



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

DATE & TIME: Thursday, April 10, 2014, 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

LOCATION: City of San Pablo, Council Chambers
13831 San Pablo Avenue (at Church Lane)
San Pablo, California (Accessible by AC Transit #72 and #72R)

1. **Call to Order and Self-Introductions**
2. **Public Comment.** The public is welcome to address the TAC on any item that is not listed on the agenda. *Please fill out a speaker card and hand it to staff.*
3. **Minutes & Sign-In Sheet from March 13th meeting.** (Attachments – APPROVE)

AGENDA ITEMS

4. **Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) West County Representative.** (WCCTAC Staff; Attachments; Action: Recommend a West County Citizen Representative and a West County Staff Representative to the Countywide Bike-Pedestrian Advisory Committee). WCCTAC can appoint one staff representative to the CBPAC and one citizen representative. Staff is asking the TAC members to make a formal recommendation for approval by the WCCTAC Board.
5. **I-80 Integrated Corridor Management Project.** (ACTC Staff, Caltrans and consultants; No Attachments; Action: None). Update on activity and progress of the I-80 ICM project.
6. **High Occupancy Transit Corridor Study.** (WCCTAC Staff; Attachments; Action: Review and Comment). At the January 31, 2014 meeting, the WCCTAC Board directed staff to work with transit operators and others to draft a scope for a high occupancy transit corridor study in West County. A staff report and a draft outline are attached for review and discussion.

El Cerrito

Hercules

Pinole

Richmond

San Pablo

Contra Costa
County

AC Transit

BART

WestCAT

7. **TDM Draft Ordinance and Resolution.** *(WCCTAC Staff; Attachments; Action: Review and comment).* Each member agency has been contacted and asked to review the Draft Model TSM/TDM Ordinance and Resolution. Comments are due to Danelle Carey, TDM Program Manager by May 1, 2014. Staff will also update the TAC on Bike to Work Day and on related TDM activities.
8. **Active Transportation Program Applications.** *(WCCTAC Staff; Attachments; Action: Discussion for the benefit of the TAC members).* At the previous meeting, TAC members requested a group discussion of possible ATP applications to consider coordination and to determine the best approach for obtaining an award/s in West County. <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/index.html>
9. **TAC & Staff Member Comments and Announcements**
 - a. **TCC Update**
 - b. **CCTA Planning Committee Items – CC-TLC funds and Call for Projects**
 - c. **Mobility Management Plan – Board comments and next steps**
 - d. **DRAFT Acronym List Update**
10. **Other Business**
11. **Upcoming meetings:**
 - a. Board – Friday, April 25, 2104, 7:45 a.m.
 - b. TAC – Thursday, May 8, 2014, 9:00 am

-
- In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, if you need special assistance to participate in the WCCTAC Board meeting, or if you need a copy of the agenda and/or agenda packet materials in an alternative format, please contact Valerie Jenkins at 510.215.3217 prior to the meeting.
 - If you have special transportation requirements and would like to attend the meeting, please call the phone number above at least 48 hours in advance to make arrangements.
 - Handouts provided at the meeting are available upon request and may also be viewed at WCCTAC's offices.
 - Please refrain from wearing scented products to the meeting, as there may be attendees susceptible to environmental illnesses. Please also put cellular phones on silent mode during the meeting.
 - A meeting sign-in sheet will be circulated at the meeting. Sign-in is optional.



Minutes of March 13, 2014 WCCTAC-TAC Meeting

1. **Self-Introductions:** (see attached sign-in sheet)
2. **Public Comment:** None
3. **Minutes and Sign In Sheets: March 13, 2014** - Adopted with one abstention from City of San Pablo, Michele Rodriguez. Staff was asked to clarify the TDM item with language provided from Linda Young.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

4. Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Nominations.

Action: Chad Smalley from the City of Richmond and Michele Rodriguez from the City of San Pablo were nominated to the TCC. Lori Reese-Brown from the City of Richmond was selected as an alternate.

Discussion: TAC members agreed that the TCC membership should represent both planning and engineering expertise.

5. Paratransit Coordinating Committee.

Action: None

Discussion: Joanna Pallock handed out information on the PCC application process and directed members to send CCTA the names of any interested parties from the community.

6. Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC).

Action: None

Discussion: TAC members were asked to seek out interested citizens to represent West County on the CBPAC whose meetings are held roughly four times per year at CCTA's offices. Nominations will be put forth at the April TAC meeting.

7. West County Action Plan.

Action: The Action Plan was forwarded to the March 28, 2014 Board meeting.

