

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

TRANSPAC TAC MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2024
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

Public Comments: Public Comment may be provided in person during the public comment period on items not on the agenda or during the comment period of each agenda item. Comments are limited to 3 minutes. Please begin by stating your name and indicate whether you are speaking for yourself or an organization. Members of the public may also submit written comments to irina@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.

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 irina@graybowenscott.com or (925) 937-0980 during regular business hours at least 48 hours prior to the time of the meeting.

- 1. CONVENE MEETING/ SELF-INTRODUCTIONS.**
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT.** Members of the public may address the Committee on any item not on the agenda.

ACTION ITEMS

- 3. MINUTES OF THE JUNE 26, 2024, MEETING.**

Attachments: TAC minutes from the June 26, 2024, meeting. 🌀 **Page 5**

ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Approve Minutes.

Transportation Partnership and Cooperation
Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek, and Contra Costa County
1320 Mount Diablo Blvd, Suite 206, Walnut Creek 94596
(925) 937-0980

4. **TRANSPAC TAC APPOINTMENTS TO CCTA COMMITTEES.** TRANSPAC is represented on the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) by two primary representatives and one alternate and on the CCTA Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) by three primary representatives and one alternate. Due to staffing changes, there are vacancies for alternate positions on both the CBPAC and the TCC. The TAC is requested to provide recommendations to fill the alternate CBPAC seat for the remainder of the term ending December 31, 2025, and TCC seat for the remainder of the term ending March 31, 2025. 🌀 **Page 9**

ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Appoint TRANSPAC TAC representatives to fill the vacant alternate seats on the CCTA CBPAC for the term ending December 31, 2025, and the CCTA TCC for the term ending March 31, 2025.

Attachment: Staff Report

INFORMATION ITEMS

5. **TRANSPAC SUBREGIONAL TRANSPORTATION MITIGATION PROGRAM (STMP).** Through the Central County Action Plan, TRANSPAC has established a Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP) to generate funding for project mitigations from private developers whose projects increase traffic on Routes of Regional Significance. The STMP outlines the process for assessing and, if necessary, mitigating the impacts of proposed developments. At this meeting, staff will review the STMP and its associated procedures. (INFORMATION). 🌀 **Page 11**

Attachment: Staff Report

6. **COMMITTEE UPDATES:**

- a. **TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE (TCC).** The TCC Meeting scheduled for September 19, 2024, was canceled. The next regular meeting will be held on October 17, 2024.
- b. **COUNTYWIDE BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CBPAC):** The CBPAC Meeting scheduled for September 23, 2024, was canceled. The next regular meeting will be held on November 25, 2024.
- c. **PARATRANSIT COORDINATING COUNCIL (PCC):** The last PCC meeting was held on September 16, 2024. The next regular meeting is scheduled for November 18, 2024.

7. INFORMATION ITEMS:

- a. **GRANT FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES.** This agenda item is intended to provide an opportunity to review and discuss grant opportunities. (INFORMATION). 🌀 **Page 39**

- b. **CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (CCTA) MEETING CALENDAR:** The CCTA Calendar for September 2024 to December 2024 may be downloaded using the following link: [Click to View Meeting Schedule](#)

8. MEMBER COMMENTS

9. NEXT MEETING: OCTOBER 31, 2024.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting Summary Minutes

MEETING DATE: June 27, 2024

STAFF PRESENT: Smadar Boardman, Walnut Creek; Jason Chen, Clayton; John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Ryan McClain, City of Pleasant Hill; Celestine Do, BART; Kirsten Riker, 511CC; John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Samantha Harris, Contra Costa County; Matt Todd, TRANSPAC Managing Director; Tiffany Gephart, TRANSPAC, Irina Nalitkina, TRANSPAC Clerk

GUESTS/PRESENTERS: John Hoang, CCTA

MINUTES PREPARED BY: Irina Nalitkina

1. **CONVENE MEETING / SELF-INTRODUCTIONS.**

Matt Todd called the meeting to order at 9:02 A.M. Introductions followed.

2. **Public Comment.**

There were no comments from the public.

3. **Minutes of the June 27, 2024, Meeting.**

The minutes of the June 27, 2024, TRANSPAC TAC meeting were approved by consensus.

4. **Transportation Fund For Clean Air (TFCA) Fund – Fiscal Year 2024/2025 Call for Projects.**

Matt Todd summarized recent changes in the programming of TFCA funds noting that the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) had introduced a new TFCA fund policy.. This policy now prioritizes county-wide projects before distributing remaining funds among sub-regions using a jobs-housing formula..

An overview of the county-wide projects funded by TFCA was provided, including programs like the 511 Contra Costa suite of programs. The discussion then focused on the remaining \$812,000 allocated to the four sub-regions, with Central County's share being approximately \$250,000. Two projects were under consideration for funding: the Walnut Creek Bikeway and the 511 Contra Costa Active4Me program. The recommendation was to fully fund the Walnut Creek Bikeway

project with \$104,000 and use the remaining \$145,000 of TFCA funds to cover part of the \$183,000 needed for the Active4Me program. The remaining balance of the funds needed to fully fund the Active4Me program (\$37,616) will utilize contract capacity from the existing contract. The extra contract capacity is available due to lower costs incurred by the program during COVID restrictions.

Ms. Boardman elaborated on the Walnut Creek Bikeway project, clarifying that the \$104,000 would support the city's contribution to the project, which includes improvements to the Treat Boulevard bike facility and pedestrian safety at key intersections. The project is expected to receive additional federal funding.

Mr. Todd sought consensus to recommend this funding strategy to the board, which the members approved.

5. CCTA Countywide Data and Corridor Analysis.

Mr. Hoang of CCTA introduced a new dashboard which aims to assist elected officials, city staff, and the public by providing a comprehensive view of transportation data. The dashboard uses AWS cloud services and includes data from multiple sources like INRIX, StreetLight, and 511.org and reports speed, volume, congestion, and collision data among other data points.

Mr. Hoang outlined the phases of the project, including the current phase of live dashboard deployment and future plans for integrating a data repository. He also discussed the use of StreetLight data and its cost-effectiveness compared to traditional analysis methods. Examples of data analysis, including pre- and post-COVID travel patterns, were presented.

Mr. Cunningham asked if they would be able to obtain mode split data from the ongoing effort. Mr. Hoang inquired whether John Cunningham was referring to data dashboards or something else, to which Mr. Cunningham clarified that he was asking about the entire year's efforts. Mr. Hoang responded that they would look into it.

Mr. Cunningham emphasized the importance of mode split data, especially given that Contra Costa has historically had the worst bike mode split in the entire Bay Area, tied with Solano County. He noted that with new Class 4 facilities coming online, this could be a positive selling point for future tax measures, showcasing how these efforts have significantly improved mode split.

Mr. Hoang appreciated the suggestion and asked if the needle had moved on bike mode split over the past 5 to 10 years. Mr. Cunningham admitted that he hadn't checked MTC's Vital Signs dashboard in a few years but recalled that the data had been flatlining for about ten years.

Ms. Riker asked about the trip purpose data and how they determined the purpose of trips, such as home-based work or other purposes. Mr. Hoang explained that this data came from location-

based services, which track vehicle locations using GPS, previously cellular data, and even credit card transactions to determine trip purposes. He noted that the data is anonymized. Ms. Riker followed up, asking if all trips were automatically tracked via GPS. Ms. Hoang clarified that only the vehicles with GPS systems that they had access to were tracked.

Ms. Do asked if GPS tracking occurred even when not actively using navigation systems in cars. Mr. Hoang explained that once location tracking is accepted on an app or device, it can continue to track movements, whether actively using it or not.

Mr. McClain noted that the safety dashboard discussed Vision Zero but seemed to focus more on delays caused by crashes rather than on safety outcomes. He suggested reframing the data to better align with Vision Zero's goals.

Mr. Hoang acknowledged Mr. McClain's feedback, mentioning that the current dashboard was freeway-centric, but they were working to include data from arterial routes and possibly overlay pavement condition index data onto the dashboard.

Mr. McClain appreciated the user-friendly interface and provided further feedback.

Ms. Do asked who CCTA was working with from BART for the data. Mr. Hoang explained that they were currently using publicly available data from BART's website but appreciated the offer to connect with someone directly if needed.

Mr. Todd suggested adding headers related to transit and bike trips on the webpage, asking if there was data available for bike trips. Mr. Hoang explained that it depended on the available data sources and that they were still working to find and access relevant data.

Mr. McClain mentioned that there is data available somewhere that tracks daily bike and pedestrian trips. Mr. Boardman added that Strava data, which is often cited for bike trips, is heavily skewed toward cycling enthusiasts and should be used with caution.

6. COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST.

Mr. Hoang reiterated the importance of early submissions for the Measure J Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist and reminded everyone of the upcoming deadlines.

Mr. Hoang explained that the checklist process happens annually and involves cities and agencies complying with the Growth Management Program as part of Measure J. He outlined that the checklist for calendar years 2023 would be followed by fiscal year numbers for 2023-24 and 2024-25, with funds to be distributed accordingly. He noted that the purpose of the checklist was to ensure member agencies are compliant and eligible to receive their local streets maintenance & Improvement allocated funding.

Mr. Hoang mentioned that the checklist includes various categories such as local streets and road maintenance, housing production, and other city improvements. He emphasized that cities need to submit their checklists by the first deadline of June 30th of the following year. Mr. Hoang explained that the checklist was put online a couple of years ago, making it easier for cities to provide the required information. He also reminded the committee that early submission of the checklist would be beneficial, especially once the final dollar amount for fiscal year 2023-24 is available.

Mr. Hoang concluded his presentation by reiterating the importance of submitting the checklists promptly, noting that the estimated local streets maintenance & Improvement funds amount to approximately \$23.4 million, with final numbers expected in August or September.

7. COMMITTEE UPDATES:

Mr. Todd noted that the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) meeting had been canceled. He also mentioned that the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) meeting had occurred in May 2024, and they had already received an update on it last month. Similarly, the last Paratransit Coordinating Committee (PCC) meeting was held in May 2024 and there was no update. Finally, there were no new grant funding opportunities to note.

8. INFORMATION ITEMS:

Mr. Todd outlined the upcoming CCTA meetings. He noted that the TRANSPAC TAC committee would recess in July, with the next meeting scheduled for August 29th. He added that the Board would meet next in July, recess in August, and resume regular meetings in September.,

Mr. Todd further noted that staff is working with Jack Hall from CCTA to bring one of the autonomous vehicles from the Martinez pilot program to the Board meeting.

9. Member Comments:

There were no comments from the TAC.

10. Next Meeting: September 26, 2024.

The meeting adjourned at 10:14 a.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for September 26, 2024.

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: September 26, 2024

Subject:	TRANSPAC COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS
Summary of Issues	TRANSPAC is represented on the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) by one primary, one alternate and one citizen representative and on the CCTA Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) by three primary representatives and one alternate. Due to staffing changes, there are vacancies for alternate positions on both the CBPAC and the TCC. The TAC is requested to provide recommendations to fill the alternate CBPAC seat for the term ending December 31, 2025, and the alternate TCC seat for the term ending March 31, 2025.
Recommendation	Appoint TRANSPAC TAC representatives to fill the vacant alternate seats on the CCTA CBPAC for the term ending December 31, 2025, and the CCTA TCC for the term ending March 31, 2025.
Financial Implications	No TRANSPAC financial implications.
Option(s)	Defer the recommendation.

Background

Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC)

TRANSPAC is represented on the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) by one TRANSPAC staff representative (and alternate) and one citizen representative. The purpose of the CBPAC is to advise the CCTA on bicycle and pedestrian issues and to help the CCTA carry out its responsibilities as a sales tax and congestion management agency. The CBPAC responsibilities include overseeing updates to the countywide bicycle and pedestrian Plan and other CCTA policy documents as well as helping to implement policies, to review and provide recommendations on applications for funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs, and to address other bicycle or pedestrian issues facing the CCTA, Contra Costa and the region. The committee is expected to meet 5-6 times a year.

Currently, Briana Byrne, (Walnut Creek), is the primary representative, Lynne Filson is the alternate representative, and Scott Simmons is the citizen representative on the CBPAC for the term ending 12/31/25. Staff has been informed that Lynne Filson is no longer with the City of

Martinez which leaves a vacancy for the CBPAC alternate seat. The TAC is requested to recommend a TRANSPAC representative to fill the vacant alternative position on the CCTA CBPAC for the term ending 12/31/2025.

Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC)

TRANSPAC is also 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; provides 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.

Jason Chen (Clayton), Smadar Boardman (Walnut Creek) and Ryan McClain (Pleasant Hill) are the current TRANSPAC primary representatives and Lynne Filson (Martinez) is the alternate on the CCTA TCC for the term ending March 31, 2025. As previously noted, Lynne Filson is no longer with the City of Martinez leaving a vacancy for the TCC alternate seat. The TAC is requested to appoint a TRANSPAC representative to fill the vacant alternate position on the CCTA TCC for the term ending March 31, 2025.

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: September 26, 2024

Subject:	TRANSPAC SUBREGIONAL TRANSPORTATION MITIGATION PROGRAM (STMP)
Summary of Issues	Through the Central County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance (Action Plan), TRANSPAC has implemented a Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP) to generate funding for project mitigations from private developers whose projects are found to increase traffic on Routes of Regional Significance. The STMP details the process for consideration of, and mitigation if required, for proposed developments. At this meeting, staff will review the STMP program and procedures.
Recommendation(s)	For Information Only.
Option(s)	N/A
Financial Implications	None.
Attachment(s)	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 2017 Central County Action Plan: STMP Segment2. Draft 2022 Central County Action Plan: STMP Segment3. CCTA GMP Implementation Guide - Chapter 4: Evaluating the Impacts of Proposed New Development and General Plan Amendments

Background

The STMP generates funding for project mitigations from private developers whose projects increase traffic on Routes of Regional Significance and outlines a process for identifying transportation mitigation needs. Local agencies negotiate transportation mitigation fees on a project-by-project basis. The current TRANSPAC STMP complies with the Measure J Growth Management Program and has evolved since the initial program approval in 1996, with updates included in the 2017 Central County Action Plan.

TRANSPAC STMP Status and Approach

The TRANSPAC STMP, which applies to jurisdictions with the power to approve development projects, differs from the fee programs adopted in other parts of the county. Instead of applying

a uniform fee to all new development, the Central County program requires jurisdictions to execute a “developer-sponsored mitigation agreement” with affected Central County jurisdictions when a proposed development would generate more than 100 net new peak hour vehicle trips of which 50 or more are interregional trips on Routes of Regional Significance. (An “interregional trip” is defined as any trip that enters or leaves the “home” jurisdiction.)

Historically in Central County, new development consist primarily of infill projects and redevelopment of areas near transit, activity centers and downtowns. With regard to its regional mitigation program, TRANSPAC acknowledges that “While more dense development will reduce the number of vehicle trips generated by new development, these trips will add to existing congestion. This additional congestion is the price paid for denser, more transit efficient development. TRANSPAC recognizes that even with the implementation of its Action Plan, it may not be possible to reduce congestion on its Routes of Regional Significance and arterial network. While some major projects remain to be completed, TRANSPAC is focusing on management and operational strategies to help keep traffic moving through the region.”(*Letter from Chair of TRANSPAC to Chair of CCTA, January 7, 2008*).

Considering the ongoing changes in development and congestion in the region, the goal of this discussion is to review the existing policy and gather feedback from the Technical Advisory Committee.

5. FINANCIAL OUTLOOK

On an ongoing basis, TRANSPAC makes every possible effort to identify its major capital investment priorities for inclusion in local, regional, state, and federal funding plans. TRANSPAC provides input to the Authority on the development of financial strategies that, if successful, result in the allocation of funds toward projects in Central County. In addition, TRANSPAC has implemented a Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP) to generate funding for project mitigations from private developers whose projects are found to increase traffic on Routes of Regional Significance (Regional Routes).

This Action Plan is not financially constrained; it includes both funded and unfunded projects. The Central County projects listed in Table 5-1 (pages 45-50) have a lead agency, a projected cost estimate and secured funding as well as possible funding sources. This list comprises more than just projects for Routes of Regional Significance. These projects qualify for inclusion in the Authority's Comprehensive Transportation Project List, part of the 2014 CTP Update.

5.1 TRANSPAC Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP)

TRANSPAC has adopted a Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP) to ensure that new development pays to mitigate its impacts, as required by Measure J. The TRANSPAC STMP was included in the 2009 Central County Action Plan based on the TRANSPAC Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (RTMP), which was adopted by TRANSPAC and its member jurisdictions in 1996.

The STMP is modeled after the approach used for Oakhurst development in Clayton in the early 1990s. The Oakhurst project, with 1,480 units, generated \$1.1 million in transportation fee revenues. An origin-and-destination study determined the percentage of westbound peak-hour Ygnacio Valley Road through-trips at Civic Drive attributable to Clayton, and this percentage formed the basis cost of the transportation mitigations.

