BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

DATE & TIME:  Friday, January 28, 2011, 8:00 – 9:30 a.m.

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

1. Call to Order and Self-Introductions – Chair Roy V. Swearingen

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

3. Announcement of New Board Member Appointments (Christina Atienza)

CONSENT CALENDAR


7. Receive Notice of Payment of Invoice Over $10,000. In accordance with the WCCTAC JPA, Section 12 paragraph (C), notice is hereby provided that the Executive Director has authorized payment to Fehr & Peers in the amount of $44,848 for various deliverables associated with their preparation of the Transit Enhancement Strategic Plan, out of WCCTAC funds, to be reimbursed in full by MTC with Caltrans Transportation Planning Grant funds. (Attachments – Information)

8. Approve Sponsorship of Workshop on Designing for Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety. Contra Costa Health Services requests WCCTAC’s sponsorship of the subject all-day event to be held on March 16 in Richmond. Sponsorship would
entail use of the agency’s logo on informational items and a contribution of $250 toward the cost of refreshments on the day of the workshop. Staff recommends approval of the request using TDM grant funds. The workshop is an allowable use of those funds and is in keeping with the intent of the TDM program of promoting alternatives to solo driving. (Attachments – Action)

9. **Approve Programming of Up to $14,000 in Measure J West County Subregional Transportation Needs (Program 28b) funds for the West Contra Costa Street Smarts Campaign (Resolution 11-01).** Street Smarts is a traffic safety education campaign started by Contra Costa Health Services (CCHS) in 2004 to remind West County drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists to exercise caution. Campaign messages are delivered via various media including signs on public property, displays at community events, newsletter inserts, cable television and theater ads, and presentations. CCHS is seeking $14,000 from WCCTAC to fund proposed FY 10-11 program activities. The approved FY 10-11 budget assumes that this initiative would be funded through Measure J, in lieu of WCCTAC dues, which were used to fund activities in prior years. Measure J Program 28b provides broad latitude to WCCTAC to designate use of the funds. To date, none of the available funds have been programmed, but preliminary discussions with the TAC have led to a consensus that the funds should be reserved for regionally significant uses. The TAC discussed CCHS’ request and recommends approval of programming up to $14,000 in Measure J Program 28b funds for actual costs of the proposed FY 10-11 campaign activities. If approved by the Board, the recommendation would be forwarded to CCTA for final approval. Following CCTA approval, WCCTAC staff would work with CCTA and CCHS staff to flesh out grant administration requirements. Staff recommends approval of Resolution 11-01 to this effect. (Attachments – Action)

**DISCUSSION**

10. **Report on SB 375 Implementation and Development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).** MTC and ABAG are in the process of developing a 2013 update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In response to SB 375, the 2013 will include an SCS – an achievable land use and transportation scenario for the Bay Area that, when implemented, will meet greenhouse gas emission reduction targets established by the California Air Resources Board for 2020 and 2035. (Martin Engelmann, CCTA Deputy Executive Director, Planning – Attachments: a) Overview of SCS, b) presentation slides of SB 375 Overview, c) SCS Planning Process, and d) Contra Costa’s Principles for Collaborative Development of the SB 375 SCS – Information and Discussion)

11. **Acceptance of Fiscal Audit and Memorandum on Internal Control Structure for the Year Ended June 30, 2010.** The purpose of the fiscal audit (including the independent auditor’s report and the general purpose financial statements) is to provide an independent assessment that WCCTAC’s financial statements accurately portray financial activities occurring during the year, in accord with generally accepted accounting principles. Maze and Associates prepared the fiscal audit for fiscal year 2009-2010. At the meeting, staff will provide an overview. Staff recommends acceptance of the financial statements. (Christina Atienza and Bradley Ward, WCCTAC Treasurer – Provided Under Separate
Cover to Board members only: a) Basic Financial Statements for Year Ended June 30, 2010, b) Memorandum on Internal Controls and Required Communications for Year Ended June 30, 2010; copies available upon request – Actions)

12. FY 2010-11 Mid-Year Budget Review. Staff will provide an update on the status of the current year budget. (Christina Atienza – Attachments – Action)

STANDING ITEMS

13. Correspondence/Other Information

a. Incoming
   - Dec. 16, from CCTA, Items Approved by the Authority on Dec. 15
   - Dec. 21, from CCTA, Request for Appointments to the SR 4 ICA PAC
   - Jan. 20, from CCHS, Request for Sponsorship of West County Pedestrian and Bicycle Design Workshop (included under item #8)

b. Outgoing
   - Dec. 14, to BAAQMD, Confirmation of Matching Grant for Richmond Shuttle Operation
   - Jan. 14, to ACTC and Caltrans, West Contra Costa County Suggestions for I-80 ICM Operations & Maintenance MOU

c. Workshops/Conferences/Events
   - CTF Transportation Forum, Feb. 22, Sacramento, $150 per person if registering before Feb. 16 (www.transportationfoundation.org)

