

**TRANSPAC TAC MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA**  
**THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2018**

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

**In the LARGE COMMUNITY ROOM at City of Pleasant Hill City Hall**  
**100 GREGORY LANE**  
**PLEASANT HILL**

**1. Minutes of the August 30, 2018 Meeting**

**ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Approve Minutes**

Attachment: TAC minutes from the August 30, 2018 meeting.

**2. Monument Boulevard / I-680 Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Feasibility Study.**

The TRANSPAC Board approved the scope of work for the Monument Boulevard / I-680 Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Feasibility Study (Study) scope of work in July 2018. The Study will identify specific improvements in the project area with the effort resulting in material to support future funding requests. The study is envisioned to detail improved bicycle and pedestrian related improvements in the study area and identify scope, cost, and delivery strategy information that could be used to pursue additional project funding. In August, TRANSPAC TAC reviewed procurement process / documents as well as project / contract management (for work beyond the traditional TRANSPAC Managing Director tasks) options for the study. Comments received on procurement material will be incorporated into final versions of the documents. The TRANSPAC TAC requested additional information regarding the project / contract management aspect of the project. Staff has reached out to Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) regarding options for CCTA staff to provide project / contract management services for the Study effort. Staff will provide additional information at the meeting regarding the CCTA proposal to provide these services. During the discussion with CCTA staff regarding project / contract management services, the existing CCTA on call services lists were also discussed. The use of the existing CCTA on call consultant list could provide efficiencies (schedule and financial) to the procurement process for the Study. Continuing discussion from the August meeting, TRANSPAC TAC is requested to review project / contract management services, including considering alternative options for the provision of, as well as additional information regarding the CCTA on call services consultant list. As has been previously noted, the costs for the project / contract management tasks are proposed to be funded from the funds identified for the Study and that are included in the FY 2018/19 budget. Additional information will be available at the meeting.

**ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Consider options to provide project / contract management services as well as new alternatives for procuring consultant services.**

3. **MTC Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program.** As part of the extension of the initial One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) for an additional year, MTC allocated an additional \$822,000 to Contra Costa in funding for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects and programs. These federal funds were not included in the OBAG 2 call for projects and they remain available to Contra Costa jurisdictions. Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) staff has material that outlines potential options that are being considered to allocate the funds, including an estimate of \$217,000 as the Central County “share.” Continuing discussion from the August TRANSPAC TAC meeting, the attached material includes SRTS project proposals collected since the last meeting. Not all proposed projects may be good candidates for the proposed federal funds. TRANSPAC TAC is requested to review the proposed projects. Based on TRANSPAC TAC discussion, staff anticipates a programming recommendation would be available for discussion at the October TRANSPAC TAC meeting.

Attachment: Summary of SRTS Candidate Project List, Additional Safe Routes to School Funding (CCTA Memo, August 1, 2018)

4. **TRAFFIX School Bus Program.** Lisa Bobadilla, with the City of San Ramon, will provide information about the Program. TRAFFIX is a traffic congestion relief program funded in part by Measure J. Its sole purpose is to reduce traffic congestion caused by parents driving their children to and from school through some of the San Ramon Valley's most congested intersections. To determine where the program would reduce the most traffic, TRAFFIX conducted comprehensive traffic studies throughout the service area as well as surveyed parents at all San Ramon Valley schools, prior to establishing routes for specific schools in the area. The TRAFFIX Program is operated jointly by the local cities, county, and school district through a joint exercise of power agreement.
5. **Contra Costa Accessible Transportation Strategic Plan.** Peter Engel, with the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, will provide information about the plan effort. The Contra Costa Accessible Transportation Strategic (ATS) Plan is a collaborative effort between CCTA and the County. The overall objective of the ATS Plan is to improve accessible transportation services and administration in Contra Costa County through an assessment process, which will include a wide range of organizations, and encompasses the entire County. The ATS Plan will include expansive outreach specifically designed for the target population and has three core tasks or milestones: 1) Study of existing, individual [city, transit agency, other programs receiving Measure J or state/federal funding] programs resulting in recommendations; 2) Study of alternative countywide system designs with alternatives presented to: elected officials, staff, passengers, advocates, and the public with a preferred design identified; and 3) Presentation of an implementation plan for the consensus design. The effort is also proposed to include policy, technical and rider advisory committees.

Attachment: Review SOW and MOU, Authorize Release of an RFP, for the ATS Plan (CCTA Memo, September 5, 2018)

- 6. Grant Funding Opportunities.** This agenda item is intended to provide an opportunity to review and discuss grant opportunities.

Attachment: CCTA Local Agency Funding Opportunities – Updated 9/19/18

- 7. Committee Updates:**

- a. Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC): The next meeting is October 18, 2018.
- b. Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC): The next meeting is September 24, 2018.
- c. Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC): The next meeting is September 17, 2018.

- 8. Future Agenda Items:**

- The CCTA Calendar for July to October 2018, may be downloaded at: [http://ccta.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view\\_id=1&clip\\_id=410&meta\\_id=38087](http://ccta.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=410&meta_id=38087)

- 9. Next Meeting: October 25, 2018.**

**MEETING DATE:** August 30, 2018

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Scott Alman, Clayton; G. Aileen Hernandez, BART; Ruby Horta, County Connection; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Abhishek Parikh, Concord; Robert Sarmiento, Contra Costa County; and Andy Smith, Walnut Creek

**STAFF:** Matt Todd, TRANSPAC Managing Director; and Anita Tucci-Smith, TRANSPAC Clerk

**GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Brad Beck, Senior Transportation Planner, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA); Brianna Brewer, HDR Engineering; Peter Engel, Director, Programs, CCTA; Lynne Filson, Clayton, Harris & Associates; Stephanie Hu, Senior Civil Engineer, CCTA; Colin Piethe, Department of Conservation and Development, Contra Costa County; and Kirsten Riker, Street Smarts Diablo/511 Contra Costa

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

The meeting convened at 9:03 A.M.

Robert Sarmiento introduced Colin Piethe, a new Planner in the County's Department of Conservation and Development.

**1. Minutes of the June 28, 2018 Meeting**

The minutes of the June 28, 2018 meeting were approved by consensus.

- 2. Monument Boulevard / I-680 Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Feasibility Study.**  
The TRANSPAC Board approved the scope of work for the Monument Boulevard / I-680 Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Feasibility Study (Study) scope of work in July 2018. The Study will identify specific improvements in the project area with the effort resulting in material to support future funding requests. The study is envisioned to detail improved bicycle and pedestrian related improvements in the study area and identify scope, cost, and delivery strategy information that could be used to pursue additional project funding. TRANSPAC has not procured a professional service contract procurement for a project of this type in the recent past. Therefore, TRANSPAC TAC is requested to review the proposed procurement process proposed for the Study as well as the draft RFP document.

As discussed at the last TRANSPAC TAC meeting, it was identified that this Study will require additional project/contract management work beyond the traditional TRANSPAC Managing Director tasks. The TRANSPAC TAC is requested to review the scope and cost estimate for the project management tasks associated with the Study effort. The costs for the project/contract management tasks are proposed to be funded from the funds identified for the Study and that are included in the FY 2018/19 budget.

