

# **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, MAY 22, 2014**

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

**in the COMMUNITY ROOM at CITY OF PLEASANT HILL CITY HALL  
100 GREGORY LANE  
PLEASANT HILL**

**1. Review/Revise Accept/Minutes of the April 24, 2014 TAC Meeting**

**ACTION: Accept April 24, 2014 TAC minutes and/or as revised/determined.**

**Attachment:** TAC Minutes from April 24, 2014 meeting

**2. A Proposal to Distribute Central County Measure J Line 28a Funds Presented by Ray Kuzbari**

**ACTION: As determined.**

**Attachments:** Description of a proposal and proposed distribution of Measure J Program (28a) funds to TRANSPAC jurisdictions.

**3. CCTA is in the Process of Authorizing the Release of “Call for Projects” for the Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning Grant Program.** As part of its Resolution 4035, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) allocated \$2.745 million to the Authority to help local jurisdictions in their planning and implementation of PDAs. This PDA Planning Grant Program must be consistent with the County’s adopted PDA Investment & Growth Strategy. Authority staff has prepared a “Call for Projects” for the PDA Planning Grant Program for release. Following the release, a subcommittee to the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) will evaluate the grant applications received. The subcommittee is comprised of local staff representatives from the four subareas of Contra Costa. Staff seeks Authority approval to release the “Call for Projects” for the PDA Planning Grant Program. The CCTA Planning Committee approved the release of a “Call for Projects” for the Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning Grant Program. The full CCTA Board is expected to approve this action on May 21, 2014.

**ACTION: As determined.**

**Electronic Attachment:** Planning Committee Staff Report dated May 7, 2014 regarding Authorizing Release of “Call for Projects” for the Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning Grant Program.

4. **FYI - CCTA Staff has made changes to the 2014 Countywide Transportation Plan Goals and Strategies.** The changes may be viewed on the electronic attachment from Item 2 on the CCTA May 7, 2014 Planning Committee Agenda.

**ACTION: As determined.**

**Electronic Attachment:** Revised Strategies for the 2014 CTP Update.

5. **FYI – CCTA is in the process of releasing a Request for Proposals (RFP) to Update the Contra Costa Express Bus Study.** The Contra Costa Express Bus Study Update Scope of Work, Item 1 on the CCTA May 7, 2014 Planning Committee Agenda, is attached as information.

**ACTION: As determined.**

**Electronic Attachment:** Scope of Work and Request for Proposals to Update the Contra Costa Express Bus Study.

6. The next TAC meeting is scheduled for June 26, 2014 at 9:00 A.M. in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room unless otherwise determined.

TAC 5 22 2014

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

**MEETING DATE:** April 24, 2014

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Corinne Dutra-Roberts, 511 Contra Costa; Deidre Heitman, BART; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; John McKenzie, Caltrans; Robert Sarmiento, Contra Costa County; and Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager

**GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill; Michael Eiseman, Senior Planner, Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates; Matthew Kelly, Associate Transportation Planner, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA); Chris Lau, Senior Civil Transportation Engineer, Contra Costa County; Angela Viller, Transportation Department, Contra Costa County; and Duncan Watry, Principal Planner, BART

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

The meeting was convened at 10:30 A.M. Self introductions followed.

### **1. Review/Revise/Accept Minutes of the March 27, 2014 TAC Meeting**

The minutes were presented in the TAC agenda packet. There were no comments.

The next item was taken out of agenda order.

### **4. Update on the Kirker Pass Truck Climbing Lanes Project by Chris Lau, Senior Civil Engineer, Contra Costa County**

Chris Lau, Senior Civil Engineer, Contra Costa County, presented an update to the Kirker Pass Truck Climbing Lanes Project, specifically in the northbound direction connecting Central County with East County, a main commute route as well as a truck route carrying 18,000 vehicles per day and 1,200 trucks per day, through hilly area and steep grades that made it difficult for trucks to climb the hills. He noted that the project had been identified for a good number of years and that both northbound and southbound lanes had been considered, although the cost of the project had been broken up into two phases with a concentration on northbound lanes first because that direction was relatively cheaper. The County had applied for a State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) grant, had been successful, and had forged ahead to get the project out. The goal was to improve safety along Kirker Pass Road and reduce congestion due to slow traveling trucks. The project was one mile in length beginning on the south, or west side, near the Concord Pavilion heading in the northbound direction, over the crest, and ending approximately at the northerly Hess Road intersection.

The project would widen the lane to a 12-foot truck climbing lane and an eight-foot shoulder that would complete a segment of a future Class II bike lane, the widening required a significant amount of retaining walls given the steep terrain, and required coordination with various property owners. Pavement widening, grading, storm drain, stormwater treatment, and utility funding would be facilitated with \$6 million from Measure J and \$2.6 million in STIP funds, with \$4.3 million unfunded requiring whatever funding was necessary to complete the project. Any other funding sources that became available would augment the total required.

Mr. Lau reported that the County was currently completing environmental studies and design with the studies expected to be completed in 2015, and with the design to be completed and right of way acquired in 2016. STIP funds would become available in 2018/19 with the hope to advance construction in 2017. He reported that the project was within the City of Concord and the County would coordinate with Concord, with the Sleep Train Pavilion, with the Contra Costa Water District (CCWD), and with various other property owners.

Jeremy Lochirco referred to the bike lane and asked if there would be enough room to create a bumper bike lane given that speeds in the section were fast and an extra barrier was desired.

Mr. Lau noted that the proposed eight-foot shoulder would provide an area for breakdowns. Anything larger than eight feet would be more costly.

Ray Kuzbari clarified that the shoulder was eight feet and that potentially a buffer for bikes could be installed.

John McKenzie noted that unless cyclists were in the truck driver's line of sight they would be invisible unless in or viewable through the mirror. He commented that as a cyclist it was no fun being next to a big truck even if there was room.

Ms. Neustadter referenced a theoretical possibility that there would be another ballot box and the project could be proposed and enhanced, if possible. She stated that the project would be tracked over time. In addition, Chris Lau was scheduled to make a presentation to TRANSPAC on May 8, 2014, and any questions should be brought to that meeting.

**2. Presentation by BART staff and its consultants on the analysis of access projects along BART's C-line.** At BART Boardmember Gail Murray's request, BART conducted an analysis of possible access improvements along the Concord line and focused on stations from Orinda to Concord. At its March meeting, the TRANSPAC TAC indicated its interest in a briefing on the results of this analysis.

Deidre Heitman introduced Duncan Watry from BART and Michael Eiseman of Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates to identify the results of the study and to identify next steps.

Duncan Watry, Principal Planner, BART, stated the BART Board had instituted market-based pricing for all BART parking in the system with the pricing to be used for various BART upgrade and access projects.

Mr. Watry explained that at the time of Board approval, staff had taken a look at the kinds of access projects BART could participate in with the idea that as parking prices got higher and as lots filled earlier and earlier there should be additional ways for people to get to BART, which was the initial impetus for the study. The initial interest came from Boardmember Gail Murray with the idea that BART had never done that kind of an access study looking broadly at an area, looking at a group of stations, what kinds of projects to invest in, and take the model to other stations. He explained that it would be a pilot study to inform future studies throughout the system. One of the things the Board was interested in different from what BART had done in the past was looking at assisting transit operations, which BART had typically not done on a route-to-route or service basis. Orinda, Lafayette, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek, and Concord stations had been evaluated as part of the study where 40 percent of the revenues were derived with one transit operator serving all of the stations considered.

Mr. Watry described the original fieldwork at some of the stations, reported that BART staff had met with the cities, the County, the CCTA, and the CCCTA, and had also met with Bishop Ranch since it was one of the employers affecting transportation in Central County. From the discussions with the various stakeholders and some of the work, a list of the challenges of getting people to come to BART by a non-single occupant auto had been compiled in an attempt to figure out a way to address the issues along with other things such as information systems, transit frequency, and capital projects. He explained that fare penalty, the penalty a rider experienced in transferring from any bus operator to BART requiring two fares, was seen as a deterrent to taking transit to BART.

Mr. Watry listed the strategies developed in order to address some of the challenges. On the transit side there was a desire to look at service enhancement and things related to fare policy/discounts, capital projects, and intermodal transfer center improvements, along with bike and pedestrian issues, infrastructure projects, wayfinding, and secure bicycle parking to allow bikes on BART at all hours.

Michael Eiseman, Senior Planner, Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates, spoke to the process the firm had pursued to assist in the development of strategies and priorities. He referred to the County Connection (CCCTA) bus system, where the frequency and boardings were occurring, and stated for the study they had looked at all modes, and on feeder transit access saw how it could be enhanced. From the work done on the study and from previous work in Contra Costa County, it was their impression that the coverage that CCCTA provided was good in that there were routes serving most of the corridors feasible to serve with transit. What was not good and what was constrained by CCCTA resources was the frequency. He stated that most routes served a BART station at some point and a large percentage of the boardings were either transferring to and from BART or transferring to and from CCCTA routes. He identified the high frequency areas and the areas considered to be reasonable feeder transit access to BART with frequency more than 15 minutes during peak periods showing where the most transfers were occurring; in Walnut Creek where 17 routes came together, and some in Pleasant Hill and Concord which also had high transit ridership.

In terms of trying to assess the best potential for BART investment in transit service on the number side, Mr. Eiseman reported that they had looked at how the frequency lined up with density of jobs and housing, and the network that CCCTA provided allocated resources fairly efficiently although their resources were limited.

From BART's perspective where those who drove to BART lived, it was found that there was a high concentration of those folks along Clayton Road where close to 600 people a day drove to BART who could conceivably be served by transit alone. Shadelands in Walnut Creek was also an area where BART could invest in transit service.

Mr. Eiseman explained, when asked by Ms. Neustadter about transit service provided by BART, that they wanted to stay neutral as to the vehicle to be used and who would provide the service, and had considered different options where BART could provide its own shuttle service. Another option was whether BART could partner with CCCTA service along the route with CCCTA to increase service, and had proposed bus service in all the corridors as opposed to considering additional rail.

Ms. Neustadter noted that BART shuttle service had been very popular. She suggested that the size of the vehicle was an issue.

Mr. Watry stated that some BART staff was leaning toward a model to work with CCCTA and enhance CCCTA services in order to get an economy of scale in that there was already a layer of service being provided. If upping the frequency of a single service, more options would be provided. He commented that he had been viewing the proposal as an augmentation of CCCTA service.

Mr. Eiseman explained that the quality and amenities of the vehicle were also issues to consider and suggested that a partnership with CCCTA could still be considered.

Mr. Watry referred to potential Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) with BART to Diablo Valley College (DVC), with a co-branded bus and potentially some additional amenities; wi-fi or other on-board amenities.

Mr. Eiseman referred to the handout identified as a Prioritization Matrix, a list of potential projects including bike and ped access, parking management, fares, and the like, and explained that the items on the list had been derived from the stakeholders (cities and county) categorized on the best return on investment for BART in terms of bringing in new passengers, improving the passenger experience, and practical consideration in terms of when the projects could be implemented; a combination of return on investment, timelines, and practicalities, categorized in high, medium, and low priority order in short-term, medium-term, or long-term investment from BART's perspective.

John McKenzie asked if there was any consideration of using state and county Park and Ride lots given that at one point in time there had been CCCTA service from the Park and Ride lot on I-680, and since its closure people were driving to BART.

In response, Mr. Eiseman explained that upping Park and Ride lots and driving to Park and Ride lots had been discussed but none had made the cut.

Mr. McKenzie suggested if there was an incentive for Caltrans to improve Park and Ride lots to get more people to use them that should be considered in that bike racks or other amenities could be considered to encourage people to use the Park and Ride lots.

