

TRANSPAC TAC MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2019

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

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

1. Minutes of the May 30, 2019, June 11, 2019, and August 29, 2019 Meeting

ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Approve Minutes

Attachment(s)

- TAC minutes from the May 30, 2019 meeting
- TAC minutes from the June 11, 2019 meeting
- TAC minutes from the August 29, 2019 meeting.

2. TRANSPAC Strategic Planning Discussion. TRANSPAC requested a strategic planning discussion to review the TRANSPAC scope of work, prioritization of work, and how we complete that work. The TRANSPAC TAC and TRANSPAC Board discussed this item at their August and September meetings. The TRANSPAC Board requested the TRANSPAC TAC to continue the discussion and to identify, from the topics discussed to date, a recommendation for initial items that should be addressed as well as actions items that can be taken in the next year to support those items.

Attachment(s)

- Summary of TRANSPAC Strategic Planning Discussion
- TRANSPAC 2018/2019 Work Plan
- TRANSPAC 2019/2020 DRAFT Work Plan (dated April 2019)

3. 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 Draft TEP on August 28, 2019. Assuming the Draft TEP is approved by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors and the City/Town Councils representing both majority of the cities/towns in Contra Costa County and majority of the population residing in the incorporated areas of Contra Costa County, the Draft TEP will be considered by the Authority for final approval on October 30, 2019. Additional information on the TEP approval process is included in the attached material.

Attachment(s)

- CCTA Draft TEP Schedule Information

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

Attachment: CCTA Local Funding Opportunities Summary Update September 4, 2019

5. Committee Updates:

- a. Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC): The next meeting is scheduled for October 17, 2019.
- b. Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC): The next meeting is scheduled for November 25, 2019.
- c. Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC): The next meeting is scheduled for November 18, 2019.

6. Future Agenda Items:

- The CCTA Calendar for September to December 2019 may be downloaded at:
https://ccta.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=482&meta_id=46561

7. Member Comments

8. Next Meeting: October 31, 2019

MEETING DATE: May 30, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Churchill, County Connection; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Abhishek Parikh, Concord; Colin Piethe, Contra Costa County; and Andy Smith, Walnut Creek

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

GUESTS/PRESENTERS: Ralph Dennis, Golden Rain Foundation; and Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA)

MINUTES PREPARED BY: Anita Tucci-Smith

The meeting convened at 9:05 A.M.

1. Minutes of the April 25, 2019 Meeting

The minutes of the April 25, 2019 meeting were approved by consensus.

- 2. Measure J Line 20a Amendment – Rossmoor On Demand MicroTransit Pilot.** Measure J Expenditure Plan includes a program, 15: Transportation for Seniors & People with Disabilities. The name generally self-describes the activities that the program funds. There is an additional program in Measure J, 20a: Additional Transportation Services for Seniors & People with Disabilities, which provides the TRANSPAC area an additional 0.5% for these types of services. TRANSPAC is responsible for recommendations on how the Line Item 20a funds are to be used. The Golden Rain Foundation (Rossmoor) is requesting an amendment to its Measure J Line 20a funds grant for the On Demand MicroTransit Pilot (approved in spring 2018). The project included purchasing scheduling software that would allow for the provision of a demand-response, point-to-point transit service within Rossmoor and the neighboring Walnut Creek community while maintaining the use of the already owned bus fleet, dispatch and drivers. After the initial operating and evaluation period of the pilot, the Golden Rain Foundation has identified a software program that will better serve the needs of the program at a reduced cost, and is requesting approval to utilize remaining grant funds of \$10,500 for an additional pilot partnership with GoGo Grandparents for a subsidized On Demand service for service after normal operating hours after normal fixed route service ends at 5:00 P.M. GoGo Grandparents provides a dispatch service utilizing Uber and Lyft. Patrons would be able to call GoGo Grandparents to request a ride to any location with an up to \$10 subsidy of each ride and the remaining balance of the ride being charged to the patron. Additional information available at the meeting.

Matt Todd explained that the Golden Rain Foundation (Rossmoor) had requested an amendment to its Measure J Line 20a funds grant for the On Demand MicroTransit Pilot previously approved, which included purchasing scheduling software that would allow for the provision of a demand-response, point-to-point transit service within Rossmoor and the neighboring Walnut Creek community while maintaining the use of the already owned bus fleet, dispatch, and drivers. After a year of the pilot program, the Golden Rain Foundation had identified a software program that would better serve the needs of the program at a reduced cost, and requested approval to utilize remaining grant funds of \$10,500 for an additional pilot partnership with GoGo Grandparents for a subsidized On Demand service for service after normal operating hours and after normal fixed route service ended at 5:00 P.M. The new program was called Cad Labs under Jungleworks and offered a more customized program. He described it as a TNC [transportation network carrier] similar to the software used in the first year.

Ralph Dennis, Golden Rain Foundation, explained how the new software would work to provide trips for the hours after the normal bus routes operated, which he suggested would allow residents to do more outside the community after hours. He described how the program worked, how a new software program for the regular service hours represented an improvement over the former program with Transloc, Inc., and how it would save money over time. The new software would be procured under a license for one year.

