



SWAT

Danville • Lafayette • Moraga • Orinda • San Ramon & the County of Contra Costa

SOUTHWEST AREA TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

MEETING AGENDA

Monday, March 7, 2011

3:00 p.m.

Orinda City Hall –Sarge Littlehale Community Room
22 Orinda Way, Orinda, CA

Any document provided to a majority of the members of the Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at the meeting and at the Danville Town Offices, 510 La Gonda Way, Danville, CA during normal business hours.

1. CONVENE MEETING/SELF INTRODUCTIONS

2. PUBLIC COMMENT:

Members of the public are invited to address the Committee regarding any item that is not listed on the agenda. *(Please complete a speaker card in advance of the meeting and hand it to a member of the staff)*

3. BOARD MEMBER COMMENT

4. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

5. CONSENT CALENDAR:

5.A Approval of Minutes: SWAT Minutes of January 10, 2010 *(Attachment - Action)*

5.B Appoint SWAT Technical Advisory Committee (TCC) Members for the 2011-2013 Term
(Attachment - Action)

End of Consent Calendar

6. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

6.A Update on Release of Draft Guidelines for the Measure J Transportation for Livable Communities and Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Trails Facilities Programs: CCTA staff will present this item. *(Attachments)*

- 6.B Update on Contra Costa Safe Routes to School Program and Proposed Funding Allocation Options:** CCTA staff will present this item. (*Attachments*)
- 6.C 2013 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Call for Projects and Public Outreach Plan:** CCTA staff will present this item. (*Attachments*)
- 6.D Appoint South County Alternate Representative to the CCTA for remainder of the current term ending January 31, 2012** (*Attachment - Action*)

7. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: Consider Actions as Appropriate (*Attachments*)

- 2010 SWAT TDM Year in Review Report*
- CCTA summary of actions from Board meeting of 2/18/11
- WCCTAC summary of actions from Committee meeting of 2/25/11
- TRANSPAC summary of actions from Committee meeting of 2/10/11
- TRANSPLAN summary of actions from Committee meeting of 1/13/11
- Town of Danville – Release of Draft EIR for Weber Property Residential Development
- City of San Ramon – Notice of Public Hearing for General Plan Amendment for 2030 General Plan

* Related materials to be provided as meeting hand-out

8. DISCUSSION: Next Agenda

9. ADJOURNMENT to Monday, April 4, 2011, 3:00 p.m., Orinda City Hall, Sarge Littlehale Community Room, or other meeting as deemed appropriate.

The SWAT Committee will provide reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities planning to participate in SWAT monthly meetings. Please contact Andy Dillard at least 48 hours before the meeting at (925) 314-3384 or adillard@danville.ca.gov.

Staff Contact: Andy Dillard, Town of Danville


Phone: (925) 314-3384 / E-Mail: adillard@danville.ca.gov.

Agendas, minutes and other information regarding this committee can be found at: www.cccounty.us/SWAT

SOUTHWEST AREA TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
MEETING LOCATION MAP
CITY OF ORINDA, SARGE LITTLEHALE COMMUNITY ROOM
22 ORINDA WAY, ORINDA, CA 94563

DIRECTIONS:

- From CA-24 West, take the ORINDA VILLAGE/RICHMOND exit.
- Merge onto CAMINO PABLO
- Turn right onto SANTA MARIA WAY
- Continue on SANTA MARIA WAY, going past Orinda Way.
- Turn into the 3rd driveway on the left.
- This will take you into a long parking lot with 90 degree parking. The rear of City Hall and the Sarge Littlehale Community Room will be directly to your left once you enter the parking lot.



ATTACHMENT 5.A



SWAT

Danville • Lafayette • Moraga • Orinda • San Ramon & the County of Contra Costa

SUMMARY MINUTES
January 10, 2011 – 3:00 p.m.
Danville Town Offices, Large Conference Room
510 La Gonda Way
Danville, CA

Committee Members Present: Newell Arnerich, Town of Danville; Amy Worth, City of Orinda; Don Tatzin, City of Lafayette; Gayle Uilkema, Contra Costa County; Mike Metcalf, Town of Moraga. Dave Hudson, City of San Ramon arrived at 3:25 p.m.

Staff members present: Leah Greenblat, John Greitzer, Lisa Bobadilla, Tai Williams, Richard Yee, Lori Salamack, Emmanuel Ursu, Andy Dillard

Others present: Karen Stepper, Town of Danville; Martin Engelmann, CCTA; Grace Cho, MTC; Sailaja Kurella, ABAG

1. **CONVENE MEETING/SELF INTRODUCTIONS:** Meeting called to order by Vice-Chair Worth at 3:05 p.m.
2. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None
3. **BOARD MEMBER COMMENT:** None
4. **ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:** Andy Dillard recorded the minutes. Extra agenda packets were made available.
5. **CONSENT CALENDAR:**
 - 5.A **Approval of Minutes:** SWAT minutes of July 12, 2010
 - 5.B **Review and Approve Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for SWAT Administrative Services for Contract Service Years 2011 and 2012:**

The Committee took action to approve an MOU to enter in to contract with the Town of Danville for SWAT Administrative Services for 2011 and 2012.

ACTION: Tatzin/Worth/unanimous

End of Consent Calendar

6. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

6.A Report on SB 375 and Development and Implementation Efforts of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) for the Bay Area:

Martin Engelmann, CCTA staff, presented this item. Also present was Sailaja Kurella, ABAG staff, and Grace Cho, MTC staff. Mr. Engelmann stated that the initial overview presentations related to SB 375/SCS are being presented at the RTPC level by Authority staff.

The implementation of SB 375 is being conducted at the regional level by MTC, ABAG, BAAGMD, and BCDC, and the final plan will ultimately be adopted by MTC. SB 375 sets greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets for the Bay Area for a 7% reduction by 2020, and a 15% reduction by 2035 for the 18 State MPO's. The question was raised as to exactly what metric is used to calculate emission reductions for autos and light trucks. It was reported that the metric referenced is in million metric tons. Further, it was explained that SB 375 provides CEQA streamlining which provides incentives for smart-growth housing projects, and requires that there be a jobs-housing balance by 2035.

The Committee requested that future presentations and meetings regarding SB 375/SCS additionally be conducted separately for both the Lamorinda and South County in order for the local jurisdictions to better focus on how SB 375/SCS will directly affect their respective areas.

ACTION: None

6.B Appoint the Lamorinda SWAT Representative to the CCTA for the 2011-12 term:

The Committee took action to appoint the Lafayette SWAT representative as the Lamorinda representative to the CCTA, and took action to appoint the Moraga SWAT representative as the alternate Lamorinda representative to the CCTA for the 2011-12 term.

ACTION: Worth/Uilkema/unanimous

6.C Appoint the SWAT Chair and Vice-Chair for 2011:

The Committee took action to appoint the Orinda SWAT representative as Chair, and the Moraga representative as Vice-Chair of SWAT for 2011.

ACTION: Tatzin/Uilkema/unanimous

7. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: The following written communication items were made available:

- SWAT 2011 Meeting Calendar
- CCTA summary of actions from Board meetings of 10/21/10 and 12/16/10
- WCCTAC summary of actions from Committee meetings of 09/24/10, 10/29/10, and 12/10/10
- TRANSPAC summary of actions from Committee meetings of 11/16/10 and

12/15/10

- TRANSPLAN summary of actions from Committee meeting of 12/10/10
- Town of Danville – Notice of Preparation of Draft EIR for Magee Ranch - SummerHill Homes Development

ACTION: None

8. **DISCUSSION:** Future SWAT meetings will be held at the City of Orinda, Sarge Littlehale Community Room.

ACTION: None

9. **ADJOURNMENT:** The next meeting is scheduled for **Monday, February 7, 2011** at the Orinda City Hall, Sarge Littlehale Community Room, 22 Orinda Way, Orinda, CA.

ACTION: Meeting adjourned by Chair Arnerich at 4:30 p.m.

Staff Contact:

Andy Dillard
(925) 314-3384 PH
(925) 838-0360 FX
adillard@ci.danville.ca.us

Agendas, minutes and other information regarding this committee can be found at: www.cccounty.us/SWAT

ATTACHMENT 5.B



SWAT

Danville • Lafayette • Moraga • Orinda • San Ramon & the County of Contra Costa

DATE: March 7, 2011
TO: SWAT Committee
FROM: SWAT TAC
SUBJECT: Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Appointments for 2011-2013 Term

At the request of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, the SWAT TAC has considered and recommends the appointment of the following SWAT staff members to the Authority's Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) for a two-year term, beginning on April 1, 2011 and ending on March 31, 2013.

	Primary Representative	Alternate Representative
Planning:	Janice Carey, Orinda	Lisa Bobadilla, San Ramon
Engineering:	Leah Greenblat, Lafayette	Tony Coe, Lafayette
Transportation:	Tai Williams, Danville	Andy Dillard, Danville

Staff Contact:
Andy Dillard, Town of Danville
Phone: (925) 314-3384
Email: adillard@danville.ca.gov

ATTACHMENT 6.A

Planning Committee **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: March 2, 2011

Subject	Proposed Guidelines for the Measure J Transportation for Livable Communities and Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities Programs
Summary of Issues	Measure J includes Program 12, Transportation for Livable Communities (CC-TLC), which will support local efforts to create compact, mixed-use and pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly developments and encourage more walking, bicycling and transit use, and Program 13, Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities (PBTF) which is designed to fund projects identified in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Working with the CC-TLC working group and the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, staff has prepared draft guidelines for circulation and review by the RTPCs.
Recommendations	Review the proposed guidelines, refine policies, and circulate to the RTPCs for review and comment.
Financial Implications	During the first five years of Measure J (FY 2009-10 through FY 2014–15), an estimated \$22.7 million will be available through the CC-TLC program and \$6.7 million through the PBTF program
Options	Revise the draft CC-TLC and PBTF guidelines
Attachments	<p>A. Draft Guidelines for Measure J Program 12: Transportation for Livable Communities</p> <p>B. Draft Guidelines for Measure J Program 13: Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities</p>
Changes from Committee	

Background

Measure J allocates 6.5 percent of the sales tax revenues received — 6.94 percent if additional funds allocated specifically to West County are added in — to Programs 12 and 13 of the measure: the Contra Costa Transportation for Livable Communities and Pedestrian, Bicycle and

Trail Facilities programs. Staff has been working with an ad hoc group of staff for the CC-TLC program, and the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee for the PBTF program to develop guidelines and a process for allocating these revenues. Staff brought these proposed guidelines to the TCC on February 17, and incorporated the committee's comments as noted below.

Estimated Funding Available: Based on the estimates in the most recent Strategic Plan, about \$22.7 million will be available through the CC-TLC program through FY 14–15 and \$6.7 million through the PBTF program. These estimates include the additional revenues set aside in Programs 25 and 26 for TLC and PBTF in West County. Staff also expects these estimates to be higher than the Authority will actually receive.

Estimated CC-TLC Funding Available

\$1,000s, FY 2009–2015

<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>WCCTAC¹</i>	<i>TRANSPAC</i>	<i>TRANSPLAN²</i>	<i>SWAT</i>	<i>CC Total</i>
2008–09	220.8	203.9	191.7	132.8	749.2
2009–10	1,007.7	930.4	875.1	606.2	3,419.5
2010–11 ³	1,028.1	949.2	892.8	618.5	3,488.5
2011–12	1,059.1	977.9	919.7	637.1	3,593.8
2012–13	1,091.1	1,007.4	947.5	656.4	3,702.4
2013–14	1,124.0	1,037.8	976.1	676.2	3,814.2
2014–15	1,158.0	1,069.2	1,005.6	696.6	3,929.4
TOTAL	6,688.8	6,175.7	5,808.6	4,023.9	22,697.0

- 1 Includes additional CC-TLC funding specifically allocated to West County; \$210,000 of this amount is already allocated to El Cerrito as local match for the MTC TLC program, bringing the total down to 46.48 million
- 2 East County funds are already allocated to the eBART project and the Pittsburg-Bay Point BART Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Plan; no additional projects in East County would be funded through the CC-TLC program
- 3 Estimates for FY 2010–11 are expected to be lower than shown and will be adjusted downward in the recently begun update of the Measure J Strategic Plan

Estimated PBTF Funding Available

\$1,000s, FY 2009–2015

	Total Measure J	Ped-Bike- Trails Share	With Expenditure Cap	Competitive share	EBRPD share	West County share ⁴
		1.5%	98.5%	66.7%	33.3%	0.04%
FY08–09 ¹	14,086.1	211.3	208.1	138.8	69.4	5.6
FY09–10 ²	61,527.2	922.9	909.1	606.1	303.0	24.6
FY10–11 ³	65,585.5	983.8	969.0	646.0	323.0	26.2
FY11–12	67,566.2	1,013.5	998.3	665.6	332.7	27.0
FY12–13	69,606.7	1,044.1	1,028.4	685.7	342.8	27.8
FY13–14	71,708.8	1,075.6	1,059.5	706.4	353.1	28.7
FY14–15	73,874.4	1,108.1	1,091.5	727.7	363.8	29.5
Total	423,954.9	6,359.3	6,263.9	4,176.2	2,087.8	169.6

1 Actual; only for the final quarter of the fiscal year

2 Actual

3 Estimated; staff expects actual revenues to be lower

4 West County share is in addition to the share for the countywide PBTF

Allocation of Funding: The projects receiving CC-TLC funds will be recommended by the RTPCs, while the projects receiving PBTF funds will be identified through a countywide call for projects. Staff proposes to program funds from both sources through program-specific Strategic Plans.

Eligible Projects: The two programs would fund similar, but not identical, types of projects:

1. The CC-TLC program will fund projects that would “encourage the use of alternatives to the single occupant vehicle such as: pedestrian, bicycle and streetscape facilities, traffic calming and transit access improvements.” These projects must either “(a) facilitate, support and/or catalyze developments, especially affordable housing, transit-oriented or mixed-use development, or (b) encourage the use of alternatives to the single occupant vehicle and promote walking, bicycling and/or transit usage.” Funds can be used for both planning and construction.
2. The PBTF program will fund “construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities including regional trails throughout Contra Costa.” Two-thirds of the funds are to complete projects in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and the remaining third will be allocated to the EBRPD for developing or rehabilitating paved regional trails.

Eligible Sponsors: The CC-TLC explicitly limits eligible sponsors to:

1. Local jurisdictions that comply with the Measure J GMP “at the time a grant is approved by funding allocation by the Authority” and
2. Transit agencies

The proposed PBTF guidelines limit sponsors to those public agencies that can fulfill the Authority’s guidelines for implementing Measure J projects.

Policy Issues

Staff has identified a number of issues that we hope the TCC will focus on. These issues are identified in the draft guidelines by the line — | — at the left hand side of the text block.