Mr. Eiseman advised that there were references to enhance Park and Ride lots and enhance Moraga Road transit, potentially using some of the church parking lots up and down Moraga Road as Park and Ride lots to and from Orinda BART

Focusing on the items in the short-term and high priority category, Mr. Eiseman stated that there were four particularly high priority transit services that would meet the standard of return on investment that BART could invest in. He referred specifically to *Enhance Clayton Transit (Route 10)*, and *Enhance DVC Transit (Route 20)*, and suggested that they could be considered individually and increase the frequency on those routes using funds partly provided by BART to better serve the area, or combine the routes and brand them as a single route and consider them as a quasi-bus route, which was a high priority set of projects that in combination or separately could consider a fare structure in connection with DVC. He stated that BART could enter the conversation and make resources available. In terms of capital investment, he suggested that County Connection real time arrival information at County BART stations would be beneficial.

Ms. Heitman noted that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) had a 511 information feed and the proposal was that all the bus operators would install the real time systems. She explained that had been put on the list as a high priority and since that time had been funded.

Mr. Eiseman added that a related item was if that was implemented and worked well they could add arrival and other information at BART stations.

In response to Mr. Lochirco as to some of the enhancements specifically targeting Walnut Creek, Mr. Eiseman referred to an adapted service plan and in some cases medium short-term and medium long-term plans. The Board had approved an increase in frequency during peak times so the service is there but it's not a free service, similarly the Creekside service, a reroute of Route 5, had also been approved and there would be additional frequency there.

Mr. Lochirco explained that the Walnut Creek City Council had just approved negotiations with CCCTA to make Route 5 a free service as a two-year pilot program, and would be operating Route 4 as a free service as well. In terms of Route 4 enhanced service, he asked if morning and afternoon frequency would be provided at a higher level, and he noted that Walnut Creek was supportive of enhanced service but the agreement to maintain those service levels were with CCCTA and the City of Walnut Creek. He asked if the recommendation was to work with the local jurisdiction and CCCTA to broaden that service to identify any gaps. He asked if it still needed to be on the list or if the idea was that BART would partially help Walnut Creek or other jurisdictions beyond what was currently being provided.

Mr. Eiseman commented that Walnut Creek was ahead of them in some things and in talking about the issue several months ago the question was whether additional frequency would be sufficient to meet the demand. For all of them on the operating side, the suggestion was not that BART would start running its own service but that BART would partner with those currently doing the service or investing monies to assist.

Mr. Lochirco referred to Bike Share and asked if a more coordinated program for a potential investment at the Central County BART stations was being considered. He stated that Walnut Creek had an interest from the community in terms of Bike Share and asked whether long term that could be included as an idea.

Mr. Watry stated that the report had been prepared prior to the announcement of the East Bay pilot and there was a question of moving into less dense areas to have a certain number of use to make do, something that BART was very interested in to participate fully in Bike Share. He added that while they were done with the report it was an idea that BART was open to consider.

Matt Kelly reported that Dave Hudson of TVTC was fighting for Bay Area Bike Share to come to the I-680 corridor in Contra Costa County.

Mr. Lochirco emphasized that the establishment of pods throughout any city in Contra Costa County would need assistance from BART.

Mr. Eiseman referenced the need to come up with some good projects, and stated the larger issue was to set the policy framework where BART could invest.

Ms. Neustadter commented that BART had previously conducted partnerships with others over time.

Ms. Dutra-Roberts reported that the Mobile Source Committee at BAAQMD was voting to make Bike Share part of the regional fund categories.

Mr. Eiseman referred to the high priority medium-term recommendations, real-time arrival at CCCTA stops, and additional connectivity, and noted that there were procedural challenges and a few other things that required some policy working out of BART, such as whether some of the parking at BART stations should be converted from parking only and require additional enforcement.

Referring to some of the items on the list particularly related to Pleasant Hill BART, Mr. Hu referenced a current study in the County to enhance bike and ped across Treat Boulevard on the south side of BART, which should be on the list; and access from Oak Park Boulevard and Coggins Drive with close to 100 bike trips in that direction so that enhancements in that corridor with bike access could be facilitated given the thousands of single-family units within a quarter mile of BART.

Ms. Neustadter acknowledged the historical use of bikes at BART and suggested there would be no problem finding partners. She added that TRANSPAC would assist if needed.

Mr. Eiseman described a long-term project as BRT to connect to Bishop Ranch, which could be an important project. He referred to the policy questions raised by the study for BART; whether a portion of new parking revenue should be dedicated specifically to bike, ped, and transit access investments; whether BART should consider access investments both on- and off-station properties; whether the program should consider providing funding for such ongoing operating expenses related to access; and how BART should determine which access projects to invest in.



In addition, on what specific basis should future investments be selected and prioritized; and how funds should be divided between stations and corridors.

Mr. Watry explained that the projects recommended for inclusion in the next fiscal year budget would be paid for out of the revenues. BART staff had recommended paying annual operating costs for a new Pleasant Hill attended bike station (Avalon Bay), and would assemble some capital funds for Measure J, and BART would pay ongoing annual costs. There was also a recommendation for a capital project in Orinda from BART to the Theater District.

Ms. Heitman referred to trail in downtown Lafayette to Mt. Diablo Boulevard with the desire to make it more obvious to get to BART. The Concord Plaza project was also going forward. BART had gotten Prop 1B money and had set it and other funds aside and the City of Concord had produced a Specific Plan with BART involvement, with preliminary ideas and cost estimates, and asking TRANSPAC for Measure J money for next steps.

Ms. Neustadter stated that if BART needed assistance or guidance TRANSPAC would be willing to listen.

Ms. Heitman reported that BART would be approaching the TRANSPAC Board at its June 12, 2014 meeting.

The TAC thanked Mr. Watry and Mr. Eiseman for the update.

**3. City of Concord Measure J Reprogramming Request Presented by Ray Kuzbari, City of Concord Transportation Manager.** The City of Concord is proposing a Measure J Reprogramming Request for Major Capital Complete Streets.

Ray Kuzbari presented the City of Concord's request to reprogram Measure J funds between Concord projects. He noted that Concord had two projects under the Major Streets category in Measure J; one had been a placeholder, the Waterworld Parkway Bridge project with \$3.5 million in Measure J money, and another Measure J capacity improvements project for the Clayton Road/Treat Boulevard/Denkinger Road Intersection Capacity Improvements project, which required acquisition of right of way. He reported that the property owner adjacent to the Clayton Road/Treat Boulevard/Denkinger Road project was not cooperative and the City had to use eminent domain, was going into the trial phase, and needed more money to get through that process, estimated at \$219,000 to pay attorney fees. The City of Concord had decided the best way to do that would be to request a transfer of monies from the Waterworld Parkway Bridge project to the Clayton Road/Treat Boulevard/Denkinger Road Intersection project. Another project (not a Measure J project) was the Farm Bureau Road Safe Route to School Improvements project and one segment of Farm Bureau Road between Wren Avenue and Willow Pass Road to provide a safe walking route to Wren Elementary School.

Given the City of Concord's newly adopted Complete Streets policy, Mr. Kuzbari explained that if touching one side of the street for the SR2S project, the City might as well go all the way and do Complete Streets improvements. In order to do that, it would need \$781,000 more funding.

As a result, the City of Concord had decided to contribute more local funds to the project, \$500,000 from the Citywide Traffic Impact Fee Program, and still needed \$281,000 to do the work. Mr. Kuzbari stated that the decision had been made to incorporate the project into the Measure J Strategic Plan and transfer \$281,000 from the Waterworld Parkway Bridge project into the Farm Bureau Road project. The total request from the City of Concord was to transfer \$500,000, all Concord money.

TAC members concurred with the request from the City of Concord.

5. **As noted on the March TAC agenda, TRANSPAC circulated the Action Plan for Comments with a Note that any Comments Received Would be Reviewed at This Meeting in Anticipation of TRANSPAC Review and Possible Action Plan Approval at its May 8, 2014 Meeting.** To date only one comment has been received.

Ms. Neustadter presented a letter from the City of Lafayette with comments on the Central County Action Plan.

Mr. Kuzbari advised that he had an update on a cost estimate for a project and wanted to update the table that listed traffic impact fees.

Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill, reported that Mr. Lochirco had also advised of an update to the Project List.

With respect to the Lafayette letter, Ms. Dagang reported that the City of Lafayette had seven comments, one of which related to the fact that in the Lamorinda Action Plan BART had been designated as a Route of Regional Significance (RORS). Lafayette asked TRANSPAC to also designate BART as a RORS, and stated if doing so Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) and RORS would have to be identified. Given that the TRANSPAC Board was expected to adopt the Action Plan at its May 8, 2014 meeting and be asked to include the Action Plan in the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) that action would be more than could be accomplished prior to that time. She advised that BART had been discussed previously, and while recognized as an important route designating it as an RORS had not been supported.

Ms. Neustadter commented that this was the second time that discussion had occurred and it had been declined, and because the City of Lafayette was making the request did not mean that the TAC would have to accept it and make that recommendation to the TRANSPAC Board.

Ms. Heitman added that designating BART as a RORS had been discussed at the Countywide Task Force and would elevate the needs of BART to a different level with more ownership of BART to the RTPCs. In the particular case of Lamorinda, she explained that last time and this time Lamorinda had suggested that BART have a different loading factor, and if each RTPC had different performance measures it would likely be problematic

Ms. Neustadter stated that BART performance measures were not the tact of the agencies, and anyone who had ridden BART would have suggestions although that was not TRANSPAC'S goal.

Matt Kelly commented that Lamorinda was the only subarea to make BART a RORS.

Mr. Kuzbari noted that while BART was a great service for the Bay Area there was a finite capacity that could not be exceeded because of safety and capacity issues. He added that the Action Plan would have to be updated again in the future and there was time to learn more.

After the discussion, Ms. Dagang explained that it had previously been decided that the BART line would be shown on the RORS map. The official comment to Lafayette was no action at this time.

Ms. Neustadter referred to one of the other comments in the Lafayette letter related to affecting downstream traffic, the widening of Geary Road, and the like; she had nothing to say in that there was not a whole lot of traffic involved from a Central County perspective.

Ms. Dagang wanted to focus on the responses to comments and would provide a few more words of description for Pleasant Hill Road, the widening of Geary Road, and measures in the traffic program for Taylor Boulevard, and follow up with the City of Pleasant Hill in terms of response.

Ms. Neustadter wanted it to be clear that there was no proposed widening of Geary Road.

Mr. Kelly recommended phrasing it in the context of vehicle capacity.

Mr. Hu verified that the Geary Road Widening project, Phase 3 was not a capacity increasing project.

Mr. Kuzbari questioned the justification for the Lafayette comment related to Geary Road and recommended that the City of Pleasant Hill communicate directly with the City of Lafayette in that he did not see that those issues had to be considered in the context of the Action Plan.

Ms. Dagang suggested that the next step would be for the CCTA to take the charge to evaluate the issue between the two jurisdictions.

Mr. Kuzbari agreed that the CCTA could facilitate the matter.

Ms. Neustadter suggested that it be defined and she referred to the comment in the letter with respect to the Central County Action Plan not characterizing Taylor Boulevard and Pleasant Hill Road as de facto bypass route alternatives to I-680.

Ms. Dagang suggested that the language could be softened. She noted that a statement had been made that some local travelers used those roads as a bypass.

Mr. Kelly suggested an alternative route.

Mr. McKenzie suggested people were using those routes in the event of a non-recurring event on I-680.

Ms. Neustadter explained that would set TRANSPAC up as being responsible for a car crash on I-680. She emphasized that Pleasant Hill Road was physically a parallel road. She commented that if Central County drivers used the road as a back door now and again, Lafayette drivers did as well. The issue had previously been discussed with the same conclusions.

Ms. Dagang referred to the next comment that Lamorinda had established thresholds different from TRANSPAC and TRANSPAC should acknowledge Lamorinda's thresholds. She suggested that a statement could be added that Lamorinda had different thresholds.

Ms. Neustadter explained that she sent out environmental notices and she did not know that the threshold issue had previously been raised.

