

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) 673-1740 Cell (925) 890-0827

TRANSPAC TAC MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 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

SECOND AMENDED AGENDA

Meeting to be hosted by the City of Walnut Creek

1. Review/Revise Accept/Minutes of the January 28, 2016 TAC Meeting

Attachment: TAC minutes from January 28, 2016 meeting.

2. Update on the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP). CCTA staff will present an update on the special meetings and continuing discussions for development of a Draft TEP. (*Hisham Noeimi, CCTA Engineering Manager*)

Attachment: None

3. Update on the I-680 Southbound Express Lane Project. I-680 SB Carpool Lanes Completion/Express Lanes Project – Contra Costa Transportation Authority staff will provide an update on the project, assisted by Leo Scott of Gray-Bowen-Scott. This presentation will also include a brief update on the I-680/SR-4 Phase 3 Project. (*Susan Miller, CCTA Director of Projects*)

Attachment: None

4. Update on Senate Bill (SB) 743 and Impacts on the Action Plans. On January 20, 2016, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) released revised CEQA Guidelines addressing the transition from delay-based metrics to a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)-based metric under SB 743. CCTA staff will discuss the new method for quantifying impacts from development and transportation improvements under CEQA and its effect on the Action Plans and Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP). (*Matt Kelley, CCTA Associate Transportation Planner*)

Attachment: Memo dated January 26, 2016 from Martin Engelmann, CCTA Deputy Executive Director, Planning, Regarding Action Plan Updates

5. **Request to Program Measure J Funds for the EasyMile Pilot Project.** BART in partnership with the CCTA is requesting the programming of \$250,000 in Measure J funds from the BART Station, Access, and Parking category for EasyMile testing and initial rollout at BART Stations in Central County. EasyMile is an automated on-demand shuttle service that will improve access to BART stations. (*Hisham Noeimi, CCTA*)

Attachment: None

6. **The next meeting to be hosted by **The City of Concord**, is scheduled for March 24, 2016 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined.**

**REMINDER: FORM 700 IS DUE NO LATER THAN
APRIL 1, 2016**

EVEN IF FILED ELSEWHERE, THE TRANSPAC OFFICE STILL NEEDS A COPY OF THE FILING

PLEASE PRESENT THE FORM 700 TO ANITA L. TUCCI-SMITH

TRANSPAC Technical Advisory Commission (TAC) Meeting Summary Minutes

- MEETING DATE:** January 28, 2016
- MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Corinne Dutra-Roberts, 511 Contra Costa; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; Anne Muzzini, County Connection; 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 9:12 A.M.

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

On motion by Ray Kuzbari, seconded by Jeremy Lochirco, the minutes of the November 19, 2015 TAC meeting were unanimously accepted, as submitted.

- 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 agreement 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, Engineering Manager, CCTA)*

Hisham Noeimi, CCTA Engineering Manager, stated that in December the Board had determined a revised approach for a Transportation Expenditure Plan, although a final decision would not be made until May 2016. The revised approach called for special CCTA meetings twice a month on the first and third Wednesday of each month at 6:00 P.M., after the Planning Committee and full Board of Directors meetings to focus on the TEP. The goal of the meetings was to find areas of agreement on policies and programs to include in a new measure. Policies that would be discussed included the Growth Management Program (GMP), requirements for return to source, the Urban Limit Line (ULL), a local and regional mitigation program, the need for a mobility manager, as well as accountability and taxpayer protections, among others.

The issues had come up in a document prepared by a large coalition of stakeholders and advocates, half of which were members of the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC), calling for a transportation sales tax. They had discussed several policies and proposals and the policies included a return to source formula based more on housing production and population, new requirements for the GMP, protections for agricultural lands, and significant funding for transit and other things.

Mr. Noeimi reported that the CCTA Board had met on January 6, 2016, when after a long discussion and seeking areas of agreement, the Board had heard consistently of the need to maintain the current system of roadways and transit, to find alternatives to single occupant vehicles, and to be flexible enough in the new measure to plan for changes and technology, such as self-driving cars. A summary of the second meeting on January 20, 2016, which had focused on the GMP with no changes, had been emailed to the RTPC managers.

