

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, JANUARY 28, 2016

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**

Meeting to be hosted by the City of Martinez

1. Review/Revise Accept/Minutes of the November 19, 2015 TAC Meeting

Attachment: TAC minutes from November 19, 2015 meeting.

- 2. Update on the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP).** At its December 16, 2015 meeting, the Authority approved a revised approach for development of a TEP which includes special meetings of the Authority Board, a revised strategy to re-engage the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC), and continuing engagement with Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs), cities and the County, other stakeholders, and members of the public. The revised approach is intended to allow the Authority to approve a Draft TEP for review and comment in March 2016 and to approve a proposed final TEP in May 2016. If desired, the RTPCs have an opportunity to revise their prior recommendations, as long as input is received by February 29, 2016. CCTA staff will present the item. *(Hisham Noeimi, CCTA)*

ACTION: To be determined

Attachments: (1) Memo dated January 7, 2016 Re: Potential November 2016 Ballot Measure; (2) CCTA Path to TEP Recommendation; (3) Letter to Chair of the CCTA Board dated January 6, 2016 from the East Bay Leadership Council; and (4) A Community Vision for a New Transportation Sales Tax.

- 3. Continued Discussion of the Pacheco Transit Hub**
- 4. Status of the Conditions of Compliance document for Calendar Year 2014 and 2015 Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP) Compliance Checklist**
- 5. The next meeting to be hosted by **The City of Walnut Creek**, is scheduled for February 25, 2016 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined.**

TRANSPAC Technical Advisory Commission (TAC) Meeting Summary Minutes

MEETING DATE: November 19, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Corinne Dutra-Roberts, 511 Contra Costa; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa; and Tim Tucker, Martinez

GUESTS/PRESENTERS: Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA)

MINUTES PREPARED BY: Anita Tucci-Smith

The meeting, hosted by Tim Tucker, City of Martinez, convened at 9:11 A.M.

PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Review/Revise/Accept Minutes of the September 24, 2015 TAC Meeting

The minutes were accepted, as submitted.

2. 2015 Measure J Strategic Plan: At its May 2015 meeting, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) initiated the update to the 2013 Strategic Plan. Authority staff will provide an update and seek concurrence on proposed fund programming changes to be done as part of the 2015 Strategic Plan. *(Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, CCTA)*

Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, CCTA, explained that Measure J had been passed in 2004, was updated every two years to reflect changes in the economy, and looked at the assumptions on future Measure J revenues, debt service costs, and projected expenditures in order to respond to fluctuations in economic conditions and project schedule.

For the 2015 Strategic Plan, Mr. Noeimi explained that there would be a slight increase in revenues over the life of Measure J at \$2.72 billion versus \$2.71 billion for 2013, with a \$4 million increase for projects. The CCTA Board had considered how much was in construction now, and had decided to put that \$4 million in construction reserve based on Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC) share. There was no intent to put that revenue on new projects at this time. He noted the expectation that \$27 million in cash flow capacity would be available in the last two years of the 2015 Strategic Plan. A breakdown between the subregions had been based on each region's share of projects in the Expenditure Plan.

Mr. Noeimi reported that Central County's share would be \$10 million. He distributed an updated table of projects of CCTA Program of Projects to correct errors in the table of projects that had been included in the TAC packets, and explained that there was a need to establish priorities to distribute the \$10 million expected by Central County.

Stating that there were a few issues to address, Mr. Noeimi referred to the Caldecott Tunnel project which had not yet been closed out. Given some remaining commitments, he recommended that TRANSPAC retain \$3 million of the \$10 million in case it was needed for cost increases on the Caldecott Tunnel. While the hope was that it would not be needed, that would not be known for six months. As a result, he recommended that \$3 million be parked in case it was needed for the tunnel, which would leave \$7 million.

When asked what remained to be funded for the Caldecott Tunnel, Mr. Noeimi stated it related to the main tunnel. There was money in the contingency to cover some of the commitment, although until the close out of the project there was a need to retain enough funds to cover any possibilities. He explained that the landscaping portion of the project at a cost of \$2.7 million had gone well.

With respect to the I-680 Southbound Carpool Lane Completion project, Mr. Noeimi explained that TRANSPAC had agreed in 2013 to reprogram up to \$4.9 million from the I-680 Corridor Reserve to fully fund the I-680 Southbound Gap Closure. With that, the \$7 million remaining would be reduced to \$2 million.

