



WCCTAC Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

El Cerrito

DATE & TIME: Thursday, March 11, 9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

Hercules

LOCATION: City of San Pablo, Council Chambers
13831 San Pablo Avenue (at Church Lane)
San Pablo, California

- Accessible by AC Transit lines #72 and #72R
- Additional Parking is available in the Yard-Birds lot

Pinole

1. Welcome and Self-Introductions – John Rudolph, Chair

Richmond

2. Public Comment. At this time, the public is welcome to address the TAC on any item that does not otherwise appear on the agenda. Please fill out a speaker card. Comments are limited to three minutes per speaker. Speakers shall follow the rules of common courtesy and decorum.

San Pablo

3. Meeting Summary and Sign-In Sheet from the February 11, 2010 Meeting.
(Attachment)

Contra Costa
County

4. I-80 ICM Corridor System Management Plan and Ramp Metering Plan – 75 minutes. The Alameda County Congestion Management Agency and its consultant will review recent deliverables on two major initiatives pertaining to the CMIA (freeway) portion of the project. The CSMP is [here](#); the Ramp Metering Plan is [here](#). *(John Hemiup and Bijan Yarjani, ACCMA; Anush Nejad, Kimley-Horn Associates – Attachment and Handout – Discussion)*

AC Transit

5. Update on Pt. Molate – 5 minutes. Staff will provide an update on the Board's action of Feb. 26, 2010. *(Staff – Attachment – Information)*

BART

6. Update on SB 83, Potential Ballot Measure for November 2010 – 5 minutes. Staff will provide an update on a potential source of local revenue, through the vehicle registration fee, for transportation projects and programs. *(Staff – Attachment – Information)*

WestCAT

7. Update on Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Grant Opportunities – 10 minutes. Applications to the Regional TLC Program are due to MTC by April 22. Staff have identified a number of local West County projects already on the County Transportation Planning List that may be eligible for TLC funding. The TAC will discuss strategies for maximizing opportunities for West County jurisdictions to access TLC funding. *(Staff – Handout – Discussion)*

- 8. Update on MTC CMA Block Grant Program – 5 minutes.** Staff will provide an update on recent actions by the Board and Authority. (*Staff – No Attachment – Information*)
- 9. Project Updates and Announcements – 10 minutes.**
- a. Transit Enhancement and Wayfinding Signage Strategic Plans – *No Attachment*
 - b. Safe Routes to School – *No Attachment*
 - c. TDM / 511 Contra Costa – *No Attachment*
 - d. AC Transit Service Adjustments Community Outreach – *Attachment*
 - e. Rail~Volution, Oct. 18-21, Portland, OR, Call for Proposals – *Attachment*

10. Other Business.

11. Adjournment.

Next WCCTAC-TAC meetings:

- April 8, 2010, 9:00 a.m.
- May 13, 2010, 9:00 a.m.

Next WCCTAC Board meetings:

- March 26, 2010, 8:00 a.m.
- April 30, 2010, 8:00 a.m.

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 John Rudolph at 510.215.3042 or Nancy Cuneo at 510.215.3035 prior to the meeting. If you have special transportation requirements and would like to attend the meeting, please call WCCTAC (see phone numbers above) at least 48 hours in advance to make arrangements. Please refrain from wearing scented products to the meeting, as there may be attendees susceptible to environmental illnesses. Please turn off all cellular phones and pagers during the meeting. A meeting sign-in sheet will be circulated at the meeting. Sign-in is optional.



TO: WCCTAC Technical Advisory Committee

DATE: February 18, 2010

FR: John Rudolph JR

RE: Summary of February 11, 2010 WCCTAC-TAC Meeting

1. Pt. Molate DEIS/DEIR Response: Richmond staff and the City's environmental consultants met with the TAC to present and discuss their proposed disposition of WCCTAC's comments to the DEIS/DEIR. The TAC reviewed a list of discussion points relative to the traffic impact report in the environmental analysis, and suggested, among other matters, (a) that a transit plan be developed as part of the environmental review; and (b) that analysis of Interstate 80 south of I-580 be included in the traffic impact report. Knowing that the project could generate trips in excess of those anticipated, and yet desiring to encourage local economic development, the TAC discussed inviting Richmond to participate in creating principles of agreement that would serve as a framework for monitoring and mitigation of traffic impacts as the project develops over time.