Mr. Todd reported that the scope of the Monument Boulevard / I-680 Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Feasibility Study had been reviewed by the TAC the last two months, had been brought to the TRANSPAC Board of Directors, and had been approved by the Board. He asked the TAC to review the proposed procurement process, the draft Request for Proposal (RFP) document, and the scope and cost estimate for the project management tasks associated with the study. He referred to the draft procurement process and contract in the TAC packet, reported that the study was expected to be in the \$125,000 range, and referred to the handouts which presented an inventory of bicycle and pedestrian design consultants, a draft consultant selection schedule, and a cover letter for the RFP. He advised that after evaluating the written proposals, oral interviews would be scheduled, a recommendation would be made to the Board, and a contract would be negotiated.

Eric Hu referred to the cost proposal and recommended language that the proposals be submitted in separate sealed envelopes. For the proposal criteria, Item 5 on Page 29 of the agenda packet, since the project was not a federal project he stated the federal requirements did not need to be included and suggested it could also be another category regarding coming up with a feasible design that would be acceptable. With respect to the Bid Protest Procedure on Page 30, he recommended a simple title of Protest Procedure. He added that the eight-month period referenced on Page 34 appeared to be overly optimistic.

For the consultant selection schedule, Andy Smith expressed a preference for oral interviews. With respect to the draft cover letter, he stated the scope was not complete and he requested clarity in that regard. He also verified that the surplus from which the study would be funded was \$220,000; the consultant could be \$125,000 to \$130,000, and the contract management could be in the range of \$50,000, so there would be something left over. He also suggested that the TRANSPAC Board would have additional comments and would need additional information.

Mr. Todd stated that the eight-month reference was for the technical work that the consultant needed to do but did not account for additional time that would be outside of that aspect of the project work for other unanticipated factors.

It was also recommended that the \$52,000 shown on Page 34 for the Total Estimated Cost should be rounded up to \$55,000, with a reference to additional time based upon the County's Treat Boulevard effort.

The TAC discussed the staff time estimated for the Treat Boulevard project with respect to the required time involved, stated the proposed management of the contract hourly rate was high, sought a comparison, and suggested the Board would ask for an explanation of the hourly charges and what that amount might cover.

By consensus, the TAC supported the draft contract procurement process, the draft RFP, and the draft scope. The TAC requested additional information regarding the contract management task and that the Managing Director delineate the hours and the titles for staff hours, the use of the hours, and with respect to the contract show detail for the hourly rate for the project management aspect to be performed by the Managing Director. There was a desire for more information from the County with respect to its Treat Boulevard project.

- 3. Amendment to the Major Streets Program Measure J Grant (CCTA #24007).** The City of Pleasant Hill and the City of Walnut Creek have an existing Measure J Major Streets Program grant (CCTA #24007) through the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) for the Geary Road Improvement Project. That project has been completed and the cities are fully reimbursed for those project costs, with a remaining balance of unexpended Measure J funds of about \$478,000. These funds are requested to be split evenly between the City of Pleasant Hill and the City of Walnut Creek to be programmed for two new projects along regional routes of significance. City of Pleasant Hill also has approximately \$501,000 in unexpended Measure J Line 24 funds (Major Streets Program) from the Buskirk Avenue Realignment Project (CCTA #24006, completed in 2015) to reprogram to a new project. New project scopes for the Measure J funds will need to meet the requirements of the Measure J Line 24 “Major Streets: Traffic Flow, Safety, and Capacity Improvements” which include improvements to major thoroughfares. Upon TRANSPAC approval of an amendment request to Measure J Line 24 funds, the CCTA will need to approve the amendment through the CCTA Measure J Strategic Plan. Additional information for this item will be available at the meeting.

Mr. Todd presented the handout related to Pleasant Hill Road Improvement project (Taylor Boulevard to Gregory Lane), and the City of Walnut Creek project for fiber communications and intelligent transportation system components citywide.

Eric Hu explained that the Taylor Boulevard to Gregory Lane project, a Complete Streets project, was somewhat short on funding. He identified the project goals as shown in the handout and explained that the project was currently funded with One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) 2 funds, Senate Bill (SB) 1 funds, local funds, and hopefully the Measure J savings from the Geary Road Improvement Project that would be shared between the cities of Pleasant Hill and Walnut Creek. The project was currently in design and was expected to commence in the summer of 2019.

Andy Smith reported that Walnut Creek was interested in using the remaining funds for a fiber communications and intelligent transportation system components project. He explained that the new technology for the signal systems would lay the ground work for smart streets in the future, along with traffic signal improvements. Five hundred thousand dollars would be funded from the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which along with the savings from the Geary Road project would fund the project.

Stephanie Hu asked for a letter to verify TRANSPAC's concurrence, to be forwarded to the CCTA. In terms of schedule, she explained that anything over \$500,000 in construction costs would require peer review and review by the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), which would have to be incorporated into the project schedule. She sought more detail for a fact sheet, to be presented to the TRANSPAC Board of Directors, and to be included in TRANSPAC's communication to the CCTA.

By consensus, the TAC approved the recommendation for approval to the TRANSPAC Board of Directors for the City of Pleasant Hill and City of Walnut Creek requests to amend the programming of the balance of CCTA #24007 and #24006 Measure J Line 24 funds.

**4. MTC Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program.** As part of the extension of the initial One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) for an additional year, MTC allocated an additional \$822,000 to Contra Costa in funding for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects and programs. These federal funds were not included in the OBAG 2 call for projects and they remain available to Contra Costa jurisdictions. Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) staff has material that outlines potential options that are being considered to allocate the funds.

Brad Beck reported that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) had extended funding for an additional year of OBAG 1 in an amount of \$822,000 for SRTS projects. Since Central County was expected to receive \$217,000 of those funds, he presented options for consideration. Option 1 could allocate the funds as had been done in the first phase of OBAG 2 and let the Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC) identify some new project, although that would not meet the goal of minimizing projects going through the local assistance process. Option 2a could add funding to projects already being funded and could add funding to cost overruns or new scope items. Option 2b could combine the two and take the share and either add to existing projects or identify new projects, and would offer more flexibility. Option 3 could give money to a project that did not get funding through OBAG 2. He noted there were two projects in East County and one in West County that had asked for SRTS funding but had not been awarded that funding.

Mr. Todd referred the handout entitled TRANSPAC Coordinated Call for Projects (CFP) Programs – Approved March 9, 2017, pointed out the SRTS projects that would be funded through the CFP, and explained that there would have to be a discussion of how to use the additional funds.

Scott Alman asked if the existing projects were fully funded. He noted that the City of Clayton had two intersections that were problematic that could be considered SRTS safety projects.

Abhishek Parikh explained that while the Concord project had been funded, the City was struggling to find the local match which represented 80 to 90 percent of the project. He supported anything that would reduce the local match and add funding to the project. He also noted there were additional safety components that could be added to the SRTS project.

