

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

TRANSPAC TAC MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 2026

1:00 P.M. to 3:00 P.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.

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 MAY 28, 2026, MEETING. 🌀 Page 5

Attachment: TAC minutes from the May 28, 2026, meeting.

ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Approve Minutes.

4. TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR CLEAN AIR (TFCA) FUND - FY 2026/2027 CALL FOR PROJECTS. The Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) program funds projects that promote alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles and result in reduced air pollution from motor vehicles. The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) released the TFCA FY 2026-27 call for projects on April 30, 2026, with draft applications due May 19, 2026. At this meeting, staff will present the TRANSPAC subregional projects seeking FY 2026-27 TFCA funding. 🌀 **Page 11**

ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Recommend prioritized Central County projects for the FY 2026/27 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Fund.

Attachment: Staff Report

5. CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY 2026 COORDINATED CALL FOR PROJECTS — MEASURE J TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR LIVABLE COMMUNITIES SCORING CRITERIA AND APPLICATION REVIEW COMMITTEE. CCTA has coordinated a streamlined call for projects that consolidates the application process for five separate funding programs with a combined \$95 million (approx.) in funding available: One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 (OBAG 4), MTC's Community Action and Regional Empowerment (CARE) program, the third cycle of the Measure J Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) and Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities (PBTF) programs, and the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Additional Bicycle Infrastructure Program. The call for projects was released on June 23, 2026. CCTA staff will be present to provide an update and respond to questions.

🌀 **Page 21**

ACTION RECOMMENDATION: Approve scoring criteria for the Central County 2026 Measure J TLC Cycle 3 applications and identify TAC members to serve on the subregional TLC application review committee.

INFORMATION ITEMS

- 6. 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 35**

- 7. Committee UPDATES:**

 - a. **TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE (TCC).** The last TCC Meeting Scheduled for Thursday, June 18, 2026, was cancelled. The next regular meeting will be held on July 16, 2026.
 - b. **COUNTYWIDE BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CBPAC):** The last CBPAC Meeting was held on May 18, 2026. The next regular meeting will be held on July 27, 2026.
 - c. **ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING:** The last Meeting was held on June 15, 2026. The next regular meeting will be held on July 20, 2026.

- 8. INFORMATION ITEMS:**

 - a. **GRANT FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES.** This agenda item is intended to provide an opportunity to review and discuss grant opportunities. (INFORMATION).
 - b. **CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (CCTA) MEETING CALENDAR:** The CCTA Calendar for June 2026 through September 2026 may be downloaded using the following [link](#)

- 9. MEMBER COMMENTS.**

- 10. NEXT MEETING: AUGUST 27, 2026.**

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting Summary Minutes

Meeting Date:	May 28, 2026
Staff Present:	Aaron Elias, Concord; Anthony Nuti, Pleasant Hill; Trevor McGuire, Martinez; Matt Redmond, Walnut Creek; Henry Rood, Walnut Creek; Samantha Harris, Contra Costa County; Pranjal Dixit, County Connection; Celestine Do, BART; Matt Todd, TRANSPAC; Irina Nalitkina, TRANSPAC
Guests/Presenters:	Danielle Elkins, CCTA; Matt Kelly, CCTA; Colin Clarke, CCTA; Brinna McNulty, Parsons; Cara De Jong, 511CCTA; Greg Bearer, Contra Costa County; Carl Warner, Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, Chris Lau, Contra Costa County
Minutes Prepared By:	Tiffany Gephart

1. Convene Meeting / Self-Introductions

Mr. Todd called the meeting to order at approximately 9:00 A.M. A quorum of city representatives was present. Self-introductions followed.

2. Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

3. Minutes of the April 30, 2026 Meeting

The minutes of the April 30, 2026 meeting were approved by consensus.

4. Measure J Line 20a Fund Program – FY 2026/2027–FY 2027/2028

Mr. Todd presented the Final Draft Measure J Line 20a Funds Program. Following the Board's release of the draft for public review, staff recommended Scenario B, which funds 9 program and capital requests across 7 applicants at approximately \$1.335 million.

Mr. Todd reviewed revised oversight and accountability policies provided in a handout, consolidating the policies in the packet into three provisions: advance notice of service changes and a plan for notifying users of any service reductions; notification and a corrective plan in the event of a driver shortage affecting service delivery; and notification of broader changes to an applicant's overall transportation program that affect the funded service.

Mr. Dixit asked whether County Connection's practice of notifying TRANSPAC when additional qualifying schools express interest in the midday free program would satisfy the new policy. Mr. Todd indicated that this type of change should be addressed separately and most likely requires follow-up outside the meeting.

Mr. Elias noted the policies as drafted provided notification but no enforcement mechanism, and recommended adding language reserving the right to review funding when an applicant makes a significant reduction to the service described in its grant proposal. Mr. Todd agreed to add language providing that a service reduction would trigger additional discussion regarding the requirements of the grant proposal.

By consensus, the TAC recommended that the Board approve the Final Draft Measure J Line 20a Funds Program for FY 2026/2027 and FY 2027/2028, and with the addition of the accountability provisions as recommended by the TAC.

5. TRANSPAC Work Plan and Budget Process for FY 2026/2027

Mr. Todd reviewed the draft work plan and budget, previously discussed by the TAC and reviewed by the Board. Workplan revisions reflecting TAC and Board comments included stronger language on monitoring and coordination of the Concord Naval Weapons Station and its growth management implications; tracking of regional ballot measures, a potential new countywide Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)/renewal of Measure J; the regional long-range plan update (Plan Bay Area); and strengthened language addressing e-bike policy, education, and integration into the bicycle and pedestrian plan.

