, and how it would be prioritized so that all jurisdictions were treated equally.

Mr. Moreno requested the \$750,000 as an advance on the City of Pleasant Hill's fair share of Line 28a funds given the current immediate need. He referred to another project with the City of Walnut Creek and explained that he might have to come back again and ask for additional funds.

Mr. Kuzbari emphasized the need for a policy discussion in the future with respect to the use of Line 28a funds. He did not want to hold up the process and would be willing to move forward to review project specific information at this time.

Mr. Tucker agreed that sharing the funds would have to be clarified so that everyone had an opportunity to use Line 28a funds.

Ms. Neustadter concurred but suggested that an allocation of \$750,000 at this time would not be significant. She agreed with the need for a future discussion on the use of the funds.

Mr. Lochirco was comfortable that the discussion of policy be used on a case-by-case basis for emergencies. He was not comfortable without an understanding of how the funds would be used and sought a policy for unanticipated expenses without too much rigidity. He was pleased that there was a contingency fund to help cities when the need arose.

Mr. Kuzbari agreed with the need to be as flexible as possible and to think long term, particularly since Measure J was in place until 2034.

Mr. Moreno explained that Contra Costa Boulevard was one of the City of Pleasant Hill's main corridors and the project would bring in all the multi modes; a good project that the City supported. He appreciated the help to move the project forward and stated that the detailed information would be made available this week. He noted that the bids had been rejected in August.

Mr. Lochirco did not see the need to return to the TAC in that the City of Pleasant Hill would have to go through the CCTA to get the funds anyway and would have to follow the required mechanisms to qualify for that program. He was comfortable with the request as is.

It was clarified that the project detail was required because the request would have to go through TRANSPAC.

Mr. Hu noted that there were different options as part of value engineering which was the reason for the uncertainty given that the details were being worked out at this time. He commented that bids tended to be higher than the Engineer's Estimate, and since the economy had turned around costs had increased.

Ms. Neustadter clarified the City of Pleasant Hill's request for \$750,000 and that the TAC is supportive of moving the request to TRANSPAC at its next meeting, and that the TAC will develop a recommendation for future disbursements of Line 28a funds for TRANSPAC's consideration.

Mr. Lochirco sought the ability to use the funds as a local match for regional grants to make them more competitive regionally, part of the discussion for another day. He added that the ability to leverage would be important and it would be nice to have those resources in a situation where the remainder of funds had not been fully identified.

Ms. Neustadter recommended that with a renewal of Measure J, a Central County line item could be considered for use by jurisdictions for local share grant costs, which could serve a long-term purpose in addition to a contingency fund. She sought other thoughts on the subject and wanted the TAC to think through what a new set of projects would look like for Central County.

Mr. Lochirco noted a conversation with BART given facility improvement projects specific to Central County and the attempt to get a more regional approach to the projects, such as with the Pleasant Hill BART shortcut path between Concord and Walnut Creek, which had died for lack of maintenance monies. When starting to look at RORS, he suggested starting to look at routes of regional opportunity, not just in one jurisdiction, with jurisdictions working together on grant applications to leverage money. He suggested this might be an opportunity to do that. He referred to the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG), recognized the competitiveness, and in light of the geographic negative of Central County, wanted to better strategize to get better funding and be able to compete better.

Mr. Hu was fully supportive of a separate line item for local matches but suggested it would be equally important to have a line item for contingencies. He wanted to keep the line item but would hate to be in a situation and have a project without options to be able to proceed.

Ms. Neustadter stated that with a new measure anything could be included. She emphasized that Central County needed to address Central County issues.

#### **4. 511 Contra Costa Street Smarts Presentation Re: Project Methodologies with School Districts and City/County by Lynn Overcashier 511 Contra Costa**

Lynn Overcashier was not available. The information had been included in the TAC agenda packet.

#### **5. Briefing on 511 Contra Costa and TRANSPAC JPA Formation**

Ms. Neustadter referred to the special TRANSPAC meeting held this date when there had been agreement to proceed with a 511 Contra Costa/TRANSPAC Joint Powers Authority (JPA), and explained that while there may be some increase in costs as a result of addressing legal issues and how accounting and check writing would be done, there would be no new administrative construct. She stated that the issue had come about as a result of a CalPERS audit.