Mr. Noeimi also referred to the State Route 4 Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM) project where the CCTA had received a \$200,000 grant to develop the scope for a SR-4 ICM project, and would be competing for another \$6 million in federal grants for the project. In that case, a local match of \$4 million was required. He stated that the TRANSPAC Committee had agreed to set aside \$2 million from one of its project categories, and the TRANSPAC Committee was being asked to do the same. He explained that the I-680 Corridor Reserve could be tapped, and the cap would have to be increased on the Highway 4 Project for use on I-680, or if that didn't work the funds might have to be taken from a project that had already been programmed. He hoped not to get to that point and noted that a decision would be a couple of years away. He added that the projects they would be looking at already had huge funding shortfalls.

Mr. Noeimi also reported that there was a surplus on the Alhambra Creek Bridge and Ferry Street Improvements project and this was the time to determine how to use that surplus. While it could be split between the cities, he stated it was really a Martinez share although if Martinez did not have a project ready it could be placed on the SR-4 ICM project or other projects.

Mr. Noeimi expressed his hope that a Draft Strategic Plan would be available by February 2016. He also noted that there were more and more opportunities for Information Technology Services (ITS) type of projects and to be competitive one of the goals of Measure J was to leverage funds to qualify for other funding sources. He emphasized there was a need to be ready for such projects. In terms of the ICM project, he characterized it as a combination of tools to manage the freeway traffic, tools to allow Caltrans to close lanes or guide traffic away from an incident, and that adaptive measures would be used to address traffic.

Ray Kuzbari asked about the schedule for the ICM Study, and Mr. Noeimi stated the study had not yet been started but would have to start by September 2016. The plan was to have TAC meetings throughout for the study and the scope of the project, which had been estimated to cost \$80 million.

Mr. Kuzbari noted that the Strategic Plan would come up again in 2017, and suggested the timing might work to go out for a grant at that point. He suggested there was no appetite right now to transfer funds from a capital project for an operational project, and stated that was something that could be discussed again in two years. He did not see a need for any decisions at this point in time.

Mr. Noeimi referred to the I-680/State Route 4 (Phase 3) project, identified a big shortfall in that project, and explained that CCTA staff was still working with Caltrans to cover some of the shortfall. If Caltrans did not help, he was not sure what could be done, which was a big factor in the next Strategic Plan as well. For this Strategic Plan, the CCTA recommended advancing money to be ready to proceed with the project. He referred to the reference to the I-680/SR-4 Interchange Improvements – Phase 3 project on the table of projects, advised that there would be \$3.6 million in outer years, and recommended that be advanced in the Strategic Plan to work on the shortfall, and as part of the 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) asking the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to get \$5 million from the Hercules Intermodal Station project in West County to put in the project. He noted it would be unknown what would be available in the next few months until Caltrans identified its State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) funds.

Mr. Kuzbari verified that the table of projects that had been distributed was the adopted 2013 Strategic Plan, with the exception of the reserve. He asked how the cash flow would work and how that would affect other projects, to which Mr. Noeimi stated he would have to work it out.

Mr. Noeimi explained that when updating the Strategic Plan, he would look at all the project schedules and spread out the money, and if ending up with a negative cash flow some projects would have to be delayed, which could inform when the next bond would occur.

Mr. Kuzbari asked that the table of projects be returned after the analysis of funding so that the TAC could weigh in on it. He did not think it would be an issue although he wanted to make sure it would not affect other projects, especially freeway projects, since that was a very sensitive issue for Concord.

Mr. Noeimi explained, when asked, that the SHOPP was expected to be available in April 2016 so the Strategic Plan had to be finished prior to that time. He also noted that the STIP was broke, which might delay projects. He referred to Major Streets and stated that all projects except for the Pacheco Boulevard Realignment and Widening project were within the Strategic Plan window, and the three highway projects with big shortfalls were outside the window. He added that the reserve was where the TAC had the most flexibility.

Mr. Kuzbari requested that the SR242/Clayton Road Southbound Off-Ramp (6002) project and the SR242/Clayton Road Northbound On-Ramp (6004) project be combined in the next update.

Mr. Tucker stated with respect to the surplus for the Alhambra Creek Bridge and Ferry Street Improvements project that the Pacheco Boulevard project had been awarded but not the Ferry Street portion, which had a different funding source.

Mr. Tucker reported that a detailed letter had been provided on the various components of the project and he asked what the surplus represented with respect to that project. He wanted to make sure that the surplus had not included funds dedicated for the project that had yet to be expended.

Mr. Noeimi stated he would work with Mr. Tucker to verify the accuracy of the surplus number, and if there was a surplus the TAC would have to determine where the funds would go.

Mr. Tucker reiterated that he would like to make sure that the full project was funded before any surplus was distributed. He explained that the City of Martinez was working with Contra Costa County on the Pacheco Boulevard Realignment and Widening project, there were four segments to that project, and there was a shortfall in that project.

