

TRANSPAC Transportation Partnership and Cooperation
Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek, and Contra Costa County

TRANSPAC TAC MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2022
9:00 A.M. to 11:00 A.M.

**TELECONFERENCING SPECIAL NOTICE – PUBLIC MEETING
GUIDELINES FOR PARTICIPATING VIA PHONE/VIDEO
CONFERENCE**

Pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act provisions under Assembly Bill 361, which went into effect on October 1, 2021, meetings of the TRANSPAC Board and TAC will be held utilizing video and teleconference as the State and County continue to recommend measures to promote social distancing. Options for observing the meeting and participating in public comment are provided below:

Video Conference Access: Please click the link at the noticed meeting time
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88040271703?pwd=M2RQa3ZMVGRlakQvWEgyNURnNDZ5QT09>
Meeting ID: 880 4027 1703 and Password: 176178.

Phone Access: To observe the meeting by phone, please call at the noticed meeting time 1 (669) 900 6883, then enter the Meeting ID: 880 4027 1703 and Password: 176178.

Public Comments: Public comment may be provided by submitting written comments to tiffany@graybowenscott.com by 3 p.m. on the day before the meeting, which will be read during Public Comment or on the related item when Public Comment is called and entered into the record. To comment by video conference, click the “Raise Your Hand” button to request to speak when the Public Comment period is opened on an Agenda item. After the allotted time, you will then be requested to mute your microphone. To comment by phone, indicate the “Raise Your Hand” icon by pressing “*9” to request to speak when the public comment is opened on an Agenda item. After the allotted time, you will then be requested to mute your microphone. Please begin by stating your name and indicate whether you are speaking for yourself or an organization.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA): This agenda is available upon request in alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by the ADA of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §12132) and the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal. Govt. Code §54954.2). Persons requesting a disability related modification or accommodation should contact TRANSPAC via email or phone at tiffany@graybowenscott.com or (925) 937-0980 during regular business hours at least 48 hours prior to the time of the meeting.

1. **CONVENE MEETING / VIRTUAL MEETING ACCESS GUIDELINES / SELF-INTRODUCTIONS.**
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT.** Members of the public may address the Committee on any item not on the agenda.
3. **Minutes of the July 14, 2022 Meeting** 🌀 **Page 4**

ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Approve Minutes.

Attachments: TAC minutes from the, July 14, 2022 meeting.

4. **TRANSPAC COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS – CCTA TCC APPOINTMENT FOR THE TERM ENDING MARCH 31, 2023.** TRANSPAC is represented on the Contra Costa Transportation Authority's (CCTA) Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) by three (3) primary representatives and one (1) alternate. Due to staff changes the TCC alternate position is now vacant. 🌀 **Page 11**

ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Approve the appointment of Lynne Filson to fill the vacant alternate position on the TCC for the term ending March 31, 2023.

Attachment: Staff Report

5. **DYNAMIC PERSONAL MICRO TRANSIT FEASIBILITY STUDY.** The Cities of Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley, and Pittsburg recently completed the East Contra Costa County Dynamic Personal Micro Transit (DPMT) Feasibility Study. The study was conducted in partnership with Glydways, one of several companies that are developing a DPMT solution and explores the Glydways DMPT system and potential benefits, challenges and strategies with the goal of increasing transit accessibility options for residents and workers in the future. At this meeting staff will discuss the outcomes of the feasibility study. (INFORMATION)
🌀 **Page 13**

Attachment: Staff Report

6. **CENTRAL COUNTY ACTION PLAN UPDATE.** The Central County Action Plan is intended to address the key transportation issues that Central County will face over the next long-range period (i.e. about twenty five years). Action plans for each subregion of the county were developed through the cooperative, multi-jurisdictional planning process included with Measure J. The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) has secured the services of a team of consultants lead by Placeworks to assist TRANSPAC to update the Plan. At this meeting, TRANSPAC staff will facilitate discussion on Action Plan updates. (INFORMATION)

7. COMMITTEE UPDATES:

- a. Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC):** The TCC meeting scheduled for September 15, 2022 was canceled. The next regular meeting is scheduled for October 20, 2022.
- b. Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC):** The next regular meeting is scheduled for September 25, 2022.
- c. Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC):** The last PCC meeting was held on September 19, 2022. The next regular meeting is scheduled for November 21, 2022 (No meeting is scheduled in October).

