

**TRANSPAC**  
**Transportation Partnership and Cooperation**  
**Meeting Notice and Agenda**

**THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2019**

**REGULAR MEETING**

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

Pleasant Hill City Hall – Community Room  
100 Gregory Lane, Pleasant Hill

**TRANSPAC reserves the right to take formal action on any item included on this agenda, whether or not a form of resolution, motion, or other indication that action will be taken is included on the agenda or attachments thereto.**

- 1. CONVENE REGULAR MEETING / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE / SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT:** At this time, the public is welcome to address TRANSPAC on any item not on this agenda. Please complete a speaker card and hand it to a member of the staff. Please begin by stating your name and address and indicate whether you are speaking for yourself or an organization. Please keep your comments brief. In fairness to others, please avoid repeating comments.
- 3. CONSENT AGENDA**
  - a. MINUTES OF THE JULY 3, 2019 MEETING ☼ Page 5**
  - b. MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2019 MEETING ☼ Page 17**
  - c. MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 15, 2019 MEETING ☼ Page 23**

Attachment:

- Minutes of the July 3, 2019 meeting,
- Minutes of the July 18, 2019 meeting,
- Minutes of the August 15, 2019 meeting.

**END CONSENT AGENDA**

- 4. TRANSPAC STRATEGIC PLANNING DISCUSSION.** TRANSPAC has requested a strategic planning discussion to review the TRANSPAC scope and prioritization of work and how to complete that work. The attached material includes information about how TRANSPAC is organized/administered and information about past items addressed as well as information about other RTPC's / similar agencies to inform the discussion. This item

was on the August 29, 2019 TRANSPAC TAC and the summary of the topics they discussed, including items to consider for future TRANSPAC workplans, is included in the attached material. TRANSPAC is requested to provide comment and direction on next steps to the TRANSPAC TAC and the Managing Director on this item. 🌀 Page 29

Attachment(s):

- The attached includes material regarding TRANSPAC TAC discussion summary, CCTA guidance on RTPCs, TRANSPAC documents (i.e. JPA, budget, position work scopes), and information regarding other RTPCs

5. **TRANSPAC MANAGING DIRECTOR CONTRACT AMENDMENT.** The TRANSPAC budget is normally approved in the month of June. Through the prior agenda item, TRANSPAC is conducting a strategic planning session discussion to review the work of TRANSPAC and how to proceed into the future. In consideration of the strategic planning session discussion that may impact the proposed budget, the approval of the TRANSPAC budget has been deferred. The contract term for the current Managing Director Services agreement was extended from June 30, 2019 to September 30, 2019 and the not to exceed amount supplemented with additional funds at the July 3, 2019 TRANSPAC meeting. As a follow up to the prior discussion, TRANSPAC is requested to discuss next steps to approve a budget and workplan. It is also recommended to amend Managing Director contract to allow for continued support in the near term, including the ongoing strategic planning process, and other ongoing TRANSPAC business. A status on the current contract will be provided at the meeting. Additional information on this item will be available at the meeting.

**ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Approve a contract amendment with GBS to provide Managing Director services for TRANSPAC for an interim term of upcoming fiscal year for a time and materials contract and not to exceed amount. Additional information on this item will be available at the meeting.**

<b>INFORMATIONAL ITEMS</b>
----------------------------

6. **2020 TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURE PLAN STATUS.** The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) is developing a new Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) for possible placement on the March 2020 ballot. The CCTA approved the TEP on August 28, 2019, including the addition of 5 years to the revenue assumption. The CCTA will now circulate the TEP for consideration by the cities/towns and Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors.

Attachment(s):

- Copy of the Draft 2020 TEP (Published September 4, 2019) may be downloaded at: [https://ccta.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/CCTA\\_TEP\\_Draft24\\_final\\_090419\\_lowres.pdf](https://ccta.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/CCTA_TEP_Draft24_final_090419_lowres.pdf)

7. **TRANSPAC FINANCIAL REPORTS.** This report contains a summary of the amount of funds held, receipts and expenses of TRANSPAC for FY 2018/19 for the period ended June 30, 2019. The TRANSPAC JPA calls for the reporting of this financial information on a quarterly basis. 🌀 **Page 63**

Attachment(s):

- TRANSPAC Quarterly Financial Report for period ending June 30, 2019

8. **TRANSPAC CCTA REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS**

9. **CCTA EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT REGARDING AUTHORITY ACTIONS/DISCUSSION ITEMS** 🌀 **Page 67**

Attachment: CCTA Executive Director Randell H. Iwasaki's Report dated July 17, 2019.

10. **ITEMS APPROVED BY THE AUTHORITY FOR CIRCULATION TO THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEES (RTPCs) AND RELATED ITEMS OF INTEREST** 🌀 **Page 73**

Attachment:

- CCTA Executive Director Randell H. Iwasaki's RTPC Memo dated July 5, 2019 and July 19, 2019.

11. **TAC ORAL REPORTS BY JURISDICTION:** Reports from Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek, and Contra Costa County, if available. 🌀 **Page 77**

- TRANSPAC – Status Letter dated July 5, 2019, July 31, 2019 and August 19, 2019.
- TRANSPLAN – Meeting Summary dated June 27, 2019 and July 1, 2019.
- SWAT – Meeting Summary dated August 5, 2019.
- WCCTAC – Meeting Summary dated July 16, 2019.
- Street Smarts Programs in the TRANSPAC Region can be found at: <https://streetsmartsdiablo.org/events/>
- County Connection Fixed Route Monthly Report: [http://countyconnection.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/10a.Fixed-Route-Rpt\\_June-2019.pdf](http://countyconnection.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/10a.Fixed-Route-Rpt_June-2019.pdf)
- County Connection Link Monthly Report: <http://countyconnection.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/10b.June-MOPS-Report.pdf>
- CCTA Project Status Report may be downloaded at: <https://www.ccta.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/02-Attachment-A-QPSR.pdf>
- The next meeting of the CCTA Board is scheduled for September 18, 2019. The agenda is not yet available.
- The next meeting of the CCTA Administration & Projects Committee (APC) meeting is scheduled for October 3, 2019. The agenda is not yet available.
- The next meeting of the CCTA Planning Committee meeting is scheduled for October 2, 2019. The agenda is not yet available.
- The CCTA Calendar for July to October 2019, may be downloaded at: [https://ccta.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view\\_id=1&clip\\_id=470&meta\\_id=45326](https://ccta.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=470&meta_id=45326)

**12. BOARDMEMBER COMMENTS**

**13. MANAGING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

**14. ADJOURN / NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is scheduled for October 10, 2019 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined.

## **TRANSPAC Special Meeting Summary Minutes**

**MEETING DATE:** July 3, 2019

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Sue Noack, Pleasant Hill (Chair); Carlyn Obringer, Concord (Vice Chair); Loella Haskew, Walnut Creek (CCTA Representative); Karen Mitchoff, Contra Costa County; Julie Pierce, Clayton (CCTA Representative); and Mark Ross, Martinez

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** John Mercurio, Concord; and Bob Pickett, Walnut Creek

**STAFF PRESENT:** Bill Churchill, County Connection; Danielle Habr, Pleasant Hill; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Kevin Martsall, Concord; Abhishek Parikh, Concord; Robert Sarmiento, Contra Costa County; Andy Smith, Walnut Creek; Matt Todd, Managing Director, TRANSPAC

**GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Ray Akkawi, AMG; Tim Haile, CCTA; Hisham Noemi, CCTA; Linsey Willis, CCTA;

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:** Danielle Habr, City of Pleasant Hill Deputy City Clerk

### **1. Convene Regular Meeting/Pledge of Allegiance/Self Introductions**

Chair Noack called the regular meeting of the TRANSPAC Board of Directors to order 9:01 A.M. and led the Pledge of Allegiance; introductions followed.

### **2. Public Comment**

There were no comments from the public.

### **3. Consent Agenda**

#### **a. Minutes of the June 13, 2019 Meeting**

**On motion by Director Mitchoff, second by Vice Chair Obringer to adopt the Consent Agenda, as submitted. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote of the members.**

**End of Consent Agenda**

### **4. TRANSPAC Managing Director Contract Amendment**

Matt Todd, Managing Director, TRANSPAC, explained that the TRANSPAC budget is normally approved in June, but TRANSPAC wants to have a strategic planning session first to determine how to proceed in the future. He explained that the request is to add an additional \$30,000 to

the current time and materials contract and to extend the term for a three-month period. Mr. Todd added that it is just a not-to-exceed amount so what is not needed would not be spent.

**On motion by Director Mitchoff, second by Director Pierce to approve a contract amendment of \$30,000 with GBS to provide Managing Director services for TRANSPAC for the interim term of upcoming fiscal year through September 30, 2019 for a time and materials contract that is not to exceed \$403,259 for Managing Director services (representing the period of November 2016 to September 2019) and an overall contract value of \$442,259. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote of the members.**

## **5. 2020 Transportation Expenditure Plan**

### **a) TEP Projects/Programs**

Tim Haile, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA), distributed the latest detailed Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) while Mr. Todd reported on what was covered at last TRANSPAC meeting.

Mr. Haile described the new TEP and the differences from the TEP distributed at the previous TRANSPAC meeting. He reported that CCTA staff has been attending regional transportation planning committee (RTPC) meetings and that staff concluded people are having challenges finding their projects. He said that at the June 19<sup>th</sup> CCTA Board meeting, there was a proposal to reorganize projects into corridors primarily taking all the categories and focusing them into two major headers instead of four – “relief congestion” and “improved transportation in your community” – to make it simple and easy for people to find what is in the TEP for them. Mr. Haile explained that under relief congestion, funding categories were reorganized by corridors instead of a regional standpoint so people can find projects by their commute and see all projects benefitting them on their commute rather than splitting projects across two sub-regions. (Examples: State Routes (SR) 4/242, I-680/SR 24 and I80/I580 addressing the three biggest bottlenecks in the County at the 680/4 interchange, I80, and the 680/24 interchange.) He said that Central County is split between two corridors, SR 4/242, I-680/SR 24, Innovate 680 is located under the I-680/SR 24 corridor, and the improvements to 680/4 interchange and SR 4 operational improvements projects, are in the SR 4/242 corridor projects; the dollar values remain the same.

Mr. Haile reported that based on preliminary input from the RTPCs, return to source is the biggest area of interest. He explained that improving transportation in your community is the base 15% rate everyone has been looking at for the measure, but based on the input from the RTPCs, CCTA made a decision to increase the 15% to 18% for Central, Southwest, and East County for the life of Measure J for return to source (from 2020 to 2034 total return to source would be 36% when including the existing Measure J). Mr. Haile clarified for Director Mitchoff that with West County accepting 15%, the balance of their funding would go to transit. He added that to get the \$24M [additional funds for the fix and modernize local roads category in Southwest, Central, and East County], CCTA deleted the regional transportation priority and focused job growth categories and shifted those dollars to return to source and any remaining funds available shifted to transit.

Director Pierce repeated that focused job growth and regional transportation priorities were deleted at the wish of TRANSPAC and moved to return to source to make up the difference between 15 and 18%. Mr. Haile confirmed.

Mr. Haile explained that another way to look at it is that whole transit funding is 52.9% or 50% to congestion relief and 50% to improving transportation in the County. He stated that the spreadsheet is the current version of the plan that the Board-appointed ad hoc committee made based on input received and that CCTA is targeting circulating the TEP to the public the following week.

Director Pierce added that the changes were made the day before in the ad hoc committee meeting to address concerns and based on polling. Director Haskew and Chair Noack commented that it is counterintuitive as one of the survey results was that people were not seeing enough local impact and Director Pierce responded that the public wants predictability in their travel – getting where they need to go – and not just pothole relief.

Mr. Haile commented that the poll results are arranged by sub-region and that in Central County, 90% want to reduce congestion on the local highways and similarly, 87% want to reduce it on highways and major roads, 87% want to ensure funds benefit local commuters – the accountability piece – 85% want to make BART and trains in Contra Costa County cleaner and safer, and 84% want to improve the frequency, reliability, cleanliness, and safety of busses, ferries, and BART. He explained that on the accountability piece, the survey said, “This measure will make our elected officials accountable how they spend our tax money by requiring proof that anything funded with revenue will make a real impact on congestion in Contra Costa County. They will not be allowed to spend any money on projects that don’t make our commutes faster or more predictable” so accountability is more about congestion relief and making commutes more predictable than the local aspect.

Chair Noack commented that the biggest issue for Pleasant Hill is that congestion on the highways causes traffic to come into Pleasant Hill. Director Haskew and Vice Chair Obringer added in their communities as well. Chair Noack asked if there will be significant congestion relief to avoid that because if not, local people will not be supportive. Mr. Haile responded that there is congestion relief on major roads.

Director Pierce gave an example of a possible major corridor project on Contra Costa Boulevard and other directors added other major corridors. There was a brief discussion between Chair Noack and Director Pierce about the goals.

Vice Chair Obringer asked if the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) had looked at the TEP. Mr. Haile responded not yet. Director Pierce reiterated the current version of the TEP was just confirmed the night before.

Chair Noack commented that she did not see the Caldecott Tunnel added to Central County as offered; Mr. Haile responded that it was in the I-680 and SR 24 section and that the funding categories had not changed. Director Pierce commented that the TEP did not show Central

County paying for some of it. Mr. Haile responded that the specific change had not been made yet because CCTA was awaiting formal feedback from the RTPC.

Mr. Todd added that some of what was talked about on the previous TEP was the Caldecott Tunnel at \$2.5M and enhanced ferry service and commuter rail in Contra Costa having a minimum of \$13M. He said the June 27<sup>th</sup> TAC discussion on the previous TEP questioned how to show an 18% scenario for local streets and roads. He distributed a handout describing what had been discussed at the last TAC meeting to get to 18% and to help get major corridors done and explained the adjustments on the handout: reducing some of the ferry service and commuter rail pot by \$17M to \$13M; reducing seamless connected transportation options and reduced emissions by \$11M to \$40M; reducing regional transportation priorities by \$5M down to \$0; removing any adjustment to transportation planning and facilities to leave it at \$27M; removing any adjustment to relieving congestion and improving local access along I-680 to leave it at \$105M; removing adjustments to improve transit reliability along I-680/SR 24 corridors to leave it at \$25M; and reducing relieve congestion on Highway 4/SR 242 by \$10M to \$144M. He explained that those adjustments allowed for an increase for local roads by 3% to get it up to 18%, left \$2.5M for the Caldecott Tunnel and that there was \$16.5M on top of that so the TAC discussed adding it to improve traffic flow on local streets to adjust it up to \$110M.

Hisham Noemi, CCTA, provided reconciliation details to get to the \$24M: the new TEP removed regional transportation priorities and one thing on the TRANSPAC list not proposed for removal on the new TEP was focused growth and transportation to housing and employment centers for approximately \$20M.

Mr. Todd asked for confirmation that it was \$20M from focused growth and \$5M from regional transportation priorities. Mr. Noemi confirmed and Mr. Haile explained that the new TEP deleted the regional focused growth category; enhanced ferry service and commuter rail stayed at \$30M; seamless connected transportation was split between two categories (stayed at \$41M); transportation planning stayed the same; relieve congestion/improve local access on I-680 stayed the same at \$105M; transit reliability stayed the same; relieve congestion on Highway 4/SR 4 stayed the same; improve traffic flow on major streets stayed the same at \$93M; and modernize safety improvements at \$2.5M was not shown. He added that primarily by deleting regional transportation priorities and job focused growth, they were able to keep all of the categories basically the same. In response to the confusion of some of the directors, Mr. Haile confirmed that job focused growth was deleted entirely from the new TEP and that previously there was \$20.21M and that was moved to return to source. He and Mr. Noemi confirmed for Mr. Todd that the remaining money was moved to reduced emissions (approximately \$.8M).

Director Pierce commented there are other sources for what used to be the TLC program and that the transportation for local communities program is funded with substantial resources through MTC's OBAG grants.

Mr. Haile commented that the TRANSPAC TAC was trying to secure additional funds to reduce traffic on local streets.

Mr. Todd commented that ferry service is sufficiently funded since TRANSPAC indicated a \$13M minimum, and that there were no amendments to the I680-4 category, but \$2.5M would still be needed for Caldecott. Mr. Haile suggested to take it out of seamless connected transportation and offered other suggestions of how to adjust funding.

Director Pierce commented on her reluctance to take funding from anywhere other than seamless transportation. She added that she would rather take it from regional focused growth, the old TLC program, instead of taking it out of major programs. Director Pierce said they will need every bit to leverage it and will still get to 18% without cutting short programs Central County will need money for.

