MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

DATE & TIME: Friday, September 28, 2018, 8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

LOCATION: City of El Cerrito, Council Chambers
10890 San Pablo Avenue (at Manila Ave)
El Cerrito, California (Accessible by AC Transit #72, #72M & #72R)

1. Call to Order and Self-Introductions. (Chris Kelley – Vice Chair)

2. Public Comment. The public is welcome to address the Board on any item that is not listed on the agenda. Please fill out a speaker card and hand it to staff.

CONSENT CALENDAR

3. Minutes of August 3, 2018 Board Meeting. (Attachment; Recommended Action: Approve).


5. Financial Reports. The reports show the Agency’s revenues and expenses for August 2018. (Attachment; Information Only).

6. Payment of Invoices over $10,000. WCCTAC paid $11,511.31 to MarkOne Visual Communications for Pass2Class promotional material. (No attachment; Information Only).

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

7. STMP Nexus Study Update: Maximum Potential Allowable Fee and Possible Fee Exemptions. At the August 3, 2018 meeting, the Board received a presentation on the maximum potential allowable STMP fee that WCCTAC could collect from new development projects. WCCTAC Board and TAC members were requested to solicit feedback from their local jurisdictions in anticipation of the Board providing direction at its September meeting. The study’s consultants will also lead a discussion on possible fee exemptions or reductions the Board may wish to consider. (Leah Greenblat – WCCTAC Project Manager, Julie Morgan – Fehr and Peers and Robert Spencer – Urban Economics; Attachment; Recommendation: Receive a recap from previous meeting and provide a
recommendation on a new STMP fee level and possible fee exemptions or reductions).

8. Proposed 2018 STMP Call for Projects. The current STMP program will be winding down as WCCTAC moves to an updated STMP program after the conclusion of its Nexus Study Update process. The transition provides an opportunity to allocate funds from the old program in order to close that program out. As of July 2018, there is approximately $3 million available for the WCCTAC Board to allocate to STMP eligible projects. Staff prepared a draft call for projects which the TAC reviewed and recommended that the Board approve its release. Requests for funds would be due October 25, 2018 with final Board action to program the funds expected at its December 14, 2018 meeting. (Leah Greenblat – WCCTAC Project Manager; Attachment; Recommendation: Authorize release of the 2018 STMP Call for Projects).

9. Request for Appropriation of 2018 Measure J Funds 2018 Western Contra Costa County, San Francisco Bay Trail Rehabilitation (North Richmond Regional Wetlands, Point Pinole Regional Shoreline and San Pablo Bay Regional Shoreline). Measure J designates one-third of the funds generated under its Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities category (Program 13) to the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) for development and rehabilitation of paved regional trails. EBRPD rotates these funds among the CCTA’s four subregions such that every four years EBRPD implements a project in West County. EBRPD now seeks the review and approval from WCCTAC for the proposed projects prior to being granted a funding allocation by the CCTA. (Sean Duggan – EBRPD Trails Development Manager and Kevin Takei – EBRPD Shoreline Unit Operations Manager; Attachment; Recommendation: Forward recommendation of support to CCTA to approve the project scope and appropriation request for the EBRPD’s project).

10. Text Your Commute Update. Staff will make a brief presentation on 511 Contra Costa’s Text Your Commute challenge, a countywide TDM incentive program that encourages commuters to shift from single occupant cars to “green” commutes. The program begins October 1. (Coire Reilly – WCCTAC TDM Project Manager; Attachment; Recommendation: Information only).

**STANDING ITEMS**

11. Board and Staff Comments.
   a. Board Member Comments, Conference/Meeting Reports (AB 1234 Requirement), and Announcements
   b. Report from CCTA Representatives (Directors Abelson & Butt)
   c. Executive Director’s Report
12. **General Information Items.**
   a. Letter to CCTA Executive Director with August 3, 2018 Summary of Board Actions
   b. Acronym List

13. **Adjourn.** Next meeting is: October 26, 2018 @ 8:00 a.m.
    in the El Cerrito City Hall Council Chambers, located
    at 10890 San Pablo Avenue, El Cerrito

- 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 510.210.5930 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 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.
MEMBERS PRESENT: Cecilia Valdez, Chair (San Pablo); Chris Kelly Vice-Chair (Hercules); Janet Abelson, (El Cerrito); Tom Butt, (Richmond); Ada Recinos (Richmond); Roy Swearingen (Pinole); Chris Peeples (AC Transit); Eduardo Martinez (Richmond)

STAFF PRESENT: John Nemeth, Joanna Pallock, Valerie Jenkins, Coire Reilly, Kris Kokotaylo (Legal Counsel)

ACTIONS LISTED BY: Valerie Jenkins

Meeting Called to Order: 8:01am

Public Comment: n/a

Consent Calendar: Motion by Director Peeples; seconded by Vice-Chair Kelley; motion passed unanimously.

Item #3. Minutes of the June 15, 2018 Board Meeting  
Item #4. Monthly Update on WCCTAC Activities (Information Only)  
Item #5. Financial Reports for June 2018 (Information Only)  
Item #6. Memo to Board Regarding the FY 2017-18 Budget and STMP Funds (Information Only)  
Item #7. Payment of Invoices over $10,000. None  
Item #8. Approved FY19 Measure J 19b claims for WestCAT and AC Transit.  
Item #9. FY 2019 Measure J 21b, Safe Transportation for Children Funds, to John Swett Unified School District (JSUSD).  
Item #10. Approved Joint Marketing and Funding Agreement for Soltran’s BOGO.  
Item #11. Approved Fiscal Audit and Memorandum of Internal Control for Fiscal Year 2017.  
Item #12. Approved Program for Arterial System Synchronization (PASS) Grant Match: Funding the Local Cash Match.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM/DISCUSSION</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #13</td>
<td>Received an update from consultant Julie Morgan at Fehr and Peers, regarding the STMP Nexus Study. WCCTAC Board will review the study with their TAC members and city managers and bring back comments and provide staff with direction at the September 28 WCCTAC Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STMP Nexus study Update: Maximum Potential Allowable Fee.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #14</th>
<th>City of Richmond’s First Mile/Last Mile Study</th>
<th>Information Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Richmond staff, Lori-Reese-Brown, gave an update on the First Mile/Last Mile Strategic Plan. The Plan looks at opportunities to link the first and last mile trips modes other than a single occupant car.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #15</th>
<th>Pass to Class Update</th>
<th>Information Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coire Reilly, WCCTAC TDM Program Manager, provided an update regarding the Pass to Class program for West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD)K-12 students for this school year 2018 19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Adjourned: 9:46am
TO: WCCTAC Board  
FR: John Nemeth, Executive Director  
RE: Monthly Update on WCCTAC Activities