Eric Hu agreed with the need to consider a project that was currently federalized given the relatively small amount of funding available. He recommended not focusing just on the SRTS lists, which tended to be the smaller projects, but other OBAG 2 projects with a new component of an already federalized project.

When asked, Mr. Beck explained that there was no timeline although the funding was tied with the OBAG 2 schedule, or 2022. He advised that the CCTA wanted to decide the issue this year.

Mr. Todd recommended a survey of projects to identify TRANSPAC area SRTS candidate components, and would collect information on existing projects and send out a survey to the TAC to request projects that might qualify for the available funding.

5. **Street Smarts Diablo Program Update.** Kirsten Riker, with 511 Contra Costa / Street Smarts Diablo Program, will provide information about the Program. The Street Smarts Diablo program is a traffic safety program that educates pedestrians, bicyclists and drivers in central and eastern Contra Costa County. The program is funded with Measure J Line 21a (Safe Transportation for Children) in Central County. The Measure J Line 21a program is forecast to generate about \$440,000 in FY 18/19.

Kirsten Riker reported that the Street Smarts Diablo Program had been busy with traffic safety programs in Central and East County schools. In Central County, the work funded through Measure J 21a funds served elementary, middle, and high schools with programs, safety events, providing school resources, and safety materials for parents. She reported that all schools in all Central County cities had been served, and were being served routinely every eighteen months to two years, with programs that had started in 2012. City Council leadership and local Police Departments were invited to attend and be involved in the events. She reported that there had been a lot of community support and the cities had been very supportive as had legislative representatives. To improve the programs, audio visual equipment would be upgraded for assemblies and staff would continue developing the plan to build the bicycle garden into a hands on bicycling training facility in Concord. Everyone was invited to the events.

When asked by Mr. Engel, Ms. Riker affirmed that every public school in Central County had been visited; some work had been done at a private school some years ago.



Ms. Riker questioned whether the funding was available for non-public schools and Mr. Engel asked the TAC to opine on whether private schools could be served through the Line 21a program, particularly since there would be no additional cost to fit private schools into the schedule.

The TAC discussed whether private schools should be included, recommended that public schools be served first, and did not think that Line 21a funds should be restricted from use in private schools.

Ms. Riker suggested it might cost \$500 for an event. She noted if there was room in the schedule she would be happy to work in private schools beyond the 81 public elementary, 26 middle schools, and 15 high schools that were currently being served. She added that Street Smarts had provided a high school presentation at Clayton Valley High School, a charter school, and had reached out to Carondelet and De La Salle for the new driver programs.

Mr. Engel noted that the presentation had been intended to identify what was being done in Central and East County, and they were always looking for fresh ideas with the intent to keep the popular programs going given the importance of bike safety. He added that Central County was way ahead of the other RTPCs in that respect.

As to the status of the Street Smarts Diablo Bicycle Garden / Bicycle Playground concept presented to the TAC in January, Mr. Engel reported that staff was working with the City of Concord on Concord Community Park, had given a presentation to the Parks and Open Space Commission, were working with the city and getting good fund estimates, and had interest from some private entities.

**6. Electric Vehicle Ready Communities Challenge, Phase 1 Grant.** TRANSPAC supported the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) request for funding from the California Energy Commission (CEC) for an electric vehicle readiness plan/blueprint for Contra Costa. In the spring, the CCTA was informed their application was not successful, primarily due to the program geographic equity requirements. Since that time, a northern California project that was selected for the CEC funding is no longer moving forward, and the CCTA project has now been awarded \$200,000 in Electric Vehicle Ready Communities Challenge, Phase 1 Grant funding. The CCTA, in partnership with Contra Costa County and 511 Contra Costa, will use the funding to develop an implementation plan for large-scale electric vehicle charging infrastructure and related policies. The CCTA has initiated an RFP process to retain a qualified consultant to assist in the plan development. CCTA will provide additional information on the project and opportunities for Central County to participate in the process.

Peter Engel explained that the proposals for the Electric Vehicle Ready Communities Challenge, Phase 1 Grant for \$200,000 were due the middle of September, and would likely be awarded at the October 2018 meeting of the CCTA Board of Directors for a plan that would be countywide. He referred to an online tool to identify where the electric vehicles and the charging stations were located in the county with an overlay of land use, doing work force development programs to train folks to work on the vehicles themselves or to install the electric chargers, and also have them work with current transit operators and how they viewed the future in terms of electric buses. The grant process was on a fast track and the CCTA would be putting together a steering committee and work with jurisdictions on the study. The County was a partner in the study and would work to bring in the county perspective.

Aileen Hernandez expressed a desire to work on the project, and Mr. Engel agreed and noted there was a BART component.

- 7. Grant Funding Opportunities.** This agenda item is intended to provide an opportunity to review and discuss grant opportunities

Mr. Todd reported that an update would be provided next month.

- 8. Committee Updates**

There had been no meetings in August.

- 9. Future Agenda Items**

Aileen Hernandez reported that a Contra Costa County Liaison had been hired for Community Affairs at BART. Ariel Mercado would attend the next TRANSPAC meeting. In addition, Ian Griffins had taken a leave and Rachel Factor would be the contact in the interim.

- 10. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 A.M. to the next meeting on September 27, 2018.