Mr. Noeimi summarized the options for the Growth Management Program (GMP) and reported that the first element discussed was whether a Growth Management Element (GME) needed to be adopted. The agreement was that every city and jurisdiction should keep a requirement for a GME as part of their Growth Management Checklist to obtain return to source money. The second element was to adopt a Development Mitigation Program, and since each subregion had its own unique program, there was no consensus to change the requirement. The third component addressed housing options, and at this time the current policies in Measure J requiring jurisdictions to demonstrate reasonable progress in addressing housing at all levels, and consider the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists and transit in the review of new development were noted. The general discussion had acknowledged that jurisdictions already performed many of the elements suggested, such as the adoption of Complete Street policies and the adoption of a State Housing Element, and there was general recognition for the need to incentivize development in the cities now, which might be an area in the new measure to focus on.

Mr. Noeimi referred to the fourth component as participation in an on-going cooperative, multi-jurisdictional planning process. He stated jurisdictions were now required to work with the RTPCs and the Authority to standardize models and evaluate methodology, assess performance of regional routes, and develop a Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP). There was general discussion on the item and it had been made clear to the group that the Level of Service (LOS) metric had been eliminated from the existing GMP. In addition, the Authority was monitoring the development of guidelines being developed by the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) where LOS was being removed from technical procedures relative to Action Plans required to be developed as part of the CTP, and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) was being required in place of LOS.

Mr. Noeimi stated that the fifth component related to the adoption of a ULL. The advocates wanted to eliminate or reduce exemptions that currently existed that allowed cities to change the ULL without a public vote. The Board had questioned why that would need to be done, was resistant to the proposal, and did not support any change. He stated the County was doing an assessment of the ULL but that would not be done until later this year.

When asked whether the County Board of Supervisors planned to place a ULL item on the ballot, John Cunningham noted that the original Measure L required that the County conduct a ULL review in 2016 with the cities, and the County would conduct that review in 2016 but not until the fall. It would be taken to the Board of Supervisors to discuss in February. He stated they needed to see if there was still capacity within the existing ULL to accommodate development.

Ray Kuzbari verified that if there was any recommendation to move the ULL that would have to go back to the voters.

Mr. Noeimi emphasized that the advocates issue was the exemption. Those were the five items that had been discussed under the currently existing GMP; two other items related to the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and the recommendation to adopt a Transportation System Management (TSM) ordinance or resolution. There was no discussion of those two items and no request to change them from the advocates.

Mr. Noeimi explained that some new components had been recommended to be added. The advocates wanted the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) old formula based on population and housing production to be used as the formula for return to source as opposed to the current method, and there was a general discussion of the need to maintain the current formula. The Board in general was leaning towards maintaining the current formula. In addition, the advocates wanted to incorporate anti-displacement housing policies, which had not been addressed at this point.

Mr. Noeimi stated the advocates also wanted to specifically exclude two projects from the measure, including SR-239 and the James Donlon Extension in East County, and a project in the County at Camino Tassajara. He reported that the TRANSPLAN Committee would not support those exclusions in East County. The advocates also wanted the adoption of an Agricultural Protection Ordinance, which was a new requirement that had not yet been discussed in detail. He was not sure how many cities had much agricultural land left.

Mr. Noeimi added that the advocates also required the adoption of a few program standards, such as the adoption of a hillside development ordinance, a ridgeline protection ordinance, an open space system with major ridgelines defined, protection of wildlife corridors, a plan to conserve buffers around open space and agriculture, and others. The general discussion was that many of the proposed policies were often included in the adopted General Plans or that many did not apply to all jurisdictions. While good practices, there was no consensus to add them to the GMP checklist as a requirement to receive return to source funds.