Noting that 511 Contra Costa secured grants for programs and paid for itself, Mr. Hu asked if a JPA would preclude that process, to which Ms. Neustadter explained that one of the upsides was that 511 Contra Costa could do that directly, as could TRANSPAC, in that with JPA status an agency could go after its own money. She reported that TRANSPAC had been directed to work with Mala Subramanian, the General Counsel for the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) who is also the City Attorney for the cities of Clayton and Lafayette, to assist it through the process with the idea that it would be done reasonably quickly although there were steps to follow in the establishment of a new construct. Day-to-day things would not change but how 511 Contra Costa and TRANSPAC did business would change.

Mr. Cunningham noted the need to move ahead quickly. He wanted to be ahead of the curve as much as possible in the process of the formation of a JPA.

Ms. Dutra-Roberts concurred with the need to move quickly on the JPA, primarily due to the CalPERS issue, and agreed that a JPA would be one way to resolve the situation.

Ms. Neustadter acknowledged that the process would be challenging but was a result of state actions that had determined that 511 Contra Costa employees were “erroneous employees,” and the situation should be rectified through the formation of a JPA.

## **6. Update on TAC Meetings Schedule**

Ms. Neustadter explained that January 23, 2014 and January 30, 2014 had been set aside for additional Action Plan sessions in the event additional sessions were necessary.

## **2. Preliminary Review of the Calendar Year 2012 and 2013 Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP) Biennial Compliance Checklist**

Ms. Neustadter noted that Martin Engelmann had crafted a Growth Management Program Biennial Compliance Checklist, and she asked if there were any issues with that version of the checklist that would be released to jurisdictions early in 2014.

Mr. Lochirco expressed concern with how the new checklist deviated from the previous checklist and asked if there had been substantial changes, and if so, requested that those changes be redlined.

Ms. Neustadter explained that the checklist had been working its way through the GMP Task Force and the Citizens Advisory Committee, as well as the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC). She advised that she would forward a request that Mr. Engelmann prepare a redline strikeout version of the new Compliance Checklist for TAC review at its November meeting.

## **7. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 A.M. The next meeting of the TAC is scheduled for November 21, 2013 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined.

## Planning Committee **STAFF REPORT**

**Meeting Date:** October 2, 2013

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Preliminary Review of the Calendar Year 2012 &amp; 2013 Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP) Biennial Compliance Checklist.</b>
<b>Summary of Issues</b>	The next GMP compliance reporting period will cover Calendar Years (CY) 2012 & 2013. It will be the first Checklist that pertains entirely to the Measure J GMP. The full Measure J Checklist will be released to local jurisdictions in early 2014. Staff recommends that the Planning Committee delegate the detailed discussion of the Measure J Checklist to the Growth Management Program Task Force. Concurrently, the Authority's Citizen Advisory Committee is also review the Checklist.
<b>Recommendations</b>	Review and comment on the preliminary draft Checklist, and delegate further discussion to the GMP Task Force.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	Local jurisdictions are eligible to receive 18 percent Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) Funds, subject to the Authority finding that the jurisdiction is in compliance with the GMP.
<b>Options</b>	N/A
<b>Attachments</b>	<p><b>A.</b> Draft CY 2012 &amp; 2013 Measure J GMP Compliance Checklist</p> <p><b>B.</b> GMP Task Force Roster</p>
<b>Changes from Committee</b>	

### Background

The Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP), as amended, requires that every two years each jurisdiction submit a statement of compliance with the GMP. The Authority then reviews that statement, makes a findings of compliance, and allocates



Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds to cities, towns and the County.

The Biennial Compliance Checklist provides a vehicle for measuring local jurisdictions' fulfillment of the requirements of the GMP. The last compliance review cycle covered the CY 2010 & 2011 reporting period. Jurisdictions that demonstrated compliance in CY 2010 & 2011 received FY 2011-12 LSM funds, with the second-year's funding, also known as the "off year" (in this case, FY 2012-13) allocated automatically on the one-year anniversary of the first year's allocation.

Attachment A shows the text for the Preliminary Draft of the CY 2012 & 2013 GMP Checklist. In previous review cycles, the text was exported into a web-accessible form that could be filled out by the local jurisdiction's staff. We will continue this process and strive to incorporate new technologies to make the form more accessible still, and easier to complete. For now, however, the primary focus is on the substance of the checklist questions as they pertain to the basic compliance requirements for the GME.

Staff recommends that the Authority allow for further discussion of the Checklist with the GMP Task Force and continued consultation with the Authority's Citizens Advisory Committee prior to Authority adoption of the Checklist in early 2014. The roster of GMP Task Force members is shown in Attachment B.