**Safe Routes to School Project Candidates**

Reference	Sponsor	Project Title / Location	Project Scope	Safe Route to School Eligible Scope	Does Project already have federal funds? (Y/N)	Fund Sources	Amount	Schedule			Other Information <small>(i.e. CCTA Coordinated program project, new funds or funds that SRTS would replace, match percentage with requested SRTS funds)</small>
								Begin (Month/Year)	End (Month/Year)		
1	Clayton	Signalization Improvements for Mt. Diablo Elementary School  Clayton Road at Mitchell Canyon Road (600.0 feet West of Mt. Diablo Elementary School)	-Intersection and signal study to determine ultimate needs of the intersection, -Environmental review and document (CEQA), -Purchase and installation of additional signal and signal support equipment as determined by the study, -Striping and pavement marking revisions and enhancements as necessary to facilitate the pedestrian scramble cycle, -Advance warning signage, -Enhanced, lighted and interactive crossing warning signage.	This is a skewed four-legged intersection that is the nearest signalized opportunity to cross Clayton Road from the elementary school. Improvements are needed to the existing signal to enhance crossing safety for parents and students. The signal is capable of operating in an all-pedestrian "scramble" mode but not all of the required supporting signal equipment is present.	N	TBD	\$ 150,000	Env.			
							\$ -	Design			
							\$ -	CON			
							\$ -				
							\$ -				
<b>Total \$ 150,000</b>											
2	Clayton	Signalization Improvements for Diablo View Middle School  Marsh Creek Road at Clayton Road (Diablo View Middle School)	-Intersection and signal study to determine ultimate needs of the intersection, -Environmental review and document (CEQA), -Purchase and installation of additional signal and signal support equipment as determined by the study, -Striping and pavement marking revisions and enhancements as necessary to facilitate the pedestrian scramble cycle, -Advance warning signage, -Enhanced, lighted and interactive crossing warning signage.	This is a four-legged intersection with the fourth leg being the school entrance. Improvements are needed to the existing signal to enhance crossing safety for the students. Currently students attempt to cross two legs of the intersection to get to parents parked across Marsh Creek Road from the school. The signal is capable of operating in an all-pedestrian "scramble" mode but not all of the required supporting signal equipment is present.	N	TBD	\$ 150,000	Env.			
							\$ -	Design			
							\$ -	CON			
							\$ -				
							\$ -				
<b>Total \$ 150,000</b>											
3	Concord	Willow Pass Rd @ Ashdale Dr  Intersection safety improvement project at Ashdale Dr/Willow Pass Road intersection.	Installing two double-sided rapid flashing beacon, curb ramps and (possibly) a small concrete center median island for an additional solar powered flashing beacon in the center	Ashdale Dr, provides access to Monte Garden Elementary School, Mt Diablo School District and Sunrise School and sees significant pedestrian activity  Installing two double-sided rapid flashing beacon, curb ramps and (possibly) a small concrete center median island for an additional solar powered flashing beacon in the center	N	TBD	\$ 180,000	Env.			Within 1,000 feet of existing OBAG 2 project  Given the 4 lane Willow Pass Corridor with high speeds, it is a high priority improvement that would fit in with our existing Willow Pass Road safe route to school project that improves traffic safety for pedestrians in the nearby San Vicente neighborhood
							\$ -	Design			
							\$ -	CON			
							\$ -				
							\$ -				
<b>Total \$ 180,000</b>											
4	Martinez	Center Ave at Redwood Dr Pedestrian Crossing Flashers  Center Avenue at Redwood Dr. This crossing is within 200 feet of Hidden Valley Elementary School property.	Install solar powered Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB), crossing signs, poles and controller along with advance warning crossing signs and poles.	Install solar powered Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFB), crossing signs, poles and controller along with advance warning crossing signs and poles.	N	Local	\$ 10,000	Env.			
							\$ 20,000	Design			
							\$ 100,000	CON			
							\$ -				
							\$ -				
<b>Total \$ 130,000</b>											

**Safe Routes to School Project Candidates**

Reference	Sponsor	Project Title / Location	Project Scope	Safe Route to School Eligible Scope	Does Project already have federal funds? (Y/N)	Fund Sources	Amount	Schedule			Other Information <small>(i.e. CCTA Coordinated program project, new funds or funds that SRTS would replace, match percentage with requested SRTS funds)</small>
								Begin (Month/Year)	End (Month/Year)		
5	Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill Road Improvements (Taylor Boulevard to Gregory Lane) - Phase 2  Within the City of Pleasant Hill, on Pleasant Hill Road between Gregory Lane and Taylor Boulevard	Overall project split into two project phases. The Locally funded project (phase 1) consists of traffic signal upgrades, median reconstruction, ADA curb ramp upgrades, street lighting, irrigation, and landscaping. Local project will be completed before federally funded project begins. Federally funded project (phase 2) includes pavement rehabilitation; installation of pavement markers, striping, and signage; and installation of bicycle lanes.	Project corridor approximately 1000 feet from Strandwood Elementary School and will provide Class II bike and ped. facilities to the school. SRTS funds will be used specifically for striping work and pavement rehabilitation for the Class II bike lanes area only along the project limit.	Y	Sales Tax - Measure J - CC	\$ 98,000	Env.	Aug-18	Feb-19	SRTS funds will reduce other local funds that would be used for the construction of the Federal phase of the project.  In MTC TIP CC-170044
						STP - T5 - OBAG2 - CO	\$ 920,000	Design	Mar-18	Nov-19	
						Proposed SR2S Funds	\$ 217,000	CON	Mar-20	Oct-20	
						Other Local Funds	\$ 133,000				
							\$ -				
						<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,368,000</b>				
6	Walnut Creek	Walnut Boulevard Sidewalk at Walnut Heights Elementary  Walnut Boulevard from View Lane to Walnut Heights Elementary	This project would construct a sidewalk along Walnut Boulevard in front of Walnut Heights Elementary School and close a sidewalk gap from the school to View Lane. This project will complement a Contra Costa County project to construct a pedestrian path on Walnut Boulevard east of the school.	This project would construct a sidewalk along Walnut Boulevard in front of Walnut Heights Elementary School and close a sidewalk gap from the school to View Lane. The project would provide pedestrian facilities within 1/2 mile of an elementary school along a known walking route for the school's students.	N	MTC	\$ 200,000	Env.	Mar-19	Sep-19	
						City	\$ 200,000	Design	Sep-19	Mar-20	
							\$ -	CON	Jun-20	Sep-20	
							\$ -				
							\$ -				
						<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 400,000</b>				
7	Walnut Creek	Parkside Sidewalk Gap Closure  Parkside Drive from Overlook to 250 feet east of Buena Vista Ave	Project would construct sidewalk along Parkside from the intersection of Overlook drive along the county border with Walnut Creek and connect to existing sidewalk and curb ramps leading to Buena Vista Elementary and Walnut Creek Intermediate Schools.	This project would construct a sidewalk along Parkside Drive connecting to Buena Vista Avenue for Buena Vista Elementary School and close sidewalk gap a to North Broadway which is adjacent to Walnut Creek Intermediate. The project would provide pedestrian facilities within 1/2 mile of an elementary school along a known walking route for the school's students.	N	MTC	\$ 200,000	Env.	Mar-19	Sep-19	
						City	\$ 400,000	Design	Sep-19	Mar-20	
							\$ -	CON	Jun-20	Sep-20	
							\$ -				
							\$ -				
						<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 600,000</b>				

## **MEMORANDUM**

**Date** August 1, 2018

**To** Safe Routes to School Task Force, RTPC Managers

**From** Brad Beck

**RE** **Additional Safe Routes to School Funding**

As part of the extension of the first cycle of the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) for an additional year, MTC allocated an additional \$822,000 to Contra Costa in funding for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects and programs. These federal funds, unfortunately, were not included in the OBAG 2 call for projects. They remain available to Contra Costa and Authority staff has prepared the following memo outlining potential options for allocating these funds.

### **BACKGROUND**

#### **Previous Funding Cycles**

MTC has allocated funding to CMAs for SRTS projects and programs through several funding cycles. The first OBAG cycle allocated \$3,289,000 to Contra Costa for SRTS projects and programs. It was used to fund 10 projects and one program. The funding was allocated by formula to the four Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) which recommended which projects to fund. The formula was based 50 percent on school enrollment and 50 percent on population.

