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

TRANSPAC TAC MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2026
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 marlene@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 marlene@graybowenscott.com or (925) 937-0980 during regular business hours at least 48 hours prior to the time of the meeting.

Meeting Code of Conduct: TRANSPAC is committed to providing a respectful and productive meeting environment for all participants. All attendees, members, and staff are expected to engage constructively and treat others with courtesy. A copy of TRANSPAC's Meeting Code of Conduct is available at transpac.us

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 SEPTEMBER 24, 2026 MEETING. Page 5

Attachment: TAC minutes from the September 24, 2026, meeting.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Approve Minutes of the September 24, 2026, TRANSPAC TAC meeting.

4. **TRANSPORTATION FOR LIVABLE COMMUNITIES (TLC) CYCLE 3 – PROJECT RANKINGS AND PROGRAMMING SCENARIOS.** The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) program funds bicycle, pedestrian, and complete streets projects with Measure J revenue. Central County received 11 applications from six sponsors requesting approximately $59 million. The TAC Scoring Subcommittee met to review and score the applications. At this meeting, staff will present the ranking and programming scenarios for TAC review and direction. **Page 13**

ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Recommend a Measure J TLC program of projects for TRANSPAC Board consideration.

Attachment: Staff Report

5. **TRANSPAC TAC APPOINTMENTS TO CCTA COMMITTEES.** TRANSPAC is represented on the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Countywide Active Transportation Advisory Committee (CATAC) by one primary, one to two alternates and one citizen representative. The current primary representative term will expire on December 31, 2027. There is a vacancy in the primary representative seat. The TAC is requested to provide recommendations to fill the CATAC primary representative seat for the remainder of the current term ending December 31, 2027. **Page 31**

ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Recommend a TRANSPAC TAC representative to fill the primary CCTA CATAC seat for the remainder of the term ending December 31, 2027.

Attachment: Staff Report

INFORMATION ITEMS

6. **CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURE PLAN FRAMEWORK.** Measure J, approved by Contra Costa voters in 2004, extended the county's half-cent transportation sales tax through 2034 and established a Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) for how revenues would be spent. To prepare for the next TEP, CCTA staff is gathering input from Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) including TRANSPAC. At this meeting, CCTA will present funding projections and an initial "Strawman" TEP outlining proposed Transformative Visions and Investment Categories, and will seek feedback on the TEP framework and potential Named Projects ahead of the initial draft TEP. (INFORMATION) **Page 33**

Attachment: Staff Report

7. **TRANSPAC MEETING SCHEDULE FOR 2027.** The TRANSPAC TAC is requested to review and comment on the proposed meeting schedule. (INFORMATION) Page 41

Attachment: Staff Report

8. **TRANSPAC SUBREGIONAL TRANSPORTATION MITIGATION PROGRAM – DEVELOPMENT PROJECT TRACKING.** This agenda item is intended to provide an opportunity to review and discuss the general plan amendments and development proposals that have issued environmental notices, with potential impacts to TRANSPAC jurisdictions. (INFORMATION) Page 43

9. **COMMITTEE UPDATES:**

   a. **TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE (TCC).** The last TCC meeting was held on October 15, 2026. The next regular meeting is scheduled for November 19, 2026.

   b. **COUNTYWIDE ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CATAC).** The last CATAC meeting was held on September 28, 2026. The meeting scheduled for November 16, 2026, has been canceled.

   c. **ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING (AAC):** The last Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting was held October 19, 2026. The next regular meeting is scheduled for November 16, 2026.

10. **INFORMATION ITEMS:**

    a. **GRANT FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES.** This agenda item is intended to provide an opportunity to review and discuss grant opportunities. (INFORMATION). Page 45

    b. **CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (CCTA) MEETING CALENDAR:** The CCTA Calendar for November 2026 through February 2027 may be downloaded using the following link.

11. **MEMBER COMMENTS.**

12. **NEXT MEETING:** The next meeting is proposed for January 28, 2027, pending TRANSPAC board approval.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting Summary Minutes

Meeting Date:	**September 24, 2026**
Staff Present:	Aaron Elias, Concord; Anthony Nuti, Pleasant Hill; Samantha Harris, Contra Costa County; Matthew Redmond, Walnut Creek; Trevor McGuire, Martinez; Celestine Do, BART; Matt Todd, TRANSPAC Managing Director; Tiffany Gephart, TRANSPAC
Guests/Presenters:	Ryan McClain, CCTA; Nikki Foletta, CCTA; Cara De Jong, 511CCTA; Andy Smith, County Connection
Minutes Prepared By:	Tiffany Gephart

1. Convene Meeting/Self-Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. Self-introductions were conducted.

2. Public Comment

No members of the public offered comment during the public comment period.

3. Minutes of the August 27, 2026 Meeting

The minutes of the August 27, 2026, TRANSPAC TAC meeting were approved by consensus.

4. Contra Costa Transportation Authority Transportation Expenditure Plan Framework

Tiffany Gephart introduced the item, noting that Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Executive Director Timothy Haile presented an overview of the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) process to the TRANSPAC Board on July 9, 2026, and that CCTA held a TEP special workshop on September 16, 2026, to which Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC) staff were invited. Ryan McClain (CCTA) continued the discussion and sought TAC feedback on how input is shaping the emerging TEP framework. The presentation is available for download with the September 24, 2026 meeting materials at transpac.us.

Mr. McClain reviewed the outcome areas of congestion, safety, access, connectivity, thriving communities, goods movement, and the environment, followed by a mock-up of how investment categories, named projects, and infrastructure and non-infrastructure programs would be organized in the TEP. He stated that projects addressing multiple outcomes would rank higher.

The following is a summary of the discussion:

- Aaron Elias commented on the proposed delay measure, and discussion followed on how delay should be calculated. Celestine Do asked what incentivizes drivers to choose alternative modes, and discussion followed on reliability and time savings. Members

noted that, other than potentially faster and more reliable transit travel times, the framework offers few incentives to take drivers off the road.

- Mr. Elias asked whether building out East County to increase vehicle throughput addresses what he described as a land use and affordability issue. Mr. McClain responded that East County board members have cited the need for more jobs in that area, that the growth management program is being considered as part of the TEP, and that CCTA now has data to assess the benefit of a project to regions beyond where it is located, using the Caldecott Tunnel as an example.
- Mr. Elias questioned whether a target of zero fatal and serious injury crashes is realistic. Mr. McClain stated that a safe system approach focuses on what local agencies can control, primarily infrastructure, and that a target of zero reflects that no deaths or serious injuries are acceptable.
- Mr. McClain stated that CCTA had discussed taking on a maintenance role for routes of regional significance, such as Ygnacio Valley Road and Treat Boulevard. In response to Matthew Redmond, he stated that any regional signal timing would be limited to event and incident recovery and evacuation plans, and that the concept was intended to achieve economies of scale on repaving. Mr. Elias stated a preference for CCTA to serve as a coordinator of paving contracts among cities. Mr. Redmond stated that economies of scale in paving could be beneficial and asked whether return-to-source funds would be redirected to CCTA; Mr. McClain stated that whether such funding would be in addition to or part of return-to-source funds had yet to be determined. Mr. Redmond stated that local right-of-way responsibilities should remain clear.
- Ms. Do asked when member comments would be integrated. Mr. McClain stated that comments would be reflected in the draft TEP at the beginning of next year, which would identify specific projects and be presented with a trade-off tool showing how funding levels change outcomes.
- Ms. Do asked how the pavement condition measure supports community vibrancy. Mr. McClain stated that the thriving communities outcome is intended to go beyond maintaining existing infrastructure, and Mr. Elias stated that residents associate road condition with transportation network performance. Ms. Do, Andy Smith, and Anthony Nuti noted that they had provided comments at previous meetings and asked that those comments be included.
- Mr. Elias stated that Concord receives truck complaints and that truck route restrictions are difficult to enforce because trucks may leave designated routes to make deliveries. Mr. McClain explained that streetscape projects improve walking and bicycling infrastructure and, in response to Ms. Gephart, that a tree cover measure could be considered.
- Mr. Nuti asked whether vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would be a measure under the environment outcome, and Mr. Redmond stated that it should be included. Mr. McClain asked about the cost for County Connection to transition to zero-emission buses. Mr. Smith stated that zero-emission buses cost approximately twice as much as diesel buses

and that charging infrastructure costs are significant. He stated that Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) advised that electrical service upgrades to County Connection's yard could take approximately five years, that no U.S. manufacturer makes 30-foot battery electric or hydrogen buses, and that County Connection plans to request a waiver from the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

- Mr. McClain stated that named projects and the size of each category remain to be determined and requested feedback on the project list over the next couple of weeks.
- Mr. Nuti asked whether the TEP would account for the expansion of the Monument Boulevard/I-680 project to include Contra Costa Boulevard under an Active Transportation Program (ATP) grant, and whether the Coggins Drive and Oak Park Boulevard listing covers the full corridor. Mr. McClain stated that he would note the expansion and that he believed the listing covers the full corridor.
- In response to Mr. Elias on how projects funded through ATP or One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) before the TEP is finalized would be treated, Mr. McClain explained that listed projects are examples of the types of projects within a category, that funding can be redirected if a project is funded elsewhere, and that dollar values are used to size each category.
- In response to Mr. Redmond, Mr. McClain stated that a category with no example projects would be removed and that transit priority corridor projects, which were not part of the five-star local project process, would be added to the list.
- Mr. McClain stated that CCTA would present to the TRANSPAC Board and the other RTPC boards, with an October workshop to which TAC members would be invited. Ms. Do stated that she understood CCTA would return to the TAC in December. Mr. McClain stated that he would confirm the timing and that project changes may be submitted to him by email.