Bill Churchill was not opposed with what Rossmoor had proposed, and was not opposed to the TNC model for after-hours service, particularly in a contained environment, supported the experimentation with different software, but urged caution with the TNC model since TNCs could bleed off of fixed route provided trips. If that were to occur, he explained that a negative problem would be created in that congestion would be added instead of being reduced. He noted there were certain areas/scenarios where it would be challenging for fixed route service to be effective. He recommended setting up caps on rides or dollar value, time of day or other component to help contain the experiment.

Mr. Churchill also noted that County Connection had recently gone out to bid for paratransit and Transdev had won the contract and had proposed a TNC that specialized in providing accessible TNC services, creating partnerships with small transportation companies that had accessible vehicles, and used their software and dispatching to create it and to provide service for those in outlying areas who were not served by regular providers. Through the dollar volume of the contract, he suggested there may be a way to leverage the program in pockets in the subregion in the future.

Colin Piethe echoed the comments of containment and agreed the most appropriate place to use it would be for seniors and the disabled to avoid taking away from regular transit service.

Abhishek Parikh asked if there was a desire to keep subsidizing rides with Line 20a funds, and the discussion centered on the models being used to cap the subsidies.

Mr. Dennis advised that for the Rossmoor program there would be a \$10 cap. He explained that the farthest point in Walnut Creek from Rossmoor would be \$7 for Lyft and the \$10 had been incorporated to cover the ride and the administrative fee. The patron would be charged for the remaining balance if going beyond that point. The \$10,500 was being requested for a three-month pilot. He also described working with Cad Labs to produce an algorithm that would be workable with Rossmoor's needs.

The TAC discussed the issues raised, the fact that continued subsidies could not be guaranteed, whether Line 20a funds were intended as a lifeline or to provide continuing funds, and requested direction from the TRANSPAC Board in that regard.

Mr. Todd suggested that the issue should be flushed out before the next two-year call for projects, and a discussion should determine whether there were certain requirements for TNC based service, time limits, amount of subsidy, type of rides, how much of grant funds should be dedicated to short-term experiments, and other policy issues. He verified that the current item under discussion was the request for the funds already awarded with a recommendation to the TRANSPAC Board for approval.

The TAC recommended the TRANSPAC Board's approval of Rossmoor's amendment to the Measure J Line 20a funds for its on demand micro transit project.

- 3. 2020 Transportation Expenditure Plan.** At its May 15, 2019 meeting, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) authorized staff to proceed with the development of a new Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) for possible placement on the March 2020 ballot. Included in the material provided was a TEP development schedule that includes the anticipated release of an initial Draft TEP in early June. Information attached to assist in discussing the proposed 2020 TEP includes CCTA Guiding Principles for Development of a TEP, a TEP workplan, schedule information, and the projects and programs included in the 2016 TEP. The TRANSPAC TAC is requested to provide input regarding projects and programs to include in the proposed 2020 TEP.

Mr. Todd referred to the proposed schedule to develop a Transportation Expenditure Plan for the March 2020 ballot, the short timeframe involved, and the need for a consensus on the TEP. He explained that the CCTA had been scheduling special meetings to address the issue.

As background, Hisham Noeimi stated that in November 2016 Measure X did not garner the required two thirds votes to pass. If adopted, it would have generated \$2.9 billion in 2016 dollars at that time.

Measure X had been supported by the Taxpayers Association, a 30-year plan which would have started on April 1, 2017 and would have augmented the sales tax by half a cent. He stated that Measure J would expire in 2034. Measure X would have run from April 1, 2017 to 2047.

Mr. Noeimi advised that the CCTA Board had instructed staff to work on a TEP for the March 2020 ballot, which would offer little time for preparation. The new TEP would start with the proposals in the prior Measure X, fine-tuned based on polling, which had just been completed by EMC Research and had been presented to the CCTA Board on May 15. The polling was similar to what it had been in 2016, about 67 percent in support, although there was a margin of error. Traffic had been the top concern at that time. In this case, housing and traffic were competing for the area of greatest concern.

In terms of what resonated with the voters, Mr. Noeimi explained that two ballot questions had been tested; outcome based versus project based. Outcome based language seemed to work better. In Central County the highest concerns were reducing congestion on I-680, I-80, SR-24, and SR-4; reducing congestion on highways in general; requiring funds to directly benefit commuters; making BART trains safer; and increasing frequency, among others. He referred to the huge needs for transportation improvements and explained that a local fund source was needed to provide matching funds and that with no local money the projects would not compete well for other funding sources. Measure J funding had virtually been utilized at this point. There were also needs on local streets, and while SB1 helped it wouldn't cover all the local needs. A new measure would generate about \$3 billion thirty years out based on the assumptions of the conservative strategic plan.

Mr. Noeimi spoke to the public outreach for a new TEP, the stakeholders involved, that Bike East Bay wanted 10 percent of the funds for bike related improvements, and there were some issues to address such as the 30-acre exemption for changing the Urban Limit Line (ULL), which had been an issue in the past.

Mr. Noeimi reported that there would be special CCTA Board meetings on June 3 and June 12, with the regular CCTA Board meeting scheduled for June 19, at which time the goal was to finalize the Draft TEP, solicit comments from the RTPCs, and have all input by the end of July to refine, revise, and adopt a Final TEP by August, at which point the process would require approval from the cities and the county to place it on the ballot (a majority of the cities representing the majority of the population). Measure X had been unanimously supported by all the cities and the county. The county would have to submit the item in November for placement on the March 2020 ballot. He identified the ad hoc committee comprised of five members of the CCTA Board to facilitate the TEP process.

