

El Cerrito



Hercules

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA

DATE & TIME: Thursday, September 13, 2018 • 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM
LOCATION: WCCTAC Offices • 6333 Potrero Ave. at San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito, CA 94530
TRANSIT OPTIONS: Accessible by AC Transit #72, #72R, #72M & El Cerrito del Norte BART Station

Pinole

1. CALL TO ORDER and SELF-INTRODUCTIONS
Estimated Time: 9:00 AM, (5 minutes)*

Richmond

2. PUBLIC COMMENT
Estimated Time: 9:05 AM, (5 minutes)*

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. Please limit your comments to 3 minutes. Pursuant to provisions of the Brown Act, no action may be taken on a matter unless it is listed on the agenda, or unless certain emergency or special circumstances exist. The TAC may direct staff to investigate and/or schedule certain matters for consideration at a future TAC meeting.

San Pablo

3. CONSENT CALENDAR
Estimated Time: 9:10 AM, (5 minutes)*

A. Minutes & Sign in Sheet from July 12, 2018
Recommendation: Approve as presented.
Attachment: Yes

Contra Costa County

4. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

A. STMP Nexus Update: Feedback from Local Staff on Possible Fee Level and Outline for Administrative Guidelines

AC Transit

Description: At the August 3, 2018 meeting, the WCCTAC Board received a presentation on the maximum potential STMP fee that could be charged based on the nexus analysis. WCCTAC staff requested that the Board make its recommendation at its September meeting on the fee level it desires to set. In the interim, we asked that each TAC member provide a progress report at the September TAC meeting on their jurisdiction's feedback on the fee level to date. Another aspect of the STMP Nexus Update is development of administrative guidelines which is intended as a reference document when the update is completed. The consultants have prepared an outline of this future document, see attached, and noted items requiring TAC input. At the meeting, we plan on soliciting input on these discussion items.

BART

WestCAT

Recommendation: TAC members are asked to provide verbal progress reports on local discussions of possible STMP fee levels. Review and provide feedback on outline of Administrative Guidelines.

Attachment: Yes

Presenter/Lead Staff: Bob Spencer, Urban Economics, Julie Morgan and Francisco Martin, Fehr and Peers / Leah Greenblat, WCCTAC Project Manager

Estimated Time:* **9:15 AM**, (50 minutes)

B. STMP Call for Projects

Description: WCCTAC staff is proposing a STMP Call for Projects, subject to concurrence by the WCCTAC Board. This Call would help to close out the existing STMP Program as West County transitions to a new set of STMP programs rules and eligible projects. When committed funds are excluded, there is nearly \$3,000,000 in STMP funds available to be allocated by the WCCTAC Board.

Recommendation: Forward a proposed STMP Call for Projects to the WCCTAC Board for their concurrence and release.

Attachment: Yes

Presenter/Lead Staff: John Nemeth, WCCTAC Staff

Estimated Time:* **10:05 AM**, (25 minutes)

C. Additional Safe Routes to School Funding Options

Description: As part of the OBAG grant program, MTC allocated an additional \$822,000 to Contra Costa for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects and programs. CCTA staff developed four different options for how these funds could be used. If the previously used formula were applied and each subregion were to receive an allocation, West County would receive \$177,000. WCCTAC staff is seeking the TAC's feedback on a recommendation for CCTA.

Recommendation: Staff recommends CCTA Option 2b, which would allow funds to be used for one or both of the projects that received funding in the OBAG 2 Cycle. These two projects are the Lincoln Elementary SRTS Pedestrian Enhancements (Richmond) and the West County Walk and Bike Leaders Program (County)

Attachment: Yes

Presenter/Lead Staff: John Nemeth, WCCTAC Staff

Estimated Time:* **10:30 AM**, (20 minutes)

D. West Contra Costa Express Bus Implementation Plan: Status Update

Description: AC Transit, WestCAT, WCCTAC staff have held a kick-off meeting. The consultants are beginning to work on outreach and evaluating existing conditions. The first TAC meeting is planned for the second half of October.

Recommendation: Receive update.

Attachment: No

Presenter/Lead Staff: Leah Greenblat, WCCTAC Staff

Estimated Time:* **10:50 AM**, (5 minutes)

5. **STANDING ITEMS**

A. **Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Report**

Recommendation: Receive update.