Discussion: Julie Morgan from Fehr and Peers presented the Draft Action Plan for final comments before it went to the Board. It will return after it is incorporated into the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and an EIR is created as part of the CTP process. Alameda and Solano as well as Marin County were added to Action Item #47.

8. Safe Routes to School Needs Assessment Study.

Action: Review and forward comments to the Board.

Discussion: Julie Morgan from Fehr and Peers presented the study. TAC members asked questions and commented. One comment involved a concern that the list is unconstrained and that it might be beneficial for priorities to be spelled out. Other concerns surrounded the ability (or challenge) to implement all the items on the list. There was also a suggestion to focus on Safe Routes *from* School, which is also concern.

9. Mobility Management Plan.

Action: TAC members provided feedback for consideration by the WCCTAC Board. TAC members were also given the opportunity to provide written comments for the March 28th Board packet.

Discussion: The TAC members discussed the MMP and each TAC representative gave their agency's feedback. There were a number of comments and some of the key points included:

- There was broad confusion about whether the MMP was a “visioning document” as articulated by its presenters, or whether it was supposed to be the planning template for Contra Costa County to follow.
- One recommendation was to re-title the Plan a “Background Report” rather than calling it a “Plan” and viewing as a concept for consideration.
- Some TAC members suggested that the formation of a new Oversight Committee is redundant and that its functions can be carried out within the existing Paratransit Coordinating Committee. They also noted that the proposed Oversight Board does not include consumers, while the PCC does.
- Some concerns were raised over the costs of a new governing entity. One suggestion was that it might be preferable for CCTA hire a Mobility Manger.
- One TAC member noted that mobility management and coordination is already occurring but the MMP does not recognize those existing efforts.
- There was widespread support for the general concept of mobility management and for the idea of improving coordination among providers of services for seniors and the disabled.
- Transit agencies noted that they struggle financially to meet the growing demand for paratransit services and that rising costs can result in cuts to fixed-route services.

10. I-80 ICM Project.

No staff were present to report on item – will be brought back in April

11. TAC & Staff Member Comments and Announcements

- **ATP Workshop:** TAC members asked if WCCTAC staff could coordinate an ATP application discussion at the April meeting to see who is applying and where collaborations could be made.
- **TIGER GRANT Cycle 6:** Suggestions on coordination for Cycle 7 were made. Cycle 6 is already underway and Richmond may be submitting an application.

- **San Pablo Paratransit Efforts:** Greg Dwyer, City of San Pablo Community Services Manager, gave an update on new efforts to enhance the City's Paratransit program.