Mr. Noeimi referred to the projects from the old measure and noted the potential for an extra \$60 million to identify for projects.

M. Noeimi also referred to the reluctance to dedicate more funds to BART but explained that cleaning up stations and making BART safer had been recommended. As a result, whatever was included for BART would have to be carefully crafted.

Mr. Noeimi referred to the list of projects from the prior TEP and requested updated information to change, remove or clarify the projects on the list. He walked through all the projects on the list and expressed a desire to include example projects to help inform the voting public.

On the discussion of the list and a new TEP, TAC members offered the following comments:

- Consider that the failure of Measure X had to do with the fact that there had been no marquee project;
- Instead of spending so much money on BART, the majority of the funds could be spent on Bus on Shoulders or improvement to transit frequency;
- Maintain the existing system as a top priority;
- Some jurisdictions such as Walnut Creek and Concord suffered significantly from pass through traffic,
- Educate the voting public as to what the measures past and present had done, specifically that they had addressed the different needs of the different regions of the county;
- Work with other RTPCs to develop programs or service, such as bus passes or a school bus program;
- Recommend that the TRANSPAC Board increase funds for local street maintenance;
- Recommend cutting funds to BART and placing more funds for Safe Transportation to Children, increase funds for transit and bikes as the most viable non-auto modes of transportation to get people in, around, and out of Central County;
- Emphasize and facilitate first mile/last mile to BART, increase parking at BART stations, consider free bus shuttles, free feeder services, and subsidize the fare (fast, frequent, and free) to BART stations;
- Request a category for "access improvement to BART stations and the last mile to BART stations;"
- Recommend clarifying the different phases of the I-680/SR4 Improvement Project to ensure that the voting public was aware that more than one project/phase was involved.

The TAC discussed potential special meeting dates and designated a special meeting on Tuesday, June 11, 2019 from 11:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M., with a potential second special meeting for the same time on June 20, 2019, if needed. The potential for a meeting on July 25, 2019 was also noted.

- 4. Innovate 680 Corridor Project Status.** Contra Costa Transportation Authority to provide an update on the project.

Mr. Noeimi presented a status of the four projects as part of Innovate 680: I-680 NB Express Lane (Strategy 1 and 2); Bus on Shoulder (Strategy 3); and Transit Improvements (Strategy 4). He reported that for the I-680 NB Express Lane, a contract with HDR for the environmental would be submitted to the CCTA Board for approval. For Bus on Shoulder, a contract with Kimley-Horn and Associates had been approved and there would be a kick-off meeting with the CHP towards the end of the month. The Transit Improvements portion would wait for corridor management consultants to get help with the RFP before selecting a consultant, and pushing Caltrans to complete a PSR for I-680.

In terms of a corridor manager, Mr. Noeimi identified the consultants selected to do the various components of the project, to be taken to the June 14, 2019 CCTA Board meeting for approval. He identified the individual funds that had been secured, totaling \$122 million in dedicated funds for the Innovate 680 project, the large shortfall that remained, and the attempt to get the project shovel ready to be able secure additional resources when available. He added that a PowerPoint presentation would be made to the TRANSPAC Board at its next meeting.

5. **2020 State Transportation Improvements Program Call for Projects.** The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) has issued the Call for Projects for the 2020 State Transportation Improvements Program (STIP). The 2020 STIP will add programming of funds, if available, in Fiscal Year (FY) 2023-24 and FY 2024-25. The STIP funds can be used to fund one or more phases of a Capital Project (e.g. environmental clearance, design, Right-of-Way (ROW) and/or construction). Applications are limited to no more than two per jurisdiction and are due to CCTA on July 12, 2019 by 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Noeimi reported that the deadline for submitting projects for the \$20 to \$30 million in STIP funds would be July 12, 2019. He identified the projects to be submitted including funds for the I-680/SR4 Improvement Project, Phases 1 and 2. He reported that safety projects, traffic congestion projects, and transit/intermodal projects all tended to compete well and he encouraged cities to apply. He added that the application was simple; if the project was on a state highway there had to be a Project Study Report (PSR); if not a PSR equivalent with scope, schedule, and cost would be required. Information and supporting materials were available at <https://ccta.net/about-us/#funding>. Funds would not be available until FY 2024 and FY 2025.

6. **2020 State Transportation Improvements Program Review Committee.** TRANSPAC TAC is requested to identify two (2) volunteers to serve on the CCTA 2020 STIP evaluation committee. The evaluation meeting is anticipated to occur in late July.

Given that not all members were available, Mr. Todd stated the matter would be considered at the special TAC meeting on June 11, 2019.

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

Mr. Todd referred to the CCTA Local Agency Funding Opportunities Summary dated April 8, 2019 in the meeting packet.

8. Committee Updates

There were no Committee updates.

9. Future Agenda Items

There were no future agenda items.

10. Member Comments

There were no comments.

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 A.M. to the next meeting, a special meeting on June 11, 2019 at 11:00 A.M., and then to the regular meeting on June 27, 2019.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

MEETING DATE: June 11, 2019

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

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

GUESTS/PRESENTERS: Ray Akkawi, AMG; and Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA)

MINUTES PREPARED BY: Anita Tucci-Smith

The special meeting of the TRANSPAC TAC convened at 11:10 A.M.