Attachment: No

Presenter/Lead Staff: WCCTAC's TCC Representatives & WCCTAC Staff

Estimated Time:* **11:55 AM**, (5 minutes)

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

Description / Recommendation: Adjourn to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the TAC on Thursday, October 11, 2018.

Estimated Time:* **11:00 AM**

- In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, if you need special assistance to participate in the WCCTAC TAC meeting, or if you need a copy of the agenda and/or agenda packet materials in an alternative format, please contact Valerie Jenkins at 510.210.5930 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 office.
 - 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.
-

This Page Intentionally Blank

El Cerrito

WCCTAC TAC Meeting Minutes

Hercules

MEETING DATE: July 12, 2018

Pinole

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mike Roberts, Hercules; Yvetteh Ortiz, El Cerrito; Misha Kaur, Richmond; Rob Thompson, WestCAT; Nathan Landau, AC Transit; Robert Sarmiento, County; Jill Mercurio, San Pablo; Tamara Miller, Pinole; Celestine Do, BART

Richmond

GUESTS: Bill Pinkham, CBPAC; Julie Morgan and Francisco Martin, Fehr and Peers; Bob Spencer, Urban Economics; Hisham Noeimi, CCTA

San Pablo

STAFF PRESENT: John Nemeth, Leah Greenblat, and Coire Reilly

ACTIONS LISTED BY: WCCTAC Staff

Contra Costa
County

AC Transit

BART

WestCAT

ITEM	ITEM/DISCUSSION	ACTION/SUMMARY
1.	Called to Order	The meeting was called to order at 9:06 a.m.
2.	Public Comment	None.
3.	Adoption of Agenda	Moved by Ortiz, seconded by Sarmiento and unanimously adopted.
4.	Consent Calendar: a. Action Minutes and Sign-in Sheet from June 7, 2018	Moved by Sarmiento, seconded by Ortiz and unanimously adopted.
5.	STMP Nexus Update Part 1: Presentation on Development Fees and VMT	Bob Spencer of Urban Economics provided an abbreviated version of a presentation he gave at MTC's forum "Moving from LOS to VMT"
6.	STMP Nexus Update Part 2: Maximum Potential Allowable Fee	Francisco Martin and Julie Morgan presented their work calculating what the maximum potentially allowable STMP fee could be. Miller moved, Roberts seconded and the TAC unanimously agreed to forward the report to the Board for its consideration.

ITEM	ITEM/DISCUSSION	ACTION/SUMMARY
7.	Update on WCCTAC Board's I-80 Ad-hoc Subcommittee Work	John Nemeth shared that the Subcommittee sent letters to MTC, CCTA, Caltrans, CHP and ACTC requesting assistance with HOV lane performance. He also explained that the group recognized that the I-80 ICM TAC provided a first line forum for addressing any issues with the I-80 ICM Project. Leah Greenblat relayed that WCCTAC was notified that its PASS application was funded, but without the TSP element. Hisham Noeimi will be following up with WestCAT and Caltrans staff regarding TSP.
8.	Statewide and Regional ATP Cycle 4: Projects within West County	<p>The TAC noted that the following projects may be seeking grant funding in the upcoming cycle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Pablo Ave. Complete Streets in Rodeo and Crockett • Appian Way sidewalks in El Sobrante • Market Ave. from Fred Jackson to 7th St. in Richmond. • Harbor Way in Richmond • Central Ave. Multi-Purpose Path in El Cerrito and Richmond
9.	TCC Update	Yvetteh Ortiz and Leah Greenblat reported that the TCC reviewed the draft Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan and agreed to forward it to the Authority Board.
10.	Adjourn	The meeting adjourned at 11:09 AM.