### **Requirements of the Measure J GMP**

Requirements are summarized as follows:

- **Adopt a Growth Management Element.** Local jurisdictions are required to have a Growth Management Elements (GME) in their General Plan that substantially complies with the Authority's Measure J Model Growth Management Element adopted in June 2007. The GME is the jurisdiction's main platform for outlining goals and policies for managing growth and requirements for achieving those goals. Jurisdictions are encouraged to supplement their GMEs with any elements outside of the Model GME that may be helpful in achieving the objectives of the Growth Management Program as well as local General Plan goals and policies. (Note: this requirement was addressed in the CY 2010 & 2011 reporting period).

- **Adopt a Development Mitigation Program.** Local jurisdictions must participate in a Development Mitigation Program which consist of two parts: a local program to mitigate development impacts on local streets, and a regional program developed by the relevant RTPC that establishes fees, exactions, assessments, or other measures to fund regional and subregional transportation projects.
- **Participate in an Ongoing Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Process.** Each jurisdiction must participate in an ongoing, multi-jurisdictional planning process through the Regional Transportation Planning Committees.
- **Address Housing Options.** Each jurisdiction must demonstrate reasonable progress in achieving the objectives in its Housing Element. The jurisdiction must complete a report that illustrates this progress in various ways. Additionally, jurisdictions must incorporate policies and standards to support transit, bicycle, and pedestrian access in new development.
- **Develop a Five-Year Capital Improvement Program.** Jurisdictions must continue to prepare five-year capital improvement programs, including approved projects and an analysis of the costs of proposed projects. The program must outline a financial plan for providing proposed improvements.
- **Adopt a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Ordinance or Resolution.** Jurisdictions must adopt an ordinance or resolution that promotes carpools, vanpools, and park and ride lots, and is substantial consistent with the Authority's Model TSM Resolution.
- **Urban Limit Line.** Jurisdictions must have a voter-approved Urban Limit Line (ULL) to be considered in compliance with the Measure J Growth Management Program. The Urban Limit Line may conform to the countywide line, or a jurisdiction may adopt its own Local Voter-Approved Urban Limit Line to fulfill this requirement.

### **Next steps**

Following further review and discussion by the GMP Task Force and the CAC, staff will bring the checklist back to the Authority in early 2014 for approval to distribute to local jurisdictions. Local jurisdictions may submit their completed Checklists as early as April

1, 2014, for allocation of FY 2013-14 funds on July 1, 2014. The Checklist will be due no later than June 30, 2015. Payment of the “off-year” FY 2014-15 LSM funds occurs automatically on the anniversary of the first year’s payment.

Reporting Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_

For Fiscal Years 2013-14 and 2014-15

Reporting Period: Calendar Years 2012 &amp; 2013

**Measure J Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist**

<b>1. Action Plans</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
a. Is the jurisdiction implementing the actions called for in the applicable Action Plan for all designated Routes of Regional Significance within the jurisdiction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Has the jurisdiction implemented the following procedures as outlined in the <i>Implementation Guide</i> and the applicable Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance?			
i. Circulation of environmental documents,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Analysis of the impacts of proposed General Plan amendments and recommendation of changes to Action Plans, and	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Conditioning the approval of projects consistent with Action Plan policies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Has the jurisdiction followed the procedures for RTPC review of General Plan Amendments as called for in the <i>Implementation Guide</i> ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2. Transportation Mitigation Program</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	
a. Has the jurisdiction adopted and implemented a local development mitigation program to ensure that new development pays its fair share of the impact mitigation costs associated with that development?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Has the jurisdiction adopted and implemented the regional transportation mitigation program, developed and adopted by the applicable Regional Transportation Planning Committee, including any regional traffic mitigation fees, assessments, or other mitigation as appropriate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