12. Other Business – none

This Page Intentionally Blank

WCCTAC Technical Advisory Committee Meeting: March 13, 2014

NAME	INITIALS	AGENCY	EMAIL	PHONE
Amin AbuAmara		CCTA	aabuamara@ccta.net	925-256.4740
Ray Akkawi		ACTC	rakkawi@alamedactc.org	510.208.7424
Dean Allison		Pinole	dallison@ci.pinole.ca.us	510.724.9010
Erik Alm		Caltrans	erik_alm@dot.ca.gov	510.286.6053
Aleida Andrino-Chavez		Albany	achavez@albanyca.org	510.528.5759
Danelle Carey	DC			
Brad Beck		CCTA	bbeck@ccta.net	925.256.4726
Wil Buller		AC Transit	wbuller@actransit.org	510.891.5414
Dave Campbell		EBBC	dcampbel@lmi.net	510.701.5971
Julie Campero		Caltrans	jcampero@dot.ca.gov Delete	510.622.5905
John McKenzie	JM	Caltrans	john.mckenzie@dot.ca.gov	510.286.5550
Jim Cunradi		AC Transit	jcunradi@actransit.org	510.891.4841
Robert Del Rosario		AC Transit	rdelrosa@actransit.org	510.891.4734
Randy Durrenberger		Kimley-Horn	randy.durrenberger@kimley-horn.com	510.350.0230
Peter Engel		CCTA	pengel@ccta.net	925.256.4741
Martin Engelmann		CCTA	mre@ccta.net	925.256.4729
Jack Hall		CCTA	jhall@ccta.net	925.256.4743
Deidre Heitman		BART	dheitma@bart.gov	510.287.4796
John Hemiup		ACTC	jhemiup@alamedactc.org	510.208.7414
Adèle Ho		San Pablo	adeleh@sanpabloca.gov	510.215.3068
Farid Javandel		Berkeley	fjavandel@ci.berkeley.ca.us	510.981.7010
Maurice Kaufman		Emeryville	mkaufman@ci.emeryville.ca.us	510.596.4334
Matt Kelly	MK	CCTA	mkelly@ccta.net	925.256.4730
Hamid Mostowfi		Berkeley	hmostowfi@ci.berkeley.ca.us	510.981.6403
Raj Murthy		ACTC	rmurthy@alamedactc.org	510.208.7470
John Nemeth		WCCTAC	john@sanpabloca.gov	510.215.3221
Nathan Landow	NL	AC Transit		
Stephen Newhouse		AC Transit	snewhouse@actransit.org	510.891.4867
Hisham Noeimi		CCTA	hnoeimi@ccta.net	925.256.4731
Yvetteh Ortiz		El Cerrito	yortiz@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us	510.215.4345
Joanna Pallock		WCCTAC	joannap@sanpabloca.gov	510.215.3035
Bill Pinkham		EBBC (E. Bay)	bpinkham@gmail.com	510.734.8532
Coire Reilly		CCHS	coire.reilly@hsd.cccounty.us	925.313.6252
Michele Rodriguez		San Pablo	michelr@sanpabloca.gov	510.215.3031
Winston Rhodes		Pinole	wrhodes@ci.pinole.ca.us	510.724.9832
Hector Rojas		Richmond	hector_rojas@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.620.6662
Robert Sarmiento	RS	CCC CD	robert.sarmiento@dcd.cccounty.us	925.674.7822
Chad Smalley		Richmond	chadrick_smalley@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.412.2067
Jamar Stamps		CCC CD	jstam@cd.cccounty.us	925.335.1220
Steven Tam		Richmond	steven_tam@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.307.8091
Robert Thompson	RT	WestCAT	rob@westcat.org	510.724.3331
Lina Velasco		Richmond	lina_velasco@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.620.6841
Wladimir Wlassowsky		Oakland	wwlassowsky@oaklandnet.com	510.238.6383
Linda Young	LY	WCCTAC	linday@sanpabloca.gov	510.215.3008
John Xu		Caltrans	Zhougping.xu@dot.ca.gov	510.286.5577
Sam Casas	SC	Richmond	samuel_casas@ci.richmond.ca.us	510-621-1258

Adrienne Harris

- I am an avid bicyclist.
- I was the founding chair of the Richmond Bicycle / Pedestrian Advisory Committee (RBPAC) and served as chair for three years. Thanks to the participation of the RBPAC, the Richmond City Council adopted its first Bicycle Master Plan as well as a Pedestrian Plan on November 1, 2011.
- I have been a resident of Richmond for 25 years.
- I hold a BA in Computer Science from UC Berkeley ('86), and worked in a technical capacity as a software engineer and as a release engineer for 16 years..
- I have served on a number of committees in Richmond., and I am currently a member of the Richmond Livable Corridors Project Advisory Committee Meeting
- I am a former member of the Richmond Recreation and Parks Commission.
- I served as an elected member of the school board from 1995-1999.
- I currently work in the local high schools as a substitute teacher in secondary math.

The RBPAC has set a new standard in outreach and communication among stakeholders in the city of Richmond. Through our website www.richmondbpac.org and Facebook page Richmond BPAC, both of which I manage and maintain, we serve as a *de facto* clearinghouse of information for the public. Should you choose to appoint me, I will insure a high level of communication between cyclists and WCCTAC.

Bill Pinkham

- Bike East Bay (formerly the East Bay Bicycle Coalition), Board of Directors
- Current West County appointee on the WCCTAC BPAC
- Contra Costa County Bicycle Advisory Committee (TDA grants)
- Richmond Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Vice Chair
- 350 Bay Area, Steering Committee
- SunFlower Alliance (recently formed coalition of environmental groups), Coordinating Council
- Education: Jurassic Era B.A. in Philosophy and English Literature

I believe I have a fair sensitivity to issues seniors might have with transportation, since I'm a codger myself. I bike almost every day, and because I'm a frequent BART rider, that senior discount comes in handy for a retiree on a fixed income. For three years, along with other members of the Richmond BPAC, I worked on the Master Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans adopted by the City Council. We are now in the process of prioritizing projects and exploring funding to implement them, which is an exciting phase of the work. One advantage of being retired is that I now have the time to go to meetings and do other relevant work that would not have been possible when I was working. I have attended quite a few bicycle/pedestrian workshops, gone to a number of MTC's meetings about the One Bay Area plan, testified at City Council sessions, and recently participated in the charette in Richmond on the Active Transportation Program. I attend most meetings of WCCTAC's TAC, so I'm able to help make an ongoing connection with the Bike East Bay Board and bring to their attention issues, policies, and infrastructure developments in Contra Costa County. (Our Board is predominately from Alameda County and is often unfamiliar with what is happening in our county.) Participating in TAC meetings has also helped me with my work in the CBPAC, keeping me abreast of current programs and acquainting me with cities' staff and transit representatives. I'm very concerned with issues relating to global warming, so if reappointed, I will look forward to another opportunity to weigh in on bicycle and pedestrian matters and do my part to help keep our county pointed in an environment-friendly direction.