Mr. Noeimi explained that not all EPAC members were supportive of the requirements. There was a need for compromise to make sure that the new measure would have something for everybody. The policy issues would continue to be discussed. He noted they were pretty much done discussing the GMP, except for the discussion of the ULL. Future meetings would discuss a mitigation program to mitigate for large projects as opposed to individual projects, mobility management, potentially Complete Streets, and accountability and taxpayer protection.

The schedule called for a Draft TEP in March, with a final TEP in May 2016, after which every City Council and the Board of Supervisors would receive a presentation in June and July to get support for the measure to be able to place it on the ballot. He explained that realistically everybody had to be in support.

Jeremy Lochirco advised that the City of Walnut Creek was concerned with the very slow development creep from transportation type issues that the measure currently addressed to something more of a land use component, which MTC had already been doing with regulations that were directed more to urban areas like San Francisco. He suggested the only safe haven to fund projects was Measure J, and he was concerned that a dual set of requirements were being developed. He noted that some of the recommendations reflected current state law, but giving priority to jurisdictions that had a strong track record for affordable housing production and connecting that to return to source was objectionable. Some cities, such as Clayton, had no ability to add affordable housing and he questioned what that would mean for Clayton. He stated that Walnut Creek relied on Measure J tax dollars and there were projects and programs that needed to be funded. He commented that reporting requirements were rigorous, duplicative, and that was not what the voters wanted.

Mr. Lochirco reiterated that the City of Walnut Creek had serious concerns about the measure and whether it would make it more cumbersome and laborious to rightfully obtain and apply for money that the voters would expect to be delivered, if approved. He added that he did not know how much outreach MTC had performed but stated it showed the regional trail network as having a very robust component here and had identified trails as a high priority, but when it came to projects like the Olympic Boulevard Corridor Study that Walnut Creek and Contra Costa County had developed, the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) did not want to have anything to do with it. He was concerned if the proposal had not been vetted with the agency that had the responsibility for maintaining it.

Mr. Kuzbari agreed and noted that the EBRPD was supposed to take care of those things and it was not clear how the Measure J money distributed to the EBRPD was being used to do that. He recommended that the EBRPD be invited to attend a TRANSPAC TAC meeting to advise of future plans for improvements and to advise how Measure J money was being used.

Mr. Noeimi stated he could find out.

Eric Hu concurred and noted that it had been four years since an EBRPD representative had addressed the TRANSPAC TAC.

Mr. Noeimi stated that the pedestrian and bicycle trail program in Measure J had been allocated 1.5 percent, and .5 percent of the one third went to EBRPD for maintenance. He noted that the EBRPD should address each RTPC to identify its plans.

Mr. Lochirco urged being cautious about the diverse county that changed from agricultural to rural, from suburban to urban, and if appealing to everyone, everyone should get a piece of the pie and it should not be made a competitive situation.

The discussion emphasized the importance of the TAC's role to educate the Board on what the proposed policies, if implemented, might mean, and that the new policies could make the process much more onerous requiring more administration. It was clarified that three polls had been taken on the probability of a measure passing; the latest identified a potential 74 percent approval, and there was a high likelihood of passage. Two more polls were anticipated.

As to whether the TEP recommendations determined last July had been changed as a result of the new discussions, Mr. Noeimi reported that West County had listened to the transit agencies and had revised recommendations to allocate more money to transit; SWAT was trying to look at the policy issues and ask the cities to provide their input on the pitfalls, with the goal to educate the Board; TRANSPLAN supported the same approach with a letter to outline what the jurisdictions thought about some of the proposals; and he was not sure whether TRANSPLAN or SWAT would reopen the recommendations.

Anne Muzzini stated there had been a discussion at SWAT to reopen and allocate more money into the BART Car project.

Mr. Noeimi highlighted the summary of submittals by RTPC for the TEP, and noted that TRANSPAC had committed \$10 million to BART cars, which he suggested might be one area to reconsider and Complete Streets might be another, along with bike/ped considerations.

Mr. Hu stated that TRANSPAC's recommendations were representative of Central County's needs, and local street maintenance and arterials were the priority for Central County. He recommended that major street categories be shown as Complete Streets.