CC-TLC Program

Required Match. The CC-TLC working group recommended that, to ensure the commitment of sponsors to the plan or project proposed, a local match should be required as follows:

- **Plans and preliminary engineering/design:** 20 percent of total project cost, which can be met, in whole or in part, through local staff time
- **Project Development and Construction:** 10 percent of total project cost, which can be met, in whole or in part, through local staff time

Minimum and Maximum Requests: The working group also suggested minimum and maximum requests. The draft guidelines include the following:

- **Plans and preliminary engineering/design:** \$75,000 to \$200,000
- **Project Development and Construction:** \$125,000 to the amount available for allocation by the RTPC

RTPC Treatment of Planning and Design Proposals: The draft guidelines would give the RTPCs the discretion to set aside up to 12.5 percent of the CC-TLC funds allocated to their subregion specifically for funding plans and design. Staff included this recommendation as a way of offsetting somewhat the bias towards actual construction in the proposed criteria.

Criteria: The draft guidelines propose nine criteria. The first six are taken directly from the six CC-TLC goals set in Measure J. The other three would be used to assess the readiness and

feasibility of the proposed project, its consistency with locally adopted policies and the amount of local match above the minimum required.

PBTF Program

What Projects are in the CBPP? Measure J limits the countywide share of PBTF funds to those projects that are “in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.” The draft guidelines would define being in the CBPP as:

- Specifically listed in Appendix E, Local Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects, of the most recent CBPP as a bicycle, pedestrian or TLC project
- A bicycle project identified in Appendix D, Local Bicycle Networks, of the most recent CBPP as either an existing or proposed bicycle facility; while completion of *proposed* facilities are generally a higher priority, improvements to *existing* facilities may also be funded if they would significantly improve the usefulness of a facility
- A pedestrian project located in a priority location — pedestrian-oriented districts, routes to transit, and routes to other key activity centers — as described in the most recent CBPP

Minimum and Maximum Requests: The draft guidelines would set the following minimum and maximum requests:

- **Minimum request** of \$100,000
- **Maximum request** of one-half of the available PBTF funds currently unprogrammed or \$2.5 million, whichever is greater

Application: Because it is a competitive countywide program with criteria for selecting projects established in the CBPP, the PBTF will need to use an application process through which sponsors describe their proposed project and demonstrate how well it meets both the criteria set in the CBPP and the Authority’s policies for implementing projects.

TCC Comments on the Guidelines

The TCC had several comments on the two sets of guidelines. Staff has tried to incorporate them into the drafts in Attachments A and B.

TCC Guidelines

Simplify the application. To lessen the burden on local staff, the TCC suggested that the application be as simply as possible. TCC members did recognize that the application needs to

provide enough information for RTPC and Authority to identify those projects that best meet the goals of the Measure J and its TLC program.

Recognize subregional differences. TCC members suggested that the guidelines should explicitly recognize that different RTPCs would emphasize different policy objectives.

Three- or Five-Year Programming Period. Measure J gave RTPCs the option of recommending either a three- or five-year program of CC-TLC funding. The purpose of this option was to allow the RTPCs to reserve funds for larger projects that would need funds from expected future revenues. To carry out this part of Measure J, the draft guidelines would allow to the RTPCs to hold two years of their share of the CC-TLC funds for programming in later funding cycles. The TCC asked that the guidelines be clarified on this point.

60 percent design. The draft guidelines required that any funding for project design go at least through the 60 percent design stage. The TCC asked that the guidelines clarify designing to the 60 percent stage is the minimum that the CC-TLC program would fund, but that the program could fund up to the completion of the design phase.

Set aside for plans. The TCC asked to clarify the proposed language allowing the RTPCs to set aside a portion of their share of CC-TLC funds exclusively for planning and design. Staff has tried to clarify that RTPCs use a greater share of their CC-TLC funds than the maximum set aside for planning in the guidelines.

PBTF Guidelines

Normal accommodation. The draft guidelines propose that no PBTF funds can be used to fund a project that would primarily serve vehicular traffic, even if the project includes The TCC asked that the guidelines clarify what “normal accommodation” means in this context. Staff has made changes to attempt to clarify this.

Other Comments

TCC members suggested that the draft guidelines be sent to the City-County Engineers Advisory Committee for review as well as to the RTPCs. Staff endorses having the CCEAC review the guidelines.

Staff also suggests that the Authority incorporate site review into the process for evaluating funding applications. Staff is willing to try to organize such visits but recommends not including them in the guidelines themselves.

Review Process

The Authority is asking the Planning Committee to release the draft guidelines for the two programs for review by the RTPCs as well as the CCEAC. The deadline to submit comments on the guidelines would be April 22. The CBPAC and the CC-TLC working group will review the comments submitted and recommend the final proposed guidelines for the two programs. The PC would review the guidelines again in June with Authority approval later that month.

Program Guidelines

Identified policy questions are shown by the gray bar at the left of the text block

Background

Measure J sets aside 1.54 percent of sales tax revenues to fund the Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities (PBTF) program. These revenues will fund the “construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities including regional trails throughout Contra Costa.” The program has three components:

1. **Countywide Share:** One percent will go to “complete projects in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan” (CBPP)
2. **EBRPD Share:** One-half percent will go the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) for the “development and rehabilitation of paved regional trails”
3. **West County Share:** The remaining 0.04 percent will go exclusively for “additional trail/pedestrian/bicycle capital projects, and/or facility maintenance in West County”

The selection of projects to be funded will differ among the three programs but the allocation of funding to those projects for all three will be outlined in the Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities component of the Measure J Strategic Plan.

Overall Policies

ELIGIBLE SPONSORS

Public agencies that are able to carry out eligible projects including their design, the purchase of right-of-way, requesting bids and constructing the project consistent with the

Authority's policies including Resolution 08-13, *Implementation of Measure J Projects Policy* are eligible to receive PBTF funds

ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

Measure J restricts use of PBTF funds to pedestrian and bicycle facilities, including regional trails, either their construction or their maintenance, although maintenance may not be funded with the Countywide Share.

Countywide Share

ELIGIBLE SPONSORS

Any sponsor that can complete a project identified in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and is eligible to receive Measure J funds can apply for and receive funding through the Countywide Share portion of the PBTF program.

ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

The countywide share of PBTF funds may be used to fund *facilities* that support and encourage walking or bicycling and that identified in the *Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan*.

Funds from the countywide share can only be used to fund the bicycle or pedestrian portion of a roadway improvement primarily design for vehicular movement and only if the bicycle and pedestrian improvements go beyond normal accommodation. A project would go beyond "normal accommodation" if the bicycle or pedestrian facilities exceed the agency's adopted standards for the facility on which the improvement is proposed to made. This approach is consistent with Measure J which states that "where it is appropriate, routine accommodation for pedestrians and bicyclists should be incorporated in construction projects funded from...other categories."

What Projects are in the CBPP?

To be considered "in the *Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan*", a proposed project must be:

- Specifically listed in Appendix E, Local Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects, of the most recent CBPP as a bicycle, pedestrian or TLC project
- A bicycle project identified in Appendix D, Local Bicycle Networks, of the most recent CBPP as either an existing or proposed bicycle facility; while completion of *proposed* facilities are generally a higher priority, improvements to *existing* facilities may also be funded if they would significantly improve the usefulness of a facility

- A pedestrian project located in a priority location — pedestrian-oriented districts, routes to transit, and routes to other key activity centers — as described in the most recent CBPP

Eligible Project Phases

PBTF funds may be used to fund all phases of a project, including design, right-of-way and construction.

Minimum and Maximum Requests

The **minimum request** of PBTF funds is \$100,000. Setting a minimum request will help limiting the cost of project oversight. This amount is consistent with the minimum amounts of bicycle and trail projects funded through Measure C.

To meet the minimum request, project sponsors combine similar projects at different locations within the jurisdiction of the sponsor into a single application. That is, the components of a project need not be contiguous but must be the same type of improvement.

The **maximum request** is one-half of the available PBTF funds currently unprogrammed or \$2.5 million, whichever is greater, through the Strategic Plan.

INELIGIBLE PROJECTS

The PBTF program can fund only those projects that directly serve pedestrians and bicyclists; no other types of projects may be funded through this program. For example, while projects that making walking or bicycling to connect to transit safer and more convenient are eligible, projects that improve transit operations are not. Similarly, if the purpose of the project is primarily to improve vehicular movement, the project would not be eligible for PBTF funds. In addition, the PBTF program will not fund:

- Planning studies (for example, the development of pedestrian plans or alignment studies),
- Operations (for example, the operation of a bike stations) are eligible for these funds, or
- Maintenance of facilities.

East Bay Regional Park District Share

ELIGIBLE SPONSORS

Only the East Bay Regional Park District is eligible for this portion of the PBTF funds.

ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

The funding available to the EBRPD through half-percent portion of the PBTF program must be spent on the improvement or maintenance of paved regional trails. Eligible projects could include improving and maintaining the trails themselves, trail crossings, lighting and signage.

MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

[TBD]

FORMULA FOR DISTRIBUTING EBRPD FUNDS AMONG SUBREGIONS

Measure J requires that the half-percent EBRPD share of PBTF funds be spent “equally in each subregion”. The EBRPD shall use the formula used in Measure J to allocate funding to the four subregions — each subregion’s share of county population in the year 2020 — to determine subregional allocations. The EBRPD may adjust any of the subregional allocations by no more than five percent, subject to RTPC approval, to better match funding to the improvement or maintenance projects proposed. Any adjustments shall be considered in determining subregional allocations in each following PBTF component.

The subregional allocations shall be for the whole programming period, not for each programming year.

RTPC REVIEW AND APPROVAL

As part of the development and updating of the PBTF component to the Measure J Strategic Plan, the EBRPD shall develop a program of projects to develop or rehabilitate regional trails grouped by subregion. The EBRPD shall present this program of projects to each RTPC for its review. To be incorporated into the PBTF component, the projects proposed for a subregion must be approved by that subregion’s RTPC.

West County Share

The West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee (WCCTAC) will recommend how the PBTF funds available through Program 26b, Additional Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trail Facilities. Recommendations will be based on the criteria established in the most recent CBPP.

ELIGIBLE SPONSORS

Only sponsors that can legally bid and construct or maintain pedestrian, bicycle or trail facilities in West County are eligible for this portion of the PBTF funds.

ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

The 0.04 percent of Measure J funds available to West County may be allocated both to construct and maintain bicycle or pedestrian facilities and to maintain those types of facilities.

INELIGIBLE PROJECTS

The PBTF program can fund only those projects that directly serve pedestrians and bicyclists; no other types of projects may be funded through this program. For example, while projects that making walking or bicycling to connect to transit safer and more convenient are eligible, projects that improve transit operations are not. Similarly, if the purpose of the project is primarily to improve vehicular movement, the project would not be eligible for PBTF funds.

Project Selection

APPLICATION FOR PBTF FUNDING

Sponsors of projects asking for PBTF program funds must complete an application that provides detailed information on the project, including contacts, project description, cost estimates and funding plan, and an assessment of how well that project meets the criteria for selection.

The outline for the PBTF funding application is included as Exhibit A.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTING PROJECTS

The Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) will review and rank project applications using the criteria established in the most recently adopted CBPP. The CBPAC and Authority may refine and clarify the criteria, including adjusting the weight of each criterion in the review process, as part of the preparation of each call for projects for the PBTF program funds. The criteria are included in Exhibit B, attached.

Programming of PBTF Funds

The Authority will program the PBTF funds through the *Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities Component of the Measure J Strategic Plan*. The PBTF component will build on the revenue estimates and implementation policies included in the Measure J Strategic Plan as well as the policies in the most recent CBPP. It will contain:

1. **Introduction** describing the purpose and contents of the plan

2. **The PBTF Program** describing what Measure J says and providing an overview of how the program is defined in Measure J and the kinds of projects that it would fund
3. **Goals and Policies:**
 - a. Goals and policies from Measure J Strategic Plan that would affect the allocation of PBTF funds
 - b. Goals and policies that would apply specifically to the PBTF, including the criteria used to select projects and project development requirements
4. **Funding:** Estimated amount of PBTF funding available during the allocation period based on adopted estimates from the Measure J Strategic Plan.
5. **Programming of Funds:** Matrix of projects recommending for funding through the PBTF program and funding allocated by fiscal year. The PBTF component will track the EBRPD share to ensure that these funds are allocated equally among the four subregions, consistent with the requirements of Measure J.
6. **Project Fact Sheets:** Descriptions of each plan or project to be funded through the PBTF program comparable to the project fact sheets in the Measure J Strategic Plan

PROGRAMMING PERIOD AND UPDATE SCHEDULE

Programming Period

The PBTF funds will use the same programming period used in the Measure J Strategic Plan.

Update Schedule

The Authority will update the PBTF component as part of or following the updating of the funding estimates in the Measure J Strategic Plan or at least every two years, whichever is greater. It is also the Authority's intent to release the PBTF call for projects as part of or immediately following an update of the projects or policies of the CBPP.

Project Development

Project sponsors must comply with all Authority requirements for implementation of projects funded through Measure J, including the requirements of Resolution 08-13-P, Implementation of Measure J Projects Policy.

Exhibit A

Application Outline

Measure J Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities (PBTF) Program Funds

1. PROJECT INFORMATION

- a. Project Name
- b. Project Location
- c. Sponsor
- d. Implementing agency (if different than sponsor)
- e. Partner agencies (only if they would play a substantial role in implementing the proposed project)
- f. Contact for project
- g. Funding
 - i. Total project cost
 - ii. Committed funding
 - iii. Requested PBTF funds
 - iv. Unfunded balance
- h. Potential phasing (the applicant will be asked to identify project components that could be eliminated if insufficient funding is available to fund the full project)

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- a. Short Description
- b. Long Description, including purpose and issues addressed
- c. Attachments (location map, design, existing and planned bicycle or pedestrian facilities within the project area, and nearby destinations that would generate or attract walking or bicycling trips)
- d. Maintenance and Operation: describe the agencies responsible for operating and maintaining the facility and resources to be assigned for that purpose

3. ABILITY TO MEET CRITERIA

Criteria used will be those outlined in the most recent CBPP.