8. INFORMATION ITEMS

- a. GRANT FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES.** This agenda item is intended to provide an opportunity to review and discuss grant opportunities. Additional information will be available at the meeting if available. (INFORMATION).
- b. CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (CCTA) MEETING CALENDAR:** The CCTA Calendar for September 2022 to December 2022, may be downloaded at: <https://ccta.primegov.com/Portal/viewer?id=18849&type=2>

9. MEMBER COMMENTS

10. NEXT MEETING: OCTOBER 27, 2022.

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting Summary Minutes

MEETING DATE: July 14, 2022

STAFF PRESENT: Andy Smith, Walnut Creek; Abhishek Parikh, Concord; John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Philip Ho, Pleasant Hill; Dana Ayers, Clayton; Jason Chen, Clayton; Dana Ayers, Clayton; Melody Reeb, County Connection; Celestine Do, BART; Kirsten Ryker, 511CC; Matt Todd, TRANSPAC Managing Director; and Tiffany Gephart, TRANSPAC Clerk

GUESTS/PRESENTERS: Matt Kelly, CCTA; John Hoang, CCTA; Raul Tovar, Placeworks; Erin Vaca, DKS; Torina Wilson, Placeworks; Charlie Knox, Placeworks; Julie Morgan, Fehr & Peers; Martin Engelmann, Stantec; Bruce Ole Ohlson

MINUTES PREPARED BY: Tiffany Gephart

1. Convene Regular Meeting / Pledge of Allegiance / Self-Introductions

Matt Todd called the meeting to order at 9:06 A.M. Introductions followed.

2. Public Comments

There were no comments from the public.

3. Minutes of the May 26, 2022 Meeting

The minutes of the May 26, 2022 meeting were approved by consensus.

4. TRANSPAC COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS – CCTA TCC APPOINTMENT FOR THE TERM ENDING MARCH 31, 2023.

Mr. Todd commented that staff is requesting a TAC member recommendation for the CCTA TCC alternate position. He notified the group this item will be brought back to the next TAC meeting. There were no comments from the TAC.

5. CENTRAL COUNTY ACTION PLAN UPDATE – REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION OBJECTIVES AND PROPOSED ACTIONS.

Matt Kelly introduced the item. Torina Wilson gave a presentation on the updated Regional Transportation Objectives (RTOs), Routes of Regional Significance (RRS) and corridor maps. Ms.

Wilson noted that the intent of the corridor maps is to combine RRS maps to show the multimodal network and desired future conditions. Ms. Wilson further noted that the corridor maps will not replace the RRS maps and those will still be in the Action Plans and demonstrate for example which roadways are being measured for Level of Service (LOS) RTOs or where countywide low-stress bike networks do or do not exist yet.

Jason Chen asked if the map can be adjusted to better reflect Clayton position relative to Ygnacio Valley and Kirker Pass Road. He also requested to reflect the bus service that operates in Clayton. Mr. Kelly clarified Mr. Chens requests and Ms. Wilson agreed to update the map accordingly.

Andy Smith commented on the Alhambra Avenue corridor and asked why Taylor Boulevard is absent. Mr. Smith further noted that Pleasant Hill Road becomes Taylor and curves over to 680 around the 242/680 interchange and is a significant commute corridor.

Ms. Wilson commented that one approach could be to add Talyor Blvd/Alhambra Ave or Taylor Blvd/Pleasant Hill Road as its own corridor. Mr. Smith further noted that Taylor Blvd seems to operate as its own corridor bypassing the 680 and part of Highway 24 through Central County. Mr. Todd suggested to add an orange line on the map that connects where 680/24 comes together.