## Compliance Checklist - DRAFT

Reporting Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_

For Fiscal Years 2013-14 and 2014-15

Reporting Period: Calendar Years 2012 & 2013

<b>3. Housing Options and Job Opportunities</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
a. Has the jurisdiction prepared and submitted a report to the Authority demonstrating reasonable progress in providing housing opportunities for all income levels under its Housing Element? The report can demonstrate progress by  (1) comparing the number of housing units approved, constructed or occupied within the jurisdiction over the preceding five years with the number of units needed on average each year to meet the housing objectives established in its Housing Element; or  (2) illustrating how the jurisdiction has adequately planned to meet the existing and projected housing needs through the adoption of land use plans and regulatory systems which provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development; or  (3) illustrating how its General Plan and zoning regulations facilitate improvement or development of sufficient housing to meet the Element's objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the jurisdiction's General Plan—or other adopted policy document or report—consider the impacts that its land use and development policies have on the local, regional and countywide transportation system, including the level of transportation capacity that can reasonably be provided?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Has the jurisdiction incorporated policies and standards into its development approval process that support transit, bicycle and pedestrian access in new developments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Compliance Checklist - DRAFT

Reporting Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_

For Fiscal Years 2013-14 and 2014-15

Reporting Period: Calendar Years 2012 & 2013

4. Traffic Impact Studies	YES	NO	N/A
a. Using the Authority's <i>Technical Procedures</i> , have traffic impact studies been conducted as part of development review for all projects estimated to generate more than 100 net new peak-hour vehicle trips? (Note: Lower traffic generation thresholds established through the RTPC's Action Plan may apply).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. If the answer to 4.a. above is "yes", did the local jurisdiction notify affected parties and circulate the traffic impact study during the environmental review process?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

  

5. Participation in Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning	YES	NO
a. During the reporting period, has the jurisdiction's Council/Board representative regularly participated in meetings of the appropriate Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC), and have the jurisdiction's local representatives to the RTPC regularly reported on the activities of the Regional Committee to the jurisdiction's council or board? (Note: Each RTPC should have a policy that defines what constitutes regular attendance of Council/Board members at RTPC meetings.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Has the local jurisdiction worked with the RTPC to develop and implement the Action Plans, including identification of Routes of Regional Significance, establishing Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) for those routes, and defining actions for achieving the MTSOs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Has the local jurisdiction applied the Authority's travel demand model and <i>Technical Procedures</i> to the analysis of General Plan Amendments (GPAs) and developments exceeding specified thresholds for their effect on the regional transportation system, including on Action Plan MTSOs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Compliance Checklist - DRAFT

Reporting Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_

For Fiscal Years 2013-14 and 2014-15

Reporting Period: Calendar Years 2012 & 2013

	YES	NO
d. As needed, has the jurisdiction made available, as input into the countywide transportation computer model, data on proposed improvements to the jurisdiction's transportation system, including roadways, pedestrian circulation, bikeways and trails, planned and improved development within the jurisdiction, and traffic patterns?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>6. Five-Year Capital Improvement Program</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
Does the jurisdiction have an adopted five-year capital improvement program (CIP) that includes approved projects and an analysis of project costs as well as a financial plan for providing the improvements? (The transportation component of the plan must be forwarded to the Authority for incorporation into the Authority's database of transportation projects)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>7. Transportation Systems Management Program</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
Has the jurisdiction adopted a transportation systems management ordinance or resolution that incorporates required policies consistent with the updated model ordinance prepared by the Authority for use by local agencies or qualified for adoption of alternative mitigation measures because it has a small employment base?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>8. Maintenance of Effort (MoE)</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
Has the jurisdiction met the MoE requirements of Measure J as stated in Section 6 of the Contra Costa Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Ordinance (as amended)? (See the Checklist Instructions for a listing of MoE requirements by local jurisdiction.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Compliance Checklist - DRAFT

Reporting Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_

For Fiscal Years 2013-14 and 2014-15

Reporting Period: Calendar Years 2012 & 2013

<b>9. Posting of Signs</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Has the jurisdiction posted signs meeting Authority specifications for all projects exceeding \$250,000 that are funded, in whole or in part, with Measure C or Measure J funds?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>10. Adoption of the Measure J Growth Management Element</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Has the local jurisdiction adopted a final GME for its General Plan that substantially complies with the intent of the Authority's adopted Measure J Model GME?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>11. Adoption of a voter-approved Urban Limit Line</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
a. Has the local jurisdiction adopted and continually complied with an applicable voter-approved Urban Limit Line as outlined in the Authority's annual ULL Policy Advisory Letter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. If the jurisdiction has modified its voter-approved ULL or approved a major subdivision or General Plan Amendment outside the ULL, has the jurisdiction made a finding of consistency with the Measure J provisions on ULLs and criteria in the ULL Policy Advisory Letter after holding a noticed public hearing and making the proposed finding publically available?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>12. Other Considerations</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>
If the jurisdiction believes that the requirements of Measure J have been satisfied in a way not indicated on this checklist, has an explanation been attached below?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