4. COST ESTIMATES

- a. Proposed funding plan: fill in matrix of committed and requested PBTF funding by phase and fiscal year
- b. Preliminary cost estimates: itemize costs of project components in the estimated project cost
- c. Proposed schedule: identify milestone dates for project development

Exhibit A

Criteria for Project Selection from Most Recent CBPP

10 February 2011

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>To what extent would the project...</i>	<i>Points</i>
Safety	Address a documented or commonly recognized safety deficiency, especially conflicts with motor vehicles	15
Range and number of users	Serve a wide range of users — children, transit riders, bicycle commuters, shoppers — and increase the number of pedestrians and bicyclists within the project area	15
Countywide or regional significance	Implement a project in a pedestrian priority location, on the countywide bicycle network or on the regional bicycle network designated by MTC	15
Destinations served	Be located near a larger number of destinations within normal walking and bicycling distance (one-half to three miles, respectively) of the project	15
Latent demand	Be more likely to generate walking and bicycling trips given other characteristics of the project area — e.g., greater population and employment density, mix of land uses, percentage of zero-vehicle households and relative lack of car parking	8
Improved connectivity	Eliminate gaps in existing pedestrian or bicycle facilities that the project, remove barriers to access that the project, and increase the directness or capacity of the bicycle/pedestrian network (including alternatives to trails that are closed overnight), especially where they facilitate connections to work, school or transit	8
Feasibility	Be able to complete the project development process — design, environmental clearance, right-of-way purchase, and PS&E — and resolve any outstanding issues	8
Local and policy support	Implement policies in local plans, integrate with other local efforts, and have support from the general public, the RTPCs and other relevant agencies	8
Matching funds	Leverage funds from other sources that are or would be committed to the project	8

ATTACHMENT 6.B

Planning Committee **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: March 2, 2011

Subject	Contra Costa Safe Routes to School Program and Approach to Allocating SR2S Funds from MTC
Summary of Issues	As the designated Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Contra Costa, the Authority has accepted delegation from MTC for the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) program, including allocation of \$2.47 million in federal CMAQ funds. To meet upcoming federal and State deadlines, decisions must be made soon on how to allocate those funds. In consultation with local stakeholders, CCTA staff has generated some preliminary ideas on how to allocate these funds.
Recommendations	Staff recommends that the Authority release a letter alerting jurisdictions and agencies of the upcoming “call for projects” for the SR2S funds. Concurrently, Authority staff will hold a meeting with the SR2S Task Force and RTPC managers to flesh out options for allocating the SR2S funds, and will bring those options back through the TCC and to the PC/Authority for review and discussion.
Financial Implications	Since these funds come out of the federal CMAQ program, an 11.47 percent match will be required from project sponsors
Options	
Attachments	A. Use of SR2S Funds by Other CMAs B. SR2S Task Force Roster
Changes from Committee	

Background

Through its *Climate Initiatives Program*, MTC has allocated \$2.47 million to fund safe routes to school programs or projects in Contra Costa and gave the Authority the responsibility for determining how those funds would be allocated. The funds are programmed for fiscal year 2011–12 which means that

project sponsors will need to obligate the funds by February 1, 2012. While that date is still eleven months away, some decisions will need to be made soon so that sponsors can meet the deadline.

In addition to the \$2.47 million for SR2S projects and programs, the Authority has allocated \$345,000 in federal STP funds for consultant support to assess the overall SR2S needs in Contra Costa, and prepare an SR2S Master Plan that documents and prioritizes those needs. In December 2010, the Authority committed the first \$100,000 of the \$345,000 to engage the services of Parisi Associates. The initial Parisi contract includes only the first of four tasks. Task One is to perform the upfront work of refining the overall SR2S approach for preparing the Master Plan, developing procedures for a technical assistance program, and assisting Authority staff in developing an approach to allocating Cycle 1 funds. Tasks 2, 3 and 4 involve crafting the SR2S Master Plan, providing the technical assistance to local proponents, and supporting Cycle 1 project development activities.

The major challenge we face is that the allocation of Cycle 1 funds (the \$2.47 million) occurs well in advance of the completion of a long-range SR2S master plan. Consequently, we must proceed with allocating the funds even though overall needs have yet to be identified, documented, and prioritized through the Master Plan. To address this challenge, Authority staff will meet with the SR2S Task Force and RTPC managers to develop a proposed approach for allocating the SR2S funds. Future allocation cycles will benefit from having the completed master plan at hand to guide the effort.

The remainder of this board letter describes what projects and programs can be included in SR2S efforts, funding eligibility, a look at existing programs, both in Contra Costa and for the Bay Area region, and some preliminary options for fund allocation.

FOCUS OF THE SR2S FUNDING

What Do Safe Routes to School Efforts Cover?

According to the National Center for Safe Routes to School, such programs are intended:

...to improve safety and encourage more children, including children with disabilities, to safely walk and bicycle to school. In the process, programs are working to reduce traffic congestion and improve health and the environment, making communities more livable for everyone.

The SR2S approach is often described as covering the 5Es: *education, encouragement, engineering, enforcement and evaluation*. A wide range of actions can be covered in those five categories:

Education	Curricula Scheduling and teaching classes or assemblies “Street Smarts” programs
Encouragement	Outreach to parents Support for “Walk to School Day” Maps of suggested routes to school “School pool”
Engineering	Conceptual designs Construction of pedestrian and bicycle improvements
Enforcement	Crossing guards Speed monitoring
Evaluation	Walkability audits Project databases Annual program evaluation

What Can the CMAQ Program Fund?

The \$2.47 million in SR2S funds will come through the federal CMAQ program, which imposes some limitations on what can be funded. This program will fund a variety of activities, some of which may fall under the SR2S rubric:

- **Bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs**, including paths, bike racks, support facilities, etc. that are not exclusively recreational and reduce vehicle trips, and non-construction outreach related to safe bicycle use
- **Travel demand management** including traveler information and marketing
- **Public education and outreach activities** that educate the public, community leaders, and potential project sponsors about connections among trip making and transportation mode choices, traffic congestion, and air quality.
- **Carpooling and vanpooling** including marketing of existing, expanded, and new activities designed to increase the use of carpools..

Some of “5Es” cannot be funded with CMAQ funds, specifically enforcement and planning activities such as walkability audits and conceptual designs. (The Authority, however, can use STP funds to support planning activities, education and outreach.)

Because they are federal funds, the CMAQ funds require an 11.47 percent local match. For many of the CMAQ- or STP-funded programs that the Authority is involved in — such as the Regional Bicycle Program and the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program that were part of the 2010 CMA Block Grant — the project sponsors provided the match. For Measure J projects, such as the SR4 widening and the Caldecott Tunnel, local or state funds often provide the match. For the \$2.47 million available through the SR2S program, a local match of roughly \$320,000 from a non-federal source will be required.

What Does MTC Require?

MTC adds its own limitations on the funding. As its name implies, the SR2S component of the “Climate Initiatives Program” is limited to SR2S activities that significantly reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions generated by school-related travel. MTC, however, also requires every project proponent to conduct a “before-and-after” assessment of each individual project or program. For example, a project that fills a sidewalk gap would require the fund recipient to measure how many students used the street to get to and from school before and after the improvement and report those findings to MTC. To summarize, eligibility for this funding source requires that the project or program:

1. Help support or encourage walking or bicycling to school,
2. Include before-and-after evaluation as part of their proposals, and
3. Be an eligible activity under the CMAQ program.

In addition, sponsors of these projects and programs must be able to:

1. Submit their request for allocation to Caltrans (obligate the funds) by February 1, 2012
2. Receive federal CMAQ funds, and
3. Provide (or at least arrange to provide) the required local match.

EXISTING SR2S EFFORTS IN CONTRA COSTA

Agencies in Contra Costa have implemented both SR2S projects and programs. Since the first State SR2S program in 2001, 11 of the 20 Contra Costa jurisdictions have received funding grants, a total of 19 separate grants altogether. Most of the projects included sidewalks and curbs and gutters but the improvements have also included upgraded signals and lighting; traffic signs, striping and pavement; speed feedback signs; and bicycle facilities.

Contra Costa has “Street Smarts” programs in the San Ramon Valley, West Contra Costa and, more recently, in East County. The purpose of these programs is to educate drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians on issues related to traffic safety through outreach. These programs carry out bike rodeos, assemblies

on walking and bicycling, poster contests, and organizing “walking school buses”¹ and Walk to School Days. Besides supporting the Street Smarts programs, 511 Contra Costa also runs a “schoolpool” program that helps set up carpools to school and encourage use of transit to school.

WHAT ARE THE OTHER CMAs DOING?

Each Bay Area Congestion Management Agency has taken a somewhat different approach to allocating the SR2S funding they get through MTC. The CMAs are, however, putting the overwhelming majority of the funds they have control of towards programs, and not projects. Attachment A summarizes how the other eight CMAs are planning to use their SR2S funds.

QUESTIONS

Staff has identified several questions whose answer will determine what approach the Authority will take in allocating the SR2S funds.

1. **Projects vs. Programs.** What mix of projects and programs will the Authority allocate funding to? Should it go only to projects, only to programs, or to a mix of projects and programs?
2. **Role of Subregions.** Should the funds be allocated differently in different subregions?
3. **Local Match.** For programs, who would provide the required 11.47 percent local match? (Sponsors of capital projects would be expected to provide the match for their project.)

Projects versus Programs

There is a continuing need for both projects and programs to encourage more walking or bicycling to school in Contra Costa, even with the existing efforts being made. Using the SR2S program to fund these two actions raise somewhat different issues.

Projects are relatively straightforward to allocate funding to, at least for the Authority. Once the funds are allocated, project sponsors take on the responsibility for providing the local match, going through the local assistance process (though Authority staff helps where it can), and overseeing actual construction. With programs, the Authority may need to play a more active role over a longer time period unless the agency running the program is able to receive CMAQ funds directly. (For example, the Alameda County Transportation Commission will administer an education and outreach program in which TRANSFORM will provide the actual services needed.)

¹ *Walking School Bus: A “safety in numbers” strategy where groups of 20-30 young children walk down the sidewalk in rows of 2 or 3, holding hands in a formation that creates a long rectangular shape similar to that of a school bus.*

Subregional Roles

In discussions with the SR2S Task Force and RTPC staff and based on the preliminary work on the SR2S Master Plan, Authority staff understands that needs vary among the four subregions. Some areas have well-established programs although they may not cover all of the subregion. Subregions would like to provide additional services but lack funding to do so. Access to a number of schools in Contra Costa could be greatly improved with new sidewalks, crosswalks, and signage.

One option for the Authority to consider is to have the RTPCs identify the mix of projects and programs as well as the agencies charged with implementing those projects and programs. Staff estimates that the four subregions would have between \$400,000 and \$750,000 to allocate between projects and programs.

Local Match

As noted above, the \$2.47 million in CMAQ funds will require a local match of around \$320,000. For physical improvements, the project sponsor could be required to provide the local match as is normally required in capital programs.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Authority release a letter alerting jurisdictions and agencies of the upcoming call for projects for the \$2.47 million in SR2S funds. Concurrently, Authority staff will hold a meeting with the SR2S Task Force and RTPC managers to flesh out options for allocating the SR2S funds, and will bring those options back through the TCC and to the PC/Authority for review and discussion.

Attachment A

Use of SR2S Funds by Other CMAs

San Francisco

San Francisco will split their \$1.79 million share into two parts. They are allocating \$500,000 to fund outreach efforts through a previously established coalition of schools, public works, police, parents and other groups. This work will focus on education and outreach related to their anti-idling campaign and parent outreach. The fiscal agent is the Department of Health, which is federal-aid eligible, unlike most health departments. The education and outreach work will focus on 15 pilot schools. The remaining \$579,000 will be allocated to capital projects. They will release their call for projects soon. San Francisco chose this particular split because 1) they had an existing SR2S coalition (schools, policies, public works, etc.) funded with a federal SRTS grant and with programmatic needs and 2) they had unfunded project needs (identified through walking audits) and CMA experience with handling capital calls for projects.

San Mateo

All \$1.4 million available to San Mateo will be allocated to the San Mateo County SR2S Program. This program will provide “modularized safe routes to school programs and projects that focus on education, encouragement, evaluation and enforcement components to all interested schools.” The City /County Association of Governments of San Mateo (CCAG), the San Mateo CMA, was originally going to be the agency responsible for implementing the program using steering committees (both policy and technical). The County Office of Education, however, suggested that CCAG contract with the COE to carry out the program.

The program will go entirely to fund non-infrastructure activities. They shifted about \$200,000 in STP funds into the SR2S program so that it could fund walking audits and possibly some enforcement activities. CCAG will remain the project sponsor and fiscal agent and will also serve on the various steering committees.

Santa Clara

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency has put \$1 million of its funds into a SR2S program for Santa Clara County. The program will “provide a comprehensive Safe Routes to Schools education and awareness program, countywide outreach, and a teen-centered middle/high school project.” It put about \$945,000 into the “San Jose Walk N Roll” program which will “develop and implement a walking and biking encouragement program, partnered with the City's nationally-recognized pedestrian and bicycle safety education program.”

In addition, the program will provide \$500,000 each to the Mountain View, Palo Alto and Santa Clara VERBS Programs. In the Mountain View and Palo Alto programs, each city, in partnership with local school districts and individual schools, will develop and implement comprehensive programs to promote the benefits of safe walking, biking and carpooling to reduce traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emissions around schools. In the Santa Clara program, the city will develop Safe Routes to School walking route maps along with educational and encouragement programs for Santa Clara schools to make bicycling and walking to school a safer and more appealing transportation alternative

Alameda

In Alameda County, the CMA is putting all \$2.7 million of its share into its Countywide SR2S Program. These funds will expand the existing SR2S program to include more areas and more activities. The CMAQ-funded activities will include four components:

1. Education and outreach efforts in various elementary and middle schools with the target of reaching 30 percent of elementary and middle schools in the county
2. Similar outreach in up to 13 high schools
3. Outreach to encourage commute alternatives to parents at those schools
4. Funding for capital projects and technical assistance to local schools and jurisdictions

Solano

All \$942,000 available to the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) has been allocated to the Countywide Solano Safe Routes to School Program, which will fund planning, education, and encouragement events and materials. \$35,000 in STP will help fund engineering assistance to draft project concepts and cost estimates for seven schools, one for each city in Solano County. \$607,000 in SR2S CMAQ funds and \$520,000 in Eastern Solano CMAQ funds Education & Encouragement events, including Bicycle Rodeo Equipment & Education Materials, Walk & Roll Encouragement events, marketing, walking school bus program, and program coordination through a Solano County Public Health/STA Partnership.

Napa

In Napa County, the CMA has the \$315,000 available to expand existing SR2S program from six to 15 schools and enhance program offerings. Only non-infrastructure activities — marketing, education, and outreach activities — will be funded.

Sonoma

The Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) has allocated the roughly \$1 million available through the MTC program to a comprehensive SR2S program to shift mode away from single family vehicular trips to bicycle/pedestrian/carpooling. The SCTA/RCPA has developed a countywide SR2S program with the overall goal of reducing emissions related to school related travel. Specific goals are to:

1. Reduce traffic congestion around schools;
2. Create safer, calmer streets and neighborhoods;
3. Improve air quality and provide a cleaner environment;
4. Increase physical activity for children and youth; and
5. Increase the range of options for travel to school for all Sonoma County students.

SCTA is now working on organizing the program, including determining who will carry the work and what activities will be funded.

Marin

The Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) already has a Safe Routes to School program, funded with their sales tax measure, which was in place before MTC created its SR2S program. The sales tax measure funds both capital and programmatic activities. TAM will receive \$475,000 in CMAQ funds through MTC's SR2S program. TAM plans on dedicating these funds to a school infrastructure improvement project in Marin County that was developed with broad stakeholder support through its SR2S program. This will "free up" an equivalent amount of sales tax measure school infrastructure funds, which TAM will then redirect to its program activities to potentially carry out expansion of its SchoolPool trip-match program, preparation of school walking route maps, development of school area traffic control plans, and other programmatic tasks.