Ms. Wilson commented that the Bike/Ped facilities used are from the 2018 Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and noted future projects are also included in the maps such as designating a facility as a low-stress bikeway by 2050 which is why there is a Bike/Ped facility along Marsh Creek Road and along Pleasant Hill Road.

Mr. Smith commented on Marsh Creek Road and noted that as part of the recommendation designating it as Route of Regional Significance, any improvements would be for safety and not capacity. Mr. Smith further commented about his concern that that when others review this material, there is nothing to indicate this RRS surface street is intended for only safety improvements.

Ms. Wilson commented that the project team agrees with the assumption that improvements will be for safety and not capacity. Ms. Wilson suggested an additional note on the map that states Marsh Creek Corridor is considered regionally significant for safety considerations and is not considered regionally significant for capacity improvements to the surface roadways. Mr. Chen and Mr. Cunningham supported the additional note.

Mr. Chen commented about distinguishing Marsh Creek Road from Clayton Road in the footer note. Ms. Wilson commented that they can include that the note encompasses Marsh Creek Road southeast of Clayton City limits.

Mr. Smith asked why freeways are shown as surface street corridors. Ms. Wilson commented that the corridors are generalized. Mr. Smith asked to remove the surface street connection going over Benicia Bridge. Ms. Wilson noted the correction.

Ms. Wilson continued her presentation with Regional Transportation Objectives (RTOs).

Mr. Cunningham asked if Electric Vehicles (EVs) were inclusive of e-bikes. Ms. Wilson commented that the referenced RTO is only for automobile EVs. Mr. Cunningham requested stronger e-bike actions /metrics or parallel RTOs to the automobile EV's. Mr. Kelly clarified that the DMV tracks automobile EV's currently and noted a lack of reliable data on e-bikes. Mr. Kelly further noted that the 511 CC subsidy program is currently the only tracking mechanism for the other non-automobile EVs.

Mr. Smith commented on slide 13 and requested further discussion on LOS. Mr. Smith expressed concerns on suggesting more stringent LOS standards. Ms. Wilson clarified following some discussion that the existing intersections labeled LOS-F will be kept and that there will be no LOS standards for downtown, key school sites or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) as recommended by the group. Mr. Smith recommended to keep the list as-is as LOS-F.

Mr. Smith asked to clarify the intersection of Treat/Geary on the map. Mr. Kelly commented that staff will clarify the intersections and that it shouldn't be labeled as Treat/Geary.

Ms. Riker commented that the goal discussed for 2027 and 2050 is that the transit time would be equal or less than driving and noted that in the equity section it was discussed that transit time to Equity Priority Communities (EPC) and worksites within the county would be a goal of 30-minute drive time or 45-minutes transit time. Ms. Riker asked why that would be acceptable if transit time would be much longer.

Mr. Kelly commented that the intent behind the two RTOs is different (encouraging mode shift by a reduction in transit time, vs. tracking access to transit). In the EPC metric, it allows staff to measure the level of access to transit in EPCs.

Mr. Parikh commented that there is a goal of zero accidents by 2027 and that many cities don't have their own Vision Zero plans and there is no funding associated yet. He suggested a target of a 50% reduction by 2027, then zero by 2050. Ms. Wilson commented that staff received a similar comment from another jurisdiction and that CCTA staff may discuss with local jurisdictions what is causing the incidents as well.

Mr. Parikh asked if EV charging stations should be tracked within the county. Ms. Wilson commented that several entities are tracking EV charging stations but there is not currently a reliable source tracking the larger EV charging infrastructure. Ms. Wilson noted that there were a lot of considerations that led to not including the specific RTO. Mr. Kelly commented that it is difficult to measure but should be included in the Actions. Ms. Wilson recommended an Action that could say "Work with CCTA and applicable agencies to find a feasible way to track the

number of EV installations and their locations”, as an example and the funding or supporting the installation of additional charging stations.

Mr. Parikh commented that there are conflicting goals with keeping LOS-D at intersections and adding RRS for Bikes/facilities. Ms. Wilson commented that there will not be a penalty if there are competing targets (for example, if a jurisdiction selects Bike/Ped improvements and this pushes the LOS to exceed D on that corridor.)