On the budget, Mr. Todd noted the Managing Director line is the largest annual expense. He reviewed the five-year audit contract, the City of Martinez Pacheco Transit Hub and park-and-ride maintenance commitment, a contingency of approximately 10 percent of the budget, and the project reserve fund. Member contributions under the Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JPA) formula were also reviewed. The final budget will be presented to the Board for approval in June.

6. Measure J Line 21a Safe Transportation for Children Program – CCTA Program Proposal

Mr. Todd introduced the item, noting the Line 21a program generates approximately \$600,000 annually and that the last allocation of \$41,000 supported the Summer Youth Ride Free program for 2026. Ms. Elkins of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) presented several concepts for future use of Line 21a funds to support student transportation in central Contra Costa County: a Clipper Bay Pass pilot for approximately 2,000 of the most vulnerable students in the Mount Diablo Unified School District SOAR program; expansion of the Walk and Roll program to all schools in the subregion; expansion of the annual Bike Family Fest; additional bicycle parking at schools and secure bicycle parking in the public right-of-way near large multifamily complexes; expansion of travel training to youth; and a study of yellow school bus feasibility in the TRANSPAC region.

The TAC provided the following comments on the Line 21a program concepts:

- A funding equity concern was raised that, because only TRANSPAC has Line 21a funding, passes would be available only to students registered in the TRANSPAC region and not to students in the SWAT subregion.

- A recommendation was made to keep the administrative burden of any pass program as low as possible so that funds are directed to student access.
- Bicycle parking was supported as lasting infrastructure that complements the Walk and Roll program; support was expressed for parking at schools and public buildings, with a recommendation that jurisdictions incorporate bicycle parking requirements into development standards, and hesitation about parking sited specifically for multifamily housing rather than in public rights-of-way.
- A recommendation was made to pursue a yellow school bus pilot route rather than a study alone; staff noted the program’s cost would likely exceed available funding, limiting the program to a study at this time. A separate comment questioned the value of funding a study for a program the subregion cannot afford to implement.
- A request was made for the fund balance and a funding projection through the end of Measure J in 2034, with prioritized, costed options including cost per user, to inform allocation decisions.
- A recommendation was made to include sidewalk and pedestrian infrastructure for school access and to use Walk and Roll mapping to identify network gaps for prioritization.

Ms. Elkins noted she would return with costed options based on TRANSPAC priorities.

7. Iron Horse Trail and Contra Costa Canal Trail Connection Feasibility Study – Route Alignment Concept Alternatives

Mr. Clarke of CCTA, supported by Ms. McNulty of Parsons, presented the feasibility study, which originated from the I-680/SR-4 interchange improvement project. The study is developing route concepts and evaluation criteria to connect the Iron Horse Trail and the Contra Costa Canal Trail, an area that includes an equity priority community and the Pacheco mobile home community, with physical barriers including the 680/4 interchange, Grayson Creek, Walnut Creek, and Buchanan Field airport. Staff reviewed stakeholder feedback, the evaluation criteria, and five route alignment concept (RAC) alternatives, and invited written comments and one-on-one meetings as part of ongoing public engagement.

Mr. Bearer, Director of Airports for Contra Costa County, stated that RAC 3 (the Marsh Drive alignment, which carries a congressional earmark of approximately \$1.2 million) passes through the airport’s Runway Protection Zone (RPZ), and explained that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) establishes RPZs to protect people on the ground from aircraft excursions. In response to a question from Mr. Elias, Mr. Bearer clarified that the RPZ boundary is dimensionally defined by the FAA and is binary in application — a facility is either within or outside the zone, with no intermediate gradations. He indicated he would need to consult further with the FAA and CCTA staff before taking a definitive position, particularly given the earmark’s association with the RAC 3 alignment, and that the airport’s preferred alignment would be away from the RPZ. Mr. Warner of the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District reported that routing a trail beneath I-680 along Grayson Creek would be problematic due to standing water levels. It was also noted the current I-680 vertical alignment does not allow

for flood control maintenance access. If there was an undercrossing, there would also be concerns about encampments.

The TAC provided the following comments on the feasibility study:

- Support was expressed for RAC 4, leveraging the existing creeks and waterways and extending the Iron Horse Trail, with the option to extend further over time.
- Concern was noted that the Grayson Creek Trail is largely unimproved (gravel) and would require improvement to function as the preferred connection.
- A potential middle-ground alignment was suggested running up the Grayson Creek Trail to Pacheco Boulevard to avoid both the RPZ and the I-680 undercrossing.
- A suggestion was made to combine the earmark with improvements to Marsh Drive and Center Avenue to serve the equity priority community and continue the trail.
- A question was raised regarding the earmark's association with one alignment; Mr. Clarke clarified that the earmark was a separate county project awarded through federal legislation, not designated specifically for RAC 3, though its geography overlaps with that alignment.
- Mr. Nuti asked about the preferred facility type for the RAC 4B connection near Golf Club Road, noting Pleasant Hill is developing Safe Routes to School concepts in that area; Mr. Clarke indicated CCTA would coordinate with Pleasant Hill staff directly on that question.
- Mr. Redmond asked whether a tunnel alignment under the RPZ could address the FAA constraint for the RAC 3 alignment; Mr. Bearer confirmed that an underground crossing would not be subject to the RPZ, while noting cost and other practical constraints.
- It was noted that RAC 3 and RAC 4 may not be feasible given the FAA and flooding constraints, and that feasibility should be confirmed before further consideration.

8. Contra Costa Transportation Authority 2026 Coordinated Call for Projects

Mr. Kelly of CCTA presented the 2026 Coordinated Call for Projects (CCFP). A copy of the full presentation is available at transpac.us with the meeting materials. The CCFP combines more than \$95 million across several programs: the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 (OBAG 4) federal program, Measure J Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) and Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities (PBTF) funds, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Community Action Resource and Empowerment (CARE) program, and Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Additional Bikeway Funding.