1. **2020 Transportation Expenditure Plan.** At its May 15, 2019 meeting, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) authorized staff to proceed with the development of a new Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) for possible placement on the March 2020 ballot. Included in the attached material is a TEP development schedule. An initial Draft TEP had been discussed by the CCTA on June 5, 2019 at a Special Board Meeting. The CCTA will also discuss a range of other TEP topics including schedule, outreach, revenue estimate and funding targets, proposed TEP structure and strategies at the June 5, 2019 meeting. The TRANSPAC TAC began discussing this item at its meeting on May 30, 2019 by reviewing the 2016 TEP project list with categories being discussed including transit, school access, local streets and roads, major arterial projects, BART access, assumptions for leveraging other funding, and larger phased projects. TRANSPAC TAC is requested to review and comment on the proposed TEP process as well as projects and programs to include in the proposed 2020 TEP. TRANSPAC TAC is also requested to review additional special meeting dates, with the CCTA proposing to approve a final version of a TEP in late August. Additional information regarding the CCTA TEP schedule is expected to be available for the June 11, 2019 TRANSPAC TAC meeting and additional information regarding proposed special meeting dates to be considered will be provided at the meeting.

Matt Todd reported the CCTA had held special meetings to continue the discussion for a Transportation Expenditure Plan for possible placement on the March 2020 ballot. The discussions had centered around the overall schedule, an outreach plan, additional special meetings, funding needs, the term and rate of any proposed sales tax, a sunset or no sunset of a measure, structure, categories in example projects, and other options.

Mr. Todd explained that August 21, 2019 would be the critical path for an approved TEP, to then be submitted to the cities for support, requiring 50 percent of the cities representing 50 percent of the population. CCTA had seven meetings planned between now and August 21 and the TRANSPAC TAC might also have to schedule additional meetings. The TRANSPAC Board would meet on June 13, and it was his hope the TAC could submit amendments to the TEP at that time.

Hisham Noeimi distributed an updated list of project examples and types per funding category to inform the discussion and identified each of the funding categories and Central County projects. He reported that at this point, 22 percent of the TEP had been allocated to freeway or infrastructure projects to reduce congestion and there were two proposals for BART; \$100 million for station mobilization and \$100 million for eBART cars and access improvements outside of BART property. He highlighted the differences between the previous Measure X and the current TEP and identified what the polling had produced where people wanted reliable frequent transit, clean and safe BART, and relief from congestion. He spoke to multiple goals, identified some of the major proposals throughout the County, and emphasized the importance to the cities of local streets and road maintenance (return to source).

Mr. Todd distributed several handouts including the StreetSaver 10-Year Analysis of Pavement Conditions, explained that based on the StreetSaver analysis, SB1 funding was not sufficient to address the pavement maintenance backlog in Contra Costa County, and stated that more local streets funding would be required. He noted the more maintenance was delayed the higher the cost to fix.

Mr. Noeimi referred to the handout for Capital Projects with Funding Shortfalls and identified the many goals, some conflicting. He spoke to a reasonable level of return to source to address the needs of the cities and what would appeal to the voters. He added the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) was still working on the numbers and he characterized the process as a balancing act in that what worked in one subregion might not work in another.

Mr. Noeimi stated that a third of the funding in the proposed financial plan, by formula, would go to cities through major streets for traffic flow, interchange improvements, return to source, and bike/ped. He spoke to interest from the bike/ped and environmental communities who wanted to see performance-based projects to reduce greenhouse gases and VMT [vehicle miles traveled]. He also spoke to the need to attract jobs to reduce commutes, funding for seamless connections between transit systems, and some flexibility in the measure given that it would go out 30 years and technology would change. The current proposal was different from Measure X given a greater focus on transit.

Mr. Noeimi referred to the discussions related to the allocation of funds for return to source, the desire of some subregions for a 23 percent return to source, and the fact that if Central County wanted 23 percent, it would have to eliminate \$69 million from other areas of the TEP.

To clarify the return to source discussion, Mr. Noeimi stated that Measure J's 18 percent return to source would expire in 2034, and a 15 percent return to source in a new measure would add to the 18 percent (in Measure J) until it expired in 2034. He noted that one proposal was to provide about 12 percent of the new measure for return to source through 2034, and to provide about 18 percent of the new measure for return to source for the remainder of the new measure. Some cities had supported a consistent amount and there were several options to consider to get that done.

Abhishek Parikh advised that the City of Concord wanted a return to source greater than 15 percent, and had expressed a preference for 30 percent.

Robert Sarmiento reported that the County would accept 22 percent as included for Measure X.

Eric Hu stated the priority for the City of Pleasant Hill would be a return to source of 23 percent consistent with Measure X along with the regional routes and arterial streets, which to him went hand in hand.

Mr. Parikh referred to projects that benefitted more than one subregion, such as Ygnacio Valley Road, and suggested rather than taking the money from local streets there might need to be a separate category to identify regionally beneficial routes.

Scott Alman emphasized the need to educate the city councils to the situation related to return to source since each city preferred a higher percentage, and whether that could jeopardize the adoption of the measure.