Attachment B

SR2S Task Force Roster

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	JURISDICTION/ ORGANIZATION	PHONE
Nat	Rojanasathira	Town of Danville	925-314-3382
Lynn	Osborn-Overcashier	511 Contra Costa/TRANSPAC	925-969-0841 x 202
Nancy	Baer	Contra Costa Health Svcs	925-313-6837
John	Hild	Contra Costa Office of Education	925-942-3388
Catalin	Kaser	West Contra Costa Unified School District	510-231-1100
Shannon	Ladner-Beasley	Contra Costa Health Svcs	925-313-6813
CONSULTANT			
David	Parisi	Parisi Associates	415-388-8978
AUTHORITY STAFF			
Brad	Beck	CCTA	925-256-4726

ATTACHMENT 6.C

Planning Committee **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: March 2, 2011

Subject	Public Outreach Plan for the 2013 RTP/SCS
Summary of Issues	MTC has requested that each Bay Area Congestion Management Agency (CMA) undertake a public outreach effort that will garner community participation and input during MTC's 2013 RTP "Call for Projects." As the designated CMA for Contra Costa, the Authority would be responsible for undertaking this effort. The outreach effort is intended to provide opportunities for public input into the 2013 RTP. It is one component of the broader, more comprehensive outreach plan that was adopted by MTC in December 2010.
Recommendations	That the Authority review and approve the proposed Public Outreach Plan.
Financial Implications	The cost of undertaking the proposed public outreach plan includes staff time, and consultant costs associated with preparing outreach presentation materials and assisting with public workshops. The cost of this effort would be covered by federal funds received by CCTA through an interagency agreement with MTC. Partial funding for this effort is included in the FY 2010-11 planning budget. The remaining funding will be included in the forthcoming FY 2011-12 CMA budget.
Options	The Authority could beef up or pare down the proposed Public Outreach Plan as appropriate.
Attachments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Draft Public Outreach Plan for the 2013 RTP Call for Projects B. MTC's Call for Projects, Guidance, February 14, 2011
Changes from Committee	

Background

MTC has requested that each Bay Area CMA undertake a public outreach effort to complement the broader effort undertaken by the regional agencies. CMA participation is required as part of an interagency agreement between CCTA and MTC enabling receipt of federal funds. The

objective of the outreach effort is to encourage all interested stakeholders and transportation constituents to participate and comment in the RTP/SCS development process.

Following Authority consideration of the attached proposal, staff will incorporate the Authority's comments and implement the program. Staff notes that the proposed outreach effort is still conceptual in nature, and that specific meeting locations, times, and dates will need to be firmed up in the coming months.

The scope of this outreach effort is intended to provide opportunities for public input into the 2013 RTP/SCS. It is one component of a broader, more comprehensive outreach effort that will be conducted by the regional agencies.

DRAFT

**PROPOSED PUBLIC OUTREACH PLAN FOR
THE CONTRA COSTA COMPONENT OF MTC'S 2013 RTP
"CALL FOR PROJECTS"**

March 2, 2011

Scope

The scope of this outreach effort is intended to fulfill the CMA's* role to conduct public outreach at the county-level on behalf of MTC. This effort is intended to complement the broader public outreach effort that is expected to be deployed by the regional agencies. The requirement for CMA outreach is found in the Inter-agency funding agreement between CCTA and MTC, which states that CCTA shall "assist MTC and ABAG with public outreach and involvement of county residents and local organizations in the development of the RTP/SCS, pursuant to MTC's adopted Public Participation Plan (MTC Resolution No. 3821, revised). More detailed requirements are set forth in the attached "Call for Projects Guidance" issued by MTC on February 14, 2011.

Overall Approach

- Make full use of available forums such as the public meetings held by CCTA, PC, the RTPCs, the CAC, the PMA, and the Contra Costa Council;
- Use the Authority's full electronic contact list for distribution of notifications and information materials. Avoid mass mailings to the public at large;
- Maximize use of the Authority website. Keep meeting notifications current. Post the links to draft RTP materials on the website. Also, post all related meeting handout and presentation materials. Post links to (and from) other resource sites where appropriate.
- Video record major RTP/SCS-related public meetings using Contra Costa TV, which is available to the Authority at minimal cost, and encourage CCTV to re-broadcast the proceedings. The video recordings may also be edited (for brevity) and posted on the Authority's web site.

Authority, PC, APC, CAC, and RTPC Review

This portion of the review uses, to the fullest extent possible, existing public forums where the RTP/SCS can be presented for review and comment. The Authority and its standing committees will receive regular briefings on the status of the outreach effort. Members of the CAC will hear presentations on the RTP/SCS as well. Presentations to the RTPCs will take place at their regularly scheduled meetings; these will be in addition to the Public Workshops described below. Furthermore, from time-to-time, the RTPCs may wish to hold "expanded" meetings where the full councils from each member jurisdiction are invited to participate. Expanded meetings should be held in the evening hours or on weekends when the vast majority of stakeholders are available to attend.

*See attached list of acronyms

Mass e-mailings

Meeting notices and relevant information will be transmitted to an expanded e-mail contacts listing. Approximately 2000 contacts are available in the Authority's Outlook Contracts database. Additional contact lists will be obtained from the RTPCs and other interested parties, for a grand total of approximately 5000 contacts. Mass e-mailings will be transmitted using software to ensure that the individual e-mails can bypass spam filters.

Public Workshops (tentative)

Three public workshops, jointly sponsored by MTC and CCTA, will be held in the evening in various subareas. Meeting locations will be accessible to public transit. Meeting rooms should be capable of holding at least 100 persons. MTC will arrange meeting schedule, location, and setup.

Workshop Format:

- **Sign-in and Walk-through:** The first 15 to 20 minutes will allow the public to sign in and walk through a series of posters explaining the RTP/SCS.
- **Staff Presentation:** MTC staff will make a PowerPoint® presentation (20-minutes max.) that pulls together all aspects of the RTP/SCS effort, including the Authority's role, current issues, goals, and strategies, and the public review schedule.
- **Formal Testimony:** Attendees will be encouraged to comment on the materials as presented and circulated. Comments will be recorded on the projection screen using Word® software.
- **Videotaping:** Arrangements will be made for Contra Costa TV to tape and broadcast one or more of the public workshops for re-broadcast at appropriate times that maximize public viewership. Furthermore, excerpts from the broadcasts will be posted on the CCTA website.
- **Language Translation Services:** Upon request, language translation services will be provided at the workshop subject to advance notification by the interested party.

Presentations to Local Jurisdictions

Local jurisdictions are encouraged to become involved in the RTP/SCS through their respective RTPCs. Authority staff will, however, be available to present the RTP/SCS to interested City or Town Councils and the Board of Supervisors. The Councils/Board are encouraged to schedule presentations on their regular meeting agendas, or request special work sessions for a more focused discussion and review. Already, several local jurisdictions have scheduled RTP/SCS presentations on their agendas.

Addressing Equity through Involvement of Communities of Concern and NGOs

MTC has requested that the CMAs assist MTC with addressing Title VI equity requirements by involving “communities of concern” in the RTP Call for Projects. MTC has indicated that for the 2013 RTP “Call for Projects,” any Non-governmental Organization (NGO) may submit a project, provided a public agency is willing to sponsor it. To enable the participation of low income communities, CCTA will notify NGOs throughout Contra Costa, and encourage them to participate in the process. The notifications will inform the NGOs of upcoming meeting locations and dates, including RTPC meetings. We will also provide a CCTA e-mail contact that NGOs can use to submit project ideas. CCTA and RTPC staff will work with the NGOs to develop the project scope of work. If a project submitted by an NGO has a clear scope of work, and is eligible for inclusion in the RTP, then CCTA and RTPC staff will assist the NGO in identifying a potential project sponsor.

Parallel Outreach Effort Conducted through a Private Grant

MTC staff has indicated that additional workshops may be sponsored by NGOs through a private grant. Authority staff will make every effort to coordinate the schedule of the NGO workshops with other planned activities. Furthermore, the Authority will include information regarding NGO workshop times and locations on the CCTA website and through the mass e-mailings.

Website

The Authority’s website will serve as a major hub for the public outreach effort. The website will provide information on the RTP/SCS, and will link visitors to draft RTP/SCS documents and resource materials. All meeting announcements and presentation materials will also be posted on the website. Any website visitor who wishes to submit comments may do so via e-mail, using the information provided on the website.

Staff and Consultant Resources

- Much of the work will be done in-house, however, limited consultant resources will be available through Dyett & Bhatia, Nolte, and Economic Planning Systems (EPS) through existing on-call services agreements. Dyett & Bhatia will assist in preparing presentation materials, workshop posters, and portions of the “hand-out” materials for the workshops. Nolte and EPS can provide technical support for information delivery.
- MTC and ABAG staff will accompany CCTA staff to attend the public meetings/workshops and make the RTP/SCS presentation.
- Authority staff will attend all other meetings with the various standing committees and Councils/Boards.

Cost Estimate

- The cost of issuing electronic mail is covered under administrative expenses.
- Newspaper Advertisements: Assumed to be approximately \$1,000.
- Television Broadcast: CCTV charges a nominal fee of approximately \$700 for each recording session, editing, and subsequent broadcast of the public workshops on cable television.
- Website: There is a fixed cost associated with maintaining the CCTA website. Although some staff time is required to post additional notices, no additional costs are directly attributed to posting the 2013 RTP Update information.

Documentation

The Authority will provide MTC with written documentation of how the public was involved in the process for nominating and/or commenting on projects for inclusion in the RTP/SCS. The documentation will include a description of how the public engagement process meets the outreach requirements of MTC's Public Participation Plan. It will summarize comments received, indicate whether the comments were incorporated, and will provide the rationale for each specific response.

Acronyms/Definitions

CAC: Citizens Advisory Committee

CCTA: The Contra Costa Transportation Authority

CMA: Congestion Management Agency

Communities of Concern: Low income communities identified by MTC as part of the Lifeline Transportation Program.

Expanded e-mail Contacts Listing: A combined listing of the Authority's existing contacts list plus additional listings received from the RTPCs and other interested agencies.

MTC: Metropolitan Transportation Commission

NGO: Non-governmental organization

PC: The Authority's Planning Committee

PMA: The Contra Costa Public Managers Association, comprised of the city managers of each local jurisdiction in Contra Costa

Project Sponsor: A government organization, such as a city, town, the county, or a transit agency, that is eligible to receive federal funds and is willing to support the environmental review, design, right-of-way, and construction for a proposed transportation improvement project.

RTP: Regional Transportation Plan

RTPCs: Regional Transportation Planning Committees

SB 375: Senate Bill SB 375, the 2008 legislation that created the requirement for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (such as MTC) to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy in the RTP.

SCS: The Sustainable Communities Strategy required under SB 375. An SCS is a land use and transportation plan that limits suburban sprawl and encourages compact growth and more mixed-use communities that will reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions from cars and light trucks.

Title VI: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance. Specifically, Title VI provides that "no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." (42 U.S.C. Section 2000d). Subsequent Executive Orders include the requirement for "environmental justice," to ensure that federally -funded transportation projects do not have a disproportionate adverse environmental impacts on minority communities.

TCC: The Authority's standing Technical Coordinating Committee

Call for Projects Guidance

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) requests the assistance of the nine Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to help with the Call for Projects within their counties. CMAs are best suited for this role because of their existing relationships with local jurisdictions, elected officials, transit agencies, community organizations and stakeholders, and members of the public within their counties. MTC expects the CMAs to plan and execute an effective public outreach and local engagement process to solicit candidate projects to be submitted to MTC for consideration in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

Project sponsors with projects vying for future state or federal funding must have their project identified in the financially constrained RTP/SCS. CMAs will be the main point of contact for local sponsoring agencies and members of the public submitting projects for consideration for inclusion in the 2013 SCS/RTP. Sponsors of multi-county projects (i.e. Caltrans, BART, Caltrain, etc.) may submit directly to MTC, but communication and coordination with CMAs is encouraged. Members of the public are eligible to submit projects, but must secure a public agency sponsor and coordinate the project submittal with their CMA.

CMAs will assist MTC with the Call for Projects by carrying out the following activities:

1. Public Involvement and Outreach

- ***Conduct countywide outreach to stakeholders and the public to solicit project ideas.*** CMAs, as well as multi-county transit operators and Caltrans, will be expected to implement their public outreach efforts in a manner consistent with MTC's Public Participation Plan (MTC Resolution No. 3821), which can be found at http://www.onebayarea.org/get_involved.htm. CMAs are expected, at a minimum, to:
 - Execute effective and meaningful local engagement efforts during the Call for Projects by working closely with local jurisdictions, elected officials, transit agencies, community-based organizations, and the public through the project solicitation process. In addition to the CMAs' citizen advisors, MTC's Policy Advisory Council members are a good resource to the CMAs to help plan community outreach events, engage members of the public, and identify candidate projects. Please see **Attachment A.4** for a list of MTC's Policy Advisory Council members.
 - Explain the local Call for Projects process, informing stakeholders and the public about the opportunities for public comments on project ideas and when decisions are to be made on the list of projects to be submitted to MTC;
 - Hold public meetings and/or workshops at times which are conducive to public participation to solicit public input on project ideas to submit;
 - Hold at least one public hearing providing opportunity for public comment on the list of potential projects prior to submittal to MTC;
 - Post notices of public meetings and hearing(s) on their agency website; include information on how to request language translation for individuals with limited English proficiency. If agency protocol has not been established, please refer to MTC's Plan for Assisting Limited English Proficient Populations.
 - CMA staff will be expected to provide MTC with a link so the information can also be viewed on the website OneBayArea.org;
 - Hold public meetings in central locations that are accessible for people with people with disabilities and by public transit;

- Offer language translations and accommodations for people with disabilities, if requested at least three days in advance of the meeting.
- ***Document the outreach effort undertaken for the local call for projects.*** CMAs, as well as multi-county transit operators and Caltrans, are to provide MTC with:
 - A description of how the public was involved in the process for nominating and/or commenting on projects for inclusion in the RTP/SCS. Specify whether public input was gathered at forums held specifically for the RTP/SCS or as part of an outreach effort associated with, for example, an update to a countywide plan;
 - A description of how the public engagement process met the outreach requirements of MTC's Public Participation Plan, including how the CMA ensured full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the project submittal process.
 - A summary of comments received from the public and a description of how public comments informed the recommended list of projects submitted by the CMA. Conversely, rationale must be provided if comments or projects from the public were not able to be accommodated in the list of candidate projects and a description of how the CMA, in future project nomination processes, plans to address the comments or projects suggested by the public.

2. Agency Coordination

- ***Work closely with local jurisdictions, transit agencies, MTC, Caltrans, and stakeholders to identify projects for consideration in the RTP/SCS.*** CMAs will assist with agency coordination by:
 - Communicating this Call for Projects guidance to local jurisdictions, transit agencies, Caltrans, and stakeholders and coordinate with them on the online project application form by assigning passwords, fielding questions about the project application form, reviewing and verifying project information, and submitting projects as ready for review by MTC
 - Working with members of the public interested in advancing a project idea to find a public agency project sponsor, and assisting them with submitting the project to MTC;
 - Developing freeway operations and capacity enhancement projects in coordination with MTC and Caltrans staff.
 - Developing transit improvements in coordination with MTC and transit agency staff.