He explained that the funds are combined for a single application process but are not commingled. The OBAG 4 county target is \$43.4 million, with a required submittal of 120 percent, or \$52.1 million; approximately \$33 million is available countywide for TLC (with a Central County share of about \$11 million); approximately \$12 million is available for PBTF (including the East Bay Regional Park District share); and \$3.3 million is available for TFCA Additional Bikeway Funding.

Mr. Kelly reviewed OBAG compliance requirements, application limits per jurisdiction, minimum grant sizes, the 12 scoring criteria, and the proposed schedule leading to an October submittal to MTC. He described five countywide programs CCTA proposes to submit, including a Smart Signals phase two, continuation of Safe Routes to School mapping, expansion of student transportation programs (Walk and Roll and Bay Pass youth transit passes), and an Electric Vehicle (EV) Blueprint plan update, plus competitive categories for local active transportation/safety projects and transit state of good repair.

Mr. Kelly reported two recommendations from the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC): to split the application schedule so OBAG 4 applications are due August 3 with an extended deadline for TLC and PBTF; and to shift approximately \$10 million from the countywide programs to the competitive categories. CCTA indicated a preference for a coordinated single due date and would take both recommendations to its planning committee. CCTA also requested that the TAC establish a scoring subcommittee for the Central County TLC applications. He noted that members would not be allowed to score their own jurisdictions' applications.

The TAC provided the following comments regarding the CCFP:

- Ms. Do asked for clarification on whether the unified scoring criteria applied to all fund sources; Mr. Kelly confirmed that all 12 criteria apply to all programs, with scoring weights adjustable by the respective scoring committees for TLC and PBTF applications.
- Ms. Do also asked about the scope of technical assistance available under the CARE program, specifically whether eligible projects must come from the Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) project list and whether BART could apply for construction-phase funding rather than technical assistance; Mr. Kelly confirmed that CCTA would receive a grant to hire a consultant to advance CBTP projects, that any CBTP project not yet constructed would be eligible, and that BART could apply for construction-phase funding.
- Ms. Do also asked whether CCTA had a map of equity priority community geographies available to view alongside the funding eligibility areas; Mr. Kelly confirmed a combined overlay map would be provided with the call for projects materials.
- Mr. Elias asked whether countywide OBAG funding for the student transportation program would free up the TRANSPAC funding currently supporting Walk and Roll in Central County, and noted concern that subregional priorities should not be disadvantaged; Mr. Kelly responded that augmentation of subregional programs would be a TRANSPAC decision.
- Mr. Elias also relayed the TCC concern regarding the countywide program dollar amounts, noting that the lack of detailed cost justification — particularly for the \$20 million student transportation figure — created uncertainty for the scoring committee; he asked whether the committee could partially fund the programs. Mr. Kelly confirmed the programs are scalable and that the scoring committee retains the ability to partially fund them based on the applications submitted.

- Mr. Elias asked whether TLC or PBTF could be used to match federal grants; Mr. Kelly cautioned against commingling any federal source and confirmed that using TLC or PBTF as match to federal funds would also be considered commingling and would require confirmation with CCTA programming staff before proceeding. Mr. Todd asked specifically about Measure J local return and sub-regional funds as match, and Mr. Kelly confirmed those are available for that purpose.
- Mr. Redmond questioned the rationale for the two-application limit; Mr. Kelly confirmed the limit is intended to manage scoring committee workload, estimating approximately 60 applications at the current maximum. Mr. Clarke noted that a jurisdiction can participate as a co-applicant, sponsor, or beneficiary on another jurisdiction's application in addition to its own two submissions and encouraged bundling projects using a safe systems approach. Mr. Clarke emphasized that applicants should disclose when project funding is contingent on other grant awards.
- Mr. Rood asked whether TFCA Additional Bikeway and CARE program applications count toward the two-project limit per jurisdiction; Mr. Kelly confirmed that no application limit has been established for those fund sources.

9. TRANSPAC Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program – Development Project Tracking

Mr. Todd reviewed the development project tracker and reported no new projects. He noted recent activity on the Concord Naval Weapons Station; Mr. Elias reported the City had agreed to terms with the Navy, that approvals from the Navy and Brookfield remain outstanding, and that the next step would be a specific plan, with coordination with nearby jurisdictions likely beginning in the fall. Mr. Rood noted the two Mitchell Townhomes entries could be consolidated into a single line item. Mr. Nuti reported no submittal for the In-N-Out project, which will remain off the list until an application is filed. Staff requested that jurisdictions send tracker updates to Ms. Gephart or enter them in the shared spreadsheet.

10. Committee Updates

Mr. Todd noted that staff is coordinating a presentation to the Board by CCTA Executive Director Tim Haile, and that a two-day CCTA Board workshop on the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) was held in late May.

11. Information Items

Mr. Todd noted the grant funding opportunities and the CCTA meeting calendar were included in the packet by reference and link.

12. Member Comments

Mr. Dixit announced that the County Connection Youth Ride Free program begins June 1, 2026 and runs through the end of July.

13. Adjourn / Next Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:15 A.M. The next regular meeting is scheduled for June 25, 2026.