## Compliance Checklist - DRAFT

Reporting Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_

For Fiscal Years 2013-14 and 2014-15

Reporting Period: Calendar Years 2012 & 2013

### 13. Review and Approval of Checklist

---

This checklist was prepared by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name & Title (print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Phone

\_\_\_\_\_  
Email

The council/board of \_\_\_\_\_ has reviewed the completed checklist and found that the policies and programs of the jurisdiction as reported herein conform to the requirements for compliance with the Contra Costa Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Program.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Certified Signature (Mayor or Chair)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name & Title (print)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Attest Signature (City/Town/County Clerk)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name (print)

## Compliance Checklist Attachments

Reporting Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_

For Fiscal Years 2013-14 and 2014-15

Reporting Period: Calendar Years 2012 & 2013

### Supplementary Information (Required)

#### 1. Action Plans

- a. *Please summarize steps taken during the reporting period to implement the actions, programs, and measures called for in the applicable Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance:*
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- b. *Attach, list and briefly describe any General Plan Amendments that were approved during the reporting period. Please specify which amendments affected ability to meet the standards in the Growth Management Element and/or affected ability to implement Action Plan policies or meet Traffic Service Objectives. Indicate if amendments were forwarded to the jurisdiction's RTPC for review, and describe the results of that review relative to Action Plan implementation:*

*Provide a summary list of projects approved during the reporting period and the conditions required for consistency with the Action Plan:*

#### 2. Transportation Mitigation Program

- a. *Describe progress on implementation of the regional transportation mitigation program:*

#### 3. Housing Options and Job Opportunities

- a. *Please attach a report demonstrating reasonable progress in providing housing opportunities for all income levels.*

## Compliance Checklist Attachments

Reporting Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_

For Fiscal Years 2013-14 and 2014-15

Reporting Period: Calendar Years 2012 & 2013

- c. *Please attach the jurisdiction's adopted policies and standards that ensure consideration of and support for walking, bicycling, and transit access during the review of proposed development.*

### **4. Traffic Impact Studies**

*Please list all traffic impact studies that have been conducted as part of the development review of any project that generated more than 100 net new peak hour vehicle trips. (Note: Lower traffic generation thresholds established through the RTPC's Action Plan may apply). Note whether the study was consistent with the Authority's Technical Procedures and whether notification and circulation was undertaken during the environmental review process.*

### **5. Participation in Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning**

*No attachments necessary.*

### **6. Five-Year Capital Improvement Program**

*Please attach the transportation component of the most recent CIP version, if the Authority does not already have it. Otherwise, list the resolution number and date of adoption of the most recent five-year CIP.*

### **7. Transportation Systems Management Program**

*Please attach a copy of the jurisdiction's TSM ordinance, or list the date of ordinance or resolution adoption and its number.*

## Compliance Checklist Attachments

Reporting Jurisdiction: \_\_\_\_\_

For Fiscal Years 2013-14 and 2014-15

Reporting Period: Calendar Years 2012 & 2013

### **8. Maintenance of Effort (MoE)**

*Please indicate the jurisdiction's MoE requirement and MoE expenditures for the past two fiscal years (FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11). See the Instructions to identify the MoE requirements.*

### **9. Posting of Signs**

*Provide a list of all projects exceeding \$250,000 within the jurisdiction, noting which ones are or were signed according to Authority specifications.*

### **10. Adoption of the Measure J Growth Management Element**

*Please attach the adopted Final Measure J Growth Management Element to the local jurisdiction's General Plan.*

### **11. Adoption of a voter-approved Urban Limit Line**

*The local jurisdiction's adopted ULL is on file at the Authority offices. Please specify any actions that were taken during the reporting period with regard to changes or modifications to the voter-approved ULL, which should include a resolution making a finding of consistency with Measure J and a copy of the related public hearing notice.*

### **12. Other Considerations**

*Please specify any alternative methods of achieving compliance for any components for the Measure J Growth Management Program*