2. Caltrans Community Based Transportation Plan: West County CBTP: The TAC discussed the proposed grant application, and recommended that the project focus on specific corridors. Staff also announced that WCCTAC is not an eligible applicant, and noted that one of the member agencies may be asked to sponsor the project.

3. MTC's CMA Block Grant: Technical details pertaining to the proposed program will be discussed at the February 18th TCC meeting. The TAC opposed the transfer of Regional Bicycle Program funds to the Local Streets and Roads Program, noting that the funds make a big difference in the Bike Program and would make virtually no difference in the Local Streets and Roads Program, considering the magnitude of the shortfall.

4. Guiding Principles for SB 375: Matt Kelly, CCTA, provided an overview. With respect to apparent discrepancies between CCTA's Principles and the text of SB 375, the TAC asked CCTA to consider creating a chart indicating points of comparison.

5. Safe Routes to School: Shannon Ladner-Beasley announced (a) that at the recent Smart Growth conference in Seattle the presentation of the Health Element of Richmond's General Plan was enthusiastically received by a national audience; and (b) a pedestrian safety assessment in Richmond was recently undertaken with financial and technical assistance from UC Berkeley's Traffic Safety Center.

6. I-80 ICM: Comments on the CSMP are due March 1, except that a presentation by the ACCMA on the CSMP is expected at both the March 11 TAC and March 26 Board meetings, after which time members of the TAC and Board may submit comments.

7. West County Paratransit Study: A Board subcommittee is working with staff to develop a Scope of Work to include in a forthcoming RFP to increase long- and short-term effectiveness.

8. Richmond Traffic Safety Survey: Steven Tam announced that Richmond Traffic Engineering is conducting an online poll: <http://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/CivicAlerts.aspx?AID=474>.

9. Adjournment until March 11, 2010, at 9:00 a.m.

The next **regular WCCTAC-TAC meetings** will be:

- Thursday March 11, 2010 at 9:00 a.m.
- Thursday April 8, 2010 at 9:00 a.m.

The next **WCCTAC Board meetings** will be:

- Friday February 26, 2010 at 8:00 a.m.
- Friday March 26, 2010 at 8:00 a.m.