In response to John Cunningham with respect to the SR-4 ICM project, Mr. Noeimi reiterated the need to make sure that the tools were available to move cars back to the freeway from blocking arterial streets.

Ms. Overcashier urged that the project, when identified, not impact the funds when available for the I-680/SR-4 Interchange Project.

Mr. Noeimi stated there were still some safety issues. He clarified that the ICM proposal would not impact the interchange projects and he commented that there would still be issues at those locations.

Mr. Kuzbari noted that the ICM study talked about a revision of what the ITS improvements ought to be with the interchange project when fully built, and provide something else in the interim depending on how the project would be phased.

Mr. Noeimi reported that the ICM Study would evaluate technologies or infrastructure for connected vehicle technology, although whether it would be part of the scope would have to be determined. The boundary was SR-160 to I-80, and one of the issues to consider would be how to link with the I-680 ICM. He was hopeful the TAC would see the benefits of the project and be able to support it.

To clarify the distribution of the \$10 million, Mr. Noeimi explained that \$3 million would be dedicated to the Caldecott Tunnel, if needed; \$4.9 million would be dedicated to the I-680 Southbound Carpool Lane Completion; he recommended reserving \$2 million for SR-4 ICM project if it was decided the project would proceed; and dedicating the remaining \$3.4 million to the I-680/SR-4 Interchange Phase 3 project assuming that project would be able to move forward. He also reiterated the need to determine where a surplus, estimated at \$3.3 million from the Alhambra Creek Bridge and Ferry Street Improvements project, would go when that surplus was verified. He suggested the surplus could be parked in the Pacheco Boulevard Realignment and Widening project.

When asked by Mr. Tucker, Mr. Noeimi highlighted the situation with respect to the Grayson Creek Bridge, verified that there had been considerations to phase that project, and explained that Caltrans had yet to respond to the requests to help fund that bridge replacement. He added that the CCTA was hopeful of having a measure on the ballot for 2016, and if it passed would help with that project.

Mr. Noeimi also spoke to some of the options that had been considered to address the Grayson Creek Bridge.

Mr. Noeimi verified that the TAC did not want anything programmed for the SR-4 ICM project at this time, and in two years the revenue projections might be higher and there might be program capacity available so that it would not be an issue.

M/S/U Cunningham/Kuzbari to designate the surplus, to be verified, from the Alhambra Creek Bridge and Ferry Street Improvements project to the Pacheco Boulevard Realignment and Widening project.

3. Update and Review of the Initial Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP). *(Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, CCTA)*

Mr. Noeimi reported that the CCTA Board at its last meeting had decided to continue to move forward with the augmentation. He added that the measure was polling well.

4. 2016 TRANSPAC and TAC Meeting Schedule.

The TAC accepted the 2016 TRANSPAC and TAC meeting schedule, and had no comments.

5. Announcement from Lynn Overcashier, Program Manager, 511 Contra Costa.

Lynn Overcashier announced her retirement after 23 years and stated it had been an honor to work with such wonderful colleagues in a collaborative effort. Her last day would be December 15, 2015.

Mr. Tucker referred to the comments from the TRANSPAC Board at its last meeting and stated it was obvious that Lynn had been appreciated for everything she had done.

Ms. Overcashier reported that Corinne Dutra-Roberts was her replacement, that Corinne had great expertise and historical knowledge, and that the 511 Contra Costa program would continue seamlessly.

The TAC wished Lynn the best in all her future endeavors.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 A.M. The next meeting of the TAC, to be hosted by the City of Walnut Creek, is scheduled for December 17, 2015 at 9:00 A.M. in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room unless otherwise determined.



MEMORANDUM

Date: Thursday, January 7, 2016

RE: Consideration of a potential November 2016 ballot measure by the
Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA)

The CCTA Board is discussing a potential half-cent transportation sales tax that could raise \$2.3 billion over 25 years to help implement our transportation and general plans. Based on experience, this is money that could be leveraged to secure additional funding.

What the voters approved as Measure C in 1988 and as Measure J in 2004 included both a transportation expenditure plan and a growth management program, and any potential new ballot measure will follow a similar structure to define the use of the potential new sales tax revenue and the associated policies that will govern those expenditures.

Overview of the process

The CCTA Board started this process at its meeting in March 2015 by directing staff to work towards development of a possible Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) to be considered for placement on the ballot in November 2016 or a later general election. The decision on whether a TEP is placed on the November 2016 ballot will not occur until July.