## Attachment B

GMP Task Force  
CONTACT LIST

<b>JURISDICTION/ ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>FIRST NAME</b>	<b>LAST NAME</b>	<b>TITLE</b>
County	Steve	Goetz	Deputy Dir. Transportation Planning
City of Walnut Creek	Andrew	Smith	Senior Planner
City of Hercules	Robert	Reber	Planning Director
TRANSPAC	Barbara	Neustadter	RTPC Manager
County	John	Cunningham	Sr. Transportation Planner
SWAT/Danville	Tai	Williams	Transportation Services Director
City of Concord	Ray	Kuzbari	Transportation Manager
WCCTAC	Jerry	Bradshaw	Executive Director
Lafayette	Leah	Greenblat	Transportation Planner
Antioch	Tina	Wehrmeister	Community Development Director
Brentwood	Steve	Kersevan	Traffic Engineer
County	Jamar	Stamps	Planner
Pittsburg	Leigha	Schmidt	Planner
El Cerrito	Noel	Ibalio	Sr. Planner
Clayton	Charlie	Mullen	Community Development Director



## MEMORANDUM

TO: TRANSPAC TAC  
FROM: LYNN OVERCASHIER, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager  
DATE: November 7, 2013  
RE: Recommended edits to the Calendar year 2012 & 2013 Measure J  
Growth Management biennial Compliance Checklist

---

At the October 16, 2013 Contra Costa Transportation Authority meeting, the preliminary draft of the Calendar year 2012 & 2013 Measure J Growth Management biennial Compliance Checklist was released for review. The two sections of the checklist that reference the Transportation Systems Management Ordinance have not been updated since the 2004 passage of Measure J. Below are suggested updates to these sections for TAC and TRANSPAC approval.

Page 2.3.10-3 of the CCTA October 16 packet includes the current language:  
Adopt a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Ordinance or Resolution.  
Jurisdictions must adopt an ordinance or resolution that promotes carpools, vanpools, and park and ride lots, and is substantially consistent with the Authority's Model TSM Ordinance or Resolution.

Recommended changes include:  
Adopt a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance or Resolution.  
Jurisdictions must adopt an ordinance or resolution that promotes alternative transportation modes to the single-occupant vehicle, and is substantially consistent with the Authority's Model TDM Ordinance or Resolution.

Page 10-8 of the Compliance Checklist currently reads:  
7. Transportation Systems Management Program  
Has the jurisdiction adopted a transportation systems management ordinance or resolution that incorporates required policies consistent with the updated model ordinance prepared by the Authority for use by local agencies or qualified for adoption of alternative mitigation measures because it has a small employment base?

Recommended changes include:  
7. Transportation Demand Management Program  
Has the jurisdiction adopted a Transportation Demand Management Ordinance or Resolution that incorporates required policies consistent with the updated model ordinance/resolution prepared by the Authority for use by local agencies?



**APPENDIX G****DRAFT MODEL TRANSPORTATION  
DEMAND MANAGEMENT  
ORDINANCE/RESOLUTION****OVERVIEW**

The model Transportation Demand Management (TDM) ordinance/resolution (formerly called the Model Transportation Systems Management Ordinance/resolution) contained in this appendix was adopted by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) in 2013 to provide local jurisdictions with an example of how both the Authority's policy requirements for TDM and recent changes in State and Regional legislation could be incorporated into an updated local ordinance. Transportation projects and programs must now also reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (SB 375). The original CCTA model TSM Ordinance was approved in 1995 and revised in 1997 to reflect legislative requirements at the time. All Contra Costa jurisdictions' TDM Ordinances/Resolutions were approved and revised subsequently.

Each jurisdiction must have an updated and approved TDM Ordinance or Resolution in order to comply with the CCTA Growth Management Program (GMP) requirements and Conditions of Compliance Checklist submittals. Jurisdictions must complete, and each Council or Board must approve the CCTA

Growth Management Program's biennial Conditions of Compliance Checklist. Upon submittal and CCTA approval of the Compliance Checklist, a jurisdiction is eligible to receive its share of Local Street and Road Maintenance (LSM) funds. The LSM funding for each jurisdiction is based upon its percentage of the County's total population and total road miles.

The TDM Ordinance/Resolution is one section of CCTA's GMP Conditions of Compliance Checklist and is intended to provide actions to reduce vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled and with more recent legislative requirements, GHG emissions. <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Legislative requirements include Measure J Growth Management Program TDM requirements which include an adopted TDM Ordinance/Resolution with biennial Conditions of Compliance Checklist; RTPC Action Plans; the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) elements including the Sustainability Action Plan; SB 1339 (Employer pre-tax benefit requirements); Congestion Management Program (CMP); AB 32 and SB 375; the CA Clean Air Act, etc.).