WCCTAC Technical Advisory Committee Meeting: *February 11, 2010*

NAME	INITIALS	AGENCY	EMAIL	PHONE
Dean Allison		Pinole	dallison@ci.pinole.ca.us	510.724.9010
Christina Atienza	<i>cma</i>	WCCTAC	christinaa@ci.san-pablo.ca.us	510.215.3044
Nancy Baer		CCHS	nbaer@hdsd.cccounty.us	925.313.6837
Brad Beck		CCTA	bbeck@ccta.net	925.256.4726
Jerry Bradshaw		El Cerrito	jbradshaw@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us	510.215.4382
Julie Campero		Caltrans D4	jcampero@dot.ca.gov	510.622.5905
Martin Engelmann		CCTA	mre@ccta.net	925.256.4729
Avan Gangapuram	<i>A</i>	San Pablo	avang@ci.san-pablo.ca.us	510.215.3201
Steve Goetz		CCC CD	sgoet@cd.cccounty.us	925.335.1240
Jack Hall		CCTA	jhall@ccta.net	925.256.4743
Lisa Hammon		Hercules	lhammon@ci.hercules.ca.us	510.799.8251
Deidre Heitman	<i>dh</i>	BART	dheitma@bart.gov	510.287.4796
Adèle Ho	<i>AH</i>	San Pablo	adeleh@ci.san-pablo.ca.us	510.215.3068
Matt Kelly	<i>MK</i>	CCTA	mkelly@ccta.net	925.256.4730
Sailaja Kurella		ABAG	sailajak@abag.ca.gov	510.464.7957
Edric Kwan		Richmond	edric_kwan@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.621.1825
Nathan Landau	<i>NL</i>	AC Transit	nlandau@actransit.org	510.891.4792
Shannon Ladner-Beasley	<i>SLB</i>	CCHS	SLadner-Beasley@hdsd.cccounty.us	925.313.6813
Cory LaVigne		AC Transit	clavigne@actransit.org	510.891.4846
Steve Lawton		Hercules	slawton@ci.hercules.ca.us	510.799.8233
Alan Lee		BART	aleel@bart.gov	510.464.6121
John McKenzie		Caltrans D4	jmckenzie@dot.ca.gov	510.286.5556
Richard Mitchell		Richmond	richard_mitchell@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.620.6858
Jannat Muhammed		NHNR	jannatmuhammad@yahoo.com	510.229.5041
Hisham Noeimi		CCTA	hnoeimi@ccta.net	925.256.4731
Yvetteh Ortiz		El Cerrito	yortiz@ci.el-cerrito.ca.us	510.215.4345
Joanna Pallock	<i>JP</i>	WCCTAC	joannap@ci.san-pablo.ca.us	510.215.3035
Lori Reese-Brown		Richmond	lori_reese-brown@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.620.6869
Winston Rhodes	<i>WR</i>	Pinole	wrhodes@ci.pinole.ca.us	510.724.9832
Hector Rojas		Richmond	hector_rojas@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.620.6662
John Rudolph	<i>JR</i>	WCCTAC	johnr@ci.san-pablo.ca.us	510.215.3042
Puja Sarna		AC Transit	psarna@actransit.org	510.891.4867
Jamar Stamps	<i>JS</i>	CCC CD	jstam@cd.cccounty.us	925.335.1220
Vamsi Tabjulu		MTC	vtabjulu@mtc.ca.gov	510.817.5936
Steven Tam	<i>ST</i>	Richmond	steven_tam@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.307.8091
Robert Thompson	<i>RT</i>	WestCAT	rob@westcat.org	510.724.3331
Lina Velasco	<i>LV</i>	Richmond	lina_velasco@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.620.6706
Michael Williams		Richmond	michael_williams@ci.richmond.ca.us	510.307.8147
Linda Young	<i>LY</i>	WCCTAC	linday@ci.san-pablo.ca.us	510.215.3008
Tim Fehon	<i>TF</i>	DKS Ass	tjf@DKSASSOCIATES.COM	510.267.6643
Joe Story	<i>JS</i>	DKS	jst@dksassociates.com	510.267.6635
Charlie Abrams		Abrams Assoc		
Steve Abrams	<i>SA</i>	Abrams Assoc	steve@abramsassociates.com	925.945-0201
Mike Taggart	<i>MT</i>	RES	m.taggart@analyticalcorp.com	916.447.3448
Chad Brissard	<i>CB</i>	"	cbrissard@analyticalcorp.com	"
John Salmon		UPSTREAM PART MGMT	jsalmon@hol.com	707.357.5545
Julie Eldridge	<i>JBE</i>	Kimberl Horn	julie.eldridge@kimberl-horn.com	707.331.915
Chad Smalley	<i>CS</i>	Richmond District	chad-smalley@ci.richmond.ca.us	415.2267

Point Molate Discussion Points for WCCTAC Board

Background

- WCCTAC submitted extensive comments on traffic study last Sept.
- Richmond staff and environmental consultants met with the TAC, discussed proposed disposition of comments.
- TAC provided comments on proposed disposition. Most are relatively minor issues that can be easily accommodated.
- Measure J Growth Management Program requires participation in ongoing cooperative, multi-jurisdictional planning process to address growth and its impacts on routes of regional significance. If CCTA determines that a jurisdiction is not in compliance, CCTA may withhold local street maintenance and improvement funds (aka 18% return-to-source) and eligibility for TLC funds.

Core Issues

- Big issue with the traffic study is that there is a lot of uncertainty with the trip generation.
 - No truly comparable projects from which to draw data.
 - Number of trips could vary greatly depending on gaming type and number of positions.
 - Study is based on a number of conditional assumptions: ferry service provisions, success of TDM strategies, internal reductions as a result of mixed uses.Uncertainty translates into difficulties with accurately predicting the magnitude and character of the project's traffic impacts on affected routes of regional significance (I-580, I-80, SR 4, Richmond Pkwy, San Pablo Av, Cutting, MacDonald, 23rd, Carlson, Central, Appian, El Portal, San Pablo Dam Rd).
- Current STMP fee schedule does not include this type of use.
- The Richmond MSA and County IGA do not sufficiently address potential impacts on routes of regional significance. They are focused on localized impacts and generally assume that the traffic study is accurate.
- CEQA has provision to revisit environmental analysis if necessary, even after the EIR has been certified. But land transfer to the Tribe could preclude ability to avail of provision.