In response to Mr. Ross, Mr. Haile described seamless connected transportation as rideshare, bikeshare, on-demand transit, smart payment systems, and data driven mobilities of service to collect data. Chair Noack commented it showed up in three locations on the spreadsheet and Mr. Haile confirmed it was broken out specifically in each corridor. Director Pierce added that most people in Central County are not going to look at other county corridors so they need to be given a package of their projects.

Chair Noack commented that the \$13M was not sufficient to do anything in Central County.

Mr. Todd referred to the program concept of subsidizing a student pass program and stated that County Connection provided data on how many students are using the system. Director Pierce asked if it is based on number of students; he stated it is based on 1,950 riders plus 25% student growth. In response to a question from Chair Noack, Bill Churchill, County Connection, said only K-12 is included, not DVC students as they are considered adults.

Mr. Todd followed up that between the seniors, veterans/disabled, and the student pass programs, TRANSPAC is looking at an 1.5% per year level of funding. He said that for the current Measure J, .5% of funding is currently allocated for seniors (\$500K per year) and .14% is allocated for student safety funding for a total of .65% in Central County for seniors and students. In response to Chair Noack, Mr. Todd said that it is \$1.5M on top of current funding and the question is how to mix the new \$1.5M, with the TEP proposal including more funding toward senior/disabled programs.

Director Mitchoff noted one thing discussed at the ad hoc committee meeting was providing bus service in a different manner such as smaller buses, not the traditional concept of large buses on arterials. Director Pierce added it is closer to an on-demand concept.

Mr. Haile commented that the concepts brought up are the kinds of things CCTA wants to do – work with transit operators to better understand what is happening in the County, and what to do to better serve residents. He said CCTA has been meeting often with transit operators to review the transit policy and so far everyone has been excited. Chair Noack added that they need to meet with the school district to understand where students are coming from and cited the example of a large amount of Concord students coming by car to Pleasant Hill. She added that \$13M is not going to do anything to change that as elementary and middle school kids are not

going to ride County Connection, especially if it takes longer than their parents driving them; she said there needs to significant enough dollars to make it happen.

Mr. Churchill confirmed there are challenges and said what they are trying to balance is to design focused transportation for students and trips designed to coincide with school bell times. He said one big challenge is to get students from Concord to Pleasant Hill and elementary kids' parents will not allow them to use transit, but intermediate kids will use busses within their own city. He added that if you look at schools, you get pockets of congestion surrounding schools that are really intense, but there needs to be enough of a reason to get parents to put kids on a free bus to reduce pockets of congestion around school bell times. Mr. Churchill stated that afternoon is not as important because it is prior to commute hours, but morning drop-off coincides with commuter traffic. He added that it is easier to get students on the bus than seniors, but the seniors need the flexibility Mr. Haile referred to.

Director Pierce described her dentist's comment that on the East Coast kids ride school buses and her dentist could not understand why that does not happen here. She noted there could be a customized shuttle for the school if you do not think about the city boundaries; Chair Noack agreed that it is a great idea, but said she does not think \$13M will fund it. Director Pierce commented that other transit money goes to County Connection in the plan. Mr. Haile confirmed that it is throughout the plan and that the integrated transit plan will customize everything. Chair Noack reiterated that the money needs to be identified.

Mr. Noemi summarized requests to accomplish the goals: 18% return to source and \$1M total per year for safe routes to school. He said he thinks the goals can be accomplished by eliminating the programs discussed.

Vice Chair Obringer stated that she was not sure if TRANSPAC had discussed its comfort with the 18% scenario and asked if everyone was comfortable with it. In response, Chair Noack said that the TAC had recommended a higher number.

Vice Chair Obringer noted her discomfort with voting during the meeting without staff having an opportunity to review and discuss the new information. Chair Noack clarified it is not a vote; just information to give feedback to CCTA.

Mr. Haile provided the schedule: the initial draft TEP for the public and stakeholders to review is scheduled for release the week after the meeting with the 18% return to source; TRANSPAC will have the opportunity to work with staff and discuss the draft TEP and CCTA can receive feedback until August 1<sup>st</sup>; and the TEP will be considered by the Authority Board on August. 7<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Todd added that the purpose of the item was to provide comments for a formal letter to CCTA with TRANSPAC's review. Vice Chair Obringer reiterated it is hard to provide robust comments without fully processing it.

Mr. Haile reported CCTA would be meeting with the Public Managers Association the following Thursday regarding the return to source.

Director Mitchoff said that a lot City Managers want 23% return to source, but policy makers have noted there is already 36% total return to source (when including Measure J) until 2034. She said it is more a policy decision than a dollar decision because the purpose is to get people to vote for the new measure and unless they see change, they are not going to vote for it. She added that a high return to source is going to take money from major projects that will get the measure passed. Director Mitchoff said it is important for policy makers to understand that 18% is a balance between the original proposal of 15% and the 23% City Managers wanted. She asked everyone to go back to their agencies and talk with their City Managers about this level of funding.

Vice Chair Obringer added that she originally understood that City Managers wanted 30% and the threshold had come down to 23%, but understands there needs to be a regional perspective. She explained that what she is trying to balance is that the primary issue is the \$17+M annual shortfall and she needs to be able to show that local roads are being fixed.

Director Mitchoff responded that agencies cannot just show that potholes are being fixed with the money.

Vice Chair Obringer responded that it would be helpful to have something concrete to show Concordians that congestion will be addressed as well as reduced impact on local streets. Director Pierce added that it is in the major streets category.

Chair Noack commented on the balance of improving highways also relieving impact on local roads. She said there is a need to explain/communicate clearly to people that fixing major roads/highways and transit will relieve impact (reduce driving) on local roads. Director Mitchoff agreed.

Director Pierce added that performance standards will also need to be addressed and part of what they are working on is the narrative that goes into the pamphlet, both the big problems and the solutions.

Chair Noack expressed skepticism on high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes as an example of trying to respond to the public. Mr. Haile commented on the HOV lane ending right at 24 causing a bottleneck; Chair Noack said that is the type of thing that needs to be explained. Director Pierce added those bottlenecks are on major projects and not local streets and roads and that is why 18% is feasible, not 23%

Mr. Haile said \$93M is being proposed to improve traffic flow on local streets and roads in Central County and that RTPCs would pick the projects such as Ygnacio Valley Road, the project would go through the performance-based review, and assuming it satisfies the criteria, CCTA would approve the allocation and the project would proceed without touching return to source funding.

There was confirmation that it is making a corridor work and incorporating technology, not just paving roads in compliance with policies.

Mr. Todd summarized for the letter: Caldecott tunnel needs \$2.5M; student transportation needs more money; determining if major streets – traffic flow at \$93M is good or if an adjustment is needed. Chair Noack commented \$93M is good and that to improve 242, 680 and 24, \$93M is sufficient to address major roads.

Eric Hu, City of Pleasant Hill, commented that he recognized that 23% return to source was not feasible, but 18% was, and that the TAC concluded major streets and roads was a compromise of what voters want and came up with a list of \$3M+. He described complete streets type projects (Mr. Todd referred to page 19 of the agenda packet) all separate from return to source. Mr. Hu said that it is going back to overall need and the point of the TAC is to say that the need far exceeds \$93M.

Director Pierce commented that it is not the only money available, it is matching dollars. In response, Mr. Hu said the TAC looks holistically at what other money would go into the roads and noted that Pleasant Hill is not competitive for federal dollars even on major roads and that the next measure will be the primary funding source for major roads. He added that freeway projects are more competitive for federal grants from a County perspective.

Mr. Haile added that historically CCTA has been focused on freeways and sees taking on a larger role for major projects that crosses jurisdictions and CCTA would partner with RTPCs to fund projects to solve congestion on big arterial projects. He said the measure would be built to fund a project like Ygnacio Valley Road from several different sources and provided examples of possible funding categories. He added that it would be based on the scope of future projects and there would be the ability to craft a funding plan from the measure.

Vice Chair Obringer questioned the 20% scenario. Mr. Todd responded that with 18%, TRANSPAC added \$16M to improve traffic flow on local streets; he described how the 20% scenario was created to get to \$40M.

Director Pierce reiterated the point is if you can pull from various categories to get projects done and that voters have to be shown their commute is going to change beneficially. She said if the cities are getting 18% of essentially pavement money and can draw from other categories, cities will get to the number they want.

Bob Pickett, Walnut Creek Planning Commission, questioned if the survey showed facilitating the commute was the primary desire of people polled. Director Pierce confirmed. Mr. Pickett commented that voters will be looking at seeing 680/24/4 get improved.

Mr. Haile added that “fill potholes and pave roads” polled at 48%. Mr. Pickett reiterated it is a regional solution in response to directors saying it was different for each city. Vice Chair Obringer clarified she was asking how to promote the measure to Concord voters.

Mr. Haile commented that CCTA was trying to balance the TEP to fit everyone’s needs and that asking the voters for 23% was a risk.

Chair Noack asked if 23% is just from the measure or overall. Director Mitchoff responded that it is just from the new measure for a total of 41% of return to source (when accounting for existing Measure J funding).

Director Pierce commented that if the measure passes, cities effectively double return to source. Chair Noack commented she is more concerned about congestion.

Director Ross commented he would like more funding (and a viable amount) for the ferry service as people see and like ferries. He noted that the real issue for voters is the local measures they have seen and how they have been implemented. He said focusing on 18 versus 20 versus 23% does not matter; people are generally satisfied, but there will always be naysayers.

Director Haskew reported that it was initially counterintuitive with the first discussion about putting the plan together and the problem with how it actually plays out is trying to explain that; she said she believes 36% for the measureable future is a solid number for work to be done at the city level, but there is no perfect answer. She said that she is more confident that she can promote the measure by saying agencies are working together for Contra Costa County, and particularly Central County.

Director Ross commented that when agencies go out for a bond or measure, it is about the perceived need for voters and the improvements they see from local measures and not so much about percentages. He also noted that the number of voters who do not vote in certain areas can also impact the passage of a measure.

Director Mitchoff asked where \$2.5M is coming from; Mr. Todd responded that the proposal is to take it from the seamless transportation category and Mr. Haile confirmed and noted that reducing emissions and improve air quality were bundled with it. Everyone agreed to take it out of reducing emissions and improving air quality.

There was a brief discussion about student transportation. There was agreement to leave it as is for now.

Mr. Todd added that for the letter, there has been a list of sample projects carried forward from the past for the improving traffic flow in streets category and he would like to collect information for an updated projects list from agencies to provide to CCTA. Everyone agreed.

#### **b. Proposed Policies to be contained in the TEP**

Mr. Todd listed the proposed policies to be added to the draft TEP: Growth Management Program; Urban Limit Line Policy; Complete Streets Policy; Advance Mitigation Program; Taxpayer Safeguards and Accountability Policy; Transit Policy; and Vision Zero Policy.

Director Mitchoff asked if everyone could read the policies as there are not a lot of changes from Measure X. She described the small changes: the Urban Limit Line Policy/Growth Management Policy will have some language removed and the Vision Zero Policy will have “reduce traffic accidents and fatalities” added to the title.

Director Pierce added that the Growth Management Policy has an added section to have the potential to account for changes to the urban limit line after called for actions that may impact the issue in 2026.

Mr. Todd summarized the proposed changes listed in the agenda packet and added that the Advanced Mitigation Program changed to make it consistent with SB1. Chair Noack suggested adding clarifying language to the policy title.

Proposed Policy changes:

- Taxpayer Safeguard and Accountability Policy – revise clauses about local contracting that will not be in the public draft, but will be available after; formalize strategic development plan from CCTA; formalize periodic review for technology and changing situations; and lay out what to do if you have excess programming
- Transit Policy – TRANSPAC to work with County Connection to get input on plan and overlap with complete streets issues
- Vision Zero – there is an overlap with complete streets so the checklist will be part of the complete streets checklist to consolidate the separate checklists; and develop a plan to take a more proactive approach to vision zero working with local jurisdictions to collect data, put it into a plan to address hotspots, and meet the Vision Zero goal of eliminating hotspots

Chair Noack noted Vision Zero standing alone with no dollars attached seems disjointed from the rest of the TEP. Mr. Haile said that had been fixed.

Chair Noack commented on Growth Management, there previously was not as much focus on housing as there is now and there is pressure on the cities to improve housing. She suggested rethinking wording. Director Mitchoff commented that everyone agrees there needs to be housing, but not everyone wants it near them so she is concerned if too much housing is added. Chair Noack suggested it be more subtle. Vice Chair Obringer and Director Haskew added that they do not want to tie housing to transportation dollars for cities and local governments.

Mr. Haile added that in Item 3 under Growth Management Plan, nothing is changing or being added for local jurisdictions' requirements (page 26 of the agenda packet) and is the exact same thing being done currently for Measure J.

The directors confirmed not to include housing in the formal letter to CCTA.

### **c. TEP Public Information and Outreach**

Linsey Willis, CCTA, reported that CCTA would release the initial draft TEP to the public for comment by August. She said the when the draft get released, she would provide general talking points to TRANSPAC and there would be points tailored to each City. Ms. Willis said the telephone town hall would be implemented before August to reach a lot of people (1,800-3,200 per call average) from 6 to 7pm and questions would be taken live with an in-call polling option. She said

that postcards would be sent out with the town hall call-in date and that CCTA would dial out to residents and potentially use text messaging to know whether to call residents on that date.

Mr. Todd asked how soon postcards would be sent and the call scheduled. Ms. Willis said the postcard would be finalized the next week, a week would be required to mail it, and July 23<sup>rd</sup> would be the potential first date for the call hosted at the CCTA office. She said that the call would be simulcast in Spanish and English with an audio recording and written transcript available after.

There was a discussion about social media.

Directors Pierce and Haskew confirmed their attendance.

Ms. Willis reported there would be pop-up events throughout the County and asked for information on upcoming community events to be routed through Mr. Todd to give communities an opportunity to comment on the draft TEP.

#### **d. TEP Schedule and Other Information**

Mr. Todd reviewed the schedule of future meetings:

- CCTA meeting July 10<sup>th</sup> cancelled; still holding planning committee meeting
- TRANSPAC Board meeting July 11<sup>th</sup> cancelled
- TAC meeting July 11<sup>th</sup> at 9 am
- CCTA special meeting July 17<sup>th</sup> to review updates and release draft
- TRANSPAC Board meeting July 18<sup>th</sup> at 9 am
- CCTA meeting August 7<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, and 21<sup>st</sup>
- CCTA special TEP meeting September 18<sup>th</sup>
- CCTA special TEP meeting October 30 (if CCTA has received all resolutions of support from cities and approve resolution for Board of Supervisors to add to ballot; final draft TEP has to be approved Aug. 21<sup>st</sup> to stay on track.)

Director Pierce noted she'll be on vacation on August 7<sup>th</sup> and will miss the special CCTA meeting.

#### **6. TRANSPAC CCTA Representative Reports**

Tabled to next meeting due to lack of time

#### **7. CCTA Executive Director's Report Regarding Authority Actions/Discussion Items**

CCTA Executive Director Randell H. Iwasaki's Report dated June 19, 2019 had been included in the Board packet.

#### **8. TAC Oral Reports by Jurisdiction**

There were no reports.

**9. Boardmember Comments**

There were no comments.

**10. Managing Director's Report**

There were no reports.

**11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:03 A.M. The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for Thursday, July 18, 2019.

## ***TRANSPAC Meeting Summary Minutes***

**MEETING DATE:** July 18, 2019

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Carlyn Obringer, Concord (Vice Chair); Julie Pierce, Clayton (CCTA Representative); Mark Ross, Martinez; and Loella Haskew, Walnut Creek (CCTA Representative)

**STAFF PRESENT:** Abhishek Parikh, Concord; Robert Sarmiento, Contra Costa County; Ruby Horta, County Connection; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Andy Smith, Walnut Creek; Matt Todd, TRANSPAC Managing Director; and Margaret Strubel, Gray Bowen Scott

**GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Tim Haile, Deputy Executive Director, Projects, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA)

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:** Margaret Strubel

### **1. Convene Regular Meeting/Pledge of Allegiance/Self Introductions**

Vice Chair Obringer called the special meeting of the TRANSPAC Board of Directors to order 9:05 A.M. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **2. Public Comment**

There were no comments from the public.

### **3. 2020 Transportation Expenditure Plan**

There were two items that were carry over business from the previous evening's conversation regarding the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) at the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) meeting. At its May 15, 2019 meeting, the CCTA authorized staff to proceed with the development of a new TEP for possible placement on the March 2020 ballot.