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: June 30, 2026

Subject:	TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR CLEAN AIR (TFCA) FUND - FY 2026/2027 CALL FOR PROJECTS
Summary of Issues	The Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Fund Program supports projects that promote alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles and result in reduced air pollution from motor vehicles. CCTA released the TFCA FY2026-27 call for projects on April 30, 2026; draft Applications were due May 19, 2026. Four subregional programs/projects were received totalling approximately \$760,000 in requests with \$329,000 in available funding.
Recommendation	Recommend prioritized Central County projects for the FY 2026/27 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Fund.
Financial Implications	TRANSPAC is responsible for making recommendations on the utilization of TFCA grant funds for eligible projects within the subregion. Any program resulting from the recommendation and subsequent CCTA Board action, will commit CCTA administered TFCA grant funds to implement the program(s).
Attachment(s)	A. CCTA TFCA FY2027 Call for Projects Memo B. CCTA TFCA Project Submittal and Benefits Calculation Worksheet

Background:

The Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funds projects that reduce air pollution from motor vehicles. Regional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies such as programs implemented under the umbrella of the 511CCTA program (which aim to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by decreasing single occupancy vehicle use), have been supported by TFCA grant funds in the past as well as other types of projects such as bike lane facilities. CCTA released an FY 2026-27 TFCA call for projects on April 30, 2026 with approximately \$2M available for countywide and subregional programs. Draft applications were due May 19, 2026.

The TFCA 40% Fund uses a two-tier funding process. CCTA first identifies countywide programs — such as the 511CCTA TDM programs and the countywide vanpool program — that benefit all county residents. Each subregion is credited with a proportional share of countywide program costs based on a jobs-housing formula; Central County's share is 30.7%. After countywide program costs are deducted, remaining funds are distributed to each subregion by the same formula percentages.

For subregional funds, TRANSPAC reviews local project proposals and provides a funding priority recommendation to the CCTA Board. Eligible project types include ridesharing programs, shuttle services, bicycle facility improvements, traffic management, telecommuting demonstrations, vehicle buy-back programs, clean fuel vehicle purchases, and infrastructure supporting emission reductions. CCTA evaluates all projects for cost-effectiveness and vehicle miles traveled reduction in accordance with TFCA grant program requirements.

Summary of TRANSPAC TFCA TDM Programs/Projects - FY 25-26 Funded and FY 26-27 Proposed

FY 2025-2026 Programs/Projects	FY 2026-2027 Proposed Programs/Projects
Countywide	
511CCTA: Brand Maintenance; Year-Round "Big Win on Transit" Program; Seasonal TDM Incentives (Winter Walk Challenge, Earth Day, Bike to Work, Summer Bike Challenge etc.); School Pool, Pass2Class	511CCTA Countywide Brand; Year-Round TDM Incentives ("Big Win on Transit", Weekly Spair the Air); Seasonal TDM Incentives (Pass2Class, Summer Bike Challenge, Winter Walk Challenge, SchoolPool Carpool, Bike to Work Day, National and regional TDM campaigns)
Guaranteed Ride Home	<i>Note: the Guranteed Ride Home program will continue in FY 2026-27 but is being funded with program balance from the prior year</i>
Vanpool Incentives	Countywide Vanpool Program
Subregional	
Walk & Roll (Active4Me) Program for Central County	TRANSPAC Walk & Roll Program (511CCTA)
	TRANSPAC College Pass2Class+ Trip Reduction (511CCTA)
	TRANSPAC Public Employee Trip Reduction Pilot (511CCTA)
	Parkside Cycletracks (Walnut Creek)

FY 2026/27 Funding Availability

Central County available funds for FY 2026/27 are as follows:

Component	Amount
Formula allocation (30.7%)	\$200,755
Reprogrammed rollover (24CC02, CCTA)	\$128,474
Central County Available Funds	\$329,229

FY 2026/27 Applications — Central County

Four projects were submitted for Central County TFCA subregional funding. Total requests of \$759,684 exceed available funds by approximately \$430,455 (see attachment A).

Project	Sponsor	Requested Amount
Walk & Roll (TRANSPAC)	CCTA	\$276,100
TRANSPAC Public Employee Trip Reduction Pilot	CCTA	\$162,610
TRANSPAC College Pass2Class+ Trip Reduction	CCTA	\$100,974
Parkside Cycletracks	City of Walnut Creek	\$220,000
Total Requests		\$759,684

Program Descriptions

Walk and Roll provides schools with a trackable method for reducing drive-alone school trips. Using the Active4me app platform, students earn rewards for walking, biking, carpooling, and taking transit to school. The program currently serves more than a dozen schools in the TRANSPAC subregion and has demonstrated reductions in vehicle drop-off trips. The FY 2026/27 application proposes expansion to 27 schools (17 existing, 10 new) across all Central County cities. Requested: \$276,100.

TRANSPAC College Pass2Class+ Trip Reduction provides up to two months of free public transit to approximately 350 college students at Diablo Valley College in Pleasant Hill and California State University East Bay in Concord at the start of the academic year, along with carpool parking incentives for 75 carpools. Requested: \$100,974.

TRANSPAC Public Employee Trip Reduction Pilot is a new program through which 511CC would work with public employers in the TRANSPAC subregion to advertise and fulfill commute incentives for employees. Target employers include the cities of Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, and Walnut Creek; Contra Costa County; the community college districts; the County Office of Education; Mount Diablo, Walnut Creek, and Martinez school districts; Central San; and Contra Costa Water District. Incentives would include cash rewards, Clipper cards, and gift cards for carpooling and active transportation. At least 1,000 employees are expected to participate. Requested: \$162,610.

Parkside Cycletracks encompasses a 0.4-mile Class IV cycle track on Parkside Drive, providing an east-west connection between Riviera Avenue near the Walnut Creek BART Station and Civic Drive. The improvement would serve approximately 14,000 daily vehicles and provide bicycle access to Downtown Walnut Creek, two schools, the Iron Horse Trail, and regional employment centers. The project has previously received Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities

(AHSC) Grant funding; this request addresses a remaining funding gap of \$220,000 resulting from increased construction costs. Requested: \$220,000.