New Bay Trail Bridge in Pinole

Over 100 people turned out for the ribbon cutting on September 12 at Pinole Bayfront Park to celebrate the opening of the new Bayfront Park bicycle and pedestrian bridge. This $13 million addition to the Bay Trail will close one more trail gap along the West Contra Costa shoreline. Whether walking or biking across the 1200-foot bridge, the views offered are fantastic.

California Chapter American Planning Associate Award of Excellence

Staff previously announced that the Northern California Section of the American Planning Associate (APA) recognized the West County High Capacity Study, but now we have even bigger news: The California Chapter selected the study to receive its Award of Excellence in Transportation Planning. Early next month, the award will be officially presented at the state APA conference in San Diego. Hopefully, the study’s higher profile will help garner additional interest and support for its recommended projects. In any case, the CA-APA encouraged WCCTAC to submit the study for consideration of its national award.
Congressman DeSaulnier Hosts Roundtable on Public Transit and Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) like Lyft and Uber

Staff attended a roundtable, chaired by Congressman DeSaulnier, on September 18, at Richmond City Hall. The roundtable focused on pulling together academics (from UC Berkeley, UC Davis, and the Mineta Institute) and elected officials and staff from Bay Area transit agencies with the two largest TNC providers, Uber and Lyft. Presentations from both academic scholars and Uber and Lyft focused on the tensions between the TNC world and the world of public transit. The attendees discussed issues like data sharing, curb management, workforce and labor issues as well as moving from solo TNC trips to multi-passenger rideshare trips. Stay tuned: participants plan to continue to meet and focus on these and other critical issues of concern in the upcoming months.

West County Seeks a Different Approach to Travel Training Program

In April of this year, the WCCTAC Board approved an allocation of $100,000 in Measure J Program 28b funds (Subregional Transportation Needs) to the Center for Independent Living (CIL) to enhance travel training for senior and disabled residents in West County. This allocation was in direct response to the study of West County’s Measure J-funded Programs for Seniors and People with Disabilities which identified the need for more outreach and travel training to meet mobility needs. The next step in the process for the Board was for WCCTAC staff to return with a scope of work and a funding agreement with CIL for the Board’s consideration. Based on WCCTAC staff’s conversations with CIL and our partner agencies, it appears that CIL is not in a position to provide the type of services that were expected. Staff will return to the Board soon with alternative proposals for how to use the $100,000 that are consistent with the Board’s original proposal. CIL will continue to develop their Train-the-Trainers program under the original Caltrans grant they received in 2017.
Pass 2 Class Surpasses Last Year’s Numbers
WCCTAC’s TDM Program is excited to announce that this year’s Pass 2 Class participant numbers (1,191 students) has already surpassed last year’s (994 students), with still another week and a half until the program ends. Pass 2 Class provides any student, grades 1 through 12, in the West Contra Costa Unified School District and John Swett School District with a free one month pass on either AC Transit or WestCAT to encourage students to take the bus to school rather than driving or being driven. Last year, after receiving a pass at the beginning of the school year, over 80% of students continued to take the bus and over 60% of them report that they would have driven or been dropped off otherwise. Applications for Pass 2 Class will be accepted until October 9. You can visit https://511contracosta.org/schools/pass2class-program/pass2class.org for more information.