TAC members reiterated the specific needs of Central County jurisdictions, stated the decisions needed to be made at the local level, but suggested that many of the advocates' concerns could be addressed through the actual description of the projects and programs that had been proposed. The TAC discussed the issues, the revised schedule, and the approach, and looked for ideas to address the comments received from the vision document.

3. Continued Discussion of the Pacheco Transit Hub

Tim Tucker summarized the situation that had resulted in the City of Martinez serving as the construction manager for the Pacheco Transit Hub, at which time the City of Martinez had secured commitments from the TRANSPLAN Committee, from TRANSPAC, and from WCCTAC to help fund maintenance costs. The project had been constructed, was not fully utilized, and electric charging stations had been added to the project at the request of a TRANSPAC Boardmember. No buses were currently serving the site and Martinez was dismayed that the project had become just a park and ride project. He advised that Martinez was currently maintaining the Pacheco Transit Hub for less than \$25,000 a year, was not charging an administrative cost, was managing electric bills, security lights, landscaping, and doing additional litter removal, but did not want to be left with the full expense of the maintenance cost for the site.

A discussion developed on the commitments that had been made to maintain the Pacheco Transit Hub, the fund to be used to pay TRANSPAC's share of the maintenance costs, whether the TRANSPLAN Committee and WCCTAC would fund their share of the cost, and how to find a different way to fund the maintenance costs.

Mr. Noeimi commented that he would speak to CCTA staff to determine if there could be another way to fund the maintenance costs for 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

Ray Kuzbari referred to the Conditions of Compliance that needed to be attached with all of the checklists required from the local agencies. Given that the Action Plan had changed in 2014 and compliance needed to be reported based on the new Action Plan, he had rewritten the document. He thanked the members of the TAC who had assisted in the rewrite process and advised that he would edit the document one more time and forward it to TAC members. He urged members to read the document and offer any comments by mid-February, and if he did not receive any comments by that time would use it to prepare the City of Concord's checklist.

TAC members thanked Mr. Kuzbari for all his work.

Mr. Lochirco advised that he had a change to one of the projects and would forward a marked up copy to identify that change.

On other matters, Mr. Noeimi reported that the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 3 Call for Projects would be out in March, applications were due in June, although the funds would not be available until Fiscal Year 2020 and 2021. In addition, the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) cycle, and Measure J bike/ped programs would occur afterwards. He asked TAC members to identify any plans to apply to the three funding sources, and explained that some budget had been set aside to provide technical assistance to the cities. He noted there was potentially \$51 million for OBAG for Contra Costa County, although 70 percent had to be in Priority Development Areas (PDAs).

5. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 A.M. The next meeting of the TAC, to be hosted by the City of Walnut Creek, is scheduled for February 25, 2016 at 9:00 A.M. in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room unless otherwise determined.



TECHNICAL

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 26, 2016

To: RTPC Managers

From: Martin R. Engelmann, Deputy Executive Director, Planning

RE: Action Plan Updates: Discontinuation of LOS or Delay-Based Traffic Measurements as an Indicator of Significant Impact on the Environment in the Action Plans

The purpose of this technical memo is to request that the RTPCs revisit the Draft Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance in light of recent changes to State law and proposed revisions to project analysis methodologies pursuant to SB 743.

SB 743

The passage of Senate Bill (SB) 743 (Steinberg, 2013) will change the way that public agencies evaluate the transportation impacts of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). It will prohibit the use of vehicle delay and level-of-service standards in infill opportunity zones and transit priority areas, and it directs the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to revise the CEQA Guidelines to establish “alternative metrics” for identifying transportation impacts in those areas. The legislation also permits OPR to establish alternative metrics for transportation impacts outside transit priority areas. These changes are intended to further the Legislature’s commitment to encouraging land use and transportation planning decisions and investments that reduce vehicle miles travelled and contribute to the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions as defined in SB 375.