Managing Director Matt Todd gave a synopsis of the CCTA meeting. Mr. Todd said there was a request to add 1.5% for transportation improvements in the line item Focused Growth, Support Economic Development and Create Jobs in Contra Costa; this had been amended out of the July 11, 2019 version of the TEP. This would include \$45M in the TEP countywide. Proportional share for TRANSPAC would be \$13-14M. In addition, TAC had been discussing improvements to major arterial routes (i.e., Ygnacio Valley Road and Treat Boulevard) including the need for adaptive signal timing that would ease congestion. TAC was concerned that these arterial routes have

regional impacts regional trips making their decisions to use these arterial routes instead of the highways. Mr. Todd said there was no need to delve into policy details. Mr. Todd advised that the discussion could start with the TAC proposal then move to the 1.5% addition topic in case funding needed to be moved around with the TAC proposal.

Abhishek Parikh from the City of Concord presented the handouts regarding a study of regional trips that drive through Concord, travel patterns on Ygnacio Valley and Treat, and the percent of roadway traffic that is cut-through by location.

Director Pierce asked if a study was conducted of drivers that stopped in Walnut Creek versus those who were passing through on the arterials. Mr. Parikh stated that 25% of the trips on Treat and 45% of the trips on Ygnacio Valley are cut-throughs during the A.M. period, which shows that there is no destination in Concord. However, he said that the study had not been completed but would ultimately include information about destinations within and outside the TRANSPAC area.

Director Pierce indicated she participated in the ad-hoc committee discussion that resulted in removing the category (Focused Growth, Support Economic Development and Create Jobs in Contra Costa) from the TEP. She said that from a policy standpoint, transportation improvements facilitate access to jobs and housing which makes Contra Costa County more attractive for businesses. She continued that the entire plan, not just a category, should focus on access to jobs and on shortening commute times.

Director Haskew asked a procedural question regarding how a potential no vote from today's meeting would effect the vote from last night's CCTA meeting. Mr. Todd said that this is not an action item but the TRANSPAC comments will be reported in the form of a letter to CCTA. Deputy Executive Director of Projects, Tim Haile (CCTA) said that the RTPCs are the foundation of CCTA, so if a letter came from TRANSPAC regarding this that the CCTA Board would definitely consider the comment. Vice Chair Obringer noted that TRANSPAC could take a formal motion if desired. Director Pierce said that if there was to be a formal motion, that TRANSPAC supports the concept and principle to increase Contra Costa County's attractiveness to employers with a functioning transportation system.

Director Ross asked if there is language in the TEP that encourages employers to participate in telecommuting. He said it is important to promote telecommuting as a proactive way to engage employers and take several thousand cars off the road. He was concerned that this would be ignored in the development of the TEP. Mr. Haile said that one of the topics from last night was adding to the TEP guiding principles that all TEP funding be eligible for projects that enhance access to jobs. He continued that telecommuting could be one of the projects or strategies that could come out of the various funding categories. He added that access to jobs could be one of the performance criteria, which could then compete with other criteria such as congestion management; this would depend on how the criteria is developed and weighted. Mr. Haile said

that there are some funding categories that have language about incentives for alternative transportation; it would be possible to change the language to include telecommuting concepts as Director Ross is proposing; this would then go back to the CCTA Board for approval on August 7. He said that strategies could be developed to make the funding eligible for these programs. Director Ross said that incentive programs could be politically attractive for employers and the general driving public.

Director Pierce wanted to add a bullet to the 242/Highway 4/eBART corridor section (or perhaps this could be a policy change for the entire TEP) regarding transportation improvements that encourage reverse commute. She stated that the goal is to draw businesses to the county.

Director Haskew said that there is over capacity ridership levels on BART, those who can ride buses already do so, and we have undercapacity for reverse commute options. Ms. Haskew does not like the term “reverse commute”, but she thinks that highlighting this could steer funds to reverse commute options instead of all funding going to transit.

Director Haskew also said that the expenditures on the pie charts are not realistic because it only highlights instances where transit is specifically named. Mr. Haile noted that the charts are generated by data; assumptions are made on all funding categories and the percentage of dollars that these categories would contribute to the various modes. He said that these are focused on Transportation Demand Strategies (TDS), which helps manage congestion using tools such as 511.org by helping people to get out of cars and use transit, which includes reverse commute. There is some language about reducing emissions and improving air quality, but this language could be developed further, such as saying that incentives will be provided for reverse commute options.

Director Pierce said that specific language regarding access to the Northern Waterfront was added to Section 242 as well as page 16, fourth paragraph, and page 18. She said that after this change was made, the county said they were happy, but they have reconsidered and now they are requesting a new section for Northern Waterfront.

Director Haskew said that creating jobs is outside the scope of TRANSPAC. Director Ross responded that this is a form of transportation zoning, building infrastructure for jobs.

Vice Chair Obringer asked for a motion. She said that TRANSPAC wants to encourage this plan but she is concerned that the 1.5% will be taken from some other category if the current language is not approved. A conversation continued about crafting the language of the motion. This included: noting that TRANSPAC is supportive of this plan as a whole, as a tool for job creation and economic development to make the county competitive; encouraging the use of the reverse commute capacity; using technology for telecommuting in lieu of vehicle trips; encouraging job

development that reduces commute times as jobs are closer to housing (i.e., balancing jobs to housing ratios); and redirecting, reducing and refining commute traffic patterns.

Director Haskew pointed out that the use of the word “reverse commute” signals that there is a void, that we do not have capacity to locate employers here. Director Pierce said that due to the mobile nature of the workforce, only the opportunities for jobs can be the focus.

Deputy Executive Director Haile repeated the guiding principles language discussed at the previous night’s meeting:

Mr. Todd asked the Board if they would like to add to the motion that they would like to retain the allocations as submitted rather than creating a new category. Mr. Todd will draft the letter to CCTA, and upon approval of the Vice Chair Obringer, will then transmit it to CCTA.

**On motion by Director Haskew, seconded by Director Pierce, to send a letter to the CCTA with comments as discussed regarding the addition of 1.5% for transportation improvements in the line item Focused Growth, Support Economic Development and Create Jobs in Contra Costa in the TEP. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote of the members present, unless otherwise noted.**

Director Pierce said that a discussion was needed regarding return to source on page 57, second line item (the 680/24/BART corridor). She said this draft of the TEP proposes 18% plus the major streets and roads category which could be used for corridors. She noted as an example the Treat to Geary to Pleasant Hill Road route could be considered as one corridor; this would involve collaborating with neighboring jurisdictions to create corridors to facilitate traffic flow. She said that the 18% local funding could be augmented by various categories, so it would be more than 18% in order to make projects viable and still demonstrate support with voters. She said that some of these communities that interface with the I-680 corridor could have this funding.

Vice Chair Obringer said she was looking for support for the \$10M as discussed earlier so that the TRANSPAC Board can speak with one voice. She would like board members to be able to respond to constituents when they ask why the Board are supporting this measure when the number one concern is pavement repair. She said she needed assurances that TRANSPAC would be competitive for the funding; she is concerned that some of the proposed projects could use over half the funding.

Vice Chair Obringer said she will not oppose or support the 18% until further discussion with her staff.

Deputy Executive Director Haile said the TEP is drafted to be performance based. He said the difficulty will be to develop the guidelines and criteria, which requires working with all of the local jurisdictions, the public, and stakeholders; this will happen after the measure passes. He

said this will have a number of stakeholders who are concerned about the development of performance-based criteria and weights of the categories. He said the TEP is focused on the projects: there will be a Call for Projects that will go before the CCTA Board, the projects will have a performance-based analysis. As an example, he noted that Ygnacio Valley Road may have high-performing components, but the CCTA Board may want some changes in order to arrive to the best mix of funding. He continued that CCTA will decide the funding mix; this may include leveraging funding from other RTPCs.

Director Pierce said there was collective interest to support projects in central county as these projects support all of us, even if we do not have all of our projects represented. She said that the issue is not the Board committing to specific projects, but agreeing on the overall TEP. Director Ross noted that for instance, Highway 4 is spilling over into the Martinez local streets, which the streets cannot handle.

**On motion by Director Ross, seconded by Director Haskew, to affirmation of support for the prior revision that moved the percentage up from 15% to 18%; and, encouraging collaboration between regions or jurisdictions in order to fund larger projects using multiple funding categories. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote of the members present, unless otherwise noted.**

Vice Chair Obringer asked if there was any other business before the Board. Mr. Todd said that the schedule needed to be discussed. Both he and Deputy Executive Director Haile noted the following dates: August 7-the CCTA Board will review all input received on the draft TEP and staff will have recommended changes to the initial draft TEP; August 8: telephone townhall; August 9- the draft TEP will be in the CCTA packet; August 14-the next iteration of the Draft TEP will be released; August 21-the CCTA Board will review the final TEP; then this final version will be sent to all the jurisdictions for approval.

Director Pierce suggested that TRANSPAC have a special meeting on August 15, 2019 to review the Draft TEP approved by the CCTA. He said that there will be a meeting on August 8, 2019 to review the strategic plan and other TRANSPAC business.

Deputy Executive Director Haile requested information about events in jurisdictions for public outreach reasons. He also asked the Board to email him if there was interest in having TEP information at city council meetings. He also said that they needed dates for the September / October meetings so that those drafting the TEP could brief the jurisdictions about resolutions accepting the TEP.

#### **4. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:26 A.M. The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for August 8, 2019.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

## ***TRANSPAC Meeting Summary Minutes***

<b>MEETING DATE:</b>	August 15, 2019
<b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b>	Sue Noack, Pleasant Hill (Chair); Carlyn Obringer, Concord (Vice Chair); Julie Pierce, Clayton (CCTA Representative); Mark Ross, Martinez; Loella Haskew, Walnut Creek (CCTA Representative); and Karen Mitchoff, Contra Costa County District 4 Supervisor
<b>PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:</b>	John Mercurio, Concord
<b>STAFF PRESENT:</b>	Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Ruby Horta, County Connection; Bill Churchill, County Connection; Abhishek Parikh, Concord; Ricki Wells, BART; Matt Todd, TRANSPAC Managing Director; Margaret Strubel, Gray Bowen Scott; and Debby Chernila, Gray Bowen Scott
<b>GUESTS/PRESENTERS:</b>	Tim Haile, Deputy Executive Director, Projects, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA); Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, CCTA; Debora Allen, BART;
<b>MINUTES PREPARED BY:</b>	Margaret Strubel

### **1. Convene Regular Meeting/Pledge of Allegiance/Self Introductions**

Chair Sue Noack called the special meeting of the TRANSPAC Board of Directors to order 10:11 A.M. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **2. Public Comment**

There were no comments from the public.

### **3. 2020 Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)**

Managing Director Matt Todd mentioned that the TRANSPAC Telephone Town Hall took place on July 23, 2019 and had 600 initial participants (largest meeting of the four subregions of the county).

Mr. Todd also gave a synopsis of the changes to the TEP out of the CCTA meeting. He provided a handout that covered the main changes to the July 11, 2019 version of the TEP with the revisions from the previous evening's CCTA meeting. It was discussed that input should be geared towards comments, slight modifications, or suggestions and not changes to the language. The Board discussed that they would be able to weigh in on the development of future policy should the TEP be approved. Mr. Todd distributed a handout with areas that CCTA discussed and proposed to revise in the TEP last night and noted that there will be another CCTA meeting on August 21, 2019 that will incorporate changes to the categories and policies in the TEP that are highlighted on the handout.

Member Mitchoff noted that the TEP handout is the most up to date printed version (95% comprehensive).

These are the major topics that were discussed last night's meeting:

1. New Reduce and Reverse Commutes category

The funding category "Reduce and Reverse Commute" has been added to the Expenditure Plan Summary and "Improving Transportation Countywide in all of our Communities", page 50, section 2. This category has \$45M for the entire county, of which \$13M is for TRANSPAC. There is flexibility for RTPCs to leverage funds and approve matching funds from this category if other funds are not available. Page 49, paragraph 35 has the description of the category.

Director Pierce said that the CCTA Board felt strongly that the housing language should come out of this section but still remain a component of the TEP.

Discussion was around whether TRANSPAC wanted to add that they could use this money directly versus leveraging but this was not pursued.

Director Pierce noted for the record that Vision Zero will be renamed to Road Traffic Safety.

**On motion by Director Pierce, seconded by Director Haskew, to affirm the reversal of the TRANSPAC Board's original comment regarding the Reduce and Reverse Commutes category and accept the category as is. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote of the members present, unless otherwise noted.**

2. VMT Bank

Page 38-39 covers the Advanced Mitigation Program; language was added to address Senate Bill 743 (SB 743) (which creates a process to change the way that transportation impacts are analyzed under CEQA) and describe the development of a Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) Mitigation Program. This states that CCTA will begin to develop a policy describing how this will work but there is no specific language in the TEP as this is still under development. Deputy Executive Director Tim Haile noted that all CEQA projects that are approved after July 2020 are subject to the new statewide requirements.

Discussion ensued regarding the purpose of having a VMT Bank in the TEP including assisting with meeting county and State GHG goals and proactively developing a program to address SB 743. The program was described as cap and trade without the auction. Mr. Haile said the program could be developed one of two ways: a mitigation bank (that could then be used to mitigate CEQA) or an exchange for credits (which is similar to a developer impact fee). He said that while mitigation will be the industry standard, this will be an option for agencies trying to comply with CEQA, but will never be a requirement. He said that CCTA wants to be at the forefront using this tool to assist with development.

Director Ross shared his experience with emissions reduction credits and his concern that there eventually would be a cap put in place that would be an issue for smaller projects.

3. GMP/ULL Policy

Mr. Todd said that a bullet was added as clarification to give a more technical description about ULL:

#### 4. Transit Policy

Mr. Todd said that the Transit Policy was going to include a requirement to not fund any construction of a transit capital improvement until funding is available to operate the improvement with at least 15-minute service frequencies during peak periods.

Discussion ensued around the impracticality of the 15-minute headway requirement, such as for pilot programs. The 15-minute criteria was moved to the ITP and is now presented as a goal. Also, language was added about transformative services and funding transit capital improvement using planning funding. As an example, County Connection would have met the 15-minute criteria but are losing service that had the 15-minute criteria due to lack of operators.

5. Public Oversight Committee (POC)
6. Project Performance Based Review (PPBR)

Mr. Todd noted that the language was revised regarding project performance based reviews on page 44, Policy 16: Article 40, Development of Guidelines for Performance-based Projects Review and Programs in the Taxpayers Safeguards and Accountability policy has been updated to include input from the POC and commitment to public engagement during the development of the guidelines.

Mr. Todd also noted that on page 51, Policy 43 detailed the guidelines for the PPBRs. He said that there is a \$10M threshold that triggers adding PPBR criteria as the project is developed. However, he noted that if there is a project included in the traffic flow category, the threshold is \$5M (page 48, Policy 31). Tim Haile, CCTA Deputy Director, clarified that the \$5M threshold is to be removed from the TEP, and will instead be \$10M..

Member Mitchoff said that advocates want a more robust role in the POC, more than just oversight and they wanted to be able to hire consultants. The CCTA Board did not approve this request. She said they wanted to have more input into the project list. because there is no specified project list and so it is perceived that this requires more citizen input. Mr. Todd said that the CCTA Board did approve a few things such as four new POC categories: transit, seniors, climate change, and low income. He noted that the substance of the POC role is on page 40. Further discussion centered around the growing list of stakeholders, the number of POC members and alternates required, and the effect of absenteeism.

There was a public comment from Debora Allen, BART Director. She referenced the meeting from the previous night regarding the discussion of the POC. She noted that in order to accommodate the four additional advocate positions, there was agreement to cut down the four Board of Supervisors appointments to one as the POC was becoming too large. She catalogued the 17-members: four from the RTPCs and one for the Board of Supervisors (this would be 5 members), and 12 seats for the various advocates. Her concern was that the primary focus of advocates would be on each of their particular advocacy interests.

#### 7. TEP Amendment Process

Mr. Todd said the suggested change from the advocates was that the comment period be extended from 45 days to 90 days. The discussion included that the 90-day period would be for major category shifts of

funding (which need approval), but not for the strategic plan (page 42). In addition, the thresholds for the amounts of amendments were discussed: less than \$50 million, 45 day, and \$50m or more, 90 day.