The TAC provided the following comments on the TEP framework:

- Mr. Redmond recommended measuring person throughput along routes of regional significance, not only vehicle throughput, by combining vehicle occupancy, transit ridership, and bicycle and pedestrian counts, and using a cordon line to track change over time.
- Mr. Redmond recommended that the safety outcome refer to eliminating, rather than reducing, fatal and serious injury crashes.
- Mr. Redmond recommended mode share as a connectivity measure, along with business-level mode share, air quality and community health indicators, and Walk and Roll program data.
- Cara De Jong suggested mode shift to active and transit as a thriving communities measure.
- Ms. Gephart suggested a measure of access to community resources, such as parks, schools, and medical facilities, by mode. Mr. McClain stated that CCTA could map connectivity to key resources by mode.
- Matt Todd suggested lower average vehicle speed as a measure of community vibrancy and asked whether pavement condition belongs in a separate category for maintaining existing

infrastructure. Mr. McClain and Mr. Elias discussed setting target speeds supported by infrastructure changes.

- Mr. Elias recommended measuring VMT for gas-powered vehicles rather than overall VMT. Mr. Redmond suggested measures for electric vehicle charger deployment and the source of electricity.
- Mr. Smith stated that the framework does not reflect increased transit service frequency, that County Connection's five-star requests included frequency, and that County Connection is working with other bus operators on a joint TEP request. Mr. McClain stated that he would review the project list.
- Mr. Todd suggested a bundled project addressing I-680 as a barrier to pedestrians and bicyclists, with crossings at North Main, Monument, Willow Pass, and Concord, and the SR-4/I-680 interchange. Mr. McClain stated that he liked the concept.
- Mr. Elias and Mr. Nuti suggested extending the Monument corridor via Concord Avenue to the Grayson Creek Trail and Iron Horse Trail, including connectivity at Contra Costa Boulevard and Concord Avenue.
- Mr. Elias stated that he would look into the Pittsburg-Antioch Highway Improvements project listing to verify its sponsor.

5. County Connection Student Transit Program Proposal

Mr. Todd stated that the TAC previously recommended approval of a CCTA-proposed program for the SOAR program with the Mount Diablo Unified School District, which the Board approved and funded for the remainder of the 2026–27 school year and the 2027–28 school year. He stated that the Board requested that the County Connection proposal be brought to the TAC and the Board, that TAC input would be included in the Board staff report, and that a letter from CCTA (Timothy Haile) received the previous day was available.

Mr. Smith stated that County Connection submitted the proposal at the direction of the Board for a year-round Youth Ride Free program for riders ages 6 to 18, building on the summer pilots; riders ages 5 and under already ride free. He stated that the program requires no sign-up or pass and that the proposal reimburses fares not collected at the $1 youth fare. He stated that the cost across the County Connection service area, which includes TRANSPAC and SWAT, would be approximately half a million dollars per year, with the proposal showing fare loss with and without Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) funds, which he stated were expected to end next year. He stated that a countywide program, excluding AC Transit, would be approximately two to two and a half times the County Connection amount.

The following is a summary of the discussion:

- Mr. Elias asked whether the estimates account for ridership growth. Mr. Smith stated that the projections assume a 15 percent long-term increase in youth ridership. He explained that the large increase referenced in the written materials compared summer 2025 Youth Ride Free with a prior summer youth pass program, and that County Connection ridership increased approximately 4.3 percent between summers 2025 and

2026, with larger increases at Tri Delta Transit and WestCAT. Nikki Foletta clarified that the large percentage compared two different types of programs.

- Ms. Foletta stated support for youth transit and described the interaction of Youth Ride Free with the countywide Bay Pass grant application and with the Pass2Class program, for which the CCTA Board approved Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funding. Mr. Smith stated that he had been informed that other subregions effectively subsidize County Connection's participation in meeting the TFCA cost-effectiveness requirement. Ms. Foletta clarified that the countywide structure is what makes Pass2Class cost-effective, and that removing County Connection could affect delivery in other subregions, such as East County. Ms. Foletta asked whether Youth Ride Free would be offered in other subregions and what the funding source would be. Mr. Smith responded that it would ideally be offered in other subregions and that the funding source would have to be determined.
- Ms. De Jong asked whether TRANSPAC would fund both the TRANSPAC and SWAT areas, and Ms. Do asked whether SWAT would contribute. Mr. Smith stated that these are matters for the TRANSPAC and SWAT boards and that the proposal was prepared at Board direction to include both subregions. Ms. Gephart stated that the Board is seeking TAC comments, including funding and implementation questions.
- Mr. Elias asked what the funding source would be and what would be reduced to fund the program. Mr. Todd stated that an accumulated balance exists in Line 21a funds and that the Board sees it as a potential source. Ms. Foletta noted that funds are not sufficient for all programs discussed and that trade-offs would be required. Mr. Todd stated that Line 21a funds approved last month support student transportation programs, including bike fests and walk and roll, and that approximately half of the balance has been programmed. Mr. Todd stated that staff would like to prepare a cash flow through 2034 showing committed funds, the remaining balance, expected revenue, and the trade-offs among programs. Mr. Smith stated that the Bay Pass component of the SOAR program could be limited to students living outside TRANSPAC.
- Ms. De Jong asked what would happen to a student traveling outside of the County Connection service area. Mr. Smith stated that a youth transferring to WestCAT would pay the WestCAT youth fare unless WestCAT participates, and that marketing would continue within County Connection's existing budget and is not included in the request.
- Mr. Todd asked about supplementing data collection. Mr. Smith responded that an on-board survey conducted by consultants is the standard approach. He stated that operators record each youth boarding, that data is available by route and date, and that he would confirm whether time-of-day and stop-level data are available. Ms. Foletta offered to lead a transit working group on program coordination, and Mr. Smith stated that County Connection welcomes coordination.

Additional TAC comments and follow-up requests:

- Mr. Elias stated that the funding source and the programs that would be reduced need to be identified, and that he is in favor of seeing whether the program can be accommodated.

- Ms. Do requested an analysis of how Youth Ride Free would combine with the SOAR program, bike racks, and walk and roll as a complete program. Mr. Smith stated that program goals, such as local or regional trips, would need to be defined.
- Ms. Foletta requested that the proposal be considered alongside countywide youth transit programs, including Pass2Class and Bay Pass.

6. TRANSPAC Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program – Development Project Tracking

Ms. Gephart reported that no additional projects were received for tracking and invited members to update the tracking spreadsheet. Mr. Elias reported that the Navy signed the term sheet for the Naval Weapons Station the previous day, establishing agreement on the allocation and price of the land, and that Brookfield could proceed with the specific plan.

7. Committee Updates

7a. Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC). The TCC last met on September 17, 2026. Mr. Redmond reported that the TCC reviewed OBAG project submittals and provided ranking input from the subcommittee. Mr. Elias stated that the TCC's action was to approve the subcommittee's recommended project list, and that a funding recommendation was expected the following day. Ms. Do stated that Matt Kelly (CCTA) indicated the first three or four listed projects may receive funding. Ms. Do stated that Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) and Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities (PBTF) projects had not yet been scored. Ms. Gephart stated that the TRANSPAC subcommittee would review TLC applications in mid-October. The next TCC meeting is October 15, 2026.

7b. Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC). Mr. Elias stated that OBAG project sponsors were asked to give a three-minute project overview at the meeting. Ms. Do stated that the committee has a new name, and Mr. McClain stated that Countywide Active Transportation Advisory Committee (CATAC) is the preferred abbreviation.

7c. Accessibility Advisory Committee.

The September meeting was cancelled. The next meeting is October 19, 2026.

8. Information Items

8a. Grant Funding Opportunities.

Ms. Gephart noted that the grant funding opportunities spreadsheet was included in the packet for reference. No discussion followed.

8b. Contra Costa Transportation Authority Meeting Calendar.

There were no comments from the TAC.

9. Member Comments.

Mr. Smith stated that he attended in place of Pranjal Dixit of County Connection. No other comments were offered.

10. Next Meeting

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:17 a.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for October 29, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. at Pleasant Hill City Hall, Large Community Room, 100 Gregory Lane, Pleasant Hill.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting ***STAFF REPORT***

Meeting Date: November 19, 2026

Subject:	**TRANSPORTATION FOR LIVABLE COMMUNITIES (TLC) CYCLE 3 – PROJECT RANKINGS AND PROGRAMMING SCENARIOS**
Summary of Issues	The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) program funds bicycle, pedestrian, and complete streets projects with Measure J revenue. The Central County share of this cycle is $11,091,000, and TRANSPAC may nominate projects up to 120 percent of that amount, or $13,309,200. Central County received 11 applications from six sponsors requesting approximately $59 million. The TAC Scoring Subcommittee met to review and score the applications. At this meeting, staff will present the ranking and programming scenarios for TAC review and direction.
Recommendation(s)	Recommend a Measure J TLC program of projects for TRANSPAC Board consideration.
Financial Implications	TRANSPAC is responsible for recommendations on how the Central County share of Measure J Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) funds is to be used in the TRANSPAC subregion. The program resulting from the above process will commit Measure J revenue to projects that improve walking, bicycling, and access to transit in the TRANSPAC subregion.
Attachment(s)	A. CCTA TLC Scoring Criteria for RTPCs

Background

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) administers the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) program, which funds bicycle, pedestrian, and complete streets projects with Measure J sales tax revenue. Each Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC), including TRANSPAC for Central Contra Costa County, recommends projects for its subregion's share of program funds. CCTA issued the Cycle 3 call for projects with scoring criteria dated July 1, 2026.