MOU Concept

- Traffic analysis in EIR, corrected for the minor issues, could serve as the baseline. First step is to define STMP fees appropriate for this use.
- MOU could outline terms for monitoring actual trip generation and conditional assumptions, and establish conditions for refining the traffic analysis, reevaluating mitigation measures, and recalculating project contributions; for example, if ferry service is not provided, if TDM only results in 5% auto trip reduction, etc.
- MOU would not preclude completion of the CEQA process, i.e. it would not be presented as a mitigation to cover uncertainties.
- Need to ensure consistency with MSA and IGA.
- May need to resolve potential conflicts of interest due to Richmond and County's membership on WCCTAC.
- Could require significant legal assistance. Cost to prepare should be borne by sponsor.
- Advantages
 - Avoids potential legal challenge to validity of traffic analysis
 - Minimizes risk to Richmond of losing Measure J 18% return-to-source & TLC eligibility
 - Minimizes risk to developer of overpaying for mitigations
- Disadvantage – unchartered territory

Subject	Potential November 2010 Ballot Measure for a Vehicle Registration Fee Increase to Fund Transportation Programs and Projects
Summary of Issues	<p>The passage of Senate Bill 83 (2009) gives countywide transportation planning agencies the option of imposing an annual fee of up to \$10 on motor vehicles registered within their respective counties. The agencies would be required to develop an expenditure plan before placing the measure on the ballot, and would have to demonstrate a nexus between the funded programs and projects and the benefit to the vehicle owners paying the fee increase.</p>
Recommendations	<p>At its February 17, 2010 meeting, the Authority considered the possibility of placing a measure on the Contra Costa ballot in November 2010, and directed staff to begin work immediately to develop a general approach, along with a timeline and budget.</p> <p>1) Approve general approach, schedule and work plan, advisory committee structure, and revenue estimate for the development of an expenditure plan, nexus analysis and measure language per SB 83; and</p> <p>2) Approve entering into Amendment No. 2 to the Contract #230 with Nolte and Associates providing up to \$90,000 for consulting services associated with the development of the expenditure plan, nexus study and ballot measure language.</p>
Financial Implications	<p>In the short term, the recommendations involve a \$90,000 authorization for consulting services to be funded from Measure C planning funds.</p> <p>Excluding the election costs, the process could cost up to \$150,000 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$90,000 Amendment No. 2 to Contract #230 • \$40,000 Polling Services (authorized) • \$20,000 Legal Services by Nossaman • ? Election Costs (an estimate to be provided by Contra Costa Elections Dept. prior to the APC meeting) <p>Revenue could total approximately \$8.46 million annually. SB83 allows up to 5% to be used for administration costs.</p>
Options	<p>The Authority could recommend modifications to the proposed approach, schedule, and advisory committee structure. The Authority could also elect to issue a request for proposals for consulting services but that would delay the process, making the November 2010 ballot problematic.</p>
Attachments	<p>A. Proposed Scope of Work, Amendment No. 2 to Contract 230 B. Senate Bill 83</p>
Changes from Committee	

Background

At its February 17, 2010 meeting, the Authority considered the possibility of placing a measure on the Contra Costa ballot in November 2010 that would increase the registration fees by up to \$10 on motor vehicles registered in the county to pay for transportation programs and projects. Before making a decision to place a measure on the ballot, Authority members wanted to explore voter sentiment on the subject of a fee increase. On that basis, staff was directed to solicit proposals from qualified polling firms and to recommend the most appropriate firm to the Authority at its March meeting.

Given the extremely tight timeline involved with getting a measure drafted, vetted and finalized by the August 6, 2010 deadline, the board directed staff to begin work immediately to develop a general approach to the development of an expenditure plan and a nexus study, along with a timeline and budget.

