



SWAT

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

SOUTHWEST AREA TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA Monday August 3, 2026, at 3:00 p.m.

Location 1: Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors' Office - District 2 (Candace Andersen) Lafayette Office at 3338 Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Lafayette, CA 94549.

This is an in-person meeting of the SWAT Committee, with the option for members of the public to appear in person or to participate via Zoom teleconference. Persons who wish to address the Board during public comment or with respect to an item on the agenda may comment in person or may call in or log in to the meeting via Zoom.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://ccccounty-us.zoom.us/j/87853618130?pwd=gWRoaGMnh1iRZ31aVQ4AJE7IfWwQB9.1>

Meeting ID: 878 5361 8130

Passcode: 572085

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 San Ramon City Hall, 7000 Bollinger Canyon Road, San Ramon, CA during normal business hours.

1. CONVENE MEETING/SELF INTRODUCTION

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 to a staff member)*

3. BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

4. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

6. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

6.A Presentation & Recommendation: At the May 4th, SWAT BOD meeting, SWAT voted to support Street Smarts Contra Costa's application for \$45,450 of rollover TFCA funds to onboard three Lamorinda schools to the "Walk N Roll" program in Lamorinda for next year. These funds would still need to be applied for and won from a SWAT TFCA application. The intent was to support them in applying for three new schools each year for a total of nine (9) schools onboarded by the end of 28/29 when an OBAG 4 Grant, if awarded, could take over.

Available TFCA Funds:

The full roll over available, for SWAT use only, from the closed TFCA TDM Grant 24CC03 is \$164,038.13. The full amount of TFCA funding available this round, by formula, to SWAT for **sub**-regional projects is \$134,055. The combined available TFCA funds for SWAT are \$298,093

Funds Applied For- Sub-Regional:

The City of San Ramon, SWAT Administrator, applied for \$104,000 in TFCA funds for Lamorinda School Bus and \$95,000 for TRAFFIX School Bus program for a total of \$199,000 in TFCA funds, plus the \$45,450 approved for Street Smarts to onboard three schools next school year increases the total application to \$244,450.

Remaining Funds:

Subtracting the ‘funds applied for’, from the total available funds, leaves \$53,643 in roll over TFCA. The ongoing ability to roll over the funds is being debated at TFCA and there is a chance the funds will **not** be rolled over to next cycle for SWAT. They may be returned to the larger pot for all RTPC’s.

Recommendation & Discussion:

Approve an increase of \$53,643 to the amount of roll over funds already approved for Street Smarts Contra Costa TFCA application to launch Walk N’ Roll at three schools next school year for a new total of \$99,093. These funds will be applied for, (from TFCA) to cover the three schools launched this year for next year also. The funds could also be applied to the original planned expansion schedule if new funding is identified. Total would use all available TFCA funds keeping the remaining \$53,643 in SWAT for a total of \$298,093.

By: Danielle Elkins, Deputy Executive Director, Planning, Programs, and Policy.

Attachment 6A.1 – PPT Presentation

6.B. Memorandum: Coordinated Call for Projects Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Cycle 3 Scoring Guidance for West, Central, and Southwest Sub-Regionally Competitive Project Applications. For the 2026 Coordinated Call for Projects (CCFP), the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) are responsible for evaluating and scoring their sub-region’s Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) project applications, and prioritizing and submitting a prioritized list of ranked projects valued at 120% of the RTPC formulaic share **By: Matt Kelly, Deputy Executive Director, Planning, Programs, and Policy.**

Attachment 6B.1 – Memo**Proposed RTPC TLC Scoring Schedule (all dates 2026)**

August 17	Applications Due
Late August	Screening of Applications for Eligibility & Program Fit
Early September	RTPCs Receive TLC Applications for Scoring
September/October	RTPC Application Evaluation Panels Score Projects
November	RTPC Boards Adopt Prioritized Project List
December 16	CCTA Adopts TLC Funding Program

7. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS (*Attachments* – No action required)

- TRANSPLAN Board Meeting Summary – June 11, 2026
- TRANSPAC Board Meeting Summary – July 9, 2026
- CCTA Board Meeting Summary - June 17, 2026

8. DISCUSSION Next Agenda & Meeting Date: September 7 , 2026**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The SWAT Committee will provide reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities planning to participate in SWAT monthly meetings. Please contact Chris Weeks at least 48 hours before the meeting at (925) 973-2547 or

cweeks@sanramon.ca.gov

Agendas, minutes, and other information regarding this committee can be found at: <https://swatcommittee.org/>

AGENDA ITEM 6.A



FISCAL YEAR 2026-27 (FY27)

TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR CLEAN AIR (TFCA)