Ms. Dagang suggested that the Action Plan established threshold levels be included with a notification that the City of Lafayette received each environmental and general notification, with a statement that *TRANSPAC sends out notices for all developments regardless of whether they are above or below the threshold.*

Ms. Dagang reported that she had received comments from CCTA staff at 5:00 P.M. on April 23, 2014, and she highlighted those comments at this time, such as the request for a new section in the Introduction to highlight what was new in the Action Plan to show that Central County had added Bailey Road, move the comments related to Complete Streets, and reference SB 375. Given the lateness of the comments, she asked whether or not to incorporate them in the draft Action Plan.

Mr. Kuzbari did not know if it was necessary to include and stated that new sections had not previously been highlighted. He suggested leaving the Action Plan as is. With respect to Bailey Road, he did not know what to mention other than being cooperative with the City of Pittsburg.

Ms. Neustadter suggested an acknowledgement that the comments had been sent.

Ms. Dagang explained that there would be another chance for comment between the draft and the final Action Plan. Regarding Clayton Road, she referenced a comment about moving part of the issue statement to be an action that TRANSPAC and TRANSPLAN will work together on the East County Action Plan. Noting the comment that the Pacheco Transit Hub should be deleted from the Project List, it was recommended leaving it as is given that changes were always possible between the draft and the final document. Another comment had asked for an introductory sentence on the section of review of General Plan Amendments, to state that the General Plan review process shall be in accordance with the CCTA's general management plan. Given that the comment was unclear, it was not included. She stated that based on the earlier presentation she was to update the dollar amount for the Kirker Pass Climbing Lanes. She had received no comments from any TRANSPAC Director and the plan was to get the draft to Ms. Neustadter by April 30, 2014.

The TAC expressed no desire to review the Draft Action Plan again.

On another matter, Ms. Neustadter referred to Line 28a, Subregional Transportation Needs Funding and the Kuzbari Protocol. She asked if the TAC wanted to review that item.

Mr. Kuzbari expressed a desire to review Line 28a funding at the next TAC meeting.

Ms. Neustadter explained that Line 20a, Additional Transportation Programs for Seniors and People with Disabilities funding would come up at the end of the fiscal year. TRANSPAC had conducted two allocations and had come up with a group of people using those funds who had been very grateful for the opportunity. Given that there was no one providing services not previously known, she asked whether the same process utilized the last time should be used again.

By consensus, the TAC agreed to do the same thing as last time until there was a conversation about anything different.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that the only outstanding issue was funding and information.

Information and referral for Line 20a funding would be presented to the TRANSPAC Board at its next meeting and Line 28a funding would be discussed by the TAC at the next meeting.

Corinne Dutra-Roberts asked if the information referral component dovetailed into the Mobility Management Plan (MMP), to which Ms. Neustadter noted that those were the small organizations that provided the service and right now should not be in the MMP.

Ms. Neustadter reported that while the proposed MMP was to include an information and outreach referral component of that kind of service throughout the County, it was a ways off.

Mr. Kuzbari asked about the Conditions of Compliance Report and any timeline on conditions of compliance. He stated he would read through and see if there was anything that needed to be done. He verified that the same document did not have to be used and he reported that Concord needed the money and he would go over the document and make changes and use it.

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 P.M. The next meeting of the TAC is scheduled for May 22, 2014 at 9:00 A.M. in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room unless otherwise determined.

# **Proposal for the Allocation of Central County Measure J Line 28a Funds**

**By Ray Kuzbari**

I would like to propose a new approach to allocating Program 28(a) funds to local jurisdictions in Central County. As you know, most cities in the Bay Area are facing serious challenges trying to keep up with ongoing CIP commitments, given the rising costs of construction and the limited resources available. Concord is no different. Numerous projects and maintenance improvements are currently on hold due to lack of funding. The amount of money we receive from the 18% return-to-source is not enough to meet all of our obligations, not to mention how difficult it is to take advantage of outside grant funding when we simply don't have the necessary funds for local matching. Consequently, I would like to discuss with the TAC the possibility of augmenting the return-to-source distribution with Line 28(a) funds as described below.

One of the advantages of return-to-source funds is that they come without too many strings attached and are left to the discretion of the local cities on how to use the money. By contrast, Measure J funds that are programmed to projects competitively or through the Strategic Plan Major Streets category come with conditions, paperwork, process, and limits on eligibility of admin costs.

I would like to propose to TRANSPAC TAC that Line 28(a) funds be split among our jurisdictions according to the 2.09% formula for Central County and be disbursed to the jurisdictions on an annual basis prior to October of each year. In other words, the disbursements of Line 28(a) funds would not be attached to any specific projects, but rather they would be used to fulfill the need for additional return-to-source funds to help support local street maintenance and improvements.

I have inquired with CCTA staff regarding the feasibility of implementing such a proposal with respect to GMP guidelines. They have advised me that this proposal is similar to what SWAT has done and is not subject to GMP restrictions. CCTA would only require an annual report on how the funds are spent in September of each year.

I have attached for TAC discussion on May 22<sup>nd</sup> a proposed allocation plan for Program 28(a) funds for the next three years, recognizing that there is only \$1.55 million available in the fund balance, not to mention things could be different down the road should a Measure J extension be approved by the voters in 2016.

Please let me know if you have any questions or suggestions regarding this proposal.

**CENTRAL COUNTY**

**PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF MEASURE J PROGRAM 28(a) FUNDS TO LOCAL JURISDICTIONS**

Jurisdiction	Distribution of Funds by Population & Road Miles			Proposed Fund Allocations									
	Population	Road Miles	Average	Prior	2014	2015	2016	2017	% To Date	2018	2019	2020-2034	TOTAL REMAINING
Clayton	3.47%	4.26%	3.87%	-	\$46,773	\$46,773	\$26,106	\$26,106	3.56%				\$480,371
Concord	38.75%	34.34%	36.55%	-	\$442,259	\$442,259	\$246,842	\$246,842	33.61%				\$4,542,087
County	15.24%	19.60%	17.42%	-	\$210,813	\$210,813	\$117,663	\$117,663	16.02%				\$2,165,089
Martinez	11.45%	11.18%	11.32%	-	\$136,931	\$136,931	\$76,427	\$76,427	10.41%				\$1,406,313
Pleasant Hill	10.53%	11.81%	11.17%	-	\$750,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	18.29%				\$1,059,540
Walnut Creek	20.56%	18.81%	19.69%	-	\$238,223	\$238,223	\$132,962	\$132,962	18.11%				\$2,446,600
<b>TOTAL</b>	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	-	\$1,825,000	\$1,075,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	100.00%				\$12,100,000

Program 28(a) receives a fixed percentage of actual annual revenues from Measure J. Figures in the table above assume \$2 billion in revenues over the life of Measure J (2034, in 2004 dollars), including \$16.2 million for Program 28(a) for Central County. Distribution of funds is based on the CCTA budget estimate for Measure J FY14 distribution of 2.09% additional Measure J funds to local jurisdictions for Local Street Maintenance (LSM) and Improvements. Program 28(a) funds are proposed to be paid to local jurisdictions prior to October of each year. On average, an annual revenue of \$600,000 is credited to Program 28(a) after October 1st of each year. The proposed fund allocations are preliminary and subject to change according to actual Measure J revenues. An annual report on how the funds are spent will be submitted to CCTA in September of each year.

---

## Planning Committee **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: May 7, 2014

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Authorize Release of “Call for Projects” for the Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning Grant Program</b>
<b>Summary of Issues</b>	As part of its Resolution 4035, MTC allocated \$2.745 million to the Authority to help local jurisdictions in their planning and implementation of PDAs. This PDA Planning Grant Program must be consistent with the county’s adopted <i>PDA Investment &amp; Growth Strategy</i> . Authority staff has prepared a “call for projects” for the PDA Planning Grant Program for release. Following the release a sub-committee to TCC will evaluate the grant applications received. The sub-committee is comprised of local staff representatives from the four subareas of Contra Costa. Staff seeks Authority approval to release the “Call for Projects” for the PDA Planning Grant Program.
<b>Recommendations</b>	Approve release of the call for projects for the Contra Costa PDA Planning Grant Program
<b>Financial Implications</b>	MTC has allocated \$2.745 million in federal Surface Transportation Program funds to Contra Costa for the PDA Planning Grant Program
<b>Options</b>	Revise Call for Projects
<b>Attachments</b>	<b>A.</b> Proposed Call for Projects
<b>Changes from Committee</b>	

### Background

In the final version of its Resolution 4035, MTC allocated \$20 million to the nine Bay Area counties for PDA Planning Grants, \$2.745 million of which was allocated for PDA planning in Contra Costa. In addition, MTC retained \$20 million for the regional PDA



planning grants and planning assistance, both of which programs are regionally competitive.

Resolution 4035 on page 9 describes the PDA Planning Grants as follows:

**PDA Planning Grants:** MTC and ABAG's PDA Planning Grant Program will place an emphasis on affordable housing production and preservation in funding agreements with grantees. Grants will be made to jurisdictions to provide support in planning for PDAs in areas such as providing housing, jobs, intensified land-use, promoting alternative modes of travel to the single occupancy vehicle, and parking management. These studies will place a special focus on selected PDAs with a greater potential for residential displacement and develop and implement community risk reduction plans. Grants will be made to local jurisdictions to provide planning support as needed to meet regional housing goals. Also program funds will establish a new local planning assistance program to provide staff resources directly to jurisdictions to support local land-use planning for PDAs.

**Local PDA Planning & Implementation:** Funds are made available to support local jurisdictions in their planning and implementation of PDAs in each of the nine counties, developed through the county PDA Investment & Growth Strategy in consultation with ABAG and MTC. Funding is distributed to the county CMAs (with funds for San Francisco distributed to the City/County of San Francisco planning department) using the OBAG distribution formula with no county receiving less than \$750,000 as shown in Appendix 5. Local jurisdictions will either directly access these funds through Caltrans Local Assistance similar to other OBAG grants provided to them by the CMAs, the CMAs may choose to provide individual grants to local jurisdictions through a single program administered by the CMA, or the CMA may request that ABAG administer the grants in cooperation with the local jurisdictions. CMA grants to local jurisdictions and the expenditure of funds by the San Francisco Planning Department are to be aligned with the recommendations and priorities identified in their adopted PDA Growth and Investment Strategy; as well as to the PDA Planning Program guidelines as they apply only to those activities relevant to those guidelines. The CMAs are limited to using no more than 5% of the funds for program administration.

The \$2.745 million allocated to Contra Costa came through the "Local PDA Planning & Implementation" component of Resolution 4035.

As noted above, the Authority's PDA Planning Grant Program must be aligned with "the recommendations and priorities identified in their adopted PDA Growth and Investment Strategy". The draft Call for Projects incorporates the recommendations and priorities in the 2014 PDA Investment & Growth Strategy.

### **Overall Process**

The process for allocating the PDA Planning Grant funding will involve the following steps:

1. The Authority will create a list of qualified consultant teams with the expertise to provide the planning services needed for the planning studies (Note: this process is underway through release of RFQ 14-1, which closed on April 10, 2014).
2. The Authority will select projects for funding using the adopted screening and selection criteria and other program guidelines.
3. Authority and agency staff will work together to develop a scope of services to be funded through the planning grant and select and negotiate with a consultant team to provide professional services to the local jurisdictions.

Further details regarding the proposed process and criteria are found in the draft "Call for Projects" (Attachment A).

### *Relationship to MTC/ABAG Regional PDA Planning Grant Program*

As noted above, Resolution 4035 allocated funding to both regional and county ("local") PDA Planning Grant programs. In January, MTC released a Call for Projects for funding through the regional program. Applications were due to MTC on April 2, 2014 and a draft list of recommendations is scheduled to be ready on May 7, 2014. Potential sponsors may apply for either or both of the regional or county programs.

### *Schedule for the Contra Costa PDA Planning Grant Program*

To allow time for the draft list of regional projects to be released by MTC, Authority staff postponed release of the local (county) Call for Projects to May 23, 2014.