Funding Scenarios

Because available funds are insufficient to cover the four eligible programs/projects at requested levels, the TAC is requested to identify funding priorities. Several scenarios are presented for discussion below. Scenario B sub-options include Measure J Line 21a as a supplemental source for consideration since the Walk & Roll program is also eligible for 21a funding.

Scenario A — Walk & Roll + College Pass2Class+

In scenario A, both programs are funded from available TFCA. The combined request of \$377,074 exceeds available funds by approximately \$47,845; one or both programs would require partial funding. This scenario does not include the Public Employee Trip Reduction Pilot or the Walnut Creek Parkside Cycletracks Project.

Project	TFCA Funding
Walk & Roll	\$276,100
College Pass2Class+ (partial)	~\$53,129
Total	\$329,229

Scenario B — Walk & Roll (TFCA + Line 21a) + remaining programs

Scenario B funds Walk & Roll at its full requested amount using a combination of TFCA and Line 21a, with TFCA directed first to other eligible programs. Three sub-options are presented which include scenarios that prioritize either the TDM programs or the Parkside Cycletracks capital project. In all scenarios, available TFCA is fully expended and Line 21a covers the Walk & Roll remainder.

Project	TFCA/21a Funding Source Split					
	Scenario B1		Scenario B2		Scenario B3	
	TFCA	Line 21a	TFCA	Line 21a	TFCA	Line 21a
Walk & Roll	\$65,645	\$210,455	\$228,255	\$47,845	\$109,229	\$166,171
College Pass2Class+	\$100,974	—	\$100,974	—	—	—
Public Employee Trip Reduction Pilot	\$162,610	—	—	—	—	—
Parkside Cycletracks	—	—	—	—	\$220,000	—
Total	\$329,229	\$210,455	\$329,229	\$47,845	\$329,229	\$166,171

Parkside Cycletracks Project Readiness

Staff is coordinating with the City of Walnut Creek regarding the project schedule for the Parkside Cycletracks Project. Based on information provided by CCTA, the project's proposed construction start date of May 2029 would not meet the timely use of funds requirement that implementation begin within one year of award. Additional information will be provided at the meeting.

At this meeting, the TAC is requested to recommend prioritized projects for the TRANSPAC subregional TFCA fund program which will be brought to the TRANSPAC Board at its July 9, 2026 meeting for consideration. Following the TRANSPAC Board action, prioritized projects will be forwarded to the CCTA staff for committee circulation and approval and subsequent initiation of funding agreements.

Call for Projects Schedule

Date	Activity
April 30, 2026	CCTA FY 2026/27 TFCA Call for Projects Release (complete)
May 19, 2026	Draft applications due to CCTA (complete)
June 22, 2026	Final project submissions due to CCTA (complete)
June 30, 2026	TRANSPAC TAC meeting — FY 2026/27 program recommendation
July 9, 2026	TRANSPAC Board meeting — FY 2026/27 program action
August 13, 2026	Subregional Project Selections Submittal Deadline to CCTA
September 3, 2026	CCTA Planning Committee review
September 16, 2026	CCTA Board approval
October 2026	Funding agreements executed



CONTRA COSTA
TRANSPORTATION
AUTHORITY

COMMISSIONERS

Darlene Gee,
Chair

Sue Noack,
Vice Chair

Mark Armstrong

Newell Arnerich

Juan Banales

Diane Burgis

Ken Carlson

Chris Kelley

Aaron Meadows

Carlyn Obringer

Rita Xavier

Timothy Haile,
Executive Director

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 30, 2026
TO: Prospective Contra Costa County Project Sponsors
FROM: Danielle Elkins, Deputy Executive Director, Planning, Programs, & Policy
SUBJECT: Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Fund Fiscal Year 2026-27 Call for Projects

Draft Applications Due by 5PM on Tuesday, May 19

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) is pleased to announce a Call for Projects in the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Fund for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2026-27 cycle.

In 1991, the California State Legislature authorized the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) to impose a \$4 surcharge on motor vehicles registered within the Bay Area to fund clean air projects. The Air District allocates this revenue through its TFCA program to fund eligible programs and projects. Forty percent (40%) of these TFCA funds are pass-through funds to the designated county Administering Agency in each of the nine counties within the Air District’s jurisdiction based on the county’s proportionate share of fee-paid vehicle registration. CCTA has been designated as the Administering Agency for the TFCA 40% Fund in Contra Costa County and is responsible for administering the County program including annually adopting a program of projects that meet the legislative requirements of the program.

The FY 2026-27 TFCA 40% Fund Expenditure Plan includes \$2,075,475. Of that total amount, \$401,953 consists of prior year (pre-FY2025) unspent balances, and will be reprogrammed to affected Contra Costa subregions: Central (TRANSPAC), East (TRANSPLAN), and Southwest (SWAT). The remaining \$1,673,522 will be allocated by formula to the four subregions of the county, equal to the current jobs/housing formula benefit defined in the Contra Costa TFCA Policy (adopted 2024). CCTA is required to allocate all funds to eligible projects and programs. The fund year begins July 1, 2026, and projects can also begin as early as July 1, 2026.

All interested parties should review the Air District FYE 2027 TFCA 40% Fund County Program Manager Guidance. All Air District guidelines and requirements apply to this Call for Projects. For further reference, at its meeting on April 17, 2024, the Authority Board approved the TFCA

2999 Oak Road
Suite 100
Walnut Creek
CA 94597
PHONE:
925.256.4700
ccta.ca.gov

40% Fund Policy that outlines fund allocation principles and program/project selection procedure.

Bikeways & Bike Parking Projects

For FY 2026-27, the Air District has also allocated an additional \$3,333,094 in TFCA 40% Funds to Contra Costa County, which shall be dedicated to funding bikeways and bike parking projects. This particular program will be incorporated into the forthcoming Coordinated Call for Projects with One Bay Area Grant (OBAG Cycle 4)/Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)/Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Trail (PBTF) funding programs, which is scheduled for release in late spring 2026.