General Approach: The recommendations that follow reflect a variety of factors, some stemming from the provisions of the enabling legislation (SB 83, 2009), while others from logistical and political realities. For instance:

- The legislation provides for an imposition of a *fee*, rather than a tax. The good news is that the measure can pass with a majority vote, rather than the 2/3rds required to pass a tax. However, the fee designation triggers the requirement that a nexus be established between the funded programs and projects and the benefit that inures to those paying the fee. All projects and programs in the expenditure plan will have to demonstrate that nexus.
- Time-wise, we are already ‘behind the eight ball’. While there are reasons why aiming for the November 2010 ballot is preferable to waiting until 2011 or 2012 (which were discussed at length at the February Authority meeting), the logistics of developing an expenditure plan that has the support of key constituent groups in less than four months will be a major challenge. Simplicity will be key, as will sticking to such low-controversy programs such as local streets and roads maintenance and rehabilitation, transit operations, TLC projects, etc.
- Unlike Measure J, this would not be a \$2 billion measure. The maximum amount Contra Costa could generate annually from a \$10 vehicle registration fee increase would be approximately \$8.5 million—far below the funding level that allows for the kind of ‘marquee’ projects and programs that tend to generate voter support for transportation sales tax measures. It will be important to focus discussions with constituent groups on realistic objectives and expectations with optimum benefit.

Preliminary Schedule and Work Plan: The preliminary schedule below would enable the Authority to place a vehicle registration fee measure on the November 2010 ballot. Refining the schedule and work plan will be the first task to be completed once the consultant team is confirmed.

Meet the aggressive schedule calls for monthly actions by the Authority Board. It also requires delegating the approval of the polling questions to the Administration and Projects Committee. Otherwise a special board meeting would be necessary. There is no “float” in the proposed schedule. Delays to one or more of the activities could jeopardize the Authority’s ability to place a measure on the November 2010 ballot.

Proposed Work Plan and Schedule

Authorization to Solicit a Polling Consultant	February 17, 2010 > FULL BOARD MEETING
Issuance of Polling Request For Proposals	February 18, 2010
- Approval of Polling Consultant/Approach & Schedule/ Advisory Committee Structure /Revenue Estimate/Budget - Amendment to Nolte contract	March 4, 2010 > APC MEETING
Polling Proposals Due	March 5, 2010
Evaluation of Polling Proposals/interviews (if necessary)	March 8 – March 10, 2010
- Approval of Polling Consultant/Approach & Schedule/ Advisory Committee Structure /Revenue Estimate/Budget - Amendment to Nolte Contract - Delegation to APC to Approve Polling Questions	March 17, 2010 > FULL BOARD MEETING
Advisory Committee Meeting	March 18 – 19, 2010
Development of Polling Questions	March 22 – April 1, 2010
Approval of Polling Questions	April 1, 2010 > APC MEETING
Polling	April 12 – April 16, 2010
Review of Poll Results	April 21, 2010 > FULL BOARD MEETING
Advisory Committee Meetings	April 22 – May 7, 2010
Expenditure Plan Options	May 19, 2010 > FULL BOARD MEETING
Commencement of Nexus Study	May 20, 2010
Public Workshop	May 20 – June 9, 2010
Draft Expenditure Plan	June 16, 2010 > FULL BOARD MEETING
Finalize Nexus Study	June 17 – July 7, 2010
Adopt Final Expenditure Plan, Nexus Study - Public Hearing	July 21, 2010 > FULL BOARD MEETING
Ballot Measure Due	August 6, 2010
Election Day	November 2, 2010

Revenue Estimate: Every \$1 increase in vehicle registration fees will generate approximately \$846,000. A \$10 increase could generate \$8.5 million. Based on historical data between 2000 and 2008, the collected fees could grow at an average annual rate of 1.46%. For comparison purposes, Measure J generated about \$64.3 million in FY2008-09.