Developing a TEP requires involvement of a number of key stakeholders and the public through a variety of means. The plan approved by the CCTA Board solicits input through the following three primary tracks:

1) **Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs)**

In June 2015, CCTA requested that each RTPC provide its recommendation for funding for the portion of future sales tax revenue

that could be made available to the RTPC region. Each RTPC provided its recommendation on projects and programs to CCTA in August 2015, but no policy changes were brought forward with these recommendations.

2) Contra Costa Residents (Public)

CCTA established a robust and award-winning public engagement program for the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and built upon the participation developed through that process for continued public engagement on the TEP. CCTA also conducted two public opinion polls, one related to the Countywide Transportation Plan and another to test various scenarios of combined ballot proposals among the Authority, Contra Costa County and the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART). .

3) Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC)

At its May 2015 meeting, the CCTA Board approved the formation of the EPAC and subsequently appointed individuals to establish membership of the EPAC. The committee membership is intended to represent a balance of stakeholders (defined by stakeholder categories) that reflect the broad range of issues and interests in Contra Costa.

The EPAC has held a number of meetings since June 2015 to receive information about critical funding needs in Contra Costa and to discuss transportation-related matters such as the relationship of transportation and land use, impacts on climate as a result of transportation and greenhouse gas emissions, and other topics. The EPAC is continuing to meet to advise CCTA on these critical issues.

Where we are in the process:

Time is running out for a November 2016 ballot measure. Therefore, CCTA is holding a series of special meetings, which will occur twice a month to create a DRAFT Transportation Expenditure Plan, which could potentially include modifications to the growth management program currently in place under Measure J. CCTA will also be utilizing an approach that hosts multiple conversations with our various stakeholders (RTPCs, Public Manager's Association, EPAC, cities, citizens, etc.) concurrently to provide the CCTA Board with multiple viewpoints for critical decisions.

Last night we had the first direct discussion between the CCTA Board and several EPAC members, who raised many important topics and set us on a path towards finding common ground.

Here are highlights from last night's meeting:

Areas of Agreement:

Through a high-level, facilitated discussion we were able to come to agreement on the following general concepts:

- Recognition that any new potential ballot measure must be compatible with the intent of AB32, SB375, and current state law.
- There is a need to fund alternatives to single occupant vehicles – sidewalks, bikeways, and complete streets for walking and bicycles; BART, buses, other mass-transit.
- It is important to keep the current system of transit and roadways working well, consistent with a fix-it-first policy, which is popular with the public. However, the Authority should carefully evaluate new projects that could increase Greenhouse Gas emissions (GHGs) and look to ways to mitigate this effect.
- Awareness that unlike prior measures, rapid changes in technology provide opportunities, which are just beginning to emerge. With a proposed 25-year measure, we need to include enough flexibility to remain nimble and responsive to new transportation technologies.

Topics that require further discussion:

New issues emerged last night, which will be further developed and considered at future meetings. These issues included whether to retain or strengthen the current Urban Limit Line (ULL) policy, consideration of additional Return to Source requirements, the relationship between transportation investments and job creation and housing initiatives, and many other topics.

Next steps:

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority board will continue to meet semi-monthly for several months with a goal is to compile and release a DRAFT Transportation Expenditure Plan in March, with presentations to city councils on the DRAFT plan beginning in April. Feedback will help CCTA craft a final TEP with

a goal of having formal approval by cities and the Board of Supervisors by July 2016.

In the meantime, CCTA will provide monthly updates at the Mayors Conference, to the RTPCs, Public Managers Association meetings and elsewhere upon request.

CCTA heartily encourages you to report on our progress on this during your City Council meetings, RTPC meeting, Public Managers or CCEAC meeting, etc. to update all Council members, staff and the public and to provide feedback to CCTA as we move forward.

PATH TO TEP RECOMMENDATION

	DEC 2015	JAN 2016	FEB 2016	MAR 2016	APR 2016	MAY 2016	JUN 2016	JULY 2016	AUG 2016
	DEVELOP DRAFT TEP			REVIEW DRAFT TEP		FINAL TEP			
CCTA BOARD MEETINGS/ SPECIAL MEETINGS		Discuss TEP issues	Discuss TEP issues	Review and release Draft TEP		Approve Final TEP for circulation to the Cities and Board of Supervisors		Approve Final TEP, Adopt Ordinance, Request BOS to place on ballot	
EPAC MEETINGS	EPAC Subgroup Meetings	EPAC develops TEP recommendation			Review and Comment on Draft TEP				
RTPCs MEETINGS	RTPCs Subgroup Meetings	RTPCs submit revised TEP recommendations if desired			Review and Comment on Draft TEP				
CITIES & COUNTY					Review and Comment on Draft TEP		Cities/BOS Approval of TEP		BOS Approves Measure for Placement on the Ballot
PUBLIC OUTREACH				Polling			Polling		