Mr. Noeimi suggested that 23 percent or less would be acceptable according to the polling data from EMC Research produced in May 2019, where 1,300 people had been interviewed, and where it had been found that 67 percent (plus or minus three percent) would support the measure. He explained that those interviewed had been given two ballot languages, one traditional and one more outcome based, and the outcome based language was preferred. He read the two references to the TAC. For Central County, the things that resonated were reducing congestion, making BART stations cleaner and safer, improving the frequency and safety of BART, transit, and ferry. He noted that Measure X had received 63.5 percent of the vote in 2016 where 66 2/3rds was required for passage.

Mr. Tanner stated with respect to BART safety and cleaner BART that BART would sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Contra Costa and other counties using some of the \$100 million of other funds to address those issues. In order for Contra Costa residents to see the benefit, all stations would have to be made cleaner and safer. He clarified that the money from this measure would remain in Contra Costa County.

Mr. Noeimi commented that BART had access to Measure RR funds as well. He also commented with respect to the two BART categories that of the \$100 million for Contra Costa County, \$30 million would be allocated to Central County for station modernization. Most of that \$30 million would be spent in Walnut Creek and Concord, with a possibility for some at the North Concord station, and BART would have to request the funds from TRANSPAC to actually be able to spend any funds. He reiterated that the second BART category was not necessarily directly to BART but to others improving access to BART.

On the discussion, several members of the TAC expressed concern for the public's acceptance of the measure given the BART allocations, although given the volume of BART ridership, the need for transit, and the lack of alternatives, it had been acknowledged that BART must be included in the TEP. The TAC also discussed the category for ferry service to Martinez, the fact that Martinez was not represented at this time, and the need to retain the \$8 million that had previously been identified for ferry service in Martinez.

Mr. Todd advised that local congestion, school bus programs, and student bus passes were categories that should be discussed.

With respect to the category Providing Affordable and Safe Transportation for Children, Seniors, Veterans, and People with Disabilities, and the fact that there were two separate categories; one for seniors, veterans, and people with disabilities, and one for youth and students, Mr. Parikh suggested the total amount be split between the two, which Mr. Noeimi stated could be done. The TAC agreed.

Mr. Hu noted that there was more money available for safe transportation for youth and students but the look of the service had not been determined. He explained that 2,000 students from outside Pleasant Hill traveled to the city of Pleasant Hill to attend its schools. While the TAC had heard about the TRAFFIX program in San Ramon and the cooperation of the San Ramon Valley Unified School District (SRVUSD) in that case, that had not been the case with the Mt. Diablo Unified School District (MDUSD) in Pleasant Hill, which was a concern.

Andy Smith agreed, referenced a high number of intra-district transfers, and acknowledged an equity issue with respect to intra-district transfers.

Ruby Horta reported that County Connection had the 600 service routes, which were all school routes for certain schools based on demand, the routes were heavily used, and the routes were not funded by Measure J. She supported a school bus pass and explained there was no reduced cost for students other than the annual Summer Youth Pass.

The TAC supported a school bus pass to expand on County Connection's successful 600 service routes, which had been coordinated with bell schedules.

On the question of County Connection service and the percentage of riders who were seniors as opposed to non-seniors, Ms. Horta identified 10 to 12 percent of senior ridership on fixed routes.

As to whether the student and senior funding should be combined or separated, by consensus the TAC decided to raise that as an issue with the TRANSPAC Board. The TAC recommended the addition of a comment to the TRANSPAC Board that the Advance Mitigation Program was not part of Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC).

Mr. Parikh prioritized the Operational Improvements along Highway 4 from 242 to Bailey Road over the I-680/Highway 4 Interchange project, although Mr. Noeimi explained that it was the same category so that decision could be made later.

Robert Sarmiento noted that the County supported the line item Focused Growth, Support Economic Development and Create Jobs in Contra Costa.

Mr. Hu emphasized that all the projects were important and all served a purpose, and while he recognized that more money would have to be dedicated to freeways, there was always potential that freeway routes in Central County would be competitive; however, the routes included were not competitive, and if not getting the roads on the measure for passage with the measure, if approved, they would not be done.

Mr. Todd recommended looking at example projects and requested feedback as to cost with a dollar amount of example projects that would make the information more current.

The TAC considered each of the Central County projects/programs in an effort to identify \$69 million from the project list that could be used adjusted to increase the return to source funds to 23 percent. It was recommended that the TRANSPAC Board move \$11 million from Seamless Connected Transportation Options and Reduce Emissions; \$5 million from Regional Transportation Priorities; \$10 million from Relieve Congestion and Improve Local Access Along Interstate 680 Corridor; \$20 million from Relieve Congestion on Highway 4 and State Route 242 Between Martinez and Pittsburg; \$22 million from Enhance Ferry Service and Commuter Rail in Contra Costa; and \$1 million from Transportation Planning, Facilities & Services, with the assumption that all cities would agree with a 23 percent return to source.

2. Member Comments

There were no comments.

3. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:49 P.M. to the next meeting, a regular meeting on June 27, 2019 at 9:00 A.M.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting Summary Minutes

MEETING DATE: August 29, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chair Sue Noack, Pleasant Hill (Chair); Abhishek Parikh, Transportation Division Manager, Concord; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Robert Sarmiento, Contra Costa County; Scott Alman, Harris & Associates for Clayton/Martinez; Bill Churchill, CCTA; Lynne Filson, Harris & Associates for Clayton/Martinez

STAFF PRESENT: Matt Todd, TRANSPAC Managing Director; Margaret Strubel, Gray-Bowen-Scott; and Debby Chernila, Gray-Bowen-Scott

GUESTS/PRESENTERS: Hisham Noeimi, CCTA

MINUTES PREPARED BY: Margaret Strubel and Debby Chernila

The meeting of the TRANSPAC TAC convened at 9:02 A.M. Self introductions followed.