Sign in Sheet for the WCCTAC Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

WCCTAC TAC	INITIALS	AGENCY	EMAIL	PHONE
Lori Reese Brown		Richmond	Lori_reese-brown@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.620.6869
Chareles Ching		San Pablo	charlesc@sanpabloca.gov	
John Cunningham		CCC DCD	John.cunningham@dcd.ccccounty.us	925.674.7833
G. Aileen Hernandez		BART	ghernan@bart.gov	510.464.6564
Deneé Evans		Richmond	Denee.evans@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.621.1718
Carol Huang		San Pablo	carolh@sanpabloca.gov	
Nathan Landau	<i>NL</i>	AC Transit	NLandau@actransit.org	510.891.4792
Jill Mercurio	<i>JM</i>	San Pablo	jillm@sanpabloca.gov	510 215 3061
Tamara Miller	<i>TM</i>	Pinole	tmiller@ci.pinole.ca.us	510.724.9010
Melanie Mintz		El Cerrito	mmintz@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us	510.215.4330
Yvetteh Ortiz	<i>YO</i>	El Cerrito	yortiz@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us	510.215.4345
Winston Rhodes		Pinole	wrhodes@ci.pinole.ca.us	510.724.9832
Mike Roberts	<i>MR</i>	Hercules	miker@ci.hercules.ca.us	510.799.8241
Robert Sarmiento	<i>RS</i>	CCC DCD	robert.sarmiento@dcd.ccccounty.us	925.674.7822
Holly Smith		Hercules	hsmyth@ci.hercules.ca.us	510.245.6531
Michael Tanner		BART	mtanner@bart.gov	
Robert Thompson	<i>RT</i>	WestCAT	rob@westcat.org	510.724.3331
Ryan Greene-Roesel		BART	rgreene@bart.gov	510.287.4797
Celestine D. Co	<i>CD</i>	BART	cd@bart.gov	510 287-4757
WCCTAC STAFF				
Leah Greenblat	<i>LG</i>	WCCTAC	lgreenblat@wcctac.org	510.210.5935
Valerie Jenkins		WCCTAC	vjenkins@wcctac.org	510.210.5931
John Nemeth		WCCTAC	jnemeth@wcctac.org	510.210.5933
Joanna Pallock		WCCTAC	jpallock@wcctac.org	510.210.5934
Coire Reilly	<i>CR</i>	WCCTAC	creilly@wcctac.org	510.210.5932
CCTA STAFF				
Brad Beck		CCTA	bbeck@ccta.net	925.256.4726
Peter Engel		CCTA	pengel@ccta.net	925.256.4741
Matt Kelly		CCTA	mkelly@ccta.net	925.256.4730
Hisham Noeimi	<i>HN</i>	CCTA	hnoeimi@ccta.net	925.256.4731
JURISDICTION AGENCY STAFF				
Charlie Anderson		WESTCAT	charlie@westcat.org	510.724.3331
Yader Bermudez		Richmond	Yader_berumudez@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.774.6300
Jim Cunradi		AC Transit	jcunradi@actransit.org	510.891.4841
Deidre Heitman		BART	dheitma@bart.gov	510.287.4796
Dane Rodgers		Richmond	Dane_rodgers@ci.richmond.ca.us	510-307-8112
Robert Del Rosario		AC Transit	rdelrosa@actransit.org	510.891.4734
Rod Simpson		San Pablo	Rods@sanpablo.gov	510.215.3036
Lina Velasco		Richmond	lina_velasco@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.620.6841
Patrick Phelan		Richmond	Patrick_phelan@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.307.8111
GUEST				
Dave Campbell		Bike East Bay	dave@bikeeastbay.org	510.701.5971
Bill Pinkham	<i>BP</i>	CBPAC Rep	Bpinkham3@gmail.com	510.734.8532
Rita Xavier		San Pablo Res.		
Misha Kaur	<i>MK</i>	Richmond	misha-kaur@ci.richmond.ca.us	510-620-6797
Robert Spencer	<i>RS</i>	Urban Economics	bobinva@clerk@gmail.com	510-816-4747

MEMORANDUM

To: Leah Greenblat, WCCTAC
From: Robert D. Spencer, Urban Economics
Julie Morgan, Fehr & Peers
Date: September 7, 2018
Subject: Outline of STMP Fee Administrative Guidelines

Now that we have completed the nexus study for the WCCTAC Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP) update, our next priority is to develop administrative guidelines. The purpose of the guidelines is to codify procedures for applying and administering the STMP fee. The target audience for the guidelines will be WCCTAC staff along with local agency staff responsible for collecting and forwarding fee revenue to WCCTAC.

Attached is a draft outline for the guidelines based on our experience with other fee programs and initial guidance from WCCTAC staff. As the consulting team prepares to draft the guidelines, we would appreciate input from WCCTAC staff and the WCCTAC TAC to ensure that the guidelines cover the necessary topics.