Update on I-80 Happenings
The WCCTAC Board’s I-80 Ad-Hoc subcommittee is gearing up to give the full Board a more formal update on its work, but in the interim, we wanted to brief the Board on some recent staff activity. Beginning July 1, MTC began funding four additional California Highway Patrol (CHP) officers to target HOV violators on I-80 between the Carquinez Bridge and the Bay Bridge Toll Plaza. WCCTAC staff met with staff from the CHP, Caltrans and CCTA to discuss a possible new study focused on improving HOV operations, enforcement and transit operations on the corridor.
This Page Intentionally Blank
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Adopted</th>
<th>Budget Adjustments</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>YTD Actual</th>
<th>Variance Encumbered</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>% Avail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7700 WCCTAC Operations</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>443,068.00</td>
<td>443,068.00</td>
<td>55,814.38</td>
<td>387,253.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>387,253.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41200</td>
<td>PERS Retirement</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>29,909.38</td>
<td>-29,909.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-29,909.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41310</td>
<td>Medical Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,355.69</td>
<td>-10,355.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-10,355.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41311</td>
<td>Retiree Healthcare</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>472.39</td>
<td>-472.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-472.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41400</td>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>767.86</td>
<td>-767.86</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-767.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41500</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>-135.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41800</td>
<td>LTD Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>543.30</td>
<td>-543.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-543.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41900</td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>944.21</td>
<td>-944.21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-944.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41901</td>
<td>Other Insurances</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,293.71</td>
<td>-3,293.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-3,293.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41904</td>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>157.35</td>
<td>-157.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-157.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41911</td>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>3,804.54</td>
<td>195.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>195.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary and Benefits</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>447,068.00</td>
<td>447,068.00</td>
<td>106,197.81</td>
<td>340,870.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>340,870.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-43500</td>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>390.33</td>
<td>3,609.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,609.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-43501</td>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-43520</td>
<td>Copies/Printing/Shipping/Xerox</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,800.00</td>
<td>3,800.00</td>
<td>776.42</td>
<td>3,023.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,023.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-43600</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>51,450.00</td>
<td>51,450.00</td>
<td>14,846.49</td>
<td>36,603.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>36,603.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-43900</td>
<td>Rent/Building</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,250.00</td>
<td>22,250.00</td>
<td>3,148.00</td>
<td>19,102.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19,102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-44000</td>
<td>Special Department Expenses</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-44320</td>
<td>Travel/Training Staff</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,800.00</td>
<td>5,800.00</td>
<td>927.53</td>
<td>4,872.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,872.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Supplies</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>99,300.00</td>
<td>99,300.00</td>
<td>20,288.77</td>
<td>79,011.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>79,011.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense WCCTAC Operations</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>546,368.00</td>
<td>546,368.00</td>
<td>126,486.58</td>
<td>419,881.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>419,881.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7700 WCCTAC Operations</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>322,000.00</td>
<td>322,000.00</td>
<td>34,195.24</td>
<td>287,804.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>287,804.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41200</td>
<td>PERS Retirement</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,510.84</td>
<td>-24,510.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-24,510.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41310</td>
<td>Medical Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>547.50</td>
<td>-547.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-547.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41311</td>
<td>Retiree Healthcare</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>258.62</td>
<td>-258.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-258.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41400</td>
<td>Dental Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>629.76</td>
<td>-629.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-629.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41400</td>
<td>LTD Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,693.76</td>
<td>-1,693.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1,693.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41900</td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70.81</td>
<td>-70.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-70.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41901</td>
<td>Other Insurances</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,293.71</td>
<td>-3,293.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-3,293.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41904</td>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70.81</td>
<td>-70.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-70.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Adopted Budget Adjustments</td>
<td>Adjusted Budget</td>
<td>YTD Actual</td>
<td>Variance Encumbered</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>% Avail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-41911</td>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>3,804.54</td>
<td>195.46</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>195.46</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salary and Benefits</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>326,000.00</td>
<td>74,901.41</td>
<td>251,098.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>251,098.59</td>
<td>77.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-43500</td>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>-12,614.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-11,614.61</td>
<td>-1,161.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-43501</td>
<td>TDM Postage</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.79</td>
<td>-23.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-23.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-43502</td>
<td>TDM Postage</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-43520</td>
<td>Copies Printing Shipping Xerox</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,500.00</td>
<td>22,500.00</td>
<td>1,456.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21,043.97</td>
<td>93.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-43600</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>49,500.00</td>
<td>49,500.00</td>
<td>8,066.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>41,433.29</td>
<td>83.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-43900</td>
<td>Rent Building</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,000.00</td>
<td>22,000.00</td>
<td>3,147.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18,852.02</td>
<td>85.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-44000</td>
<td>Special Department Expenses</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>130,903.00</td>
<td>130,903.00</td>
<td>14,437.20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>116,465.80</td>
<td>88.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-44320</td>
<td>Travel Training Staff</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,200.00</td>
<td>2,200.00</td>
<td>416.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,783.16</td>
<td>81.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service and Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>229,203.00</td>
<td>229,203.00</td>
<td>40,163.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>189,039.84</td>
<td>82.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7720</td>
<td>WCCTAC TDM</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>555,203.00</td>
<td>555,203.00</td>
<td>115,064.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>440,138.43</td>
<td>79.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7730</td>
<td>STMP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773-7730-41000</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salary and Benefits</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773-7730-43600</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,311,226.00</td>
<td>4,311,226.00</td>
<td>7,066.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,304,159.50</td>
<td>99.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773-7730-44000</td>
<td>Special Department Expense</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,426,684.00</td>
<td>4,426,684.00</td>
<td>7,066.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,419,617.50</td>
<td>99.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service and Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,426,684.00</td>
<td>4,426,684.00</td>
<td>7,066.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,419,617.50</td>
<td>99.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7730</td>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,476,684.00</td>
<td>4,476,684.00</td>
<td>7,066.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,469,617.50</td>
<td>99.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7740</td>
<td>STMP</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,476,684.00</td>
<td>4,476,684.00</td>
<td>7,066.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,469,617.50</td>
<td>99.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7740</td>
<td>WCCTAC Special Projects</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>542,509.00</td>
<td>542,509.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>542,509.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service and Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>542,509.00</td>
<td>542,509.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>542,509.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7740</td>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>542,509.00</td>
<td>542,509.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>542,509.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WCCTAC Special Projects</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>542,509.00</td>
<td>542,509.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>542,509.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expense Total: 0.00 0.00 6,120,764.00 248,617.65 5,872,146.35 0.00 5,872,146.35 0.9594
REQUESTED ACTION
Provide a recommendation for new STMP fee levels and make decisions about possible exemptions for affordable housing and government buildings and facilities.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION
At the Board’s meeting on August 3, 2018, the consultant team presented a technical memo that calculated the maximum potential transportation mitigation fee that the STMP could charge. Three fee scenarios were presented and are summarized in the table below. That meeting’s staff report and PowerPoint presentation are included as attachments. Board and TAC members were asked to consult with their agencies, so Board members would feel comfortable setting a fee level at the September meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Maximum Potential Fee</th>
<th>Fee Set at 75% of Max Residential, 50% of Max Non-Residential</th>
<th>Current WCCTAC Fee (Indexed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family (per DU)</td>
<td>$7,230</td>
<td>$5,423</td>
<td>$3,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (per DU)</td>
<td>$3,562</td>
<td>$2,672</td>
<td>$2,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (per SF)</td>
<td>$11.59</td>
<td>$5.80</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (per SF)</td>
<td>$8.76</td>
<td>$4.38</td>
<td>$2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (per SF)</td>
<td>$7.39</td>
<td>$3.70</td>
<td>$3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Maximum Fee Revenue</td>
<td>$161,281,000</td>
<td>$161,281,000</td>
<td>$161,281,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Revenue Generated from this Scenario</td>
<td>$161,281,000</td>
<td>$101,611,000</td>
<td>$81,970,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WCCTAC staff now seeks the Board’s direction on which of these three scenarios, or possibly another alternative, it wants included in the STMP’s model ordinance which each city and the county will be asked to adopt in early 2019.