TO: WCCTAC TAC

DATE: April 10, 2014

FR: John Nemeth, Executive Director

RE: High Occupancy Transit Corridor Study

On January 31, 2014 the WCCTAC Board approved a resolution supporting a study of high occupancy transit options in West County, which the staff report described as a “comprehensive corridor study”. The staff report’s requested action was to “direct WCCTAC staff to work with BART staff to develop a study scope of work, and to identify possible funding for the study.” The Board broadened this direction by requesting that staff to be inclusive in the development of the scope and, particularly, to work with the other West County transit operators.

The study is supported by goal 4.1.B (Expand High Capacity Transit) in the recently updated Action Plan for West County, as well as Action #46, which calls for WCCTAC, transit providers, local jurisdictions and CCTA to, “participate in a study of high occupancy transit options in the I-80 Corridor in West County.”

Since the January Board meeting, WCCTAC has worked with BART, AC Transit and WestCAT to develop a draft outline for the corridor study, which is attached. As noted in the January staff report to the WCCTAC Board, the types of transit studied could include BART technology, commuter rail, express buses, bus rapid transit, and possibly others. The study could also consider a variety of different alignments.

The study would determine the ridership potential for various transit options, along with their capital and operations and maintenance costs. It could also evaluate their compatibility with local and regional goals, such as: congestion mitigation, air quality, economic development, or land use plans. The study would involve considerable local community outreach. A key benefit of the study is its ability to inform a potential future countywide transportation sales tax measure.

The details of study management, organization and funding are still to be determined. The study would likely include a policy committee, a technical advisory committee, and possibly a smaller study committee. Funding sources may include funds provided by BART, Measure J sub-regional needs funds for West County, and potentially others. WCCTAC staff is seeking feedback from the TAC and plans seek further direction from the WCCTAC Board for at the upcoming April 25, 2014 meeting.

This Page Intentionally Blank

Western Contra Costa High Capacity Transit Study Scope – Outline

Task

1. Develop goals and objectives for the study (examples of goals and objectives below)
 - a. Understand travel markets and demand for high-capacity transit in the I-80 corridor as part of the larger regional transit network.
 - b. Understand current and future land uses in the corridor and linkages to transportation.
 - c. Define and evaluate multimodal high capacity transit options in the western Contra Costa corridor.
 - d. Understand impacts on local transit services.
 - e. Understand costs and potential funding sources.
 - f. Establish a basis for further study of most promising alternatives.
2. Develop Purpose and Need for the project (examples of Purpose and Need below)
 - a. Link corridor more closely to the regional transit network and major destinations.
 - b. Link transportation and land use more closely in the corridor.
 - c. Support TOD development throughout corridor, especially in PDAs.
 - d. Provide alternative to congested highway corridor.
3. Conduct public participation (ongoing throughout study)
 - a. Outreach meetings
 - b. Print, social media and electronic outreach
 - c. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) - agencies
4. Literature review of prior studies in corridor
5. Document existing and planned transportation network.
6. Document existing and future land use conditions
7. Define/understand travel markets in the corridor
 - a. Assess predominant travel flows
 - b. Document context beyond corridor (Solano County, Alameda County, San Francisco)
 - c. TAC check-in
8. Define conceptual alternatives for evaluation
 - a. Potential technologies (examples)
 - Express bus
 - BRT
 - BART
 - Standard gauge rail (DMU, other)
 - b. Potential alignments (examples)
 - I-80
 - San Pablo Avenue
 - Richmond Parkway
 - UP and BNSF corridors
9. Develop evaluation criteria (examples)
 - a. Ridership
 - b. Support for regional land use goals
 - c. Impacts on local transit services (ridership, other)
 - d. Impact on BART (state-of-good-repair and capacity)
 - e. Cost
10. Conduct preliminary evaluation and alternatives screening (examples)
11. Ridership modeling
12. Define final alternatives
13. Conduct final alternatives evaluation (examples)

- a. Refine ridership modeling
- 14. Develop cost estimates and funding options
- 15. Develop initial environmental assessment
- 16. Develop initial Title VI evaluation
- 17. Document findings and recommendations
- 18. Produce draft and final report
- 19. Develop work scope for next phase

DRAFT

BIKE TO WORK DAY

MAY 8, 2014

MAY IS BIKE MONTH



CELEBRATE BIKE MONTH IN MAY!