1. Minutes of the June 27, 2019 Meeting

The minutes of the June 27, 2019 TAC meeting were approved by consensus.

2. TRANSPAC Strategic Planning Discussion

Managing Director Matt Todd introduced the strategic planning discussion agenda item. He noted that the TRANSPAC Board requested a review of TRANSPAC's scope of work, the prioritization of work, and how work is completed. He referred to the agenda packet for information from other RTPC's, including scope, duties and workplans, to inform the discussion. He said this feedback would be provided to the TRANSPAC Board. The TRANSPAC Board is scheduled to discuss this item at their meeting on September 12, 2019.

Mr. Todd discussed the TRANSPAC similarities with other RTPCs. TRANSPAC is medium size organization compared to other RTPCs. TRANSPAC has a JPA that was approved in 2014, when it transitioned from an MOU. He noted WCCTAC a full-time director and staff and budget of about \$5 million. SWAT and TRANSPAC use staff from member agencies and may call on member agencies for staffing assistance. One has an MOU with the County and the other with the City of San Ramon. TRANSPAC has a Managing Director and has had a clerk for the last 2 ½ years.

Mr. Todd stated that questions to consider include what TRANSPAC doing well and what could be done better. Chair Noack noted that some Board members have indicated the desire for more creativity or more ways to get information about funding sources for projects. A general question to start discussion was posed regarding what do TAC members look to TRANSPAC for. It was noted that the roles and responsibilities of agencies and staff in 2019 are not necessarily the same as in the past. Hisham Noeimi said there are many plans to develop and a lot of room for creativity if the Measure passes.

It was noted that TRANSPAC has a sub-regional transportation mitigation program that is not structured in the same way as other parts of the County. Lynne Filson noted the benefit of having local funds to leverage other sources. Mr. Todd mentioned that other subregions have suggested that TRANSPAC restructure the STMP. Chair Noack suggested the topic be put on the calendar to discuss in the future.

Scott Alman is suggested evaluating routes from a regionally viewpoint to best serve the users.

Chair Noack wants to look at how TRANSPAC works as a subregion with other neighboring subregions.

Eric Hu indicated TRANSPAC should be looking at regional issues, provide guidance on TRANSPAC vision, and performance measures. Action plans should include MTSOs that reflect TRANSPAC's decisions and focus on improvements to the transportation system rather than negative consequences. As an example, he noted that being creative could mean handing out 511.org information when a house is sold or that first mile around BART has different measures than the next 3 miles which may be bikeable.

Lynne Filson suggested a focus on constituent travel, and how to make reduced travel time and options to driving alone. Abhishek Parikh highlighted the need for transportation technology, and consistency between jurisdictions and the need for coordination on routes of regional significance. It was noted that the Treat and Ygnacio Valley Road corridors do not have consistency in operations or technology. Bill Churchill mentioned that CCCTA is using a more regional approach to operations than in the past, how it is evaluating trip making patterns that do not stay with one jurisdiction or subregion.

Chair Noack discussed the trips generated into Pleasant Hill every day from students travelling into Pleasant Hill. Mr. Churchill indicated CCCTA works with multiple districts and they are varied in their interactions and focus with transportation. It was noted the school origin destination related data would be a helpful first step. A suggestion was made that the Chairperson of the school board be requested to attend a TRANSPAC meeting to discuss this regional transportation issue.

Abhishek Parikh suggested the identification of priority issues or projects in advance so we can focus efforts and better compete for funds. Hisham Noeimi noted that a subregional priority on projects could assist in moving projects forward. Eric Hu added that the focus should be on regional transportation issues and that can change behavior. Lynne Filson suggested that TRANSPAC assist with grant applications. Abhishek Parikh added the concept to identify the top 5 schools and focus efforts on prioritized schools. Mr. Todd summarized themes to have a regional plan, and to identify/prioritize top issues, such as school improvements and route congestion, and rank those as a region.

The group continued to brainstorm concepts. They discussed benefits of a subregional prioritization, including better using resources to supply applications for funding. The opportunities to improve travel options within 3 miles of BART stations was discussed. That different modes should be used where they are most beneficial (not a one size fits all solution). The role of traffic calming in certain areas. The impact of existing travel patterns and modes and opportunities to change those trends based on new technology and the needs and preferences of the younger generations. Chair Noack noted that these issues are helping us think more strategically, regionally focused and more visionary.

3. 2020 Transportation Expenditure Plan Status

Hisham Noemi gave an overview of the TEP status. He noted there is significant funding for transit and that multiple stakeholders indicated support for the plan at the CCTA Board meeting. The next step is to request cities to give support. Once city approval is achieved, the plan will go back to the CCTA Board in October. Ultimately, the schedule is for the Plan to be placed on the ballot in March 2020. Modeling of the plan implementation shows a reduction of VMT and GHG. There will also be an economic analysis of the TEP. Cities have until October 22 to approve resolutions to support.

4. Grant Funding Opportunities

It was noted the report was distributed. No questions were asked.

5. Committee Updates.

Robert Sarmiento attended the TCC meeting and noted no information to report.