#### 8. Disadvantaged Communities

Article 12, Requirements for Fund Recipients in the Taxpayers Safeguards and Accountability policy has been updated to require any fund recipient receiving \$10 million (project specific) or more from the TEP to report on how received funding benefits disadvantaged communities in their jurisdiction and service areas

Discussion included:

- Disadvantaged Communities is to be referred to as Communities of Concern (CoC) as defined by ABAG or MTC.
- Advocates believe more money should be allocated to this category and requested that this should be specified in the TEP.
- There are two areas of TRANSPAC that are defined as CoCs: Monument Corridor and a part of Martinez.
- Funding is now project specific, not based on cumulative receipt. An eligible project may not be directly located in a CoC but can still help or serve a CoC.
- Reporting was discussed at length. Larger projects, over \$10M, will have to report how CoCs will be benefited, which could be completed through an annual report. It was noted that this would work well for the POC because they need the annual data. The goal is to be open and transparent and inclusive. Guidelines would need to be developed after the Measure passes.
- There was discussion about equity. During the CCTA Board meeting, an advocate had referred to the 2017 CWTP that details how the CCTA tracks against targeted disadvantaged communities goals. The TEP may be revised to reference the standing documents regarding reporting about equity. The concern was whether it was required to use funds in a CoC and the relation to other performance measures such as lessen VMT, or reduce greenhouse gases. There was concern about the need for flexibility to choose where funding is directed. The reporting requirements of the TEP in relation to Plan Bay Area 2050 and State and federal policies were also discussed.

#### 9. Local Contracting and Good Jobs

Mr. Todd said that there was not much discussion on this during the CCTA meeting. This is detailed on page 45, number 21. There was discussion that this language has been agreed to by stakeholders, including unions, and has been reviewed with legal staff. It was noted that project labor agreements are currently used in the County.

There was a public comment from Debora Allen, BART Director. She said that mandating only union apprenticeships means that only union labor will be mandated. She explained that due to the lack of people who are being trained, there are not enough apprentices to ease the demand and the lack of apprentices in the construction industry could affect project delivery.

#### 10. Modernize Local Roads and Improve Access to Job Centers

Mr. Todd mentioned that there is a sentence saying that 15% of local road funds should be going towards biking and pedestrian improvements. He said that this was on Page 48 Policy 30. He said this was a reference to equity and reporting on/reporting to CoCs; the CCTA Board accepted this language.

Discussion centered around the percentage requirement of jurisdictions and that a local agency does not need to add 15% on top of the funds for this requirement.

#### Punchlist of revised items

Mr. Todd discussed the punchlist of items from the CCTA Board meeting, including Item 1, “Reduce and Reverse Commute”. There was concern about the potential impact to projects over time and the lack of technical expertise that needs to be counterbalanced in order to be functional. The discussion continued regarding the Board having final authority about projects, but discussion with the POC about if a project meets TEP requirements could take place. There is need for at-large members who do not have any experience with transportation to represent diverse interests of the community. Also noted was that TRANSPAC has the legal responsibility for these decisions which needs to be impressed upon the POC. It was noted that there is a need to move forward in a unified manner in order to get the measure to pass.

#### **4. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 A.M. The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for September 12, 2019, in the Large Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall, unless otherwise determined.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

## **TRANSPAC Strategic Planning Discussion Attachments**

- Summary of TRANSPAC TAC Strategic Planning Discussion
- CCTA
  - Administrative Code (as amended through 11/19/2014)
- TRANSPAC
  - JPA (August 2014)
  - Bylaws
  - 2018-2019 Budget and Workplan
  - Managing Director Contract Scope
  - Secretary / Clerk of Board Contract Scope
  - Summary of past TRANSPAC agenda item topics
- Summary of other RTPC organizations

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

## Summary of TRANSPAC TAC Strategic Planning Discussion

From August 29, 2019 Meeting

**A theme that emerged throughout the discussion was “Regional” issues.**

The discussion also included more specific items to be considered:

- Priority Projects
  - Identify deficiencies and priority projects
  - Concept of an annual process / update
  - Multi-jurisdiction project requests
    - Strong partnerships will equate to strong project candidates
- Regionally Significant Corridors
  - Corridor plan
    - Consistent vision among local agencies
    - Not necessarily a one size fits all approach - different segments may require different strategies
    - Includes role of transit
    - Consistent technology
  - May include partnering with agencies outside TRANSPAC area
  - Working with neighboring SWAT and TRANSPLAN
- Schools
  - Better partnership with School Districts
    - District Board members
    - Facilitate better information as first step
  - Physical improvements to access schools
    - Identify priorities (see Priority Projects above)
- Transit
  - Focus on providing trips
  - Partnerships with TMAs/Business (related to TDM)
- TDM / 511 Contra Costa
  - Increase interactions and participation
  - Re-evaluate ordinances/ roles / focus
    - Opportunities with current innovations and technologies
- Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program
- SB473 / CEQA Reform
- How to address aspirational goals
  - Social patterns / mindsets
  - Emerging modes
    - Out there today - i.e. scooters
    - Pending – what will be next?

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

## **From Administrative Code of the CCTA (as amended through 11/19/2014)**

104.3 Standing and Advisory Committees. The following committees have been established to assist in the creation of the Authority and the development of the Ordinance and the Expenditure Plan, to assist in the development of programs and projects under the Expenditure Plan and Ordinance, and to continue as standing committees. The standing and advisory committees are as follows:

- (a) Regional Transportation Planning Committees. For each of the Central, East, West and Southwest County regions, a regional transportation planning committee has been established with responsibility for transportation issues within such area. Relative to the Authority's programs and processes, the Board shall prescribe the powers, duties and responsibilities of each RTPC. The RTPCs shall cooperate with the Authority in furtherance of Authority purposes. Each RTPC is responsible for developing a transportation plan for its area and updating it periodically, for incorporation by the Authority into a countywide transportation plan consistent with the Expenditure Plan and the Ordinance authorized by the voters and as amended from time to time by the Authority.
- (b) Each RTPC shall consist of Elected Officials from each City in the region as well as a member or members of the Board of Supervisors representing the unincorporated area within the region. RTPCs may also include planning commissioners from the Cities and/or County represented on such RTPC as well as members from the policy board of other public bodies such as transit organizations, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and ports, airports, or other agencies concerned with transportation. For election or recall of Commissioners, only City and County Elected Officials shall vote, and each City and Board of Supervisors shall have one vote for each such action. Other voting rights and procedures of the RTPCs governing the conduct of their activities shall be determined by each such RTPC with the concurrence of the Authority. Robert's Rules of Order shall be observed in the conduct of all RTPC meetings.
- (c) Each City RTPC member shall be appointed by the governing body of the City and in the case of Board of Supervisors' members, by the Board of Supervisors; provided, that the removal or resignation of any RTPC member who is a Commissioner shall not cause such Commissioner to be removed from the Board. Members from other public bodies and special interest groups shall be appointed by the RTPC and shall serve at the pleasure of the RTPC. Each RTPC shall, by vote of a majority of the members of such RTPC, elect a chair at its first meeting and thereafter from time to time as required.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**TRANSPAC**

**JOINT EXERCISE OF POWERS AGREEMENT**

This Joint Powers Agreement (“Agreement”) is entered into on this 21st day of August, 2014, by and between the cities of Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, and Walnut Creek, all municipal corporations, and Contra Costa County, a state political subdivision. Each public agency which is a party to this Agreement is hereby referred to individually as “Party” and collectively as “Parties”.

**RECITALS**

WHEREAS, the Parties entered into the Central Contra Costa Transportation/Land Use Partnership (“TRANSPAC”) Agreement dated November 29, 1990 and superseded by the First Amendment to the Central Contra Costa Transportation/Land Use Partnership Agreement dated February 22, 1993 (“Partnership Agreement”) to cooperate in the establishment of policies and action to more effectively respond to the requirements of Measure C; and

WHEREAS, Section 12 of the Partnership Agreement provides that TRANSPAC shall conduct an annual review of the implementation of the Partnership Agreement to determine whether the execution of a Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement that establishes TRANSPAC as a separate legal entity is a more suitable alternative to the Partnership Agreement; and

WHEREAS, Government Code Section 6500 et seq. permits two or more public agencies by agreement to exercise jointly powers common to the contracting parties; and

WHEREAS, the Parties have determined that establishing TRANSPAC as a separate legal entity enables the Parties to more effectively respond to transportation issues and is a more suitable alternative to the Partnership Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PARTIES TO THIS AGREEMENT DO AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

1. **DEFINITIONS**

The following words as used in this Agreement are defined as follows:

- (a) “Agency” shall mean each city and county which is a Party to this Agreement.
- (b) “Board” or “TRANSPAC Board” shall mean the board designated herein to administer this Agreement.
- (c) “Joint Transportation Planning Program” shall mean a transportation planning program undertaken by the Agencies.
- (d) “Managing Director” shall mean the person selected by the Board to manage the day-to-day activities of TRANSPAC.

(e) "Measure C" shall refer to half-cent local transportation sales tax established in 1988.

(f) "Measure J" shall refer to the extended half-cent local transportation sales tax first established by Measure C or replacement and augmentation thereof.

(g) "TRANSPAC" shall mean the public and separate entity created by this Agreement.

(h) "TRANSPAC TAC" shall mean a technical advisory committee to TRANSPAC.

## 2. OBJECTIVES

The intent of this Agreement is to express cooperation between the Parties and to establish policies which will protect and advance the interest of the Central Contra Costa County communities, which include the TRANSPAC boundaries as shown in Appendix A attached hereto and incorporated herein, with respect to transportation issues in general and the utilization of Measure J funds in particular. More specifically, TRANSPAC is hereby authorized to do all acts necessary for the exercise of its objectives, including but not limited to, the following:

- (a) Conduct, authorize, review and accept studies and reports;
- (b) Periodically review transportation plans and recommend changes thereto;
- (c) *Hold and conduct meetings pursuant to this Agreement;*
- (d) Develop regional strategies to meet Measure J requirements;
- (e) Address transportation issues that affect the Central Contra Costa County communities;
- (f) Assess Central Contra Costa County transportation needs, including transit services;
- (g) Coordinate with County Connection regarding transit services;
- (h) Advise the Agencies on transportation issues that impact the Agencies and the region;
- (i) Coordinate with Agencies on the responses and actions concerning transportation issues;
- (j) Work with Central Contra Costa jurisdictions to formulate transportation policy statements;
- (k) Sponsor educational forums, workshops and discussions on transportation matters;

(l) Advocate the interest of Agencies concerning transportation management and funding issues to local, state and federal officials;

(m) To provide comprehensive, accurate, reliable and useful multimodal travel information to meet the needs of Central Contra Costa travelers; and

(n) Gather information necessary to accomplish the foregoing purposes.

### 3. POWERS

The powers of TRANSPAC include, but are not limited to, the following:

(a) To make and enter into contracts;

(b) To apply for and accept grants, advances and contributions;

(c) To employ and contract for services of agents, employees, consultants, engineers, attorneys, and other such persons or firms as it deems necessary to carry out the objectives of this Agreement;

(d) To conduct studies;

(e) To incur debts, liabilities, or obligations, subject to the limitations set forth herein;

(f) To receive and use contributions and advances from an Agency as provided in Government Code section 6504, including contributions or advances of personnel, equipment or property;

(g) To provide a program of benefits for employees, including, but not limited to, contracting for retirement benefits with an existing retirement system; and

(h) To exercise other reasonable and necessary powers in furtherance or support of any purpose of the Authority or the bylaws of the Authority.

### 4. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The TRANSPAC Board shall provide overall policy direction for the operations and activities of the Joint Transportation Planning Program. TRANSPAC TAC shall provide administrative guidance, technical review, and decision making for the ongoing operational activities of the Joint Transportation Planning Program. Any staff or consultants hired by TRANSPAC shall report directly to the TRANSPAC Board or its designee.

### 5. TRANSPAC ORGANIZATION

TRANSPAC Board. TRANSPAC shall be governed by the TRANSPAC Board. The TRANSPAC Board is empowered to establish its own procedures for operation and may revise these periodically as deemed necessary.

(a) Members.

The Board shall consist of 6 members (one member from each Agency), which shall be determined as follows:

(i) For the City Agencies, one councilmember shall be appointed by the respective City Council.

(ii) For the County Agency, one Supervisor shall be appointed by the County Board of Supervisors.

Upon execution of this Agreement, the governing body of each Agency shall appoint its member to serve as a member of the Board and an alternate member of the Board to serve in the absence of its regular member, both shall be elected officials. Each member and alternate shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing governing board without compensation.

The Board shall also consist of 6 ex-officio members (one member from each Agency), which shall be determined as follows:

(i) For the City Agencies, one planning commissioner shall be appointed by the respective City Council.

(ii) For the County Agency, one planning commissioner shall be appointed by the County Board of Supervisors.

Upon execution of this Agreement, the governing body of each Agency shall appoint its ex-officio member to serve as an ex-officio member of the Board and an alternate ex-officio member to serve in the absence of its regular ex-officio member, both shall be planning commissioners. Each ex-officio member and alternate shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing governing board without compensation. Ex-officio members shall not be entitled to vote and shall not be counted towards the quorum.

(b) Officers.

TRANSPAC shall select a Chair and a Vice Chair who shall be elected officials and shall hold office for a period of one year, commencing February. However, the first Chair and Vice Chair shall hold office from the date of appointment to the following February. If any Agency removes a Board member who is also an officer, the Board shall appoint a member from the newly constituted Board to fill the vacant office for the remainder of that term.

(i) Chair

The Chair shall preside over Board meetings, call them to order and adjourn them, announce the business and order to be acted upon, recognize people entitled to the floor, put to vote all questions moved and seconded, announce voting results, maintain rules of order, and carry out other duties as set forth in the bylaws.

(ii) Vice Chair

The Vice Chair shall serve as chair in the absence of the regularly elected chair.

(iii) Secretary

The Board shall designate someone to serve as the Secretary and shall prepare, distribute, and maintain minutes of the meeting of the TRANSPAC Board, TRANSPAC TAC and any committees of TRANSPAC or shall contract for such services. The Secretary shall also maintain the official records of TRANSPAC and shall file notices as required by this Agreement.

(iv) Treasurer/Auditor

The City of Pleasant Hill shall serve as the initial Treasurer/Auditor. The Board shall have the authority to designate a different Treasurer/Auditor consistent with Government Code Section 6505.5 should the City of Pleasant Hill not be able to serve as the Treasurer/Auditor in the future for any reason.

The Treasurer shall:

(1) Receive and provide for the receipt of all funds of TRANSPAC and place them in the treasury to the credit and for the account of TRANSPAC.

(2) Be responsible, upon an official bond, for the safekeeping and disbursement of all TRANSPAC funds.

(3) Pay, when due, out of TRANSPAC funds, the indebtedness of TRANSPAC and any other sum duly authorized for payment from TRANSPAC funds.

(4) Verify and report, in writing, in July, October, January, and April of each year to the Board and to the Parties to this Agreement the amount of funds held for TRANSPAC, the amount of receipts and amount paid out since the last report.

(5) Invest TRANSPAC's funds in the manner provided by law and collect interest thereon for the account of TRANSPAC.

The Auditor shall ensure that an independent audit is made by a certified public accountant to ensure that the Treasurer is complying with the aforementioned requirements and Government Code section 6505 regarding strict accountability of all funds.

(c) Board Meetings.

(i) Regular Meetings. The Board should attempt to hold at least one regular meeting a month.

(ii) Special Meetings. Special meetings of the Board may be called as provided in accordance with the Ralph M. Brown Act (Gov. Code sections 54950 et seq.) ("Brown Act").

(iii) Notices of Meetings. All meetings of the Board shall be held in accordance with the Brown Act and other applicable laws.

(iv) Minutes. The Board shall keep written minutes of all meetings. As soon as possible after each meeting, the Board shall cause a copy of the minutes to be distributed to members of the Board and to the Agencies.

(v) Quorum. A majority of the members of the Board shall constitute a quorum, except that less than a quorum may adjourn from time-to-time.

(d) Vote.

(i) Authorized Voting Members. Each voting member or designated alternate when taking the place of the member shall be authorized to vote.

(ii) TRANSPAC Business. Four votes of the voting members present shall be required to take action with respect to the budget. A majority vote of the voting members present will be required to take action on all other matters.

(iii) Appointments of Representatives to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority ("CCTA"). A majority of the members present shall be required to appoint or recall a representative to the CCTA consistent with the requirements of CCTA's Administrative Code. The TRANSPAC representatives and his or her alternate to the CCTA shall be a Board Member of TRANSPAC.

(e) TRANSPAC Staff.

TRANSPAC shall have staff to carry out the objectives of the Agreement. In addition, independent consultants may be engaged as needed. The Managing Director shall report to the TRANSPAC Board. Additional staff may be added with Board approval within the constraints of the then current fiscal year budget.

(f) TRANSPAC TAC.

The TRANSPAC TAC shall serve as the technical advisory committee for Transpac. It shall be made up of at least one staff member from each Agency selected by each Agency. TRANSPAC TAC shall study and discuss issues pertaining to TRANSPAC and shall make recommendations to TRANSPAC concerning those issues.