Additionally, at the August Board meeting and the TAC’s September meeting, both bodies raised the question of whether affordable housing units should be granted an exemption or reduction to the STMP fee. The TAC also sought guidance from the Board regarding exemptions for government buildings. WCCTAC staff has provided additional background below on both of these items.

**Consideration of an Affordable Housing Exemption**

The TAC identified three possible options: 1. no exemption, 2. a partial reduction, and 3. a full exemption. The following discussion touches on the arguments for each and the impact on STMP revenue, based on the consultants’ analysis.

For this analysis, affordable-housing units are defined as any deed-restricted, housing that meets the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) definitions for very-low and low-income housing. These are housing unit production numbers that each city and the county currently track for reporting purposes. Based on West County data over the past ten years, a total of 528 new affordable units were built. If that same pattern of production continues, that would imply an average of about 50 new affordable units built each year. The projections for the nexus study extend to year 2040, which is 22 years. Within that 22-year period, there would be about 1100 new affordable units, which is about 6% of the total number of new housing units projected in the sub-region. For analysis purposes, the consultants think a reasonable assumption is that all new affordable units would be in the multi-family category.

1. **No Exemption for Affordable Housing:** According to this argument, while affordable housing is desirable, it nevertheless comes with some new trip generation. If the STMP’s premise is for new development to pay its fair-share of traffic impacts, then no development type should be exempted. This option would not have an impact on STMP revenue projections since it would not involve exemptions or discounts. While not a full exemption, a developer under this scenario could still seek a reduction in the STMP fee due based on the submittal of traffic study that demonstrated a lower trip generation than that used to set the STMP fee (as is the case under the current program).

2. **Partial Reduction for Affordable Housing:** Studies show that affordable housing that is targeted to seniors or the disabled has lower trip generation rates than market-rate housing. But not all affordable housing is the same. Affordable housing targeted to families or with larger unit sizes could well have higher trip generation rates than market-rate housing because of the likelihood of having more people living in each unit. Most new affordable housing falls within STMP’s Multi-family category even though there could be a wide variability in trip generation. One option for setting a reduced fee for affordable housing is to provide a general discount for affordable housing, but not a full exemption. For this revenue analysis, a new Affordable Housing fee was set at 50% of the
Multi-family fee rate, since multi-family is the most common type of affordable housing built. If the STMP fees were set to charge the maximum potential fee and there was an Affordable Housing fee category set at 50% of the Multi-family category, then the STMP program would lose $1.95 million in revenue over the life of the program by exempting the 1100 new affordable housing units, or about 1.2% of the total potential revenue. If the 75/50 fee scenario were implemented, then the STMP program would lose $950,000 in revenue over the life of the program, or about or about 0.95% of the total potential revenue.

3. **Full Exemption for All Affordable Housing Regardless of Traffic Impacts:** A full exemption would shield affordable housing from the STMP fee as a means to help encourage its production. If the maximum fee were being charged, the STMP program would lose $3.9 million in revenue over the life of the program by exempting the 1100 new affordable housing, or about 2.4% of total potential revenue. If the 75/50 fee scenario were selected, then the STMP program would lose $2.9 million in revenue over the life of the program, or about 2.9% of total potential revenue.

**Consideration of a Government Buildings/Facilities Exemption**
There are a wide variety of types of government buildings and facilities, including city halls, community centers and corporation yards. There are County facilities like libraries, jails, or health services that could be located in incorporated or unincorporated jurisdictions. There are also special districts such as school districts (with and without Charter Schools), colleges, transit districts, fire districts, hospital district, sanitary districts and agencies such as WCCTAC. Additionally, there are state and federal facilities that could be located within a West County jurisdiction. Depending on the type of new facility, the trip generation can vary greatly.

Our consultants research was unable to find much information about either the current or projected number of public buildings, but they presume that the number of new government buildings is likely to be fairly small. As a result, the analysis below does not include an estimate of the revenue effects of a STMP exemption for government buildings.

The TAC discussed several options for exemptions for government buildings and facilities. These included: 1. granting no exemptions, 2. an exemption based on who owns the building and 3. exempting all government buildings and facilities.

1. **No Exemption for Government Buildings and Facilities**
Whether or not a new building or facility is owned by a government entity, its new development is likely to generate new trips. If the true traffic impacts from new development are to be addressed, then no STMP fee exemptions for government buildings and facilities should be authorized, according to this argument. A no exemption policy could also encourage the developer of the government building to implement trip reduction measures. Some WCCTAC member cities have policies in place that do not allow themselves to be exempt from development fees. The philosophy is that government should be subject to the same regulations as others.
2. **Exemption Based on Local Ownership of Government Buildings and Facilities**
   A city may control the development of its own buildings and facilities, but it may have less control over the development of buildings and facilities within their jurisdiction by other government agencies and thus their traffic impacts. One option the TAC discussed was granting a STMP fee exemption to buildings and facilities that were owned by a local jurisdiction, e.g. a community center. The local government agencies eligible for the exemption would need to be specified but could include cities and school districts. (The TAC noted that since new public libraries are owned by the local city, those libraries would also be exempt from the STMP fee under this example.) Administratively and legally, this option creates additional burden both for local and WCCTAC staff. Undoubtedly, a local government agency not specified on the exemption list could appeal and request that their agency or development also be granted an exemption.