To give applicants adequate time to respond to the Call for Projects, the due date for submitting applications will be set at July 18, 2014. This would give applicants eight

weeks to prepare their applications and three weeks for the review committee to review and rate them. The TCC would review the committee's recommendations at its August 21 meeting. The Authority would act on the recommendations at its September meeting.

*Draft Call for Projects*

Authority staff has prepared a draft Call for Projects and application for PDA Planning Grants (see Attachment A). The draft Call for Projects includes the background of the program, its requirements and the criteria for screening and selecting projects to be funded.

Staff seeks Authority approval to release the "Call for Projects" for the PDA Planning Grant program.

## Call for Projects

---

**Date** May 23, 2014

**To** Potential Applicants

**RE** **Call for Projects for the Contra Costa PDA Planning Grant Program**

---

The Authority is pleased to announce the call for projects to be funded through the Contra Costa PDA Planning Grant Program. This program will fund a variety of planning activities, all intended to help plan for the development of designated priority development areas (PDAs) in Contra Costa and the implementation of those plans. The planning activities funded can range from full-scale Specific Plans with CEQA clearance, to more focused studies designed to augment or complete existing plans for the PDAs. These more focused studies could range from design studies for the transportation network, to financing plans for needed infrastructure improvements.

Completed applications and all other required materials are due by **3:00 pm on Friday, July 18, 2014**. Deliver your completed application — by mail, email, delivery service or hand — to:

Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597  
*Attn: Brad Beck, Senior Transportation Planner*  
[bbeck@ccta.net](mailto:bbeck@ccta.net)

Application forms may be downloaded from the Authority's website at [www.ccta.net](http://www.ccta.net). The following list outlines the schedule for the program:

<i>Step</i>	<i>Date</i>
PDA Planning Grant "Call for Projects" released	5/23
Applications for Contra Costa PDA Planning Grants due	7/18
TCC Subcommittee reviews applications	7/21–8/8
TCC reviews PDA Planning Grants	8/21
TCC Special Meeting (if necessary)	8/28
PC recommends PDA Planning Grants	9/3
Authority approves PDA Planning Grants	9/17

## Background

MTC has allocated \$2,745,000 in federal STP funds to Contra Costa to help local jurisdictions plan and implement their PDAs. The funds will be available to fund projects over the next three fiscal years. MTC's Resolution 4035 requires that these grants to local jurisdictions are aligned with the recommendations and priorities identified in the adopted PDA Growth and Investment Strategy. Unlike formula-based programs, the PDA Planning Grant Program will target PDAs that are high impact and capable of early implementation.

The key planning goals of this program, building upon the original MTC Planning Grant Program goals, are as follows:

- To increase both the housing supply, including affordable housing for low-income residents, and jobs within the PDAs;
- By increasing land use intensities in PDAs, boost transit ridership and thereby reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by PDA residents, employees and visitors;
- Increase walking, bicycling, carpooling and car-sharing by effectively managing parking and driving while promoting multimodal connections for residents, employees and visitors within the PDA; and
- Locate key services and retail businesses within PDAs thus further reducing VMT.

The Authority will provide planning services to local jurisdictions from a list of consultant teams. The consultant teams are being identified through a separate request for qualifications (RFQ) process. A committee of Authority staff and local staff familiar with

PDA, infill, land use and multimodal transportation planning will review the qualifications and recommend which consultant teams should be put on the list.

Consultant teams will include a broad spectrum of expertise in transportation and land use planning, environmental and fiscal impact assessment, market evaluation and community outreach. Each team will include the expertise necessary to prepare a range of studies, from a focused financial assessment of a specific market opportunity to an overall specific plan.

## **Planning Grant Funding**

### **ELIGIBILITY AND GRANT SIZES**

Any jurisdiction with a designated PDA is eligible to apply for a PDA Planning Grant to fund eligible planning activities.

- No more than one third of the available funding in this cycle will be awarded to any one single jurisdiction.
- The minimum grant size will be \$75,000.
- The maximum grant will be \$700,000.

### **REQUIRED LOCAL MATCH**

The PDA Planning Grants will use federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. To streamline the administration of the grants, the Authority will obtain the required approvals from Caltrans, develop a list of qualified consultant teams to provide the requested services, administer the contracts with those firms, and manage the invoicing for the consultant services provided.

The STP funds require that local agencies provide an 11.5 percent match for the federal funds. That is, the federal funds will pay for only 88.5 percent of the total cost of the project. Sponsoring jurisdictions will be required to provide this match. The Authority, however, will attempt to offset the share of the local match as much as possible by crediting a portion of the match with Authority staff time plus the cost of the consultant planning managers who, under a separate contract funded through Measure J, will oversee and facilitate the PDA Planning Grant Program.

## **Recommended Planning Elements**

According to MTC guidelines, planning for PDAs should include all six of the following elements as a part of improving “development readiness”. The Contra Costa PDA Planning

Grant will fund any or all of these six elements, whether as a comprehensive Specific Plan that covers all six or as study covering only a single or several elements, particularly where other elements are already completed or are not necessary. The exact mix of elements and emphasis on them in the proposed work scope will depend on the character of the particular PDA, past planning efforts, and planning needs. Applicants may therefore request funding for one or more elements, either as a supplement to previous planning efforts or as part of an ongoing planning effort within the PDA. The proposed work scope need not include all six recommended planning elements.

If the PDA planning grant would fund only some of the elements listed below, the applicant must identify how the other elements have been or will be addressed or why they are not necessary in the PDA. Applicants may, for example, rely on previously completed planning studies addressing the PDA that have been completed within the last 10 years or on other ongoing planning studies to meet some of these planning elements. The applicant should also identify the scope and schedule for remaining elements that may be needed after the completion of the proposed work.

- 1) **Existing and Forecast Conditions in the PDA.** Identify demographic and socio-economic characteristics, transit/travel patterns and use, or other physical aspects of the PDA, as well as any known issues to be addressed in the planning process within the PDA. In addition to the components more traditionally a part of a specific plan or area plan, this element could include less traditional elements such as:
  - a) A **market demand analysis** for housing at all levels of affordability, jobs and retail in the planning area.
  - b) An **accessibility analysis** that ensures fully accessible transit stations, paths of travel between stations and surrounding areas, and accessible and habitable housing units for people with disabilities.
  - c) A **parking analysis** to create a parking policy and management element that aims at reducing parking demand and supply through pricing, zoning, and support for alternative modes.
- 2) **Land Use and Development Alternatives.** The plan should identify alternative approaches to developing the PDA and evaluate their relative ability to achieve plan objectives.
- 3) **Plan Policies.** The plan should identify the policies, standards and guidelines for the development of the PDA. These policies should include, at a minimum, the land use and design standards for the PDA and the circulation components of the plan, including an approach that ensures multi-modal access and connectivity to and within the PDA. This element should also include a *housing strategy* that: a) promotes affordable housing to

low-income residents, b) attempts to minimize displacement of existing residents, and c) offers *pedestrian-friendly design standards* for streets, buildings and open space.

- 4) **Implementation Element.** The plan should include a program of actions designed to carry out the plan policies. The implementation program should include a realistic financing strategy that describes all actions needed to implement the plan, an analysis of infrastructure needs, and a budget for meeting those needs.
- 5) **Community Outreach and Involvement.** Development of the plan should include a community outreach component designed to involve the affected community, including existing residents and business owners, to ensure that community concerns are understood and reflected to the extent possible in the plan. This process should make a special effort to involve traditionally under-served populations.
- 6) **Environmental Review.** The plan should include the appropriate level of environmental analysis. At the Specific Plan level, this would likely mean the development of a program environmental impact report (as defined in CEQA) for the PDA plan area which will help provide environmental clearance for the actual development of the PDA. More limited planning efforts may require more limited environmental review (for example, an implementation action being undertaken to realize an existing plan) or no environmental review (for example, a baseline study to set the stage for a future planning project).

Planning for Contra Costa PDAs should include all or most of these elements. The PDA Planning Grants, however, may cover only one or a few of these elements, or they may supplement an implementation task identified in earlier planning for the PDA. Applications for grants that cover less than a full Specific or Area Plan will be evaluated in part on how well the planning study would build upon what the jurisdiction has already done in the way of detailed planning.

In addition, any planning element addressed through a PDA planning grant must be consistent with the MTC Planning Program “as they apply only to those activities relevant to those guidelines.” That is, if a proposed PDA planning grant includes the development and analysis of land use and development alternatives — planning element 2 above — then that planning activity must follow the requirements and guidelines of the regional PDA Planning Program. Those guidelines are attached to this call for projects.

## Potential Planning Activities

The PDA Planning Grant Program can fund a variety of planning activities that support the development of PDAs. Specific Plans or detailed Area Plans are the most comprehensive



way to plan for the development of the PDA. They can cover all of the aspects of such planning, as outlined in the six elements described above.

Besides Specific Plans, the program can fund more detailed planning studies that further the goals of the program such as:

- Corridor plans that balance transit, motor vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian movement with existing or planned land uses within the corridor
- Transportation network design plans that harmonize the demands of through traffic with the needs for multimodal access and movement within the PDA
- Analysis of alternative land use and development patterns within the PDA
- Market studies to evaluate the demand for various land use types and intensities within the PDA
- Infrastructure studies to assess existing capacity and identify needed improvements and their costs
- Designs for the transportation network within the PDA that support multimodal access from transit to land uses within the PDA
- Financing strategies that would help fund needed infrastructure improvements and housing and jobs within the PDA, especially planning for mixed income housing and mixed use development
- Parking management and pricing connected to new land uses
- Community outreach and environmental assessment associated with a Specific Plan or other eligible planning activities

## Selection Criteria

### PART ONE: SCREENING CRITERIA

- 1) Planning area is a planned or potential PDA (meets the basic criteria for a PDA) or contains a Resolution 3434 transit station.
- 2) Local transit providers that serve the planning area are supportive of or partnering with the applicant.

- 3) Applicant has committed the minimum local match amount (11.47 percent of total project cost).
- 4) Indication of support from its Council or Board supporting the proposed planning process either through direct Council or Board action or other action indicating support for the proposed planning study.

## **PART TWO: EVALUATION CRITERIA (100 POINTS TOTAL)**

Planning Grant Applications will be scored and ranked using the following criteria:

### **1. Location within a Community of Concern (yes or no) .....5 points**

Project area includes a Community of Concern as defined by MTC's Lifeline Transportation Program – see <http://geocommons.com/maps/110983>

### **2. Project impact..... up to 35 points**

Extent to which the proposed planning effort has the potential to:

(a) Improve the following within the PDA:

- Housing supply, particularly affordable housing for low-income residents
- Employment, key services and retail
- Multimodal access and connectivity within the PDA, especially where it would support increased transit ridership, safety and connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians, and minimizing the effects of through traffic

(b) Remove key constraints to implementation of the PDA plan or development of the PDA

### **3. Local adoption of supportive policies and objectives ..... up to 15 points**

Extent to which jurisdiction has demonstrated its commitment to provide an increase in housing and transportation choices through *existing* planning policies and development policies and regulations, such as:

(a) Supportive general plan policies and zoning,

(b) Existing citywide affordable housing policies and approved projects,

- (c) Innovative parking policies and transportation demand management strategies, and
- (d) Sustainability policies, including green building policies and alternative energy policies.

**4. Ability of proposed project to eliminate policy gap..... up to 15 points**

The extent to which the proposed planning activity would fill a missing policy gap, including completion of the recommended planning elements described above, or complete planning needed to eliminate an obstacle to implementation of local plans for the PDA. This point score will recognize the merit of any existing planning elements and the ability of the proposed effort to complete the planning elements.

**5. Local commitment and readiness..... up to 20 points**

- (a) Planning process is ready to begin – the jurisdiction will be able to enter into a funding agreement with CCTA within three months of grant award. Applicant is prepared to see the funded planning program through to implementation, including any associated updates to the jurisdiction’s general plan, zoning code, or other related municipal ordinances and creation of local financing mechanisms as may be necessary to achieve desired development.
- (b) Demonstration of support from community and stakeholders (major property owners, City Council, and relevant transit operators) for planning process (may be demonstrated through statements made during public outreach, letters of support, and Council actions).
- (c) Community outreach will be an integral part of the process.