Contra Costa TFCA 40% Fund Applications



Danielle Elkins, Deputy Executive Director
Nikki Foletta, Director of Programs
Contra Costa Transportation Authority





Agenda

- TFCA 40% Fund Overview
- FY27 Call for Projects Evaluation Process
- FY27 TFCA Applications, Funding Requests, & Preliminary Recommendations
- Next Steps
- Finish | Q&A

FY27 TFCA 40% Fund Overview

Policy adopted in spring 2024

The Authority Board approved the Contra Costa TFCA 40% Fund Policy on May 16, 2024

FY26-27 is the third TFCA 40% Fund Call for Projects cycle

The Call for Projects was released on April 30, 2026. Eligible sponsors were provided three (3) weeks to respond with applications

TFCA funds are allocated annually by Bay Area Air District

FY26-27 funds available for projects is \$2,075,475*

**After deducting 6.25% administrative costs*

**Includes subregional unspent rollover of \$402k.*

16 project proposals received by deadline with cumulative funding request for \$3,175,000

The total requested funds exceeded the available county FY27 TFCA 40% Fund allocation by \$1,099,525**

***53% oversubscribed*

FY27 Call for Projects Evaluation Process

Application Statistics

Total project proposals: **16**

- *Three (3) countywide*
- *Thirteen (13) subregional*

Total funds requested:
\$3,175,000

CCTA Staff Review

Projects evaluated with certain metrics:

- Submitted by eligible sponsor
- Application completeness
- Consistent with state law in category and vehicle emission reduction
- Consistent with Air District policies
- Cost-Effectiveness (CE) ratio below the maximum threshold for project type

Initial Feedback & Collaboration

CCTA staff have provided initial application and funding feedback to applicants & the Contra Costa TFCA Working Group

RTPCs are asked to review sub-regional requests in **July 2026**, refine scopes as needed to fit available sub-regional funding amounts and forward final recommendations to CCTA before **August 13, 2026**.

Countywide Project Applications

Countywide/Subregional	Name	Sponsor	Requested
Countywide	511 CCTA Countywide Brand + Countywide TDM Commute & School Incentives + Seasonal Programs	511 CCTA	\$ 785,425
Countywide	Countywide Vanpool Program	City of San Ramon	\$ 234,172
Countywide	Guaranteed Ride Home	WCCTAC	\$ 62,000
Countywide total requested			\$ 1,081,597
Contra Costa County TFCA funds available			\$ 2,075,475
Less FY24 rollover funds			\$ 401,953
Total subregional funds available			\$ 591,925

Countywide Project Applications – Proposed

Countywide/Subregional	Name	Sponsor	Requested
Countywide	511 CCTA Countywide Brand + Countywide TDM Commute & School Incentives + Seasonal Programs	511 CCTA	\$ 785,425
Countywide	Countywide Vanpool Program	City of San Ramon	\$ 234,172
Countywide total requested			\$ 1,019,597
Contra Costa County TFCA funds available			\$ 2,075,475
Less FY24 rollover funds			\$ 401,953
Total subregional funds available			\$ 653,925

Preliminary Recommendation(s)

1. Defer additional Guaranteed Ride Home funding to next cycle (FY28). Remaining FY25 and FY26 balances are deemed sufficient to continue funding program scope through FY27.

Contra Costa TFCA Formula Allocations

Subregion	Formula Benefit	Countywide Benefit	Subregional Benefit	FY24 Funds Rollover	Total
Central	30.7%	\$ 313,016	\$ 200,755	\$ 128,474	\$ 642,245
East	26.6%	\$ 271,213	\$ 173,944	\$ 109,441	\$ 554,598
Southwest	20.5%	\$ 209,017	\$ 134,055	\$ 164,038	\$ 507,110
West	22.0%	\$ 226,351	\$ 145,171	\$ -	\$ 371,522
Total					\$ 2,075,475

Southwest County (SWAT) Project Applications

Countywide/Subregional	Name	Sponsor	Requested
Subregional	Walk & Roll (SWAT)	CCTA	\$ 45,450
Subregional	Lamorinda School Bus Trip Reduction	City of Lafayette	\$ 104,000
Subregional	TRAFFIX School Bus Trip Reduction	City of San Ramon	\$ 95,000
Sub-regional total requested			\$ 244,450
Southwest County funds available (formula + FY24 rollover)			\$ 298,093
Balance			\$ 53,643

Preliminary Recommendation(s)

1. Approve funding sub-regional funding request.

Southwest County (SWAT) Project Applications – Alternative

Countywide/Subregional	Name	Sponsor	Requested
Subregional	Walk & Roll (SWAT)	CCTA	\$ 99,093
Subregional	Lamorinda School Bus Trip Reduction	City of Lafayette	\$ 104,000
Subregional	TRAFFIX School Bus Trip Reduction	City of San Ramon	\$ 95,000
Sub-regional total requested			\$ 298,093
Southwest County funds available (formula + FY24 rollover)			\$ 298,093
Balance			\$ -