Through the second cycle of OBAG funding — OBAG2 — MTC allotted \$4.088 million to Contra Costa for SRTS. As in OBAG 1, the Authority used the same 50 percent enrollment and 50 percent population formula. The funding share are shown below:

<i>Region</i>	<i>Share</i>
West	\$881,000
Central	\$1,077,000
East	\$1,223,000
Southwest	\$907,000
TOTAL	\$4,088,000

Based on the RTPC recommendations and some subsequent fund swapping, the Authority allocated the SRTS funding to the following four projects and two programs:

<i>Project</i>	<i>Sponsor</i>	<i>SRTS Funding</i>
Willow Pass Road Repaving and 6 <sup>th</sup> Street SRTS *	Concord	\$1,077,000
Moraga Way and Canyon/Camino Pablo Improvements **	Moraga	\$607,000
L Street Pathway to Transit-Bike Ped Improvement	Antioch	\$1,223,000
Lincoln Elementary SRTS Ped Enhancements	Richmond	\$320,000
Street Smarts San Ramon Valley	San Ramon	\$300,000
West Contra Costa Walk and Bike Leaders	Contra Costa County	\$561,000
TOTAL		\$4,088,000

\* This project combines components from two projects that were originally separate

\*\* Originally named "Strategic Bicycle, Pedestrian and Safe Routes to School Improvements"

The first two projects combine both SRTS improvements and other roadway improvements. The third and fourth projects focus on physical improvements for safe bicycle and pedestrian access to schools. The final two will fund SRTS programs at schools in the San Ramon Valley and West County.

### **Eligible Projects and Programs**

The \$822,000 in SRTS funds comes from the federal CMAQ program. While they may fund a wide range of projects and programs, they do impose some limits. One of the key limits is that, overall, each activity must lead to changes in travel behavior that result in air quality benefits. Some of the main limitations include:

- **Planning activities** are ineligible, including walking audits. Project development activities that support a tangible improvement or program, however, are eligible.

- **Safety improvements** such as crossing guards and mobile radar trailers are ineligible for CMAQ funding since they specifically address safety but do not directly lead to changes to travel behavior that lead to air quality improvement. Also safety improvements such as signage, warning lights, etc. that are oriented to motorists are not eligible. In contrast, safety improvements specifically oriented to bicyclists and pedestrians, such as street crossings, actuated signals are eligible.
- **Material incentives** have limitations regarding the use of federal funds to pay for items such as raffles, prizes, gift cards, etc. Federal statutes prohibit using federal funds to provide gifts and free incentives. The exceptions to the rule are low-cost gifts such as pencils, stickers, paper pads, magnets, helmets, etc. that have little or no monetary value.

The requirements that apply to other OBAG-funded projects apply to SRTS projects as well. These include:

- The CMAs average OBAG funding request can't be less than \$500,000 and no individual request can be less than \$100,000.
- Sponsor must provide a local match of at least 11.47% of eligible project costs
- Sponsor must maintain eligibility for the funding including complete streets, pavement management and housing element requirements

## **OPTIONS**

Staff has identified a few options for allocating the \$822,000 in additional SRTS funds that we would like your feedback on.

### **Option 1**

**Allocate the additional SRTS funds among the four RTPCs for new projects.** This is the same as the previous approach; in it, the RTPCs would identify new projects to be funded with their share of the funds. Using the same 50% population/50% enrollment formula, the funds would be apportioned as shown on the following table. MTC requires, among other things, that no funding grant be less than \$100,000 and all of the following allocations would meet this requirement.

<i>Subarea</i>	<i>Population Share</i>	<i>Enrollment Share</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Funding Share</i>
West	24.1%	19.0%	21.6%	\$177,000
Central	28.7%	24.0%	26.3%	\$217,000
East	28.6%	31.2%	29.9%	\$246,000
Southwest	18.6%	25.7%	22.2%	\$182,000
				<b>\$822,000</b>

**Pros:** This option would be consistent with the approaches used for OBAG 1 and 2, and it would expand the number of SRTS improvements that could be made in Contra Costa.

**Cons:** This option would increase the number of projects that must go through the Caltrans local assistance process. (One of the Authority’s goals in the Coordinated Call was to minimize the number of projects that had to go through Caltrans.) This option would also require RTPCs to go through another application and review process.

**Option 2a**

**Add funding to projects already in the TIP.** In the second option, the Authority would use the \$822,000 to modify one or more of the projects funded through the Coordinated Call. (This is consistent with the Authority’s goal of minimizing the number of projects that needed to go through the Caltrans process.) In this option, the Authority could use the \$822,000 to either:

- Replace some of the local match where the match exceeds the 11.47 percent minimum, or
- Expand the budget of projects to address cost overruns or to add new scope items

The table on Option 2a below lists the seven SRTS projects now funded through OBAG 2; the amounts of funding from federal, local and Measure J sources they will use; and the local match share. All but one of the projects provides a significantly larger match than the 11.47 percent required. Those six projects could use a portion of the \$822,000 to replace at least some of the local match. For example, the Moraga Way and



Canyon/Camino Pablo Improvements project could use the \$822,000 to replace all of the Town of Moraga's local match, leaving the \$603,00 in Measure J funding to serve as the local match.

To use the SRTS funding to replace local or Measure J funding, sponsors would need a sufficiently high local match and enough eligible SRTS components funded by the local match. For example, the Moraga project uses both OBAG SRTS and LSRP funds to both improve bicycle and pedestrian access to nearby schools and to preserve streets. The latter component would not specifically improve access to school and thus is not eligible for CMAQ funding.

The Option 2a table shows the funding committed to each project, the part of that funding that represents the required local match, and potential additional CMAQ funding that could be used to backfill the local match fall down to the required 11.47 percent.

**Pros** Option 2a would not increase the number of projects going through the Local Assistance process and would reduce the amount of funding that local agencies must contribute. Depending on how the funding is allocated, it could be used to defray the costs of sponsors that have proposed the most significant local contributions.

**Cons** The Authority would need to identify a way to determine how much of the \$822,000 would go to each project. These methods might include allocating the funds by the relative size of the sponsor's local contribution to total of all local contributions. Or it might be determined by the relative share of the total project cost each sponsor contributed. There are likely to be other alternatives.

### **Option 2b**

**Add regional share of funding to projects already in the TIP.** Option 2b combines Options 1 and 2a. In it, the RTPC shares of the additional SRTS funding would be added to funding for the projects that were already selected for OBAG 2 SRTS funding. A potential allocation of the \$822,000 in funds is shown in the Option 2b table. In both the Central and East subregions, only one project was allocated SRTS funding; those projects would get the full share of the subregion's funds. The SRTS funding in both the West and

Southwest regions was allocated to two projects. The Option 3 table shows the Southwest potential share of funding split 50/50 between the two Southwest projects. In West County, however, the maximum amount of additional funding that can be allocated to one of the projects — Lincoln Elementary SRTS Pedestrian Enhancements — is \$63,000 without the local match dropping below the 11.47 percent requirement.

**Pros** Option 2b would not add any new projects, thus meeting one of the Authority's goals, it would be consistent with previous approach of allocating funding among the RTPCs, and — like Option 2a — would reduce the amount of funding that local agencies must contribute.