Specific policy and procedural issues that we need to discuss are listed below along with a reference to the relevant section of the outline:

- ◆ Definition of a “development project” subject to fee, e.g. how to apply fee to re-use of vacant buildings (Sec. 3.a)
- ◆ Allowable fee exemptions and role of WCCTAC in approving by project (Sec 3.b)
- ◆ Types and definition of standard land use categories e.g. does “multi-family” include townhouses, use of “per trip” fee for “other” land uses (Sec. 4)
- ◆ Procedures for credits and reimbursements for developer-constructed transportation improvement projects included in the STMP (Sec. 5)
- ◆ Appeals process, e.g. local agency vs. WCCTAC decision authority, allowance for reduction or waiver of fee (Sec. 6)
- ◆ Local agency fee accounting and reporting (Sec. 7)
- ◆ WCCTAC verification procedures for local agency fee accounting (Sec. 7)
- ◆ Penalties for under-reporting (Sec. 7)
- ◆ Schedule for annual inflation update and fee adjustment (Sec. 8)
- ◆ Funding program administration: e.g. local agency charges in addition to STMP fee, WCCTAC four percent charge included in STMP fee (Sec. 9)

We look forward to discussing this at the upcoming TAC meeting on September 13.

STMP FEE ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Note: Although we would appreciate comments on the entire outline, sections noted “TBD” are specific policy issues requiring guidance from WCCTAC.

1. Introduction
 - a. Purpose of STMP and STMP Fee
 - b. Purpose of STMP Fee Administrative Guidelines
 - c. Supporting Documents (nexus study, model ordinance, etc.)
2. Administrative Organization & Responsibilities
 - a. Local Agencies
 - i. Apply Fee to Development Projects
 - ii. Track Permit Activity & Fee Revenues
 - iii. Comply with WCCTAC Reporting Requirements (quarterly)
 - iv. Transfer of Funds to WCCTAC (quarterly)
 - b. WCCTAC
 - i. Receive and Manage Funds
 - ii. Verify Agency-Reported Revenue & Permit Activity
 - iii. Complete Mitigation Fee Act Reporting Requirements
3. Applicability of STMP Fee
 - a. Development Projects
 - i. New construction of dwelling units or nonresidential building space
 - ii. Intensification of use of an existing building
 - iii. Re-use of a vacant building
 - b. Exemptions
 - i. Allowed Exemptions
 - (1) Prior Vested Rights
 - (2) Affordable Housing
 - (3) Residential Additions
 - (4) Local Government Facilities (city and school district facilities only)
 - (5) Re-use of vacant buildings if vacancy occurs after 2018 and is less than five years

- ii. Process (e.g. pre-approval of WCCTAC)
- 4. Calculation of STMP Fee
 - a. Land Use Categories
 - i. Residential
 - (1) Single Family Residential (detached only)
 - (2) Multi-Family Residential (includes condominiums, townhouses, apartments, and accessory dwelling units)
 - ii. Nonresidential
 - (1) Hotel
 - (2) Office
 - (3) Retail/Service
 - (4) Hospital
 - (5) Industrial
 - (6) Religious Facility
 - (7) Storage Facility
 - iii. Other (e.g. uses not covered by standard categories)
 - b. Fee Calculation
 - i. Residential Development Projects
 - ii. Nonresidential Development Projects
 - iii. Mixed Use Development Projects
 - iv. Existing Building Intensification of Use
 - v. Other Land Uses (“per trip fee” for uses not covered by standard categories)
- 5. Credits & Reimbursements
 - a. Definitions
 - b. Credit & Reimbursement Agreement
 - c. WCCTAC Approval
- 6. Appeals
 - a. No Authority for Local Agency to Reduce or Waive Fee
 - b. Appeals Process
 - i. Apply to WCCTAC
 - ii. Final Decision by WCCTAC Executive Director
- 7. Payment and Accounting of STMP Fee (TBD)
 - a. Payment of STMP Fee to Local Agency by Development Projects