Preliminary Recommendation(s)

1. Approve funding sub-regional funding request.

Next Step: RTPC Review & Final Recommendations

TRANSPAC

- TAC review – Jun. 30
- Board approval – Jul. 9

TRANSPLAN

- TAC review – Jul. 21
- Board approval – Aug. 12

SWAT

- TAC review – Jul. 15
- Board approval – Aug. 3

WCCTAC

- TAC review – Jul. 13
- Board approval – Jul. 24



CCTA

- PC review – Sep. 3
- Board approval – Sep. 16





Thank you!



AGENDA ITEM 6.B

MEMORANDUM

Date: July 1, 2026

To: West, Central, and Southwest Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC) Technical Advisory Committees (TACs)

From: Matt Kelly, Director, Planning

RE: Coordinated Call for Projects Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Cycle 3 Scoring Guidance for West, Central, and Southwest Sub-Regionally Competitive Project Applications

For the 2026 Coordinated Call for Projects (CCFP), the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) are responsible for evaluating and scoring their sub-region's Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) project applications, and prioritizing and submitting a prioritized list of ranked projects valued at 120% of the RTPC formulaic share (see table below).

Subregion	TLC Funding Share Target	TLC Nomination Amount from RTPC to Authority Board (120% of Funding Target)
West	\$14,403,000	\$17,283,600
Central	\$11,091,000	\$13,309,200
Southwest	\$7,619,000	\$9,142,800

The [CCFP program guidelines](#) contain a set of twelve (12) scoring criteria that have been established for the scoring of all applications for all programs. The criteria established for the CCFP has been vetted and updated since the TLC Cycle 2 and OBAG 3 call for projects to reflect current priorities through the discussions with the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC), the Countywide Vision Zero Working Group (CVZWG), and RTPCs, among other groups, and address new priorities from OBAG

Cycle 4. The table below is a summary of the criteria and weighing established for the CCFP.

Scoring Categories Summary and Assigned Weights (Maximum Points per Criterion for OBAG 4 County Program; sub-regionally competitive TLC and countywide competitive PBTF (Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities) may each use alternate values for weightings than the CCFP’s countywide and regionally competitive grant applications).

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

For the scoring of TLC grant applications, the RTPCs have the option to assign alternate weights (scoring maximums) for each of the criterion to reflect local (sub-regional) priorities. The following general guidance is provided for the sub-regional TLC scoring:

- All scoring is out of a total of 75 points per grant application. Weightings for individual criterion can be adjusted up or down but the total needs to add to 75;
- Weighting should be in whole numbers (no half or partial points);
- Each criterion should have a weighting of at least 1 (no zero-ing out of individual criterion);
- Criteria may be grouped differently, but not combined. Similar criteria may be grouped by theme for ease of scoring, but each criterion must be preserved with at least the minimum weight of one (1);
- Each criterion contains representative sub-criteria and proposed scoring ranges for review and consideration by application evaluators. These sub-criteria may be prioritized as deemed sub-regionally appropriate.

Scoring Categories Detail and Assigned Weights

The following is a list of the twelve (12) TLC scoring criteria. Each criterion contains a set of sub-criteria that reflect the goals and objectives of the criterion, as well as a suggested scoring range for consideration during the application evaluation.

Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
<u>Criterion 1 of 12: Vision Zero Safety and Injury Prevention</u> e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #1 – 2, 15. ☐ To which Level-of-Traffic-Stress (1 through 4) will the final scope implement a transformative segment that is part of a future safer, more contiguous countywide Low-Traffic-Stress Network (mainly Class I bicycle facilities) for all ages & abilities? ☐ Extent to which the systemic / Safe Systems approach is integrated into the final scope? e.g., a specific collision type addressed in multiple locations via careful site selection/planning. ☐ Proportion (%) by which the final project scope will reduce each segment’s maximum potential Speed (observed/actual instead of “posted speed limit”) of vehicles? Through new bulbouts & curb extensions? ☐ To which extent (% and \$) will the (cost and) severity of each potential collision be reduced by way of kinetic energy transfer that will result from the project? By which percentage will the \$1.3-billion annual county-	<u>20 max points.</u> 0–5 = minimal safety improvement that would demonstrably effectively eliminate fatal & severe injuries in most scenarios; or not on a High-Injury Network; LTS 3-4 6–10 = moderate reduction of risk of severe crash/injury; on a Local HIN; LTS 2—3	

Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
wide socioeconomic cost of fatal & severe injuries (\$1,151 per resident), or subregion, be estimated to improve? ☐ Will the final project scope add a new roundabout? Type? ☐ To which extent (% and \$) will the individual & regional economic costs (2026) per incident (e.g., including repair/recovery) be reduced by the proposal? (e.g., refer to MTC “BayViz” regional safety data webtool for local analysis here & regional HIN) ☐ To which extent will the cumulative “Plan Countermeasures” (e.g., Leading Pedestrian Interval) be effective after the final project scope is completed, to move toward Countywide Vision Zero? (e.g., refer to MTC “BayViz”) ☐ Which of the Livable Streets Policy / Playbook (e.g., Five-Star Projects & Transformative Visions) vs. Countywide Vision Zero toolbox actions are included in the proposal? ☐ Is an Entertainment Zone adopted in the public right-of-way including a (bicycling/rolling &) pedestrian priority area? i.e., place for farmer’s market, school or extracurricular activity, or street events/activities safe & physically separated from vehicles? ☐ Is the proposal located along or within a particular proximity of a High-Injury Network (HIN) corridor, emergency evacuation route, and/or a subregional Action Plan-designated Regional Route of Significance? (latest) ☐ Quantifies the estimated reduction in severity of each collision. Which of the Caltrans (or FHWA) “proven countermeasure(s)” or “crash modification/reduction factor(s)” (here; explained here) will be included in the final scope to reduce maximum potential vehicle Speed during construction and future operation? ☐ How has the City committed to using the speed reduction law? (Assembly Bill 43)	<u>11–20</u> = LTS-1; significant reduction of exposure to & risk of severe crash/injury; on a Regional or Countywide HIN; locally adopted timeline to eliminate fatal & severe injuries & locally adopted jurisdiction-wide Vision Zero Policy (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation or Technical Assistance)	

Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
☐ Which of the Common Countywide Collision Pattern(s) from December 2024-adopted CCTSAP fatal & severe injury collision (2013 – 2022 and 2008 – 2017) data, jurisdiction-wide per-capita, will be eliminated or reduced as a result of the final implementation scope? ○ Excessive Unsafe Speeding (considering conditions) ○ Driving under the Influence ○ Contraflow bike riding ○ Seniors (vulnerable population) ○ Youth (vulnerable population) ○ Highway interchange(s) ○ Trail/Street crossing(s) ○ Channelized right turn slip-lanes ○ Skewed intersection(s) ○ Unprotected left turns at signal ○ Red light violation ☐ Will the final scope significantly reduce bicycling or pedestrian jurisdiction-wide per-capita fatal and/or severe injuries? ☐ How will the final scope improve the pavement condition index (PCI) on an off-street trail or pedestrian/walkway and maintain the condition of public (transit) assets in a state of good repair? ☐ To which extent has and/or will the proposal address the topics above?		
Criterion 2 of 12: Public Health e.g., refer to responses for Application Form #1 – 4, 15. ☐ To which extent (tools here) will the final scope reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and air pollution? ☐ Number of trees (excluding plants/shrubs) that will be added (excluding number to be retained) in the final scope to address climate adaptation, equity (MTC EPCs & Caltrans EQI), low maintenance, carbon sequestration, regenerative/regeneration, shade coverage, and reduce the urban heat island effect and increasing average temperatures vs. Tree Equity Score here.	6 max points. <u>0–1</u> = minimal <u>2–4</u> = moderate (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation or EV Blueprint or Technical Assistance) <u>5–6</u> = significant	

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Scoring Range</u>	<u>Points Assigned</u>
☐ To which extent will the final scope enhance to bicycling/pedestrian “trail standards” the conditions of easements, driveways, paths, streets, and roads intended for maintenance access? ☐ To which extent will the final scope improve Public Health? e.g., physical health and mental health at the individual level. ☐ Has a qualified Public Health professional committed in writing to any amount of participation in design and construction scope development/review, ongoing operation, etc.? ☐ To which extent has and/or will the program address the topics above?		
<u>Criterion 3 of 12: Total Project Cost and Funding Match Percentage from Applicant</u> e.g., refer to response to Application Form #12 - 14 & Funding Plan. ☐ To which extent/percentage will funds be leveraged from other non-grant program fund-related sources that already are, or will be, committed to the final scope and secured by the applicant? (eligible to count toward match: applicants, co-sponsors, other cities/towns/districts, and project sponsors’ contributions and all other fund sources excluding Measure J) How-To Resources from FHWA here , including Training May 24-25, 2022	8 max points. 8 = 60% match 7 = 50% match 6 = 40% match 4 = 30% match 2 = 20% match 0 = 11.47% match (of total project cost)	
<u>Criterion 4 of 12: Safe System Approach Bundled Projects</u> e.g., refer to response to Application Form #1 – 4, 15. ☐ Explains any Collaborative Governance and extent to which the Project Sponsor will partner with a different (or smaller or more resource-limited) jurisdiction that is optionally designated an Equity Priority Community (MTC EPC and Caltrans EQI) or limited-staff govern-	4 max points. 0 = minimal 1–2 = moderate 3–4 = significant (each range above applies also to a Tech-	