3. Title VI Responsibilities

- ***Ensure the public involvement process provides underserved communities access to the project submittal process as in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.***
 - Assist community-based organizations, communities of concern, and any other underserved community interested in submitting projects;
 - Remove barriers for persons with limited English proficiency to have access to the project submittal process;
 - For additional Title IV outreach strategies, please refer to MTC's Public Participation Plan found at: http://www.onebayarea.org/get_involved.htm

4. County Target Budgets

- ***Ensure that the County project list fits within the target budget defined by MTC for the county.***
 - To establish the county target budgets, MTC used the discretionary funding amount (\$32 billion) from the Transportation 2035 Plan and assigned counties a target budget based on a population share formula with an additional 75% mark up. County target budgets can be seen below. This formula approach is consistent with the formula used in Transportation 2035 Plan.
 - County target budgets are intended as a starting point to guide each CMA in recommending a project list to MTC by providing an upper financial limit.
 - County target budgets are not intended as the financially constrained RTP/SCS budget. CMAs and MTC will continue to discuss further and select projects later in the process that fit the RTP/SCS financially constrained envelope.

County Target Budgets (in billions)

Alameda: \$11.76

Contra Costa: \$7.84

Marin: \$2.24

Napa: \$1.12

San Francisco: \$6.16

San Mateo: \$5.60

Santa Clara: \$14.0

Solano: \$3.36

Sonoma: \$3.92

5. Cost Estimation Review

- ***Establish guidelines for estimating project costs.*** CMAs are to establish cost estimation guidelines for use by project sponsors. The guidelines may be developed by the CMAs or CMAs can elect to use other accepted guidelines produced by local, state or federal agencies. MTC has identified the following cost estimation guidelines available for use:
 - Federal: National Cooperative Highway Research Program's Guidance for Cost Estimation and Management for Highway Projects During Planning, Programming, and Preconstruction (http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp_w98.pdf)
 - State: Caltrans' Project Development Procedures Manual Chapter 20, Project Development Cost Estimates (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/opdpd/pdpm/chap_pdf/chapt20.pdf)
 - Local: Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Cost Estimation Guide (http://ccta.net/assets/documents/Cost_Est_Guide_Documentation.pdf)
- ***Review and verify with MTC that each project has developed an appropriate cost estimate prior to submittal.***

6. General Project Criteria

- ***Identify whether projects meet basic project parameters as outlined by MTC.*** CMAs will encourage project sponsors to submit projects which meet one or more of the general criteria listed below, keeping in consideration that projects should support SCS principals promulgated by SB 375:
 - Supports the goals and performance targets of the RTP/SCS (see **Attachment A.1**).
 - Serves as a regionally significant component of the regional transportation network. A regionally significant transportation project serves regional transportation needs (such as access to and from the area outside of the region, major activity centers in the region,

- major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, etc., or transportation terminals as well as most terminals themselves).
- Supports focused growth by serving existing housing and employment centers FOCUS Priority Development Areas.
- Derives from an adopted plan, corridor study, or project study report (e.g., community-based transportation plans, countywide transportation plan, regional bicycle plan, climate action plans, etc.).
- ***Assess how well the project meets basic criteria***
Project sponsors are welcome to use MTC's qualitative/quantitative approach or some hybrid thereof to develop and evaluate project priorities (See **Attachment A.3**). Sponsors may include qualitative discussion and/or quantitative data to demonstrate how proposed projects meet the RTP/SCS goals and targets, the magnitude of project impacts and cost effectiveness. MTC will provide a function in the on-line application for this information and may use it to inform the Goals Assessment portion of MTC's evaluation.

7. Programmatic Categories

- CMAs should group similar projects, which are exempt from regional air quality conformity that do not add capacity or expand the transportation network, into broader programmatic categories rather than submitting them as individual projects for consideration in the RTP/SCS. These individual projects may address a concern of the community (e.g., improved pedestrian ways to transit, curb bulb-outs to calm traffic, etc.), but do not have to be individually specified for the purposes of air quality conformity. See **Attachment A.2** for guidance on the programmatic categories.

Timeline

Task	Date
Issue Call for Projects Letter to CMAs, Caltrans, and Multi-County Transit Operators	February 10, 2011
Open Online Project Application Form for Use by CMAs/ Project Sponsors	March 1, 2011
Close of Project Submittal Period	April 29, 2011
MTC Conducts Project-Level Performance Assessment and Selection Process for Projects for Detailed SCS Scenarios	May – July 2011

J:\PROJECT\2013 RTP_SCS\Call for Projects\Final Version\Attachment A - Guidance.doc

Technical Coordination Committee **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: February 17, 2011

Subject	2013 Regional Transportation Plan “Call for Projects”
Summary of Issues	<p>MTC is expected to release a “call for projects” for the 2013 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on February 11, 2011. In preparation for this event, the Authority began working with the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and Transit Operators on developing a 25-year financially-constrained project list for submittal to MTC in April.</p> <p>For a transportation project to receive State or federal funding or approvals, it must first be included in the RTP. Staff will provide an overview of the process and timeline for project submittals to MTC.</p>
Recommendations	n/a – Information Only
Financial Implications	<p>Draft “discretionary” funding targets for the 2013 RTP are expected to be released by MTC in March. A funding target of \$400 million (in 2011 dollars) will be used as a starting point for the financially-constrained project list.</p>
Options	n/a
Attachments	<p>A. Signed letter sent to RTPCs and transit operators, dated February 3, 2011</p> <p>B. MTC Call for projects expected to be released on February 11, 2011 (<i>to be handed out at the meeting</i>).</p>
Changes from Committee	

Background

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) has begun preparing its 2013 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update. As a planning document, the 2013 RTP Update, also known as “T-2040”, will outline the region’s programmatic and policy objectives for the 28-year time period of 2013 through 2040. Adoption of the Final 2013 RTP is tentatively scheduled for early-to-mid 2013.

State and federal law requires that the RTP include the four elements:

1. A Policy Element;
2. An Action Element;
3. A Financial Element; and,
4. Newly required under SB 375, a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Element.

Federal and State law also requires that every RTP is “financially constrained”, that is, the total cost of the programs and projects included in the Action Element of the RTP must not exceed the expected revenues forecast in the Financial Element. Any transportation project requiring future State or federal funding must be included within that element. MTC’s schedule calls for the draft Financial Element to be developed during spring 2011.

State law also requires the RTP be internally consistent. That is, the projects proposed must fit within the financial constraints identified and must support the land use and development pattern that the SCS will establish.

“Call for Projects” for the T-2040 Plan

MTC’s “Call for Projects” for the 2013 RTP (T-2040) will be issued on February 11, 2011. As part of the Call for Projects, each Congestion Management Agency (CMA) has been requested to coordinate project submittals from its county.

Following the Planning Committee meeting on Feb 2, 2011, a letter was sent to the RTPCs and transit operators to begin the process with a list of projects from the last RTP (see Attachment A). The list will include: 1) “committed projects” that are currently fully funded (from local, state or federal sources) or will be fully funding with local funds; 2) a financially-constrained list of candidate RTP projects to be funded with new STIP, TE and ITIP funds; and 3) a list of additional projects that would require additional funding beyond the T-2040 financial constraints, for possible inclusion in a “vision element” of the RTP. To communicate Contra Costa’s priorities to MTC, the Authority will develop similar lists of projects for the T-2040 Plan.

During February and March, Authority staff will work with project sponsors, the RTPCs, and transit operators to respond to the call for projects. Potential core evaluation criteria recommended by the Authority to prioritize projects include completion of Measure J projects and project readiness. Project sponsors are also encouraged to submit projects that support stated 2013 RTP goals.

As part of the process, all projects will be input into the project database maintained by MTC. Project entries into the database will need to be completed during April 2011. Final Authority Board approval of the project list would occur in May.

Funding Target

Based on the last RTP, a funding target of \$400 million (in 2011 dollars) will be used as a starting point for the financially-constrained project list. Draft “discretionary” funding targets for the 2013 RTP are expected to be released by MTC in March. Should the final funding target exceed \$400 million, projects from the vision list will be shifted to the financially constrained list based on stated RTPCs priorities.

Project Evaluation

Following the Call for Projects, MTC staff intends to undertake a project-level performance evaluation to determine which projects to ultimately include in the financially constrained element of the RTP. For this purpose, MTC has developed performance evaluation measures that will be applied to establish project priorities. The project evaluation phase is tentatively scheduled for May through July 2011. Following the completion of the performance evaluation, MTC will notify the CMAs regarding which projects have performed adequately for inclusion in the RTP.


Project evaluation will be conducted for all projects submitted in MTC database if they are not under construction by 2011. The evaluation will consist of qualitative assessment on how projects meet stated 2013 RTP goals, and benefit-cost analysis of projects with costs greater than \$50 million (in 2011 dollars).

Tentative Schedule

The deadline for submittal of all projects into the T-2040 database will likely be end of April 2011. To meet this extremely tight timeframe, the following schedule is proposed:

<u>Tentative Date (2011)</u>	<u>Activity</u>
January 20	TCC discusses overall strategy for RTP project development process
Feb. 2	Authority Planning Committee discusses overall strategy for project development
Feb. 3	Following the PC meeting, Authority staff distributes a letter to the RTPCs and Transit Operators regarding the tentative schedule for development of the T-2040 project list, and request that the RTPCs initiate review of the existing project list from the 2009 RTP
Feb 11	MTC releases “Call for Projects” and Guidance for project submittals
Feb. 16	Authority Board discusses overall strategy for project development
Feb. 17	TCC reviews status report on MTC project development process. This review will be based on materials available from the P-TAC and MTC committee meetings

Feb 23	CAC reviews MTC project development process
Feb. 24	Authority staff forwards "Call for Projects" to RTPCs, transit operators, and project sponsors, along with any updated guidance regarding agency coordination, cost estimating techniques, and financial constraints
March 1	MTC opens online project application form for use by CMAs and project sponsors
March	RTPCs, Transit Operators, and project sponsors review project list and formulate recommendations for projects to be included in the 2013 RTP
March 17	TCC reviews and discusses RTP project development status
April 5	RTPCs/Transit Operators complete and submit final project lists to CCTA
April	Authority staff works with project proponents to input projects into MTCs online database
April 21	TCC reviews the project lists and recommends changes to constrain it further if needed. Projects that do not fit into the financially constrained list could be included in a "vision element" project list
April 29	MTC closes the project submittal window. After this date, CMAs and project sponsors will no longer have direct access to the database, however, the CMAs can work with MTC staff to refine the project list
May 4	PC reviews the financially constrained 25-year project list, and reviews the larger proposed comprehensive list of RTP "vision element" projects
May 18	Authority approves by resolution (1) a financially constrained 25-year project list for inclusion in the 2013 RTP (2) a list of additional "vision" projects for inclusion in MTC's database, and (3) any comments or concerns regarding the RTP process
May-July	MTC conducts project-level performance assessment



CONTRA COSTA
transportation
authority

COMMISSIONERS

Robert Taylor, Chair

David Durant,
Vice Chair

Janet Abelson

Newell Arnerich

Ed Balico

Susan Bonilla

Jim Frazier

Federal Glover


Mike Metcalf

Julie Pierce

Maria Viramontes

Randell H. Iwasaki,
Executive Director

February 3, 2011


From: Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director

To: Regional Transportation Planning Committees and Transit Operators

Re: Development of a 25-year STIP list for inclusion in the 2013 Regional Transportation Plan

MTC's call for projects for the 2013 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is expected to be released by the end of February. In preparation for this event, the Authority's Planning Committee authorized staff to begin work with the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and Transit Operators on developing a 25-year State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) list.

During the RTP update process, MTC works with the CMAs and project sponsors to update the project list and constrain it based on discretionary funding projected to be available during the 2013 RTP period. For the Authority, most of its discretionary funding comes from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Projects must be included in the RTP committed or financially constrained lists if they are expected to impact the capacity of the transportation system and air quality – such as adding lanes to freeways and roadways, rail extensions, Park and Ride lots – or if they expect to receive state and/or federal funding or action (e.g. NEPA clearance). Routine roadway and transit maintenance projects (e.g. pavement rehabilitation) will be included in general categories in the RTP.

Definitions:

Committed Projects List: This list refers to projects that are currently fully funded or expected to be fully-funded by local sources. (See *Exhibit A* for the 2009 RTP committed project list).

Financially Constrained List: Projects on this list are expected to request future discretionary STIP funds during the RTP period. The fund requests must not exceed MTC's fund estimate for Contra Costa. (See *Exhibit B* for the 2009 RTP financially constrained project list).

Vision List: Projects that are not included in the committed or financially constrained lists would be included in the vision list. (See *Exhibit C* for the 2009 RTP vision list).

2999 Oak Road
Suite 100
Walnut Creek
CA 94597
PHONE: 925.256.4700
FAX: 925.256.4701
www.ccta.net

Fund Estimate:

During the 2009 RTP, MTC estimated that Contra Costa would receive \$380 million in STIP-RIP funds (in 2007 dollars) and \$38.9 million in STIP-TE funds, of which \$19.5 million is under MTC discretion. For the 2013 RTP, MTC will release the fund estimate in late February. However, in order to get a head start on the process, staff recommends using \$400 million in STIP-RIP funds (in 2010 dollars) and \$20 million in STIP-TE funds (in 2010 dollars) as a starting point for updating the financially constrained project list.

The Authority is requesting the RTPCs and Transit Operators to do the following:

1. Review the committed project list and determine the following:
 - a. Remove projects that are completed, no longer supported, or substantially under construction.
 - b. Update cost estimates, project descriptions, committed fund sources, and determine if the project has a funding shortfall.

Committed projects with funding shortfalls have to be either moved to the financially constrained list or the vision list if total funding requests exceed the fund estimate above. Adding non-STIP funding sources (such as fees, local funds) will reduce the demand on future STIP funds.

2. For projects in the financially constrained list, RTPCs should assign priority to the projects in their areas. Potential core evaluation criteria recommended by the Authority include completion of Measure J projects and project readiness.

MTC will use the following goals in their evaluation of all submitted projects (not in order):

- a. Reduction of emissions
 - b. Reduction of injuries and fatalities from collisions
 - c. Encouragement of walking and biking
 - d. Reduction of trip travel time and vehicle miles of travel
 - e. Maintenance of transportation system in good repair
 - f. Encouragement of development within urban footprint
 - g. Improvement of equitable access by reducing transportation/housing costs
 - h. Improvement to economic vitality
 - i. Promotion of healthy and safe communities
 - j. Providing adequate housing.
3. Identify significant new projects deemed critical to the RTPC and/or transit operator, sought to be included in the financially constrained list. For projects to be added, provide project

descriptions, costs (including year costs was developed), expected mid-year of construction, funding secured to date and potential future STIP requests (escalated dollars).