- b. Local Agency Charges for Program Administration (in addition to STMP Fee)
- c. Transfer of STMP Fee Funds to WCCTAC
 - i. Documentation of Permit Activity & Fee Revenue (see attached form to be expanded, e.g. project-by-project list of activity and fee revenue)
 - ii. Transfer of Funds and Permit Activity Reports (quarterly)
- d. WCCTAC Verification of Fee Revenue & Permit Activity
- e. Local Agency Penalties for Under-reporting of Fee Revenue
- 8. Periodic STMP Fee Adjustments and Reporting
 - a. Annual Inflation Update
 - i. WCCTAC Responsibilities
 - ii. Local Agency Responsibilities
 - iii. WCCTAC Annual Report
 - b. Five Year Program Review
- 9. Expenditure of STMP Revenue
 - a. Program Administration
 - i. Local Agency (program administration charges in addition to STMP fee)
 - ii. WCCTAC (four percent of fee revenue)
 - b. STMP Projects (policies and procedures for call-for-projects, project prioritization, etc. to be addressed outside this document)

Funding Available

The balance in the WCCTAC STMP account as of July, 2018 is 4,276,684, when funds needed for administration in FY18-19 and completion of the STMP Nexus Study are excluded. The WCCTAC Board has also allocated a total of \$1,311,266 to BART, El Cerrito and Hercules that has not yet been disbursed. This leaves \$2,965,418 available for the WCCTAC Board to allocate to STMP-eligible projects.

Evaluation Criteria

WCCTAC staff is proposing that it evaluate funding requests using the TAC’s evaluation method, developed in 2016. That method recommended giving higher priority to: 1) projects that were further along in the development process, 2) projects with sponsors that have not recently received funding, to ensure a balance across agencies, and 3) projects in STMP categories that have not recently received funding, to ensure a balance across project categories.

Project requests would be ranked from top to bottom for each of the three criteria. A “1” would be given the project that best fit the criteria, a “2” for the next best, and so on. Then the scores for each of the three criteria would be combined. The project with the lowest overall score would be considered the top ranked project, the second lowest score would be the second ranked project, and so on.

From this initial ranking provided by WCCTAC staff, the TAC could propose adjustments in order to develop a consensus recommendation for the WCCTAC Board.

Next Steps

If the TAC forwards a STMP Call for Projects to the WCCTAC Board, the next step would be for the Board to provide concurrence and officially release the Call. The proposed schedule for the Call for Projects is as follows:

Activity	Date
Notification of Proposed Call for Projects	Sept 13
Release Call for Projects	Sept 28
Funding Proposals Due	Oct 26
WCCTAC Staff Review of Proposals	Oct 29-Nov 1
Funding Proposals Reviewed by TAC	Nov 2-Nov 8
TAC forwards recommendation to WCCTAC Board	Nov 8
Board takes action to allocate funds	Dec 14

Attachment

A: Current (2005) STMP Project List

2005 STMP PROJECT LIST

1. **Richmond Intermodal Station** – Public improvements including, but not limited to: the parking garage, station building, transit center, east side improvements, lighting and real-time transit information.
2. **Interchanges on I-80 at San Pablo Dam Road and Central Avenue; and on Highway 4 at Willow Avenue** – Upgrade and improve the interchange at I-80/San Pablo Dam Road including provisions for bicyclists and pedestrians; enhance operations and vehicular, bicycle, pedestrian safety in the vicinity of the interchange. Modify and realign the interchange and ramp at I-80/Central Avenue, and/or other improvements to improve access to/from I-80 and I-580 at Central Avenue. Relocate and realign ramps at Willow Avenue to meet current standards for improved local access and freeway movements.
3. **Capitol Corridor Improvements** – Parking, station platform, signage and plazas, rail improvements, etc. at the Hercules Passenger Rail Station and/or track improvements, drainage, fencing, safety improvements and/or other improvements along the Capitol Corridor line in West Contra Costa County.
4. **Ferry Service to San Francisco from Richmond and/or Hercules/Rodeo** – New ferry service utilizing high-speed vessels and funds for capital improvements such as terminals, landside improvements, parking, lighting, transit feeder service, signage, etc.
5. **BART Access and/or Parking Improvements** – Parking, aesthetic, and/or access improvements, station capacity improvements, sidewalks, lighting/restroom renovations, bicycle storage, expanded automatic fare collection equipment, etc. at the El Cerrito Plaza, El Cerrito Del Norte, and/or Richmond BART stations.
6. **Bay Trail Gap Closure** – Close gaps in the Bay Trail in West Contra Costa County, including, but not limited to the following: (1) the one-mile gap along the Richmond Parkway between Pennsylvania and Gertrude Avenues; (2) the 1.8-mile gap north of Freethy Boulevard to Payne Drive in Richmond; (3) the two-mile gap from Payne Drive to Cypress Avenue in Richmond; (4) the one-mile gap from Pinole Shores to Railroad Avenue in Pinole; and (5) the 1.8 mile gap from Railroad Avenue to Parker Avenue in Hercules.
7. **San Pablo Dam Road Improvements in Downtown El Sobrante** – Traffic calming, additional signals, pedestrian improvements, turn lanes, etc. that are identified in the Downtown El Sobrante Transportation and Land Use Plan (and subsequent documents).
8. **San Pablo Avenue Corridor Improvements** – Infrastructure improvements on San Pablo Avenue through West Contra Costa County within a half-mile walking distance of San Pablo Avenue in either direction and/or San Pablo Avenue SMART Corridor improvements.
9. **North Richmond Road Connection Project** – Extend Seventh Street northward to connect to an eastward extension of Pittsburg Avenue in North Richmond.
10. **Hercules Transit Center** – Relocate and expand the Hercules Transit Center on the east side of Highway 4.
11. **Del Norte Area Transit Oriented Development Project Public Improvements** – Parking facilities; bicycle, pedestrian, and/or bus transit access improvements; signage; lighting; improvements to station access or station waiting areas; ADA improvements; improvements to adjacent streets, street crossings, or signals; and/or Ohlone Greenway improvements.