**Cons** The increase in fund allocations would not be tied to an agency's current local contribution, the cost of the project itself, or to budgetary issues, thereby somewhat arbitrarily rewarding sponsors with a windfall.

### Option 3

**Use the funding on a SRTS project that didn't receive funding through OBAG 2.** In Option 3, the \$822,000 in funding would go to a SRTS project that applied for, but did not receive, funding during the initial OBAG 2 round. Three of the 11 projects that applied for SRTS funding did not receive any funding:

1. Empire Avenue at Amber Lane Traffic Signal (Brentwood) – \$366,000 requested;
2. Arlington Boulevard Pedestrian Safety Improvements, Phase 1, (El Cerrito) – \$345,000 requested; and
3. Safe Routes to Orchard Park Elementary School (Oakley) – \$1,22, million requested.

The remaining eight received either SRTS or Measure J TLC funds. In this option, the additional SRTS funding would be allocated to one or more of these projects.

**Pros** Option 3 would expand the number of SRTS projects funded through OBAG 2 and the facilities provided to create safe routes to walk or bicycle to school.

**Cons** This option would add a new project and thus another project that must go through the local assistance process. The funding available doesn't fit neatly with

the funding needed to make the projects whole; staff may need to work with sponsors to adjust project scopes, though this is often done.

**Option 2a: Add funding to projects already in the TIP**

	<i>SRTS</i>	<i>Other OBAG</i>	<i>Measure J</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Current Match</i>		<i>Minimum Match</i>	<i>Potential Add</i>
Willow Pass Repaving and 6th Street SRTS	1,077,000	4,183,000	120,000	1,137,000	6,517,000	1,257,000	19.3%	747,000	510,000
Moraga Way and Canyon/Camino Pablo Improvements	607,000	596,000	603,000	822,000	2,628,000	1,425,000	54.2%	301,000	1,124,000
L Street Pathway to Transit	1,223,000			1,777,000	3,000,000	1,777,000	59.2%	344,000	1,433,000
Lincoln Elementary SRTS Pedestrian Enhancements	320,000		63,000	50,000	433,000	113,000	26.1%	50,000	63,000
San Ramon Valley Street Smarts	300,000			102,000	402,000	102,000	25.4%	46,000	56,000
West County Walk and Bike Leaders	561,000			561,000	1,122,000	561,000	50.0%	129,000	432,000
	4,088,000	4,779,000	786,000	4,449,000	14,102,000	5,235,000		1,617,000	3,618,000

**Option 2b: Add regional share of funding to projects already in the TIP**

	Current SRTS Amount	Regional SRTS Shares				Potential SRTS Funds	Total Potential SRTS Funds
		West	Central	East	Southwest		
Willow Pass Repaving and 6th Street SRTS	1,077,000		217,000			217,000	1,294,000
Moraga Way and Canyon/Camino Pablo Improvements	607,000				91,000	91,000	698,000
L Street Pathway to Transit	1,223,000			246,000		246,000	1,469,000
Lincoln Elementary SRTS Pedestrian Enhancements	320,000	63,000				63,000 *	383,000
San Ramon Valley Street Smarts	300,000				91,000	91,000	391,000
West County Walk and Bike Leaders	561,000	114,000				114,000	675,000
	4,088,000	177,000	217,000	246,000	182,000	822,000	4,910,000

\* This is the maximum additional SRTS funding that can be added while still meeting the 11.47 percent match requirement

## Planning Committee **STAFF REPORT**

**Meeting Date:** September 5, 2018

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Review Scope-of-Work (SOW) and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), Authorize Release of a Request for Proposals (RFP), for the Contra Costa Accessible Transportation Strategic (ATS) Plan.</b>
<b>Summary of Issues</b>	The Authority has been awarded a grant from Caltrans in the amount of \$340,000 (\$400,000 total project cost) to prepare the ATS Plan. Staff is preparing the RFP to engage a consultant to prepare the plan. An MOU among Plan partners is a requirement of the grant and is intended to ensure agency engagement/commitment to the process and ultimately foster Plan implementation.
<b>Recommendations</b>	Staff seeks approval of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The attached Scope-of-Work</li> <li>B. The release of a RFP for a consultant to perform the scope for an amount not-to-exceed \$340,000</li> <li>C. The proposed ATS Plan Oversight Committee Structure</li> <li>D. The release of the attached draft MOU for review by agency partners.</li> </ul>
<b>Financial Implications</b>	The ATS Plan has received a Caltrans grant in the amount of \$340,000. Matching funds in the amount of \$60,000 will be provided through staff time from the Authority and County.
<b>Options</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not approve one or all of the recommended items at this time.</li> <li>2. Direct staff to investigate other options.</li> </ol>
<b>Attachments (See PC Packet dated 9/5/18)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. ATS Scope-of-Work</li> <li>B. Draft MOU</li> <li>C. Draft ATS Oversight Committee Structure</li> </ul>
<b>Changes from Committee</b>	<i>None</i>

## **Background**

The need to conduct the Accessible Transportation<sup>1</sup> Strategic (ATS) Plan was established during two recent Authority led countywide planning efforts. During the development of the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) for the Measure X (2016) transportation sales tax, the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) indicated support for improvements to this segment of the transportation system. The ATS Plan was included in the final TEP. After the transportation sales tax effort concluded, the ATS Plan was included as an explicit implementation action in the 2017 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP).

These two policy actions came about as a result of advocates, representing seniors and persons with disabilities, effectively communicating the need for additional funding and improvements for this segment of the transportation system. This message was brought to the EPAC, the Authority, and the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors. That message was, in summary, as Contra Costa residents get older and/or have mobility impairments; they “age out” of the ability to get from point A to point B.

Details on the message brought by these advocates include the fact that Contra Costa County is experiencing similar demographic shifts (the “silver tsunami”) seen across the country, an aging population with corresponding changes in mobility needs, and limited capacity to fill those needs. In addition, the target population served by accessible transportation is a concentration of overlapping disadvantaged populations as described below. Staff is highlighting these characteristics given the trend at the state level to prioritize projects and programs to these populations:

- Persons with disabilities are a protected class under federal anti-discrimination law (Rehab. Act [1973], ADA [1990]).
- The elderly have protected class status under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
- Compounding the above characteristics, the elderly and disabled are typically low-income. (TCRP Report 119-Improving ADA Paratransit Demand Estimation, 2007).

---

<sup>1</sup> Accessible transportation is not a common or industry recognized term. These services are delivered by diverse agencies and of organizations operating a spectrum of transit options and mobility services. This spectrum includes a wide spectrum of transit options and mobility services for seniors and persons with disabilities; Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit, non-ADA paratransit, program specific providers, city/community based programs, mobility management/travel training programs, etc.