The Authority will only add projects to the financially constrained list if capacity exists or if other projects are removed from the list.

Transit Operators are requested to coordinate their recommendations with the affected RTPCs. Multi-area system-wide requests can be submitted directly through Peter Engel of Authority staff, who will facilitate other transit project requests.

In order to compile the project lists and submit to MTC as Contra Costa's priority list in April 2011, we need you input no later than **April 5, 2011**.

Should you have any questions, please contact Hisham Noeimi at 925.256.4731 or Jack Hall at 925.256.4743.

Thank you in advance for your input.

Attachments:

Exhibit A: 2009 RTP committed project list by sub-region

Exhibit B: 2009 RTP financially constrained project list by sub-region

Exhibit C: Vision list developed during the 2009 RTP

Instructions to the project sponsors:

Please review your projects in the committed, financially constrained, and vision lists and provide requested information as follows: *(note that we included costs and funding from the 2009 RTP for your information)*

- Projects no longer supported should be deleted
- Projects completed should be deleted
- Projects substantially under construction and don't anticipate future federal actions should be deleted.
- Provide updated total project costs (includes capital and soft costs) in 2011 dollars and in Year of Expenditure (YOE) dollars (also called inflated/escalated dollars). Use 2.2% inflation rate to escalate costs to mid-year of construction.
- Fill out the date for anticipated mid-year of construction (year only).
- List all fund sources and amounts in the committed funding column.
- The difference between the YOE cost and the committed funding should be entered in the funding shortfall column.
- Cost estimates should be as accurate as possible. Underestimating costs will preclude projects from receiving federal actions such as NEPA clearance. Overestimating the cost will tie scarce funding to projects, preventing other important projects from being added to the RTP. Project sponsors are encouraged to use the Authority's Cost Estimation Guide or equivalent to develop their cost estimates, available at these web links:
<http://ccta.net/EN/main/state/tools.html>
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/pdpm/chap_pdf/chapt20.pdf
http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp_w98.pdf
- Upon determination of projects to be included in the committed, financially constrained and vision lists, Authority staff will contact you for additional information on the project including cost per phase (environmental, design, R/W, construction), description, limits, milestone schedule, other fund sources by phase, and how the project meets RTP goals.
- Submit information on the scope, cost (2011 and YOE dollars), and fund sources for any new projects. Because the RTP is updated every 4 years, and due to funding constraints, sponsors are encouraged to only add projects that are expected to move forward in the next 5 years.

COMMITTED LIST OF PROJECTS

County	RTP ID	Subregion	Sponsor	Project Description	Cost (VOE \$)	Committed Funding	Updated Cost (2011 \$)	Updated Cost (VOE \$)	Mid Year of Construction	Updated Committed Funding (list all sources)	Notes
Contra Costa	21225	CCTA	CCTA	Improve regional and local pedestrian and bicycle system, including constructing overcrossings, expanding sidewalks, and expanding facilities	22.2	22.2				Measure J	
Contra Costa	24206	SWAT	CCTA	Construct a fourth bore at the Caldecott Tunnel complex north of the three existing bores	445.9	445.9					under construction
Contra Costa	22402	SWAT	SWAT	Implement the San Ramon School Bus Program, and continue the Lamorinda School Bus Program	168.2	168.2					
Contra Costa	22613	SWAT	CCTA	Widen and extend major streets, and improve interchanges in southwest Contra Costa County (including widening Camino Tassajara)	30.0	30.0					
Contra Costa	94532	SWAT	SWAT	Gateway Lamorinda Traffic Program (including carpool lots, road improvements, pedestrian accommodation, and signal coordination)	15.9	15.9					
Contra Costa	98132	SWAT	San Ramon	Widen and extend Bollinger Canyon Road to 6 lanes from Alcosta Boulevard to Dougherty Road	4.7	4.7					
Contra Costa	98134	SWAT	County	Widen Dougherty Road to 6 lanes from Red Willow to Contra Costa County line	47.8	47.8					
Contra Costa	98196	SWAT	Orinda	Construct auxiliary lanes on Route 24 from Gateway Boulevard to Brookwood Road/Moraga Way	7.3	7.3					
Contra Costa	21207	TRANSPAC	Martinez	Construct Martinez Intermodal Station (Phase 3 initial segment) including site acquisition, demolition and construction of 200 interim parking spaces	12.0	12.0					under construction
Contra Costa	22353	TRANSPAC	CCTA	Construct HOV lane on I-680 southbound between North Main Street and Livorna	115.0	115.0		80.0	2015	Measure J: \$38, RM2: \$14	move to financially constrained list
Contra Costa	22365	TRANSPAC	Martinez	Improve Martinez Ferry landside facilities	5.3	5.3					
Contra Costa	22609	TRANSPAC	CCTA	Widen and extend major streets, and improve interchanges in central Contra Costa County	30.0	30.0					
Contra Costa	22657	TRANSPAC	BART	Construct BART crossover at Pleasant Hill BART Station	25.0	25.0					under construction
Contra Costa	98115	TRANSPAC	Concord	Widen Ygnacio Valley/Kirker Pass Roads from 4 lanes to 6 lanes from Michigan Boulevard to Cowell Road	8.2	8.2					
Contra Costa	98126	TRANSPAC	CCTA	Improve interchanges and parallel arterials to I-680 and Route 24 (projects to be determined based on analysis)	21.5	21.5					
Contra Costa	98193	TRANSPAC	Concord	Extend Panoramic Drive from North Concord BART Station to Willow Pass Road	12.9	12.9					
Contra Costa	98194	TRANSPAC	Concord	Extend Commerce Avenue from current terminus to Waterworld Parkway, including construction of vehicular bridge over Pine Creek and installation of trails and pedestrian bridge, and connect Willow Pass Road to Concord Avenue/Route 242 interchange	7.7	7.7				Measure C: \$4.4, Local: \$1.9, Earmark: \$1.4	
Contra Costa	230212	TRANSPAC	Concord	Improve Clayton Road/Treat Boulevard intersection to improve operational efficiency and increase capacity (includes upgrading traffic signal and constructing geometric improvements)	2.1	2.1				Measure J	
Contra Costa	230239	TRANSPAC	Pleasant Hill	Widen and improve Buskirk Avenue between Monument Boulevard and Hookston Road to provide 2 through-lanes in each direction (includes road realignment, new traffic signals, and bicycle/pedestrian streetscape improvements)	10.6	10.6				Measure J	
Contra Costa	230820	TRANSPAC	CCTA	Extend the Interstate 680 southbound high-occupancy vehicle lane northward 1 mile from Livorna Road to north of Redgear Road	3.1	3.1					under construction

Contra Costa	230596	TRANSPAC	County Connection	Construct Pacheco Boulevard Transit Hub on Blum Road at the Interstate 680/State Route 4 Interchange, including 6 bus bays and 110 park-and-ride spaces.	2.7	2.7				Measure C: \$0.8, RM2: \$1.1, Prop 1B: \$0.8	
Contra Costa	21211	TRANSPAC	BART	Extend BART/East Contra Costa Rail (eBART) eastward from the Pittsburg/Bay Point BART station into eastern Contra Costa County	525.0	525.0	464.0	2013		Measure J: \$135, RM2: \$96, RM1: \$52, AB1171: \$115, Fees: \$6, STIP: \$13, Prop 1B: \$37, STA: \$3, TCRP: \$5	
Contra Costa	21214	TRANSPAC	Antioch	Widen Wilbur Avenue over Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad from 2 lanes to 4 lanes	15.7	15.7					
Contra Costa	22600	TRANSPAC	Antioch	Widen Somersville Road Bridge in Antioch from 2 lanes to 4 lanes	2.2	2.2					
Contra Costa	22607	TRANSPAC	CCTA	Widen and extend major streets, and improve interchanges in east Contra Costa County	90.0	90.0					
Contra Costa	94046	TRANSPAC	CCTA	Improve interchanges and parallel arterials to Route 4	21.5	21.5					
Contra Costa	94538	TRANSPAC	Caltrans	Route 4 transportation management system	1.1	1.1					
Contra Costa	98142	TRANSPAC	CCTA	Widen Route 4 from Loweridge Road to Somersville Road from 4 lanes to 8 lanes, with HOV lanes	170.0	170.0					under construction
Contra Costa	98999	TRANSPAC	CCTA	Widen Route 4 from Somersville Road to Route 160 including improvements to interchanges	530.0	530.0	415.0	2012		Measure J: \$110, SLPP: \$15, Prop 1B: \$85, Measure C: \$12.4, Fees: \$30, Earmark: \$1.6, Tolls: \$90, STIP: \$44.5, BART: \$26	
Contra Costa	230188	TRANSPAC	Oakley	Purchase land in Oakley for use as a park-and-ride lot	1.2	1.2					
Contra Costa	230202	TRANSPAC	SR4 Bypass	Widen Route 4 Bypass from Laurel Road to Sand Creek Road from 2 lanes to 4 lanes	42.4	42.4					
Contra Costa	230203	TRANSPAC	SR4 Bypass	Construct Route 4 Bypass interchange at Sand Creek Road	40.4	40.4					
Contra Costa	230205	TRANSPAC	SR4 Bypass	Widen Route 4 Bypass from Sand Creek Road to Balfour Road from 2 lanes to 4 lanes	23.6	23.6					
Contra Costa	230206	TRANSPAC	SR4 Bypass	Construct Route 4 Bypass interchange at Balfour Road (Phase 1)	46.1	46.1					
Contra Costa	230233	TRANSPAC	Pittsburg	Extend James Donlon Boulevard to Kirker Pass Road by constructing a new 2 lane expressway	35.0	35.0					
Contra Costa	230236	TRANSPAC	Antioch	Widen Pittsburg-Antioch Highway from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with turning lanes	19.9	19.9					
Contra Costa	230238	TRANSPAC	Pittsburg	Widen California Avenue from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with 2 wide left turn lanes	16.0	16.0					
Contra Costa	230249	TRANSPAC	Brentwood	Construct a 6-lane grade separation undercrossing along the Union Pacific Line at Lone Tree Way.	26.6	26.6					
Contra Costa	230250	TRANSPAC	Brentwood	Widen Brentwood Boulevard from 2 lanes to 4 lanes between Sunset Court and Lone Tree Way.	23.5	23.5					
Contra Costa	230253	TRANSPAC	Antioch	Replace the old 2-lane Fitzuren Road with a new, 4-lane divided arterial, including shoulders, bicycle lanes, a park-and-ride lot and sidewalks.	10.0	10.0					
Contra Costa	230274	TRANSPAC	Oakley	Widen Main Street from State Route 160 to Big Break Road from 4 lanes to 6 lanes.	12.6	12.6					
Contra Costa	230288	TRANSPAC	Oakley	Widen Empire Avenue from 2 to 4 lanes between Lone Tree Way and Union Pacific Railroad right of way/Antioch city limits.	2.1	2.1					
Contra Costa	230535	TRANSPAC	County	Realign curves along Marsh Creek Road to improve safety and operations.	4.6	4.6					
Contra Costa	230538	TRANSPAC	County	Widen Bailey Road to 12-ft lanes and 4-ft shoulders.	5.7	5.7					

Contra Costa	230631	TRANSPLAN	Caltrans	Double the existing rail track between Oakley and Port Chicago	28.1	28.1						
Contra Costa	21208	WCCTAC	AC Transit	Construct Richmond Parkway Transit Center, including signal timing and reconfiguration, parking facility and security improvements	30.5	30.5	28.7	2012	STIP: \$12.7, RM2: \$16			
Contra Costa	21209	WCCTAC	Hercules	Relocate and expand Hercules Transit Center including relocation of park-and-ride facility and construction of express bus facilities	13.0	13.0					relocation complete	
Contra Costa	21210	WCCTAC	Hercules	Construct Capitol Corridor train station in Hercules	39.8	39.8						
Contra Costa	22603	WCCTAC	Richmond	Construct 680-space parking garage at Richmond-Intermodal Transfer Station	34.3	34.3						under construction
Contra Costa	22610	WCCTAC	CCTA	Widen and extend major streets, and improve interchanges in west Contra Costa County	30.0	30.0						
Contra Costa	22611	WCCTAC	WCCTAC	West County low-income student bus pass program	36.9	36.9						
Contra Costa	94045	WCCTAC	MTC	Purchase new express buses for I-80 HOV service (capital costs)	17.5	17.5						
Contra Costa	94048	WCCTAC	CCTA	Improve interchanges and parallel arterials to I-80 (specific projects to be determined)	21.5	21.5						
Contra Costa	98157	WCCTAC	AC Transit	Improve AC Transit bus service in San Pablo corridor.	12.9	12.9						
Contra Costa	98211	WCCTAC	Caltrans	Extend I-80 eastbound HOV lanes from Route 4 to the Crockett interchange	55.5	55.5						under construction
Contra Costa	230127	WCCTAC	WestCAT	Construct new satellite WestCAT maintenance facility (includes land purchase)	8.2	8.2						
Contra Costa	230129	WCCTAC	WestCAT	Expand WestCAT service, including purchase of vehicles	8.8	8.8						
Contra Costa	230193	WCCTAC	AC Transit	Enhance AC Transit Zero Emission Bus (ZEB) program, including fueling stations and new maintenance bays	8.1	8.1						
Contra Costa	230194	WCCTAC	AC Transit	Implement AC Transit Environmental Sustainability Program to address environmental issues associated with bus transit operation	6.6	6.6						
Contra Costa	230195	WCCTAC	AC Transit	Improve safety and security on AC Transit vehicles and in facilities, including installing surveillance systems and emergency operations improvements	4.5	4.5						
Contra Costa	230196	WCCTAC	AC Transit	Implement AC Transit San Pablo Dam Road Transit Priority Measures (TPM), including passenger safety improvements and road improvements to increase bus speeds	12.2	12.2						
Regional/ Multiple Counties	230221	WCCTAC	WCCTAC	I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM) Project Operations and Management	187.8	187.8						
Regional/ Multiple Counties	230222	WCCTAC	WCCTAC	San Pablo Avenue SMART Corridors Operations & Management	37.6	37.6						
Contra Costa	230225	WCCTAC	Hercules	Improve and expand arterial streets in Central Hercules for express bus and rail transit facilities to support transit-oriented development at I-80/Route 4 intersection	7.7	7.7						
Contra Costa	230227	WCCTAC	WCCTAC	Conduct engineering, environmental and financial feasibility assessment of rail mass transit to western Contra Costa County (includes future station site acquisition)	2.9	2.9						
Contra Costa	230293	WCCTAC	County	Add transit stops, sidewalks, along with bicycle and pedestrian amenities to San Pablo Dam Road.	7.3	7.3						
Contra Costa	230397	WCCTAC	WestCAT	Construct and develop infrastructure enhancements to improve operations of transit service within the WestCAT service area, including Park-and-Ride lots, signal prioritization, bus-only lanes and freeway drop ramps	12.4	12.4						