**Chair of the Board**

Andrew Sabey
Cox, Castle & Nicholson, LLP

Chair-Elect

Steve Van Wart
Tunbridge Associates

Vice President – Finance

A.J. Major
Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Company, LLP

Vice President - Engagement

Bielle Moore
Republic Services

Vice President - Events

Patricia A. Deutsche
Tesoro Refining & Marketing Company

Vice President – Talent & Workforce

Ken Mintz
AT&T

Vice President – Economic Development & Jobs

Sharon Jenkins
John Muir Health

Vice President – Communications

Peggy White
Diablo Regional Arts Association

Vice President – Membership

James Brandt
Morgan Stanley Wealth Management

Chief Legal Counsel

Peter McGaw
Archer Norris

Vice President - Infrastructure

Terry Bowen
Gray-Bowen-Scott

Immediate Past Chair

Keith Archuleta
Emerald HPC International, LLC

President & CEO

Kristin B. Connelly

January 6, 2016

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

Dear Chairperson Pierce:

As the Contra Costa Transportation Authority continues its consideration of a potential sales tax measure to fund improvements to the County's transportation infrastructure, the East Bay Leadership Council (EBLC) appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on this process. Several of EBLC's members are represented on the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC), providing us with a wide-ranging perspective on the process and the essential elements for a successful measure.

In October of 2014, EBLC sent a letter to your predecessor, Kevin Romick, encouraging the CCTA to draft the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) in a way that ensured it would create an aspirational transportation vision to support a thriving business community and contribute to the economic development of the entire region. Similarly, any draft expenditure plan should maintain its focus on increasing mobility in a manner that will meet the needs and desires of voters and residents of Contra Costa County.

As I have stated publicly throughout the EPAC process, any Expenditure Plan should fund the following major improvements to our transportation infrastructure:

- **Mt. Diablo Loop Plan:** Four legs comprise the loop around Mount Diablo connecting residents to job centers: Highway 4; the connection between Highway 4 and I-580; I-580; and I-680. We need a plan to identify the improvements necessary to complete this loop and provide efficient mobility around Mount Diablo. The work to produce a plan should be fully funded by the new measure so that it can serve as a basis for leveraging outside funding sources with new measure capital funds. The Plan should consider the use of tolling, express lanes, autonomous vehicles, transit such as rapid bus lines, and ITS infrastructure. The plan should determine a cost-effective way to increase corridor person trips without large, capacity increasing projects.
- **I-680:** Sufficient funding to implement the recommendations of CCTA's 680 Corridor Study which is underway. Given the results of CCTA's polling, as well as public input through the Authority's public outreach process, the amount of money allocated to the project should be on the order of 10% of the total revenue. This project has the potential to serve as a 'marquee project' as the Caldecott 4th Bore was for Measure J in 2004.
- **East County Corridor Improvements:** The measure should include sufficient funding to improve the connection between the newly completed Highway 4 (formerly Highway 4 Bypass) and I-580. The measure should not specify which corridor should be selected (Vasco or Byron Hwy), but should include measures related to advance mitigation, as well as access controls to protect against growth inducement beyond the urban limit lines.
- **80 Corridor –** The measure should include funding sufficient to implement the recommendations of the West County 80 Corridor Study, which could serve as an additional marquee project.

Transportation and land use policy are both critically important to our region and inextricably

linked. To succeed, any potential measure must make clear, predictable, and meaningful improvements to mobility, especially along the most congested corridors such as I-680; address deferred maintenance on local streets; and utilize advanced technology to accommodate future demand, while maintaining a clear commitment to established environmental policies supported by EBLC as well as local, state and federal regulations. The EBLC looks forward to continuing to work with you towards this important goal.

Warmest regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Kristin Connelly". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Kristin Connelly
President and CEO

A Community Vision for a New Transportation Sales Tax

Prepared by a growing coalition of environmental, labor, transportation, housing, social justice, faith, civic, and other public interest groups representing Contra Costa voters.

[January 6, 2016]

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) is expected to seek voter approval for a new ½ cent transportation sales tax in 2016. If approved, this measure could raise more than \$2 billion dollars over 30 years. Experience shows that a plan will only pass if it is developed with an extensive public process that draws the nearly full and unanimous support of the community.

A revised draft Countywide Transportation Plan and revised draft Environmental Impact Report have yet to be completed. Decision-makers, residents, and organizations need to see these documents to appropriately plan for future transportation investments. Without this planning, the process to achieve consensus on a variety of vision and policy goals will be considerably more difficult.