In addition to the information above, the need for the ATS Plan is magnified by the following:

- 1)** As reported in the Federal Transit Administration’s 2014 report *Accessible Transit Services for All*, the cost of providing demand response service is increasing faster than other types of transit. From 1999 to 2012, the cost of providing ADA paratransit service increased 138%. During the same time frame conventional fixed-route bus service increased by 82%.
- 2)** The need to establish how best to take make use of the efficiencies provided by transportation network companies (Lyft, Uber, etc.), and other emerging technologies and service delivery models enabled by advances in individual access to mobile data.
- 3)** Consolidation trends in healthcare provision (which increases demand for more trips and longer trips).
- 4)** The current institutional structure for providing accessible transportation service in Contra Costa County has grown organically over time without a deliberate strategy. This Plan will assess if a more methodically designed system would be advantageous in terms of cost-effectiveness and ease of access and use.

In addition to the ATS Plan being an implementation action in the 2017 CTP, it is fulfilling other goals of the CTP:

- 1)** Consistent with the *“Innovation is the Key”* section of the CTP, the RFP directs potential respondents as follows: *“Conventional or traditional transit/planning/transportation consulting firms are encouraged to partner with transportation/mobility technology leaders...”*;
- 2)** As described in the *“Projected Growth in Population and Jobs”* section of the CTP, the median age of the population is increasing and will need to be addressed which is a specific goal of this Plan;
- 3)** Consistent with *“CTP Strategy 3.2. TRANSIT SERVICE COORDINATION. Link transit investments to increased coordination and integration of public transit services...”* this plan specifically addresses the need to increase coordination of providers and to develop mechanisms to transfer paratransit passengers to fixed route transit whenever possible (reducing costs and greenhouse gasses);
- 4)** The ATS Plan specifically fulfills the following CTP strategy *“3.7. SERVING ALL CONTRA COSTA RESIDENTS. 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”*; and
- 5)** The ATS Plans will specifically investigate new service models that increase funding streams consistent with the following CTP Strategy, *“4.1. STABLE FUNDING SOURCES. Advocate for stable sources of funds for transit operations and other programs that support the transportation system...”*



## **Overall ATS Plan Objectives**

The overall objective of the ATS Plan is to improve accessible transportation services and administration in Contra Costa County through an assessment process, which will include a wide range of organizations, and encompasses the entire County.

The initial timeline for the ATS Plan was originally assumed to be from approximately winter 2018 to summer 2021. However, based on input from Commissioner Tatzin (Bus Transit Coordinating Council Ex-Officio Authority Board member), staff is investigating how the process could be expedited.

The ATS Plan will include expansive outreach specifically designed for the target population and has three core tasks or milestones: 1) Study of existing, individual [city, transit agency, other programs receiving Measure J or state/federal funding] programs resulting in recommendations; 2) Study of alternative countywide system designs with alternatives presented to: elected officials, staff, passengers, advocates, and the public with a preferred design identified; and 3) Presentation of an implementation plan for the consensus design. Specific objectives:

- Establish a detailed implementation program with a schedule addressing short, medium, and long term steps, the responsible parties, necessary policy board actions, and additional studies, revenue (capital and operating) requirements, etc.
- Educate decision makers on the policy, administration, existing conditions & system performance, and legal characteristics/implications of this type of service.
- Examine a wide range of options for a more strategically designed countywide system. The range includes incremental changes all the way up to a new unified, countywide system inclusive of: Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA), countywide coordinated mobility management, one-call/one-click entry point, etc.
- Improve service efficiency (cost per trip, number of shared trips [GHG reduction]).
- Reduce the volume of operator-to-operator transfers.
- Examine feasibility/approach to implementing mobility management, travel training, transfers between paratransit and fixed route (rail and bus).
- Improve client access and ease of use.
- Ensure the scalability of the system enabling responsiveness to the widely documented, forecasted increases in demand.

- Develop a comprehensive funding strategy (inclusive of legislative approaches) taking into account the increase in demand due to new healthcare-related transportation requirements, latent demand, service models that inherently attract increased and new funding, demographic shifts, etc.
- Ridership projections (inclusive of latent demand dynamics).
- Establishment or designation of an organization and/or structure to act as advocate and administrator for this transportation sector on an ongoing basis.
- The implementation task will propose a strategic service expansion taking in to account budgetary and operational restrictions.
- Enable greater usage of rapidly emerging technologies including transportation network companies (Lyft, Uber, etc.), and new service models enabled by these technologies.
- Development of countywide, standardized service metrics and reporting.
- Expand the interface with the Office of Emergency Services to improve response to the target population in the event of a major incident or emergency.
- Recommendations will ensure public transit operators will have uncompromised ability to fulfill ADA obligations.
- Implementation and phasing will insulate passengers and service characteristics from drastic changes and disruption.
- Insulate public transit operators from loss of funding without an offsetting reduction in obligations.
- Recommendations will clearly and accurately describe how responsibilities and costs will be equitably borne by interested parties.
- Provide a frank assessment to staff and elected bodies as to why the County has conducted 3-4 studies of this type with the majority of the recommendations **not** being implemented and how we can avoid that outcome with this study.
- Coordinate with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in their “*Sustainable Communities and Climate Resilience for People with Disabilities<sup>2</sup>*” planning grant. Specific coordination is to be determined as both efforts take shape. Note: This objective is included at the request of Caltrans.

---

<sup>2</sup>Sustainable Communities and Climate Resilience for People with Disabilities: This MTC project will develop new strategies to address the specialized needs of the disability community. To achieve this goal, the project will deliver an action plan that includes recommendations for multiple regional plans, funding programs and data collection efforts, including the regional transportation plan, the Lifeline Transportation Plan and the household travel and transit intercept surveys. The project will also create a resource book for people with disabilities.

## **Memorandum of Understanding**

As indicated in the grant application, the Authority will execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with project participants prior to initiation of the ATS Plan. The MOU will be collaboratively developed with Plan participants and reflect the Caltrans grant guidelines. The guidelines advise that the MOU define respective roles, expectations, desired outcomes, and agreements for how to work together. The MOU will include a commitment of each organization or agency to take formal action, accompanied by a stated, well-supported rationale, responding to the recommendations of the study. The intent is to structure the ATS Plan such that it will not “sit on a shelf”.

## **ATS Plan Oversight Structure**

In an effort to get a “fresh” perspective on objectives of the study, staff is proposing a plan oversight structure that includes three committees: 1) policy makers, 2) technical staff, and 3) riders/clients.

Due to the complexity of the issue, the number and diversity of the stakeholders, and our multijurisdictional collaboration protocols, this oversight structure is correspondingly robust. Specific responsibilities of each committee will be defined with the assistance of the consultant and study partners once the process is initiated. Committee meetings will be formally noticed and open to the public. Committee members will be encouraged to attend all the meetings to promote the sharing of ideas and concerns between the different committees.

## **Policy Advisory Committee<sup>3</sup> (PAC)**

**Structure Notes:** Planning processes in Contra Costa are typically overseen by the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs)<sup>4</sup>. This process deviates from that process with the transit operators given seats on the PAC (rather than RTPC representation). This is due to the significant role the transit operators play in this service area. RTPC input will be solicited through presentations at the subcommittees, discussion at the CCTA Board (which is comprised of RTPC representatives) and staff participation on the Technical Advisory Committee. City and other sub-regional operators will be asked to coordinate representation through the RTPCs.