Registered Motor Vehicles in Contra Costa County

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Cars/Trucks/Vans	739,845	763,323	789,450	776,125	817,234	804,453	818,086	824,213	820,771
Motorcycle	15,687	17,552	18,997	20,314	22,479	23,223	24,238	24,751	25,753
Total	755,532	780,875	808,447	796,439	839,713	827,676	842,324	848,964	846,524

Advisory Committee Structure: SB83 requires that the proposed Expenditure Plan be presented at one noticed public hearing before the fee can be placed on the ballot. However, in order to maximize the likelihood of success, staff recommends a robust public involvement process through the formation of a

stakeholder advisory committee. The committee, whose membership would be appointed by the Executive Director, should represent the following affiliations (up to 13 members):

- Business Community (1)
- Transit Operators (1)
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Advocacy Groups (1)
- City-County Engineering Advisory Committee (1)
- Authority's Technical Coordinating Committee (1)
- Authority's Citizen Advisory Committee (1)
- Regional Transportation Planning Committee Staff Representatives (4)
- Environmental Community (1)
- Open Space Advocacy Groups (1)
- Motorists - AAA (1)

Polling: At its meeting in February, the Authority approved the release of RFP 10-2 soliciting Public Opinion Polling Services for a cost not to exceed \$40,000. Proposals are due on March 5, 2010. Staff will recommend the highest ranked polling firm at the Authority's March 17th meeting. The polling is expected to be conducted in mid April. The consultant will work with Authority staff and the Advisory Committee to generate a list of questions for the poll. Staff is requesting the Authority delegate approval of the polling questions to the Administration and Projects Committee.

Amendment No. 2 to the Nolte Program Management Contract: Because of the ambitious schedule to place a measure on the November ballot, staff recommends that we utilize our ongoing program management contract with Nolte Associates, who function as an extension of our staff. An added advantage is that the Gray-Bowen firm – an existing member of the Nolte team - has already been selected by the Alameda Congestion Management Agency to assist in their efforts to place a similar measure on the ballot in Alameda. Because Alameda is 2-3 months ahead of Contra Costa, there will be an opportunity to benefit from work already accomplished. (As an example, we have already had access to the Alameda polling results). Circlepoint, who can assist in outreach and public information, is also a member of the Nolte team. Should the Authority approve this approach, staff would work with the consultant team to develop a detailed schedule and scope-of-work. Staff's preliminary assessment is that the overall approach needs to be streamlined, the expenditure plan needs to be simple and straightforward, with a very transparent relationship between the fee and the expenditure plan elements. Likewise, unless the engagement with our stakeholders is streamlined and collaborative, attaining the November ballot is likely to be very difficult. Depending upon the complexity of the expenditure plan we may need additional consultant assistance to conduct the nexus analysis between the fee and the projects and programs to be funded. If this becomes advisable, staff would request that Nolte add such expertise as a sub-consultant to their team. Staff is requesting approval to Amendment No. 2 to Contract #230 with Nolte and Associates in the amount of \$90,000 to prepare a nexus study (\$30,000), public outreach (\$25,000), and provide technical assistance with the development of the ballot measure language and related materials (\$35,000). Consistent with the provisions of the Nolte contract, these amounts are not fixed lump sums, but rather "not-to-exceed" estimates, with billable costs based upon actual time and materials expended.

PROPOSED SCOPE OF SERVICES

The Nolte team is expected to assist the Authority in the completion of the following tasks:

Development of Expenditure Plan and Public Outreach: Working in consultation with stakeholders and the advisory committee, the Authority would develop expenditure plan options for the fee increase, which would be presented for Authority approval. The nexus analysis will be completed for the expenditure plan options to ensure they meet the intent of SB 83.

A public involvement process is necessary to ensure success of proposed ballot measure. Public outreach is proposed through the formation of a stakeholder advisory committee. The committee, whose membership would be appointed by the Executive Director, will have representation from diverse affiliations (up to 13 members). In addition, a public meeting may be held in addition to SB 83 required public hearing. (up to \$25,000)

Nexus Study: SB 83 requires that the fees collected be used only to pay for programs and projects bearing a relationship or benefit to the owners of motor vehicles paying the fee and be consistent with a Regional Transportation Plan. It also requires that the Authority Board make a specified finding of fact (also known as a nexus finding) in that regard. Preparing of a nexus analysis on the Expenditure Plan for a potential additional new vehicle registration fee in Contra Costa would involve development of criteria to establish the reasonableness of the nexus (e.g. congestion reduction, emissions reduction), evaluation of potential expenditure plan components (projects and programs), and drafting of a final report documenting the methodology, basis of analysis, and nexus evaluation. (up to \$30,000)

Ballot Language: Based on the final proposed expenditure plan, the Authority will draft the language for the ballot measure including arguments for the measure and rebuttals. In addition, voter information pamphlets and related materials will be completed as part of this task. (up to \$25,000)

Attachment 1

Senate Bill No. 83

CHAPTER 554

An act to add Section 65089.20 to the Government Code, and to add Section 9250.4 to the Vehicle Code, relating to traffic congestion.