This Page Intentionally Blank

MEMORANDUM

Date August 1, 2018

To Safe Routes to School Task Force, RTPC Managers

From Brad Beck

RE **Additional Safe Routes to School Funding**

As part of the extension of the first cycle of the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) for an additional year, MTC allocated an additional \$822,000 to Contra Costa in funding for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects and programs. These federal funds, unfortunately, were not included in the OBAG 2 call for projects. They remain available to Contra Costa and Authority staff has prepared the following memo outlining potential options for allocating these funds.

BACKGROUND

Previous Funding Cycles

MTC has allocated funding to CMAs for SRTS projects and programs through several funding cycles. The first OBAG cycle allocated \$3,289,000 to Contra Costa for SRTS projects and programs. It was used to fund 10 projects and one program. The funding was allocated by formula to the four Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) which recommended which projects to fund. The formula was based 50 percent on school enrollment and 50 percent on population.

Through the second cycle of OBAG funding — OBAG2 — MTC allotted \$4.088 million to Contra Costa for SRTS. As in OBAG 1, the Authority used the same 50 percent enrollment and 50 percent population formula. The funding share are shown below:

<i>Region</i>	<i>Share</i>
West	\$881,000
Central	\$1,077,000
East	\$1,223,000
Southwest	\$907,000
TOTAL	\$4,088,000

Based on the RTPC recommendations and some subsequent fund swapping, the Authority allocated the SRTS funding to the following four projects and two programs:

<i>Project</i>	<i>Sponsor</i>	<i>SRTS Funding</i>
Willow Pass Road Repaving and 6 th Street SRTS *	Concord	\$1,077,000
Moraga Way and Canyon/Camino Pablo Improvements **	Moraga	\$607,000
L Street Pathway to Transit-Bike Ped Improvement	Antioch	\$1,223,000
Lincoln Elementary SRTS Ped Enhancements	Richmond	\$320,000
Street Smarts San Ramon Valley	San Ramon	\$300,000
West Contra Costa Walk and Bike Leaders	Contra Costa County	\$561,000
TOTAL		\$4,088,000

* This project combines components from two projects that were originally separate

** Originally named "Strategic Bicycle, Pedestrian and Safe Routes to School Improvements"

The first two projects combine both SRTS improvements and other roadway improvements. The third and fourth projects focus on physical improvements for safe bicycle and pedestrian access to schools. The final two will fund SRTS programs at schools in the San Ramon Valley and West County.

Eligible Projects and Programs

The \$822,000 in SRTS funds comes from the federal CMAQ program. While they may fund a wide range of projects and programs, they do impose some limits. One of the key limits is that, overall, each activity must lead to changes in travel behavior that result in air quality benefits. Some of the main limitations include:

- **Planning activities** are ineligible, including walking audits. Project development activities that support a tangible improvement or program, however, are eligible.