Under the TRANSPAC STMP, the impacts of any new development are determined through the CEQA environmental assessment process, and project-specific mitigations are developed based on the environmental assessment. While the STMP is predicated on a project basis and, as a result, calculated differently from the per-unit and per-commercial-square-foot fee programs used by other Contra Costa RTPCs, the combination of regional and local fees generally aligns in the aggregate with the fee programs in the other RTPC areas, especially fee charges in the Tri-Valley area, which has slightly lower commercial fees than the TRANSPAC area.

Agreements negotiated by TRANSPAC jurisdictions with jurisdictions in other RTPCs have also required similar traffic mitigation. For example, in March 2006, the cities of Concord and Pittsburg negotiated fee agreements for the Vista Del Mar (formally known as Alves Ranch) and Bailey Road Estates projects. In addition to paying the standard East County local and regional fees, the Vista Del Mar and Bailey Estates developer will also pay additional fair-share traffic mitigation to the City of Concord.

5.2 Local Fees

Prior to the passage of Measure C in 1988, each of the six Central County jurisdictions had established fees for local transportation improvements; some local fee programs preceded Measure C by as much as eight years.

Since the passage of Measure C and the adoption of the TRANSPAC RTMP, the six Central County jurisdictions have used both the RTMP/STMP and their local fee programs to address regional and local transportation needs. Examples of local fee programs are provided below.

Table 5-1: TRANSPAC - Example Traffic Impact Fees

Single Family Dwelling	Concord	Walnut Creek
Regional	\$268	\$0*
Local		\$2,639
Off-Site Street Improvement Program Fee (OSIP)****	\$3,251	n/a
TVTD2	n/a	n/a
Total Traffic Impact Fee Per Dwelling	\$3,519	\$2,639
Retail Building 50k SF		
Regional	\$0*	\$0*
Local		\$275,000
Off-Site Street Improvement Program Fee (OSIP)****	\$440,500	n/a
TVTD2	n/a	n/a
Total Traffic Impact Fee	\$440,500	\$275,000
Per Commercial Square Foot	\$8.81/sq ft	\$5.50/sq ft

Information compiled from local jurisdictions

* No examples exist

5.2.1 TRANSPAC Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP)

This Program is intended to fulfill the requirement for a Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP) established by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority as part of each jurisdiction's compliance with the Measure J Growth Management Program. STMP requirements are applicable to jurisdictions with statutory land use authority in the Central Contra Costa TRANSPAC area.

This program creates a requirement for an interjurisdictional agreement(s) to mitigate traffic impacts of net new peak hour vehicle trips should a proposed development meet or exceed the established interregional net new peak hour vehicle trip threshold for Routes of Regional Significance and that result in significant cumulative traffic impacts on such Routes. As provided under CEQA, an impacted jurisdiction may request an analysis of and mitigation from a proposed development outside that jurisdiction even if the established thresholds in the STMP may not have been met.

1. While the standard for project notifications to TRANSPAC and other RTPCs remains at 100 net new peak hour vehicle trips, the STMP is geared to an assessment of the cumulative impacts of net new peak hour vehicle trips and net new peak hour interregional vehicle trips on Routes of Regional Significance. Nexus and rough proportionality requirements are to be individually addressed as part of the proposed development's environmental assessment under the California Environmental Quality Act, (CEQA) as amended. For the purposes of the STMP, "interregional trip" is defined as any trip with origin or destination outside of the "home" jurisdiction in which the development is located.
2. The STMP requires the execution of an interjurisdictional agreement(s) to mitigate the cumulative impacts of development generating peak hour and interregional vehicle trips at or above the thresholds established in paragraph 3 for the development and for Routes of Regional Significance (Note: a jurisdiction may voluntarily choose to address impacts of interregional trips on roads other than Routes of Regional Significance).
3. STMP requirements are to be followed if it is first determined that a development project generates 500 or more net new peak hour vehicle trips and subsequently is determined to generate 100 or more interregional net new vehicle trips in any peak hour on a Route of Regional Significance as defined in the Central County Action Plan and/or the Comprehensive Countywide Transportation Plan. Jurisdictions are to execute a mitigation agreement(s) with all impacted TRANSPAC jurisdictions.

Interjurisdictional agreements are strongly encouraged to be executed to address impacts on TRANSPAC jurisdictions by outside jurisdictions.

TRANSPAC jurisdictions also expect to execute such agreements with jurisdictions impacted by TRANSPAC area projects as well.

For the purpose of determining if the above thresholds are met (i.e. 500 net new peak hour project vehicle trips and 100 net new interregional peak hour vehicle trips) and assessing cumulative traffic impacts on Routes of Regional Significance, a cumulative trip analysis must be completed as part of the CEQA assessment. This cumulative analysis is to review incremental trips (net new peak hour vehicle trips) not only generated by the proposed development, but also trips from "related past, present, and reasonably probable future projects" as defined by CEQA. If such cumulative analysis meets the trip thresholds and results in significant cumulative traffic impacts, the proposed development is responsible for mitigating its proportionate share of the impacts via an interjurisdictional agreement(s). Cumulative impacts are generally defined as a) existing traffic counts plus b) approved projects which have not yet been constructed or operated plus c) pending projects under review and consideration for approval by the proper agency(ies) plus d) any anticipated projects for which environmental review (e.g. Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report/Study) has been completed.

4. The required CEQA environmental assessment for a development project is to be used to determine if cumulative impacts on Routes of Regional Significance need to be mitigated.
 - A. If a development project meets or exceeds the thresholds established in Section 3 above and the environmental assessment can be accomplished by a Negative or Mitigated Negative Declaration, the jurisdiction will undertake a focused traffic study to determine if the requirements of the STMP apply. The traffic study will assess cumulative traffic impacts on Routes of Regional Significance beyond the home jurisdiction.
 - B. Should the requirements apply, the interjurisdictional agreement(s) on mitigation measures, actions and/or fees would require the voluntary consent and sponsorship of the project applicant. (Note: if such voluntary consent is not achieved, CEQA requires that an EIR be prepared, see Section 4B.) The agreement(s) will be developed in cooperation with affected jurisdictions and are to include the identification, implementation and monitoring mechanism(s) for mitigation of impacts (e.g. Central County Action Plan and Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan mitigation measures, actions, payment of fees, etc.)
 - C. If a development project meets or exceeds the thresholds and the environmental assessment requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the EIR will include an analysis of cumulative traffic

impacts outside the home jurisdiction to determine if the requirements of the STMP apply. Should the requirements apply, an interjurisdictional agreement(s) establishing the developer responsibility to mitigate project impacts (e. g. Central County Action Plan and Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan mitigation measures, actions, payment of fees, etc.) is required. The agreement(s) will be developed in cooperation with the affected jurisdictions and include the identification, implementation and monitoring mechanism(s) for mitigation requirements. Early consultation with affected jurisdictions is suggested.

- D. If a development project does not exceed the thresholds as determined under the cumulative analysis) and the required CEQA assessment is accomplished through a Categorical Exemption, Negative or Mitigated Negative Declaration, the jurisdiction is not required to develop an interjurisdictional agreement(s). Such development projects are likely to be small infill projects which are to be encouraged to promote jobs/housing balance, increased services and sustainability.
 - E. It is also possible that after a traffic analysis has been completed under 4A or 4B above, the participating jurisdictions may determine that no significant cumulative traffic impacts are expected to occur on Routes of Regional Significance. Similarly, it may be determined that the development does not create or increase congestion on a Route of Regional Significance and/or that the traffic increase is insignificant relative to the existing traffic volumes and/or capacity of the Route, and, as a result, does not warrant the development/execution of an interjurisdictional agreement. Under such circumstances, the parties may determine, and should document, that an interjurisdictional agreement is not necessary.
5. TRANSPAC may amend the STMP with the approval of its member jurisdictions at any time.

TRANSPAC Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP)

TRANSPAC adopted a STMP to ensure that new development pays to mitigate its impacts, as required by Measure J. The TRANSPAC STMP was included in the 2009 Central County Action Plan based on the TRANSPAC RTMP, which was adopted by TRANSPAC and its member jurisdictions in 1996.

The STMP is modeled after the approach used for Oakhurst development in Clayton in the early 1990s. The Oakhurst project, with 1,480 units, generated \$1.1 million in transportation fee revenues. An origin-and-destination study determined the percentage of westbound peak-hour Ygnacio Valley Road through-trips at Civic Drive attributable to Clayton, and this percentage formed the basis cost of the transportation mitigations.