Mr. Todd questioned the labeling of the Ygnacio Valley Road corridor between Oak Grove and Heather Farms as an existing low-stress facility. Ms. Wilson commented that she would review it and send out a revised map for clarification if the correction is not already accounted for.

Ms. Reeb asked about the travel time ratios and why the ratios are based on fixed guideway transit. Ms. Reeb noted that there won't be much change in BART travel times and that one of the segments is from Orinda to 12th Street outside of Central County. Ms. Wilson noted that the latter comment may be an error and that she would review it.

Ms. Wilson asked Ms. Vaca to respond to the question on fixed guideway corridors. Ms. Vaca noted that part of the intent was to show that they have an inherent advantage over auto travel because they have their own right-of-way and aren't impacted by congestion.

Ms. Reeb commented that when the metric was initially discussed, bus transit was the focus as it is heavily impacted by traffic and that transit trips take longer because of the access component, and this is an important piece of a transit trip. Mr. Knox asked about sources of good data that could be used. Mr. Kelly suggested looking at 680 express bus routes and to compare those travel times with vehicle freeway travel time. Ms. Reeb agreed that this is what she envisioned.

Mr. Smith commented that the Traffic Engineer from Walnut Creek requested no LOS standards rather than LOS-F for the list previously discussed.

Mr. Ohlson provided public comment (attached).

Mr. Todd asked if there is a copy of the RTS map with specific roads reflected. Mr. Todd commented that there is a new route in Martinez that was not in a prior plan. Ms. Wilson commented that they received feedback from Martinez separately on the routes that were added in the map.

Mr. Todd further noted that the transit RTO goal for 2027 would require a return to pre-Covid ridership and exceed that. Ms. Wilson noted that in two other sub areas the target was revised to be the same as the 2019 baseline and that the 2027 target would be 13% instead of 20%.

Ms. Wilson commented on next steps including reviewing comments and making necessary changes, creating an Action Plan components memo for the TRANSPAC Board on August 4th for input prior to drafting the Action Plan. The next meeting with the TAC will be to review the Draft Action Plan.

6. COMMITTEE UPDATES

Mr. Todd noted that the CCTA TCC, BPAC and PCC meetings were not held in June.

7. INFORMATION ITEMS

There were not comments from the TAC.

8. MEMBER COMMENTS

There were not comments from the TAC

9. ADJOURN / NEXT MEETING The next regular meeting is scheduled for August 25, 2022 at 9:00 A.M.

From: [Bruce Ole Ohlson](#)
To: [Tiffany Gephart](#); [Matthew Todd](#)
Cc: [Bike Concord](#); [Bike East Bay Advocacy Department](#); [BEB Advocacy Department](#)
Subject: Regional Transportation Objectives comments
Date: Thursday, July 14, 2022 3:48:16 PM

Tiffany, Matt, and anyone to whom you wish to forward these comments (including the CCTA full board),

I attended the TRANSPAC TAC meeting on July 14; we discussed the creation of new Regional Transportation Objectives.

From a bicyclist's perspective:

- We are writing Regional Transportation **Objectives**. I'd like to point out that during the first couple of decades of the 20th Century, our transportation system changed from relying on horses to relying on automobiles, all without the help of, or influence by, transportation planners. With the document that we are writing, we are in the position to significantly encourage electric bike usage, yet our planning basically ignores them. It appears that our objective with this plan is to perpetuate the status quo. The plan assumes that Generation Z (those under approximately age 25) will become motorists, just like their parents. Why not assume that they will become transit and electric bike users? They want, and we as policy makers say we want, to get away from use of and dependence upon fossil fuels. The creation of Regional Transportation Objectives, which will hold sway for the next 25 years, is the perfect opportunity to move in that direction.
-
- We can't keep the cars flowing with the proposed levels of service and yet make the overall County-wide network of transportation facilities safe for all modes including for non-motorists. Routes of Regional Significance for motorists are Routes of Regional Significance for people using a bicycle for transportation, too. One of the major objectives of any long-term planning effort must be to make routes of regional significance safe for those not protected by a 3,000-pound sheet metal cocoon. Please recall that the FHWA, Caltrans, and the CCTA all have already adopted the elimination of pedestrian and bicyclist deaths as a goal. One of the short-term

goals of the RTO should be to install protected bike lanes on every arterial street in the entire County with special attention being paid to freeway off-and on-ramps.