The Central County share of this cycle is $11,091,000, and TRANSPAC may nominate projects up to 120 percent of that amount, or $13,309,200. Central County received 11 applications from six sponsors requesting approximately $59 million. Table 1.1 describes each project, and Table 1.2 shows requests, total costs, and local match.

Table 1.1 Applications Received			
ID	**Sponsor**	**Project**	**Description**
C1†	Pleasant Hill	Coggins Drive Active Transportation Enhancements	Class IV separated bikeway on Oak Park Boulevard and Coggins Drive, connecting Pleasant Valley Drive to the Iron Horse Trail, with crossing and intersection safety improvements.
C2	Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Boulevard Active Transportation	Protected and separated bicycle facilities on Contra Costa Boulevard, Crescent Plaza, and Boyd Road, with an East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) trail connection, linking to downtown Pleasant Hill.
C3†	Concord	Cowell Road Complete Street Improvements	Class I shared-use path (north side) and sidewalk (south side) on Cowell Road, Mesa Street to St. Francis Drive, with high-visibility crosswalks, curb extensions, raised crossings, a rectangular rapid-flashing beacon (RRFB), and bicycle racks.
C4	Concord	Downtown Signal Safety & Connections	Safety improvements at 12 intersections on Monument Boulevard, Galindo Street, and Clayton Road, and 0.85 miles of Class I path on Clayton Road and Galindo Street. A Class I path on Monument Boulevard is a separate ATP application.
C5	Martinez	Franklin Canyon Road & Alhambra Avenue Complete Streets Improvements	New signal at Franklin Canyon Road and Alhambra Avenue, about 2,000 linear feet of sidewalk, RRFB crossing, Class II bike lanes, accessibility improvements, signing and striping, and pavement rehabilitation.
C6	Martinez / County Connection	Pacheco Boulevard Improvements	Rehabilitation of Pacheco Boulevard, Sunrise Drive to Arnold Drive, with Class II bike lanes, sidewalks, curb ramps, bus-stop access, drainage and bioretention, and a new signal at Arnold Drive.
C7	Walnut Creek	Newell Avenue Corridor Improvements	Class IV protected bikeway replacing sharrows on Newell Avenue, California Boulevard to Maria Lane-Capwell Street, with a new midblock crosswalk.
C8	Walnut Creek	Walnut Creek BART Shared Mobility Hub	Protected intersection at Ygnacio Valley Road and North California Boulevard, removing right-turn slip lanes, with Class IV bike lanes on North California Boulevard to Pringle Avenue, next to the Walnut Creek Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station.
C9	Walnut Creek / County Connection	Walnut Creek Bus Stop Accessibility and Amenities Improvements	Accessibility, amenity, and safety improvements at eight high-use Walnut Creek bus stops, including bus bulb-outs or turnout fill-ins, real-time information signs, and pedestrian access improvements.
C10	Contra Costa County	Marsh Drive Class I Bikeway – Pacheco	Class I shared-use path on the east side of Marsh Drive, Center Avenue to the Marsh Drive Bridge in unincorporated Pacheco (1.2-mile segment), with enhanced crossings and a connection to the Iron Horse Trail.

Table 1.1 Applications Received			
ID	**Sponsor**	**Project**	**Description**
C11	East Bay Regional Parks District	Martinez Intermodal Station–Crockett Bay Trail Gap Closure	About 0.5 mile of 10-foot-wide Class I path along a Union Pacific Railroad easement between the Nejedly Staging Area and Berrellesa Street in Martinez, with drainage, retaining walls, ADA transitions, and rail-crossing upgrades, closing a San Francisco Bay Trail gap.

† Shaded projects (C1 and C3) are also being considered for One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 (OBAG 4) funding. Awards are expected in spring 2027.

Projects C1 (Coggins Drive, Pleasant Hill) and C3 (Cowell Road, Concord) were also submitted for OBAG 4 County Program funding, which the Metropolitan Transportation Commission administers and CCTA coordinates for Contra Costa County. OBAG 4 award decisions are expected in spring 2027, after the TLC programming decision. Both projects remain in TLC scoring and ranking, and funding scenario 2 shows how the TLC program would change if OBAG 4 funds both projects.

Table 1.2 Request, Total Cost, and Local Match					
ID	**Project**	**Request**	**Total Project Cost**	**Local Match / Source**	**Match %**
C1	Coggins Drive Active Transportation Enhancements *Pleasant Hill*	$1,820,000	$2,275,000	$455,000 *City funds (Measure K and traffic impact fees)*	20.0%
C2	Contra Costa Boulevard Active Transportation *Pleasant Hill*	$8,602,000	$9,717,000	$1,115,000 *City funds (Measure K and traffic impact fees)*	11.5%
C3	Cowell Road Complete Street Improvements *Concord*	$8,000,000	$10,000,000	$2,000,000 *City funds*	20.0%
C4	Downtown Signal Safety & Connections *Concord*	$9,284,000	$11,605,000	$2,321,000 *City funds*	20.0%
C5	Franklin Canyon Road & Alhambra Avenue Complete Streets Improvements *Martinez*	$2,974,000	$3,374,000	$400,000 *City funds*	11.9%
C6	Pacheco Boulevard Improvements *Martinez / County Connection*	$2,910,000	$5,910,000	$1,000,000 *City funds (excludes $2,000,000 Measure J)*	16.9%
C7	Newell Avenue Corridor Improvements *Walnut Creek*	$6,895,000	$7,795,000	$900,000 *City funds (traffic impact fees)*	11.5%
C8	Walnut Creek BART Shared Mobility Hub *Walnut Creek*	$7,301,225	$8,247,176	$945,951 *City funds*	11.5%

Table 1.2 Request, Total Cost, and Local Match					
ID	**Project**	**Request**	**Total Project Cost**	**Local Match / Source**	**Match %**
C9	Walnut Creek Bus Stop Accessibility and Amenities Improvements *Walnut Creek / County Connection*	$1,822,924	$1,822,924	$0 *None reported*	0.0%
C10	Marsh Drive Class I Bikeway – Pacheco *Contra Costa County*	$7,369,000	$8,323,740	$954,740 *County funds*	11.5%
C11	Martinez Intermodal Station–Crockett Bay Trail Gap Closure *East Bay Regional Parks District*	$2,000,000	$7,763,000	$5,763,000 *CA Natural Resources Agency Urban Greening; CA State Parks Recreational Trails; CA State Coastal Conservancy; Caltrans/FHWA earmark; U.S. DOT Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A); County and EBRPD funds*	74.2%
	Total	**$58,978,149**	**$76,832,840**	**$15,854,691**	**20.6%**

Note: City funds are non-Measure J local funds identified by the sponsor in its application. The fund type is shown where the application names one; otherwise the application identifies the source only as city or local funds. Measure J funds do not count towards local match.

Evaluation and Ranking

Programs were evaluated against the 12 established criteria. Table 1.3 lists the criteria and maximum points. Reviewers scored the applications independently and recused themselves from applications from their own jurisdiction or agency. Applications were ranked by the average of the reviewer scores. Table 1.4 shows the resulting ranking and the average score for each project.

Table 1.3 Evaluation Criteria			
No.	**Criterion**	**What It Measures**	**Maximum Points**
1	Vision Zero Safety and Injury Prevention	Extent the project reduces the risk of fatal and severe injuries, including level of traffic stress, location on a high-injury network, and Safe System countermeasures	20
2	Public Health	Reduction in emissions and air pollution, tree and shade additions, and other physical and mental health benefits	6
3	Total Project Cost and Funding Match Percentage from Applicant	Share of total project cost funded by non-grant sources other than Measure J; points increase with match share, from zero points at 11.47 percent	7
4	Safe System Approach Bundled Projects	Partnerships across departments, agencies, or jurisdictions, including Equity Priority Communities, and bundled safety improvements	4
5	Grant Deliverability, Sponsor Readiness, and Overall Implementation Feasibility	Design completion at application, environmental and right-of-way readiness, construction schedule, and sponsor delivery record	8
6	Improve System/Network Connectivity	Closes a gap in the pedestrian or bikeway network or connects to work, school, health facilities, or transit	9
7	Range and Number of Users	Serves a wide range of users, all ages and abilities, and Equity Priority Communities, and increases the number of people walking and biking	6
8	Latent Demand	Likelihood the project encourages more walking, biking, and rolling, based on density, land use mix, and Equity Priority Community location	2
9	Public Engagement and Community Outreach, and Policy Support	Community support and letters of support, inclusion in adopted plans, and locally adopted Vision Zero policy	3
10	Alignment with Regional Policy and Objectives	Consistency with regional plans and policies, including community-based transportation plans and housing policies	6
11	Prioritizing Public Space	Right-sizing vehicle parking, bicycle parking, and pedestrian priority areas in the public right-of-way	2
12	Increase or Sustain Transit Ridership	Improves the transit customer experience or access, such as stops, shelters, stations, or mobility hubs	2
	Total		**75**