6. **TRANSPAC BUDGET, WORK PROGRAM AND AGENCY PAYMENTS**

TRANSPAC shall adopt a budget by an annual resolution. The budget shall set forth all operational expenses of TRANSPAC. It shall also set forth the proportional amount each Agency will be required to pay.

(a) Within 120 days of the effective date of this Agreement the Board shall formulate a budget for the first fiscal year of TRANSPAC's operation. In doing so, the Board shall assign each agency a proportionate share of required funding to meet the budget agreed upon. Absent

formal Board action extending this deadline, failure to agree upon a budget within the 120 days' time frame shall cause this Agreement to terminate.

(b) After the first year, the annual budget and work program shall be prepared by April 1 and shall then be submitted to the Board for its review and consideration to be adopted on or after July 1.

(c) All bills and invoices for expenses incurred pursuant to said budget shall be routed to the Treasurer, who shall pay such expenses from the budget. The Treasurer has the authority to set forth the method and timing of payment of such invoices. The Treasurer shall also calculate the amount owed by each Party under the formula set forth in Section 7, and shall bill each Party accordingly. Each Party shall pay its billing by TRANSPAC within 30 days of receipt thereof. Bills shall be prepared for each calendar quarter in which activity occurs and shall be payable by the Parties upon demand.

## 7. PAYMENT OBLIGATIONS

Each Party shall pay, upon demand, its proportionate share of expenses. The funding allocation of each Party is as follows: each Party shall contribute 50% of TRANSPAC funding on an equal (1/6th) share basis. The remaining 50% TRANSPAC subsidy is based on the percentage of Measure J return-to-source funding received by each Party from Contra Costa Transportation Authority. This funding allocation shall be reviewed annually and, if necessary may be altered by written amendment to this Agreement.

## 8. DISPOSITION OF TRANSPAC FUNDS UPON TERMINATION

In the event this Agreement is terminated, TRANSPAC funds, together with interest accrued thereon, which remain after payment of all outstanding TRANSPAC debts, shall be distributed to the Parties in the same proportion as the Parties have paid into TRANSPAC.

## 9. WITHDRAWAL

Any Party may, upon 60 days' written notice to the Chair of TRANSPAC, withdraw from this Agreement. However, a withdrawing Party shall be liable for its proportionate share of TRANSPAC expenses incurred up to the date notice of termination became effective, which exceeds the withdrawing Agency's contribution under Section 7, and provided further, that in no event shall a withdrawing Party be entitled to a refund of all or any part of its contribution made under Section 7. A withdrawing Party may no longer be eligible to receive Measure J return-to-source funding.

## 10. TERMINATION

This Agreement shall remain in effect indefinitely, unless amended or terminated as provided hereunder. This Agreement may be terminated by the affirmative vote of the governing bodies of not less than two-thirds of the Parties.

11. AMENDMENTS

The TRANSPAC Board shall first consider any and all amendments to this Agreement. A majority vote of the TRANSPAC Board shall be required before any recommended amendment to this agreement is forwarded to the Parties for consideration and adoption. The Agreement may be amended by an affirmative vote of the governing bodies of not less than two-thirds of the Parties.

12. NOTICES

All notices shall be deemed to have been given when mailed to the governing body of each Party. Notices to TRANSPAC shall be sent to:

TRANSPAC  
c/o City of Pleasant Hill  
100 Gregory Lane  
Pleasant Hill, California 94523

13. LIMITED LIABILITY OF THE AUTHORITY

Consistent with Government Code section 6508.1, the debts, liabilities, and obligations of TRANSPAC shall be limited to the assets of TRANSPAC and shall under no circumstances be the debts, liabilities, and obligations of any of the Parties. A Party may, but has no obligations to, separately contract for or assume responsibility in writing for specific debts, liabilities, or obligations of the Authority. In furtherance of this Section, TRANSPAC shall indemnify the Parties as provided in Section 14 below.

14. INDEMNIFICATION

TRANSPAC shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless each Party and each Party's officers, officials, agents, and employees from any and all liability, including, but not limited to, claims, losses, suits, injuries, damages, costs and expenses, including attorneys' fees and consequential damages, of every kind, nature and description (collectively, "Losses") directly or indirectly arising from or as a result of any act of the Authority or its agents, servants, employees or officers in the observation or performance of any of its responsibilities under this Agreement, or any failure by the Authority to perform any such responsibilities; and/or any actions or inactions of Parties taken as a result of their membership in TRANSPAC. Notwithstanding the foregoing, TRANSPAC shall not be required to indemnify any Party against any Losses that are caused by the negligence or willful misconduct of such Party seeking indemnification or any of their respective officers, agents, or employees.

15. EFFECTIVE DATE

This Agreement shall take effect upon receipt of executed copies of the Agreement from not less than two-thirds of the Parties.

[SIGNATURES ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES]

# TRANSPAC BYLAWS

## CENTRAL CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION/LAND USE PARTNERSHIP BYLAWS

### ARTICLE I - GENERAL PROVISIONS

#### 1.1 Purpose.

The Central Contra Costa Transportation/Land Use Partnership (“TRANSPAC”) is a joint powers authority, established under the laws of the State of California (Government Code, section 6500 et seq.) and governed by that certain TRANSPAC Joint Powers Agreement dated August 21, 2014 (“Agreement”). The definition of terms used in these Bylaws shall be the same as contained in the Agreement, unless otherwise expressly provided herein. If any provision of these Bylaws conflicts with the Agreement, the Agreement shall govern.

#### 1.2 Offices.

The principal office for the transaction of the business of TRANSPAC shall be located within Central Contra Costa County at a place fixed by the Board from time to time. The Board may also establish one or more subordinate offices at any place or places within Central Contra Costa County.

#### 1.3 Amendments to Bylaws.

The Bylaws may be amended by majority vote of the Board. Any such amendment shall become effective immediately, unless otherwise stated therein.

### ARTICLE II - BOARD AND MEETINGS

#### 2.1 Board.

The Board shall consist of 6 members, one member from each Agency. For the City Agencies, one councilmember shall be appointed to the Board by the respective City Council. For the County Agency, one Supervisor shall be appointed to the Board by the County Board of Supervisors. The Board shall also consist of 6 ex-officio members, one member from each Agency. For the City Agencies, one planning commissioner shall be appointed as an ex-officio member of the Board by the respective City Council. For the County Agency, one planning commissioner shall be appointed as an ex-officio member of the Board by the County Board of Supervisors. Ex-officio members shall not be entitled to vote and shall not be counted towards the quorum.

#### 2.2 Powers of Board.

Subject to the powers and limitations as provided by law, the Agreement, or these Bylaws, all powers of TRANSPAC shall be exercised, its property controlled and its affairs conducted by the Board as is further specified in the Agreement.

#### 2.3 Compensation of Board Members, Committee Members and Officers.

Board members, members of committees and officers shall receive no compensation for their services. There will be no per diem or travel reimbursement for attending Board or committee meetings. However, they shall be able to receive reimbursement of such reasonable and necessary expenses incurred on behalf of TRANSPAC upon review of supporting documentation as may be determined by the Board.

## **2.4 Officers.**

The officers of TRANSPAC shall be the Chair, Vice Chair, Treasurer/Auditor, and Secretary and such other officers as the Board may appoint. The responsibilities of said officers shall be as set forth in the Agreement or as otherwise set forth in writing by the Board. The Board shall elect the Chair, Vice Chair, Auditor/Treasurer, and Secretary from among the elected officials, unless otherwise provided for in the Agreement. Any officer may be removed, either with or without cause, by a majority vote of the members at any duly held regular or special meeting of the Board. Any officer may resign at any time by giving written notice to the Board, the Chair, or the Secretary. Any such resignation shall take effect at the date of the receipt of such notice, or at any later time specified therein and, unless otherwise specified, the acceptance of such resignation shall not be necessary to make it effective. In case any office becomes vacant, the Board shall fill the vacancy at the next regular meeting or as soon as practicable thereafter.

## **2.5 Meetings.**

Regular meetings of the Board shall be held at such day, time and place within Central Contra Costa County as the Board may determine. All meetings of the Board, whether regular, special or adjourned shall be open to the public, except for closed session as authorized by law. The Board may adopt reasonable regulations that limit the total amount of time allotted for public speakers and for each individual speaker.

## **2.6 Advisory Committees.**

The Board may establish advisory committees to meet the needs of TRANSPAC. The chairperson of each advisory committee or his or her designee shall provide periodic reports to the Board at its regular meetings. All advisory committees that are standing committees shall be subject to the Ralph M. Brown Act (California Government Code section 54950 et seq.).

# **ARTICLE III –EMPLOYEES**

## **3.1 Managing Director.**

The Board shall appoint a Managing Director, who shall administer the day-to-day activities of TRANSPAC and report to the Board. The Managing Director shall attend meetings of the Board, but shall have no vote, and shall administer the business and activities of TRANSPAC, including those specific duties assigned by the Board or required by the Agreement. The Managing Director shall provide for such other employees and consultants as may be necessary for management of TRANSPAC's business, subject to approval by the Board.

## **3.2 Performance Evaluations.**

The Board shall meet annually to discuss the performance of the Managing Director. At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chair shall prepare a written performance evaluation for the Managing Director to be administered annually no later than January 31<sup>st</sup>. The evaluation shall include any changes to the performance standards and goals for the upcoming calendar year.

The Managing Director shall establish personnel rules, performance standards, and evaluation criteria for all other employees of TRANSPAC subject to the review of the Board. The Managing Director shall administer performance evaluations to employees annually and before the anniversary of the date of hire.

#### **ARTICLE IV – RECORDS AND REPORTS**

##### **4.1 Maintenance of TRANSPAC Records.**

TRANSPAC will keep adequate and correct books and records on account. All such records will be kept at TRANSPAC's principal office.

##### **4.2 Maintenance and Inspection of Agreement and Bylaws.**

TRANSPAC will keep at its principal office the original or copy of the Agreement and these Bylaws, as amended to date, which will be open to inspection at all reasonable times during office hours.

##### **4.3 Audit.**

No later than January 1<sup>st</sup> after the close of TRANSPAC's fiscal year, the Board will cause an audit prepared by a certified public accountant to be sent to the governing body of each Member.

##### **4.4 Fiscal Year.**

TRANSPAC's fiscal year shall commence on the 1st day of July and shall conclude on the 30th day of June of each year.

#### **ARTICLE V – CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

TRANSPAC shall be subject to the conflict of interest rules set forth in the Political Reform Act (commencing with Section 81000 of the Government Code of the State of California) and Sections 1090 et seq. of the Government Code of the State of California, and TRANSPAC shall adopt a conflict of interest code as required and as provided by the implementing regulations of the Political Reform Act.

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

# TRANSPAC 2018-2019 BUDGET AND WORKPLAN

TRANSPAC 2018-2019 BUDGET					
EXPENDITURES					
			2017-2018		2018-2019
Managing Director (time and material based expenses)			\$ 135,000		\$ 135,000
Admin Support Contract - Secretary / Clerk of the Board (includes printing, postage & supplies) (time and material based expenses)			\$ 65,000		\$ 72,000
Legal Services - expenses would be incurred on a time and material basis			\$ 5,000		\$ 5,000
Web Site - Maintain / Enhance (time and material based expenses)			\$ 5,000		\$ 10,000
Audit Services			\$ 8,000		\$ 15,000
City of Martinez - Pacheco Transit Hub / Park & Ride Lot Maintenance			\$ 10,000		\$ 10,000
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>\$ 228,000</b>		<b>\$ 247,000</b>
Pleasant Hill City/Fiscal Administration			\$ 3,000		\$ 3,000
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>\$ 3,000</b>		<b>\$ 3,000</b>
<b>Costs subtotal</b>			<b>\$ 231,000</b>		<b>\$ 250,000</b>
Contingency			\$ 22,733		\$ 16,500
Project Reserve - This line represents a cumulative carryover balance, to fund a plan/study to for project development. The Board approved I-680 / Monument Blvd. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Project (Nov. 2017).			\$ 220,000		\$ 220,000
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$ 473,733</b>		<b>\$ 486,500</b>
REVENUES					
			2017-2018		2018-2019
2017/2018 Member Agency Contributions			\$ 229,956		\$ 225,000
Carryover Balance			\$ 243,777		\$ 261,500
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$ 473,733</b>		<b>\$ 486,500</b>
NOTES:					
-TRANSPAC does not have any direct employees, with staff positions provided through contract					
-TRANSPAC is not a member of CalPERS					



<b>TRANSPAC 2018-2019 BUDGET</b>						
<b>ALLOCATION FORMULA FOR MEMBER AGENCY CONTRIBUTION REVENUE BUDGET</b>						
<b>PART B</b>	<b>MEASURE J RTS \$s</b>	<b>MEASURE J RTS %</b>	<b>\$ FROM RTS</b>			<b>Total for Jurisdiction</b>
<b>JURISDICTION</b>	<b>Allocation</b>		<b>PART B</b>		<b>PART A</b>	
<b>CLAYTON</b>	\$ 250,599	5.63%	\$ 6,334		\$ 18,750	\$ 25,084
<b>CONCORD</b>	\$ 1,541,746	34.64%	\$ 38,968		\$ 18,750	\$ 57,718
<b>MARTINEZ</b>	\$ 548,467	12.32%	\$ 13,863		\$ 18,750	\$ 32,613
<b>PLEASANT HILL</b>	\$ 561,660	12.62%	\$ 14,196		\$ 18,750	\$ 32,946
<b>WALNUT CREEK</b>	\$ 925,231	20.79%	\$ 23,386		\$ 18,750	\$ 42,136
<b>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY ^</b>	\$ 623,251	14.00%	\$ 15,753		\$ 18,750	\$ 34,503
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$ 4,450,954		\$ 112,500		\$ 112,500	\$ 225,000
^Estimated at 25% of allocation (\$2,493,002)						
Based on "DRAFT - FY 2017-18 Distribution of 18% Funds to Local Jurisdictions to Street Maintenance"						

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

# **TRANSPAC**

## **2018 / 2019 WORK PLAN**

July, 2018

- Define and initiate an audit process
- Define and initiate a web site update process

August

- No Meeting

September

- Receive Quarterly and Year End Financial Report
- Coordinate with TRANSPLAN for a joint meeting (Concord Naval Weapons Station Project)

October

- Initiate Study for the I-680 / Monument Blvd. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Project (with identified budget carryover funds)

November

- Receive Quarterly Financial Report
- Approve 2019 Calendar Meeting Schedule

December

- Appointment of CCTA Representative
- Action Plan Update

January, 2019

- No Meeting

February

- Election of Chair / Vice Chair
- Receive Quarterly Financial Report

March

- Appointment of CCTA TCC Representatives
- Conflict of Interest Form 700 Due

## April

- Review Draft 2019/2020 Budget
- Review TRANSPAC Contracts

## May

- Receive Quarterly Financial Report

## June

- Approve 2019 / 2020 Budget

## Other Potential Items

- Programming/Funding
  - Measure J Line 10 (BART Parking, Access, and Other Improvements)
  - Measure J Line 19a (Additional Bus Service Enhancements)
  - Measure J Line 20a (Additional Senior and Disabled Transportation)
  - Regional Measure 3
  - CCTA TEP
  - Identify Other Funding Opportunities
- Projects
  - Concord Naval Weapon Station Project
  - I-680 / SR 4 Interchange Improvements
    - Phase 3 - SR 4 Widening Project
  - I-680 Express Lanes
  - Quarterly (or semi annually) Project Presentations
- TRANSPAC Governance
  - Review of Bylaws
  - Administrative Procedures
    - Procurement of Services
    - Invoice Approval

# TRANSPAC MANAGING DIRECTOR CONTRACT SCOPE OF SERVICES

## EXHIBIT A Scope of Services TRANSPAC Agency Management & Administration

Gray-Bowen-Scott (GBS) will provide Agency Management & Administration services for Transportation Partnership and Coordination (TRANSPAC), essentially providing the Executive Director staff for the organization. The scope of services is further detailed below by task.