Under the TRANSPAC STMP, the impacts of any new development are determined through the CEQA environmental assessment process, and project-specific mitigations are developed based on the environmental assessment. While the STMP is predicated on a project basis and, as a result, calculated differently from the per-unit and per commercial-square-foot fee programs used by other Contra Costa RTPCs, the combination of regional and local fees generally aligns in the aggregate with the fee programs in the other RTPC areas, especially fee charges in the Tri-Valley area, which has slightly lower commercial fees than the TRANSPAC area.

Agreements negotiated by TRANSPAC jurisdictions with jurisdictions in other RTPCs have also required similar traffic mitigation. For example, in March 2006, the cities of Concord and Pittsburg negotiated fee agreements for the Vista Del Mar (formally known as Alves Ranch) and Bailey Road Estates projects. In addition to paying the standard East County local and regional fees, the Vista Del Mar and Bailey Estates developer will also pay additional fair-share traffic mitigation to the City of Concord.

Actions Related to Funding

- Financial-1: Continue to participate and periodically update the TRANSPAC Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program and the Central Contra Costa Traffic Management Program to ensure it will produce sufficient funds in light of current and anticipated growth rates and construction costs.

Shared Facilities

Implementation of many of the transportation system improvements in this Action Plan will benefit multiple jurisdictions. Each of these improvements needs a negotiated agreement about cost sharing between jurisdictions. The cost-sharing approach could be based on which jurisdiction's traffic is expected to use the facility, on the boundaries within which the facility lies, or a combination. These agreements should be negotiated in advance so that when development takes place, the responsibility for improvements is clear.

4 Evaluating the Impacts of Proposed New Development and General Plan Amendments

When a local jurisdiction approves or denies a proposed development project within its adopted General Plan, the jurisdiction is making a short-range policy decision. Longer-range policy decisions are made when the local jurisdiction amends its General Plan to change land use policies that may affect the local and regional transportation system in the longer term. State law also requires Congestion Management Programs (CMPs) to include programs to analyze the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions on regional transportation systems.

Analysis of the impacts of GPAs on the transportation priorities and the local and regional transportation system has been integrated into the process for the preparation, implementation, and monitoring of the Action Plans. Each Action Plan is based upon long-range assumptions regarding future land use, consistent with local general plans, as reflected in the Authority's LUIS. Because the Action Plans are based on land use assumptions reflecting local general plans, GPAs may affect the effectiveness of Action Plan policies or the RTPC's ability to attain its RTOs.

Previously, Measure J required that local jurisdictions work with the RTPCs to apply the Authority's travel demand model and Technical Procedures to the analysis of GPAs and developments exceeding specified CEQA thresholds for their effects on the local and regional transportation system. However, the updated GMP removes the requirement to evaluate major projects and GPAs through the environmental review process. Instead, it now requires that the impact of major projects and GPAs on the six transportation priorities be analyzed in order for local jurisdictions to remain in compliance with the GMP. Such analysis now occurs during project review and is triggered when a project is proposed on or near a designated regional route or facility, or if the project could potentially interfere with an active transportation mode RTO or threshold. CEQA analysis may occur if applicable to the proposed GPA.

Some projects and GPAs may not involve development that would result in an impact to any of the transportation priorities or to the performance of the RTOs in an adopted Action Plan. However, where a development or GPA would likely cause an impact, the analysis of the project or GPA with regard to RTOs need only show that

the project or GPA is generally consistent with the adopted thresholds used to evaluate the RTOs. Analysis of a development's or GPA's consistency with the Action Plans will require a detailed review of the proposed development or GPA to determine whether it would interfere with attainment of the adopted RTOs. When applicable, transportation impact analyses shall be used to identify project-related measures to mitigate the impacts on the local and regional transportation system. As outlined in Table 3, Authority policy defines "major development projects and GPAs" as ones that would generate more than 100 net new peak hour vehicle trips. Some of the RTPCs have chosen to specify a lower trip threshold. A traffic analysis must be completed and subject to public review prior to action on any proposed major development project or GPA. Table 3 outlines the minimum number of net new peak hour vehicle trips for major development projects and GPAs above which the Sponsoring Jurisdiction must notify RTPCs, prepare a Transportation Impact Analysis, and undertake the Authority's process for reviewing GPAs. An RTPC may set a more stringent threshold for triggering a Transportation Impact Analysis through its Action Plan. Consultation among local jurisdictions shall be triggered by whichever threshold is lower. Furthermore, consultation is not limited to jurisdictions within the RTPC or the County, but should occur wherever project impacts are expected to occur.

This Chapter addresses how local jurisdictions should consult with one another in the evaluation of the impacts of new development, both within its adopted General Plan and in the context of a GPA. This procedure is intended to be consistent with the land use impact analysis program required by the CMP to minimize time and costs imposed on local jurisdictions and provide for coordinated review of the impacts of new development on the local and regional transportation system. Similarly, it is intended to support other regional and State transportation initiatives.

Table 3. Threshold for Notification and Review, in Net New Peak Hour Vehicle Trips

	Notification ¹	Traffic Study Preparation ²	Authority GPA Review Procedure ³
The Project is Consistent with the Adopted General Plan:	100	100	—
The Project Involves a GPA:	100	100	500

1 Applies to any project for which an environmental document (either a Negative Declaration or an EIR/EIS) is being prepared.

2 Included in the Authority’s adopted Technical Procedures and Implementation Guide. The traffic analysis is to be prepared in accordance with the Authority’s Technical Procedures, and consistent with standard traffic engineering practice as applicable under the CEQA Guidelines.

3 Requires that the lead agency undertake the GPA review process shown in Exhibit 4-1.

4.1 TRANSPORTATION IMPACT ANALYSES FOR PROJECTS WITHIN AN ADOPTED GENERAL PLAN

The Authority’s *Technical Procedures* describe the Authority’s transportation impact analysis requirements in detail. Fundamentally, these analyses include three major components:

- An evaluation of the traffic congestion impacts, following traditional Level of Service or delay-based methodologies. Although traffic congestion impact analyses are no longer required under CEQA, the Authority continues to require them for roadway routes of regional significance as part of the Growth Management Program and Action Plan processes, provided that the analyses and the implementation of their results do not conflict with goals to reduce VMT.
- An evaluation of project or GPA vehicle miles traveled (VMT).
- An evaluation of project or GPA impacts on regional active mode and transit routes of significance.

This Chapter explains the overall requirements for such analyses.

Note that a project or GPA Transportation Impact Assessment is not required to include an evaluation of impacts on attainment of RTOs regarding safety, climate change and equity. Instead, the Authority expects that progress toward attainment of RTOs for these three factors will be evaluated during periodic monitoring of the

RTOs. However, RTPCs may use their Action Plans to set requirements for analysis of these factors in project and GPA Traffic Impact Analysis if they desire.

A key consideration is that the study area should be independent of jurisdictional boundaries. That is, the locations to be studied, and the selection of other transportation facilities that may be affected by the project and therefore included for analysis, are selected based upon RTPC threshold criteria rather than based upon local jurisdictional limits.

Traffic Congestion Impacts

The required transportation impact report must fully document the approach, methodology, and assumptions of the traffic analysis. It should clearly explain the reasons for any adjustments to traffic generating characteristics, assumptions for assigning and distributing traffic, and assessment of impacts and mitigations. Recommended mitigation measures should be clearly stated and should indicate the relative share of the mitigation costs assigned to the project. The analysis should consider impacts on regional roadway routes, freeways and any ramp intersections, as well as identified regional active mode routes and transit routes. The analysis must not end when traffic gets on the freeway if the traffic generated by the project would significantly add to freeway ramp or mainline volumes, or affect interchange operations. The Authority's Countywide Model and LOS methodology are used to conduct the analysis.

In general, the analysis must evaluate baseline conditions that include existing conditions plus any development that has already been approved. The project is then added in to determine its project impacts based upon existing plus approved conditions. Finally, a cumulative condition is included to address all development that is expected to occur within the adopted General Plan. Land use assumptions for each scenario should apply the latest figures in the Authority's LUIS, which are based upon land use projections from ABAG, with some modifications based upon local review.

The transportation impact analysis should identify project-related impacts on the local and regional transportation system. Where an impact has been found during the transportation impact analysis or during project review, the local jurisdiction can suggest modifications to the project to mitigate an impact. These modifications shall ensure that proposed projects do not conflict with local adopted plans or with the RTOs and their thresholds identified in the Action Plans.