Table 1.4 Project Ranking and Average Score				
Rank	**ID**	**Project**	**Sponsor**	**Average Score (of 75)**
1 (tie)	C3	Cowell Road Complete Street Improvements	Concord	61.0
1 (tie)	C11	Martinez Intermodal Station–Crockett Bay Trail Gap Closure	East Bay Regional Park District	61.0
3	C7	Newell Avenue Corridor Improvements	Walnut Creek	53.3
4	C4	Downtown Signal Safety & Connections	Concord	51.0
5	C1	Coggins Drive Active Transportation Enhancements	Pleasant Hill	50.5
6	C2	Contra Costa Boulevard Active Transportation	Pleasant Hill	49.0
7	C10	Marsh Drive Class I Bikeway – Pacheco	Contra Costa County	42.3
8	C8	Walnut Creek BART Shared Mobility Hub	Walnut Creek	41.0
9	C6	Pacheco Boulevard Improvements	Martinez / County Connection	38.7
10	C5	Franklin Canyon Road & Alhambra Avenue Complete Streets Improvements	Martinez	31.3
11	C9	Walnut Creek Bus Stop Accessibility and Amenities Improvements	Walnut Creek / County Connection	25.5

Average score is the mean of the reviewer scores for each application, out of 75 possible points.

Scoring adjustment test. Reviewers recused themselves from applications from their own jurisdiction or agency, so five applications (C1, C2, C3, C4, and C9) were scored by two reviewers and the remaining six by three. To test whether individual scoring tendencies could affect the ranking, staff compared each reviewer's score with the group average for every application and criterion, then averaged those differences to show whether the reviewer tended to score above or below the group. Scores were adjusted by that amount and compared with the straight averages. The adjusted scores differed by 1.3 points or less, resulting in no meaningful impact to project rankings. The ranking in Table 1.4 uses the straight average.

Scoring Outcomes

Categories that most separated higher- and lower-scoring projects. Vision Zero Safety and Injury Prevention (20 points) and Improve System/Network Connectivity (9 points) showed the largest gaps between higher- and lower-scoring projects. The six highest-ranked projects earned about 80 percent of the available Vision Zero points and about 88 percent of the connectivity points, compared with about 58 percent and 57 percent for the five lowest-ranked projects. Local match (7 points) also contributed, although fewer projects were separated by it: higher match earned more points, and a project could rank in the upper half without it.

Vision Zero. Applications that scored well on Vision Zero generally proposed physical safety improvements on corridors and at intersections, such as protected bikeways and shared-use paths separated from traffic, protected intersections that remove right-turn slip lanes, high-visibility crosswalks with curb extensions and raised crossings, and signal safety improvements at multiple

intersections. Reviewers also considered facility type and whether the corridor is on a high-injury network.

Local match and network connectivity. Most applications reported local match at or near the 11.47 percent baseline in the scoring criteria. Higher match earned more points. Projects that connected to existing bikeways, trails, transit, or corridors earned higher connectivity marks than improvements limited to a short segment or individual locations.

Factors that lowered scores. Lower scores most often reflected local match at or near the baseline, designs at earlier stages of development that reduced grant deliverability scores, limited emphasis on roadway safety, and improvements that were localized rather than corridor- or network-wide.

Programming Scenarios

Staff prepared two scenarios, each shown at 100 percent of target ($11,091,000) and at 120 percent ($13,309,200). Scenario 1 assumes no OBAG 4 awards and programs projects in rank order. Scenario 2 assumes OBAG 4 funds for C1 and C3 and programs the remaining projects in rank order.

Table 1.5 Programming Scenarios

Rank	Project	Scenario 1: No OBAG 4 awards		Scenario 2: OBAG 4 funds C1 and C3	
		100% ($11,091,000)	**120% ($13,309,200)**	**100% ($11,091,000)**	**120% ($13,309,200)**
1 (tie)	C3 Cowell Road *Concord*	$8,000,000	$8,000,000	OBAG 4	OBAG 4
1 (tie)	C11 Bay Trail Gap Closure *East Bay Regional Parks District*	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000
3	C7 Newell Avenue Corridor *Walnut Creek*	$1,091,000 (partial)	$3,309,200 (partial)	$6,895,000	$6,895,000
4	C4 Downtown Signal Safety & Connections *Concord*	–	–	$2,196,000 (partial)	$4,414,200 (partial)
5	C1 Coggins Drive Active Transportation Enhancements *Pleasant Hill*	–	–	OBAG 4	OBAG 4
	Total programmed	**$11,091,000**	**$13,309,200**	**$11,091,000**	**$13,309,200**

At this meeting, the TAC is requested to review the draft programming scenarios and provide a recommendation to the TRANSPAC Board.

Next Steps

Table 1.6 Schedule	
Date	**Action**
November 19, 2026	TAC reviews ranking and scenarios and provides direction
December 10, 2026	TRANSPAC Board considers the recommendation
December 2026	Staff transmits the TRANSPAC recommendation to CCTA
January 2027 (tentative)	CCTA Planning Committee (January 7) reviews and recommends TLC priorities; Authority Board (January 20 or February 17) reviews and approves
Spring 2027	OBAG 4 awards expected

RTPC – TLC Scoring (West, Central and Southwest)

Table 1. Scoring Categories Summary and Assigned Weights (Maximum Points per Criterion for OBAG 4 County Program; TLC and PBTF may use alternate weightings)

Criterion	Description	Maximum Points
1	Vision Zero Safety and Injury Prevention	20
2	Public Health Outcomes	6
3	Total Project Cost and Funding Match Percentage from Applicant	7
4	Safe System Approach Bundled Projects	4
5	Grant Deliverability, Sponsor Readiness, and Overall Implementation Feasibility	8
6	Improve System/Network Connectivity	9
7	Range and number of users	6
8	Latent Demand	2
9	Public Engagement, Community Outreach & Policy Support	3
10	Alignment with Regional Policy and Objectives	6
11	Prioritizing Public Space	2
12	Increase or Sustain Transit Ridership	2
	CCTA Total	**75**

Table 2. Scoring Categories Detail and Assigned Weights

Ranking Criterion	**Scoring Range**	**Points Assigned**
Criterion 1 of 12: Vision Zero Safety and Injury Prevention e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #1 – 2, 15. ☐ To which Level-of-Traffic-Stress (1 through 4) will the final scope implement a transformative segment that is part of a future safer, more contiguous countywide Low-Traffic-Stress Network (mainly Class I bicycle facilities) for all ages & abilities? ☐ Extent to which the systemic / Safe Systems approach is integrated into the final scope? e.g., a specific collision type addressed in multiple locations via careful site selection/planning. ☐ Proportion (%) by which the final project scope will reduce each segment's maximum potential Speed (observed/actual instead of "posted speed limit") of vehicles? Through new bulbouts & curb extensions?	20 max points. 0–5 = minimal safety improvement that would demonstrably effectively eliminate fatal & severe injuries in most scenarios; or not on a High-Injury Network; LTS 3-4 6–10 = moderate reduction of risk of severe	

Ranking Criterion	**Scoring Range**	**Points Assigned**
☐ To which extent (% and $) will the (cost and) severity of each potential collision be reduced by way of kinetic energy transfer that will result from the project? By which percentage will the $1.3-billion annual countywide socioeconomic cost of fatal & severe injuries ($1,151 per resident), or subregion, be estimated to improve? ☐ Will the final project scope add a new roundabout? Type? ☐ To which extent (% and $) will the individual & regional economic costs (2026) per incident (e.g., including repair/recovery) be reduced by the proposal? (e.g., refer to MTC "BayViz" regional safety data webtool for local analysis here & regional HIN) ☐ To which extent will the cumulative "Plan Countermeasures" (e.g., Leading Pedestrian Interval) be effective after the final project scope is completed, to move toward Countywide Vision Zero? (e.g., refer to MTC "BayViz") ☐ Which of the Livable Streets Policy / Playbook (e.g., Five-Star Projects & Transformative Visions) vs. Countywide Vision Zero toolbox actions are included in the proposal? ☐ Is an Entertainment Zone adopted in the public right-of-way including a (bicycling/rolling &) pedestrian priority area? i.e., place for farmer's market, school or extracurricular activity, or street events/activities safe & physically separated from vehicles? ☐ Is the proposal located along or within a particular proximity of a High-Injury Network (HIN) corridor, emergency evacuation route, and/or a subregional Action Plan-designated Regional Route of Significance? (latest) ☐ Quantifies the estimated reduction in severity of each collision. Which of the Caltrans (or FHWA) "proven countermeasure(s)" or "crash modification/reduction factor(s)" (here; explained here) will be included in the final scope to reduce maximum potential vehicle Speed during construction and future operation? ☐ How has the City committed to using the speed reduction law? (Assembly Bill 43) ☐ Which of the Common Countywide Collision Pattern(s) from December 2024-adopted CCTSAP fatal & severe injury collision (2013 – 2022 and 2008 – 2017) data, jurisdiction-wide per-capita, will be eliminated or reduced as a result of the final implementation scope? ○ Excessive Unsafe Speeding (considering conditions) ○ Driving under the Influence ○ Contraflow bike riding ○ Seniors (vulnerable population)	crash/injury; on a Local HIN; LTS 2—3 11–20 = LTS-1; significant reduction of exposure to & risk of severe crash/injury; on a Regional or Countywide HIN; locally adopted timeline to eliminate fatal & severe injuries & locally adopted jurisdiction-wide Vision Zero Policy (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation or Technical Assistance)	