We see the following as the major planning issues facing Contra Costa County:

- Ever-increasing traffic, the direct result of land use decisions and induced demand.
- A pressing demand for new homes and jobs within our cities and towns where residents and employees of all incomes have access to safe and convenient transit, walking, and biking networks, reducing single-occupant driving and greenhouse gas emissions.
- The need to dramatically increase funding for transit and enhance the existing transit system for peak performance.
- Growing threats to our natural and agricultural lands, requiring stronger protections and investments.
- An economic imperative to create quality jobs closer to home.

Much has changed since Contra Costa County last passed a transportation measure. When past funding measures were approved in 1998 and 2004, Contra Costa County did not face state mandated reductions in greenhouse gas emissions from transportation. The intersection between land use, transportation, conservation, social equity, health, and economic prosperity was less well understood. Voters today expect more than business as usual or incremental change. Any funding measure must be transformational. We must prioritize plans and investments that change the current dynamic and stay accountable to the public.

To achieve a transformative plan, we share the following vision:

Vision for Contra Costa County:

Any new investments in Contra Costa County's transportation system should be transformational, advancing the County's ongoing transition to a place where all residents have a variety of transportation choices to meet their daily needs. New funds should provide an alternative to traffic congestion, protect the climate, and improve mobility by creating a more balanced, multimodal system that supports transit, walking, and biking as primary modes of transportation. These investments should promote equitable, sustainable development that is well served by transit, create quality local jobs, and protect the agricultural and natural lands that make our region so special.

Incentivizing Sustainable, Equitable Development: Contra Costa should incentivize infill development for people of all incomes near transit - with a priority for affordable housing - and protect existing residents from displacement. Affordable housing near transit is widely known as a highly effective climate protection strategy, promotes increased transit ridership and should be additionally incentivized in all communities. Sales tax revenue and related grant programs that provide funding for cities to build Transit Oriented Development (TOD) must be conditioned on a demonstrated track record of building affordable housing, having locally appropriate anti-displacement policies in place and planning for affordable housing within the specific TOD development. All transportation investments should be made based on strong performance standards to achieve livable, walkable, and affordable communities. These thriving communities will also attract quality jobs located closer to Contra Costa residents.

Local and Regional Transit: Contra Costa should connect people with a transit system that is well maintained, achieves 15-minute headway or better, closes gaps in bus service, manages mobility, and ensures affordable, accessible, and efficient service for all passengers. Investments should be made to increase public transit ridership and provide service at levels that working people and their families can rely upon for daily transportation needs.

Growth management: Contra Costa should lead the region with a bold growth management program that enhances our Urban Limit Lines and protects and invests in our natural and agricultural lands. Policies and programs, such as the Growth Management Program, must be treated as seriously as large infrastructure projects; in the long run they can meet our collective goals far more cheaply.

Global Warming Solutions: Contra Costa should take leadership to exceed the State of California's mandated reductions for vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs). To do so, it should prioritize maintenance of the existing transportation system, including BART; create healthy, sustainable, walkable transit-oriented communities for all; and accelerate the transition to electric vehicles.

Good Local Jobs: The jobs that infrastructure projects and operations investments create should strengthen the local economy and improve the living standards for those who build, maintain and operate the system and provide opportunities for family-supporting jobs and career-enhancing skills for the working people and children of the entire county.

Complete Streets: Contra Costa's roads should provide choices for all people, ensuring that all communities have complete streets that reduce congestion by giving families and commuters safe and attractive options for all modes of transportation.

Regional Trail Network: Contra Costa should expand on its very popular walking and biking trails to create a fully connected, regional trail system that integrates transit centers and downtowns, neighborhoods, and the county's great open space network.

Accountability and Public Benefits: The projects funded by the revenues of this sales tax should be developed with the input of the communities the project is designed to serve, contain provisions for accountability and transparency to public institutions, including recapture provisions if public goals aren't being met, and ensure that any unexpected additional sales tax revenues will benefit the public through investment in voter-approved programs funded by this tax measure.