VMT Impacts

When assessing land use and development projects, each Contra Costa jurisdiction is required to implement consistent VMT analysis and mitigation procedures, as well as continued capacity and operational analysis and mitigation, in order to continue to receive Return to Source funds. The Authority's adopted VMT analysis and mitigation approach includes the following specific features:

- Specific metrics to quantify VMT from land use and development projects based on the land use type.
- Screening criteria which allow a jurisdiction to exempt a project that lacks substantial evidence that the project characteristics might lead to a significant amount of VMT.
- Minimum criteria that will apply to analysis and mitigation of VMT impacts from projects that are not exempted from analysis. Jurisdictions will also be able to apply more stringent VMT screening, significance and mitigation criteria if they desire.
- A set of tools to assist local jurisdictions in mitigating VMT. If adoption and implementation of all feasible mitigation measures will fail to lessen impacts to the less-than-significant levels, a jurisdiction may adopt a Finding of Overriding Consideration under CEQA.
- Collaboration with other jurisdictions to identify and mitigate capacity and operational impacts on Routes of Regional Significance.

Jurisdictions will be considered to be in compliance with the VMT analysis portion of the GMP so long as they follow these established procedures, regardless of whether these procedures result in exemption of a project from VMT analysis, a finding that a project would have no significant VMT impact, mitigation of a project to achieve less-than-significant levels of impact, or findings of significant unavoidable impacts

accompanied by findings of overriding consideration. Local jurisdictions may choose to apply methods and thresholds that are more stringent than those required by the Authority, and would still be considered to be in compliance with the GMP. The lead agencies have the ultimate responsibility for determining the most appropriate way to comply with CEQA when conducting environmental review of their projects. Appendix F describes the VMT analysis methodology.

Impacts to Regionally-Significant Active Mode and Transit Routes

The Measure J GMP requires RTPCs analyze the impacts that GPAs and other proposed developments may have on active mode routes and on transit routes. Evaluating impacts to these types of routes requires different methodologies than conventional LOS methods. The RTPCs are encouraged to explore RTOs and evaluation methods that address identified concerns in their subregions. For example, the *Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan* uses the Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) methodology to measure how stressful a street is for people bicycling on it, and to identify a countywide network of bike facilities that can accommodate cyclists of all ages and abilities. The LTS method could be used to evaluate the impact of a GPA or other proposed development on streets that are identified as part of that countywide network.

In cases where a transportation impact analysis may not be appropriate for evaluating project-related impacts on the active mode transportation system, an analysis of a development's or GPA's consistency with the applicable Action Plan shall be conducted. Such review will require a detailed look at the components of the proposed development or GPA and whether such activity would interfere with the implementation of RTOs adopted in the subject Action Plan.

4.2 Consultation and Review of GPAs

The jurisdiction considering the GPA (the Sponsoring Jurisdiction) should notify all affected local jurisdictions and applicable RTPCs as early as possible of potential impacts with respect to adopted RTOs, actions, or thresholds. Affected jurisdictions may voice concerns to the Sponsoring Jurisdiction by commenting on the project application. The Sponsoring Jurisdiction is responsible for adequately addressing the project's impacts on the regional route system by using the thresholds established to track the RTOs. If the GPA points toward revisions to the adopted Action Plan, the affected RTPC can work with the local jurisdictions to revise the Action Plan as necessary and appropriate. Ultimately, the proposed revisions to the Action Plan, if approved by the RTPC, will be incorporated into the CTP. During the project review

process, either the Sponsoring or the Affected Jurisdiction may initiate cooperative resolution discussions, with the goal of reaching an agreement regarding impacts and project modifications that reduce impacts on shared components of the transportation system. Upon request, the Authority will procure and pay for professional facilitation services to help the parties develop written principles of agreement to be memorialized in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Exhibit 4-1 provides a detailed description of each step that is required. Following the close of cooperative resolution discussions, if the Affected Jurisdiction remains unsatisfied with the outcome of those discussions, it may file a "Letter of Concern," detailing the basis for its concerns, and the proposed mitigations. Prior to approving the GPA, the Sponsoring Jurisdiction may provide a written response to the Affected Jurisdiction's "Letter of Concern." This information, along with any further written exchanges among the involved parties, is taken under consideration when the Authority evaluates a local jurisdiction's compliance with the GMP through the Biennial Compliance Checklist.

Exhibit 4-1
GPA Review Process
Detailed Description³

- 1** **Project Review.** Could the project result in an impact to one of the six transportation priorities' RTOs or thresholds or to a shared component of the transportation system?
- ➔ **NO:** Project is exempt from the GPA Review Process, although it is still subject to notification requirements in the applicable Action Plan.
 - ➔ **YES:** Sponsoring Jurisdiction shall move to the next step of the GPA Review Process.

- 2** **Notify Affected Parties.** The Sponsoring Jurisdiction shall notify potentially affected jurisdictions and RTPCs in accordance with the notification procedure as set forth in this Guide and the applicable Action Plan.
- The notification shall be issued as early as possible, but *no later* than the deadlines established in these procedures.

³ **Plural vs. singular use of the terms “Jurisdiction”, “RTPC” and “Action Plan”.**

Throughout the discussion, the Sponsoring and the Affected Jurisdiction are referred to in the singular, as though only one “upstream” jurisdiction could initiate a GPA, and only one “downstream” jurisdiction could be affected. In practice, there may be more than one Sponsoring Jurisdiction and, clearly, more than one affected jurisdiction. In either case, the plural – “jurisdictions” – would apply. Similarly, if more than one RTPC and, consequently, more than one Action Plan were involved, the plural – “RTPCs” and “Action Plans” – would apply.

Exhibit 4-1
GPA Review Process
Detailed Description ⁴

3 Traffic Impact Analysis. The Sponsoring Jurisdiction conducts a traffic impact analysis for the motorized transportation priorities - review using the thresholds established for the applicable RTOs in the adopted Action Plan(s). The traffic impact analysis shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the Authority's adopted *Technical Procedures*.

The Sponsoring Jurisdiction may raise the performance level of an RTO established in the adopted Action Plan if it believes that the target RTO is not stringent enough to serve as a meaningful threshold. The Sponsoring Jurisdiction shall provide the traffic impact analysis, complete with all necessary supporting technical information, as requested by the Affected Jurisdiction to provide an informed response.

4 Prepare Comment Letter. An Affected Jurisdiction may submit comments to the Sponsoring Jurisdiction expressing its concerns and issues regarding the potential impacts of the proposed GPA on Regional Routes.

The Affected Jurisdiction shall submit its comments as early as possible. To the greatest extent possible, the comment letter should indicate issues, what modifications are sought and/or acceptable for the project, as well as any changes in scope desired in the project, and the reasons why such changes are deemed to be appropriate.

5 Initiate Cooperative Resolution Discussions. At the request of either the Sponsoring or Affected Jurisdiction, the Authority shall facilitate cooperative discussions structured to offer an opportunity for conflict resolution. The objective of the discussions is to create principles of agreement that will serve as a framework for monitoring, review, and mitigation of potential impacts as the GPA develops over time. The goal for these discussions is to reach, through cooperative planning, an agreement regarding

Exhibit 4-1
GPA Review Process
Detailed Description ⁴

impacts on the six transportation priorities and the proposed modifications.

The affected RTPC may monitor and/or participate in the cooperative resolution discussions. Furthermore, the Sponsoring and Affected Jurisdictions shall confer with their respective RTPCs to seek concurrence with any proposed Action Plan revisions. The principles of agreement shall be memorialized in a written agreement, such as a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), between the Sponsoring and Affected Jurisdictions. The Authority shall be responsible for procuring and paying for professional facilitation services.

Have the involved jurisdictions entered into cooperative resolution discussions?

- **YES:** Sponsoring and Affected Jurisdictions move to Step 6 of the GPA review process.
- **NO:** Any jurisdiction that declines to participate in cooperative resolution discussions shall be subject to a compliance review, as specified through the Checklist review procedure, and to a finding of noncompliance by the Authority (Step 16).

6 **Develop Principles of Agreement.** Have the involved parties agreed to a set of principles, specified actions, timing and responsibilities for monitoring impacts on the six transportation priorities and memorialized them in a writing?

- **YES:** Sponsoring and Affected Jurisdictions have adopted Principles of Agreement and, if necessary, asked the RTPC to revise the affected Action Plan to reflect the actions in the agreement. (All involved parties move to Step 14)
- **NO:** Through their respective RTPCs, both the Sponsoring and Affected Jurisdictions report on progress to date on the development of principles of agreement. If Principles of Agreement have not been adopted in time for

Exhibit 4-1
GPA Review Process
Detailed Description ⁴

Authority review of the GMP Biennial Compliance Checklist of one or more involved jurisdictions, then Step 16 comes into play

Note: If the Sponsoring and Affected Jurisdictions cannot come to consensus or agreement, the RTPC may still amend its Action Plan for the purposes of providing mitigation.