**6. Implementation feasibility..... up to 10 points**

- (a) Demonstrated feasibility of the plan from a political, market, and financial perspective.
- (b) Existence of implementing resources and agreements including infrastructure funding commitments, development agreements, and other partnerships with public, non-profit, or private entities.

## **Process**

The Authority will release the call for projects for the PDA Planning Grant program on May 16, 2014. Completed applications will be due on July 18, 2014.

The applications would be reviewed by a committee of Authority and local staff. Authority staff has asked TCC to appoint a subcommittee comprised of local staff (at least one from each subarea) familiar with the planning that supports infill development, housing opportunities, or multimodal districts to serve. The committee would evaluate the applications against the screening and selection criteria described above and recommend the allocation of the \$2.745 million in grant funds to the selected projects.

The committee's recommendations for funding would be forwarded first to the TCC in August 2014, then to the Planning Committee and Authority for approval in September.

Once the Authority approves a recommended list of projects and funding amounts, Authority staff will meet with staff from each agency to refine the scope of services and schedule for the planning study, to select a consultant team (or the members of that team) from the list of pre-qualified consultants, and incorporate the scope and schedule into a funding agreement between the Authority and the local agency.

Agencies will have 36 months to expend the funds allocated.

# DRAFT

## Application

### Contra Costa PDA Planning Grant Program

Completed applications and all other required materials are due by **3:00 pm on Friday, July 18, 2014**. Deliver your completed application — by mail, email, delivery service or hand — to:

Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597  
Attn: Brad Beck, Senior Transportation Planner  
[bbeck@ccta.net](mailto:bbeck@ccta.net)

### General Information

<b>Date</b>	Enter date of application
<b>Project Name</b>	Enter Project Name
<b>Applicant</b>	Enter Name of Project Sponsor
<b>Contact Info</b>	Enter Name, Email and Phone of Contact
<b>Local Match</b>	Check box to indicate agreement to provide at least the required local match (11.47 percent of total project cost) <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Local Support</b>	Check box to indicate that sponsor's council or board supports the proposed project <input type="checkbox"/> <b>NOTE:</b> Attach evidence of support from sponsor's council or board for the proposed PDA planning activity

### Priority Development Area

<b>Name</b>	Enter name of PDA
<b>Size</b>	Enter size of PDA
<b>Place Type</b>	Enter Placetype in Plan Bay Area
<b>Transit Agencies</b>	Enter Names of Transit Agencies serving the PDA <b>NOTE:</b> Attach letters of support from or other actions of the transit agencies supporting the proposed planning activity

## Description

---

### PURPOSE

*Describe the purpose of the proposed PDA planning activity: What obstacles to the development of the PDA will it address? How will it advance local efforts to develop the PDA?*

Add text here

---

### SCOPE

*Describe the scope of the proposed PDA planning activity: What tasks will be contained in the scope for the planning activity? What reports, policies, mapping, regulations or other documents will be produced?*

Add text here

---

### RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER PDA PLANNING

*Describe how the proposed planning activity relates to and furthers local PDA planning: Will the proposed activity augment existing detailed planning for the PDA? Is the proposed planning activity part of a broader effort to develop the PDA?*

Add text here

---

### RELATIONSHIP TO RECOMMENDED PLANNING ELEMENTS

*Describe whether the proposed planning activity will complete or augment one of the following planning elements and describe existing or planned future planning efforts by the sponsor to complete these elements. Responses should also describe consistency of the proposed planning activity with the regional PDA Planning Program guidelines.*

<b>PDA Profile</b>	Describe existing or planned efforts within the PDA
<b>Alternatives</b>	Describe existing or planned efforts within the PDA
<b>Policies</b>	Describe existing or planned efforts within the PDA
<b>Implementation</b>	Describe existing or planned efforts within the PDA
<b>Outreach</b>	Describe existing or planned efforts within the PDA
<b>Environmental Review</b>	Describe existing or planned efforts within the PDA

---

## Funding Request

Minimum request is \$75,000; maximum request is \$700,000

---

<b>Estimated Cost</b>	Enter estimated cost of project
-----------------------	---------------------------------

---

<b>Local Match <sup>1</sup></b>	Enter proposed local match
---------------------------------	----------------------------

---

## Criteria

Describe how the proposed planning activity will meet the following criteria:

---

### COMMUNITY OF CONCERN

*Is the PDA within a Community of Concern?*

Add text here

---

### PROJECT IMPACT

*To what extent would project encourage housing growth, mixed-use development, a safe, complete and efficient transportation network? What obstacles to the development of the PDA would the proposed planning activity help overcome?*

Add text here

---

### SUPPORTIVE POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

*Extent to which jurisdiction has demonstrated its commitment to provide an increase in housing and transportation choices through existing planning policies and development policies and regulations.*

Add text here

---

---

<sup>1</sup> To the extent possible, the Authority will offset the required local match using Measure J-funded staff time

---

### **ELIMINATION OF POLICY GAP**

*The extent to which the proposed planning activity would fill a missing policy gap, including completion of the recommended planning elements described above, or complete planning needed to eliminate an obstacle to implementation of local plans for the PDA.*

Add text here

---

### **LOCAL COMMITMENT AND READINESS**

*Extent to which project is ready to begin, has stakeholder support and a process for community outreach.*

Add text here

---

### **FEASIBILITY**

*Capacity of sponsor and its partners to implement the planning activity or overall PDA planning once project is completed.*

Add text here

---

## **Attachments**

Please attach the following:

1. Evidence of support from partner transit agencies, sponsor council or board
2. Supporting letters and other evidence of support from the community and affected landowners
3. Map of PDA and affected planning area
4. List of detailed planning efforts — specific plans, precise plans, urban design standards and guidelines, parking studies, zoning ordinance revisions, etc. — that have been conducted within the PDA

Other material applicant feels is relevant to the application may also be attached.



## Attachment 2 PDA Planning Program

### Planning Elements - Description & Guidance

The following pages document each of the PDA planning elements, including the goal the element should aim to achieve, a description, examples or suggestions about what to include in the development of the element and what the deliverable should include. This information provides PDA planning grantees with an expectation of the scope for each element and what MTC/ABAG will be looking for in submitted deliverables.

#### **Priority Development Area (PDA) Profile**

**Goal:** Brief initial report providing an overview of demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the planning area, transit/travel patterns and use, physical aspects of the planning area, as well as any known issues that will need to be considered or addressed in the planning process. Context for the relationship between the planning area and the jurisdiction's surrounding area should be provided.

Data sources should include the US Census, as well as other planning efforts.

Results from the PDA Profile should inform subsequent planning elements.

#### **Measures to be included or described in the PDA Profile**

- Population
- Age
- Ethnicity
- Language
- Place of birth and residence
- Disability
- Households
- Employment (number of jobs by wage/salary and occupation)
- Income and poverty status
- Household tenure and costs
- Place of work
- Travel mode to work
- Vehicle availability
- Travel time to work
- Physical landscape (inventory of housing, jobs, parks, neighborhood amenities/retail, social services, schools/playgrounds, activity nodes, etc.)
- Known issues or concerns to be included in the planning process

**Deliverable:** Report containing the above-referenced measures describing the planning area. The information contained in this report should be referenced throughout the planning process in the development of subsequent planning elements.

## Community Involvement

**Goal:** Create a collaborative planning process with community stakeholders, including residents, business proprietors, property owners, transit agencies, neighborhood associations, non-profit or other community or faith-based organizations, etc. Special attention should be paid to involve community groups and minority, low-income, youth, renter, and non-English speaking populations. The purpose of the collaboration is to solicit comments from these stakeholders, review preliminary findings with them, and utilize their perspective in developing a vision for the planning area. The outcome of successful community involvement is broad-based community support for the final plan, as well as for the process to develop the plan.

### **Create a Community Involvement Plan**

Before beginning the planning process, develop a plan for community involvement. As a first step, refer to the PDA Profile for an understanding of the residents and stakeholders to be engaged in the process. The plan should outline various strategies to involve these residents and stakeholders, and should provide for on-going oversight of the planning process, as well as opportunities for input at specific points in the process. Depending on the demographic make-up of the project area, translation of materials into languages other than English may be necessary and should be factored into the community involvement budget.

The involvement plan should identify:

- a. Potential Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) members, and/or a process for selecting members
- b. Strategies to partner with local community organizations and engage community members (see below)
- c. Strategies specific to engaging low-income communities and communities of color
- d. Schedule of public meetings, TAC and CAC meetings, and other public events/meetings

### **Community Involvement Strategies**

Strategies to consider incorporating into your community involvement plan are detailed below.

- Develop a ***Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) - required***  
CACs can provide a broad-based participation in the development of the plan and offer a mechanism for on-going oversight of the planning process. A CAC also allows the community to share ownership of the planning process as well as the final plan, and can help to create community buy-in.
- Develop a ***Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) - required***  
A TAC provides input from partner agencies, including other city departments, transit providers, the congestion management agency and regional agencies.
- Partner, collaborate or ***contract with local community-based organization(s)(CBO)***  
To engage the direct participation of residents in the project area, partnering or contracting with local community-based organizations that provide services to the residents may be an effective strategy. Local CBOs may be most familiar with how to reach their client base, particularly non-traditional participants in the process.
- Establish ***project-specific fact sheets, telephone hotlines, posters, maps or websites***  
Offer a variety of ways the community can access information and/or provide feedback about the planning process.
- Attend ***regularly-scheduled meetings or public events in plan area***  
Getting on the agenda of regularly scheduled meetings, such as homeowners associations, community groups, rotary clubs, or places of worship offer an opportunity to discuss the planning process when interested stakeholders are already meeting rather than having them attend a separate meeting about the planning process. In addition, community events such as Farmer's Markets or street fairs can be used to distribute

project fact sheets, surveys or other information about the planning process. These events will also be a good opportunity to build the project mailing list for later project events.

- Conduct *focus groups and interviews*  
Focus groups or interviews offer an opportunity to obtain in-depth feedback from key stakeholders or groups.
- Distribute *surveys*  
Develop a project survey to both educate stakeholders and solicit feedback about needs, values and tradeoffs.
- Host project-specific *public meetings, workshops or open houses*  
Offer a range of options that accommodate busy schedules, allowing attendees to spend as much or as little time as they wish
- Involve *City Council and Planning Commissioners*  
Early involvement of elected and appointed officials can help ensure their buy-in and smooth the plan adoption process
- Include *developers*  
Developers and property owners bring an important perspective, particularly regarding market feasibility of plan alternatives
- Develop *photosimulations*  
Photosimulations, particularly of development alternatives, may be a useful tool to engage stakeholders, as well as help to provide visualization of densification
- Involve *local media*  
Coverage by local media can help secure coverage of planning efforts.
- Post-plan *follow-up*  
Potentially through the CAC, survey the community to identify areas of agreement, as well as what issues require additional attention

#### **Groups to include in Community Involvement**

- Residents – home owners and renters
- Businesses
- Property owners
- Local groups (i.e. neighborhood and business associations)
- Community and faith-based organizations (i.e. local non-profits serving residents in plan area)
- Seniors, including senior centers/housing
- Youth
- Non-English speaking population

#### **Techniques for Involving Low-Income Communities and Communities of Color\***

- Outreach in the community (flea markets, places of worship, health centers, etc.)
- Translate materials; have translators available at meetings as requested
- Include information on meeting notices on how to request translation assistance
- Robust use of “visualization” techniques, including maps and graphics
- Use of community and minority media outlets to announce participation opportunities

**Deliverables:**

- a. A community involvement plan detailing who will be engaged and when, along with the strategies that will be used to engage them
- b. Materials for distribution
- c. Meeting minutes, public comment summaries, survey or focus group summaries

.  
\* from MTC's 2010 Public Participation Plan

## Alternatives Analysis

**Goal:** Development of several land use alternatives or visions over the long term, their impacts upon the existing community and neighboring land uses, the feasibility of instituting each alternative, and the selection of a preferred development scenario. The alternatives should include an analysis of potentially incompatible land uses and resulting exposure issues.