3. **Full Exemption for All Government Buildings and Facilities**
   Some claim that requiring STMP fees from government agencies for their new buildings and facilities is a form of double-taxing. Additionally, some view public fees as unnecessarily adding to the cost of a new public project. There is also an issue of the potential scale of the traffic impact. New trips resulting from a new government building could vary greatly, e.g. a public hospital vs a small government office. The revenue generated from a small, low-transportation impact government building would minimally impact the subregion’s ability to implement improvements and the subregion could “absorb” this minor traffic addition with little impact. However, a new large-scale facility such as a public hospital or expansion of a college campus would not result in any contribution towards STMP despite the significant traffic impacts the development generates. Fully exempting public entities would create a situation where a large-scale public development does not pay its fair share for its traffic impacts and the subregion would not receive the revenue to implement transportation improvements to address the transportation issues the development generated. Additionally, this option would not encourage the developer of a public building to reduce the number of trips it might generate.

**NEXT STEPS**

The consultants are preparing a draft model ordinance and master cooperative agreement for the TAC and local city attorneys to review. Once drafts are prepared and reviewed, local jurisdictions will be asked to agendize these items for their Councils approval in January or February 2019. The consultants and TAC are also working on developing administrative guidelines to serve as a reference for staff tasked with working on the program.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

A. August 3, 2018 PowerPoint Presentation on Maximum Potential Allowable STMP Fee
B. Staff Report for August 3, 2018 WCCTAC Board Meeting
WEST COUNTY STMP UPDATE

WCCTAC Board Meeting
August 3, 2018
TOPICS

• Project Status Update
• Approved Project List
• Fair-share Percentages
• Calculation of Potential Maximum Fee
• Discussion of Recommended Fee Levels
West County STMP Process

1. Develop growth projections
2. Develop list of capital projects and estimate costs
3. Conduct nexus analysis
4. Account for foreseeable funding from other sources
5. Calculate maximum justifiable fee
6. Adoption by City Councils and Board of Supervisors
7. Make final fee calculations and establish new fee schedule
8. Consider reducing project list or costs
9. Consider alternative fee levels, compare with other programs

Input by Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Board
STEPS COMPLETED TO DATE

- Reviews of:
  - 2005 Nexus Study
  - Current fee levels
  - Existing program’s administration
- Existing Conditions evaluation
- Annual growth rate projections set:
  - 1.2% for housing, 0.9% for jobs
- Project list approved by Board in February 2018
## APPROVED PROJECT LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>Cost by Category ($ mil)</th>
<th># of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets Projects</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian-Focused Projects</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit and Station-Related Projects</td>
<td>$618</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street and Intersection Projects</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway and Interchange Projects</td>
<td>$111</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$854</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW DEVELOPMENT’S FAIR SHARE

- Share of future population and traffic volumes coming from new development: 19%
- 19% of $854 million = $161 million
- $161 million = Maximum amount covered through STMP fees
CALCULATION OF POTENTIAL MAXIMUM FEE
REMINDERS

• Outcome of nexus analysis is a maximum potential fee that could be charged to new development
• Policymakers can set fee levels equal to or less than the maximum potential fee
• Different land use categories can be adjusted separately to support subregion’s priorities
PREVIOUS NEXUS STUDY

• WCCTAC Board adopted “maximum” fees from 2005 nexus study (although those included discounted trip rates for retail, office, and industrial uses)

• The fees adopted in 2005 were significantly higher than original 1997 fees
### Maximum Fee Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Capital Cost Attributed to Each Category</th>
<th>Total Units of Future Development</th>
<th>Maximum Potential Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Residential</td>
<td>$33,869,010</td>
<td>4,685 DU</td>
<td>$7,230 per DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>$49,997,110</td>
<td>14,040 DU</td>
<td>$3,562 per DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$56,448,350</td>
<td>4,869,300 SF</td>
<td>$11.59 per SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>$14,515,290</td>
<td>1,656,500 SF</td>
<td>$8.76 per SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$6,451,240</td>
<td>873,000 SF</td>
<td>$7.39 per SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$161,281,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FEE COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>WCCTAC Maximum Potential Fee</th>
<th>WCCTAC (Current, Not Indexed)</th>
<th>WCCTAC (Current, Indexed)</th>
<th>East County RTPC Fee</th>
<th>Lamorinda RTPC Fee</th>
<th>Tri-Valley RTPC Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family (per DU)</td>
<td>$7,230</td>
<td>$2,595</td>
<td>$3,697</td>
<td>$18,186</td>
<td>$7,269</td>
<td>$4,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (per DU)</td>
<td>$3,562</td>
<td>$1,648</td>
<td>$2,348</td>
<td>$11,164</td>
<td>$5,088</td>
<td>$3,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (per SF)</td>
<td>$11.59</td>
<td>$3.51</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>$7.78</td>
<td>$7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (per SF)</td>
<td>$8.76</td>
<td>$1.82</td>
<td>$2.59</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$7.78</td>
<td>$3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (per SF)</td>
<td>$7.39</td>
<td>$2.45</td>
<td>$3.49</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
<td>$7.78</td>
<td>$4.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSIDERATIONS IN SETTING FEES

- Effect of fees on different land use categories
- Potential for fee exemptions for certain categories, though not currently allowed in STMP
- Comparison to similar fees in nearby areas
- Comparison to current fee levels
- Effect of fees on timing of STMP project funding and implementation
ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS

Findings from El Cerrito Affordable Housing In-Lieu Fee Economic Feasibility Study:

- Many projects in pipeline
- Market not yet established
- Residential development feasible
- Projects could support modest new fee in addition to existing city and regional fees
IMPLICATIONS FOR STMP UPDATE