14. Board and Staff Comments
a. Board Member Comments, Conference/Meeting Reports (AB 1234 Requirement), and Announcements
b. Report of CCTA Representatives
c. Executive Staff Comments and Announcements

15. Other Business

CLOSED SESSION

16. The Board will recess to closed session to consider personnel matters pursuant to Government Code Section 54957 – Performance Evaluation – Executive Director. (No Attachment – Action to be Determined)
RECONVENE OPEN SESSION

17.  Closed Session Report

18.  Employment Contract. The Board will discuss whether it wants to initiate any changes to the Executive Director’s employment contract as a result of the performance evaluation. *(No Attachment – Action to be Determined)*

19.  Adjourn. Next meeting is Friday, February 25, 2011 at 8:00 a.m.

---

- In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, if you need special assistance to participate in the WCCTAC Board meeting, or if you need a copy of the agenda and/or agenda packet materials in an alternative format, please contact Valerie Jenkins at 510.215.3217 prior to the meeting.
- If you have special transportation requirements and would like to attend the meeting, please call the phone number above at least 48 hours in advance to make arrangements.
- Handouts provided at the meeting are available upon request and may also be viewed at WCCTAC’s offices.
- Please refrain from wearing scented products to the meeting, as there may be attendees susceptible to environmental illnesses. Please also put cellular phones on silent mode during the meeting.
- A meeting sign-in sheet will be circulated at the meeting. Sign-in is optional.
WCCTAC
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes, 10 December 2010

Members Present: Janet Abelson (El Cerrito); Ed Balico (Hercules); Tom Butt (Richmond); Genoveva Calloway (San Pablo); Tom Hansen (WestCAT); Jeff Ritterman (Richmond); Roy Swearingen (Pineole), Vice-Chair; Joe Wallace (AC Transit); Joel Keller (BART); Maria Viramontes (Richmond), Chair. Absent: John Gioia (Contra Costa County)

Staff Present: Christina Atienza, Valerie Jenkins, Joanna Pallock, John Rudolph, Linda Young; Michael Rodriguez, Legal Counsel; Hisham Noeimi, CCTA.

Location: San Pablo Council Chambers, 13831 San Pablo Avenue, San Pablo, CA 94806

1. Call to Order and Self-Introductions. Chair Maria Viramontes called the meeting to order at 8:06 a.m.

2. Public Comment. Ms. Nancy Baer, County Health Services, announced a free training workshop for bicycle and pedestrian planning on March 16 in Richmond, and asked the Board’s endorsement. Ms. Baer said she was asking for use of WCCTAC’s logo in promoting the event, and was not requesting funding at this time. Director Abelson asked staff to agendize this item for discussion at a future meeting.

3. Recognition of Directors Maria Viramontes and Kris Valstad. Vice-Chair Swearingen read a proclamation and commendation to Chair Viramontes and a Certificate of Appreciation to Hercules alternate Director Valstad. Chair Viramontes expressed appreciation for the staff of WCCTAC and CCTA, and noted that she continues to live in Richmond and expects to remain involved in the community.

4. Election of WCCTAC Chair, Vice-Chair, CCTA Representative (odd-year term), and CCTA Alternate. The Board unanimously elected Director Swearingen as Chair on the nomination by Director Balico and second by Director Abelson. The Board unanimously elected Director Abelson as Vice-Chair on the nomination by Director Calloway and second by Director Balico. The cities appointed Director Calloway as the odd-year CCTA Representative on the nomination by Director Abelson and second by Director Ritterman; and appointed Director Ritterman to be the CCTA Alternative on the nomination by Chair Viramontes and second by Director Abelson.

5. 2011 Board and TAC Meeting Schedule. Ms. Atienza noted that the Board had approved the schedule in Oct, and the Sept meeting had been scheduled to avoid conflict with the League of Cities Conference. Director Wallace said that he would arrange for AC Transit’s alternate to attend the Jan 28 meeting if he is not able to return from TRB in time.

6. Appointments to Corridor Policy Advisory Committee for SR 4 Integrated Corridor Analysis. Ms. Atienza described the context for this project and asked the Board to
appoint at least two members to serve on the policy committee. The Board appointed Directors Balico, Hansen, and Ritterman to the SR 4 Corridor PAC.