Eligible applicants interested in applying for this dedicated bikeway and bike parking funding program are encouraged to notify CCTA of their interest in advance, and to monitor the Coordinated OBAG4/TLC/PBTF Call for Projects. For any questions specific to this additional bikeways and bike parking funding, please contact James Hinkamp at james@amobility.com.

Call for Projects Schedule (subject to change)

Thursday, April 30, 2026	CCTA Releases TFCA Call for Projects
thru Wednesday, May 13, 2026	Upon request, CCTA staff provides assistance to Project Sponsors to complete draft project documents.
Tuesday, May 19, 2026, 5pm	Project Sponsors submit draft Project Information Form and Cost Effectiveness Worksheet including budget and TFCA funds request to the Authority.
thru Friday, June 12, 2026	CCTA and Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPC) staff review and collaborate on selection of eligible submittals, with input from Project Sponsors.
Monday, June 15, 2026	Project Sponsors informed of Projects moving to final draft with suggested updates.
Monday, June 22, 2026 5pm	Project Sponsor submit final project requests with Project Information and Cost Effectiveness Worksheet
thru July 2026; DUE Thursday, August 13, 2026	Selection of recommended Countywide Projects by Authority and selection of recommended Subregional Projects by RTPCs
Thursday, September 3 & Wednesday, September 16, 2026	Present recommended projects to CCTA Planning Committee & Board for approval
October 2026	CCTA and Project Sponsors execute funding agreements.
Friday, November 6, 2026	Deadline for the Administering Agency (CCTA) to allocate funds identified in the Expenditure Report and submit FYE 2027 projects to the Air District

Application Materials

To submit an application for project or program funding, applicants must first complete a Microsoft Forms survey. The link to this survey is as follows:

<https://forms.office.com/r/vgb5FiKfd0>

After submittal, CCTA will then respond to the primary email contact provided in the survey with an invitation to access application materials via Microsoft SharePoint.

Upon receiving the SharePoint link, applicants should review the available reference policy materials and instructional documents. Begin with the "START HERE" document and follow the instructions to complete the required forms to submit your application via SharePoint.

SharePoint folder contents include:

- *Start Here* document outlining the steps to submit projects
- Schedule of Call for Projects activities
- Air District FYE 2027 TFCA 40% Fund County Program Manager Guidance
- Resolution 24-16-G: CCTA Transportation Fund for Clean Air 40% Fund Policy
- Resolution 26-08-G (rev): FY 2026-27 TFCA 40% Fund Expenditure Plan

Required project submittal documents:

- Project Information Form (PIF)
 - Pre-Project Cost Effectiveness (CE) worksheets for all project types
 - Project Submittal and Benefit Calculation Worksheet
-
- Reporting forms for project fund year for all project types
 - Funding acknowledgment requirements and logos
 - Funding Agreement Template

Draft Applications Due by 5PM (PST) on Tuesday, May 19*

**Late applications will not be accepted.*

FOR MORE INFORMATION :

If you need assistance with your draft project submission, please contact Danielle Elkins at delkins@ccta.ca.gov, Nikki Foletta at nfoletta@ccta.ca.gov AND James Hinkamp at james@amobility.com.

One-on-one “office hours” will be available in 30-minute segments on two (2) consecutive Wednesdays: May 6 (9:00am – 2:00pm) and May 13 (9:00am – 1:00pm). Please contact James Hinkamp (james@amobility.com) to schedule a time.

Sincerely,



Danielle Elkins,
Deputy Executive Director, Planning, Programs, & Policy

TFCA Project Submittal and Benefit Calculation Worksheet	
TFCA County Total Funds FY2027	\$ 2,075,475

<i>Sub-regional reprogramming (rollovers from prior unspent balances)*</i>	\$ 401,953
--	-------------------

	Project	Sponsor		
Central County	24CC02	CCTA	\$	128,474
East County	24CC02	CCTA	\$	109,441
Southwest	24CC03	San Ramon	\$	164,038

Funds Remaining for Countywide & Subregional Projects	\$ 1,673,522
--	---------------------

Countywide Projects - Serving All Residents

<i>Project Status</i>	Project	Sponsor	Cost
<i>Under review</i>	511CC Countywide Brand + Countywide TDM Commute & School Incentives + Seasonal Programs	CCTA/511CC	\$ 785,425
<i>Under review</i>	Countywide Vanpool Program	City of San Ramon	\$ 234,172
	Countywide Project Total		\$ 1,019,597

Funds Remaining for Subregional Projects	\$ 653,925
---	-------------------

Available by Subregion

Central County	30.70%	\$200,755
East County	26.60%	\$173,944
Southwest	20.50%	\$134,055
West County	22.20%	\$145,171

Central County Available Funds	\$ 329,229
---------------------------------------	-------------------

Reprogrammed	24CC02	CCTA	\$ 128,474
Formula	30.70%		\$ 200,755

<i>Project Status</i>	Project	Sponsor	Cost
<i>Under review</i>	TRANSPAC College Pass2Class+ Trip Reduction	CCTA	\$ 100,974
<i>Under review</i>	TRANSPAC Public Employee Trip Reduction Pilot	CCTA	\$ 162,610
<i>Under review</i>	Walk & Roll (TRANSPAC)	CCTA	\$ 276,100
<i>Under review</i>	Parkside Cycletracks	City of Walnut Creek	\$ 220,000

Central County Project Total	\$ 759,684
-------------------------------------	-------------------