OPR's revised draft CEQA Guidelines, released on January 20, 2016, reflect an across-the-board elimination of congestion-based metrics as a threshold of significance in CEQA and replaces them with a new Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) metric. We note that these revisions are presently in draft format only. They will not have the force of law until and unless they are adopted; however, the across-the-board elimination of LOS for all areas is consistent with OPR's previously released draft Guidelines. It appears, therefore, that OPR is continuing to endorse a statewide transition from LOS to VMT.

While OPR proposes to prohibit the use of vehicle delay as a threshold of significance in CEQA and replace it with VMT, SB 743 itself does not preclude agencies from using vehicle delay when applying local general plan policies, zoning codes, conditions of approval, thresholds, or any other planning requirements.

The Measure J Growth Management Program

ACTION PLANS

The voter-approved Measure J (2004) Growth Management Program (GMP) requires that local jurisdictions participate in a cooperative, multijurisdictional planning process to develop Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance and establish Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) for major arterials and freeways. All five of the recently completed draft Action Plans for the 2014 CTP include MTSOs of LOS and delay index standards. The Lamorinda Action Plan also includes "Stop Time at Cross Streets." The TVTC Action Plan includes duration of congestion.

PROJECT REVIEW PROCEDURE: APPLYING AN ACTION PLAN MTSO AS A THRESHOLD OF SIGNIFICANCE IN CEQA

One criticism that arose during the first 15 years of the Measure C GMP process was that project approvals required two separate impact studies. Measure C introduced new requirements for local jurisdictions to follow to receive their Local Streets Maintenance funds. These requirements involved analysis of the

impact of proposed major development projects and general plan amendments on local performance standards and MTSOs. Many of those standards did not lend themselves to use in an EIR. The successful passage of Measure J in 2004 streamlined the project-review process, first by eliminating the requirement for local performance measures, and later (through amendments to the GMP Implementation Documents) by aligning the action Plan MTSOs with CEQA thresholds of significance.

OPR's newly released draft CEQA Guidelines, if adopted, will prohibit the use of LOS or delay-based metrics as a threshold of significance in CEQA following an initial phase-in period. Since many of the Action Plan MTSOs use LOS and delay, we are essentially back to where we started with the two-study requirement. One study would address traffic impacts under a VMT metric, and (potentially) other studies would address non-traffic impacts under existing delay-based metrics consistent with any land use requirements. Consequently, the Authority now wishes to re-examine its Measure J GMP transportation analysis procedure, and consider re-tooling it in an effort to restore the efficiency achieved earlier through consolidation of the GMP and CEQA processes.

Request to RTPCs

Given the anticipated repercussions of SB 743, the Authority asks that the RTPCs revisit their Action Plans to determine if any changes are warranted. Table 1 below shows where each of the five draft Action Plans contain congestion-based MTSOs. As noted above, OPR's proposed CEQA Guidelines do not "prohibit" project evaluation using these metrics, but (if adopted) would prohibit their use as a threshold of significance in CEQA analyses for evaluating traffic impacts. The RTPCs could therefore continue using LOS and delay-based metrics within the Action Plans. If a project proponent's traffic analysis found that a project resulted in an exceedance of any of the MTSOs shown in Table 1, however, that exceedance could not warrant a finding of significant traffic impact on the environment under CEQA.

Table 1. LOS and Delay-Based Action Plan MTSOs by Subregion

Subregion	Intersection LOS or V/C	Arterial LOS or Delay Index	Freeway LOS or Delay Index	Side Street Signal Cycle Wait	Hours of Congestion
West	✓		✓		
Central	✓		✓	✓	
East	✓	✓	✓		
Lamorinda		✓	✓	✓	
Tri-Valley	✓	✓	✓		✓

Last December, the Authority decided to postpone adoption of the CTP. This allows the RTPCs time to consider changes to the Action Plans. Consequently, the RTPCs could, in response to SB 743, change from delay-based MTSOs to VMT-based MTSOs. The implications of making this change are yet to be determined. Clearly, additional work will be involved with changing the metrics and re-evaluating the MTSOs. The cost and schedule for this effort will be assessed after we hear from you.