CONSENT CALENDAR

7. Approval of Minutes of Oct. 29, 2010 Board Meeting, Receive Summaries of Oct 29 Board meeting and Nov 18 TAC Meeting
9c. Student Bus Pass Program – Approval to Participate in Pilot Implementation of AC Transit Easy Pass for Clipper Value Fulfillment.
9d. Student Bus Pass Program – Receive Update on Efforts to Improve Clipper Enrollment for Upcoming School Year.

ACTION: Director Abelson moved to approve all items on Consent except #8 and #9b; seconded by Director Ritterman; and passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

9b. Student Bus Pass Program – Approval for West Contra Costa Unified School District to Designate a Permanent Part-time Position for Program Administration.

ACTION: None.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Atienza removed this item altogether because of information obtained since the distribution of the agenda that the current funding agreement covers this matter sufficiently, and the School District’s hiring practices are not within WCCTAC’s authority. Director Wallace noted that AC Transit is considering raising the price for the student passes, which could affect the program.

8. HOT Lanes: Approve Submittal of Request to CCTA to Sponsor a $60,000 Independent Due Diligence Case Study on I-80 to Inform CCTA’s Overall Legislation and Advocacy Activities

ACTION: Director Abelson moved to table this item for up to six months while staff meets to determine the potential impacts of WCCTAC action; seconded by Director Ritterman; and passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION: Vice-Chair Swearingen expressed concern about using $60,000 to study the HOT lanes proposal, because HOT lanes may negatively impact traffic in West County.

Chair Viramontes clarified that the suggested study will help CCTA advocate more effectively for West County interests, as it would analyze commuter traffic to and from Alameda, Solano, and Marin counties, and would help CCTA advocate for Central County interests, as the study will include I-680. This request for a study would be put into the queue of requests to CCTA. Further, the study will help the West County subregion to remain engaged with the decision-making processes at MTC.
Director Balico stated his agreement with Director Swearingen’s analysis of HOV operations and with Chair Viramontes’ concern to use the study as a tool at the CCTA level to address equity, revenues, and improvements throughout the I-80 corridor, including San Pablo Ave.

Director Abelson noted that the implementation of the HOT lanes could increase congestion on San Pablo Ave and on other local streets, and that the study could help local agencies understand the impacts of HOT lanes. Director Abelson observed that while the state may be in a position to pay for San Pablo Ave O&M through revenues from HOT Lanes on I-80, that financial support may come with costs, as cities do not have as much flexibility with respect to streetscape design and other matters on state highways as they do with their own local roads.

Mr. Hisham Noeimi, CCTA, stated that MTC is currently conducting high-level studies that look at the entire network of proposed HOT lanes throughout the Bay Area, in order to develop a “backbone concept” for the purpose of applying for funding to the CTC. Both I-680 and I-80 are at the bottom of MTC’s list for implementation, and there is little urgency about undertaking the proposed study. Mr. Noeimi suggested that it would be prudent to hold off on asking CCTA for this study until technical staff have had an opportunity to meet and discuss the matter.

Ms. Atienza expressed concurrence with Mr. Noeimi’s suggestion to table the request for a study until staff have had an opportunity to meet.

Director Abelson clarified that the study is proposed to be conducted out of CCTA planning funds, and it is important for West County to discuss it at a later time.

10. BCDC’s Proposed Bay Plan Amendment Pertaining to Projected Sea Level Rise.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Atienza described the letter of Dec 2, and stated that this was an opportunity to provide additional comments beyond the comments already provided.

Director Butt stated that it seems that BCDC is trying to address an issue that local governments are trying to ignore.

Director Balico stated that BCDC has taken a lead in addressing climate change. The process of taking this lead has caused concern among cities that may lose their shorelines to rising sea levels, and possibly their jurisdiction over tidal areas.

Chair Viramontes stated that all cities agree that the sea level is rising. The reason that they are upset is because BCDC has land use authority within 100 ft of the shoreline of each city. Chair Viramontes said it would not be wise to allow BCDC to have jurisdiction over all tidal areas within the 55 inch sea level rise predicted by 2100, and stated that it was especially important for charter cities, such as Richmond, to express a view.

Director Ritterman confirmed that Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory is using the predicted 55 inch rise by 2100 numbers in its effort to identify a new campus location. Director Swearingen stated that a 55 inch rise will impact Pinole’s wastewater treatment. Chair Viramontes said Richmond’s wastewater will be impacted as well.
Director Butt stated that BCDC is a regional agency with expertise in the Bay, and that BCDC may be in a better position than any individual city to make broad predictions about what’s going to happen and how we’re going to deal with it.