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Scoring Range</u>	<u>Points Assigned</u>
ment, and the percentage of the final scope that will be in each jurisdiction that is within an EPC. ☐ Describes an existing or proposed partnership across departments and across agencies, e.g., County Public Health (CCH) or non-profit, non-governmental organization, park district, canal water public right-of-way (PROW) or flood control channel district, utility provider, or an application with multiple proposed protected intersections at locations in multiple jurisdictions, for example. ☐ Will the project adequately improve Safety (eliminate fatal & severe injuries) for pedestrians & people bicycling/rolling at or near a Trail Crossing with collaborative participation from a City/County/District jurisdiction and East Bay Regional Park District? (EBRPD) ☐ Will the proposal include (partially or fully privately funded) construction of fiberoptic broadband communications infrastructure in addition to scope for transportation/streetscape?	nical Assistance or Student Transportation or TDM or SRTS-NI program, e.g., multiple geographic locations across school districts or other jurisdiction boundaries)	
<u>Criterion 5 of 12: Grant Deliverability, Sponsor Readiness, and Overall Implementation Feasibility</u> e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #7 - 11. ☐ Quantified \$ amount and FY extent to which the applicant has committed annual operations & maintenance, repair, and lifecycle replacement costs after initial construction? e.g., At which frequency is the jurisdiction proposing to commit to maintenance of the new or improved facility, such as sweeping? (e.g., for safety) ☐ Which issues could arise before project implementation? ☐ Has a single jurisdiction committed as lead agency to ensuring complete implementation of the final scope across multiple jurisdictions?	8 max points. 0 = Design is less than 35% complete at application submittal. 1–2 = minimal additional Design is necessary & minimal environmental review documentation timeline, e.g., not eligible for SB-71. 3–5 = moderate: Design is less than 65% com-	

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

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

Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
○ Seniors ○ Youth, children ☐ To which extent will the final scope reduce congestion or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in an urbanized area? ☐ To which extent are any groups of people under-represented in the available data? SWITRS: race data for people involved in a crash are typically reported only based on an officer's anecdotal observation, assumption, or best guess. ☐ Will the final scope improve access to jobs, or the reliability of, <u>Freight/Goods Movement by cargo bicycle, electric bicycle, and improve Economic Access/Vitality?</u>		
<u>Criterion 8 of 12: Latent Demand</u> e.g., refer to response to Application Form #1 - 4. ☐ Will the final scope be likely to encourage more people to use pedestrian, bicycling, or rolling trips? e.g., greater population density, employment density, mix of land uses, percentage of low- or zero-vehicle ownership households, location in an Equity Priority Community (EPC), or relative lack of on-street & off-street vehicle parking. ☐ Will the final scope be located within an Equity Priority Community (EPC map here) in Plan Bay Area? ☐ To which extent has and/or will the Programmatic application address the topics above, and historically underserved community groups?	<u>2 max points.</u> 0 = (unknown, not estimated, or) minimal 1 = moderate 2 = significant	
<u>Criterion 9 of 12: Public Engagement and Community Outreach, & Policy Support</u> e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #5 - 6. ☐ Is the proposal part of the future low-stress network or otherwise included in the adopted Countywide Bicy-	<u>3 max points.</u> 0 = (unknown, none or) minimal 1 = moderate 2-3 = significant, or (partially or	

Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
cle and Pedestrian Plan’s future network and project list? ☐ Is the proposal in a locally adopted plan, Caltrans, MTC, Bay Area Air District (formerly BAAQMD), Contra Costa Health (e.g., public health), AARP Livable Communities Plan, League of American Bicyclists’ evaluation or metrics for Bike-Friendly City (or businesses’) designation, and/or not yet formally submitted to CCTA for consideration at the countywide level for inclusion in a CBPP update? ☐ Will the final scope include Safe System Approach bundled or similar projects across jurisdictions with multiple participating organizations? e.g., utilities, Bike East Bay. ☐ Does the jurisdiction(s) have a locally adopted Policy Resolution that adopted a per-resident jurisdiction-wide Vision Zero timeline to eliminate fatal and severe injuries (first) of pedestrians and people bicycling, that includes a Safe Systems approach that is both proactive/systemic and reactive (collision analysis) and prioritizes Safety before Speed, and an emphasis on planning for people (not vehicles); and prioritizes the safe movement of people, especially vulnerable road users (including seniors & youth). ☐ To which month/year/date, and at which URL/link, does the jurisdiction publicly state a commitment to eliminate jurisdiction-wide per-capita fatal and severe injuries? ☐ Does the jurisdiction’s locally adopted Policy Resolution explicitly require that staff and each project prioritize Safety before Speed and integrate model language from the countywide template here? ☐ Which adopted plan(s), adoption (and revision or amendment/enhancement) dates, and ranked project lists, included the proposal? ☐ Which Design Guidelines and standards documents were used for each component of the proposal? (here)	maximum points if entirely) Quick-Build method/materials or demonstration activities that would serve as engagement and support-building (up to 3 if a policy was locally adopted consistent with Countywide Vision Zero)	

Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
☐ Is the proposal consistent with any specific policies in the adopted General Plan? ☐ CCTA Countywide Pedestrian Needs Assessment? (CPNA) ☐ MTC Complete Streets Policy? ☐ Caltrans Complete Streets Policy? (DIB-94) ☐ Caltrans Safe Systems approach? (e.g., land use) ☐ From which organization(s) and signatories, including elected and appointed representatives, and residents & members of the traveling public, has the applicant provided a Letter of Support?		
<u>Criterion 10 of 12: Alignment with Regional Policy and Objectives</u> e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #1 - 4. ☐ Is the application/project able to be scalable & replicated by a jurisdiction(s) in other counties or transit agencies? ☐ Is the proposal in a Community-Based Transportation Plan? Housing Policies' Compliance With Regional & State Law, Policy & Programs ☐ Does the application include documentation that the involved jurisdiction is an approved member of the California Housing and Community Development (HCD) Department's Prohousing Designation Program?, describe how local policies align with or exceed criteria. https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-research/prohousing	6 max points. 0-1 = minimal 2-3 = moderate 4-6 = significant, e.g., project identified in a CBTP (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation or Technical assistance)	

Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
☐ Quantify numerically and in percentage growth of housing supply, per type/size (e.g., number of units by number of bedrooms before-&-after scenarios), & describe jurisdictional relationship to a specified number or range of future (and entitled) housing options. Example: $(\text{New} - \text{Old}) / \text{Old} = \% \text{ change per cycle \& years.}$ Housing Anti-Displacement Policies ☐ Which local housing policies have the jurisdiction [in which the final scope will be entirely (or mostly) located in], adopted – that effectively limit or prevent the displacement of (specify which) vulnerable populations? ☐ Explain why they are effective within the context of the jurisdiction. ☐ The application addresses the potential for the project to support existing, planned (General Plan), entitled, and/or permitted housing options, especially below-market-rate residential uses, and how the project will advance state, regional, countywide, and local transportation, growth management, and land-use goals.		
Criterion 11 of 12: Prioritizing Public Space e.g., refer to responses to Application Form #1 - 4. ☐ To which extent (percentage vs. amount) will the final scope Right-Size the amount of available Vehicle Parking and Parking Density within the public right-of-way? ☐ Which techniques/technologies will be used (e.g., to provide demand-based pricing of vehicle parking) within the public right-of-way to maximize public benefit from this public asset? ☐ Which policies from MTC’s Vehicle Parking Policy Play-book (or resources here & here) have been adopted to reform the local agency’s (municipal) code or let the market forces lead? e.g., zoning code adopted vehicle	<u>2 max points.</u> 0 = Unknown or None or Minimal 1 = Moderate 2 = Significant (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation or Technical Assistance)	

Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
parking maximums or removed 'provision of parking' mandatory minimum ratio(s). ☐ Walkway/bikeway proximity to, and relationship to (separated, protected, etc.) on-street or off-street vehicle parking (which can affect Level of Traffic Stress) ☐ Has the jurisdiction planned, designated, adopted, and implemented a vehicle-free commercial central area(s) that prioritizes pedestrian activity and livability? Which dimensions and location? ☐ Is an Entertainment Zone adopted in the public right-of-way including a (bicycling/rolling &) pedestrian priority area? i.e., place for farmers' market, school or extracurricular activity, or street events/activities safe & physically separated from vehicles. ☐ How many of each type (e.g., covered, secured, adaptive, recumbent, family- & cargo-sized) bicycle parking spaces will be added? Provide all existing, proposed, and net new dimensions. Serpentine & grid racks are ineligible. From which page is the proposal in APBP Bike Parking Guide's 3rd Edition? ☐ To which extent has and/or will the Programmatic application address the topics above? (select the moderate points range)		
Criterion 12 of 12: Increase or Sustain Transit Ridership e.g., refer to response to Application Form #1 - 4. ☐ Extent to which the implementation will address customer travel experience and increase or sustain the use (rider retention) of public transit? e.g., rail transit station, transit (e.g., bus or vehicle) stop, shelter (shade coverage for hotter weather, using Shade-MapApp and/or Shadow Map), regional or countywide (shared) mobility hub, bicycle parking spaces, storage/bike racks, or covered and secured mobility device storage (short-term and longer-term) and electric charging.	<u>2 max points.</u> 0 = Unknown or minimal potential 1 = moderate; bus 2 = significant; rail (*or* a program, e.g., SRTS-NI or TDM or Student Transportation	