Ranking Criterion	**Scoring Range**	**Points Assigned**
○ Youth (vulnerable population) ○ Highway interchange(s) ○ Trail/Street crossing(s) ○ Channelized right turn slip-lanes ○ Skewed intersection(s) ○ Unprotected left turns at signal ○ Red light violation ☐ Will the final scope significantly reduce bicycling or pedestrian jurisdiction-wide per-capita fatal and/or severe injuries? ☐ How will the final scope improve the pavement condition index (PCI) on an off-street trail or pedestrian/walkway and maintain the condition of public (transit) assets in a state of good repair? ☐ To which extent has and/or will the proposal address the topics above?		
Criterion 2 of 12: Public Health e.g., refer to responses for Application Form #1 – 4, 15. ☐ To which extent (tools here) will the final scope reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and air pollution? ☐ Number of trees (excluding plants/shrubs) that will be added (excluding number to be retained) in the final scope to address climate adaptation, equity (MTC EPCs & Caltrans EQI), low maintenance, carbon sequestration, regenerative/regeneration, shade coverage, and reduce the urban heat island effect and increasing average temperatures vs. Tree Equity Score here. ☐ To which extent will the final scope enhance to bicycling/pedestrian "trail standards" the conditions of easements, driveways, paths, streets, and roads intended for maintenance access? ☐ To which extent will the final scope improve Public Health? e.g., physical health and mental health at the individual level. ☐ Has a qualified Public Health professional committed in writing to any amount of participation in design and construction scope development/review, ongoing operation, etc.? ☐ To which extent has and/or will the program address the topics above?	6 max points. 0–1 = minimal 2–4 = moderate (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation or EV Blueprint or Technical Assistance) 5–6 = significant	
Criterion 3 of 12: Total Project Cost and Funding Match Percentage from Applicant e.g., refer to response to Application Form #12 - 14 & Funding Plan.	8 max points. 8 = 60% match 7 = 50% match 6 = 40% match	

Ranking Criterion	**Scoring Range**	**Points Assigned**
☐ To which extent/percentage will funds be leveraged from other non-grant program fund-related sources that already are, or will be, committed to the final scope and secured by the applicant? (eligible to count toward match: applicants, co-sponsors, other cities/towns/districts, and project sponsors' contributions and all other fund sources excluding Measure J) How-To Resources from FHWA here, including Training May 24-25, 2022	4 = 30% match 2 = 20% match 0 = 11.47% match (of total project cost)	
Criterion 4 of 12: Safe System Approach Bundled Projects e.g., refer to response to Application Form #1 – 4, 15. ☐ Explains any Collaborative Governance and extent to which the Project Sponsor will partner with a different (or smaller or more resource-limited) jurisdiction that is optionally designated an Equity Priority Community (MTC EPC and Caltrans EQI) or limited-staff government, and the percentage of the final scope that will be in each jurisdiction that is within an EPC. ☐ Describes an existing or proposed partnership across departments and across agencies, e.g., County Public Health (CCH) or non-profit, non-governmental organization, park district, canal water public right-of-way (PROW) or flood control channel district, utility provider, or an application with multiple proposed protected intersections at locations in multiple jurisdictions, for example. ☐ Will the project adequately improve Safety (eliminate fatal & severe injuries) for pedestrians & people bicycling/rolling at or near a Trail Crossing with collaborative participation from a City/County/District jurisdiction and East Bay Regional Park District? (EBRPD) ☐ Will the proposal include (partially or fully privately funded) construction of fiberoptic broadband communications infrastructure in addition to scope for transportation/streetscape?	4 max points. 0 = minimal 1–2 = moderate 3–4 = significant (each range above applies also to a Technical Assistance or Student Transportation or TDM or SRTS-NI program, e.g., multiple geographic locations across school districts or other jurisdiction boundaries)	
Criterion 5 of 12: Grant Deliverability, Sponsor Readiness, and Overall Implementation Feasibility e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #7 - 11. ☐ Quantified $ amount and FY extent to which the applicant has committed annual operations & maintenance, repair, and lifecycle replacement costs after initial construction? e.g., At which frequency is the jurisdiction proposing to commit to maintenance of the new or improved facility, such as sweeping? (e.g., for safety) ☐ Which issues could arise before project implementation?	8 max points. 0 = Design is less than 35% complete at application submittal. 1–2 = minimal additional Design is necessary &	

Ranking Criterion	**Scoring Range**	**Points Assigned**
☐ Has a single jurisdiction committed as lead agency to ensuring complete implementation of the final scope across multiple jurisdictions? ☐ Is any (potential) necessary right-of-way already acquired? ☐ Which month & year will the proposed project (realistically) begin construction? ☐ Will the project be ready for public use, e.g., pedestrians and bicyclists, no later than 2030? ☐ Describe the Sponsor Delivery Record. How many months of delay did the sponsor provide during grant delivery vs. the countywide and subregional average from Cycle-2 of TLC/PBTF and Cycle-2 of OBAG? And in submitting reimbursement-request invoice-packets that are audit-ready & acceptable for review & processing? ☐ Will the final scope be consistent with the minimum criteria required in the state law (effective since January 1, 2021) known as Senate Bill 71? (to streamline CEQA review and documentation, per guidelines here).	minimal environmental review documentation timeline, e.g., not eligible for SB-71. 3–5 = moderate: Design is less than 65% complete at application submittal, and/or SB-71-eligible scope. 6–8 = significant, or (mostly or entirely) Quick-Build materials/ method, and/or SB-71-eligible final scope (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation)	
Criterion 6 of 12: Improve System/Network Connectivity e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #1 – 4, 15. ☐ Will the final scope eliminate a gap(s)? in an existing pedestrian or bikeway(s), remove barrier(s) to access, and increase the directness or capacity of the bicycling/pedestrian network (including alternatives to trails that are closed/unlit during hours of darkness/ overnight), where they facilitate connections to work, public school, health facilities, or transit. ☐ Will the final scope straighten or shorten a curving or non-linear pathway, or create an opening in a gate, fence, retaining wall, or barrier of any kind to enhance access from an adjacent trail for people bicycling, rolling, or walking? e.g., to access shopping & retail, especially a grocery store, restaurant, or other food & drink establishment. ☐ Is the proposal included in MTC's Active Transportation Plan, or CBPP Low-Stress Network? (Network map)	9 max points. 1–3 = (not a gap closure or) minimal 3–6 = moderate 7–9 = significant (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation or Technical Assistance)	

Ranking Criterion	**Scoring Range**	**Points Assigned**
☐ To which extent the Project or Programmatic implementation will address the topics above? (select the highest points range)		
Criterion 7 of 12: Range and number of users e.g., refer to response to Application Form #1 – 4, 15. ☐ Will the final scope serve a wide range of users? e.g., all ages and abilities, females, people riding transit, electric and pedal bicycle commuters, shoppers, people with disabilities — and increase the number of pedestrians and bicyclists within the geographic boundary limits. Will an Equity Priority Community be served? Residence or work? ☐ Percentage completion of jurisdiction-wide ADA Transition Plan (toward compliance or accessibility) ☐ Will each participating jurisdiction adopt by July 31, 2027 a bicycle parking & charging ordinance with minimum requirements for proposed changes-of-use permits and per net new square foot of each land use? ☐ Which percentage of the project will be on a statewide (e.g., Great California Delta Trail) and/or the U.S. Bicycle Route System? (USBRS) ☐ To which extent will the final scope expand access, universal design, compliance or exceeding ADA accessibility, travel choices, and increase the rate of active transportation? e.g., contiguous route through engaging landscapes, connecting local neighborhoods or natural areas, parks, or elevated viewsheds, improving community interaction, integrated interactive public art by local artists, all ages and abilities (e.g., attracting seniors & children to travel (& even explore) via active transportation), mental/overall wellness, community survey input. ☐ Which of the Common Countywide Collision Pattern(s) vulnerable population from (2011 - 2020 SWITRS) collision data will be eliminated or reduced in the final scope? o Seniors o Youth, children ☐ To which extent will the final scope reduce congestion or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in an urbanized area? ☐ To which extent are any groups of people under-represented in the available data? SWITRS: race data for people involved in a crash are typically reported only based on an officer's anecdotal observation, assumption, or best guess. ☐ Will the final scope improve access to jobs, or the reliability of, Freight/Goods Movement by cargo bicycle, electric bicycle, and improve Economic Access/Vitality?	6 max points. 1–2 = (unknown, not estimated, or) minimal 3–5 = moderate 6 = significant	