1. TRANSPAC
  - a. Attend and facilitate TRANSPAC Board meetings
  - b. Attend and facilitate TRANSPAC TAC meetings
  - c. Board Member support including communication with TRANSPAC Board Members
  - d. Attend other meetings representing TRANSPAC. Other meetings could include, but are not limited to:
    - i. CCTA Board
    - ii. CCTA Planning Committee
    - iii. CCTA Administration and Projects Committee
    - iv. CCTA Technical Coordinating Committee
    - v. Other meetings as required (such as MTC, ABAG, BAAQMD or other RTPC meetings in Contra Costa County)
2. TRANSPAC support includes preparation and/or analysis of material for the consideration of TRANSPAC, including but not limited to:
  - a. Annual Work Plan
  - b. Monthly Board Agenda and Staff Reports
  - c. Monthly TAC Agenda and Staff Reports
  - d. Meeting minutes
  - e. Monthly TRANSPAC summary to CCTA
  - f. Other tasks
    - i. Coordination with RTPCs/CCTA/Other Stakeholders
    - ii. Review of CEQA Docs. / Traffic Studies / Other Studies
3. Other tasks of interest to TRANSPAC as required to be responded to, including funding opportunities, project specific efforts, or policy issues that may not occur on a regular basis.
  - a. 2016-17 OBAG 2/TLC/PBTL call for projects
  - b. Central County Action Plan Update
  - c. Other tasks as identified by TRANSPAC
4. TRANSPAC Administrative Duties
5. Other tasks as identified by TRANSPAC

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

# TRANSPAC SECRETARY/CLERK OF BOARD SCOPE OF SERVICES

## EXHIBIT "A"

### SCOPE OF SERVICES

#### TRANSPAC

#### Secretary /Clerk of the Board

Consultant will provide Secretary / Clerk of the Board services for Transportation Partnership and Coordination (TRANSPAC). The scope of services is further detailed below by task.

#### 1. TRANSPAC Board

- a. Attend meetings and record minutes
- b. Contact Board Members in advance of the meeting regarding attendance
- c. Provide support for the meeting including meeting location preparation and tear down and meeting materials (copies of agenda, name cards, sign in sheets, refreshments)
- d. Preparing draft agendas and agenda packets and other required tasks including:
  - i. Appointments,
  - ii. Minutes from the prior meeting(s), and
  - iii. Regular information from the CCTA in the form of the CCTA Executive Director's monthly report
  - iv. Executive Director's report to the RTPCs
  - v. Status and summary letters provided by the other RTPCs
  - vi. Updated web links to County Connection, the CCTA's Planning Committee and Administration & Projects Committee, and the CCTA's calendar.
- e. Prepare final agenda and packet incorporating input from Managing Director and:
  - i. Distribute material by mail and email
  - ii. Post to website

#### 2. TRANSPAC TAC

- a. Attend meetings and record minutes
- b. Contact Members in advance of the meeting regarding attendance
- c. Provide support for the meeting including meeting location preparation and tear down and meeting materials (copies of agenda, name cards, sign in sheets, refreshments)
- d. Preparing draft agendas and agenda packets and other required tasks including:
  - i. appointments,
  - ii. minutes from the prior meeting(s), and

- iii. regular information from the CCTA in the form of the CCTA Executive Director's monthly report
    - iv. Executive Director's report to the RTPCs
      - v. Status and summary letters provided by the other RTPCs
    - vi. Updated web links to County Connection, the CCTA's Planning Committee and Administration & Projects Committee, and the CCTA's calendar.
  - e. Prepare final agenda and packet incorporating input from Managing Director and:
    - i. Distribute material by mail and email
    - ii. Post to website
- 3. Admin Support
  - a. Assist Managing Director with tasks to complete other TRANSPAC business
  - b. Preparation of draft status letter of the TRANSPAC meeting to be submitted to the CCTA through Managing Director)
  - c. Work required as part of the Action Plan updates
  - d. Maintain contact list of TRANSPAC Officials, Planning Officials, TAC Staff, and other officials
  - e. Maintain annual meeting schedule and manage the meeting room availability (Board and TAC Meetings)
  - f. Routine website work including updating calendar and posting agenda material
  - g. Maintain electronic file of all agenda packets, and all other TRANSPAC and TAC documents, as well as a chronological binder of the complete packets and any handouts at the meetings, and any prepared correspondence.
  - h. Coordinate Form 700 Conflict of Interest submittals, including maintaining the files
    - i. Research of prior TRANSPAC agenda items and actions as required
    - j. Research for Public Records Act requests as required
- 4. Other tasks as identified by TRANSPAC

## December 2016 – July 2019

- CCTA 2020 TEP
- Regional Transportation Plan (2019)
- CCTA / Measure J Programming
  - Specific Projects / Strategic Plan
  - Programs
    - Coordinated Call for Projects
      - CCTA TLC
      - CCTA PBTF (Line 13)
      - MTC OBAG
      - MTC SRTS
    - Major Streets Projects (Line 24)
    - BART Station Improvement Projects (Line 10)
    - Line 20a Program
      - CFP and approval of 2 year Programming of funds
      - General Program Items
      - Includes Monument Corridor Shuttle
    - Line 19a Program
- TRANSPAC Action Plan
  - Completed update
- Monument 680 Project
  - Review and Define priority for use of funds
  - Define Project scope
- Project Reports
  - Concord Naval Weapons Station Project
  - 680 Express Lanes
  - 680 HOV Lane Project
  - 680 / 4 Interchange
  - BART Station Improvements
- Program Reports
  - TRANSPAC STMP
  - 511 Program / Street Smarts Diablo
  - TRAFFIX
- Receive Reports / Provide Comment / Indicate Support
  - CCTA 2020 TEP
  - Regional Measure 3
  - SB-1
  - Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
  - Accessible Transportation Strategic Plan
  - CCTA Electric Vehicle Ready Communities Challenge Grant
  - County Sustainable Communities Program Grant Request
  - 680 / Treat Blvd Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Project
- Appointments
- Administrative Items
  - Contracts
  - Budget
  - Financial Reporting
  - Audit

## August 2014 to November 2016

- Transition
  - Hire Managing Director
  - Regional Transportation Planning Committee Structure
- CCTA / Measure J Programming
  - Specific Projects / Strategic Plan
  - 2016 STIP Program
  - CCTA / MTC SRTS TAP
  - Measure C Programming Amendment
  - Programs
    - Line 20a Program
      - Specific Project Actions
      - Program for FY 15/16
      - Extend program for FY 16/17
    - Line 19a Program
      - Specific Project Actions
        - Pacheco/Martinez Transit Hub
        - Monument Shuttle Project
    - Line 13 (PBTF)
      - Specific Project Actions
        - Trail Rehab
    - BART Station Improvement Projects (Line 10)
    - Line 17 and 21a funds for 511 Program
    - Line 28a funds (LSR)
- TRANSPAC Action Plan Update
- Regional Transportation Plan (2017)
- Receive Reports / Provide Comment / Indicate Support
  - Marsh Creek Corridor Multi Use Trail project
- Program Reports
  - 511 Program
- Receive Reports / Provide Comment / Indicate Support
  - CCTA 2016 TEP
- Project Reports
  - 680 / 4 Interchange
  - BART Station Improvements
  - 680 CSMP Operations
  - Southbound I-680 Marina Boulevard Offramp in Martinez
  - I-680 High Capacity Transit Study
- Appointments
- Administrative Items
  - Budget
  - Financial Reporting
  - CalPERS

## January 2012 To July 2014

- CCTA / Measure J Programming
  - Specific Projects / Strategic Plan
  - 2014 STIP Program
  - CCTA / MTC SRTS
  - Programs
    - Line 20a Program
      - Program for FY 14/15
      - Program for FY 13/14
    - Line 24 funds
      - Ygnacio Valley Road Permanent Restoration
    - Line 28a funds (LSR)
      - Policy
      - Chilpancingo Parkway to Viking Drive Project
    - Major Streets Projects (Line 24)
    - Line 19a funds (transit)
    - Line 13 (PBTF)
      - Tioga to Via Montanas
      - Via Montanas to Treat Boulevard
    - CCTA TLC CFP
    - BART Station Improvement Projects (Line 10)
- Countywide Plan Update
- Congestion Management Plan
- TRANSPAC Action Plan Update
- Monument Shuttle Project
- Project Reports
  - Kirker Pass Truck Climbing Lanes Project
  - I-680 Southbound Carpool Lane Completion Project
  - SR4 Integrated Corridor
- Program Reports
  - 511 Program
- Receive Reports / Provide Comment / Indicate Support
  - Financial Feasibility of Ferry Service
  - BAAQMD Report
  - Safes Routes to School Assessment
  - County Connection Mobility Management Plan
  - Reuse of Concord Naval Weapons Station
  - SB 375/SCS Report
  - Proposed Regional Express Lanes Network
  - Mobility Management Plan
  - Real Time Ridesharing Pilot Program
  - Ramp Metering Feasibility and Implementation Plan (SR4 and SR160)
  - WETA
  - AB 904 Parking Spaces: Minimum Requirements
  - Drayage Trucks (BAAQMD)

- Appointments
- Transition to TRANSPAC JPA
- Administrative Items
  - Budget
  - Financial Reporting
  - CalPERS

Committee	Staff Arrangement	Pros	Cons	Budget
SWAT	<b>Contract w/Member Jurisdiction Staff.</b>  Occasional RFP released for the role.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower cost</li> <li>• Staff has an understanding of issues, assignments, etc. from a local agency perspective</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perception/potential for conflict of interest</li> </ul>	Annual: FY 18/19 \$32,500
TRANSPLAN	<b>Staffed by Contra Costa County.</b>  This arrangement was established in the original joint powers adopted in 1991.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lower cost</li> <li>• Consistent staffing</li> <li>• Staff has an understanding of issues, assignments, etc. from a local agency perspective</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perception /potential for conflict of interest</li> </ul>	Annual: FY 19/20 \$29,000
TVTC*	<b>Staffed by TAC members.</b>  Primary duty to administer the fee. Rotates biennially between member jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No RTPC dues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistent staffing.</li> <li>• Perception/potential for conflict of interest</li> </ul>	Annual: FY 18/19 \$161,000
WCCTAC	<b>Executive Director reporting to the WCCTAC Board.</b>  WCCTAC has staff in addition to the Executive Director: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WCCTAC Ops (2.75)</li> <li>• TDM Manager (1.9)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Independent advocate for WCCTAC interests.</li> <li>• Additional staffing enables WCCTAC to take on independent studies and planning efforts</li> <li>• Staff attention is solely on WCCTAC interests.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highest Cost</li> </ul>	Annual: FY 19/20 \$5,011,000
ECCRFFA **	<b>Contracted Director with support from County Staff.</b>  Management of ECCRFFA program including audit report; prepare planning docs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Independent advocate for ECCRFFA interests.</li> <li>• Lower cost</li> <li>• Hybrid of contracted and publicly staffed</li> </ul>		Annual: FY 19/20 \$200,000

\* TVTC is dissimilar to the other RTPCs, 1) membership also includes Alameda County jurisdictions, 2) the Tri Valley Development Fee funds certain Committee activities, and 3) the Contra Costa members are also members of SWAT.

\*\* ECCRFFA includes same member agencies as TRANSPLAN

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

REPORT.: 09/06/19  
RUN...: 09/06/19  
Run By.: ROSS

CITY OF PLEASANT HILL  
Balance Sheet Report  
ALL FUND(S)

PAGE: 001  
ID #: GLBS  
CTL.: PLE

Ending Calendar Date.: June 30, 2019      Fiscal (12-19)

Assets

			Acct ID
TRANSPAC CASH BAL.ADJ.	36,795.87	85	1010 9999
TRANSPAC INVESTMENT IN LAIF	301,629.00	85	1060
	-----		
Total of Assets ---->	338,424.87		338,424.87
			=====

Liabilities

			Acct ID
TRANSPAC MISC PAYABLES	62,420.94	85	2350
	-----		
Total of Liabilities ---->	62,420.94		

FUND Balances

			Acct ID
TRANSPAC RESTRICTED FUND BALANCE	261,004.24	85	2812
CURRENT EARNINGS	14,999.69		
	-----		
Total of FUND Balances ---->	276,003.93		338,424.87
			=====

REPORT.: 09/06/19  
RUN...: 09/06/19  
Run By.: ROSS

CITY OF PLEASANT HILL  
Balance Sheet Report  
FUND 85 - TRANSPAC

PAGE: 002  
ID #: GLBS  
CTL.: PLE

Ending Calendar Date.: June 30, 2019 Fiscal (12-19)

Assets

-----  
1010 9999 CASH BAL.ADJ. 36,795.87  
1060 INVESTMENT IN LAIF 301,629.00  
-----  
Total of Assets ----> 338,424.87 338,424.87  
=====

Liabilities

-----  
2350 MISC PAYABLES 62,420.94  
-----  
Total of Liabilities ----> 62,420.94

FUND Balances

-----  
2812 RESTRICTED FUND BALANCE 261,004.24  
CURRENT EARNINGS 14,999.69  
-----  
Total of FUND Balances ----> 276,003.93 338,424.87  
=====

# City of Pleasant Hill

## FY2018/19 Income Statement Summary by Quarter

Accounting Structure:  
 Fund            Department or Revenue Code    Expense Code  
 XX                XXXX    XXXX

Note: Revenue accounts are not associated with departments and do not utilize a

**FUND:85**    Name :TRANSPAC

Revenue	Description	Revenue Description	Activity in 1st Quarter	Activity in 2nd Quarter	Activity in 3rd Quarter	Activity in 4th Quarter	YTD thru 9/30/2018
DEPT Id	OBJ Id						
3510		INTEREST REV		2,032.69	2792.23	2,119.22	\$ 6,944.14
4570		CONTRIB FROM OTHER AGENCIES	225,000.00	-			\$ 225,000.00
<b>Total Revenue -----&gt;</b>							<b>\$ 231,944.14</b>

Expense	Description	Expense Description					
DEPT Id	OBJ Id						
7085	0100	SALS-PERMANENT	9,085.08	17,820.17	15,562.26	29,532.49	\$ 72,000.00
7085	1110	OUTSIDE CONSL/LITG					\$ -
7085	1140	AUDITING SVCS		6,500.00	2,000.00	-	\$ 8,500.00
7085	1198	CONSULTANT/OTHR					\$ -
7085	1300	CONTRACTUAL SVC	7,249.00	10,216.50	51,848.69	64,274.26	\$ 133,588.45
7085	1486	MAINT					\$ -
7085	2400	POSTAGE					\$ -
7085	4200	SUPLS/OPERATING					\$ -
7085	6800	ADMIN OVERHEAD	2,856.00				\$ 2,856.00
7085	6905	CONTINGENCIES					\$ -
<b>Total Expense -----&gt;</b>							<b>\$ 216,944.45</b>
Net Rev/(Exp)							<b>\$ 14,999.69</b>

TRANSPAC 2018-2019 BUDGET - Expenditure Status							
EXPENDITURES							
			2018-2019 BUDGET	ACTUAL		Notes	
Managing Director			\$ 135,000	\$ 121,596.89	90.1%	Includes expenses through 6/30/2019	
Admin Support Contract - Secretary / Clerk of the Board (includes printing, postage & supplies)			\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000.00	100.0%	Includes expenses through 6/30/2019	
Legal Services - expenses would be incurred on a time and material basis			\$ 5,000	\$ -	0.0%		
Web Site - Maintain / Enhance			\$ 10,000	\$ 708.75	7.1%	Includes expenses through 6/30/2019	
Audit Services			\$ 15,000	\$ 8,500.00	56.7%	Includes expenses through 6/30/2019	
City of Martinez - Pacheco Transit Hub / Park & Ride Lot Maintenance			\$ 10,000	\$ 7,281.56	72.8%	Annual invoice	
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>\$ 247,000</b>	<b>\$ 210,087.20</b>	85.1%		
Pleasant Hill City/Fiscal Administration			\$ 3,000	\$ 2,856.00	95.2%	Annual invoice	
<b>Subtotal</b>			<b>\$ 3,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,856.00</b>	95.2%		
<b>Costs subtotal</b>			<b>\$ 250,000</b>	<b>\$ 212,943.20</b>	85.2%		
Contingency			\$ 16,500	\$ -	0.0%		
Project Reserve - This line represents estimated carryover balance, to fund a plan/study to support future project development, funded with carryover balance funds.			\$ 220,000	\$ 4,001.25	1.8%	Includes expenses through 6/30/19 for coordination with CCTA to procure consultant services	
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$ 486,500</b>	<b>\$ 216,944.45</b>	44.6%		
REVENUES							
			2018-2019				
Member Agency Contributions			\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000	100.0%		
Carryover Balance			\$ 261,500	\$ 261,004	99.8%		
Interest Earned				\$ 6,944		Through 3/31/19	
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$ 486,500</b>	<b>\$ 492,948</b>	101.3%		

6-Sep-19

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**  
**July 17, 2019**

**Self Help Counties:** May 22, 2019

Linsey Willis and I met with other Self Help County staff to discuss how to proceed with a request to change the formula on the Local Partnership Program split from a 50 percent competitive and 50 percent formula base to a 5 percent competitive and 95 percent formula base. The program was set up many years ago to reward the counties that were able to pass a sales tax measure for transportation with a 95 percent formula and 5 percent competitive. Proposition 1B continued the program with the same formula. The formula changed in Senate Bill 1. Currently, we receive about \$2.3 million per year.