Chair Viramontes stated that it would be useful in the future to have a full presentation of the amendment and its status after BCDC meets and addresses the comments.

Ms. Atienza noted that she tried to keep the comments within WCCTAC’s area of concern, which is primarily focused on transportation. The Capitol Corridor, UPRR, and BNSF run along the entire coast, which will be potentially inundated. Regional efforts may include protection of the rail because it’s part of the larger Bay Area economy, in which case West County will be protected as well.

11. Measure J Programs for Transportation of Seniors and People with Disabilities: (a) Approval of Recommendations to CCTA for Appropriation of Growth Increment in West County Portion of Countywide Program Funds, and (b) Approval of Proposed Programming of West County’s Additional Funding Increment.

ACTION: Director Ritterman moved to approve staff’s recommendation as amended to pursue administrative mechanisms through the PCC, not to impose a requirement for “new services,” and to revisit the funding apportionments in five years; seconded by Director Swearingen; and passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Atienza provided an overview of Measure J funding to paratransit providers, and referenced handouts that illustrate staff’s recommended Measure J 15 Base, 15 Growth, and 20b apportionments by percent of sales tax and by proportion of fund source.

Ms. Atienza noted that the East Bay Paratransit Consortium (EBPC) would be eligible under these recommendations to apply for 20b funding, over which WCCTAC has discretion, though they would have to show that they are providing “additional” or “new” services. With respect to 15 Growth, staff’s recommendation would provide WestCAT a funding stream off the top in proportion to their share of 15 Base; of the remainder, EBPC would receive 50%; and El Cerrito, Richmond, San Pablo, and WestCAT would share the other 50% in proportion to what they receive under 15 Base.

Director Abelson remarked on what is meant by “new services.” Administrative support for public outreach for eligibility determination would not count as “new services,” but non-ADA pickups beyond ADA’s required coverage area may be an example of new service.

Ms. Atienza explained that the growth in the population of seniors will quickly outpace the funding, and that to maintain the requirement for “new services” may be unworkable given that transit and paratransit operators are facing severe shortfalls. With respect to administration, Ms. Atienza added that after her re-reading of the Paratransit Coordinating Council’s (PCC) charter, a good deal of administrative oversight authority may be delegated to the PCC, and requested that staff be allowed to flesh out this opportunity.
**Director Hansen** said that he would not vote for a motion that included a mandate for new services because the transit providers are facing severe funding shortfalls for existing services.

**Ms. Laura Timothy**, EBPC, stated that staff’s recommendations are different from those that were previously reviewed in the working group, and asked that the Board consider restoring previous funding levels to EBPC. **Ms. Timothy** noted that Measure B in Alameda County provides more funding for paratransit service than Measure J, and that staff’s recommendation provides no assurance that West County programs will be coordinated, and does not encourage such coordination. **Ms. Timothy** requested that the recommended apportionments be an interim plan for two years, and that the Board in the future authorize and receive a report describing and comparing the quality of the various paratransit programs, and that the 2010 Census could be used when it’s available to determine demographic changes over time.

**Ms. Ellen Paasch**, City of El Cerrito, stated that Measure J enables older adults who are well and able and 65 years of age to have transportation. Many of the older adults are not eligible for ADA, so if they are looking to age in place, stay in their communities, and continue to be active in the community, agencies must ensure that there is transportation for them. Further, the El Cerrito program also provides transportation for those who are disabled, or who have difficulty navigating the hills and discontinuous sidewalks of El Cerrito.

**Mr. Sam Casas**, City of Richmond, stated that he was in favor of a study because of the difficulty in comparing apples to apples in the paratransit business. **Mr. Casas** noted that in the last few years, various funding sources at MTC, such as STA and TDA, have disappeared or have been restricted so that city-based programs are ineligible to apply.

**Ms. Atienza** noted that staff and the Board had been working on this for over two years, and that it is apparent that no choice will please everybody, and there isn’t enough money to go around. **Ms. Atienza** stated that the topic could be studied more, but in her opinion the Board would just end up in the same place of having to make a compromise.

**Chair Viramontes** underscored that there is more need than funding; acknowledged the lack of political will to consolidate paratransit services under one operator; noted that federal and state funding requirements do not reward consolidation efforts; and stated that as funders we have to be fair to the smaller and larger cities.