Mr. Churchill mentioned that County Connection has recently changed to another contractor called Transdev. They have unique technology that can be leveraged to improve trips provided to longer distance paratransit riders. The new system has the ability to reduce transfers and split trip costs among providers. Four separate transit entities are coordinating with the goal of a better trip for the user.

6. Future Agenda Items

No future agenda items were noted.

7. Member Comments

There were no Member updates.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 10:34 A.M. to the next meeting on September 26, 2019 at 9:00 A.M.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Summary of TRANSPAC Strategic Planning Discussion

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

- 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
 - Measuring project effectiveness
- 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
 - Relation to other larger corridors (where trips continue onto)
 - 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)
 - School based carpools
- 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
 - Improve bike route information and dissemination of that information
- Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program
- SB743 / 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

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

DRAFT 2019 / 2020 WORK PLAN

July, 2019

- 680/Monument Bike/Pedestrian Improvements Feasibility Study - Initiated in FY 2018/2019 and ongoing into FY 2019/20

August

- No Meeting

September

- Receive Quarterly and Year End Financial Report

October

November

- Appointment of CCTA CBPAC Representative
- Receive Quarterly Financial Report
- FY 2018/2019 Audit
- Start Measure J Line 20A programming process for FY 2020/2021 and FY 2021/2022
- Approve 2019 Calendar Meeting Schedule

December

- Appointment of CCTA Representative

January, 2020

- No Meeting

February

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

March

- Conflict of Interest Form 700 Due

April

- Review Draft 2020/2021 Budget
- Review TRANSPAC Contracts

May

- Approve Measure J Line 20A programming process for FY 2020/2021 and FY 2021/2022
- Receive Quarterly Financial Report

June

- Approve 2020 / 2021 Budget

Other Potential Items

- Programming/Funding
 - Update of Action Plans (and Countywide Transportation Plan)
 - 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)
 - CCTA TEP
 - Identify Other Funding Opportunities
- Projects
 - Concord Naval Weapon Station Project
 - I-680 Corridor Improvements
 - I-680 / SR 4 Interchange Improvements
 - Phase 3 - SR 4 Widening Project
 - Innovate 680
 - SB I-680 HOV (Bridge to Walnut Creek)
 - I-680 Express Lanes (Walnut Creek to San Ramon)
 - Quarterly (or semi annually) Project Presentations
- TRANSPAC Governance
 - Update website
 - Review of Bylaws
 - Administrative Procedures
 - Procurement of Services
 - Invoices (Review/Approvals)

**CITIES/TOWNS COUNCIL AND CONTRA COSTA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SCHEDULE
FOR CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTING A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR THE
AUTHORITY'S TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURE PLAN**

| Jurisdiction | Board/Council Meeting Schedule | Presentation Briefing July 22, 2019 - August 20, 2019 | Staff | Consideration of Adopting a Resolution of Support September-October 22, 2019 | Staff | Approved | Vote |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|---|-----------------|--|-----------------|----------|------|
| Hercules | 2nd and 4th Tuesday | N/A | N/A | 9/10/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Don Tatzin | Yes | 5-0 |
| Clayton | 1st and 3rd Tuesday | N/A | N/A | 9/17/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Randell Iwasaki | Yes | 4-1 |
| Walnut Creek | 1st and 3rd Tuesday | 8/06/19 at 6:00 p.m. | Timothy Haile | 9/17/19 at 6:00 p.m. | Timothy Haile | Yes | 3-2 |
| Lafayette | 2nd and 4th Monday | 7/22/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Hisham Noeimi | 9/23/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Don Tatzin | | |
| Brentwood | 2nd and 4th Tuesday | 8/13/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Hisham Noeimi | 9/24/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Timothy Haile | | |
| Contra Costa County | Generally Tuesday at 9 a.m. | 7/30/19 at 9:00 am | Hisham Noeimi | 9/24/19 at 9:00 a.m. | Timothy Haile | | |
| Danville | 1st and 3rd Tuesday | 8/13/19 at 7:30 p.m. | Timothy Haile | 10/01/19 at 7:30 p.m. | Timothy Haile | | |
| El Cerrito | 1st and 3rd Tuesday | 8/20/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Timothy Haile | 10/01/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Hisham Noeimi | | |
| Pinole | 1st and 3rd Tuesday | 8/20/19 at 6:00 p.m. | Randell Iwasaki | 10/01/19 at 6:00 p.m. | Randell Iwasaki | | |
| Martinez | 1st and 3rd Wednesday | N/A | N/A | 10/02/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Timothy Haile | | |
| Pittsburg | 1st and 3rd Monday | 10/07/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Timothy Haile | 10/21/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Consent-N/A | | |
| Pleasant Hill | 1st and 3rd Monday | 8/19/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Timothy Haile | 10/07/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Hisham Noeimi | | |
| Oakley | 2nd and 4th Tuesday | N/A | N/A | 10/08/19 at 6:30 p.m. | Timothy Haile | | |
| San Ramon | 2nd and 4th Tuesday | N/A | N/A | 10/08/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Hisham Noeimi | | |
| Moraga | 2nd and 4th Wednesday | N/A | N/A | 10/10/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Timothy Haile | | |
| Concord | 1st, 2nd and 4th Tuesday | N/A | N/A | 10/15/19 at 6:30 p.m. | Timothy Haile | | |
| Orinda | 1st and 3rd Tuesday | N/A | N/A | 10/15/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Randell Iwasaki | | |
| San Pablo | 1st and 3rd Monday | N/A | N/A | 10/21/19 at 6:00 p.m. | Timothy Haile | | |
| Antioch | 2nd and 4th Tuesday | N/A | N/A | 10/22/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Hisham Noeimi | | |
| Richmond | 1st and 3rd Tuesday | N/A | N/A | 10/22/19 at 7:00 p.m. | Timothy Haile | | |