Criterion	Scoring Range	Points Assigned
☐ Maximum points only if the jurisdiction committed in writing to adopting a Transit First Policy by July 31, 2027, including the language from MTC’s template (“Guidance on Optional Local Transit Priority Resolution or Policy”) for local agencies. ☐ Which percentage of the final scope (geographic & funding) will be located within a CBPP -designated Pedestrian Priority Area? (PPA) ☐ To which extent will universal design & accessibility be improved beyond standard ADA compliance? To which percentage of partial completion would the local ADA Transition Plan become? ☐ To which extent will the final scope be located within two miles (or 15 minutes of travel time) of a Transit-Oriented Community? (TOC)	or Technical Assistance)	

Proposed RTPC TLC Scoring Schedule (all dates 2026)

August 17	Applications Due
Late August	Screening of Applications for Eligibility & Program Fit
Early September	RTPCs Receive TLC Applications for Scoring
September/October	RTPC Application Evaluation Panels Score Projects
November	RTPC Boards Adopt Prioritized Project List
December 16	CCTA Adopts TLC Funding Program

AGENDA ITEM 7

TRANSPLAN COMMITTEE

EAST COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Antioch • Brentwood • Oakley • Pittsburg • Contra Costa County
30 Muir Road, Martinez, CA 94553

June 23, 2026

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

Dear Mr. Haile:

The TRANSPLAN Committee undertook the following activities during its meeting on June 11, 2026:

1. Appointed the following TRANSPLAN representatives to the CCTA Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee:
 - a. Primary TRANSPLAN Representative: Khristin Labao (Pittsburg)
 - b. Alternate TRANSPLAN Representative: Kirsten Riker (511 Contra Costa)
 - c. Citizen TRANSPLAN Representative: Bruce "Ole" Ohlson
2. Appointed the following TRANSPLAN representatives to the CCTA Technical Coordinating Committee:
 - a. Primary TRANSPLAN Representative: Habibullah Habib (Oakley)
 - b. Alternate TRANSPLAN Representative: Billilee Saengchalern (Oakley)
3. Adopted the TRANSPLAN Fiscal Year 2026/27 Budget and Work Program.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 925-655-2918 or robert.sarmiento@dcd.cccounty.us.

Sincerely,



Robert Sarmiento
TRANSPLAN Staff

c: TRANSPLAN Committee	M. Todd, TRANSPAC	M. Kelly, CCTA
S. Fajeau, TVTC	J. Nemeth, WCCTAC	T. Grover, CCTA
C. Weeks, SWAT	D. Elkins, CCTA	TRANSPLAN TAC

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

July 14, 2026

Timothy Haile
Executive Director
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

RE: Status Letter for TRANSPAC Meeting – July 9, 2026

Dear Mr. Haile:

The TRANSPAC Committee met on July 9, 2026. The following is a summary of the meeting and action items:

1. The Board adopted the CCTA scoring criteria for Central County Measure J TLC Cycle 3 applications.
2. The Board approved the programming of \$329,229 in TFCA subregional funds to support the Walk & Roll school trip reduction program in Central County for FY 2026/27, including expansion to additional schools within the TRANSPAC subregion.
3. The Board received information regarding Measure J Transportation Expenditure Plan Discussion from the CCTA Executive Director.

Please contact me at (925)-937-0980, or email at matt@graybowenscott.com if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

Matt Todd

Matt Todd
Managing Director

cc: TRANSPAC Representatives; TRANSPAC TAC and staff
Danielle Elkins and Matt Kelly, CCTA Staff
Robert Sarmiento, TRANSPLAN; Susannah Meyer, Chair, TRANSPLAN
Chris Weeks, SWAT; Mark Armstrong, Chair, SWAT
John Nemeth, WCCTAC; Cameron Sasai, Chair, WCCTAC
Tarienne Grover, CCTA Staff
Lyone Conner, Ethan Bindernagel, City of Pleasant Hill

COMMISSIONERS

Darlene Gee, Chair
Sue Noack, Vice Chair
Mark Armstrong
Newell Americh
Juan Banales
Diane Burgis
Ken Carlson
Chris Kelley
Aaron Meadows
Carlyn Obringer
Rita Xavier