**REVISED MODEL TDM ORDINANCE/RESOLUTION**

for the Measure J Growth Management Program

[CITY/TOWN/COUNTY OF \_\_\_\_\_]

ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_ AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_\_, AS  
AMENDED BY ORDINANCE NO. \_\_\_\_, REQUIRING TRANSPORTATION  
DEMAND MANAGEMENT

AN ORDINANCE/RESOLUTION TO UPDATE TRANSPORTATION DEMAND  
MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO THE ADOPTION OF  
NEW POLICIES, PURPOSES, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE  
CITY/COUNTY TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to the requirements of Contra Costa Measure C on the  
1988 General Ballot, each jurisdiction within Contra Costa County was required,  
as a condition of receiving Measure C Local Street Maintenance and  
Improvement funds from the one half cent sales tax imposed by Measure C, to  
adopt a Transportation Systems Management (“TSM”) Ordinance or other  
mitigations to promote carpools, vanpools, and park and ride lots; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to the Measure C Ordinance, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (the “Authority”) drafted and adopted a model TSM Ordinance for use by local jurisdictions in developing local ordinances for adoption and implementation; and

**WHEREAS**, the model TSM Ordinance drafted by the Authority was adopted [with amendments] by (City/Town/County of \_\_\_\_\_) as Ordinance No. \_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_, 1995\_ (the “TSM Ordinance”); and

**WHEREAS** due to federal, state and local legislative requirements, the Authority’s revised model TSM ordinance was [modified and] adopted [with amendments] by (City/Town/County of \_\_\_\_\_) as Ordinance No. \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_, 1997\_; and

**WHEREAS**, since the 2004 Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP) allows for either a TDM Ordinance or Resolution (formerly known as a TSM Ordinance or Resolution) and, that the GMP allows cities with a small employment base to adopt alternative mitigation measures in lieu of a TDM Ordinance or Resolution;

**WHEREAS**, the City/County’s TDM program implementation requirements within the Measure J Growth Management Program Conditions of Compliance checklist are primarily developed and administered through the Contra Costa Transportation Authority’s RTPC TDM Programs; and

**WHEREAS**, all jurisdictions in California are now required to develop measures to achieve a reduction in VMT and GHG emissions through legislation under AB 32 and SB 375; and

**WHEREAS**, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions reductions can be achieved and quantified on behalf of all Contra Costa jurisdictions through each Regional Transportation Planning Committee’s (RTPC’s) TDM Program 2; and

---

<sup>2</sup> Using the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) adopted methodology, the program has achieved cost effectiveness ratings by the BAAQMD since the program’s inception in 1992.

**WHEREAS**, much traffic congestion and mobile source greenhouse gas emissions are generated from commute and school-based trips; and

**WHEREAS**, the RTPC TDM Programs support the City/County's efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled and GHG emissions by way of programs which support Sustainable Action Plans, the CCTA Countywide Transportation Plan's Sustainable Action Plan, subregional RTPC Action Plans and other State and Regional requirements.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED AS FOLLOWS:**

**SECTION 1. Findings.**

- A. Transportation Demand Management has the potential to reduce vehicle trips and vehicle emissions very cost-effectively without major roadway improvements and to maximize the efficiency of the roadway system;
- B. For many years prior to the passage of Measure C in 1988, local jurisdictions developed and implemented a variety of TDM projects and programs and integrated TDM elements into land use policy;
- C. Since 1992, CCTA has allocated Measure C, Measure J funds and Transportation Fund for Clean Air ("TFCA") funds to four RTPC TDM programs for the implementation of Measure C, Measure J and Clean Air Plan goals;
- D. Since 2004 the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has delegated responsibilities to the RTPC TDM Programs to implement employer-based trip reduction programs;
- E. In 2004, Contra Costa voters reauthorized the half-cent transportation sales tax with the passage of Measure J with Line 17 Commute Alternatives in the Countywide Expenditure Plan, which continues RTPC TDM Program implementation of Commute Alternative programs on behalf of Contra Costa jurisdictions which reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions;

- F. The Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan incorporates each Regional Committee's Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance, which support specific TDM goals, objectives and actions;
- G. Over the past twenty years, the RTPC TDM programs have been successful in reducing vehicle trips and emissions at the employment sites specified in the TDM Ordinance, as well as in schools and through community outreach where programs have been implemented;
- H. Since the adoption of the TDM Ordinance, TDM efforts have been expanded to include all aspects of the transportation system including: employer-based commute programs, trip reduction incentive programs, encouragement of transit ridership, enhancement of bicycle infrastructure, incorporation of new technologies into the system, promotion of clean fuel vehicle utilization, school-based trip reduction, community outreach, and the integration of TDM elements into land use policy and related enhancements;
- I. In adopting this Ordinance/Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_, cooperation and coordination with local jurisdictions and RTPC TDM programs are acknowledged as having the potential to enhance the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of these efforts; accordingly the Board/Council directs the RTPC TDM to take steps to implement TDM in accordance with the policies, goals and objectives set forth herein.