- **Safety improvements** such as crossing guards and mobile radar trailers are ineligible for CMAQ funding since they specifically address safety but do not directly lead to changes to travel behavior that lead to air quality improvement. Also safety improvements such as signage, warning lights, etc. that are oriented to motorists are not eligible. In contrast, safety improvements specifically oriented to bicyclists and pedestrians, such as street crossings, actuated signals are eligible.
- **Material incentives** have limitations regarding the use of federal funds to pay for items such as raffles, prizes, gift cards, etc. Federal statutes prohibit using federal funds to provide gifts and free incentives. The exceptions to the rule are low-cost gifts such as pencils, stickers, paper pads, magnets, helmets, etc. that have little or no monetary value.

The requirements that apply to other OBAG-funded projects apply to SRTS projects as well. These include:

- The CMAs average OBAG funding request can't be less than \$500,000 and no individual request can be less than \$100,000.
- Sponsor must provide a local match of at least 11.47% of eligible project costs
- Sponsor must maintain eligibility for the funding including complete streets, pavement management and housing element requirements

OPTIONS

Staff has identified a few options for allocating the \$822,000 in additional SRTS funds that we would like your feedback on.

Option 1

Allocate the additional SRTS funds among the four RTPCs for new projects. This is the same as the previous approach; in it, the RTPCs would identify new projects to be funded with their share of the funds. Using the same 50% population/50% enrollment formula, the funds would be apportioned as shown on the following table. MTC requires, among other things, that no funding grant be less than \$100,000 and all of the following allocations would meet this requirement.

<i>Subarea</i>	<i>Population Share</i>	<i>Enrollment Share</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Funding Share</i>
West	24.1%	19.0%	21.6%	\$177,000
Central	28.7%	24.0%	26.3%	\$217,000
East	28.6%	31.2%	29.9%	\$246,000
Southwest	18.6%	25.7%	22.2%	\$182,000
				\$822,000

Pros: This option would be consistent with the approaches used for OBAG 1 and 2, and it would expand the number of SRTS improvements that could be made in Contra Costa.

Cons: This option would increase the number of projects that must go through the Caltrans local assistance process. (One of the Authority’s goals in the Coordinated Call was to minimize the number of projects that had to go through Caltrans.) This option would also require RTPCs to go through another application and review process.

Option 2a

Add funding to projects already in the TIP. In the second option, the Authority would use the \$822,000 to modify one or more of the projects funded through the Coordinated Call. (This is consistent with the Authority’s goal of minimizing the number of projects that needed to go through the Caltrans process.) In this option, the Authority could use the \$822,000 to either:

- Replace some of the local match where the match exceeds the 11.47 percent minimum, or
- Expand the budget of projects to address cost overruns or to add new scope items

The table on Option 2a below lists the seven SRTS projects now funded through OBAG 2; the amounts of funding from federal, local and Measure J sources they will use; and the local match share. All but one of the projects provides a significantly larger match than the 11.47 percent required. Those six projects could use a portion of the \$822,000 to replace at least some of the local match. For example, the Moraga Way and

Canyon/Camino Pablo Improvements project could use the \$822,000 to replace all of the Town of Moraga's local match, leaving the \$603,00 in Measure J funding to serve as the local match.

To use the SRTS funding to replace local or Measure J funding, sponsors would need a sufficiently high local match and enough eligible SRTS components funded by the local match. For example, the Moraga project uses both OBAG SRTS and LSRP funds to both improve bicycle and pedestrian access to nearby schools and to preserve streets. The latter component would not specifically improve access to school and thus is not eligible for CMAQ funding.

The Option 2a table shows the funding committed to each project, the part of that funding that represents the required local match, and potential additional CMAQ funding that could be used to backfill the local match fall down to the required 11.47 percent.

Pros Option 2a would not increase the number of projects going through the Local Assistance process and would reduce the amount of funding that local agencies must contribute. Depending on how the funding is allocated, it could be used to defray the costs of sponsors that have proposed the most significant local contributions.

Cons The Authority would need to identify a way to determine how much of the \$822,000 would go to each project. These methods might include allocating the funds by the relative size of the sponsor's local contribution to total of all local contributions. Or it might be determined by the relative share of the total project cost each sponsor contributed. There are likely to be other alternatives.