Endorsements List:

Seth Adams, Save Mount Diablo

Bob Allen, Urban Habitat

Rome Aloise, President of Teamsters Joint Council 7

John Arantes, Service Employees International Union, Local 1021

Judy Barrientos, President Amalgamated Transit Union 1605

Cheryl Brown, AFSCME Council 57

Gloria Bruce, East Bay Housing Organizations

Dave Campbell, Bike East Bay

Joel Devalcourt, Greenbelt Alliance

Sean Dougan, East Bay Regional Park District

Chris Finn, President Amalgamated Transit Union 1555

Peter Finn, Secretary-Treasurer of Teamsters 856

Amie Fishman, Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California

Nati Flores, Monument Impact

Peter Lydon, TRANSDEF

Richard Marcantonio, Public Advocates

Steve Older, Area Director Machinists Union

Joël Ramos, TransForm

Kristin Tennessen, Bike Walnut Creek

Debbie Toth, Rehabilitation Services of Northern California

Robbie Ann White, President AFSCME 2700

Yvonne Williams, President Amalgamated Transit Union 192

Kenji Yamada, Bike Concord

Transformative Policies for a New Transportation Sales Tax

[January 6, 2016]

Incentivizing Sustainable and Equitable Development:

- 1. Establish a new competitive fund, similar to the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program** to reward jurisdictions that have a strong track record of affordable housing development and have adopted policies that encourage sustainable, equitable development with safe and convenient walkable access to transit. Funding should be directed to locally-nominated Priority Development Areas and be dedicated to transportation projects that help catalyze sustainable, equitable development. Distribute funds from this program using a formula similar to the OBAG county funding distribution formula.
- 2. All jurisdictions must maintain a state-approved Housing Element**, file a Housing Element Annual Progress Report (APR) with the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and hold an annual public informational hearing at the time of filing to receive transportation funds.
- 3. New transit projects must demonstrate existing or planned transit-supportive housing densities** within a half-mile of station areas, consistent with MTC's Resolution 3434 of 2005.¹
- 4. Establish a program to address anti-displacement** that provides funding for protections of existing residents and new affordable housing near transit stations.
- 5. Allocate Return to Source funds to local jurisdictions using the same distribution formula that MTC uses to allocate OBAG funds to counties**—based on population, past housing production, and future housing needs (RHNA) with weighting for affordable housing. Give priority to jurisdictions with particularly strong track records of affordable housing production.

Local and Regional Transit:

- 1. Develop and fund a coordinated, countywide, accessible transportation and smart mobility management system to improve efficiency and options for riders of all abilities** with the goal of increasing access to jobs, medical care, services, and more. Automobiles and fixed route services have enjoyed substantial investment, attention, funding and development for decades, this effort would start to bring accessible services up to that standard.
- 2. Create affordable and accessible transit options**, such as extending West County's student bus pass program throughout Contra Costa County.
- 3. Invest in fix-it-first strategies and facilities** to ensure a well-maintained and fully operational regional transit system that expands on opportunities for high quality service and maintenance jobs.

¹ http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/rtep/pdf/April_Commission_3434.pdf#page=14

4. Ensure that Contra Costa closes gaps in bus service so that working people across the county can access jobs, housing, and services, such as extending bus service from West County to Martinez.

5. Provide funding to achieve 15-minute headway frequencies and adequate hours of operation on key routes and within PDAs.

6. Invest in walkable transit connections—sidewalks, paths, and other pedestrian facilities—to close gaps in the pedestrian infrastructure and make it easy and quick to access transit.

Growth Management:

1. Enhance our Urban Limit Lines (ULLs): To prevent sprawl development, we must eliminate the loophole in Contra Costa County's Urban Limit Lines that allows 30-acre expansions without a public vote. And we must refine our existing ULL policies by defining key terms such as "urban" and "rural," clarifying which services must comply with our urban limit lines (water, sewer, etc.), and preventing subdivisions outside the lines.

2. Prohibit sprawl-inducing projects: These include, among others, the James Donlon Extension, Camino Tassajara Expansion, and Highway 239 alignments. Projects that are listed as poor performers in MTC's Regional Transportation Plan as well as those identified by CCTA's forthcoming performance-based project assessment will not be eligible for sales tax revenue or bond funding.

3. Ensure agricultural protections: All jurisdictions with agricultural land within their planning area, including rangelands, must adopt an Agricultural Protection Ordinance, which mitigates for the conversion and cumulative impacts on those lands, to receive return to source funding.

- a) This mitigation can overlap with other mitigation such as endangered species mitigation but must be at least 1:1.
- b) Funds may be used for ongoing management of mitigation areas.

4. Establish new Growth Management Program standards: To reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), and impacts on wildlife habitats and agricultural lands, while increasing carbon sequestration, all jurisdictions must have the following policies in place to receive return to source funding:

- a) Hillside development ordinance
- b) Ridgeline protection ordinance
- c) Open space system with major ridgelines defined
- d) Protection of wildlife corridors
- e) Plan to conserve buffers around open space and agriculture
- f) Prohibitions on culverting blueline creeks for anything more than road crossings in the shortest length possible
- g) No development of major subdivisions, urban development, or urban services allowed in non-urban Priority Conservation Areas

Global Warming Solutions:

1. The TEP shall meet or exceed the following two greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions targets:

- a) By 2020, a reduction in GHG emissions per capita of 7%

- b) By 2035, a reduction in GHG emissions per capita of 15%.²

2. Reduce GHGs by supporting Priority Development Areas (PDAs) with enhanced transit:

Incentivize housing at all income levels within the PDAs and provide high levels of transit service to make sustainable transportation choices available for residents across the income spectrum.