## **Section 2. Repeal of TSM Ordinance/Resolution.**

The TSM Ordinance/Resolution (No. \_\_\_\_\_) is hereby repealed.

## **Section 3. Adoption of a new TDM Ordinance/Resolution.**

**Section 3\_ is added to read in full as follows:**

### **Goals and Objectives**

The goal of the TDM Ordinance/Resolution as amended is to ensure the continuation of a proactive TDM program effort aimed at reducing vehicle trips, vehicle miles, vehicle emissions and traffic congestion in the most efficient and cost effective manner.

The objective of this section is to establish the following policies:

To participate, in conjunction with local jurisdictions and its RTPC, through the local RTPC TDM Program, in a proactive effort to support and develop projects and programs which will support Measure J TDM goals as described in the RTPC Action Plan, the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan, the Measure J Strategic Plan, the Congestion Management Plan, Sustainable Community Strategies, Sustainable Action Plans, and/or the Bay Area Clean Air Plan.

The following purposes, goals and objectives are adopted in order to assist the City/County and its designee to continue implementation of the TDM Ordinance/Resolution and programs:

- A. To incorporate TDM elements into local Sustainability Action Plans, the Countywide Transportation Plan's Sustainability Action Plan, Sustainable Community Strategies (AB 32 and SB 375), RTPC Action Plans, and other trip reduction/emissions reduction efforts,
- B. To promote maximum efficiency in the existing transportation system and to further the transportation trip reduction and emission reduction goals of the aforementioned state, regional and subregional plans;
  - (a) Promoting and encouraging the use of transit, ridesharing, bicycling, walking, flexible work hours, telecommuting and other options as alternatives to solo driving to reduce VMT and GHG emissions;
  - (b) Incorporating TDM elements into the land use review and planning process;
  - (c) Developing proactive programs and/or projects either alone or in conjunction with other jurisdictions, transit operators, the private sector, or with the local jurisdiction's regional transportation planning committee, aimed at achieving these goals;
  - (d) Considering the incorporation of appropriate technology designed to reduce emissions, promote trip generation alternatives, and related technology into the transportation system;

- (f) Encouraging and supporting zero-emission technology use and availability to the public;
- C. To reflect an ongoing commitment to expand TDM activities in order to achieve traffic congestion management and air quality goals.
- D. To comply with applicable regional, state and federal laws as well as with Measure J Growth Management Program requirements pertaining to TDM.
  - (a) Developing, implementing and monitoring an employer-based trip reduction program which will:
    - (i) Ensure compliance with legislation and assist employers by providing commute information and commute benefit assistance for employees (e.g. pre-tax benefits, parking cash-out and other programs);
    - (ii) Provide survey distribution and analysis of employment sites and report on trip reduction and emission reduction outcomes and strategies;
    - (iii) Provide commute alternative assistance, worksite relocation commute services, and trip reduction incentive programs to employers;
    - (iv) Encourage employers to promote local and regional events/campaigns to increase trip reduction and GHG emission reductions;
  - (b) Providing implementation measures and support through the TDM programs which enhance options to the single occupant vehicle to the community at- large and through school or student-based programs;
  - (c) Providing trip reduction and emissions reduction data to the City/County for inclusion in Sustainable Action Plans, RTPC Action Plans, and the TDM section of the GMP Conditions of Compliance Checklists, to assist in meeting trip reduction and GHG reduction goals and objectives.
- E. To incorporate these TDM elements into the City/County land use review and planning process.

THIS ORDINANCE/RESOLUTION SHALL BE ADOPTED BY APPROVAL OF [A MAJORITY OF THE MEMBERS OF] THE BOARD/COUNCIL AT A DULY AND LAWFULLY NOTICED MEETING OF SUCH BODY AND SHALL BECOME EFFECTIVE IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS OF LAW AS TO ITS ENACTMENT.