Option 2b

Add regional share of funding to projects already in the TIP. Option 2b combines Options 1 and 2a. In it, the RTPC shares of the additional SRTS funding would be added to funding for the projects that were already selected for OBAG 2 SRTS funding. A potential allocation of the \$822,000 in funds is shown in the Option 2b table. In both the Central and East subregions, only one project was allocated SRTS funding; those projects would get the full share of the subregion's funds. The SRTS funding in both the West and

Southwest regions was allocated to two projects. The Option 3 table shows the Southwest potential share of funding split 50/50 between the two Southwest projects. In West County, however, the maximum amount of additional funding that can be allocated to one of the projects — Lincoln Elementary SRTS Pedestrian Enhancements — is \$63,000 without the local match dropping below the 11.47 percent requirement.

Pros Option 2b would not add any new projects, thus meeting one of the Authority's goals, it would be consistent with previous approach of allocating funding among the RTPCs, and — like Option 2a — would reduce the amount of funding that local agencies must contribute.

Cons The increase in fund allocations would not be tied to an agency's current local contribution, the cost of the project itself, or to budgetary issues, thereby somewhat arbitrarily rewarding sponsors with a windfall.

Option 3

Use the funding on a SRTS project that didn't receive funding through OBAG 2. In Option 3, the \$822,000 in funding would go to a SRTS project that applied for, but did not receive, funding during the initial OBAG 2 round. Three of the 11 projects that applied for SRTS funding did not receive any funding:

1. Empire Avenue at Amber Lane Traffic Signal (Brentwood) – \$366,000 requested;
2. Arlington Boulevard Pedestrian Safety Improvements, Phase 1, (El Cerrito) – \$345,000 requested; and
3. Safe Routes to Orchard Park Elementary School (Oakley) – \$1,22, million requested.

The remaining eight received either SRTS or Measure J TLC funds. In this option, the additional SRTS funding would be allocated to one or more of these projects.

Pros Option 3 would expand the number of SRTS projects funded through OBAG 2 and the facilities provided to create safe routes to walk or bicycle to school.

Cons This option would add a new project and thus another project that must go through the local assistance process. The funding available doesn't fit neatly with

the funding needed to make the projects whole; staff may need to work with sponsors to adjust project scopes, though this is often done.

Option 2a: Add funding to projects already in the TIP

	SRTS	Other OBAG	Measure J	Local	Total	Current Match	Minimum Match	Potential Add
Willow Pass Repaving and 6th Street SRTS	1,077,000	4,183,000	120,000	1,137,000	6,517,000	1,257,000	747,000	510,000
Moraga Way and Canyon/Camino Pablo Improvements	607,000	596,000	603,000	822,000	2,628,000	1,425,000	301,000	1,124,000
L Street Pathway to Transit	1,223,000			1,777,000	3,000,000	1,777,000	344,000	1,433,000
Lincoln Elementary SRTS Pedestrian Enhancements	320,000		63,000	50,000	433,000	113,000	50,000	63,000
San Ramon Valley Street Smarts	300,000			102,000	402,000	102,000	46,000	56,000
West County Walk and Bike Leaders	561,000			561,000	1,122,000	561,000	129,000	432,000
	4,088,000	4,779,000	786,000	4,449,000	14,102,000	5,235,000	1,617,000	3,618,000

Option 2b: Add regional share of funding to projects already in the TIP

	Current SRTS Amount	Regional SRTS Shares				Potential SRTS Funds	Total Potential SRTS Funds
		West	Central	East	Southwest		
Willow Pass Repaving and 6th Street SRTS	1,077,000		217,000			217,000	1,294,000
Moraga Way and Canyon/Camino Pablo Improvements	607,000				91,000	91,000	698,000
L Street Pathway to Transit	1,223,000			246,000		246,000	1,469,000
Lincoln Elementary SRTS Pedestrian Enhancements	320,000	63,000				63,000 *	383,000
San Ramon Valley Street Smarts	300,000				91,000	91,000	391,000
West County Walk and Bike Leaders	561,000	114,000				114,000	675,000
	4,088,000	177,000	217,000	246,000	182,000	822,000	4,910,000

* This is the maximum additional SRTS funding that can be added while still meeting the 11.47 percent match requirement