- Land prices and construction costs have largest effect on feasibility
- Has market reached top of cycle?
- Maximum STMP fee likely to have little/no economic impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>El Cerrito Housing Fee</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Rental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0-4.0%</td>
<td>3.0-4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STMP Update: Maximum Fee</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Rental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### POSSIBLE SCENARIOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Maximum Potential Fee</th>
<th>Fee Set at 75% of Max Residential, 50% of Max Non-Residential</th>
<th>Current WCCTAC Fee (Indexed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family (per DU)</td>
<td>$7,230</td>
<td>$5,423</td>
<td>$3,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family (per DU)</td>
<td>$3,562</td>
<td>$2,672</td>
<td>$2,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (per SF)</td>
<td>$11.59</td>
<td>$5.80</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (per SF)</td>
<td>$8.76</td>
<td>$4.38</td>
<td>$2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (per SF)</td>
<td>$7.39</td>
<td>$3.70</td>
<td>$3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Maximum Fee Revenue</td>
<td>$161,281,000</td>
<td>$161,281,000</td>
<td>$161,281,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Revenue Generated from this Scenario</td>
<td>$161,281,000</td>
<td>$101,611,000</td>
<td>$81,970,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEXT STEPS

• Develop fee administration guidelines and review with TAC: Aug-Oct
• Draft fee ordinance: Sept-Nov
  • Review by WCCTAC attorney
  • Review by City Attorneys/County Counsel
• Board accepts final nexus report: December
• Fee ordinance considered for adoption by each jurisdiction: Early 2019
DISCUSSION ITEMS

• Any questions on methodology
• Discussion of different fee level options
• Direction for staff and consultants so Board can arrive at recommended fee level in September
QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS?
REQUESTED ACTION
Receive presentation and provide recommendations on new STMP fee levels.

OVERVIEW
To date, WCCTAC has gone through two iterations of its transportation mitigation fee program. The first program began in the late 1990s and collected development fees to fund three projects. Between 2005-2006, WCCTAC conducted a nexus study and implemented a new program that was intended to partially fund eleven projects and generate an estimated $95 million in revenue over 25 years. Nexus study updates are typically undertaken every few years so local priorities can be reconfirmed, completed projects removed, new projects added, and the nexus between development impacts and projects corroborated.

Since the spring of 2017, WCCTAC has undertaken updating the STMP program by conducting a new nexus study. By law, the study is required to document that the development fees collected are justified and proportional to the impacts from new development. For this fee update process, WCCTAC engaged the services of Fehr and Peers as the lead of the consultant team. To date, Fehr and Peers staff have worked with the Board and TAC to review the existing program, set appropriate growth projections, evaluate existing conditions and develop a new project list.

At this point in the process, the consultants have prepared a new memo explaining how they have used land use and employment growth projections to evaluate the listed projects’ share of the cost that could be attributable to new development. The result of this latest round of analysis is a calculation of the maximum potential transportation mitigation fee that WCCTAC could charge new development.

BACKGROUND
With the passage of Measure C, the original ½ percent sales tax that funded transportation in Contra Costa County, there was a requirement that new development pay its fair-share by establishing transportation mitigation fee programs. Within the county, subregions developed their own fee programs. Given that the fee program was new, in 1997, the WCCTAC Board set the original fees relatively low compared to what the maximum potential
fee could have been and it was anticipated that at that level the fee would raise $5.1 million over the life of that program.

For the 2005 STMP Update, the consultants calculated the maximum potential fee and then applied discounts for particular land uses. The January 2005 STMP Nexus Study included a 50% discount to the trip rates for retail uses, as well as a 25% discount for office and a 22% discount for industrial. Even with these discounts applied, the fees were significantly higher than the original 1997 fee rates. The 2005 Nexus Study presented to the Board the “maximum” fees which included these embedded discounts. According to the minutes at that time, the WCCTAC Board noted their desire for new development to pay its fair-share and the Board members expressed more comfort setting a higher STMP fee than when the original program was adopted. Ultimately the Board approved the “maximum” fee rate presented in the 2005 Nexus Study.

The adoption of the 2005/2006 STMP fee program set new fee rates and also permitted annual fee adjustments indexed to inflation. At the time, WCCTAC did not provide sufficient information to ensure that jurisdictions were being consistent in their fee adjustments. Over the years, some jurisdictions adjusted the STMP fees on their own and applied their own adjustment factors. When WCCTAC began this latest nexus update, we reported to the Board, that there was variation in the fee amounts charged by the member jurisdictions. At that time, WCCTAC staff recommended using this nexus update process as an opportunity to get all of the jurisdictions on the same fee schedule and then better institutionalize the process of adjusting the STMP fee annually.

DISCUSSION
The latest technical memo prepared by Fehr and Peers, attached, calculates the maximum potential transportation mitigation fee that the STMP program could now charge. For this nexus study, the consultants also calculated what the 2005 STMP fees would have been if the original fee had been consistently indexed annually per the program’s rules. (The STMP program identified the Engineering News-Record Construction Cost Index for the San Francisco Bay Area as the benchmark for adjusting fees annually for inflation.) In the consultant’s latest memo, these fees are called the Indexed Fee.

The consultants presented the latest memo to the WCCTAC TAC and sought its feedback. The TAC unanimously agreed to forward the technical memo to the Board but did not make a fee level recommendation. They also noted that Board guidance was needed on whether or not to incorporate any reductions or exemptions for special situations such as public buildings or certain types of housing. The existing program specifies, in the ordinances adopted by each jurisdiction, that no development shall be exempt from the fee. WCCTAC staff and the consultants recommend continuing the practice of not exempting any type of new development from STMP fees.

Determining the appropriate fee for each land use category is challenging. There is clearly a need for more transportation funding. Another factor to consider is a recent shift in project
Costs away from federal funding sources and toward local sources. Even though the STMP does not typically fully fund transportation projects, it does often serve as a critical piece of a larger funding picture.

Given unmet transportation needs in West County and limited sources of available funding, there is a strong case for setting the new STMP fees at the maximum allowable fee amounts. However, staff also understands that there may be competing economic development objectives which could be a reason for setting fees at lower than the maximum.