[Approved by Governor October 11, 2009. Filed with
Secretary of State October 11, 2009.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 83, Hancock. Traffic congestion: motor vehicle registration fees.

Existing law provides for the imposition by certain districts and local agencies of fees on the registration of motor vehicles in certain areas of the state that are in addition to the basic vehicle registration fee collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles for specific limited purposes.

The bill would authorize a countywide transportation planning agency, by a majority vote of the agency's board, to impose an annual fee of up to \$10 on motor vehicles registered within the county for programs and projects for certain purposes. The bill would require voter approval of the measure. The bill would require the department, if requested, to collect the additional fee and distribute the net revenues to the agency, after deduction of specified costs, and would limit the agency's administrative costs to not more than 5% of the distributed fees. The bill would require that the fees collected may be used only to pay for programs and projects bearing a relationship or benefit to the owners of motor vehicles paying the fee and are consistent with a regional transportation plan, and would require the agency's board to make a specified finding of fact in that regard. The bill would require the governing board of the countywide transportation planning agency to adopt a specified expenditure plan.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(1) Motor vehicle congestion negatively impacts businesses and commuters, inhibits the efficient movement of goods, and elevates pollutants that impact the quality of the state's air.

(2) There are transportation improvements that will reduce congestion, including those that improve signal coordination, traveler information systems, intelligent transportation systems, highway operational improvements, and public transit service expansions.

(3) There are measures available to lessen the impact of motor vehicle-related pollution, including congestion management programs,

stormwater runoff best management practices, and transportation control measures aimed at reducing air pollution.

(b) It is the intent of the Legislature to establish a program that allows countywide transportation planning agencies or their counterparts to address congestion through transportation services and improvements and to mitigate the impacts of motor vehicles on air and water quality, and improve the business climate and natural environment.

SEC. 2. Section 65089.20 is added to the Government Code, to read:

65089.20. (a) A countywide transportation planning agency may place a majority vote ballot measure before the voters of the county to authorize an increase in the fees of motor vehicle registration in the county for transportation-related projects and programs described in this chapter. The agency may impose an additional fee of up to ten dollars (\$10) on each motor vehicle registered within the county. The ballot measure resolution shall be adopted by a majority vote of the governing board of the countywide transportation planning agency at a noticed public hearing. The resolution shall also contain a finding of fact that the projects and programs to be funded by the fee increase have a relationship or benefit to the persons who will be paying the fee, and the projects and programs are consistent with the regional transportation plan adopted pursuant to Section 65080. The finding of fact shall require a majority vote of the governing board at a noticed public hearing.

(b) The ballot measure described in subdivision (a) shall be submitted to the voters of the county and if approved by the voters in the county, the increased fee shall apply to the original vehicle registration occurring on or after six months following the adoption of the measure by the voters and to a renewal of registration with an expiration date on or after that six-month period.

(c) (1) The governing board of the countywide transportation planning agency shall adopt an expenditure plan allocating the revenue to transportation-related programs and projects that have a relationship or benefit to the persons who pay the fee. The transportation-related programs and projects include, but are not limited to, programs and projects that have the following purposes:

(A) Providing matching funds for funding made available for transportation programs and projects from state general obligation bonds.

(B) Creating or sustaining congestion mitigation programs and projects.

(C) Creating or sustaining pollution mitigation programs and projects.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1), the following terms have the following meanings:

(A) "Congestion mitigation programs and projects" include, but are not limited to, programs and projects identified in an adopted congestion management program or county transportation plan; projects and programs to manage congestion, including, for example, high-occupancy vehicle or high-occupancy toll lanes; improved transit services through the use of technology and bicycle and pedestrian improvements; improved signal coordination, traveler information systems, highway operational

improvements, and local street and road rehabilitation; and transit service expansion.