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
Criterion 8 of 12: Latent Demand e.g., refer to response to Application Form #1 - 4. ☐ Will the final scope be likely to encourage more people to use pedestrian, bicycling, or rolling trips? e.g., greater population density, employment density, mix of land uses, percentage of low- or zero-vehicle ownership households, location in an Equity Priority Community (EPC), or relative lack of on-street & off-street vehicle parking. ☐ Will the final scope be located within an Equity Priority Community (EPC map here) in Plan Bay Area? ☐ To which extent has and/or will the Programmatic application address the topics above, and historically underserved community groups?	2 max points. 0 = (unknown, not estimated, or) minimal 1 = moderate 2 = significant	
Criterion 9 of 12: Public Engagement and Community Outreach, & Policy Support e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #5 - 6. ☐ Is the proposal part of the future low-stress network or otherwise included in the adopted Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan's future network and project list? ☐ Is the proposal in a locally adopted plan, Caltrans, MTC, Bay Area Air District (formerly BAAQMD), Contra Costa Health (e.g., public health), AARP Livable Communities Plan, League of American Bicyclists' evaluation or metrics for Bike-Friendly City (or businesses') designation, and/or not yet formally submitted to CCTA for consideration at the countywide level for inclusion in a CBPP update? ☐ Will the final scope include Safe System Approach bundled or similar projects across jurisdictions with multiple participating organizations? e.g., utilities, Bike East Bay. ☐ Does the jurisdiction(s) have a locally adopted Policy Resolution that adopted a per-resident jurisdiction-wide Vision Zero timeline to eliminate fatal and severe injuries (first) of pedestrians and people bicycling, that includes a Safe Systems approach that is both proactive/systemic and reactive (collision analysis) and prioritizes Safety before Speed, and an emphasis on planning for people (not vehicles); and prioritizes the safe movement of people, especially vulnerable road users (including seniors & youth). ☐ To which month/year/date, and at which URL/link, does the jurisdiction publicly state a commitment to eliminate jurisdiction-wide per-capita fatal and severe injuries? ☐ Does the jurisdiction's locally adopted Policy Resolution explicitly require that staff and each project prioritize Safety	3 max points. 0 = (unknown, none or) minimal 1 = moderate 2–3 = significant, or (partially or maximum points if entirely) Quick-Build method/materials or demonstration activities that would serve as engagement and support-building (up to 3 if a policy was locally adopted consistent with Countywide Vision Zero)	

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
before Speed and integrate model language from the countywide template here? ☐ Which adopted plan(s), adoption (and revision or amendment/enhancement) dates, and ranked project lists, included the proposal? ☐ Which Design Guidelines and standards documents were used for each component of the proposal? (here) ☐ Is the proposal consistent with any specific policies in the adopted General Plan? ☐ CCTA Countywide Pedestrian Needs Assessment? (CPNA) ☐ MTC Complete Streets Policy? ☐ Caltrans Complete Streets Policy? (DIB-94) ☐ Caltrans Safe Systems approach? (e.g., land use) ☐ From which organization(s) and signatories, including elected and appointed representatives, and residents & members of the traveling public, has the applicant provided a Letter of Support?		
Criterion 10 of 12: Alignment with Regional Policy and Objectives e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #1 - 4. ☐ Is the application/project able to be scalable & replicated by a jurisdiction(s) in other counties or transit agencies? ☐ Is the proposal in a Community-Based Transportation Plan? ***Housing Policies' Compliance With Regional & State Law, Policy & Programs*** ☐ Does the application include documentation that the involved jurisdiction is an approved member of the California Housing and Community Development (HCD) Department's Prohousing Designation Program?, describe how local policies align with or exceed criteria. https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-research/prohousing ☐ Quantify numerically and in percentage growth of housing supply, per type/size (e.g., number of units by number of bedrooms before-&-after scenarios), & describe jurisdictional relationship to a specified number or range of future (and entitled) housing options. Example: (New – Old) / Old = % change per cycle & years. **Housing Anti-Displacement Policies**	6 max points. 0–1 = minimal 2–3 = moderate 4–6 = significant, e.g., project identified in a CBTP (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation or Technical assistance)	

Ranking Criterion	**Scoring Range**	**Points Assigned**
☐ Which local housing policies have the jurisdiction [in which the final scope will be entirely (or mostly) located in], adopted – that effectively limit or prevent the displacement of (specify which) vulnerable populations? ☐ Explain why they are effective within the context of the jurisdiction. ☐ The application addresses the potential for the project to support existing, planned (General Plan), entitled, and/or permitted housing options, especially below-market-rate residential uses, and how the project will advance state, regional, countywide, and local transportation, growth management, and land-use goals.		
Criterion 11 of 12: Prioritizing Public Space e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #1 - 4. ☐ To which extent (percentage vs. amount) will the final scope Right-Size the amount of available Vehicle Parking and Parking Density within the public right-of-way? ☐ Which techniques/technologies will be used (e.g., to provide demand-based pricing of vehicle parking) within the public right-of-way to maximize public benefit from this public asset? ☐ Which policies from MTC's Vehicle Parking Policy Playbook (or resources here & here) have been adopted to reform the local agency's (municipal) code or let the market forces lead? e.g., zoning code adopted vehicle parking maximums or removed 'provision of parking' mandatory minimum ratio(s). ☐ Walkway/bikeway proximity to, and relationship to (separated, protected, etc.) on-street or off-street vehicle parking (which can affect Level of Traffic Stress) ☐ Has the jurisdiction planned, designated, adopted, and implemented a vehicle-free commercial central area(s) that prioritizes pedestrian activity and livability? Which dimensions and location? ☐ Is an Entertainment Zone adopted in the public right-of-way including a (bicycling/rolling &) pedestrian priority area? i.e., place for farmers' market, school or extracurricular activity, or street events/activities safe & physically separated from vehicles. ☐ How many of each type (e.g., covered, secured, adaptive, recumbent, family- & cargo-sized) bicycle parking spaces will be added? Provide all existing, proposed, and net new dimensions. Serpentine & grid racks are ineligible. From	2 max points. 0 = Unknown or None or Minimal 1 = Moderate 2 = Significant (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation or Technical Assistance)	

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
which page is the proposal in APBP Bike Parking Guide's 3rd Edition? ☐ To which extent has and/or will the Programmatic application address the topics above? (select the moderate points range)		
Criterion 12 of 12: Increase or Sustain Transit Ridership e.g., refer to response to Application Form #1 - 4. ☐ Extent to which the implementation will address customer travel experience and increase or sustain the use (rider retention) of public transit? e.g., rail transit station, transit (e.g., bus or vehicle) stop, shelter (shade coverage for hotter weather, using ShadeMapApp and/or Shadow Map), regional or countywide (shared) mobility hub, bicycle parking spaces, storage/bike racks, or covered and secured mobility device storage (short-term and longer-term) and electric charging. ☐ Maximum points only if the jurisdiction committed in writing to adopting a Transit First Policy by July 31, 2027, including the language from MTC's template ("Guidance on Optional Local Transit Priority Resolution or Policy") for local agencies. ☐ Which percentage of the final scope (geographic & funding) will be located within a CBPP-designated Pedestrian Priority Area? (PPA) ☐ To which extent will universal design & accessibility be improved beyond standard ADA compliance? To which percentage of partial completion would the local ADA Transition Plan become? ☐ To which extent will the final scope be located within two miles (or 15 minutes of travel time) of a Transit-Oriented Community? (TOC)	2 max points. 0 = Unknown or minimal potential 1 = moderate; bus 2 = significant; rail (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation or Technical Assistance)	

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting ***STAFF REPORT***

Meeting Date: November 19, 2026

Subject:	**TRANSPAC TAC APPOINTMENTS TO CCTA COMMITTEES**
Summary of Issues	TRANSPAC is represented on the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Countywide Active Transportation Advisory Committee (CATAC), formerly the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, by one primary, plus one or two alternates and one citizen representative. The current primary representative is no longer able to serve on the committee, creating a vacancy for the primary position with a term set to expire December 31, 2027. The TAC is requested to provide recommendations to fill the CATAC primary representative seat for the remainder of the term ending December 31, 2027.
Recommendation	Recommend a TRANSPAC TAC representative to fill the primary CATAC seat for the remainder of the term ending December 31, 2027.
Financial Implications	No TRANSPAC financial implications.
Option(s)	Defer the recommendation.

Background

Countywide Active Transportation Advisory Committee (CATAC)

TRANSPAC is represented on the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) CATAC, formerly the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC), by one TRANSPAC staff representative (plus one or two alternates) and one citizen representative. The purpose of the CATAC is to serve as an advisory body to the CCTA Board by reviewing active transportation policies, programs, and projects and supporting the CCTA's sales tax, congestion management, and transportation planning roles. The CATAC responsibilities include reviewing and recommending updates to the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and other planning documents; helping to implement CCTA Board-adopted active transportation policies, plans, programs, and projects; reviewing funding applications for active transportation studies, projects, and programs; commenting on project sponsors' Complete Streets checklists; identifying active transportation issues affecting users of all ages and abilities; and providing technical and community perspectives on equitable access, safety, and mobility. Regular meetings are generally held on the fourth Monday of every other month, beginning in January, at 10:00 a.m.