Both the consultants and WCCTAC staff recommend that the existing STMP’s Indexed Fee amounts be used as the minimum baseline for setting a future STMP fee. Furthermore, we recommend that the Board consider setting the STMP fees higher than this baseline so that new development does indeed pay closer to its fair share of the transportation impacts. This would help to ensure that sufficient revenue is available to mitigate development impacts and address West County’s unmet transportation needs.

**NEXT STEPS**
At the August 3 meeting, the consultant and WCCTAC staff will work with the Board on developing its recommended new STMP fee levels. Subsequent work will include an updated model ordinance that each jurisdiction will need to adopt and the development of implementation guidelines for WCCTAC staff and staff from local jurisdictions. Additionally, before transitioning to an updated STMP program, there will need to be one last call for projects under the existing program. At this time, WCCTAC staff estimates that that call for projects could allocate approximately $1,800,000 to $2,000,000 in funds to eligible projects listed in the current STMP. For each of these next work items, staff will return to the Board.

**Attachments:**
A. June 19, 2018 Memo from Fehr and Peers regarding STMP’s Draft Nexus Analysis and Cost Allocation
This Page Intentionally Blank
REQUESTED ACTION
Authorize release of the 2018 STMP Call for Projects.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION
WCCTAC is currently in the process of updating the Nexus Study for its Sub-regional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP). The process will culminate in a model ordinance with a new STMP project list that each West County local jurisdiction will be asked to adopt, as well as a master cooperative agreement for each jurisdiction to authorize.

Once the new program is established, funds will begin to be collected under the rules of the new program and will stop being collected under the rules of the old program. Funds collected after this transition can only be spent on the new STMP project list. (There are several projects that will carry over from the old program to the new program and any unspent funds remaining from the old program can only go towards the carried over projects.) The transition between programs provides an opportunity to allocate funds from the old program prior to closing that program out and will simplify the administration and tracking of funds under both programs.

Funding Available
The balance in the WCCTAC STMP account as of July 2018 is approximately $4,420,934. Of this amount, WCCTAC has budgeted or existing obligations for completion of the STMP Nexus Study, STMP projects with BART, El Cerrito and Hercules and FY 208-19 Program Administrative Expenses. The total STMP funds available for the WCCTAC Board to allocate to eligible STMP projects is approximately $3 million. The table below summarizes the revenue balance and current funding commitments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current STMP Balance as of July 2018</th>
<th>$4,420,934</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STMP Budgeted or Obligated Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior funding commitments (BART, El Cerrito and Hercules)</td>
<td>$1,311,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of STMP Nexus Study</td>
<td>$94,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 18-19 Administrative (budgeted)</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal of funding commitments</strong></td>
<td>$1,455,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total STMP Funds Available to Program</strong></td>
<td>$2,965,418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Application Process**

Agencies eligible to apply for STMP funds include any project sponsor with a project on the current list of 11 approved projects (See Attachment A for 2005 STMP Project List). The primary eligible agencies are WCCTAC members and the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD).

Interested parties should submit a brief letter of interest and any attachments in one pdf file to WCCTAC c/o both John Nemeth and Leah Greenblat by October 25, 2018. The letter should include the following information:

- Identification of which of the 11 STMP project categories the proposal falls under.
- Past STMP funding received, including the timing, amount and project category.
- The total cost of the project and/or the cost of the current project phase.
- The amount of STMP funds being requested.
- The location of the project as shown on a map.
- A description of what the STMP funds would be used for.
- A summary project schedule showing estimated month and year of PSE, start of construction, end of construction, and opening to the public.
- Identification of the project’s current project readiness status.

The proposed schedule for the Call for Projects is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notification to WCCTAC TAC of Proposed Call for Projects</td>
<td>Sept 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Call for Projects</td>
<td>Sept 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Proposals Due</td>
<td>Oct 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCCTAC Staff Review of Proposals</td>
<td>Oct 26-Nov 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Proposals Reviewed by WCCTAC TAC</td>
<td>Nov 2-Nov 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC forwards recommendation to WCCTAC Board</td>
<td>Nov 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCCTAC Board takes action to allocate STMP funds</td>
<td>Dec 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria**

WCCTAC staff and TAC concurred to 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 (project readiness), 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’s consideration.
**Next Steps**
If the Board authorizes the release of the 2018 STMP Call for Projects, WCCTAC staff would notify its member agencies and EBRPD of the official release of the Call for Projects. The WCCTAC TAC at its October meeting plans to discuss which agencies might be considering submitting proposals before reviewing actual proposals at its November meeting. WCCTAC staff anticipates bringing a programming recommendation for the STMP funds back to the Board at its December 2018 meeting.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
A. 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.
SUBJECT: Request for Appropriation of 2018 Measure J Funds
2018 Western Contra Costa County, San Francisco Bay Trail Rehabilitation (North Richmond Regional Wetlands, Point Pinole Regional Shoreline and San Pablo Bay Regional Shoreline)

Dear Mr. Beck:

The East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) requests an appropriation of Measure J Program 13, Pedestrian, Bicycle or Trail Facilities funds in the amount of $500,000 for the 2018 San Francisco Bay Trail Rehabilitation project. The appropriated funds will be used to finance the construction phases of the project as outlined in the attached funding allocation request form.