---

<sup>3</sup> Individuals can only be members of a single committee, there will be no duplication in membership for the PAC, TAC, and RAC.

<sup>4</sup> CCTA is advised by three separate RTPC subcommittees representing different regions of the County. The RTPCs consist of SWAT (Southwest), TRANSPAC (Central), TRANSPLAN (East), and WCCTAC (West).

**Role:** Study oversight, gathering information on the subject matter, liaison responsibilities to transit districts, RTPCs, full CCTA Board, and the Board of Supervisors.

1. County Connection	2. Tri Delta Transit
3. AC Transit & BART <sup>5</sup>	4. WestCAT
5. CCTA Member	6. Contra Costa Board of Supervisors
7. Subject Matter Expert/Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO)/Advocate: Disabled <sup>6</sup>	8. Subject Matter Expert/NGO/Advocate: Senior <sup>4</sup>
9. Alternate: Subject Matter Expert/NGO/Advocate: Disabled <sup>4</sup>	10. Alternate: Subject Matter Expert/NGO/Advocate: Senior <sup>4</sup>

**Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**

**Structure Notes:** Includes representation from transit districts, NGOs, etc. RTPC staff creates linkage with the subareas. At the suggestion of Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and County Emergency Operations have been included in addition to being a best practice.

**Role:** Provide subject matter expertise and public policy implications on service concepts under study and recommendations (reality check). Initial task of reviewing the scope-of-work and oversight structure.

1. AC Transit/BART/East Bay Paratransit <sup>7</sup>	2. Tri Delta Transit <sup>5</sup>
3. County Connection <sup>5</sup>	4. WestCAT <sup>5</sup>
5. Contra Costa Transportation Authority	6. Contra Costa County Planning
7. Contra Costa Employment and Human Services	8. Contra Costa County Health Services/Contra Costa Health Plan
9. NGO/Advocate: Disabled	10. NGO/Advocate: Senior
11. SWAT Staff/Designee <sup>5</sup>	12. TRANSPLAN Staff/Designee <sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> BART and AC Transit ADA paratransit obligations are both fulfilled by East Bay Paratransit.

<sup>6</sup> Membership in this seat is not strictly dependent on geography or affiliation with a local agency or organization. A recruitment and/or nomination process is being developed. Ultimately, CCTA will consider the nominations and make the appointments. Initial thoughts in terms of skill set and background include individuals from the private sector, academia, or advocacy/non-profit community with expertise or familiarity with the topic and can participate and contribute with an open mind and no explicit agenda or bias.

<sup>7</sup> Either the public transit agency members or RTPC staff/designees may coordinate amongst themselves to identify a single representative to attend meetings on behalf of two or more entities.

13. WCCTAC Staff/Designee <sup>5</sup>	14. TRANSPAC Staff/Designee <sup>5</sup>
15. Veterans Transportation	16. MTC Staff Liaison
17. County Emergency Operations (ad hoc basis)	18. NGO/Advocate: Senior or Disabled

**Rider Advisory Committee\* (RAC)**

**Structure Notes:** NGO/Advocates will be requested to appoint riders that use transportation service for a variety of ride purposes (medical, shopping/retail, recreation, etc.). Appointments should also represent the different subareas of the County (west, east, central, south). City provider representation will be coordinated through RTPC members.

**Role:** Provide client/passenger based input on concepts being studied and eventual recommendations.

1. WCCTAC Appointment	2. TRANSPAC Appointment
3. SWAT Appointment	4. TRANSPLAN Appointment
5. PCC Appointment Seat 1	6. PCC Appointment Seat 2
7. Senior Seat 1 (NGO Appointed/Recommended)	8. Senior Seat 2 (NGO Appointed/Recommended)
9. Disabled Seat 1 (NGO Appointed/Recommended)	10. Disabled Seat 2 (NGO Appointed/Recommended)

**ATS Plan Staffing**

The scope and diversity of agencies suggests the need for multiple staff. The Authority is the primary forum for transportation issues in the Contra Costa. Contra Costa County government has unique obligations regarding public health, the Older Americans Act, the Contra Costa Health Plan, etc.

**Role:** Study staff will 1) manage the process once the committees have approved the protocol, 2) fulfill TAC role, and 3) act as liaison with CCTA Board/Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors.

1. Contra Costa Transportation Authority	2. Contra Costa County
--	------------------------

## CCTA Local Agency Funding Opportunities Summary - Updated 9/19/18

### Upcoming Funding Opportunities

Funding Program	Fund Source	Application Deadlines	Program and Contact Info
<b>Tire-Derived Aggregate (TDA) Grant Program FY 2018-2019</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• August 1, 2018</li> <li>• November 1, 2018</li> <li>• January 31, 2019</li> </ul>	<p>The Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) administers the program to provide opportunities to divert waste tires from landfill disposal, prevent illegal tire dumping, and promote markets for recycled-content tire products. The TDA grant program provides assistance to civil engineers in solving a variety of engineering challenges. TDA, which is produced from shredded tires, is lightweight, free-draining, and a less expensive alternative to conventional lightweight aggregates. \$850,000 available for FY 2018-19.</p> <p><a href="http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Tires/Grants/TDA/default.htm">http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Tires/Grants/TDA/default.htm</a></p>
<b>Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) Planning and Implementation Grants (Round 2)</b>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• October 30, 2018 by 5 pm</li> </ul>	<p>The grants fund projects that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through the development and implementation of neighborhood-level transformative climate community plans. These plans include multiple, coordinated GHG emissions reduction projects that provide local economic, environmental, and health benefits to disadvantaged communities. Funding for the TCC Program is provided by Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF), an account established to receive Cap-and-Trade auction proceeds.</p> <p>SGC anticipates that approximately \$46 million in Implementation Grant funding and approximately \$800,000 in Planning Grant funding will be available for competitive awards in Round 2.</p> <p><a href="http://www.sgc.ca.gov/programs/tcc/docs/20180815-TCC_Final_GUIDELINES_07-31-2018.pdf">http://www.sgc.ca.gov/programs/tcc/docs/20180815-TCC_Final_GUIDELINES_07-31-2018.pdf</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.sgc.ca.gov/programs/tcc/resources/">http://www.sgc.ca.gov/programs/tcc/resources/</a></p>
<b>Caltrans Transportation Planning Grants (FY 2019-20): Sustainable Communities and Adaptation Planning</b>	S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• November 2, 2018 (Tentative)</li> </ul>	<p>Call for projects is scheduled for October 2018. \$25 million for Sustainable Communities Grants to encourage local and regional planning that further state goals, including, but not limited to, the goals and best practices cited in the regional transportation plan guidelines. \$6 million for Adaptation Planning Grants to local and regional agencies for climate change adaptation planning.</p> <p><a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html</a></p>