(B) "Pollution mitigation programs and projects" include, but are not limited to, programs and projects carried out by a congestion management agency, a regional water quality control board, an air pollution control district, an air quality management district, or another public agency that is carrying out the adopted plan of a congestion management agency, a regional water quality control board, an air pollution control district, or an air quality management district.

(d) Not more than 5 percent of the fees distributed to a countywide transportation planning agency shall be used for administrative costs associated with the programs and projects.

(e) For purposes of this section, "countywide transportation planning agency" means the congestion management agency created pursuant to Chapter 2.6 (commencing with Section 65088) or the agency designated pursuant to Section 66531 to submit the county transportation plan.

SEC. 3. Section 9250.4 is added to the Vehicle Code, to read:

9250.4. (a) The department shall, if requested by a countywide transportation planning agency, collect the fee imposed pursuant to Section 65089.20 of the Government Code upon the registration or renewal of registration of a motor vehicle registered in the county, except those vehicles that are expressly exempted under this code from the payment of registration fees.

(b) The countywide transportation planning agency shall pay for the initial setup and programming costs identified by the department through a direct contract with the department. Any direct contract payment by the board shall be repaid, with no restriction on the funds, to the countywide transportation planning agency as part of the initial revenues available for distribution.

(c) (1) After deducting all costs incurred pursuant to this section, the department shall distribute the net revenues pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 65089.20 of the Government Code.

(2) The costs deducted under paragraph (1) shall not be counted against the 5-percent administrative cost limit specified in subdivision (d) of Section 65089.20 of the Government Code.



AC Transit Service Changes

March 28, 2010

Community Information Tables

On Sunday, March 28, AC Transit's Service Adjustments Plan will take effect, with major service changes in every community from Richmond to Fremont. The changes – resulting in an 8 % reduction in service – were driven primarily by the realities of reduced state funding and declining sales-tax revenue.

In March, stop at an AC Transit Information Table in your community to learn how the upcoming Service Changes will affect your bus travel. We'll offer new bus schedules (as available), maps, and a chart(s) listing changes throughout AC Transit's service area.

West Contra Costa County

Monday, March 8

4 – 7 p.m.

**Richmond Public Library – Community Room
325 Civic Center Plaza, Richmond**

Monday, March 22

1 - 5 p.m.

**San Pablo Senior Center
1943 Church Lane, Richmond**

In late March and early April, you may also see AC Transit staff at several locations in your community, including some bus stops and BART stations. They'll be able to help with your questions about the changes.

You can also visit www.actransit.org or call 511 and say, "AC Transit".



Building Livable Communities
with Transit

RAIL~VOLUTION 2010

Building Livable Communities with Transit
Portland, Oregon
October 18 - 21, 2010

Call for Proposals

Rail~Volution is a conference for passionate practitioners - people from all perspectives who believe in the role of land use and transit as equal partners in the quest for greater livability and greater communities.

Never before has Rail~Volution's mission of building livable communities with transit aligned so perfectly with the federal agenda. Thanks to President Obama's commitment to creating sustainable communities, we truly have the opportunity to work in partnership with policy makers at all levels to grow more livable places -- regardless of their size, shape, demographics, locations, or economies. These ground-breaking partnerships are setting the stage for the next decade at all levels, with commitments to transit resources, renewable energy, climate change, and sustainable housing and communities.

The success of the conference depends on the quality and diversity of presentations. Help enliven the discussion! Give us your ideas now!

Proposal Deadline: March 31, 2010.

This year's program includes three conference tracks, each with suggested topics for discussion. We are asking that you identify the track that best fits your proposal ideas.

The 2010 Conference tracks are:

- **Core Sessions:** An in-depth introduction to the principles that are the foundation for creating livable communities that respond to our economic, energy and environmental challenges.
- **Livable Communities:** Strategies for planning and financing livable communities in the next real estate cycle, with the goal of enhancing transit ridership and creating neighborhoods that meet the needs of today's changing society.
- **Partnering for Sustainable Communities:** A discussion of the power of partnerships to create and sustain economically vibrant, environmentally responsible, and socially diverse communities for future generations.

Please visit www.railvolution.com/CallForProposals.asp to submit a proposal.

For information on sponsorships or the conference's trade show, please call 800.788.7077 or email convene@aol.com.

9e