Currently, Briana Byrne (Walnut Creek) is the primary representative and Aaron Elias (Concord) is the alternate representative on the CATAC for the term ending December 31, 2027. The citizen representative position is currently vacant. Staff were informed that Ms. Byrne is no longer able to serve on the committee, creating a vacancy for the primary position. The TAC is requested to recommend a TRANSPAC representative to fill the primary CATAC seat for the remainder of the term ending December 31, 2027. The TAC is also requested to review current TRANSPAC appointments to CCTA committees below and recommend any revisions as necessary.

TRANSPAC Appointments to CCTA Committees

TRANSPAC Countywide Active Transportation Advisory Committee (CATAC) Representatives	
Primary Representative (Vacant)	January 1, 2026 – December 31, 2027
Aaron Elias (Concord) (Alt)	
Citizen Representative (Vacant)	
TRANSPAC Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Representatives	
Matt Redmond (Walnut Creek)	April 1, 2026 – March 31, 2027
Aaron Elias (Concord)	
Trevor McGuire (Martinez)	
Anthony Nuti (Pleasant Hill) (Alt)	
Srinivas Muktevi (Martinez) (Alt)	
TRANSPAC Innovate 680 Representatives	
Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)	**Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**
Carlyn Obringer (Concord)	Aaron Elias, Virendra Patel (alt) (Concord)
Debbie McKillop (Martinez)	Trevor McGuire, Srinivas Muktevi (alt) (Martinez)
Sue Noack (Pleasant Hill)	Ann James, Anthony Nuti (alt) (Pleasant Hill)
Craig DeVinney (Walnut Creek)	Matt Redmond, Briana Byrne (alt) (Walnut Creek)
Ken Carlson (Contra Costa County – District IV)	Monish Sen, Fernando Valdez (alt) (Contra Costa County)
TRANSPAC Vision Zero Working Group Representative	
Aaron Elias (Concord)	

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting ***STAFF REPORT***

Meeting Date: November 19, 2026

Subject:	**CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURE PLAN FRAMEWORK**
Summary of Issues	The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) is developing a new Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) to guide countywide transportation investment following the March 31, 2034 expiration of Measure J. TRANSPAC reviewed the TEP process and priorities in July, the emerging framework and performance measures at the September 24 TAC meeting, and proposed investment categories and project-selection considerations at the October 8 Board meeting. CCTA is returning to the TAC to present funding projections and an initial "Strawman" TEP and to seek additional feedback before preparing the initial draft TEP.
Recommendation(s)	For information only.
Financial Implications	No TRANSPAC financial implications.
Attachment(s)	A. CCTA Memo – Transportation Expenditure Plan Development Update

Background

On November 2, 2004, Contra Costa voters approved Measure J, extending the half-cent countywide transportation sales tax first established by Measure C in 1988 for an additional 25 years. Measure J is projected to generate approximately $2.6 billion over its 25-year life, with the expenditure plan allocating roughly 58 percent of funding to programs and 42 percent to capital projects countywide; Central County's targeted share totals $538 million across both categories.

On June 18, 2025, the CCTA Board directed staff to begin development of a new TEP to guide investment following Measure J's expiration. CCTA has outlined a four-phase process — Listening, Initial Draft TEP, Confirm Priorities, and Adoption — with TEP adoption targeted for

late 2027 and a ballot measure targeted for November 2028, requiring a two-thirds voter majority. Five guiding pillars for the plan were identified by the CCTA Board and Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC) members at a May 2026 CCTA Board workshop: a community-first approach; keeping the plan simple; applying a countywide lens that balances local priorities with countywide benefits; establishing accountability measures; and focusing on significant outcomes that deliver meaningful, transformative improvements to mobility, safety, accessibility, and connectivity.

As part of Phase 1 (Listening), CCTA Executive Director Timothy Haile presented this overview and process to the TRANSPAC Board on July 9, 2026, as one stop in a series of visits to all four RTPCs in the county.

TRANSPAC Board TEP Listening Session Comments

Board members raised several priorities during that discussion that CCTA indicated would inform the next expenditure plan, including:

- Flexibility to fund capital needs identified later in the measure's life, addressed through a mix of committed priority projects and broader programmatic categories;
- Accountability and transparency to voters, raised in connection with rider experience on the East County BART extension;
- A substantial share of funding for local streets maintenance, citing Pine Hollow Road as an example of an ongoing local concern;
- Senior and on-demand transportation needs; and
- Curb and parking management associated with increased ride-hailing and future autonomous vehicle use.

Mr. Haile separately noted that the current plan includes limited funding for zero-emission infrastructure, which was not anticipated when the plan was adopted in 2004, and indicated this would be a consideration for the next plan.

CCTA also discussed opportunities for Board and Planning Commission members to support TEP community engagement directly, including at community events such as farmers' markets.

TAC Comments on the Draft TEP Framework

At its September 24, 2026, meeting, the TAC reviewed the emerging TEP framework presented by CCTA staff and provided the following comments:

<u>Performance Measures</u>

- **Congestion:** Measure person throughput along Routes of Regional Significance, not just vehicle throughput. This could combine vehicle occupancy, transit ridership, and bicycle and pedestrian counts, and use a cordon line to track changes over time. The TAC also discussed how the proposed delay measure should be calculated.
- **Mode shift:** The TAC noted that, apart from potentially faster and more reliable transit travel times, the framework offers few incentives to take drivers off the road.
- **Safety:** The TAC recommended that the safety outcome aims to *eliminate* rather than *reduce* fatal and serious injury crashes, consistent with Vision Zero. Members also discussed whether that target is realistic.
- **Connectivity and Thriving Communities:** Suggested measures included:
    - mode share and mode shift to active transportation and transit
    - the share of business customers arriving by walking, biking or transit
    - access by mode to schools, parks, medical facilities and community centers
    - lower average vehicle speeds
    - tree canopy or shade
    - air quality and community health indicators
- **Pavement condition:** Views differed on where the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) belongs. Some members suggested it fits better in a maintenance-focused category; others noted that residents use pavement condition to judge transportation investment.
- **Environment:** Suggested measures included vehicle miles traveled (VMT), with gas-powered VMT tracked separately, and electric vehicle charging usage.

<u>Program Structure and Funding</u>

- **Routes of Regional Significance maintenance:** The TAC suggested that CCTA coordinate multi-jurisdictional paving contracts to achieve economies of scale, rather than take on roadway operations. Local right-of-way responsibilities should remain clear. Whether this role would draw from return-to-source funds has not been determined.
- **Transit frequency:** The TAC noted that increased transit frequency is not reflected in the draft project list. Capital corridor investments depend on frequent service to be effective.
- **Zero-emission buses:** County Connection noted the higher vehicle and infrastructure costs, utility service delays, and that no U.S. manufacturer currently makes the 30-foot zero-emission buses some of its routes require.

<u>Project List and Potential Named Projects</u>

- **Monument Boulevard/I-680 project:** The TEP should reflect the expanded scope of this project to include Contra Costa Boulevard.

- **Pittsburg-Antioch Highway Improvements:** The TAC asked for the project's sponsor listing to be verified.
- **I-680 crossings:** The TAC suggested a named project bundling bicycle and pedestrian crossings of I-680, which is an east–west barrier in Central County. It could include the SR-4/I-680 interchange and connect crossings including the Monument Boulevard Trails-to-Transit, Concord Avenue, Iron Horse Trail and Grayson Creek Trail corridors.
- **Timing of next review:** The TAC asked to review named projects again before the draft TEP is released in early 2027.

TRANSPAC Board Comments on the Draft TEP Framework

At its October 8, 2026, meeting, the TRANSPAC Board reviewed the proposed investment categories and how projects and programs could be selected and evaluated. CCTA also asked jurisdictions to identify missing projects or errors in the Central County project and program lists. Board discussion included the following points:

- **Evaluation measures:** Consider local circumstances and prior investments when developing project and program metrics. Pavement condition measures could unintentionally disadvantage jurisdictions with lower PCI scores despite recent investment, as well as jurisdictions that have raised local revenue to maintain better pavement conditions.
- **Countywide and cross-subregional benefits:** Consider whom projects serve and their countywide function, rather than solely where they are physically located. The I-680/SR 4 interchange was cited as a Central County project that also serves East and West County travel.
- **Project list and future growth:** Maintain current and complete project lists and account for anticipated growth, including approximately 12,000 planned homes in Concord. Clarify that the five-star designation reflects alignment with anticipated outcomes and does not represent a ranking or funding commitment.
- **Public communication and deliverability:** Clearly communicate what can realistically be delivered, how projects will be selected, and why some long-standing projects may show substantial funding without visible construction progress.
- **Funding context:** Consider other transportation funding measures, potential transit operating needs, return-to-source funding, and opportunities to leverage non-Measure J funds as the TEP framework is developed.

CCTA indicated that the full project list includes approximately 200 projects and that an initial draft TEP is expected in early 2027, with review planned for the January 28-29, 2027 CCTA Board workshop.