Augment these investments by fostering the diffusion of electric, rather than fossil fuel, vehicles.

3. Mitigation of GHG pollution: The TEP will prioritize projects and programs that reduce VMT and GHGs. If transportation projects or programs increase greenhouse gas emissions, they must fully mitigate those emissions by protecting carbon-sequestering natural or agricultural lands. Mitigation strategies must also address localized air pollution impacts, particularly for low-income communities and other vulnerable populations, including children and seniors.

Environmental Mitigation:

1. The TEP shall dedicate a significant amount of funding to an Advanced Mitigation Program to enhance the effectiveness of transportation-related environmental mitigation activities. This program will bundle and strategically deploy mitigation funds to proactively conserve important natural and agricultural lands and leverage other conservation investments.

- a) Funds may be used for ongoing management of mitigation areas.
- b) Funding levels shall be based on the maximum number of qualifying TEP projects for environmental mitigation.

Good Local Jobs:

1. Projects and programs funded by the TEP must meet wage and benefit standards that ensure local family-supporting jobs. Major transportation projects must include Project Labor Agreements.

2. Create and monitor employment performance criteria, including the following:

- a) Local hire programs
- b) Apprenticeship programs approved by state
- c) Helmets to Hardhats Veteran hiring programs
- d) Annual monitoring:
 - i. Demographic information such as race and ethnicity, gender, age, disability status, income range, zip code or census tract, resident of an area of concentrated poverty, veteran status, criminal justice history
 - ii. Number of positions (direct, indirect)
 - iii. Job type (full-time, part-time, permanent, short-term, contract or civil service, newly created or continuation of existing jobs)
 - iv. Training opportunities and occupational ladder

Complete Streets:

1. Create a distinct Complete Streets Program category:

² http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/final_targets.pdf; <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/sb375.htm>

The goal of this program is to make major streets efficient and safe for all anticipated users, and thereby maximize investments to move more people along currently congested streets and in the process give commuters more transportation choices.

- a) This program is separate from the trails category that functions to fill gaps in the bikeway network. It is also separate from other transit operations and local streets and roads repaving funding.
- b) The program will fund, among other things, projects to restripe roadways for all users and major repaving projects that create multi-modal transportation infrastructure.

2. Eligible Complete Streets Program projects include:

- a) Road diets for improved safety and increased access for all users
- b) New protected bikeways on major streets
- c) Pedestrian and children safety improvements
- d) Transit operation improvements and associated facility improvements
- e) Smart parking management
- f) ADA access and projects to relieve paratransit demands
- g) As part of the above, truck loading, signal upgrades and repaving
- h) Any other project designed to give commuters attractive options to leave their car at home and find a better way
- i) Ongoing maintenance of Complete Streets projects

Regional Trail Network:

1. Dedicate funding for the regional trail network, including paved trail gap closure projects, countywide crossing-safety improvements, grade-separated crossings, and maintenance funds for existing and future paved trail facilities.

2. The highest priority trails for funding are:

- a) San Francisco Bay Trail
- b) Iron Horse Trail
- c) Contra Costa Canal Trail
- d) Delta De Anza Trail
- e) Marsh Creek Trail, including the newly proposed section between Round Valley Regional Preserve and Clayton
- f) Great California Delta Trail
- g) Mokelumne Coast to Crest Trail
- h) Richmond Greenway

3. Conforming to current Measure J requirements, dedicate one-third of regional trail funding to the East Bay Regional Park District. Allocate the remaining two-thirds competitively among the four sub-regions.

Accountability and Public Benefits:

1. Ensure that all funds are delivered in a timely fashion as approved by voters to benefit Contra Costa County.

2. Provide annual reviews of all project and program performance to ensure that voters know how and where their tax dollars are being spent.

3. An Independent Advisory Committee should review all CCTA tax measures and provide periodic progress reports to the public. The advisory committee should include a range of non-profit organizations and other stakeholders.

4. Ensure contract accountability with the following:

- a) Increased citizen input in the subsidy award process
- b) Inclusion of job, environmental, and social equity standards
- c) Clawback or recapture provisions if commitments not met