**WTS/CMAA Public Agency Night:** May 22, 2019

Tim Haile and I staffed the table and answered questions from our consulting partners at the Women's Transportation Seminar/Construction Management Association of America (WTS/CMAA) public agency night. The event was held in San Francisco and there were many people asking questions from the various public sector teams that wanted to talk about opportunities for the private sector to get involved in delivering their projects and programs.

**East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD):** May 28, 2019

Jack Hall and I met with Deputy General Manager Ana Alvarez and Chief of Planning/GIS Acquisition, Stewardship & Development Brian Holt with EBRPD to discuss the land transfer at the Concord Naval Weapons Station. The EBRPD is close to finalizing the land transfer and we would like to have access to Kenne Blvd. and building 420. It was a great meeting.

**CUBIC:** May 28, 2019

Jack and I met with Business Development Director Keith Foxe with CUBIC to discuss a potential partnership for the \$8 million Mobility-on-Demand (MOD) Grant.

**Plumbers and Steamfitters Local 159/Environmental:** May 30, 2019

I met with representatives from the Plumbers and Steamfitters Local 159 and the environmental community to discuss the Measure J projects and any programs. They also asked questions about our innovation program.

**NCHRP Strategic Mobility Research:** May 31, 2019

Peter Plumeau, President & CEO, Economic Development Research Group interviewed me about the National Cooperative Highway Research Program's (NCHRP's) strategic mobility research. They are contemplating developing a Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP) 3. I was the technical coordinating chair for the SHRP 2 renewal program. I thought it was a great program

and helped develop tools that practitioners could use in their quest to renew our nation's infrastructure. I strongly support another SHRP program in the next surface transportation bill.

**Senator Jim Beall:** June 3, 2019

I called Senator Beall and expressed support for Senate Bill (SB) 277, which changes the Local Partnership Program (LPP) in SB 1 from 50/50 to a proposed 95% formulaic/5% competitive. I was asked by members of the self-help counties to make the call.

**Macias Gini & O'Connell LLP (MGO):** June 4, 2019

I met with our auditors to kick off our 2019 compliance audit. They asked the normal questions about changes to our program, any plans to bond, any evidence of fraud, etc. I mentioned we were getting more phishing emails and they said they have a member of staff that can test our system for vulnerability to cyber-attacks. We are going forward with a proposal to test our system.

**Contra Costa Workforce Development (CCWD) Board:** June 5, 2019

I gave the members of the CCWD Board a presentation on GoMentum Station. I was asked about the transfer to the American Automobile Association (AAA) Northern California, Nevada and Utah, number of testing partners, etc. I had a good response from the members of the CCWD Board.

**KRON 4:** June 6, 2019

I was interviewed by a reporter from KRON 4 about the full closure of State Route (SR) 4 for the removal of two sign structures. One spans the entire eastbound lanes and the other the westbound lanes. She used an iPhone and FaceTime to conduct the interview.

**Ukraine Delegation:** June 7, 2019

At the request of the Concord California Rotary Club, we hosted a delegation of Mayors from the Ukraine. They wanted to know about our mobility program. What I found interesting is that the members of the delegation from Concord were just as interested as the members of the delegation from Ukraine.

**Federal Engagement Program: June 11-12, 2019**

Board Chair Taylor, Peter Engel and I traveled to Washington, D.C. to meet with our congressional delegation, committees of interest, Department of Transportation political appointees, and modal agencies. On June 11, we spent most of our day on Capitol Hill. Before that, we caught up with Paul Feenstra, formerly of the Intelligent Transportation Society (ITS) of America who now works at PACCAR. His company builds trucks and they are interested in testing at GoMentum Station. We had separate meetings with the House Transportation Committee's Subcommittee on Highways and Transit majority and minority staff. The Republican staff was very interested in the work we are doing with our Shared Autonomous Shuttles at Bishop Ranch, while the Democratic staff was interested in our Advanced Transportation and Congestion Management Technologies Deployment (ATCMTD) grant project, how we are and plan to utilize Mobility-as-a-Service (MaaS), and some of the challenges other agencies around the country are facing in this space. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is working on reauthorizing the surface transportation bill, so it was valuable to be able to discuss CCTA's

priorities with them. We met with Robert Edmonson, Speaker Pelosi's Chief of Staff, to give an update on Bishop Ranch and thank him for the Speaker's support on our ATCMTD application. We additionally met with Congressman Swalwell's Chief of Staff, Congressman McNerney, and Senator Feinstein's Legislative Director Josh Esquivel. We thanked the House Members on their support letters for our ATCMTD grant, discussed senior mobility challenges and various projects in the county, and had an interesting discussion with Josh about how public agencies like ours can use autonomous vehicles to the traveling public's advantage. This was a nice opportunity to inform Senator Feinstein's staff of some of the ways CCTA is utilizing new technology for the good of our county's residents. Lastly, we had an excellent meeting with Derek Kan, Under Secretary for Transportation Policy, and Finch Fulton, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy at the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT).

On June 12, we spent most of our day at DOT but started with some congressional meetings. We met with Congressman Thompson and discussed the electric vehicle tax credit followed by a meeting with the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee (the Senate committee tasked with reauthorizing the surface transportation bill). In the EPW meeting, we had a robust discussion about reauthorization priorities and the fact that California has declined to bypass the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act provision allowing the state to bypass the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). We saw Congressman DeSaulnier briefly but spoke to his staff in depth about reauthorizing the National Freight Advisory Committee and holding a hearing on how the workforce can benefit from emerging technologies. We had an interesting meeting with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) senior staff and discussed how the agency plans to roll out regulations relating to autonomous trucks and buses. They were very interested in our Bishop Ranch Shared Autonomous Vehicle (SAV) project. After FMCSA, we met with the National Highway and Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) Acting Administrator Heidi King and her staff. It was a very productive meeting. We discussed the SAV project and how to move forward with some changes we would like to make to the project. Acting Administrator King said she wants to visit GoMentum Station soon. Our last meeting was with the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) senior leadership team. APTA is interested in organizing a site visit here and mentioned that they are interested in featuring CCTA in a Mobility-on-Demand article in their magazine.

**Women's Transportation Seminar (WTS) Bay Area Chapter:** June 13, 2019

I received the Ray LaHood award at the Bay Area Chapter of WTS in Oakland. It was an honor to receive it and especially nice because a few of our commissioners and CCTA team attended the event.

**Mineta Transportation Institute and UCLA Institute of Transportation Studies:** June 17, 2019

Dr. Peter Haas from the Mineta Transportation Institute and Dr. Jaimee Lederman from the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Institute of Transportation Studies interviewed me as part of a Bay Area wide survey about our experiences with and practices in implementing Local Street Maintenance & Improvement (LSM) programs. They asked about how we allocate funding to jurisdictions (known as "return to source"), and how these funds are spent. They also asked about our experiences in forming and implementing a LSM program expenditure plan. Their goals, broadly, were to understand how funds are used and what accountability provisions exist to ensure that spending reflects the goals outlined in the ballot measure and expenditure plan.

They asked questions about our growth management program because we are the only sales tax measure in California with a Growth Management Program (GMP). Martin Engelmann provided them more information including the contact information for local staff who complete the GMP Checklists.

**Self-Help Counties Coalition Board Meeting:** June 19, 2019

Linsey Willis and I participated in the board meeting by telephone. The meeting was held in San Diego. A few issues were discussed. The main topic was the proposed legislation and the split of the Senate Bill 1 (SB1) Local Partnership Program dollars. As mentioned above, we favor 95% formulaic and 5% competitive. I was asked to call Assembly Member Frazier about the proposal.

**Frenzy:** July 1, 2019

I met with Martin McMullan the CEO of Frenzy. I met Martin on a trip to speak at a conference in New Zealand. He used to work for the transport department in New Zealand. He has developed software and hardware to provide monetary rewards for transport mode switch. He has deployed in New Zealand and Australia and is looking for a place to run a pilot project in the United States. His project would work well with our Mobility-on-Demand (MOD) project.

**Park-and-Ride Lots:** July 2, 2019

Peter Engel and I participated on a telephone call with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Tri Delta Transit. Tri Delta saved some money on a recent bus procurement. They think they may save more on the next procurement. They want to use those savings to build the two park-and-ride lots in East Contra Costa. We may need to provide some funding in case those savings do not materialize. We may do the oversight on the construction of those parking lots.

**Glydways (formerly Wayfarer):** July 3, 2019

I met with CEO Mark Seeger and Chief Business Development Officer Zach Zeliff from Glydways. They are working on an agreement to test their hardware and software on vehicles at GoMentum Station. They asked for information on where they could relocate their offices from San Francisco to Contra Costa. I provided a name of a local commercial realtor.

**First-Aid, CPR, and AED Training:** July 8, 2019

Most of the CCTA staff participated in our bi-annual first-aid, Cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), and Automated External Defibrillator (AED) training with EMS Safety. We need to stay current with our training because we have an AED machine onsite. The trainer is able to compress a one-day training session into four hours.

**Innovate 680:** July 9, 2019

Tim Haile and I met with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Executive Director Therese McMillan and key staff. We provided an update on the scope and progress of Innovate 680. Executive Director McMillan had a number of great questions. She seemed interested in the pilot Mobility-on-Demand (MOD) project and the potential to add Marin County. We are working with Marin County and MTC on a concept called Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Forward. The concepts we are working on for the I-680 corridor would fit nicely into the I-580 corridor and include another county.

*Staff Out-of-State Travel: Randell Iwasaki attended the Women's Transportation Seminar (WTS) International conference in Boston, MA from May 16-17, 2019 for a total amount of \$1,385.24. Martine Engelmann attended the Intelligent Transportation Society of America (ITSA) conference in Washington, D.C. from June 3-9, 2019 for a total amount of \$2,648.37. Peter Engel, Randell Iwasaki and Chair Taylor attended the Authority's Federal Engagement Program in Washington, D.C. from June 10-13, 2019 for a total amount of \$8,457.78.*

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



COMMISSIONERS

Robert Taylor,  
Chair

Julie Pierce,  
Vice Chair

Janet Abelson

Newell Americh

Tom Butt

Teresa Gerring

Federal Glover

Loella Haskew

David Hudson

Karen Mitchoff

Kevin Romick

Randell H. Iwasaki,  
Executive Director

2999 Oak Road  
Suite 100  
Walnut Creek  
CA 94597  
PHONE: 925.256.4700  
FAX: 925.256.4701  
www.ccta.net

---

# MEMORANDUM

---

To: Matt Todd, TRANSPAC  
Lisa Bobadilla, SWAT  
Jamar Stamps, TRANSPLAN  
Cedric Novenario, TVTC  
John Nemeth, WCCTAC  
Mike Moran, LPMC  
*WRE for:*  
From: Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director  
Date: July 5, 2019  
Re: Items of interest for circulation to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs)

---

At its June 19, 2019 meeting, the Authority discussed the following items, which may be of interests to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees:

1. **Status Update of e-Builder Software Implementation.** Staff provided an update on implementation activities and sought comments on the implementation status. *A status update was provided on the eBuilder Software implementation process, data integration and migration, system validation, workflows for the contract and invoice approval process, dashboard and reporting, and training. Staff anticipates going live in July with active projects such as Innovate 680. There will be a pilot phase to begin working with local staff and consultants and annual status updates provided to the Authority Board.*
2. **Transmittal of Recommended Project Lists to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for Inclusion in the 2021 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).** In response to the 2021 RTP "Call for Projects" issued by MTC in March 2019, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (Authority) staff worked with the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and project proponents to develop a comprehensive

list of projects for submittal to MTC. To receive future state or federal funding, a project must first be included in the RTP. Projects that impact the capacity of the transportation system must be listed individually in the RTP. The RTP also includes programmatic categories for projects that do not impact the capacity of the transportation system (e.g. pavement rehabilitation, safety projects, pedestrian/bicycle enhancement projects, etc.). Local jurisdictions, the RTPCs, and transit agencies submitted a total of 86 projects and 9 programmatic categories, with a total cost of \$9.54 billion in Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars and funding requests of \$7.6 billion. *The Authority Board approved Resolution 19-38-G authorizing submittal of the proposed 2021 Regional Transportation Plan Project Lists to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.*



COMMISSIONERS

Robert Taylor,  
Chair

Julie Pierce,  
Vice Chair

Janet Abelson

Newell Americh

Tom Butt

Teresa Gerring

Federal Glover

Loella Haskew

David Hudson

Karen Mitchoff

Kevin Romick

Randell H. Iwasaki,  
Executive Director

---

# MEMORANDUM

---

To: Matt Todd, TRANSPAC  
Lisa Bobadilla, SWAT  
Jamar Stamps, TRANSPLAN  
Cedric Novenario, TVTC  
John Nemeth, WCCTAC  
Mike Moran, LPMC  
*MRE for:*  
From: Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director  
Date: July 19, 2019  
Re: Items of interest for circulation to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs)

---

At its July 17, 2019 meeting, the Authority discussed the following items, which may be of interests to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees:

- 1. Federal Legislative Update.** Jason Tai and Madeleine Pike with Tai, Ginsberg & Associates, LLC were in attendance to discuss current federal legislative activities that may affect the Authority. *This discussion consisted of an overview of current legislation such as the transportation reauthorization bill, autonomous vehicle legislation, the appropriations process, available funding opportunities, and the current Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act bill. They also discussed the Authority's grant award of the \$8 million Advanced Transportation and Congestion Management Technologies Deployment (ATCMTD) Mobility-on-Demand grant by the U.S. Department of Transportation, continuing efforts with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, and stakeholder engagement.*
- 2. Approval of the Contra Costa Electric Vehicle (EV) Readiness Blueprint Draft and Submit the Report to the California Energy Commission (CEC).** On October 17, 2018, the Authority entered into Agreement No. 513 with The Cadmus Group, LLC (Cadmus) to prepare the Contra Costa EV

2999 Oak Road  
Suite 100  
Walnut Creek  
CA 94597  
PHONE: 925.256.4700  
FAX: 925.256.4701  
www.ccta.net

---

Readiness Blueprint with funds received by the Authority from the CEC. The draft Blueprint has been prepared with input resulting from significant stakeholder outreach. The Blueprint includes a summary of current conditions in the county, as well as short-, medium- and long-term recommendations to accelerate EV adoption in the county, as well as position the county for upcoming funding opportunities. The draft Blueprint was presented to the Authority Board at its July 17, 2019 meeting. Staff sought authorization to forward the report to the CEC by July 31, 2019 to be eligible for future funding opportunities. *The Authority Board authorized staff to forward the Contra Costa Electric Vehicle Readiness Blueprint to the California Energy Commission by July 31, 2019 to be eligible for future funding opportunities.*

3. **Release of the Draft 2019 Congestion Management Program (CMP).** As the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Contra Costa County, the Authority is responsible for preparing a CMP and updating it every other year. The Authority adopted its first CMP in 1991 and the 2019 CMP will be the Authority's fourteenth update. Based on the scope approved by the Authority Board in December, staff has prepared the draft 2019 CMP for circulation, review and comment by the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs), Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) and other interested parties. Comments will be incorporated into a revised draft CMP to be forwarded to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in October. *The Authority Board authorized staff to release the draft 2019 Congestion Management Program to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees and other interested parties for review and comment.*

**TRANSPAC**  
**Transportation Partnership and Cooperation**  
Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek and Contra Costa County  
1211 Newell Avenue, Suite 200  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
(925) 937-0980

July 5, 2019

Randell H. Iwasaki  
Executive Director  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

**RE: Initial Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan**

Dear Mr. Iwasaki:

At their July 3, 2019 meeting TRANSPAC received information from Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) staff on the Preliminary Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) (published June 19, 2019) and the Detailed Expenditure Plan table (dated July 3, 2019) and discussed the funding categories and policies included in the plan.

The TRANSPAC Board will continue to review the TEP process and schedule additional meetings as required to provide timely input. The next TRANSPAC meeting is scheduled to be on July 18, 2019, that should allow for review of the next iteration of the TEP document expected to be released.

Improve Traffic Flow on State Route 24 and Modernize the Old Bores of Caldecott Tunnel; Modernization and Safety Improvements of Old Bores of Caldecott Tunnel – TRANSPAC discussed the SWAT comment regarding the Caldecott Tunnel and that it was funded with Measure J funds from both SWAT and TRANSPAC sub-regions. TRANSPAC expressed support to include \$2.5 million of Central County TEP funds for this project in a similar manner as in Measure J. TRANSPAC suggests reducing the Central County “Reduce Emissions and Improve Air Quality” category in a like amount.