Contra Costa	230401	WCCTAC	WCCTAC	Construct bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly improvements along San Pablo Avenue from El Cerrito to Crockett to support transit-oriented development.	6.8	6.8						
Contra Costa	230402	WCCTAC	Caltrans	Install new or upgraded corridor management and traveler information elements along the Interstate 80 corridor from the Carquinez Bridge to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge Toll Plaza.	67.0	67.0	67.0	2012			CMIA: \$55.3, Measure J: \$3.8, TFCA: \$1.1, CMAQ: \$3.2M, ACCMA: \$3, STIP: \$1	
Contra Costa	230505	WCCTAC	Richmond	Provide transportation improvements on the east side of the Richmond BART station to accommodate redevelopment for a transit village.	16.1	16.1						
Contra Costa	230542	WCCTAC	Pinole	Close a bicycle/pedestrian gap on San Pablo Avenue by upgrading the existing bridge or constructing new dedicated bicycle/pedestrian bridge.	0.9	0.9						
Contra Costa	230597	WCCTAC	WCCTAC	Install new or upgraded corridor management and real-time traveler information improvements along (1) Interstate 80 and (2) key arterial routes between the Carquinez Bridge to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge Toll Plaza.	26.5	26.5	26.5	2012			TLSP: \$21.4, RM2: \$4, Measure J: \$1.1	

FINANCIALLY CONTRAINED LIST OF PROJECTS

County	RTP ID	Subregion	Sponsor	Project Description	Cost (VOE)	Committed	STIP/TE	ITIP	Other (STP, CMAQ, STA, Tolls, Prop 1B, etc.)	Updated Cost (2011 \$)	Updated Cost (VOE \$)	Estimated Mid Year of Construction	Updated Committed Funding (list all sources and amounts)	Updated Shortfall	Notes
Contra Costa	230693	CCTA	CCTA	Local Streets and roads maintenance	4362.0	2458.0			1001.0						
Contra Costa	22352	SWAT	CCTA/San Ramon	Improve I-680/Norris Canyon Road HOV direct ramps in San Ramon	101.6	58.7	42.9								
Contra Costa	22602	SWAT	CCTA/Danville	Construct I-680 auxiliary lanes in both directions from Sycamore Valley Road to Crow Canyon Road	47.0	20.0	27.0								
Contra Costa	230307	SWAT	County	Widen Camino Tassajara Road from 2 lanes to 4 lanes, including shoulders and bicycle lanes in both directions from Windemere Parkway to the Alameda/Contra Costa Countyline.	13.0	4.9	8.1								
Subtotal					229.0	40.9	145.1	43.0	0.0	78.0	0.0				
Contra Costa	21205	TRANSPAC	CCTA/TRANSPAC	Improve I-680/Route 4 interchange (phases 1-2 and 3)	229.0	40.9	145.1	43.0							
Contra Costa	22354	TRANSPAC	Martinez	Improve I-680/Marina Vista interchange	7.9	1.6	6.3								
Contra Costa	22388	TRANSPAC	Concord	Construct Route 242 on and off-ramp at Clayton Road	42.6	12.3	30.3								
Contra Costa	22390	TRANSPAC	Concord	Reconstruct Route 4/Willow Pass Road ramps in Concord to support new infill development at the Concord Naval Weapons Station.	45.1	35.1	10.0								
Contra Costa	22614	TRANSPAC	Martinez	Construct Martinez Intermodal Station (Phase 3) including an additional 425 parking spaces and auto/ped bridges	14.2	2.8	11.4								
Contra Costa	98133	TRANSPAC	County	Widen Pacheco Boulevard from Blum Road to Arthur Road from 2 lanes to 4 lanes	50.3	28.3	22.0								
Contra Costa	230216	TRANSPAC	Concord	Construct 2-lane bridge connecting Waterworld Parkway with Meridian Park Boulevard.	16.9	11.3	5.6								
Contra Costa	230240	TRANSPAC	Pleasant Hill	Add additional left- or right-turn lanes at various intersections along Contra Costa Boulevard (between Monument Boulevard and 2nd Avenue)	11.3	2.0	9.3								
Contra Costa	230291	TRANSPAC	County	Add Northbound truck climbing lane and an 8-foot bicycle lane on Kirker Pass Road from Clearbrook Drive in Concord to just beyond the crest of Kirker Pass.	10.2	8.2	2.0								
Contra Costa	230306	TRANSPAC	Martinez	Add a second southbound Alhambra Avenue lane from Walnut Avenue to the south side of Highway 4, including signal modifications.	2.1	0.3	1.8								
Contra Costa	230308	TRANSPAC	Martinez	Straighten curves to improve safety and operation of Alhambra Valley Road.	7.5	3.0	4.5								
Contra Costa	230309	TRANSPAC	County Connection	Provide rolling stock, infrastructure and information-technology for bus-rapid-transit service in the Pacheco/Contra Costa Boulevard/North Main corridor in Contra Costa County, including software support for regional Americans With Disabilities Act database	13.3	0.0	13.3								
Subtotal					45.2	10.7	34.5		0.0	261.6	43.0				
Contra Costa	98198	TRANSPAC	County	Improve safety and operations on Vasco Road in Contra Costa and Alameda counties	45.2	10.7	34.5								
Contra Costa	98222	TRANSPAC	SR4 Bypass	SR4/SR160 Connectors	60	24	36								
Contra Costa	230232	TRANSPAC	Antioch	Construct new interchange at Route 4/Phillips Lane	50.1	30.1	20.0								
Contra Costa	230237	TRANSPAC	Pittsburg	Extend West Leland Road, including a raised median, bicycle lanes and sidewalks, from San Marco Boulevard to Willow Pass Road.	45.0	37.0	8.0								
Contra Costa	230247	TRANSPAC	Brentwood	Widen Lone Tree Way to 6 lanes: O'Hara Ave. to Brentwood Blvd. to match roadway west of O'Hara Ave.	27.0	10.4	16.6								
Contra Costa	230185	TRANSPAC	Tri Delta/BART	Establish Express Bus Service and eBART support network (park-and-ride lots and rolling stock)	21.7		21.7								
Contra Costa	230289	TRANSPAC	Oakley	Construct Main Street Downtown Bypass road between Vintage Parkway and 2nd Street.	27.1	12.4	14.7								

[illegible]

VISION LIST OF PROJECTS

RTP ID	Subregion	Sponsor	Project Description	Cost (2007 \$)	Updated Cost (2011 \$)	Fund Sources/Amounts
22371	CCTA	CCTA	Park & Ride Lots for the support of Regional Express Bus Service	20		
21036	SWAT	CCTA/SWAT	Selected additional I-680 auxiliary lanes south of I-680/24 interchange	20		
22375	SWAT	CalTrans	SR24 and I-680 Traffic Operation System (TOS) and fiber optic cable project	5		
21223	TRANSPAC	CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680 transit corridor improvements (including express bus service enhancements and improved connections to BART)	100		
22343	TRANSPAC	CCTA/TRANSPAC	Express bus service expansion along I-680 (Phases 1 and 2)	57		
22350	TRANSPAC	CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR4 Phase 4 SB to EB	40.5		
22350	TRANSPAC	CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR4 Phase 5 WB to NB	26		
22350	TRANSPAC	CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR4 HOV Flyover	82		
22351	TRANSPAC	CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680 NB HOV Lane Extension: N. Main to SR242	44		
98130	TRANSPAC	Martinez	Alhambra Avenue Widening (Phase 3)	6		
230217	TRANSPAC	Concord	State Route 4/Port Chicago Highway Interchange Improvements	35		
230522	TRANSPAC	County	Kirker Pass Rd Truck Climbing Lanes Southbound	14		
21227	TRANSPAC	BART	eBART Phase 2; Extend BART using DMU technology from Hillcrest Ave to Byron.	500		
22336	TRANSPAC	County	Byron Highway shoulder widenings and railroad grade separation	20		
22376	TRANSPAC	CalTrans	Route 4 ramp meter, Traffic Operation System (TOS) and fiber optic cable project	5		
22378	TRANSPAC	CalTrans	I-80 and I-580 Traffic Operation System (TOS) and fiber optic cable project	5		
22400	TRANSPAC	County	Construct Route 239 form Brentwood to Tracy Expressway	200		
22604	TRANSPAC	County	Vasco Road Safety Improvements; Phase 2	50		
22605	TRANSPAC	SR4 Bypass Authority	SR4 Bypass: Widen Segment 2 (Lone Tree Way - Balfour Rd) to 6 lanes and Segment 3 (Balfour Rd - Walnut Blvd) to 4 lanes	143.5		
22981	TRANSPAC	County	Widen State Route 4 as continuous 4-lane arterial from Marsh Creek Road to San Joaquin County line	100		
230208	TRANSPAC	SR4 Bypass Authority	State Route 4 Bypass: Widen from 4 to 6 lanes from Laurel Road to Sand Creek Road	32		
22004	WCCTAC	AC Transit	AC Transit Regional Lifeline Transit Priorities	50		
22346	WCCTAC	CCTA/WCCTAC	Express bus service expansion along I-580	50		
22358	WCCTAC	Hercules	Re-engineer Freeway Ramps at I-80/SR4	11.8		
22382	WCCTAC	Richmond	Richmond Parkway/San Pablo Ave grade separated interchange	20		
22383	WCCTAC	Richmond	Richmond Parkway Upgrade	94		
22516	WCCTAC	Capitol Corridor JPA	Capitol Corridor Regional Rail Service (West Contra Costa and Solano counties)	70		
94050	WCCTAC	CCTA	Upgrade State Route 4 to full freeway from I-80 to Cummings Skyway (Phase 2)	75		
230131	WCCTAC	WestCAT	Lynx service Expansion	5		
230218	WCCTAC	El Cerrito	Del Norte Area TOD	25		
230283	WCCTAC	Richmond	Grade Separation @ Morton/Giant	26		
230528	WCCTAC	County	Cummings Skyway Truck Lane Extension	1.8		

ATTACHMENT 6.D



SWAT

Danville • Lafayette • Moraga • Orinda • San Ramon & the County of Contra Costa

DATE: March 7, 2011
TO: SWAT Committee
FROM: SWAT TAC
SUBJECT: South County Alternate Appointment to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA)

Currently, the South County SWAT representation to the CCTA is held by the Danville representative through January 31, 2012. Therefore, the alternate from the South County is the San Ramon SWAT representative. However, because the same San Ramon representative was recently named as the Mayors Conference representative to the CCTA, the CCTA has requested that SWAT name a new alternate South County representative.

Of the remaining SWAT members eligible to serve on CCTA, it is recommended that the Moraga SWAT representative be named as an alternate for the South County in addition to serving as the Lamorinda alternate SWAT representative to the CCTA.

RECOMMENDATION

Appoint the Moraga SWAT representative as the South County alternate to the CCTA through the remainder of the current term, ending on January 31, 2012.

ATTACHMENT 7



CONTRA COSTA
transportation
authority

COMMISSIONERS

David Durant,
Chair

Don Tatzin,
Vice Chair

Janet Abelson

Genoveva Calloway

Jim Frazier

Federal Glover

Dave Hudson

Karen Mitchoff

Julie Pierce

Karen Stepper


Robert Taylor

Randell H. Iwasaki,
Executive Director

2999 Oak Road
Suite 100
Walnut Creek
CA 94597
PHONE: 925.256.4700
FAX: 925.256.4701
www.ccta.net

MEMORANDUM

To: Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC
Andy Dillard, SWAT, TVTC
John Cunningham, TRANSPLAN
Christina Atienza, WCCTAC
Richard Yee, LPMC

From: 
Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director

Date: February 18, 2011

Re: Items approved by the Authority on February 16, 2011, for circulation to the
Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs), and items of interest

At its February 16, 2011 meeting, the Authority discussed the following items, which may be of interest to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees:

- 1. Legislation.** *The Authority received a staff report concerning a recent action on the part of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to sponsor state legislation that would call for the addition of two members to the Commission—one representing the City of Oakland and the other representing the City of San Jose. The Authority voted to support the legislation as it is currently written, and staff will monitor any changes going forward.*
- 2. Proposed Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) Regulations Pertaining to Municipal Advisors.** The proposed regulations may require Authority Commissioners to register with the SEC as a “municipal advisor.” It was recommended that the Authority comment on the proposed regulations and urge that appointed commissioners be excluded from SEC registering. *The letter from Nossaman LLP to the SEC was approved by the Authority. (Attachment)*
- 3. 2011 Update to the Measure J Strategic Plan: Revenue Projections and Development Schedule.** *Staff provided an update on Measure J revenue projections, key policy issues to be addressed, and the schedule leading to adoption in July. The Authority approved the overall approach, schedule, and revenue projection to carry forward in the 2011 Update.*

4. **Initiation of the 2013 Regional Transportation Plan “Call for Projects”.** In anticipation of MTC’s release of a “Call for Projects” for the 2013 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) by the end of February 2011, staff proposed to begin working with the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and Transit Operators on developing a 25-year financially–constrained project list for submittal to MTC in April. In order for a transportation project to receive state and/or federal transportation funding, it must first be included in the RTP. *Staff reported that MTC’s Call for Projects had been received, and provided an overview of the process and timeline for project submittals to MTC. Staff was authorized to issue a “Call for Projects” for the 2013 RTP update.*
5. **Decennial “State of the System” Update:** *Staff reported that due to the recession, overall traffic volumes in Contra Costa had gone down, and based upon recent data, traffic levels in 2010 are generally lower than previous levels for 2000. The presentation included a brief overview of the current trends, and implications for planning and forecasting activities.*
6. **SB 375 Implementation Update.** *Staff reported on recent meetings and events pertaining to the implementation of SB 375 and the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy for the Bay Area.*



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

50 California Street
34th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
T 415.398.3600
F 415.398.2438

Stanley S. Taylor III
D 415.438.7224
staylor@nossaman.com

Refer To File #: 280443-0001

February 16, 2011

Elizabeth M. Murphy
Secretary
Securities and Exchange Commission
100 F Street, NE.,
Washington, DC
20549-1090

Re: File No. S7-45-10

Ladies and Gentlemen,

This letter is submitted by Nossaman LLP on behalf of several of our public sector clients, in response to the request of the Securities and Exchange Commission (the "Commission") for comments on proposed permanent rules 15Ba1-1 through 15Ba1-7 ("the Rules") designed to give effect to provisions of Title IX of the Dodd-Frank Act that, among other things, would establish a permanent registration regime with the Commission for municipal advisors and would impose certain record-keeping requirements on such advisors.

We support the Commission's effort to implement a registration system permitting municipal advisors to satisfy the registration requirement imposed by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act ("Dodd-Frank Act"); however we also believe that the definition of "Municipal Advisor," which as contemplated in the Rules would include appointed members of a governing body of a municipal entity that are not elected ex officio members, is broader than necessary and may possibly curtail the quality of services available to municipal entities.