Pledge to ride your bike in May and be eligible to win prizes.

Remember you can bike there!
www.youcanbikethere.com

Attend Events and Energizer Stations hosted by your local county representatives.

For more information:

Alameda:	www.ebbc.org	(510) 845-7433
Contra Costa:	www.511contracosta.org	(925) 973-2655
Marin:	www.marinbike.org	(415) 456-3469
Napa:	www.napabike.org	(707) 812-1770
San Francisco:	www.sfbike.org	(415) 431-2453
San Mateo:	www.commute.org	(650) 588-8170
Santa Clara:	www.bikesiliconvalley.org	(408) 287-7259
Solano:	www.commuterinfo.net	(800) 535-6883
Sonoma:	www.bikesonoma.org	(707) 545-0153

Visit 511.org for more information on bicycle commuting, Bike to Work Day, and the Team Bike Challenge.



This Page Intentionally Blank

ATP Guidelines: Who Can Apply?

- Local, regional & state agencies
- Transit agencies
- Natural Resource or Public Land agencies (park, wildlife, fish & game, forest service)
- Public schools, universities or school districts
- Tribal govt
- Non-profits may apply for Rec Trails Program funds

ATP Guidelines: What Does it Fund?

All Projects must be:

- Selected in a competitive process
- Federal-aid eligible (except Rec Trails)

Eligible Project types:

- **Planning:** up to 5% available for DACs and rural areas
- **Infrastructure:** planning, design, construction
- **Non-infrastructure:** education, encouragement, enforcement
- **Combination** infra/non-infra

Guidelines available on CTC website:

<http://www.catc.ca.gov/>

Active Transportation Program Structure

Regional Share to MPOs
for Competitive Grants

Sub-allocated by population

40%

State Share –
Managed by CTC

50%

Statewide
Competition –
open to all

10%

Statewide
Competition –
for rural areas
<200,000

ATP Guidelines:

Match & Minimum Project Size

- Required Match: 11.47%
- Exceptions:
 - Projects predominantly benefiting DAC
 - Non-infrastructure & SRTS
- Overmatch can earn extra points; can be last \$ in

- Minimum Project Size: \$250,000
- Exceptions:
 - Non-infrastructure
 - SRTS
 - Rec Trails

Guidelines available on CTC website: <http://www.catc.ca.gov/>

Active Transportation Program Goals

- Increase % bike/walk trips
- Improve safety & mobility of peds/cyclists
- GG Reduction per SB 375
- Enhance public health
- Ensure disadvantaged communities fully benefit

Disadvantaged Communities

- **DACs: at least 25% of funds in each pot must benefit disadvantaged communities; defined as:**
 - Median HH income < 80% statewide median (census tract data)
 - Among most disadvantaged 10% in CalEnviroScreen
 - At least 75% students in FARM
 - Alternative quantitative assessment

Timeline: Key Dates

Statewide & Rural Programs

- March 20: Guidelines adopted by CTC
- March 21: Call for Projects
- May 21: Proposals due
- August 20: CTC adopts program; Projects not approved in Statewide share referred to MPOs

Regional Program (MPOs)

- May 21: Regions submit guidelines for CT Review
- June 25: regional guidelines approved/rejected
- Sept 30: MPOs submit proposed projects to CTC
- Nov: CTC adopts MPO program

Sample Eligible Projects: Infrastructure

- Development of & improvements to new bikeway, walkways, trails that improve mobility, access, or safety for peds/cyclists
- Safe Routes to School projects that improve safety for children and encourage walking and bicycling to school
- Recreational trails & trailheads; conversion of former RR corridors to trails
- Park projects that facilitate trail linkages
- Safe routes to transit projects, to encourage transit by improving biking/walking routes to mass transit & school bus stops
- Secure bicycle parking at employment and transit center
- Development of a bike, pedestrian, Safe Routes to School, or active transportation plan in disadvantaged communities, with priority to communities without an existing plan