Staff Contacts:

Randell Iwasaki, Executive Director

Timothy Haile, Deputy Executive Director, Projects

Hisham Noeimi, Director, Programming

TEP Facilitator:

Don Tatzin, Facilitator

A Roadmap to Developing a Transportation Expenditure Plan



Sample Ballot Election Schedule
Subject to Change

CCTA Local Agency Funding Opportunities Summary – 9/4/2019

Upcoming Funding Opportunities

| Funding Program | Fund Source | Application Deadlines | Program and Contact Info |
|---|-------------|--|--|
| Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) - Carl Moyer Program | L | Accepting applications starting on June 17, 2019 | More than \$8M available on a first come, first served application basis for the following project type: Equipment/Vehicle replacement, Engine replacement (repower), Power system conversion, and Battery charging and fueling infrastructure. Priority is given to projects that reduce emissions in the following impacted communities – AB 617 communities and communities for future AB 617 consideration: West Oakland, Richmond-San Pablo , East Oakland/ San Leandro, Eastern San Francisco, Pittsburg-Bay Point area , San Jose, Tri-Valley area , and Vallejo. http://www.baaqmd.gov/funding-and-incentives/funding-sources/carl-moyer-program |
| Recreational Trails and Greenways Grant Program | S | October 11, 2019 | Approximately \$27.7 million in awards will be funded by the program. Applicants submitting the most competitive proposals will be invited to participate in the next level of the competitive process, anticipated mid-late December 2019. The Trails and Greenways grant program, funded by Proposition 68, will fund projects that provide nonmotorized infrastructure development and enhancements that promote new or alternate access to parks, waterways, outdoor recreational pursuits, and forested or other natural environments to encourage health-related active transportation and opportunities for Californians to reconnect with nature. http://resources.ca.gov/grants/trails/ |
| FY 2020-21 Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Grant | S | October 11, 2019 at 5 PM | Sustainable Communities Grants (\$29.5 million) to encourage local and regional planning that furthers state goals, including, but not limited to, the goals and best practices cited in the Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines adopted by the California Transportation Commission. Strategic Partnerships Grants (\$4.5 million) to identify and address statewide, interregional, or regional transportation deficiencies on the State highway system in partnership with Caltrans. The transit component that will fund planning projects that address multimodal transportation deficiencies with a focus on transit. Grant announcements are anticipated in spring 2020. http://www.localassistanceblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Final-FY-20-21-STP-Grant-Guide.pdf |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements (CRISI) | F | Applications for funding under this solicitation are due no later than 5:00 p.m. EDT/2:00 PM PST on October 18, 2019. | The purpose of the CRISI Program is to assist in funding projects that improve passenger and freight rail transportation safety, efficiency, and reliability. The total funding available for awards is \$244,621,500, at least 25% will be made available for Rural Projects https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/08/19/2019-17741/notice-of-funding-opportunity-for-consolidated-rail-infrastructure-and-safety-improvements |
| Program for Arterial System Synchronization (PASS) FY 2019-20 Cycle | F | October 23, 2019 at 4 pm | Up to \$3 million in federal funds are currently available to fund projects that improve arterial operations through the coordination of traffic signals and related services. The purpose of PASS is to provide technical consultant assistance or funding to cities/counties to update traffic signal timing plans as a low-cost way to improve the safety and efficiency of arterials in the region. MTC will administer and manage the program but the primary responsibility for the operation and retiming of traffic signals resides with the agency that owns and operates them. MTC will work closely with the project sponsors and consultants to successfully complete the PASS projects. For more information, Robert Rich at MTC: rrich@bayareametro.gov ; (415) 778-6621 https://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/operate-coordinate/arterial-operations/program-arterial-system-synchronization-pass |
| Senate Bill 2 (SB2) Planning Grant Program | S | November 30, 2019 | The program will provide \$123M for technical assistance to all local governments to help cities/counties prepare, adopt, and implement plans and process improvements that streamline housing approvals and accelerate housing production. The program will provide grants through a noncompetitive, over-the-counter process to eligible local governments. Eligible activities include updates to the general plan, community plan, specific plans and local planning related to implementation of sustainable communities strategies, or local coastal plans; updates to zoning ordinances; environmental analyses that eliminate the need for project-specific review; and local process improvements that expedite local planning and permitting. http://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/planning-grants.shtml#awarded |
| Pavement Management Technical Assistance Program (P-TAP) Cycle 21 | F | Mid November 2019 | MTC will release the Call for Projects on 10/10/19 on http://mtc.ca.gov/p-tap-call-for-projects . The program uses federal dollars to help cities and counties implement, update and maintain the pavement management databases; provide accurate pavement condition data to local jurisdictions; provide engineering design assistance for pavement rehabilitation projects; support the region's management of non-pavement street and road assets such as signs, storm drains, curbs and gutters, traffic signals and street lights. |