Employee Exclusion Overly Narrow

The definition of "municipal advisor" excludes persons who are municipal entities or "employees of a municipal entity." Comments on the precursor to the Rules noted that this definition would not automatically exclude a person who serves on the governing body of a municipal entity, such as a board member, a county commissioner or city councilman. The commenter stated that because such persons are not technically "employees" of the municipal entity (but rather are "unpaid volunteers"), these persons would not fall within the exclusion from the definition of "municipal advisor" for "employees of a municipal entity" and, therefore, may have to register as municipal advisors. The commenter suggested, and our clients support, modifying the definition of "municipal advisor" to clearly exclude a person serving as an appointed or elected member of the governing body of a municipal entity.



Our clients have significant concerns regarding the Commission's proposed Rules relating to registration of "municipal advisors." In the commentary accompanying the proposed Rules, the Commission agreed with the suggestion that board members should be exempted, but limited the exclusion to *elected* board members. While the Commission proposes allowing an exemption for appointed board members that serve in an ex officio capacity due to their position as elected officials, the Commission expressed concern over including unelected appointees within the scope of the exclusion. The Commission reasoned that these appointees would not be "directly accountable for their performance to the citizens of the municipal entity."¹

Under the proposed Rules, directors or trustees of municipal entities may be required individually to register with the SEC and the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board ("MSRB") and to comply with various recordkeeping and inspection rules. While there may be arguments that could be made that the proposed Rules would not require municipal entity directors or trustees to register as Municipal Advisors, we believe that these individuals who devote themselves to public service on a municipal entity board deserve clear guidance. The municipal entity community appears virtually unanimous in its opposition to the proposed Rules, reflecting various considerations, particularly the anticipated difficulty in obtaining qualified citizens to serve at the government's request on boards where such service may entail reporting and other obligations and expose the members to risks of noncompliance with the Rules.

State Laws Already Address and Extensively Regulate Appointee Board Member Responsibility and Accountability

Among the concerns the new Rules are proposed to address are the reliance by municipal authorities on "external advisors" and the perceived gaps in oversight within existing regulatory structures. The Commission notes in its commentary that, prior to the Dodd-Frank Act:

- Municipal advisors had traditionally been exempt from regulation to the extent they limited their advisory activities to advising municipal issuers as to the structuring of their financings; and
- Dealers who also act as municipal advisors were subject to regulation, but those regulations applied primarily to their business as dealers rather than their activities as municipal financial advisors.²

But these problems were related specifically to dealers and external advisors. States have been much more aggressive in regulating the actions of public officials, both elected and appointed, through conflict of interest and ethics laws. For example, California's Political Reform Act ("CAPRA") extensively regulates the actions of public agency officials, particularly targeting those in a position to manage public investments.

¹ *Id.*

² 76 Fed. Reg. at 827.



Under CAPRA, public officials³ must disclose assets and income which may be affected by their official actions, and may be disqualified from acting to avoid conflicts of interest.⁴ They are forbidden from using their positions to influence governmental decisions in which they have a financial interest.⁵ Each public agency is required develop conflict of interest policies, which must specifically list the offices and officials that "manage public investments." In the interest of transparency and accountability, these lists must to be posted to each agency's website in an identifiable and accessible manner.⁶

Appointees Should Be Exempt

Appointees serving on the governing body of a municipal entity should be excluded from the proposed Rules' definition of "municipal advisor," regardless of whether they were elected to such office, serve as ex officio members, or were appointed without election. Requiring these officials to register will increase the costs states and local governments must bear, reduce the number of qualified individuals willing to volunteer for such duties, and may reduce the quality of services available to municipal entities. States already extensively regulate the activities of public officials and enforce accountability through reporting measures similar to those contemplated by the Rules. We urge you to reconsider your suggested treatment of appointed members of a municipal entity's governing body, to allow them the same exemption provided to elected officials.

We would be glad to discuss any of these suggestions with any member of the Commission staff.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Stanley S. Taylor III".

Stanley S. Taylor III
of Nossaman LLP

SST/ash1

³ Cal. Gov't Code §§ 82048, 87103, and 87105 (2010).

⁴ Cal. Gov't Code § 81002(c) (2010).

⁵ Cal. Gov't Code § 87100 (2010).

⁶ Cal. Gov't Code § 87314 (2010).

WCCTAC

West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee

El Cerrito

February 25, 2011

Hercules

Mr. Randell Iwasaki, Executive Director
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek CA 94597

RE: WCCTAC Meeting Summary

Pinole

Dear Randy:

The WCCTAC Board at its meeting today took the following actions that may be of interest to the Authority:

Richmond

1) Approved a letter to State legislative representatives identifying transportation-related impacts of the Governor's proposal to eliminate redevelopment agencies.

San Pablo

2) Approved alternative approaches to addressing West County's concerns regarding uncertain trip generation for the gaming alternatives analyzed under the Point Molate Casino Resort FEIR.

Contra Costa
County

3) Approved the expenditure plan for West County's apportionment of FY 2011-12 Transportation for Clean Air (TFCA) funds.

4) Approved the process for administration of Measure J funds for Additional Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities (Program 20b) and guidelines to East Bay Paratransit Consortium for development of proposed projects for Program 20b funds.

AC Transit

5) Received a presentation from Hisham Noeimi on the Regional Transportation Plan Call for Projects and approved the overall approach described in CCTA staff's proposed outreach plan to non-governmental organizations and communities of concern.

6) As to the I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM) project: a) received an update on recent project developments; b) directed staff to seek the establishment of a policy oversight committee for the project, with staff support that would include direct representation of local agencies; and c) appointed a subcommittee consisting of WCCTAC's CCTA representatives to provide guidance to staff during the negotiations for the operations and maintenance MOU.

BART

7) Directed staff to seek ways to reduce WCCTAC membership dues, including investigating the potential use of other revenue sources.

WestCAT

Sincerely,



Christina M. Atienza
Executive Director

cc: Danice Rosenbohm, CCTA; Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC; John Cunningham, TRANSPLAN;
Andy Dillard, SWAT

TRANSPAC Transportation Partnership and Cooperation

Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek and Contra Costa County
2300 Contra Costa Boulevard, Pleasant Hill, CA 94523 (925) 969-0841

February 11, 2011

Randell H. Iwasaki
Executive Director
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Dear Mr. Iwasaki:

At its meeting on February 10, 2011, TRANSPAC took the following actions that may be of interest to the Transportation Authority:


1. Received a presentation on the Highway 4 Widening Project by Susan Miller, CCTA Director, Projects.
2. Received a presentation on the Caldecott Tunnel by Ross Chittenden, CCTA Deputy Director, Projects.
3. Received a report by Martin Engelmann, CCTA Deputy Executive Director, Planning, on the January 31, 2011 Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) briefing.
4. Received a report by Lynn Overcashier, Program Manager, 511 Contra Costa, on 511 Contra Costa School-Based Programs for Central and East Counties.
5. Received reports on CCTA activities from TRANSPAC's CCTA representatives.
6. Reappointed City of Pleasant Hill Mayor (2011) David Durant as TRANSPAC's CCTA Representative for the 2011-13 term.
7. Appointed Walnut Creek Councilmember Kristina Lawson as the second alternate and Concord Councilmember Bill Shinn as the third alternate for Members Pierce and Durant.
8. Elected Councilmember Bill Shinn as TRANSPAC Chair for the 2011 term and Clayton Councilmember Julie Pierce as TRANSPAC Vice Chair for the 2011 term.

9. Appointed Councilmember Bill Shinn and Martinez Councilmember Mark Ross as Policy Advisory Committee representatives for the SR4 Integrated Corridor Analysis. Contra Costa County Supervisor Karen Mitchoff was appointed alternate.

TRANSPAC hopes that this information is useful to you.

Sincerely,



Barbara Neustadter
TRANSPAC Manager 

cc: TRANSPAC Representatives
TRANSPAC TAC and staff
Don Tatzin, Chair, SWAT
Federal Glover, Chair, TRANSPLAN
Martin Engelmann, Arielle Bourgart, Hisham Noeimi, Danice Rosenbohm, CCTA
Christina Atienza, WCCTAC
Roy Swearington, WCCTAC Chair
John Cunningham, TRANSPLAN
Andy Dillard, SWAT
June Catalano, City of Pleasant Hill

TRANSPLAN COMMITTEE

EAST COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Antioch • Brentwood • Oakley • Pittsburg • Contra Costa County
651 Pine Street -- North Wing 4TH Floor, Martinez, CA 94553-0095

January 31, 2011

Mr. Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Dear Mr. Iwasaki:

This correspondence reports on the actions and discussions at the TRANSPLAN Committee during their meeting on January 13, 2011.

Elect Chair and Vice-Chair for 2011: The Committee selected Brian Kalinowski (Antioch) to serve as Chair of TRANSPLAN and Jim Frazier (Oakley) as Vice Chair for 2011.

Appoint TRANSPLAN representatives and alternates to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Board: The Committee appointed Jim Frazier as TRANSPLAN's Representative to the CCTA for the Odd Year Seat (2/1/2011 to 1/30/2013) and Kevin Romick as the alternate appointment for the same seat/term.

State Route 4 Integrated Corridor Analysis Report: Martin Engelmann, CCTA Deputy Executive Director, provided the Committee with a report on the Analysis. The Committee designated Ben Johnson (Pittsburg) and Jim Frazier (Oakley) as TRANSPLAN's Representatives on the State Route 4 Integrated Corridor Analysis Policy Advisory Committee.

The next regularly scheduled TRANSPLAN Committee meeting will be on Thursday, March 10, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. (The February 2011 TRANSPLAN Meeting was cancelled)

Sincerely,



John W. Cunningham
TRANSPLAN Staff

c:

TRANSPLAN Committee
A. Dillard, SWAT
B. Neustadter, TRANSPAC
C. Atienza, WCCTAC

T. Williams, TVTC
D. Rosenbohm CCTA
E. Smith, BART

TRANSPLAN COMMITTEE

EAST COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Antioch • Brentwood • Oakley • Pittsburg • Contra Costa County
651 Pine Street -- North Wing 4TH Floor, Martinez, CA 94553-0095

January 31, 2011

Mr. Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Dear Mr. Iwasaki:

This correspondence reports on the actions and discussions at the TRANSPLAN Committee during their meeting on January 27, 2011.

3. Receive Report on City of Pittsburg Adoption of Fee Program and Take Action as Appropriate on the Following and Related Issues:

a) Whether Pittsburg's PRTDIM Fee Program constitutes a valid regional development mitigation program for the East County region.

b) Whether Pittsburg is in compliance with its obligations under the East County Action Plan to participate in a cooperative, multi-jurisdictional process for managing growth in the East County region. The Committee discussed the subject issue and in response to agenda item 3.a) the Committee recognized the East Contra Costa Regional Fee and Financing Authority is the regional development mitigation program, and in response to agenda item 3. b) the Committee determined that the City of Pittsburg was not in compliance with its obligations under the East County Action Plan to participate in a cooperative, multi-jurisdictional process for managing growth in the East County region.

The next regularly scheduled TRANSPLAN Committee meeting will be on Thursday, March 10, 2011 (The February Committee Meeting was cancelled) at 6:30 p.m.

Sincerely,



John W. Cunningham
TRANSPLAN Staff

c:
TRANSPLAN Committee
A. Dillard, SWAT & TVTC
B. Neustadter, TRANSPAC
C. Atienza, WCCTAC
E. Smith, BART



Weber Property Residential Development

REQUEST FOR COMMENTS AND PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD for a *DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*

- Project Title:** Weber Property Residential Development Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR)
(State Clearinghouse No: 2006012065)
- Project Location:** 333 Hill Road, Town of Danville, Contra Costa County, California
- The project site is located within the Green Valley area of the Town of Danville, generally northwest of the intersection of Diablo Road and Green Valley Road (see Attached Map).
- Project Description:** Requested by Davidon Homes, the project proposes the construction of 22 single-family homes and a new vehicular connection between Blemer Road and Matadera Way. The following entitlements would be required to facilitate the project: 1) Preliminary Development Plan - Rezoning to rezone the site from R-20, Single Family Residential District to P-1, Planned Unit Development District; 2) Final Development Plan - Major Subdivision to subdivide the approximately 15-acre site into 22 single-family residential lots and one remainder life estate parcel; and 3) Tree Removal Permit.
- Lead Agency:** Town of Danville
Planning Division
510 La Gonda Way
Danville, CA 94526
(925) 314-3349
dcrompton@danville.ca.gov
- Contact: David Crompton, Principal Planner
- Copies of the EIR:** Copies of the Draft EIR are available at the Town of Danville Planning Division at the above address. In addition, the Draft EIR is available for review at the Danville Public Library (400 Front Street), and on the Town's Web Site at www.ci.danville.ca.us



Weber Property Residential Development NOP

Local Vicinity

Figure 2



Not to Scale

PBF
CONSULTING

JN 35-101091

General Plan 2030 Update



**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT THE CITY OF SAN RAMON
PLANNING COMMISSION WILL HOLD PUBLIC HEARING ON
TUESDAY – MARCH 1, 2011
TO CONSIDER:**

- 1) General Plan Amendment (GPA 09-400-001) filed on February 24, 2009 - *Planning the City's Future - The General Plan 2030* incorporating changes to elements, policies, and maps in response to the November 2010 voter review. Plan modifications include:
 - Adjusting the Urban Growth Boundary to reflect the previous 2002 voter approved boundary.
 - Acknowledging the expiration of Ordinance 197 and reinforcing the City's commitment to protecting the City's scenic quality, natural resources, hillsides, ridges, and creeks.
 - Adding policies and discussion in response to the "Complete Streets Law" ensuring that all local streets and roads accommodate the needs of bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit riders, as well as motorists.
 - Addressing minor technical edits including clarifications to improve readability, definition of terms, format changes, policy numbering, and cross-referencing.
- 2) Climate Action Plan (adopted July 19, 2010) - Modifying the approved Plan to incorporate General Plan 2030 revisions and policy cross-references.

Location: Citywide

Applicant: City of San Ramon

CEQA: On July 19, 2010, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 2010-083 which certified the EIR (SCH# 2000082002) and adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the General Plan 2030 and Climate Action Plan. In January 2011, an Addendum to the General Plan 2030 EIR was prepared in accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines to address the proposed revisions.

Posting Period: February 18, 2011 to March 1, 2011

SAID HEARING will be held by the City of San Ramon City Council and Planning Commission in the Council Chamber at 2222 Camino Ramon, San Ramon commencing at 7:00 PM.

The revised General Plan 2030 is available for review at www.sanramon.ca.gov and also at the following San Ramon facilities:

Planning/Community Development Department
2226 Camino Ramon

San Ramon Community Center
12501 Alcosta Boulevard

Dougherty Station Community Center
17011 Bollinger Canyon Road

San Ramon Senior Center
9300 Alcosta Boulevard

Dougherty Station Library
17017 Bollinger Canyon Road

San Ramon Library (Marketplace)
100 Montgomery Street

If you challenge these applications in court, you may be limited to only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the City Council and Planning Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing.

For questions regarding this notice, please contact the Planning Services Division at (925) 973-2560.


Patricia Edwards, City Clerk

Dated: February 18, 2011