Remaining:	\$ (430,455)
-------------------	---------------------

TRANSPAC TAC Meeting STAFF REPORT

Meeting Date: June 30, 2026

Subject:	CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY 2026 COORDINATED CALL FOR PROJECTS — MEASURE J TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR LIVABLE COMMUNITIES SCORING CRITERIA AND APPLICATION REVIEW COMMITTEE
Summary of Issues	<p>The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) developed a coordinated call for projects for the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 (OBAG 4) federal program, the third cycle of the Measure J Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) and Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities (PBTF) funding programs, and Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funding.</p> <p>Approximately \$95 million in combined funds are anticipated to be available for projects in Contra Costa County. CCTA issued the call for projects on June 23, 2026, with application materials due August 17, 2026. At this meeting, staff will review the OBAG4 scoring rubric proposed by CCTA which the TAC can elect to modify its weighting priorities for the TLC Program. A scoring committee will also need to be formed to review Central County submissions. CCTA staff will be present to provide an update and respond to questions.</p>
Recommendation(s)	Approve scoring criteria for the Central County 2026 Measure J TLC Cycle 3 applications and identify TAC members to serve on the subregional TLC application review committee.
Financial Implications	TRANSPAC is responsible for recommending funding priorities for the Measure J Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) fund program for Central County. Any program resulting from a funding recommendation will commit CCTA administered TLC grant funds to implement the project(s).
Attachment(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">A. CCTA TCC Staff Report – Approval of the Proposed Coordinated Call for Projects Program Guidelines (May 21, 2026).B. FINAL TLC Scoring Criteria (CCTA)

Background

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) released the OBAG 4 Regional and County Call for Projects Guidelines in February 2026. As the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Contra Costa County, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) is responsible for administering the county program in accordance with MTC guidelines and submitting eligible project nominations.

CCTA issued the 2026 Contra Costa Coordinated Call for Projects (CCFP) on June 23, 2026. The CCFP consolidates funding from the following five programs to streamline the application process for local project sponsors: One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 (OBAG 4), MTC's Community Action and Regional Empowerment (CARE) program, Measure J Transportation for Livable Communities Cycle 3 (TLC), Measure J Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities Cycle 3 (PBTF), and the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Additional Bicycle Infrastructure Program.

For OBAG 4, CCTA anticipates nominating approximately \$52 million in projects to MTC with funding available in Fiscal Years 2026-27 through 2029-30. Additional funds from the Measure J TLC and PBTF programs bring the combined total to approximately \$95 million available for local applicants. All application materials are due by 5:00 PM on August 17, 2026. Program descriptions, eligibility requirements, and scoring criteria are available at ccta.ca.gov/planning/coordinated-call-for-projects.

At the April 30 and May 28, 2026 TAC meetings, CCTA staff presented an overview of the CCFP process, next steps, and draft scoring criteria. CCTA has established a unified 12-criterion scoring framework totaling 75 points to be applied across all CCFP funding programs and that each RTPC may adjust the point values assigned to each criterion for its subregional TLC scoring. The TAC is requested to provide direction on TRANSPAC's preferred weights and to identify volunteers for a application review committee to evaluate Central County TLC applications (following the August 17, 2026 deadline). Information about the meeting of the review committee will be determined at a later date. It should be noted that jurisdictions serving on the application review committee will not score their own applications.

The 12 criteria and their default point values are shown below in descending order by weight. See attachment B for full scoring details.

#	Criterion	Default Points	% Weight
1	Vision Zero Safety and Injury Prevention	20	27%
6	Improve System/Network Connectivity	9	12%
5	Grant Deliverability, Sponsor Readiness, and Overall Implementation Feasibility	8	11%
3	Total Project Cost and Funding Match Percentage from Applicant	7	9%
2	Public Health Outcomes	6	8%

#	Criterion	Default Points	% Weight
7	Range and number of users	6	8%
10	Alignment with Regional Policy and Objectives	6	8%
4	Safe System Approach Bundled Projects	4	5%
9	Public Engagement, Community Outreach & Policy Support	3	4%
8	Latent Demand	2	3%
11	Prioritizing Public Space	2	3%
12	Increase or Sustain Transit Ridership	2	3%
	CCTA Total	75	100%

The TAC is requested to review the scoring criteria and provide input on any adjustments TRANSPAC propose to CCTA for Central County TLC scoring as well as recommend TAC members to serve on the application review committee. CCTA staff will be present to respond to questions.

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
<p>Criterion 1 of 12: Vision Zero Safety and Injury Prevention e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #1 – 2, 15.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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?</p>	<p>20 max points.</p> <p>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</p> <p>6–10 = moderate reduction of risk of severe</p>	

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
<p><input type="checkbox"/> 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?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Will the final project scope add a new roundabout? Type?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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”)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> How has the City committed to using the speed reduction law? (Assembly Bill 43)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Excessive Unsafe Speeding (considering conditions) <input type="checkbox"/> Driving under the Influence <input type="checkbox"/> Contraflow bike riding <input type="checkbox"/> Seniors (vulnerable population) 	<p>crash/injury; on a Local HIN; LTS 2—3</p> <p><u>11–20</u> = 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)</p>	

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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 <p><input type="checkbox"/> Will the final scope significantly reduce bicycling or pedestrian jurisdiction-wide per-capita fatal and/or severe injuries?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> To which extent has and/or will the proposal address the topics above?</p>		
<p>Criterion 2 of 12: Public Health e.g., refer to responses for Application Form #1 – 4, 15.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> To which extent (tools here) will the final scope reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and air pollution?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> To which extent will the final scope improve Public Health? e.g., physical health and mental health at the individual level.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Has a qualified Public Health professional committed in writing to any amount of participation in design and construction scope development/review, ongoing operation, etc.?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> To which extent has and/or will the program address the topics above?</p>	<p>6 max points. <u>0–1</u> = minimal <u>2–4</u> = moderate (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation or EV Blueprint or Technical Assistance) <u>5–6</u> = significant</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>8 max points. 8 = 60% match 7 = 50% match 6 = 40% match</p>	