Sample Eligible Projects: Non-infrastructure

- Conducting bicycle and/or ped counts; walkability and/or bikeability assessments or audits; ped/bicycle safety analysis to inform plans and projects
- Conducting pedestrian and bicycle safety education programs
- Development and publishing of community walking and biking maps, including school route/travel plans
- Development and implementation of walking school bus or bike train programs; bike-to-school or walk-to-school or work day/month programs
- Development/implementation of tools to enhance emerging technologies in active transportation

Questions/Discussion

Keys to Success:

- Demonstrate your project meets goals of program – Data!
- Increase bike/walk trips, improve safety and/or provide safe route to school
- Benefits to DAC
- Robust public participation
- Bundle projects into large program – Active Transportation Networks!

SCORING CRITERIA

Graphic by SRTSNP

0 to 30 points	Potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students.
0 to 25 points	Potential for reducing fatalities, injuries, and potential safety hazards for pedestrians and bicyclists.
0 to 15 points	Public Participation and Planning, i.e. noticed meetings and consultation with local stakeholders to identify the proposed project.
0 to 10 points	Cost effectiveness, i.e. maximizing the safety and mobility benefit relative to the total project cost.
0 to 10 points	Improve public health by focusing on populations with high risk factors for health issues
0 to 10 points	Benefit to disadvantaged communities.
-5 to 0 points	Points deducted if the Conservation Corps* is not consulted to partner on the project construction
-10 to 0 points	Points deducted if the applicant has poor performance on past Caltrans grants

This Page Intentionally Blank



ACRONYM LIST. Below are acronyms frequently utilized in WCCTAC communications.

ABAG: Association of Bay Area Governments
ACCMA: Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (now the ACTC)
ACTC: Alameda County Transportation Commission (formerly ACCMA)
ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act
APC: Administration and Projects Committee (CCTA)
ATP: Active Transportation Program
BAAQMD: Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BATA: Bay Area Toll Authority
BCDC: Bay Conservation and Development Commission
Caltrans: California Department of Transportation
CCTA: Contra Costa Transportation Authority
CEQA: California Environmental Quality Act
CMAs: Congestion Management Agencies
CMAQ: Congestion Management and Air Quality
CMIA: Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (Prop 1B bond fund)
CMP: Congestion Management Program
CTP: Contra Costa Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan
CSMP: Corridor System Management Plan
CTC: California Transportation Commission
CTPL: Comprehensive Transportation Project List
DEIR: Draft Environmental Impact Report
EBRPD: East Bay Regional Park District
EIR: Environmental Impact Report
EIS: Environmental Impact Statement
EVP: Emergency Vehicle Preemption (traffic signals)
FHWA: Federal Highway Administration
FTA: Federal Transit Administration
FY: Fiscal Year
HOV: High Occupancy Vehicle Lane
ICM: Integrated Corridor Mobility
ITC or HITC: Hercules Intermodal Transit Center
ITS: Intelligent Transportations System
LOS: Level of Service (traffic)
MOU: Memorandum of Understanding
MPO: Metropolitan Planning Organization
MTC: Metropolitan Transportation Commission
MTSO: Multi-Modal Transportation Service Objective
NEPA: National Environmental Policy Act

O&M: Operations and Maintenance
OBAG: One Bay Area Grant
PAC: Policy Advisory Committee
PC: Planning Committee (CCTA)
PDA: Priority Development Areas
PSR: Project Study Report (Caltrans)
RHNA: Regional Housing Needs Allocation (ABAG)
RPTC: Richmond Parkway Transit Center
RTIP: Regional Transportation Improvement Program
RTP: Regional Transportation Plan
RTPC: Regional Transportation Planning Committee
SCS: Sustainable Communities Strategy
SHPO: State Historic and Preservation Office
SOV: Single Occupant Vehicle
STA: State Transit Assistance
STARS: Sustainable Transportation Analysis & Rating System
STIP: State Transportation Improvement Program
SWAT: Regional Transportation Planning Committee for Southwest County
TAC: Technical Advisory Committee
TCC: Technical Coordinating Committee (CCTA)
TDA: Transit Development Act funds
TDM: Transportation Demand Management
TFCA: Transportation Fund for Clean Air
TLC: Transportation for Livable Communities
TOD: Transit Oriented Development
TRANSPAC: Regional Transportation Planning Committee for Central County
TRANSPLAN: Regional Transportation Planning Committee for East County
TSP: Transit Signal Priority (traffic signals and buses)
VMT: Vehicle Miles Traveled
WCCTAC: West County Costa Transportation Advisory Committee