Timothy Haile,
Executive Director

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

MEMORANDUM

To: Matt Todd, TRANSPAC
Chris Weeks, SWAT
Robert Sarmiento, TRANSPLAN
Diane Friedmann, TVTC
John Nemeth, WCCTAC
Nate Levine, LPMC
 for
From: Timothy Haile, Executive Director
Date: July 6, 2026
Re: Items of interest for circulation to the Regional Transportation Planning
Committees (RTPCs)

At its June 17, 2026 meeting, the Authority Board discussed and approved the following agenda item recommendations, which may be of interest to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees:

- A.** *The Authority Board approved Resolution 26-19-P, designating State Route 4 Bypass Authority as the implementing agency for Regional Measure 3 funds for the Vasco Road Safety Improvements – Phase 2 Project.*
- B.** *The Authority Board authorized the Chair to execute Amendment No. 5 to Agreement No. 530 with WSP USA, Inc. in the amount of \$857,457, which includes \$60,000 in contingency, for a new total agreement value of \$14,427,038, to provide additional design services for coordinated adaptive ramp metering and program support for the Innovate 680 (Project 8009), and allow the Executive Director or designee to make any non-substantive changes to the language.*
- C.** *The Authority Board authorized staff to issue Request for Proposals No. 26-3 to obtain proposals from firms interested in providing the Authority with state legislative advocacy services and allow the Executive Director or designee to make any non-substantive changes to the language.*

-
- D.** *The Authority Board approved Resolution 26-24-P, authorizing the Executive Director or designee to enter into agreements and execute purchase orders in a total amount of \$10,033,388 to procure the Authority-furnished equipment and software necessary to advance the construction phase of the Countywide Smart Signals (Project 31000), contingent upon successful obligation of the grant funds and receipt of an Authorization to Proceed (E-76) from the California Department of Transportation; and authorize the Executive Director or designee to shift funds between procurement allotment categories as long as the total expenditures do not exceed the total amount for the Authority-furnished equipment and software procurement allotment.*
- E.** *The Authority Board authorized staff to execute Amendment No. 2 to Agreement No. 569 with StreetLight Data for a Countywide Multimodal Regional License (Multi-Domain License) for a second and final one-year term option for Fiscal Year (FY) 2026-27, execute Amendment No. 6 to the Memorandum of Understanding No. 80.09.02 between the Authority and each jurisdiction participating in the StreetLight Data Multi-Domain License cost-share for FY 2026-27, and authorize the Executive Director or designee to make any non-substantive changes to the language.*
- F.** *The Authority Board approved Resolution 26-18-A, adopting the Authority's FY 2026-27 budget following a public hearing on June 17, 2026. The proposed budget calls for funding appropriations totaling \$260.4 million for projects, congestion management, planning, programs, administration, and debt service necessary as required for Authority operations, capital improvements, and programmed activities planned from July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027.*
- G.** *The Authority Board approved Resolution 26-20-P, authorizing to commit matching funds for upcoming senate bill funding applications for the Interstate 80 San Pablo Dam Road Interchange – Phase II (Project 7002), to exchange \$7.5 million in State Transportation Improvement Program funds from the State Route 4 Eastbound Operational Improvement Project (Project 6006), authorize the Chair to execute Agreement No. 761 to facilitate a fund exchange of \$8.3 million in Measure J funds with the Pacheco Boulevard Realignment and Widening Project (Project 24003), and authorize the Executive Director or designee to make any non-substantive changes to the language.*
- H.** *The Authority Board approved Resolution 26-25-P, authorizing the Executive Director or designee to 1) approve the Richmond Street Complete Streets Improvements, (Project 31004) for design in accordance with Government Code Section 830.6 to preserve design immunity; 2) publicly advertise the construction contract for the Project at the Executive Director or designee's discretion, contingent upon successful obligation of the grant funds and receipt of an Authorization to Proceed from the Federal Highway Administration; 3) approve changes and issue addenda to the bidding documents during the advertisement period; and 4) publicly open all bids received.*

- I. *The Authority Board approved for staff to release the proposed Coordinated Call for Projects covering the fourth cycle of the One Bay Area Grant, Community Action Resource and Empowerment, the third cycle of Measure J Transportation for Livable Communities and Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities, and Transportation Fund for Clean Air Additional funding programs.*
- J. *The Authority Board approved the draft Contra Costa Countywide Community-Based Transportation Plan. The draft will be available for public comment through July 31, 2026, and will be finalized in Fall 2026.*

***To view the full meeting packet with additional agenda item information, please visit our meetings webpage [here](#). Attachments to the Authority Board packet can be found in the Administration and Projects Committee and Planning Committee packets, as referenced in the staff report.**