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
<input type="checkbox"/> 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)	
<p>Criterion 4 of 12: Safe System Approach Bundled Projects e.g., refer to response to Application Form #1 – 4, 15.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> 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) <input type="checkbox"/> 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)	
<p>Criterion 5 of 12: Grant Deliverability, Sponsor Readiness, and Overall Implementation Feasibility e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #7 - 11.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 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) <input type="checkbox"/> 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
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Has a single jurisdiction committed as lead agency to ensuring complete implementation of the final scope across multiple jurisdictions? <input type="checkbox"/> Is any (potential) necessary right-of-way already acquired? <input type="checkbox"/> Which month & year will the proposed project (realistically) begin construction? <input type="checkbox"/> Will the project be ready for public use, e.g., pedestrians and bicyclists, no later than 2030? <input type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> 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). 	<p>minimal environmental review documentation timeline, e.g., not eligible for SB-71.</p> <p><u>3-5</u> = moderate: Design is less than 65% complete at application submittal, and/or SB-71-eligible scope.</p> <p><u>6-8</u> = 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)</p>	
<p>Criterion 6 of 12: Improve System/Network Connectivity e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #1 – 4, 15.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> Is the proposal included in MTC’s Active Transportation Plan, or CBPP Low-Stress Network? (Network map) 	<p><u>9 max points.</u></p> <p>1-3 = (not a gap closure or) minimal</p> <p>3-6 = moderate</p> <p>7-9 = significant (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation or Technical Assistance)</p>	

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
<input type="checkbox"/> To which extent the Project or Programmatic implementation will address the topics above? (select the highest points range)		
<p>Criterion 7 of 12: Range and number of users e.g., refer to response to Application Form #1 – 4, 15.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 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?	<p><u>6 max points.</u> 1–2 = (unknown, not estimated, or minimal 3–5 = moderate 6 = significant</p>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Percentage completion of jurisdiction-wide ADA Transition Plan (toward compliance or accessibility)		
<input type="checkbox"/> 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?		
<input type="checkbox"/> 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)		
<input type="checkbox"/> 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.		
<input type="checkbox"/> 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? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Seniors <input type="checkbox"/> Youth, children 		
<input type="checkbox"/> To which extent will the final scope reduce congestion or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in an urbanized area?		
<input type="checkbox"/> 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.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Will the final scope improve access to jobs, or the reliability of, <u>Freight/Goods Movement by cargo bicycle, electric bicycle, and improve Economic Access/Vitality?</u>		

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
<p>Criterion 8 of 12: Latent Demand e.g., refer to response to Application Form #1 - 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> Will the final scope be located within an Equity Priority Community (EPC map here) in Plan Bay Area? <input type="checkbox"/> To which extent has and/or will the Programmatic application address the topics above, and historically underserved community groups? 	<p><u>2 max points.</u> 0 = (unknown, not estimated, or) minimal 1 = moderate 2 = significant</p>	
<p>Criterion 9 of 12: Public Engagement and Community Outreach, & Policy Support e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #5 - 6.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> Will the final scope include Safe System Approach bundled or similar projects across jurisdictions with multiple participating organizations? e.g., utilities, Bike East Bay. <input type="checkbox"/> 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). <input type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the jurisdiction’s locally adopted Policy Resolution explicitly require that staff and each project prioritize Safety 	<p><u>3 max points.</u> 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)</p>	

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
<p>before Speed and integrate model language from the countywide template here?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Which adopted plan(s), adoption (and revision or amendment/enhancement) dates, and ranked project lists, included the proposal? <input type="checkbox"/> Which Design Guidelines and standards documents were used for each component of the proposal? (here) <input type="checkbox"/> Is the proposal consistent with any specific policies in the adopted General Plan? <input type="checkbox"/> CCTA Countywide Pedestrian Needs Assessment? (CPNA) <input type="checkbox"/> MTC Complete Streets Policy? <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Complete Streets Policy? (DIB-94) <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Safe Systems approach? (e.g., land use) <input type="checkbox"/> 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? 		
<p>Criterion 10 of 12: Alignment with Regional Policy and Objectives e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #1 - 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Is the application/project able to be scalable & replicated by a jurisdiction(s) in other counties or transit agencies? <input type="checkbox"/> Is the proposal in a Community-Based Transportation Plan? <p>Housing Policies' Compliance With Regional & State Law, Policy & Programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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 <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <p>Housing Anti-Displacement Policies</p>	<p>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)</p>	

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> Explain why they are effective within the context of the jurisdiction. <input type="checkbox"/> 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. 		
<p>Criterion 11 of 12: Prioritizing Public Space e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #1 - 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> 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). <input type="checkbox"/> Walkway/bikeway proximity to, and relationship to (separated, protected, etc.) on-street or off-street vehicle parking (which can affect Level of Traffic Stress) <input type="checkbox"/> 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? <input type="checkbox"/> 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. <input type="checkbox"/> 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 	<p><u>2 max points.</u> 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)</p>	

Ranking Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
<p>which page is the proposal in APBP Bike Parking Guide's 3rd Edition?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> To which extent has and/or will the Programmatic application address the topics above? (select the moderate points range)</p>		
<p>Criterion 12 of 12: Increase or Sustain Transit Ridership e.g., refer to response to Application Form #1 - 4.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Which percentage of the final scope (geographic & funding) will be located within a CBPP-designated Pedestrian Priority Area? (PPA)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> 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?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> To which extent will the final scope be located within two miles (or 15 minutes of travel time) of a Transit-Oriented Community? (TOC)</p>	<p>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)</p>	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

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
-------------	---	-------------------	--------------	-------------	------------------	-------