- 7** **Response to Comments.** If the Affected Jurisdiction comments on the traffic impact analysis, the Sponsoring Jurisdiction shall
- a. Consider requests for changes in the scope of the project;
 - b. Address the comments directly to the Affected Jurisdiction;
 - c. Incorporate Principles of Agreement into the comments provided to the Affected Jurisdiction (if applicable); and

Provide that response, along with the final environmental documents and all affiliated supporting documents, directly to the Affected Jurisdiction.

- 8** **Notice of Intent to File a Letter of Concern.** If the Affected Jurisdiction remains unsatisfied with the response of the Sponsoring Jurisdiction, it must notify the Sponsoring Jurisdiction with a "Notice of Intent to File a Letter of Concern" outlining a summary of its remaining issues prior to or at the scheduled public meeting when the Sponsoring Jurisdiction considers approval of the environmental document and/or GPA. The Affected Jurisdiction must also submit a copy of this letter to the Authority, and subsequently document the basis for its concerns per Step 10.

- 9** **Final Cooperative Resolution Discussions.** The Sponsoring and Affected Jurisdictions enter into final discussions to address the issues raised in the "Notice of Intent to file a Letter of Concern". (Note: the Authority shall continue to facilitate these discussions.)

Exhibit 4-1
GPA Review Process
Detailed Description ⁴

10 **File Letter of Concern.** The Affected Jurisdiction prepares a “Letter of Concern” for review and approval by its Council or Board. The letter should provide the detailed basis for its concerns, as well as proposed changes to the project, transportation system enhancements and/or management plans to help offset the impacts, and/or other mitigations. The Affected Jurisdiction’s Council or Board must approve the “Letter of Concern” and transmit it to the Sponsoring Jurisdiction, and also submit a copy of this letter to the Authority.

11 **Respond to Letter of Concern.** The Sponsoring Jurisdiction may provide a written response letter to the Affected Jurisdiction, with copies of the documentation to the RTPC and Authority.

12 **GPA Approval.** Has the Sponsoring Jurisdiction approved the proposed GPA?

- **YES:** Sponsoring Jurisdiction shall move to step 13 of the GPA Review Process.
- **NO:** GPA Review Process is concluded, suspended or cooperative resolution discussions continue (return to Step 5).

Exhibit 4-1
GPA Review Process
Detailed Description ⁴

13 **Affected Jurisdiction Responds.** Has the Affected Jurisdiction that submitted a Letter of Concern concluded that the Sponsoring Jurisdiction has adequately responded to the concerns and issues outlined in its Letter of Concern

→ **YES:** Affected Jurisdiction informs the Authority in writing with a copy to the Sponsoring Jurisdiction, and all involved parties move to Step 14 of the GPA review process.

→ **NO:** Affected Jurisdiction informs the Sponsoring Jurisdiction in writing, with a copy to the Authority, that its actions on the GPA do not adequately respond to the concerns and issues of the Affected Jurisdiction. Proceed to Step 16.

14 **RTPC Revises Action Plan.** The affected RTPC, working with the Sponsoring and Affected jurisdictions, revises the Action Plan as necessary and appropriate to incorporate projects, programs, systems management investments and processes, mitigations or other actions to address the anticipated impacts and proposed mitigations and monitoring as set forth in either the Principles of Agreement from Step 6 or the Sponsoring Jurisdiction's response to comments (if the outcome of Step 13 was "yes").

15 Incorporate Action Plan Revisions into the CTP. The Authority considers the proposed revisions to the Action Plan (if such revisions were approved by the RTPC) and incorporates the revisions into the CTP, as appropriate.

Exhibit 4-1
GPA Review Process
Detailed Description ⁴

16

CCTA Evaluates Compliance with the GMP. If all of the above steps have been followed, and the GPA remains the subject of dispute, the Authority may find one or both of the parties out of compliance with the GMP. As part of the evaluation of the GMP Biennial Compliance Checklist review, the Authority will determine good faith participation in the GPA review process as described in Table 4. If Principles of Agreement are adopted, future compliance would be assessed based on ongoing adherence of the Sponsoring and Affected Jurisdictions to the Principles of Agreement.

END OF PROCESS

Table 4. Examples of Good Faith Participation in the GPA Review Process

For the Sponsoring Jurisdiction, did it take the following actions:

1. **Analysis:** Were the Countywide Model and Authority Technical Procedures used to evaluate impacts on the six Action Plan transportation priorities?
2. **Evaluation:** Were impacts to and the six Action Plan transportation priorities identified and appropriate and feasible project modifications defined?
3. **Notification:** Were all Affected Jurisdictions properly notified?
4. **Meet and Confer:** Did the Sponsoring Jurisdiction meet and confer with the Affected Jurisdiction, RTPC, and others who expressed interest in and/or concerns about the proposed GPA?
5. **Responsiveness to concerns/comments:** Did the Sponsoring Jurisdiction agree to evaluate specific concerns and impacts? Was the Sponsoring Jurisdiction responsive and did it attempt to resolve and work out issues and concerns? Did the Sponsoring Jurisdiction propose to and/or agree to participate in continued discussions? And if so, has the Sponsoring Jurisdiction taken action to implement the identified mitigation measures?

For the Affected Jurisdiction, did it take a sufficient number of the following actions:

1. **Accept Improvements:** Agree to accept improvements to the transportation system which are not in fundamental conflict with the jurisdiction's socio-economic character.
2. **Accept active transportation mode improvements, and/or other "non-physical" improvements** to enhance the transportation system.
3. Accept additional transit service.
4. **Support federal, state or regional funding** for improvements that serve the proposed development.

For all involved parties, have they, for example:

1. Committed to monitor RTOs; and
2. **Agreed on thresholds** for each RTO;

NOTE: If the Authority finds a party to be noncompliant with the GMP, the Authority may set deadlines and conditions for achieving compliance.

**Exhibit 4-2
GPA Review Process
Summary Description of GPA Review Process**

Steps	Action	Responsible Party			
		Sponsor Jurisdiction	Affected Jurisdiction	RTPC	CCTA
1	Project Review	✓			
2	Notify Affected Parties	✓			
3	Traffic Impact Analysis	✓			
4	Prepare Comment Letter		✓	✓	
5	Initiate Cooperative Resolution Discussion	✓	✓	✓	✓
6	Develop Principles of Agreement	✓	✓	✓	✓
7	Respond to Comments	✓			
8	Notice of Intent to File a Letter of Concern		✓		
9	Final Cooperative Resolution Discussion	✓	✓	✓	✓
10	File Letter of Concern		✓		
11	Respond to Letter of Concern	✓			
12	GPA Approval	✓			
13	Affected Jurisdiction Responds		✓		
14	RTPC Revises Action Plan			✓	
15	Incorporate Action Plan Revisions into the CTP				✓
16	CCTA Evaluates Compliance with the GMP				✓

✓ = Participation is Optional

4.3 MITIGATION OF IMPACTS THROUGH THE MEASURE J DEVELOPMENT MITIGATION PROGRAM

Measure J requires that each jurisdiction adopt and maintain a development mitigation program to ensure that new growth pays its share of the costs associated with that growth. The program consists of both a local and a regional component. The local program is intended to mitigate impacts on local streets and other non-regional facilities. The regional program is to fund regional and subregional transportation projects, consistent with the countywide CTP. The key GMP requirement for the local program is that the revenue received through the 18% return-to-source funds and 5% Contra Costa Transportation for Livable Communities funds do not replace private developer funding that has been or would have otherwise been committed to mitigate project impacts.

The jurisdiction's local development mitigation program should ensure that revenue provided from Measure J does not replace private developer funding that should be committed to a project. Therefore, impacts that are identified in traffic impact analyses should be incorporated into the local jurisdiction's mitigation program, and identified in the jurisdiction's five-year CIP, specifying the funding arrangements for the mitigations.

The regional development mitigation program establishes fees, exactions, assessments, or other mitigation measures to fund regional or subregional transportation improvements needed to mitigate the impacts of planned or forecast development. The regional mitigation programs that have been adopted within each subarea address the process for setting fees and other mitigations for new development. Consistent with the regional mitigation program, the traffic impact analysis should clearly indicate recommended mitigation measures and the relative share of the mitigation costs that are to be assigned to the project.

Regular review of Subregional Transportation Mitigation Programs (STMPs) is required to ensure that these programs are mitigating the impacts of new development on the regional transportation system. Occasional re-evaluation of these programs is necessary as proposed projects are constructed, development plans are implemented, and new mitigation projects are proposed.

STMPs with a uniform fee program should review project lists and fee structures every four to six years.

STMPs using other mitigation techniques should decide on an appropriate review schedule based on program components. Regular reviews are important to evaluate program effectiveness and to consider possible improvements.