Thank you for working to create a planning document that actually reflects the probable future.

All best wishes,

~Ole

Bruce "Ole" Ohlson

Bike East Bay

Delta Pedalers Bicycle Club

Contra Costa Countywide Bicycle Advisory Committee

CCTA Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Advisory Committee

TRANSPLAN appointee to Highway 4 Integrated Corridor Management Study

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: September 29, 2022

Subject:	TRANSPAC COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS – CCTA TCC APPOINTMENT FOR THE TERM ENDING MARCH 31, 2023
Summary of Issues	TRANSPAC is represented on the Contra Costa Transportation Authority's (CCTA) Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) by three (3) primary representatives and one (1) alternate. Staff were informed that Edric Kwan, the current TCC alternate from the City of Martinez, has vacated his position leaving a vacant alternate seat on the TCC for the term ending March 31, 2023.
Recommendations	Approve the appointment of Lynne Filson to fill the vacant alternate position on the TCC for the term ending March 31, 2023.
Financial Implications	No TRANSPAC financial implications.
Option(s)	Defer the appointment.

Background

TRANSPAC is represented on the CCTA Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) by three staff representatives and one alternate from the planning and engineering disciplines. The TCC provides advice on technical matters that may come before the CCTA. Members also act as the primary technical liaison between the CCTA and the RTPCs. The TCC reviews and comments on items including project design, scope, and schedule; provide advice on the development of priority transportation improvement lists for submittal to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for projects proposed under certain federal transportation acts; reviews and comments on the Strategic Plan of the CCTA; reviews and comments on the CCTA Congestion Management Program; reviews RTPC Action Plans and the Countywide Transportation Plan; and reviews and comments on the CCTA Growth Management Plan Implementation Documents. The TCC may also form subcommittees for specific issues and meets approximately ten times a year.

Staff has been informed that Edric Kwan has vacated his position with the City of Martinez and has therefore vacated the alternate position on the TCC. Staff from the City of Martinez have recommended Lynne Filson to serve in place of Mr. Kwan. It is requested that the TAC approve the appointment of Lynne Filson to fill the vacant alternate position on the TCC for the term ending March 31, 2022.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: September 29, 2022

Subject:	DYNAMIC PERSONAL MICRO TRANSIT PROJECT FEASIBILITY STUDY
Summary of Issues	The Cities of Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley, and Pittsburg completed the East Contra Costa County Dynamic Personal Micro Transit (DPMT) Feasibility Study. The study was conducted in partnership with Glydways, one of several companies that are developing a DPMT solution and explores the Glydways DPMT system and potential benefits, challenges, and strategies with the goal of increasing transit accessibility options for residents and workers in the future. At this meeting staff will discuss the outcomes of the feasibility study.
Recommendation	None – for information only
Financial Implications	None.
Attachment(s)	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. CCTA Staff Report - East County Feasibility Study for Dynamic Personal Micro Transit (DPMT) Project2. CCTA Staff Report - East County Dynamic Personal Micro-Transit (DPMT) (Project 31001) – Authorization to Issue Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 22-05 to Solicit a Developer Team

Administration and Projects Committee **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: December 2, 2021

Subject	East County Feasibility Study for Dynamic Personal Micro Transit (DPMT) Project
Summary of Issues	Several jurisdictions in East Contra Costa County have developed a vision for deployment of a Dynamic Personal Micro Transit (DPMT) project in East County. The goals are to provide increased transit accessibility and creating first/last mile connections to the existing transit network, to increase transit options for residents and workers, assure economic development and attract employers. The Cities of Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley, and Pittsburg recently completed the East Contra Costa County Dynamic Personal Micro Transit (DPMT) Feasibility Study (Study) to support this potential deployment in the region.
Recommendations	Staff will present the findings of the Feasibility Study.
Staff Contact	Timothy Haile
Financial Implications	N/A
Options	N/A
Attachments	East County DPMT Feasibility Study
Changes from Committee	N/A