The ultimate project will rehabilitate approximately 3.2-miles of paved regional trail in western Contra Costa County on the San Francisco Bay Trail including 1.4-miles of trail at Point Pinole Regional Shoreline, 1.3-mile of trail at the Dotson Family Marsh, replace twin culverts at the Richmond North Wetlands and 0.5-miles of trail at San Pablo Regional Shoreline. The total project cost is estimated at $551,800 and will be funded with Measure J funds and EBRPD General Funds. This project was approved by the WCCTAC sub-region board on INSERT DATE.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

San Francisco Bay Trail, Point Pinole Regional Shoreline - Rehabilitate approximately 121,440 square feet of paved regional trails in western Contra Costa County at Point Pinole Regional Shoreline in Richmond from its beginning near the Giant Staging Area to the end of the trail east of Atlas Road. The project includes the application of approximately 4,224 linear feet of hot crack fill, the removal and replacement of approximately 42,240 square feet of asphalt and the installation of 8,448 square feet of aggregate base shoulder backing. Approximately 52,800 square feet of the trail will be treated with a Type II slurry seal.
San Francisco Bay Trail, Dotson Family Marsh – Rehabilitate approximately 68,380 square feet of paved regional trail in western Contra Costa County at the Dotson Family Marsh in Richmond from its beginning near the staging area at the end of Goodrick Avenue to the end of the trail that connects to the existing trail at Point Pinole Regional Shoreline. The project includes the application of approximately 2,120 linear feet of hot crack fill, the removal and replacement of approximately 5,110 square feet of asphalt. Approximately 68,380 square feet of trail will be treated with a double seal coat.

San Francisco Bay Trail, North Richmond Wetlands – Replace old twin-culverts in one locations within western Contra Costa County, located approximately 0.3-miles north of the Wildcat Creek Regional Trail at the North Richmond Wetlands in Richmond. The trail crosses a small slough in this area. The existing steel culverts are partially buried and too narrow for the trail location. The existing culverts will be replaced with longer 40-foot corrosion resistance HDPE double walled culverts. The trail will be repaved to the full width standard of the San Francisco Bay Trail.

San Francisco Bay Trail, San Pablo Shoreline - Rehabilitate approximately 26,400 square feet of paved regional trails in western Contra Costa County at San Pablo Regional Shoreline in Hercules from its beginning near the Pinole Creek Bridge to the end of the trail east of Santa Fe Avenue in Hercules. The project includes the application of approximately 9,000 linear feet of hot crack fill, the removal and replacement of approximately 2,000 square feet of asphalt. Approximately 26,400 square feet of the trail will be treated with a Type II slurry seal.

MAPS
BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Replace Twin Culverts (North Richmond Wetlands)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Remove and Replace AC</td>
<td>47,350</td>
<td>$331,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Type II Slurry</td>
<td>79,200</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Double Seal Coat</td>
<td>68,380</td>
<td>$21,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shoulder Backing</td>
<td>8,448</td>
<td>$21,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$608,768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The project is operated the East Bay Regional Park District. This section of trail is operated and maintained by the park rangers and maintenance and skilled trades crews centered out of the Pacheco Corporation Yard in Martinez. All of these crews are funded as part of the District's annual budget. This rehabilitation project will extend the life of the trail and aid in its maintenance.

FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total project cost</td>
<td>$608,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested PBTF funds</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRPD General Fund</td>
<td>$108,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other committed funding</td>
<td>$000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfunded balance</td>
<td>$000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you need any further information, please contact acting Grants Manager Tiffany Margulici at tmargulici@ebparks.org or 510-544-2204.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Margulici
Grants Manager
511 Contra Costa's TEXT-YOUR-COMMUTE Challenge

REGISTER NOW:
1. Text START to (925) 905-TRIP (8747) to register from September 24 until October 15
2. You will receive daily texts at 10am and 7pm asking you about your commute
3. Respond by texting your commute using up to 2 of the following modes (separated by spaces):
   1. Carpool
   2. Transit
   3. Ride Share App
   4. Walk
   5. Bike
   6. Drive alone
   7. Other

BE SMART. DO NOT TEXT OR USE YOUR PHONE WHILE DRIVING.

In order to participate, participants must have a cell phone number with the ability to text message. Standard data fees and text messaging rates may apply. For eligibility, prizes, terms and conditions visit:

www.511cc.org/tyc
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August 3, 2018

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

RE: August WCCTAC Board Meeting Summary

Dear Randy:

The WCCTAC Board, at its meeting on August 3, 2018, took the following actions that may be of interest to CCTA:

1. Approved FY2019 Measure J 19b claims for WestCAT ($368,872) and AC Transit- ($1,604,872) for bus service in West County.
2. Approved an allocation of $60,000 of Measure J 21b funds for the Safe Transportation for Children Fund for the John Swett Unified School District (JSUSD).
3. Approved a Joint Marketing and Funding Agreement for the Soltrans Buy One Get One (BOGO) program.
5. Approved the use of $91,000 in Measure J 28b funds for a match to an MTC PASS Grant.

Please let me know if you have any follow-up questions.

Sincerely,

John Nemeth
Executive Director

cc: Tarienne Grover, CCTA; John Cunningham, TRANSPAC; Jamar Stamps, TRANSPLAN; Lisa Bobadilla, SWAT; Matt Todd, CCTA
ACRONYM LIST. Below are acronyms frequently utilized in WCCTAC communications.

**ABAG**: Association of Bay Area Governments
**ACTC**: Alameda County Transportation Commission
**ADA**: Americans with Disabilities Act
**APC**: Administration and Projects Committee (CCTA)
**ATP**: Active Transportation Program
**AV**: Autonomous Vehicle
**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
**CIL**: Center for Independent Living
**CMAs**: Congestion Management Agencies
**CMAQ**: Congestion Management and Air Quality
**CMIA**: Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (Prop 1B bond fund)
**CMP**: Congestion Management Program
**CSMP**: Corridor System Management Plan
**CTC**: California Transportation Commission
**CTP**: Contra Costa Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan
**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 RITC**: 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
PASS: Program for Arterial System Synchronization
PBTF: Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities
PC: Planning Committee (CCTA)
PCC: Paratransit Coordinating 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 Officer
SOV: Single Occupant Vehicle
STA: State Transit Assistance
STIP: State Transportation Improvement Program
STMP: Subregional Transportation Mitigation Plan
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
TEP: Transportation Expenditure Plan
TLC: Transportation for Livable Communities
TOD: Transit Oriented Development
TRANSPEC: 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
WETA: Water Emergency Transportation Agency