### **Considerations:**

- Specify the time horizon for the scenarios, taking into consideration the implementation timeframe of the plan
- Review existing place-type for the planning area; does the place type change based on the community's vision in the preferred alternative?
- Develop options for different development scenarios early in the process to allow for discussion and input from community and key stakeholders (see Community Involvement)
- Scenarios may include
  - \* Minimum allowable density standards
  - \* Ridership forecasts based on different development scenarios
- How do different land uses relate to circulation in the planning area, ridership, parking, open space, etc.
- What transportation impacts or opportunities are uncovered by evaluating *multi-modal* levels of service intersections in the planning area based on different land uses
- What land uses are under consideration now vs. what uses are proposed for the future
- Land uses should consider zoning, form based code or both

### **Deliverable:** Memo including:

- Alternatives considered
- Process for selecting the preferred alternative
- Description of the preferred alternative
- Supporting maps, i.e. land use map, circulation map, density/form map

### Market Demand Analysis

**Goal:** An analysis of the future market demand for higher density-housing at all levels of affordability, retail, commercial and industrial (if appropriate) uses. The analysis should consider the existing market and outcomes in the short-term, as well as an assessment of trends with a long-range perspective. The trend analysis should reflect outcomes identified in the Alternatives Analysis.

#### **Elements to include in Market Demand Analysis**

- Delineation of primary and secondary (broader) market areas (set context for analysis)
- Assessment of *potential for employment* in the planning area
  - \* Identify characteristics of current employment near planning area based on land use, industry breakdown, and the type and frequency of nearby transit
  - \* Describe trends in the current real estate market and expected patterns of growth based on reports from commercial real estate brokers or government agencies
  - \* Analyze feasibility of various mixed-use components
  - \* Project employment based on projected square footage of potential commercial development of each type (see below)
  - \* Project jobs by wage/salary and occupation
- Assessment of *potential for housing* in the planning area
  - \* Assess current demographics (population, household type, age, income, etc), as well as projected growth and projected changes in trends (i.e., more households of a certain type)
  - \* Consider tendency of various household types and age groups to locate near transit
- Assessment of *potential for commercial development* (i.e. retail, entertainment, etc.)
  - \* Assess existing commercial development
  - \* Describe trends in the current real estate market and expected patterns of growth based on reports from commercial real estate brokers or government agencies
  - \* Cross reference with analysis of how much more retail could be supported by expected growth in housing and population.
- Projected absorption of housing at various income levels

**Deliverable:** A report containing current conditions, as well as short-term and long-term potential for employment, housing and commercial development in the planning area. Analysis should link back to the preferred vision identified in the Alternatives Analysis

## **Affordable Housing and Anti-Displacement Strategy**

**Goal:** Develop a strategy to provide existing and future plan area residents with a range of housing options that are affordable to households at all income levels. The strategy should describe the existing demographic and housing profile of the area, quantify the need for affordable housing, identify specific affordable housing goals for the plan, assess the financial feasibility of meeting the need for affordable housing, and identify strategies needed to meet the affordable housing goals.

To limit or prevent displacement in the area, the strategy should identify how non-subsidized affordable housing units in or neighboring the plan area may be impacted by the plan build-out. The plan should describe existing preservation policies to maintain neighborhood affordability and additional zoning changes or policies needed. The anti-displacement strategy may also include the maintenance and enhancement of small businesses, services and community centers that serve lower-income residents.

### **Elements to include in Affordable Housing and Anti-Displacement Strategy:**

#### *Assessment of Existing Conditions*

- Describe the demographic characteristics of the existing population in the plan area, including factors such as income levels, ethnic/racial composition, and presence of low-income renters (who are at greatest risk of displacement)
- Describe the housing characteristics in the plan area, including factors such as housing tenure, household size, and housing affordability for both deed-restricted and market-rate units
- Describe market conditions that affect the provision of affordable housing, such as land availability and value, obstacles to development in the plan area, and existing affordable housing policies (e.g., inclusionary zoning, rent control or stabilization policies, housing preservation programs, etc.)

#### *Quantification of Affordable Housing Need*

- Quantify the expected need for affordable housing, by income level, in the plan area based on the characteristics of the existing and expected future population
- The statement of need should not be limited by estimates of what seems feasible

#### *Identification of Goals*

- Consider goals such as:
  - No net loss of affordability in the plan area
  - Total number of affordable units, by income level, that will be accommodated in the plan area
  - Target for percentage of total units that are affordable
- Demonstrate consistency with the jurisdiction's Regional Housing Need Allocation and the sites and policies identified in the Housing Element

#### *Feasibility Analysis*

- Assess the amount of affordable housing, by income level, that is likely to be produced by the market
- Estimate the public financial burden and the private costs required to meet the identified housing need
- Identify potential funding sources available to develop affordable housing
- Identify the "gap" between the dollar amount needed for affordable housing and the potential sources available

#### *Implementation Strategy*

- Identify specific strategies to retain existing affordable units
- Specify the location and type of units (size, tenure, etc.) to be developed in the plan area
- Identify funding sources that will be used to preserve or add affordable housing
  - Local sources (bonds, impact fees, housing trust fund, etc.)
  - State and Federal sources (HOME, CDBG, tax credits, grants, etc.)
  - Other

- Identify policies that will be used to preserve or add affordable housing
  - Inclusionary housing
  - Housing trust fund
  - Reduced parking standards
  - Rehabilitation programs
  - Land trusts
  - Foreclosure mitigation
  - Other
- Identify policies that will be used to avoid displacing existing residents
  - Engagement of communities likely to be displaced
  - Economic development (locally owned businesses, local hire, new area jobs that meet residents' skill levels)
  - Enhancement of community centers and facilities

**Deliverable:** A report that outlines the plan's approach to providing a range of affordable housing options to existing and future residents, based on the elements identified above.



### **Multimodal Access, Levels of Service & Connectivity Component**

**Goal:** Strategies for improving bus access to rail stations and ferry terminals and frequency of feeder services (in consultation with transit providers) as well as pedestrian, bicycle and auto access and safety. Multi-modal connections between transit stations and high-density housing, surrounding neighborhood amenities, activity nodes, and open space should be emphasized. This should apply throughout the planning area boundaries (include significant nodes outside plan area boundaries).

#### **Pedestrian Access & Circulation (see also, Pedestrian-Friendly Design Standards)**

Identify pedestrian access and circulation patterns between station/terminal, local transit, neighborhood amenities and activity nodes in the planning area. Utilizing the PDA Profile and Alternatives Analysis (for future land uses), show the most heavily pedestrian traveled routes in your planning area, emphasizing pedestrian safety.

- Identify primary pedestrian routes
- Consolidate and minimize driveways
- Accommodate ADA requirements

#### **Bicycle Access & Circulation**

Incorporate county-wide and local bike plans, station/terminal access for bicycles, bicycle parking and storage. Identify circulation pattern to adjacent activity centers and nodes. Show the bicycle network identified by class in the planning area. Identify connections to regional routes.

- Incorporate Countywide and City Bike Plans
- Bike lane treatments at intersections
- Bike racks and storage
- Bike lane width and treatment, designation class I-III and sharrows

#### **Transit Connectivity**

Identify and locate feeder bus service/hubs at stations/terminals, identify various lines serving stations, and routes and stops within the planning area.

- Bus stops at intersections
- Bus Shelters
- Bus bulb outs
- Intermodal access, including way-finding signage, accessible transit information, real-time technology, schedule coordination, fare coordination and last-mile connecting services
- Close and early consultation/coordination with all affected transit operators

#### **Auto Circulation**

Locate vehicular routes from core planning area parking structures/ lots to arterials, expressways, and freeways. Minimize auto and pedestrian/bicycle conflicts.

- Identify auto intensive land uses
- Keep vehicular circulation to a minimum in pedestrian core areas
- Relocate auto oriented land uses in highly pedestrian trafficked areas. Including vehicular entrances of parking structures

**Deliverable:** Multimodal access and connectivity plan/memo and pedestrian-friendly design standards or similar (See Pedestrian-Friendly Design Standards)

## **Pedestrian-Friendly Design/Placemaking Guidelines**

**Goal:** Building, open space and street design standards that focus on pedestrian-oriented design that enhances the walking environment and increases pedestrian comfort and convenience as well as the safety and security of transit patrons in and around the plan area. Capitalizes on physical and cultural assets.

### **Background:**

In preparation for the TLC 2010 Capital Call for Projects, MTC developed design guidance utilizing context-sensitive design solutions. The guidance suggests ranges (minimum and maximums) for a variety of design elements, which can be viewed as best practices, and can be considered a base from which to work for the design elements included in the plan.

### **Possible approaches that prioritize pedestrians:**

Pedestrian Friendly Design Guidelines  
Form Based Code  
Street Design Guidelines  
Context Sensitive Solutions

Considerations to prioritize pedestrians include:

- Sidewalk width
- Block Length 300'-400'
- Mid-block crossings (controlled)
- High visibility crosswalk treatments at all legs of intersections
- Pedestrian refuge islands
- Pedestrian-scaled lighting
- Curb return radii
- Audible signals
- Curb extensions (Bulb outs)
- ADA compliant ramps
- Street trees & planters
- Street furniture and fixtures
- Max. Travel lane width
- Way Finding signage
- 25 mph Speed Limit in Pedestrian Zones

**Deliverable –** See Multimodal Access and Connectivity Component

## Accessible Design

**Goal:** Create an accessibility plan for people with disabilities, ensuring fully accessible transit stations, accessible paths of travel between the stations and surrounding areas, and visitable and habitable housing units adjacent to transit stations and in the planning area where feasible. **If new housing is proposed within the planning area, at least 10% of townhomes should be habitable by persons with disabilities.** Accessible paths of travel between the transit stations and essential destinations within the planning area should take into consideration width of sidewalks, presence of curb cuts, physical barriers that would prevent persons with mobility limitations from access and enhancements that would facilitate access.

### Key Definitions

- **Accessible:** Housing and routes to transit that meet the needs of an individual of a person with mobility limitations
- **Adaptable:** Housing that allows some features of a building or dwelling to be readily changed to be accessible
- **Habitable:** Dwelling where a person with a disability can live with an accessible bedroom
- **Visitable:** Dwelling where a person with a disability can visit with an accessible restroom
- **Townhome:** A multi-story residence that is connected by a common wall to another residence
- **Universal Design (UD)\*:**
  - The design of products and environments to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without adaptation or specialized design.
  - A user-friendly approach to design in the living environment where people of any culture, age, size, weight, race, gender and ability can experience an environment that promotes their health, safety and welfare today and in the future.

### Considerations when developing the Accessibility Plan

- Do new housing units (including townhomes) in the planning area incorporate universal design, or are habitable by persons with mobility limitations (e.g have accessible bathrooms and bedrooms, or can be converted through universal design)
- Does your jurisdiction have a policy to incorporate universal design in new housing developments in the planning area? If yes, what is the policy and how will it apply to the planning area?
- Describe the path of access to and from transit and essential services within a ½ mile from existing and planned housing units in the planning area. Description should include width of sidewalks, presence of curb cuts, physical barriers that would prevent persons with mobility limitations from access, and enhancements that would facilitate access.

**Deliverable:** Memo containing how the planning area will accommodate persons with disabilities, both in path of travel to/from transit and surrounding destinations, as well as habitable and visitable housing units.