Background

Several jurisdictions in East Contra Costa County have developed a vision for deployment of a Dynamic Personal Micro Transit (DPMT) project in East County. The goals are to provide increased transit accessibility and creating first/last mile connections to the existing transit

network, to increase transit options for residents and workers, assure economic development and attract employers.

The Cities of Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley, and Pittsburg recently completed the East Contra Costa County Dynamic Personal Micro Transit (DPMT) Feasibility Study (Study) to support this potential deployment in the region.

The Study was conducted in partnership with Glydways, one of several companies that are developing a DPMT solution. Micro Transit is a form of demand responsive transportation that can provide flexible connections to existing transit, transit hubs and recreational and employment centers typically using flexible routes and on-demand scheduling. The Glydways system consists of a fleet of personal driverless electric vehicles operating on-demand in dedicated at-grade or elevated paved pathways. The Glydways vehicle is a small (approximately 3.5' wide, 10' long) electric vehicle with full functionality steering, sensing and control in each direction. Glydways is currently completing additional testing of this technology at the GoMentum Station in Concord.

The Study looked at the Glydways DPMT system, how it operates, the potential benefits, potential ridership demand, implementation challenges, risk mitigation strategies, and potential business models to ultimately inform the decision-making entities whether a DPMT system could be successfully integrated over time, to complement transit, and support the region's greater transportation strategies.

This Study concluded that DPMT is feasible to deploy in the East County with the following potential benefits:

- Support economic development and create jobs
- Congestion relief by way of converting vehicle trips to transit trips
- Increased transit access for underserved communities
- Cost effective and scalable solution
- Environmentally sustainable solution
- Speedy deployment delivered through public/private partnership

The Study findings proposed the use of a Public Private Partnership (P3) delivery strategy to finance the costs of the project. Additional studies will be required to further refine costs and potential fare revenue as well as evaluating phasing options. Additional industry outreach will help refine the project assumptions and financing options.

Administration and Projects Committee **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: September 01, 2022

Subject	East County Dynamic Personal Micro-Transit (DPMT) (Project 31001) – Authorization to Issue Request for Proposals (RFP) No. 22-05 to Solicit a Developer Team
Summary of Issues	<p>In the Spring of 2021, the cities of Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley, and Pittsburg completed the East County DPMT Feasibility Study (Study) to support a potential micro-transit deployment with autonomous vehicles in East Contra Costa County. The goals of the project are to provide increased transit accessibility, improve connections to the existing transit network, increase transit options for residents and workers, assure economic development, and attract employers.</p> <p>Over the past year, Authority staff have worked with the East Contra Costa Transit Authority (ECCTA) to further evaluate the potential for deployment of DPMT in East Contra Costa County and to develop a procurement strategy to advance the project.</p> <p>At its July 2022 meeting, the Authority Board approved Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) No. 91.00.01 with ECCTA that defines the roles and responsibilities for tasks related to the planning and advancement of the project, including development of procurement documents to solicit a Developer Team necessary to advance the project. The MOU was executed on July 28, 2022</p>

Recommendations	Staff seeks authorization to issue RFP No. 22-05 to solicit a Developer Team to advance the East County DPMT project.
Staff Contact	Stephanie Hu
Financial Implications	Initial phases of the work will be performed at risk by the Developer Team with no entitlement to payment from the Authority. Subsequent phases of the work will be subject to securing funding to complete the work.
Options	The Authority Board could elect to direct staff to revise the RFP prior to issuance or elect to not issue the RFP at this time.
Attachments (<i>Attachments A and B are revised</i>)	<p>A. Draft RFP No. 22-05 - <i>Revised</i></p> <p>B. Draft System Pre-Development Agreement - <i>Revised</i></p>
Changes from Committee	<i>None</i>