The Countywide Model may be used to assess changes in a number of factors other than traffic volumes and LOS. These factors could include VMT, vehicle hours traveled, public transit hours travelled, and use of active transportation modes, among others. This information may be applied to establish a “nexus” between the impacts of new development and the costs of mitigating those impacts. Such nexus can be determined through a select link analysis, by analyzing how much the new residents and employees from a development are going to use a particular transportation facility.

4.4 CONSULTATION PROCEDURES

Local jurisdictions will need to review their procedures to ensure that proposed development complies with the thresholds established in the Action Plans, where applicable, and that the notification procedure ensures that all jurisdictions are apprised of proposed development plans.

As outlined in Exhibit 4-1, when considering a development proposal that meets the threshold for invoking the GPA review process, a Sponsoring Jurisdiction must, at a minimum, use the established thresholds in the adopted Action Plans in the transportation impact analysis.

When a proposed project is suspected to impact one of the six transportation priorities or an adopted RTO, notification of RTPC chairs or designated staff is required. The Sponsoring Jurisdiction is responsible for ongoing notification to all interested parties as the proposed project continues through the development review process. Furthermore, as noted above, consultation with the affected jurisdictions and RTPC(s) is required for GPAs that would exceed the thresholds specified in Table 3.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Funding Opportunities Summary 08/29/2024

Upcoming Funding Opportunities

Funding Program	Fund Source*	Application Deadlines	Program and Contact Information
Innovative Deployments to Enhance Arterials Transit Signal Priority A15(IDEA TSP)	F	9/12/2024 at 4 P.M.	MTC's Innovative Deployments to Enhance Arterials (IDEA) is a technical assistance grant program that has been helping cities, counties and transit agencies improve the signal timing of major arterial roadways. https://mtc.ca.gov/operations/programs-projects/streets-roads-arterials/innovative-deployments-enhance-arterials-idea
Bridge Investment Program (BIP) Planning Project Grant	F	10/1/2024	Bridge Investment Program (BIP) is a competitive, discretionary program that focuses on existing bridges to reduce the overall number of bridges in poor condition, or in fair condition at risk of falling into poor condition. It also expands applicant eligibilities to create opportunity for all levels of government to be direct recipients of program funds. Alongside states and federal lands management agencies, metropolitan planning organizations and local and tribal governments can also apply directly to FHWA, making it easier to advance projects at the local level that meet community needs. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/local-assistance/fed-and-state-programs/bridge-investment-program
Charging and Fueling Infrastructure (CFI) Discretionary Grant Round 2	F	9/11/2024	The Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Discretionary Grant Program (CFI Program) is a competitive grant program created by President Biden's Bipartisan Infrastructure Law to strategically deploy publicly accessible electric vehicle charging and alternative fueling infrastructure in the places people live and work – urban and rural areas alike – in addition to along designated Alternative Fuel Corridors (AFCs). https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/cfi/
Reconnecting Communities Pilot (RCP) Grant Program	F	9/30/2024	The RCP Program focuses on improving access to daily needs such as jobs, education, healthcare, food, nature, and recreation, and foster equitable development and restoration, and provide technical assistance to further these goals. https://www.transportation.gov/reconnecting
Local Highway Safety Improvement (HSIP) Project	F	9/9/2024	The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), aka Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL), was signed into law by President Biden on November 15, 2021. Under IIJA, the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), codified as Section 148 of Title 23, United States Code (23 U.S.C §148), is a core federal-aid program to States for the purpose of achieving a significant reduction in fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. The Division of Local Assistance (DLA) manages California's local agency share of HSIP funds. California's Local HSIP focuses on infrastructure projects with nationally recognized crash reduction factors (CRFs). Local HSIP projects must be identified on the basis of crash experience, crash potential, crash rate, or other data-supported means. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/local-assistance/fed-and-state-programs/highway-safety-improvement-program

Previous Funding Opportunities

Funding Program	Fund Source*	Awardees	Allocation Amount(s)	Application Date(s)	Program and Contact Information
<i>Bike/Ped/Trails</i>					

FY 2024 Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) Grant Program	F	TBD	TBD	<p>Planning and Demonstration Grant:</p> <p>Thursday, April 4, 2024, 2:00 PM Thursday, May 16, 2024, 2:00 PM Thursday, August 29, 2024, 2:00 PM</p> <p>Implementation Grant applications must be submitted by 2:00 PM on Thursday, May 16, 2024</p>	<p>The program focuses on the development of a comprehensive safety action plan and its implementation for all users of our highways, streets, and roadways, including pedestrians, bicyclists, public transportation users, motorists, personal conveyance and micromobility users, and commercial vehicle operators. The program provides funding to develop tools to strengthen a community’s approach to roadway safety and save lives and prevent serious harm.</p> <p>https://www.transportation.gov/grants/SS4A</p>
Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 7	S/F	TBD	TBD	6/17/2024	<p>The California Transportation Commission approved the final statewide and MTC’s regional guidelines for ATP Cycle 7 in March 2024, with the Call for Projects released shortly thereafter. Cycle 7 covers fiscal years 2025/26 through 2028/29. Approximately \$284 million will be available in the statewide component and \$49 million in MTC’s regional component. The deadline for applications is June 17, 2024.</p> <p>Caltrans' ATP page: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/local-assistance/fed-and-state-programs/active-transportation-program/cycle7#:~:text=ATP%20Cycle%207%20is%20expected,and%2028%2F29%20fiscal%20years.</p> <p>MTC ATP Page: https://mtc.ca.gov/funding/investment-strategies-commitments/climate-protection/active-transportation-program</p>

Active Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program (ATIIP)	F	TBD	TBD	6/17/2024	<p>The Active Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program (ATIIP) is a new competitive grant program created by Section 11529 of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law to construct projects to provide safe and connected active transportation facilities in active transportation networks or active transportation spines. ATIIP will award two types of grants: Planning and Design grants and Construction grants. FHWA will award Planning and Design grants for eligible applicants to develop plans for active transportation networks and active transportation spines. FHWA will award Construction grants to eligible applicants to construct projects to provide safe and connected active transportation facilities in an active transportation network or active transportation spine.</p> <p>https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/atiip/</p>
Transportation Development Act (TDA), Article 3 FY 2022-23	S	13 Projects	\$1,400,000	11/1/2022	<p>http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STA-TDA Jerry Fahy, Transportation Engineering Division Manager Contra Costa County jerry.fahy@pw.cccounty.us (925)313-2276 Cheryl Chi, TDA Program Manager, MTC cchi@bayareametro.gov (415)778-5339</p>

Safe Route to BART (SR2B) Program (Cycle 3)	L	Pittsburg/Bay Point	\$900,000	12/14/2023	Cycle 3 is the final call for projects for the SR2B grant program. SR2B is funded by Measure RR and provides money to local agencies in Alameda, Contra Costa, and San Francisco counties for constructing projects that improve walking and biking access to BART stations. There is about \$16 million total for this cycle with grant amounts between \$500,000 and \$3 million. www.bart.gov/sr2b
Planning, Maintenance, Safety, Bridge, Other					
Congestion Relief Program (CRP)	F	TBD	TBD	4/22/2024	The BIL establishes the Congestion Relief Program to provide discretionary grants to eligible entities to advance innovative, integrated, and multimodal solutions to congestion relief in the most congested metropolitan areas of the United States with an urbanized area population greater than 1,000,000. The goals of the program are to reduce highway congestion, reduce economic and environmental costs associated with that congestion, including transportation emissions, and optimize existing highway capacity and usage of highway and transit systems through: (1) improving intermodal integration with highways, highway operations, and highway performance; (2) reducing or shifting highway users to off- peak travel times or to nonhighway travel modes during peak travel times; and (3) pricing of, or based on, as applicable, parking; use of roadways, including in designated geographic zones; or congestion. https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/congestion_relief.cfm
Bus Accelerated Infrastructure Delivery (BusAID)	S	TBD	TBD	Spring-Summer 2024	MTC is implementing a new program, Bus Accelerated Infrastructure Delivery (BusAID), which inventories operator-identified “hotspot” locations that regularly see transit delay or reliability issues. BusAID funds the delivery of quick-build transit priority projects, investing in projects that maximize bus (and light rail) travel time savings and service reliability improvements for the most people as quickly as possible, while centering on the groups of people that depend on transit the most. https://mtc.ca.gov/operations/transit-regional-network-management/transit-priority
California Natural Resources Agency's (CNRA's) Urban Greening Program (Round 5)	S	San Pablo East Bay Regional Park District	\$4,790,690 \$1,400,000	3/28/2022	The program seeks projects that reduce Green House Gas (GHG) emissions and provide multiple benefits. \$47.5 million in awards will be funded by this program. Award announcements in February 2023. https://resources.ca.gov/grants/urban-greening/

Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program (Round 7)	S	Richmond - Metrowalk Ph2	\$42.9M	4/4/2023	<p>The Program builds healthier communities and protects the environment by increasing affordable places to live near jobs, stores, transit, and other daily needs. AHSC reduces greenhouse gas emissions by funding projects that make it easier for residents to get out of their cars and walk, bike, or take public transit. Approximately \$675 million is available.</p> <p>https://sgc.ca.gov/programs/ahsc/</p>
Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program (Round 8)	S	City of El Cerrito and City of Walnut Creek	\$75M	3/19/2024	<p>The Program builds healthier communities and protects the environment by increasing affordable places to live near jobs, stores, transit, and other daily needs. AHSC reduces greenhouse gas emissions by funding projects that make it easier for residents to get out of their cars and walk, bike, or take public transit. Approximately \$675 million is available.</p> <p>https://sgc.ca.gov/programs/ahsc/</p>
MTC – Mobility Hub Pilot Program 2023	F	CCTA – Martinez Mobility Hub San Pablo – Contra Costa College Mobility Hub Tri Delta Transit – Antioch Park and Ride (Planning & Outreach)	\$3M \$2.95M \$400,000	3/31/23 at 4 pm	<p>As part of the Climate Initiatives from Plan Bay Area 2050, both seeks to achieve a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions through a decrease in vehicle miles traveled, as well as to advance other regional priorities.</p> <p>https://abag.ca.gov/technical-assistance/climate-grant-mobility-hubs</p> <p>https://abag.ca.gov/technical-assistance/climate-grant-parking-management-planning</p>

Caltrans Transportation Planning Grants (FY 2024-25) Sustainable Communities, Strategic Partnerships, and Adaptation Planning	S	CCTA	\$1.49M	Application Deadline: January 18, 2024 Evaluation and approval of grant recommendation: Spring 2024 Grant announcements: Summer 2024	Sustainable Communities Grants (\$29.5 million) to encourage local and regional planning that supports state goals, implements Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS) (where applicable), and to ultimately achieve the State’s greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets. Climate Adaptation Planning Grants (\$31.9 million) support local and regional identification of transportation-related climate vulnerabilities through the development of climate adaptation plans, as well as project-level adaptation planning to identify adaptation projects and strategies for transportation infrastructure. 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. A sub-category funds transit-focused planning projects that address multimodal transportation deficiencies. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/transportation-planning/division-of-transportation-planning/regional-and-community-planning/sustainable-transportation-planning-grants#:~:text=The%20California%20Department%20of%20Transportation,for%20transportation%20planning%20projects%20statewide
Measure J Transportation for Livable Communities FY 2018-22	L	West County Central County Southwest County	\$11,392,000 \$9,880,000 \$6,314,000	- - -	Colin Clarke, Associate Transportation Planner, Authority cclarke@ccta.net (925) 256-4726 (In addition, \$350,000 for Iron Horse Active Transportation Corridor Study covers both Central and Southwest County)
Safety - Roadway					
Pavement Management Technical Assistance Program (P-TAP) Cycle 25	F	City of Clayton City of Lafayette City of Martinez City of Orinda City of Pittsburg City of Pleasant Hill City of San Ramon City of Walnut Creek	TBD	November 27, 2023 by 4 pm	P-TAP is for implementing, updating and maintaining pavement management database; providing accurate pavement condition data to city councils, county supervisors or other local decision makers; supporting our region’s management of non-pavement street and road assets such as signs, storm drains, curbs and gutters, traffic signals and street lights. https://ptap.streetsaver.com/

Program for Arterial System Synchronization FY 2022-23 Cycle	F	Concord – Treat Blvd; Clayton Rd; Monument Blvd; Galindo St/Concord Ave Pittsburg – Buchanan Ave; Railroad Ave; West Leland Road Walnut Creek – Ygnacio Valey Rd and California Blvd	\$155,838 \$100,463 \$113,805	5/12/2022	Approximately \$2.5 million in Federal funds are available to fund projects that improve arterial operations through the coordination of traffic signals and related services. https://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/operate-coordinate/arterial-operations/program-arterial-system-synchronization-pass
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Cycle 11 Call for Projects	S	Antioch, Concord, County, Danville, Moraga, Pinole, Richmond	\$19.1 M Total	9/12/2022	The purpose of HSIP is to achieve significant reduction in fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. Local HSIP projects must be identified on the basis of crash experience, crash potential, crash rate, or other data-supported means. Award announcement in January 2023. https://dot.ca.gov/programs/local-assistance/fed-and-state-programs/highway-safety-improvement-program/apply-now
Major Projects					
Consolidated Rail Infrastructure Safety Improvements (CRISI)	F	TBD	TBD	5/28/2024	The purpose of the CRISI Program is to invest in a wide range of projects within the United States to improve railroad safety, efficiency, and reliability; mitigate congestion at both intercity passenger rail and freight rail chokepoints to support more efficient travel and goods movement; enhance multi-modal connections; and lead to new or substantially improved Intercity Passenger Rail Transportation corridors. This program invests in railroad infrastructure projects that improve safety, support economic vitality (including through opportunities for small businesses), create good-paying jobs with the free and fair choice to join a union, increase capacity and supply chain resilience, apply innovative technology, and explicitly address climate change, gender equity and racial equity. https://www.grantsolutions.gov/gs/preaward/previewPublicAnnouncement.do?id=110514
United States Department of Transportation - Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) Grant FY2024	F	None	N/A	2/28/2024	The RAISE program helps communities build transportation projects that have significant local or regional impact and improve safety and equity. Half of the funding will go to projects in rural areas, and half of the funding will go to projects in urban areas. The FY2024 round has \$1.5 billion available. https://www.transportation.gov/RAISEgrants

2024 State Transportation Improvement Program	S/F	Contra Costa County - Various	\$43,154,000	6/16/2023	The 2024 STIP will cover the 5-year period from Fiscal Year (FY) 2024-25 through FY 2028-29. The 2024 STIP Fund Estimate estimated total statewide new programming capacity of \$1.718 billion, including positive capacity in the SHA (\$1.644 billion) and PTA (\$242 million). Programming of the 2024 STIP includes \$1.148 billion to projects carried forward from the 2022 STIP and a new capacity of \$1.718 billion, for total of \$2.865 billion. The 2024 STIP was adopted by California Transportation Commission (CTC) on March 21, 2024.
USDOT’s Multimodal Project Discretionary Grant 2025-2026 (MPDG)	F	TBD	TBD	5/6/2024	The MPDG contains 3 grant programs: the National Infrastructure Project Assistance grants program (Mega), the Nationally Significant Multimodal Freight and Highways Projects grants program (INFRA), and the Rural Surface Transportation Grant program (Rural). The funding opportunities are for surface transportation infrastructure projects, including highway and bridge, intercity passenger rail, railway-highway grade crossing or separation, wildlife crossing, public transportation, marine highway, and freight projects, or groups of such projects, with significant national or regional impact, or to improve and expand the surface transportation infrastructure in rural areas. \$1.7 billion is available for Mega; \$2.7 billion is available for INFRA; and \$780 Million is available for Rural. https://www.transportation.gov/grants/mpdg-program
Signal Improvements/Technology					
Strengthening Mobility and Revolutionizing Transportation (SMART) Grants Program	F	CCTA - Integrated Open Data Platform for Multimodal Accessible Transportation (OPTIMAT)	\$1,096,500	10/10/2023	The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) established the SMART discretionary grant program with \$100 million appropriated annually for fiscal years (FY) 2022-2026. The SMART program was established to provide grants to eligible public sector agencies to conduct demonstration projects focused on advanced smart community technologies and systems in order to improve transportation efficiency and safety. https://www.transportation.gov/grants/SMART
Innovative Deployments to Enhance Arterials (IDEA) Grant	F/R	Category 1: San Ramon – Bollinger Canyon Road, Crow Canyon Road Category 2: Authority – Concord Boulevard, Clayton Road, Willow Pass Road Walnut Creek – Olympic Boulevard, S. California Boulevard, Newell Avenue	\$563,000 \$560,000 \$600,000	9/29/2017 Category 1 11/17/2017 Category 2, and Combination of Categories 1 and 2	The new IDEA grant program aims to use \$13 million in Federal funds to help cities, towns, counties and transit agencies improve the operation of major arterial roadways and to make these roadways ready for Connected Vehicle and Automated Vehicle technologies. http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/operate-coordinate/arterial-operations/idea-innovative-deployments-enhance-arterials