\* from Universal Design Alliance, <http://www.universaldesign.org/universaldesign1.htm>

## **Parking Policy and Management**

**Goal:** Create a parking policy and management element that aims at reducing parking demand through pricing, zoning, and support for alternative modes. Pricing and zoning requirements have the largest impact on parking demand. Although most drivers do not pay a direct fee to use most parking, creation and operations of the spaces is not free: developers must pay to build and maintain the parking spaces and they add a cost to rental and purchase prices, typically hidden. Commercial tenants, in turn, pass the cost on to consumers by adding it to prices of good and services. Minimum parking requirements tend to lower density, encourage sprawl and reduce demand for transit and other modes. The plan should include requirements on new developments/uses, and employers in the planning area as described below.

### **A. New developments or uses - City Parking Requirements**

Include one or more of the following three approaches:

1. **Eliminate parking minimums** for new developments in the planning area
2. **Reduce parking minimums** to levels consistent with AB 710 (Skinner), as proposed in 2011, specifically: City requirements of no more than:
  - i. 1 space per residential unit
  - ii. 1 space per 1,000 square ft of commercial space, or
3. **Establish parking maximums** at a level of no higher than one and one-half the minimums above, i.e., 1.5 spaces per residential unit and 1.5 spaces per 1,000 sq ft commercial space

Approaches 1 & 2 provide greater flexibility and choice for developers to customize their housing products to address local demand and context, providing consumers more choices. Reductions in city requirements allow developers to propose development with lower levels of parking, including for reuse of existing buildings. Examples of no parking requirements on residential developments or use include downtown areas in San Francisco, Los Angeles, Berkeley, Seattle, WA and Portland OR. Note that these approaches do not limit the level of parking that can be proposed or built by developers.

Approach 3, creating parking maximums, limits the level of parking that can be proposed or built by developers. Parking maximums are a relatively new strategy, and serve to reduce automobile travel and congestion in the local areas with good availability of alternative modes. The number of spaces allowed is typically based on either quality of transit modes or local utilization rates. Examples include downtown San Francisco, Cambridge, MA, Portland, Bend and Hood River, OR. Use of parking maximums should be carefully evaluated to determine that development is financially viable in the local context.

These strategies can be used in combination, i.e., both a lower or no minimum and a maximum. In addition, the plan should consider other appropriate strategies, such as unbundling, car-share, bicycle parking, pedestrian accessibility, shared parking, and transit passes to support these approaches.

### **B. Employers - City Parking Requirements**

Include one or more of the three approaches:

1. **Commuter Benefit Ordinance** requiring employers to choose one of the following (using the models of SF, Richmond and Berkeley)
  - a. Pre-tax dollars- Employer sets up a deduction program under existing IRS code 132(f), allows employees to make monthly pretax deductions to purchase transit passes or vanpool rides.
  - b. Employer Subsidy, see [CommuterBenefits.org](http://CommuterBenefits.org) or the IRS Fringe Benefits Guide at [IRS.gov/publications/p15b/index.html](http://IRS.gov/publications/p15b/index.html) for more information
  - c. Employer Provided -Employer offers workers free shuttle service on company-funded bus/van.
1. **Parking cash-out** based on city enforcement of state law, as per SB 728, Lowenthal, passed 2010
2. **Transportation Demand Management** - participation in an active TDM Association

Additional information on parking planning and management approaches, steps and strategies is available in the MTC Parking Toolbox - [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart\\_growth/parking/parking\\_seminar.htm](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/parking/parking_seminar.htm).

**Deliverable:** Parking management plan/memo incorporating elements listed above

### **Infrastructure Development and Budget**

**Goal:** Describe existing public infrastructure (streets and roadways, sidewalks, bike lanes and racks, utilities, street furniture, street trees, parking, stormwater management, etc.) and public facilities/services (transit stations/shelters, libraries, parks, centers, schools, police/fire, etc.) within the planning area, determine improvements needed to meet the demands of the existing and anticipated service population, develop cost estimates, and identify potential funding mechanisms for necessary improvements and maintenance.

**Considerations:**

- Describe existing public infrastructure and facilities and highlight strengths/weaknesses in the PDA Profile
- Incorporate findings from the Market Demand Analysis
  - For example, if the Market Demand Analysis finds that higher density housing can be accommodated, will utility pipe upgrades be needed?
- Factor in regulatory requirements for new development (e.g. stormwater or fire protection)
- Coordinate with local service agencies, such as school districts, police and fire to determine potential budget/facility impacts as a result of new development
- Specific mapping or analysis may be needed to fill in data gaps to assess infrastructure needs and identify service factors for estimating costs (e.g. cost per service population or per user)
- Conduct a fiscal impact analysis to determine the impact of the plan on public services and determine appropriate financing strategies to meet costs
- Prioritize/phase improvements and include in Implementation Plan and Financing Strategy

**Deliverable:** Memo outlining infrastructure development and budget

### **Implementation Plan and Financing Strategy**

**Goal:** List action items necessary to implement the goals of the plan and identify responsible department, cost estimates, potential revenue sources, and timeframe for completion.

**Considerations:**

- Identify action items for each topical section (e.g. land use or connectivity) of the plan to implement the goals of that section and for overall plan implementation, such as programmatic changes to incorporate new programs.
- Action items should be categorized and listed in a logical format (e.g. bulleted list and/or table)
- Each action item should be assigned a time frame for implementation (e.g. short 0-2 years, medium 3 to 5 years, long-term 6+ years) to easily identify immediate next steps and longer term priorities.
- Each action should have a cost estimate and potential funding sources
- Each action item should be assigned to a responsible department
- Evaluate opportunities for neighborhood groups/other organizations to implement/assist with projects (e.g. street clean-up)
- Establish a mechanism for annual review of plan implementation progress and priorities (e.g. annual staff status report to planning commission/city council or have each department review implementation action items and incorporate into their departmental budget review process)

**Deliverable:** Implementation Plan with Financing Strategy

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Preparation for Plan Implementation**

**Goal:** Prepare all necessary documents and changes at the time of plan adoption to proceed immediately with plan implementation, such as Program-level EIR

- Zoning changes
- General Plan amendments
- Developer agreements

*This Page Intentionally Blank*

## Planning Committee **STAFF REPORT**

**Meeting Date:** May 7, 2014

Subject	Approval of Revised Strategies for the 2014 CTP Update
<b>Summary of Issues</b>	In April, the Authority approved the outline and schedule for the 2014 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) but made additional revisions to the proposed goals and strategies. Authority staff has made changes to the strategies and is bringing back those revisions as requested.
<b>Recommendations</b>	Approve revised strategies
<b>Financial Implications</b>	No direct financial implications
<b>Options</b>	1. Revise strategies further
<b>Attachments</b>	A. Revised Vision, Goals and Strategies for the 2014 CTP
<b>Changes from Committee</b>	

### Background

In April, the Authority revised the goals and strategies for the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). As requested, Authority staff is bringing those changes back to the PC and Authority for confirmation.

The following revisions were made:

### Goals

- Support the efficient, safe and reliable movement of people and goods using all available travel modes;

### Strategies

- 1.4 Improve the highway and arterial system consistent with a countywide plan consistent with the General Plans of local jurisdictions to influence the location and nature of anticipated growth ~~built on the General Plans of local jurisdictions~~.



- 
- 1.5 Identify new strategies to improve freight movement on freeways and rail lines to improve air quality and the safety and efficiency of shipping goods movement.
  - 2.8 Work with local jurisdictions and other agencies to develop a connected and coordinated network for alternative fuel electric vehicles.
  - 3.7 Support the expansion of a coordinated system of transit and paratransit service to address the mobility needs of low-income, elderly, young and disabled travelers, households without cars, single-parent households, and people paying more than 50 percent of their income for rent, whether or not they reside in a — all members of “communities-community of concern” as defined by MTC and ABAG.
  - 5.5 Consider the needs of all areas and communities in Contra Costa in funding decisions to ensure fairness in the Authority’s transportation investments.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS REGARDING THE 2014 CTP UPDATE**

### **CTP Brochure**

With oversight from the Authority’s CTP Ad-Hoc Committee, Authority staff has published a brochure that provides an overview of the issues and opportunities regarding the upcoming 2014 update to the Countywide Transportation Plan, now scheduled for publication in July 2014. The CTP brochure is available at [www.ccta.net](http://www.ccta.net).

### **CTP Notice of Preparation**

Authority staff has released a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to conduct the CEQA-required environmental review of the 2014 CTP Update. In consultation with Authority Counsel, staff proposes to prepare a Supplemental EIR (SEIR) on the 2014 CTP. The SEIR would be based upon the Authority’s 2009 CTP, for which a full EIR was prepared. The NOP is available at [www.ccta.net](http://www.ccta.net).

## 2014 Contra Costa Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan

---

### **Vision, Goals and Strategies**

*As revised by the Authority — 16 April 2014*

#### **VISION**

Strive to preserve and enhance the quality of life of local communities by promoting a healthy environment and strong economy to benefit all people and areas of Contra Costa, through (1) a balanced, safe, and efficient transportation network, (2) cooperative planning, and (3) growth management. The transportation network should integrate all modes of transportation to meet the diverse needs of Contra Costa.

#### **GOALS**

- Support the efficient, safe and reliable movement of people and goods using all available travel modes;
- Manage growth to sustain Contra Costa's economy, preserve its environment and support its communities;
- Expand safe, convenient and affordable alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle;
- Maintain the transportation system; and
- Continue to invest wisely to maximize the benefits of available funding.

## **STRATEGIES FOR THE 2014 CTP**

*Reflects Authority Revisions – April 16, 2014*

The Authority will rely on a number of strategies to achieve these goals. The strategies, and the goals they will implement, are presented below, with revisions to the strategies from the 2009 Plan shown in redline/strikethrough format.

---

### **1. Support the efficient and reliable movement of people and goods using all available travel modes.**

- 1.1 Increase the ~~capacity~~ efficiency of existing highways and arterial roads through capital investments, ~~and~~ operational enhancements, and use of technology.
- 1.2 Work with jurisdictions and other agencies to identify and implement strategies for managing congestion and increasing multi-modal mobility.
- 1.3 Define and close gaps in the existing highway and arterial system, including gaps in the regional express lane and high-occupancy vehicle lane networks (high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes).
- 1.4 Improve the highway and arterial system consistent with a countywide plan consistent with the General Plans of local jurisdictions to influence the location and nature of anticipated growth ~~the General Plans of local jurisdictions.~~
- 1.5 Identify new strategies to improve freight movement on freeways and rail lines to improve air quality and the safety and efficiency of shipping goods movement.

**2. Manage growth to sustain Contra Costa's economy, preserve its environment and support its communities.**

- 2.1 ~~Continue to~~ Require cooperative transportation and land use planning among Contra Costa County, cities, towns, and transportation agencies.
- 2.2 Work to maintain and expand partnerships to achieve the Authority's goals.
- 2.3 Participate in a regional cooperative land use planning process with agencies both within and outside of Contra Costa.
- 2.4 Support land use patterns within Contra Costa that make more efficient use of the transportation system, consistent with the General Plans of local jurisdictions.
- 2.5 Require local jurisdictions to (i) evaluate and report on the impacts of their land use decisions on the transportation system using methodologies consistent with the Action Plans and the Authority's technical procedures, (ii) identify necessary capital improvements and/or supportive operational improvements and multi-modal improvements, and (iii) have new growth pay its fair share of the cost of such improvements.
- 2.6 Link transportation investments to support (i) a voter-approved urban limit line endorsed by the County and each city and town, (ii) new developments which enhance transportation efficiency and economic vitality, and (iii) infill and redevelopment in existing urban and brownfields areas.
- 2.7 Work within Contra Costa and the region to ensure that new transportation projects are fiscally viable and are environmentally sustainable ~~promote a healthy environment, fiscally viable,~~ respect community character and maintain or enhance the quality of life of our communities.
- 2.8 Work with local jurisdictions and other agencies to develop a connected and coordinated network for alternative fuel ~~electric~~ vehicles.