Background

At its December 2021 meeting, the Authority Board received a presentation on the findings of the East County DPMT Study, which was sponsored by the cities of Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley, and Pittsburg. The Study evaluated the feasibility of implementing a DPMT project in East County with the following goals:

- Provide increased transit accessibility
- Improve connections to the existing transit network
- Increase transit options for residents and workers
- Assure economic development and attract employers

Subsequently at the March 16, 2022 Authority Board meeting, staff provided an update on the project including an Industry Outreach Day that was co-hosted by the Authority and ECCTA in February. The industry outreach event was intended to share project information with potential proposers on the project and to assist in refining project delivery assumptions and financing options. Staff also provided the Authority Board with an overview of Public-Private-Partnership (P3) delivery strategies and how P3 can be used to advance the East

County DPMT project.

At its July 21, 2022 meeting, the Authority Board approved MOU No. 91.00.01 with ECCTA that defines the roles and responsibilities for tasks related to the planning and advancement of the DPMT project, including development of procurement documents to solicit a Developer Team necessary to advance the DPMT project using P3 delivery strategies. The MOU was executed on July 28, 2022.

The Authority and ECCTA have evaluated delivery options for the DPMT project and have developed an RFP to solicit a Developer Team and to enter into a System Preliminary Development Agreement (SPDA), pursuant to which the Developer Team would assist in evaluating the financial feasibility and advancement of the DPMT project. Per MOU No. 91.00.01, responsibilities for the procurement of the Developer Team, execution of the SPDA, and management of the DPMT project will be jointly shared by the Authority and ECCTA (Authorities).

The Developer Team will advance the DPMT project in the following three distinct phases:

- Phases 1 and 2 of the work will be performed at risk by the Developer Team with no entitlement to payment from the Authorities.
- Phase 3 will be subject to secured funding to complete this phase of the work.

During Phase 1, the Developer Team will identify an initial viable segment for the DPMT project that can be sustainably funded or financed through a combination of likely grant funding sources and ongoing project revenue. Additional activities in Phase 1 include the following:

- Identification of a technology solution
- Development of a funding plan for each phase of the work
- Review and analysis of assumptions made in the Study
- Development of an approach and cost for completing the environmental review of both the initial viable segment and future phases of the project

During Phase 2, the Developer Team will commence environmental scoping and apply for and obtain grant funds necessary to complete Phase 3 of the work and the Implementation Phase work.

During Phase 3, the Developer Team will advance the design of the initial viable segment to 30% and complete the following additional project development activities:

- Advancement of the technology solution
- Completion of environmental review
- Completion of an investment grade ridership and revenue analysis

Due to the specialized nature of the work and the alternative P3 delivery approach for the DPMT project, one-on-one meetings will be held with prospective proposers in October and November 2022, prior to the proposal submission deadline in January 2023. The purpose of the one-on-one meetings is to seek input from the industry on the DPMT project delivery structure and project phasing, and to receive comments on the draft RFP and draft SPDA. Based on the feedback received, the RFP and/or SPDA may be modified, and one or more addenda may be issued.

The proposal review process calls for a technical evaluation of the submitted proposals by an evaluation panel. The criteria and weighting (maximum of 100 points) of the technical elements of the evaluation will include the following:

Evaluation Criteria	Points
Qualifications and Experience of the Developer Team	40
Work Plan, Project Development, Environmental Experience and Approach, and Financial Capability	30
Autonomous Vehicle Technology, Readiness, and Approach	20
Approach and Experience Regarding Design and Construction, Quality, Safety, and Labor	10
Total Points	100

Upon completion of Phases 1, 2, and 3 under the draft SPDA, if financially feasible, the Developer Team and the Authorities will enter into a System Development Agreement for the implementation phase of the initial viable segment of the DPMT project.

Staff seeks authorization to issue RFP No. 22-05 to solicit a Developer Team to advance the East County DPMT project.