CCTA is returning to the TRANSPAC TAC to present the funding projections and allocation approaches discussed at the October 2026 CCTA Board workshop, introduce an initial "Strawman" TEP outlining proposed Transformative Visions and Investment Categories, and seek feedback on the TEP framework, the Strawman TEP, and potential Named Projects to inform the initial draft TEP.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Regional Transportation Planning Committees

FROM: Tim Haile, Executive Director, Contra Costa Transportation Authority

DATE: November 10, 2026

SUBJECT: Transportation Expenditure Plan Development Update

Purpose

Building on the October 2026 Authority Board TEP Workshop, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) staff is returning to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) to share the funding projections and allocation approaches discussed with the Authority Board. Staff will also introduce an initial "Strawman" Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) as a new working concept for RTPC discussion and seeks RTPC feedback to help inform its further development and the preparation of an initial draft TEP.

Background

In June 2025, the Authority Board directed staff to proceed with development of a new TEP. Development is organized into four phases: Listening, Initial Draft TEP, Confirm Priorities, and Adoption. The listening phase has focused on understanding transportation needs, challenges, and priorities through engagement with the Authority Board, local agencies, stakeholders, and the public.

The October Authority Board Workshop built on this input by exploring two fundamental questions within the TEP framework: How much funding do we have? and How do we make sure everyone benefits? The workshop materials provide a common foundation for continued discussion with the RTPCs about potential investments and the framework for allocating future transportation funding.

Funding Projections

CCTA is evaluating a potential continuation of the existing one-half cent transportation sales tax for an additional 25 years, beginning April 1, 2034, following the expiration of Measure J.

CCTA retained HdL Companies to prepare revenue projections using historical sales tax performance and assumptions regarding future economic conditions and growth. Based on this analysis, the potential measure is projected to generate approximately $3.272 billion in constant 2026 dollars over 25 years.

Staff will share the assumptions and projections presented at the October Authority Board Workshop. These estimates provide a planning foundation for evaluating potential investments and understanding the funding available relative to transportation needs throughout the County.

Funding Allocation Approaches

A central consideration in developing the TEP is ensuring that communities throughout Contra Costa County benefit while retaining flexibility to address changing transportation needs.

Measure J established geographic allocations and commitments to specific projects and programs. Staff is exploring an evolved TEP approach that maintains overall subregional funding targets while providing greater flexibility in how those targets are achieved over time. Projects and programs would be evaluated based on the transportation needs they address and the benefits they provide through regular updates to a TEP Strategic Plan rather than directly into the TEP, with the resulting mix of investments used to meet the overall subregional targets.

Initial Strawman TEP

Building on the Authority's Living Pillars, input received through the listening phase, and ongoing discussions regarding the overall structure of the TEP, staff has developed an initial conceptual framework, referred to as the Draft "Strawman" TEP. The Draft Strawman TEP focuses on two foundational elements: the Transformative Visions and the proposed Investment Categories that would organize future transportation investments. The purpose is to establish a shared understanding of what the TEP should seek to accomplish and how transportation investments could be structured to advance those outcomes.

The Strawman does not identify specific projects or programs, establish funding allocations, or make funding commitments. Those elements will be developed in subsequent stages, informed by continued engagement with the Authority Board, local agencies, stakeholders, and the public.

Named Projects – Additional Input and Feedback

As part of the ongoing development of the TEP, staff is continuing to engage with the RTPCs to better understand priorities and identify potential Named Projects for consideration in the plan. Named Projects represent significant transportation investments that may warrant specific identification in the TEP based on their importance to local communities, transportation needs, and broader countywide benefits.

Staff is seeking additional feedback from each RTPC on potential Named Projects, including their relative priorities, anticipated transportation benefits, and public support.

This discussion is intended to help inform the identification and evaluation of potential Named Projects as the TEP continues to develop. No final decisions regarding Named Projects or associated funding commitments will be made. Feedback received will be considered within the overall TEP Framework as staff works toward developing the initial draft TEP.

Staff is seeking RTPC input and feedback on the TEP framework, Draft Strawman TEP and potential Named Projects. This feedback will help inform the continued refinement of the Initial Draft TEP.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting ***STAFF REPORT***

Meeting Date: November 19, 2026

Subject:	**2027 TRANSPAC MEETING SCHEDULE**
Summary of Issues	The TRANSPAC TAC is requested to review the proposed 2027 schedule of meetings for the TRANSPAC Board and TAC. CCTA has also requested that the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) consider its meeting calendar when developing their schedules to minimize conflicts with CCTA committee meetings. At the November TRANSPAC Board meeting, staff also noted CCTA's consideration of shifting its annual recess from August to July and is seeking TAC input on the timing of TRANSPAC's annual recess.
Recommendations	For information only.
Financial Implications	None.
Options	None.
Attachment(s)	A. Draft 2027 Meeting Schedule.

TRANSPAC Transportation Partnership and Cooperation

2027 MEETING SCHEDULE

Unless otherwise notified, all meetings will be held at 9:00 A.M. at Pleasant Hill City Hall, Community Room (100 Gregory Lane, Pleasant Hill, California).

TRANSPAC Meetings

Regular meetings are on the second Thursday of every month or as notified. Other meetings as scheduled.

January 14
February 11
March 11
April 8
May 13
June 10
July 8
August 12
September 9
October 14
November 4*
December 9

TAC Meetings

Regular meetings are on the last Thursday of every month or as notified.

January 28
February 25
March 25
April 29**
May 27
June 24
July 29
August 26
September 30
October 28
November 18***
December 30

*Moved due to Veterans Day Holiday
**5th Thursday of the Month
***3rd Thursday of the Month

DRAFT

TRANSPAC DEVELOPMENT PROJECT TRACKER

LEAD AGENCY	GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION (City, Region, etc.)	NOTICE / DOCUMENT	PROJECT NAME	DESCRIPTION	COMMENT DEADLINE	NOTES
City of Walnut Creek	Walnut Creek	Notice of Determination Link	**Mitchell Townhomes**	400+ townhomes at Shadelands/Mitchell [October 2025]	N/A	NOD Issued 4/8/2026
		Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Link			10/6/2025	EIR Notice
Contra Costa County	Discovery Bay	General Plan Amendment, Traffic Impact Analysis (TBA)	**Cecchini Ranch**	545 acres of agricultural lands to be developed into 2,000 units of Adult Residential Living, light industrial space, sports parks, community park with community center, boat and RV storage, open space, preserved wetlands, and a fire station. (February 2025)		
Contra Costa County	Unincorporated	Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Link	**FSRE Industrial Concord Project** Link	223,145 sq ft logistics warehouse with office space, parking (223 auto/38 trailer stalls), 36 truck docks, and off-site improvements including new intersection at Marsh Drive/Sally Ride Drive with pedestrian beacon [October 2025]	10/21/2025	City of Concord and Pleasant Hill Provided Comment

NEW PROJECTS/NOTICES						
LEAD AGENCY	**GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION** (City, Region, etc.)	**NOTICE / DOCUMENT**	**PROJECT NAME**	**DESCRIPTION**	**COMMENT DEADLINE**	**NOTES**
City of Pittsburg	Pittsburg	Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Link	**West Leland Road Extension Phase II (Project No. 3038)**	Approximately 0.6-mile roadway extension connecting Avila Road to West Leland Road near Santa Teresa Drive, with two travel lanes in each direction, a landscaped median, bike lanes, sidewalks, and utility undergrounding. Grading of a 61.73-acre borrow site would supply approximately 433,715 cubic yards of net fill. [November 2026]	10/5/2026	Scoping meetings held 9/29/2026

TRANSPAC DEVELOPMENT PROJECT TRACKER

NEW PROJECTS/NOTICES						
LEAD AGENCY	**GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION** (City, Region, etc.)	**NOTICE / DOCUMENT**	**PROJECT NAME**	**DESCRIPTION**	**COMMENT DEADLINE**	**NOTES**
City of Concord (Local Reuse Authority)	Concord	Navy Term Sheet; Specific Plan in preparation Link	**Concord Naval Weapons Station (Concord Community Reuse Project)**	Redevelopment of approximately 2,422 acres of the former Concord Naval Weapons Station by Brookfield. The City Council (Local Reuse Authority) approved the Navy Term Sheet on May 26, 2026, and the Navy approved it in September 2026. The City and Brookfield are now preparing the Specific Plan. The Area Plan envisions up to 12,272 housing units (25% affordable). [November 2026]	N/A	Navy approved Term Sheet 9/2026

Funding Opportunities Summary 11/04/2026

Upcoming Funding Opportunities

Funding Program	Fund Source*	Application Deadlines	Program and Contact Information
2026 Local Partnership Competitive Program	S	11/18/2026	The primary objective of this program is to provide funding to counties, cities, districts, and regional transportation agencies in which voters have approved fees or taxes dedicated solely to transportation improvements or that have imposed fees, including uniform developer fees, dedicated solely to transportation improvements. https://catc.ca.gov/programs/sb1/local-partnership-program
2026 Solutions for Congested Corridors Program	S	11/19/2026	The purpose of the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program is to provide funding to achieve a balanced set of transportation, environmental, and community access improvements to reduce congestion throughout the state. https://catc.ca.gov/programs/sb1/solutions-for-congested-corridors-program
2026 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program	S	11/20/2026	The purpose of the Trade Corridor Enhancement Program is to provide funding for infrastructure improvements on federally designated Trade Corridors of National and Regional Significance, on California's portion of the National Highway Freight Network, as identified in California Freight Mobility Plan, and along other corridors that have a high volume of freight movement. https://catc.ca.gov/programs/sb1/trade-corridor-enhancement-program