Vision Zero Policy and Advance Mitigation Policy: TRANSPAC discussed the inclusion of the policies in the TEP and the need to detail in a way that clearly conveys the purpose of the policies for the diverse TEP audience. Neither term is used in everyday language, and we want to ensure it is understood how the TEP will support pedestrian and bicycle safety, as well as providing for required environmental mitigation in a manner that will avoid delays to ultimately constructing projects needs to be highlighted. The TRANSPAC discussion also included the observation that the two policy statements are located as standalone sections at the back end of the TEP document and that the current TEP format does not make a strong connection to what TEP funding will be used to achieve the Visions Zero and Advance Mitigation Policies. This also could include making a stronger connection within the funding category information to the TEP Policies.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input and for considering TRANSPAC's comments and recommendations. Please contact the TRANSPAC Chairperson Sue Noack or the TRANSPAC Managing Director if you have any questions or want to further discuss.

Sincerely,



Matthew Todd  
TRANSPAC Managing Director

cc: TRANSPAC Representatives; TRANSPAC TAC and staff  
Jamar I. Stamps, TRANSPLAN; Sean Wright, Chair, TRANSPLAN  
Lisa Bobadilla, SWAT; David Hudson, Chair, SWAT  
John Nemeth, WCCTAC; Chris Kelly, Chair, WCCTAC  
Tim Haile, CCTA Staff  
Hisham Noemi, CCTA Staff  
Tarienne Grover, CCTA Staff  
June Catalano, Diane Bentley (City of Pleasant Hill)

**TRANSPAC**  
**Transportation Partnership and Cooperation**  
Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek and Contra Costa County  
1211 Newell Avenue, Suite 200  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
(925) 937-0980

July 31, 2019

Randell H. Iwasaki  
Executive Director  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

**RE: Initial Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan**

Dear Mr. Iwasaki:

At their July 18, 2019 meeting TRANSPAC received information from Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) staff on the Initial Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) (published July 11, 2019) and discussed the funding categories and policies included in the plan.

The TRANSPAC Board will continue to review the TEP process and schedule additional meetings as required to provide timely input. TRANSPAC discussed meeting on August 15, 2019 to review any additional TEP information that becomes available in the next few weeks.

Improve Access to Job Centers and Housing - TRANSPAC discussed the funding category *Focused Growth, Support Economic Development, and Create Jobs in Contra Costa* (included in Preliminary Draft TEP, June 19, 2019) and revisions to the TEP that resulted in the creation of the *Modernize Local Roads and Improve Access to Job Centers and Housing* (included in the Initial Draft TEP, July 11, 2019). The TRANSPAC Board strongly supports the revision to the *Guiding Principles Used to Develop the TEP* the CCTA approved on July 17<sup>th</sup>, that added the following principle:

**ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY**

CCTA recognizes that adding jobs closer to residents' homes can reduce commute times, greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled. CCTA will consider making sales tax revenue available in many expenditure categories to partially

fund transportation infrastructure that is likely to result in significant job growth, such as the Northern Waterfront.

TRANSPAC further supports the inclusion of this principle throughout the TEP document, as a critical concept that should be an overall consideration in TEP funding decisions. TRANSPAC also discussed considerations for how to better utilize corridors with reverse commute system capacity, and the relation to future job growth in Contra Costa County. The TEP is called upon to support many aspects of the transportation system, with the funds strategically spread over the multiple transportation investment categories. TRANSPAC supports the *Improve Access to Job Centers and Housing* aspect included in the Initial Draft TEP, and also supports retaining the allocation categories and levels of fund investment included in the July 11<sup>th</sup> version of the Initial Draft TEP. TRANSPAC does not support the reduction of other investment categories to include an additional TEP category in that isolates the policy issue.

Modernize Local Roads and Improve Access to Job Centers and Housing – TRANSPAC reviewed the level of funding across all the categories in the Initial Draft TEP, including the increase of funds provided to the category that would assist local agencies in modernizing local roads. TRANSPAC concurred with the increase in level of funding, to provide 18% to this category for Central County.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input and for considering TRANSPAC's comments and recommendations. Please contact the TRANSPAC Vice Chairperson Carlyn Obringer or the TRANSPAC Managing Director if you have any questions or want to further discuss the above items.

Sincerely,



Matthew Todd  
TRANSPAC Managing Director

cc: TRANSPAC Representatives; TRANSPAC TAC and staff  
Jamar I. Stamps, TRANSPLAN; Sean Wright, Chair, TRANSPLAN  
Lisa Bobadilla, SWAT; David Hudson, Chair, SWAT  
John Nemeth, WCCTAC; Chris Kelly, Chair, WCCTAC  
Tim Haile, CCTA Staff  
Hisham Noemi, CCTA Staff  
Tarienne Grover, CCTA Staff  
June Catalano, Diane Bentley (City of Pleasant Hill)

**TRANSPAC**

**Transportation Partnership and Cooperation**

Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek and Contra Costa County  
1211 Newell Avenue, Suite 200  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
(925) 937-0980

August 19, 2019

Randell H. Iwasaki  
Executive Director  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

**RE: Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan**

Dear Mr. Iwasaki:

At their August 15, 2019 meeting TRANSPAC received information from Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) staff on the Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) (published August 14, 2019) and discussed the funding categories and policies included in the plan.

TRANSPAC discussed the funding category *Reduce and Reverse Commutes* as it is presented in the latest draft of the Plan. TRANSPAC continues to support the Economic Opportunity principle and the inclusion of this principle throughout the TEP document as a critical concept that should be an overall consideration in TEP funding decisions. That could include projects to support the utilization of corridors with reverse commute system capacity and that could support future job growth in Contra Costa County. TRANSPAC also supported the program descriptions and distribution of funds as detailed in the Draft TEP (published August 14, 2019).

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input and for considering TRANSPAC's comments and recommendations. Please contact the TRANSPAC Chairperson Sue Noack or the TRANSPAC Managing Director if you have any questions or want to further discuss the above items.

Sincerely,



Matthew Todd  
TRANSPAC Managing Director

cc: TRANSPAC Representatives; TRANSPAC TAC and staff  
Jamar I. Stamps, TRANSPAN; Sean Wright, Chair, TRANSPAN  
Lisa Bobadilla, SWAT; David Hudson, Chair, SWAT  
John Nemeth, WCCTAC; Chris Kelly, Chair, WCCTAC

Tim Haile, CCTA Staff  
Hisham Noemi, CCTA Staff  
Tarienne Grover, CCTA Staff  
June Catalano, Diane Bentley (City of Pleasant Hill)

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

# TRANSPLAN COMMITTEE

## EAST COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Antioch • Brentwood • Oakley • Pittsburg • Contra Costa County  
30 Muir Road, Martinez, CA 94553

---

July 1, 2019

Mr. Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority (“CCTA”)  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Dear Mr. Iwasaki:

This correspondence reports on the actions and discussions during the TRANSPLAN Committee special meeting on June 27, 2019.

**RECEIVE report on development of potential New Transportation Expenditure Plan (“TEP”).** The Committee received updates from TRANSPLAN and Contra Costa Transportation Authority staff. After discussion, the Committee decided to forego transmitting a comment letter until after the July 25, 2019 TRANSPLAN special meeting. TRANSPLAN would like to review polling results before finalizing comments on the TEP. In addition, the Committee will have further discussion regarding their position on the Local Street Maintenance allocation percentage.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (925) 674-7832 or email at [jamar.stamps@dcd.cccounty.us](mailto:jamar.stamps@dcd.cccounty.us).

Sincerely,



Jamar Stamps, AICP  
TRANSPLAN Staff

c: TRANSPLAN Committee  
L. Bobadilla, SWAT/TVTC  
M. Todd, TRANSPAC  
J. Nemeth, WCCTAC

T. Grover, CCTA  
Robert E. Doyle, EBRPD  
D. Dennis, ECCRFFA

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

# TRANSPLAN COMMITTEE

## EAST COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Antioch • Brentwood • Oakley • Pittsburg • Contra Costa County  
30 Muir Road, Martinez, CA 94553

---

July 1, 2019

Mr. Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority (“CCTA”)  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Dear Mr. Iwasaki:

This correspondence reports on the actions and discussions during the TRANSPLAN Committee special meeting on June 27, 2019.

**RECEIVE report on development of potential New Transportation Expenditure Plan (“TEP”).** The Committee received updates from TRANSPLAN and Contra Costa Transportation Authority staff. After discussion, the Committee decided to forego transmitting a comment letter until after the July 25, 2019 TRANSPLAN special meeting. TRANSPLAN would like to review polling results before finalizing comments on the TEP. In addition, the Committee will have further discussion regarding their position on the Local Street Maintenance allocation percentage.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (925) 674-7832 or email at [jamar.stamps@dcd.cccounty.us](mailto:jamar.stamps@dcd.cccounty.us).

Sincerely,



Jamar Stamps, AICP  
TRANSPLAN Staff

c: TRANSPLAN Committee  
L. Bobadilla, SWAT/TVTC  
M. Todd, TRANSPAC  
J. Nemeth, WCCTAC

T. Grover, CCTA  
Robert E. Doyle, EBRPD  
D. Dennis, ECCRFFA

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



# SWAT

Danville • Lafayette • Moraga • Orinda • San Ramon & the County of Contra Costa

August 7, 2019

Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

**RE: SWAT Meeting Summary Report for August 5, 2019 - Comments on Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan ("TEP") dated July 18, 2019**

Dear Mr. Iwasaki:

At a regularly scheduled meeting on August 5, 2019, the Southwest Area Transportation Committee ("SWAT") received an update from the Contra Costa Transportation Authority ("Authority") staff on the updated Draft Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan ("TEP"), and continued discussions on various funding categories related to components of the plan.

At this time, I'm pleased to report that SWAT concurs with the proposed TEP! From the beginning of this process, SWAT held several meetings and provided opportunities for the local cities, towns and the County to weigh in on the proposed expenditure plans. Ultimately, we have come together as a region, with collective input from all member agencies to gain consensus. With that said, I'm happy to report that SWAT supports the current TEP, dated July 18, 2019, and respectfully adds the following comment for consideration by the Authority:

1. **Sub-regional Flexibility** - SWAT will continue to advocate for sub-regional flexibility, which is consistent with the Authority and SWAT past practice. We recognize that each sub-region has different needs that necessitate different approaches. Consequently, SWAT will continue pursuing and advocating for sub-regional approach to program funding categories in the Proposed TEP, such as:
  - a. Seamless Connected Transportation Options;
  - b. Improve Walking and Biking on Streets and Trails;
  - c. Reduce Emissions and Improve Air Quality; and
  - d. Improve Transportation and Access to Job Centers.

SWAT appreciates the opportunities we have had to provide thoughtful and constructive input throughout this process. We acknowledge that the development of the Plan required a tremendous amount of hard work and collaboration among the Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC's), the Authority and other stakeholders.

Therefore, SWAT wishes to express our gratitude and appreciation to Authority staff for attending SWAT TAC and SWAT meetings to initiate the discussions, gather our feedback and listen to concerns raised.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide input on this worthwhile endeavor. Please contact SWAT Admin staff, Lisa Bobadilla at (925) 973-2651 or email at [lbobadilla@sanramon.ca.gov](mailto:lbobadilla@sanramon.ca.gov), if you should have any questions.

Sincerely,



Dave Hudson, Chair  
SWAT

Cc: Tim Haile, CCTA; Hisham Noeimi, CCTA; SWAT; SWAT TAC; Matt Todd, TRANSPAC; John Nemeth, WCCTAC; Jamar Stamps, TRANSPLAN

El Cerrito

Hercules

July 16, 2019

Pinole

Randy Iwasaki  
Contra Costa Transportation Authority  
2999 Oak Road, #100  
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

**RE: Initial Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan**

Richmond

Dear Randy,

I am writing to provide the WCCTAC Board's feedback on the Initial Draft TEP that was released by the Authority on July 11, 2019. The WCCTAC Board held a special meeting on July 12, 2019 to discuss the TEP. The conclusions from that meeting are described below.

San Pablo

First, the WCCTAC Board appreciates the hard work and dedication of the CCTA Commissioners and staff. WCCTAC believes that the Initial Draft TEP has a thoughtful and compelling framework, with an emphasis on addressing traffic congestion in major corridors in Contra Costa County, while also considering other key transportation needs. In short, WCCTAC is generally happy with the document.

Contra Costa  
County

WCCTAC also very much appreciates the willingness of the Authority to accept our Board's feedback on the proposed funding allocation by category. At this time, WCCTAC does not have any concerns about the categories in the TEP, the names of the categories, or the amount of funding proposed to be allocated to each category. At this time, WCCTAC is also satisfied with the policies that have been developed for the TEP and does not have any additional feedback.

AC Transit

WCCTAC is, however, seeking clarification in three main areas.

BART

General Follow-up Questions

First, WCCTAC would like greater assurance that the proposed funding allocations by subregion will remain in place if the measure passes. Right now, the overall, county-wide funding allocation by category is included in the TEP document on page 4. However, the breakdown by subregion is not included. The WCCTAC Board proposes that the allocation by sub-region be included somewhere in the TEP document, perhaps at the end. This breakdown by subregion should include both dollars and percentages. If the Authority does not want to include this information in the document because it considers it to be too much

WestCAT

detail for voters, WCCTAC would like to see this sub-regional breakdown enshrined somewhere else.

Secondly, the elimination of the *Regional Transportation Priorities* category has potentially serious implications for WCCTAC. As with Measure J 28b (subregional needs), this category would have provided a small amount of flexible funding for subregions. In WCCTAC's case, Measure J 28b funds have been critical over the last few years for leveraging outside dollars from state, regional and other local agencies. In fact, WCCTAC has used approximately \$600K to leverage over \$3M in grant funding since 2015. Just as Measure J has provided the Authority with the ability to leverage other dollars, so the 28b category has allowed WCCTAC some small, independent leveraging capability, which helps to maximize total transportation dollars for Contra Costa County.

The WCCTAC Board understands that the Authority may have removed the *Regional Transportation Priorities* category in order to limit the total number of categories and streamline the measure for voters. However, this removal raises questions about how WCCTAC will be able to utilize funding in the new measure to quickly and easily obtain matching funds for grants. Could WCCTAC tap into related funding categories within the TEP to obtain grant match money? If so, which categories? How easily will this be to do in practice? If the proposed funding categories in the TEP are not a practical source of grant matching funds because of infrequent funding cycles, formula-based funding, or because eligible projects are defined in advance, how does the Authority propose that matching funds could be obtained? Would the Authority consider carving out a special West County fund for grant matches within the Planning, Facilities, and Services category? Is there another way to accomplish this goal in the TEP?

Lastly, the WCCTAC Board has some questions about the general flexibility of the TEP. The Board understands and appreciates that the TEP will be re-evaluated every ten years. The Board also appreciates that if funds cannot be used for a particular project, that those funds could be shifted to a different project. The Board also understands that expenditure plan amendments by majority vote will be allowed in order to account for unforeseen circumstances. The Board is assuming that funds will generally not be re-purposed across categories and will not generally be re-purposed across subregions. Is that correct? The Board is also curious about how much flexibility will be allowed within each funding category. When the Authority creates funding guidelines after the passage of a measure, how much will be defined in advance and how much will be left flexible? How much of a role will RTPCs have in shaping the funding guidelines after passage, and in helping to guide investments in the future?

#### Text Corrections and Feedback

In addition to general questions about three subjects discussed above, WCCTAC has some specific feedback on the text of the TEP, as follows:

- On page 16, the document notes that "In 2017, three major freeways in Contra Costa County rank in the top 10 worst commutes: I-680, Highway 24, and Highway 4." This statement should probably be put in the past tense. Also, critically, it is missing I-80,

which consistently ranks near the top of the worst Bay Area commutes. It may also be missing I-580.

- On page 22, the WCCTAC Board would like to see more clarity or specificity around terms like: “maximize system efficiency”, “managed lane strategies”, and “shared mobility hubs”. The general public does not necessarily know what these things are.
- On page 23, under the “Enhance Ferry Service and Commuter Rail Service in West County” header, the text notes that CCTA will “consider” funding a new intermodal station. However, this would seem to be the very purpose of this line item. WCCTAC suggests stronger language related to this long standing priority project. One option is to simply remove the word, “consider”.
- On page 23, there could be a bit more clarity or information about what dedicated, part-time transit lanes might entail.

We thank you once again for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "John Nemeth". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

John Nemeth  
WCCTAC Executive Director