**3. Expand safe, convenient and affordable alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle.**

- 3.1 Help fund the expansion of existing transit services and regional express lanes that support transit service, and maintenance of existing operations, including BART, bus transit, school buses, and paratransit.
- 3.2 Link transit investments to increased coordination and integration of public transit services, and improved connections between travel modes.
- 3.3 Require local jurisdictions to incorporate policies and standards for “complete streets” that support transit, bicycle and pedestrian access in new developments and in infill development areas (“Priority Development Areas”) and transit priority areas.
- 3.4 Support transit-oriented and pedestrian-friendly developments.
- 3.5 Invest in trails, walkways, and pedestrian-oriented improvements.
- 3.6 Promote formation of more carpools and vanpools, and greater use of transit, bicycling, and walking.
- 3.7 Support the expansion of a coordinated system of transit and paratransit service to address the mobility needs of low-income, elderly, ~~young~~ and disabled travelers, households without cars, single-parent households, and people paying more than 50 percent of their income for rent, whether or not they reside in a —all members of “communities of concern” as defined by MTC and ABAG.
- 3.8 Encourage local jurisdictions and other agencies to develop a connected and coordinated system of bicycle facilities through financial assistance, technical support and other aid and encouragement.

3.9 Support congestion pricing and parking pricing programs, transportation demand management programs and other innovative strategies that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

3.10 Support Safe Routes to Schools projects and programs.

---

#### **4. Maintain the transportation system.**

4.1 Advocate for stable sources of funds for transit operations and other programs that support the transportation system.

4.2 Require programs for effective preventive maintenance and rehabilitation of the transportation system.

4.3 Provide funding to reduce the backlog of transportation rehabilitation and maintenance needs and other projects and programs that will sustain the transportation system.

4.4 Promote stable funding and preventive maintenance programs that will (i) address the backlog of rehabilitation needs and (ii) maintain the long-term health of all components of the transportation system.

---

#### **5. Continue to invest wisely to maximize the benefits of available funding.**

5.1 Use performance measures to evaluate and compare transportation investments.

5.2 Seek matching funds, whenever possible, and offer incentives and priority funding to projects that provide greater return on investment.

5.3 Develop public-private partnerships and pursue innovative financing mechanisms to accelerate project delivery.

- 5.4 Use Measure J funds to leverage State, federal and other funding whenever possible.
- 5.5 Consider the needs of all areas and communities in Contra Costa in funding decisions to ensure fairness in the Authority's transportation investments.

---

**Planning Committee *STAFF REPORT*****Meeting Date:** May 7, 2014

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Approve Scope of Work and Authorize the Release of Request for Proposals (RFP) to Update the Contra Costa Express Bus Study</b>
<b>Summary of Issues</b>	The Contra Costa Express Bus Study was prepared in 2001 prior to the passage of Measure J. The proposed scope of work and study will update the original study to reflect current revenues and operating conditions affecting express bus services within Contra Costa County.
<b>Recommendations</b>	Approve the Scope of Work and authorizes staff to release an RFP to update the Contra Costa Express Bus Study for an amount not to exceed \$150,000.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	The study update is anticipated to cost \$150,000. The funding source is Measure J Planning (OCP18-A), and is federally reimbursable. Funding for the study is included in the draft FY 2014-15 Authority Budget.
<b>Options</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Make edits to the Scope of Work</li><li>2. Do not authorize the release of the RFP at this time</li></ol>
<b>Attachments</b>	<b>A.</b> Proposed Scope of Work
<b>Changes from Committee</b>	

**Background**

The current Contra Costa Express Bus Study was prepared for CCTA in December 2001. At that time no funding was dedicated to express bus from Measure C and the reauthorization of Measure C was not yet conceived. Other proposed funding sources never really materialized and as such routing proposed in the study never improved



beyond the initial phase which was primarily funded by Regional Measure 2 (RM2) and Proposition 42 funding.

Measure J provided a committed funding source to express bus service – Program 16 which dedicated \$86 Million (2004 \$) to express bus capital and operating expenses. Unfortunately since Measure J was enacted transit revenues in general have seen significant turmoil. As a result of the economic downturn, sales tax revenues were well below projections. In addition, the State temporarily eliminated both State Transit Assistance (STA) funding and Proposition 42 funding to transit. Consequently, transit operators used their Measure J express bus allocations to maintain existing express bus services as they struggle to find a balance in service for transit dependent populations, lifeline services and commuters.

In the past two years sales tax revenues have begun to recover and other State provided funding sources have stabilized. Additionally the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has completed its review of the public transportation providers through its Transit Sustainability Project. These factors make the time right to update the Express Bus Plan to see if the original routing concepts are still viable after 13 years or if a new approach makes more sense. There is also currently a better picture, at least in the near term, of likely revenue sources for implementation of additional express bus service.

The attached Scope of Work was developed by staff and reviewed by the Bus Transit Coordinating Committee (BTCC). The scope proposes a comprehensive look at the current express service in Contra Costa County provided by all operators.

The Scope of Work tasks include:

- Task 1 – Research and Define Express Bus Criteria
- Task 2 – Review Express Routes that Serve Contra Costa and Identify Express Bus Routes
- Task 3 – Current Express Bus Route Performance
- Task 4 – Current Express Bus Funding
- Task 5 – Current Express Bus Infrastructure
- Task 6 – Express Bus Service Improvements - Stakeholder Interviews
- Task 7 – Express Bus Improvements – Technology, branding, and future innovation
- Task 8 – Express Bus Future Plan
- Task 9 – Contra Costa Express Bus Plan report

The scope, once approved, will be incorporated into CCTA's standard RFP template for "federalized" projects. This will allow CCTA to ultimately be reimbursed with federal planning funds for eligible costs for the project.

*This Page Intentionally Blank*

## CONTRA COSTA EXPRESS BUS STUDY UPDATE

### SCOPE OF WORK

#### Task 1 – Research and Define Express Bus Criteria

Define the various tiers of bus transit service, ranging from local service, to express service, to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Define express bus service, its distinguishing characteristics, and the criteria for determining which routes might qualify for express service. The consultant shall research industry practice and peer transit system definitions for express bus criteria. Criteria and thresholds used by peer systems to define express service shall be reviewed and documented.

*Deliverable – Technical Memorandum #1.*

#### Task 2 – Review Express Routes that Serve Contra Costa and Identify Express Bus Routes

*Background:* There are several public transit agencies that operate bus service in Contra Costa County including four Contra Costa agencies: County Connection in central Contra Costa, Tri Delta Transit in east Contra Costa, WestCAT in the northwest part of Contra Costa and AC Transit in the southwest part of Contra Costa. In addition, four out-of-county operators provide services into Contra Costa. From Solano County, SolTrans provides express services from Vallejo to both El Cerrito and Walnut Creek, and Fairfield and Suisun Transit (FAST) provides express service from Vacaville and Fairfield to Walnut Creek. From Alameda County, Wheels provides service from Livermore to Walnut Creek. From Marin County Golden Gate Transit provides an express route from San Rafael to the Richmond and Del Norte BART stations.

*Historical Trends:* The Consultant shall document historic levels of express bus service from 1990 and 2000 to the present. The Consultant shall document the changes in service that have occurred since 1990, and identify the factors that drove operators to change service plans.

*Existing Conditions:* The consultant shall review all publically operated bus service and determine Express Bus routes that currently operate in Contra Costa. Express bus routes shall be mapped and described. Private shuttle operations (to the extent that they are known) should be identified as well.

The consultant shall document links and coordination between services and express routes including connections to other routes and major destinations. The consultant shall also identify how current routes meet the criteria identified in Task 1.

*Deliverable – Technical Memorandum #2.*

### Task 3 – Current Express Bus Route Performance

Public routes identified in Task 2 shall be further evaluated and described in terms of ridership, total hours, revenue hours, cost, and farebox recovery ratio. As appropriate these express routes shall also be compared against similar trips by automobile (time and cost). Performance measures established by each operator for their specific express routes shall also be documented.

Operating issues, markets served and future changes anticipated shall be described. Fare rates, fare mechanisms (Clipper, East Bay Value Pass), and transfer agreements shall be documented.

*Deliverable – Technical Memorandum #3*

### Task 4 – Current Express Bus Funding

Identify funds used to support the express bus system and funding requirements. Document funding sources and the constraints and how each source is allocated throughout the existing express network. For instance some routes are paid for with Regional Measure 2 (RM2) funds that have a farebox recovery ratio requirement.

*Deliverable – Technical Memorandum #4*

### Task 5 – Current Express Bus Infrastructure

#### Park and Ride lots, Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) stations, Transit Centers

Park and ride lots, BART stations, and transit centers are key locations in the express bus system. The consultant shall identify and map current locations and identify issues and improvements. Known or planned improvement projects such as the Walnut Creek BART shall be described. Changes to the existing system that are planned shall be included. The impact on future express service shall be explained. The consultant shall evaluate capacity, bus layover space, connectivity, and passenger amenities to identify issues.

Infrastructure improvements shall be identified and prioritized, then preliminary cost estimates and agency responsibilities shall be determined.

#### Caltrans and Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) projects

Highway improvements including the creation of high occupancy vehicle (HOV) or high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes, on/off ramp changes, or highway widening work that will affect the performance of the express bus service shall be described. If a project is expected to be complete within the next 10 years it should be described in the plan. The impact on bus service shall be defined in terms of reduced travel time.

## Fleet

The fleet required to maintain existing service on the express bus routes shall be described in terms of the need for pull-out, spares required, and type of vehicle used by operator. A replacement schedule shall be developed in accordance with regional funding availability.

*Deliverable – Technical Memorandum #5*

### Task 6 – Express Bus Service Improvements - Stakeholder Interviews

The consultant shall be responsible for engaging and interviewing current transit operators and other stakeholders (including regional transportation planning committee staff) to identify desired improvements to the express bus system. Sub-regional Action Plans shall be addressed in the process. Ridership patterns shall be evaluated and system improvements shall be suggested by the consultant for stakeholder review.

*Deliverable – Technical Memorandum #6*

### Task 7 – Express Bus Improvements – Technology, branding, and future innovation

*Technology:* The consultant shall describe short-range, low cost improvements that are technology based that could make transfers easier for the passengers. These include real time signage, smart-phone apps, driver to driver communication, signal priority installations, commuter bus service technologies developed by Google, Genentech, and Apple, plus other technologies that could improve existing operations and passenger experience.

*Branding:* The consultant shall explore ways to further coordinate services that may include single branding of the buses, special signage at Express bus stops, and fare structure simplification facilitated by Clipper.

*Future Innovation:* The Consultant shall identify higher-cost current and future innovations that could improve Express Bus services. These shall include, but are not limited to, dedicated right-of-way for Express Buses or BRT, and the potential for autonomous buses.

*Deliverable – Technical Memorandum #7*

### Task 8 – Express Bus Future Plan

Three scenarios shall be developed for an express bus system: current service levels; expanded service and reduced service. The three scenarios shall represent current cost and service hours, expanded cost and hours, and reduced cost and hours. Rolling stock needs shall be identified for the expanded and reduced service scenarios. The impact on facilities shall be identified. Triggers that would affect an expansion or reduction of the service should be described such as growth in demand, increases or decreases in funding, major development, and shifts in the economy.

Each scenario shall be described with maps showing routes, service levels (hours), and ridership. A funding plan shall be developed. Assumptions about development growth, ridership pattern changes, and infrastructure improvements shall be described.

The Consultant shall reflect upon the market forces and economic conditions that would factor into the selection of each scenario.

Any service changes implementing the scenarios described that would trigger a Title VI analysis by the operator shall be identified.

*Deliverable – Technical Memorandum #8*

### Task 9 – Contra Costa Express Bus Plan report

Consultant shall prepare a draft report incorporating findings and comments from the previous technical memoranda developed within each task. The draft report shall be circulated to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, Contra Costa transit operators and Regional Transportation Planning Committees for final comments. Any final comments shall be documented and incorporated into the final plan if appropriate.

*Deliverable – Contra Costa Express Bus Plan draft report*

*Deliverable – Contra Costa Express Bus Plan final report*