**Director Wallace** stated that EBPC is operating under a deficit to both BART and AC Transit, and that he wishes the coordination would be better so operators don’t fight each other over a nickel and lose a quarter. **Director Wallace** stated that seniors should be the most important common client, and all operators should figure out how to serve them.

**Director Keller** stated that he was disappointed that WCCTAC did not move forward on a study that would have outlined many of the areas that were being discussed. The EBPC is underfunded, and the problem will not disappear, he said. Through the 2010 Census, **Director Keller** suggested that WCCTAC and other agencies will have better information, such as how many seniors are dependent on public transportation. To make a decision without that information is difficult, and **Director Keller** suggested that the recommendations be in effect for two years, as an interim program will provide time to gather information.
STANDING ITEMS

12. Correspondence/Other Information
   a. Incoming
      ▪ From CCTA: Items Approved by the Authority on Nov. 17, 2010
      ▪ From CCTA: Expiration of Authority Member Term and Appointment of
        Representative for 2011-2013
      ▪ From WCCUSD: Request to Designate Permanent Part-Time Position for
        Administration of Student Bus Pass Program
   b. Outgoing
      ▪ To Hercules: Comments on Intermodal Transit Center DEIR/DEIS
      ▪ To BCDC: Comments on Proposed Bay Plan Amendment 1-08 Concerning Climate
        Change
   c. Workshops/Conferences/Events
      ▪ None to report

13. Board and Staff Comments
   ▪ Board Member Comments, Conference/Meeting Reports (AB 1234 Requirement),
     and Announcements – none.
   ▪ Legal Counsel Comments and Announcements – none.


15. Closed Session – deferred until next meeting.


17. Employment Contract – deferred until next meeting.

18. Adjourn. Next meeting is Friday, January 28, 2011 at 8:00 a.m.
December 14, 2010

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

RE: WCCTAC Meeting Summary

Dear Randy:

The WCCTAC Board at its meeting on December 10 took the following actions that may be of interest to the Authority:

1) Recognized and commended Chair Maria Viramontes and Hercules alternate Kris Valstad for their service to west County through their respective appointments to WCCTAC.
2) Elected Pinole Mayor Roy Swearingen as Chair of the Board and El Cerrito City Council member Janet Abelson as Vice-Chair of the Board.
3) Elected San Pablo Mayor Genoveva Calloway to represent west County at the CFTA Administration & Projects Committee and CFTA Board, and Richmond Vice-Mayor Dr. Jeff Ritterman as alternate to both west County representatives on the CFTA Board.
4) Appointed Directors Ed Balico (Hercules), Tom Hansen (WestCAT), and Dr. Jeff Ritterman (Richmond) as WCCTAC’s representatives to the Corridor Policy Advisory Committee for the State Route 4 Integrated Corridor Analysis project.
5) Deferred action on staff’s recommendation to submit a request from WCCTAC to CFTA to sponsor a $60,000 independent due diligence case study on I-80 to inform CFTA’s overall legislative and advocacy platform pertaining to MTC’s HOV/HOT network proposal. Directed staff to flesh out concerns expressed by CFTA staff, and to report back to the Board within the next six months.
6) Regarding the Measure J Student Bus Pass Program, approved WCCTAC’s participation in a pilot implementation of an AC Transit EasyPass model for loading the subsidy onto the Clipper Youth cards of program participants.
7) Discussed BCDC’s proposed Bay Plan amendment pertaining to projected sea level rise.
8) Approved with amendments staff’s recommendations for programming Measure J funds that flow to west County for transportation for seniors and people with disabilities.

Sincerely,

Christina M. Atienza
Executive Director

c: Danice Rosenbohm, CFTA; Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC; John Cunningham, TRANSPLAN; Andy Dillard, SWAT

13831 San Pablo Avenue, San Pablo, CA 94806
Ph: 510.215.3035 ~ Fx: 510.237.7059 ~ www.wcctac.org
TO: WCCTAC Technical Advisory Committee      DATE: January 21, 2011

FR: John Rudolph □

RE: Addendum to Nov 18, 2010 TAC Meeting Summary

This addendum is in reference to the following, which was provided in the original Nov 18, 2010 TAC summary:

"Complete Streets" Next Steps: Staff noted the Board’s interest in seeing examples of successful projects. The TAC discussed whether a professional audit of San Pablo Ave by a renowned expert such as Dan Burden would be useful. Noting that collateral efforts such as a “green spine” for storm water runoff are underway along parts of San Pablo Ave, and that graduate students in transportation from UC Berkeley may be assigned to study San Pablo Ave, the TAC determined that its first priority is to expand its understanding of complete streets, which are context-sensitive and may have more to do with process than policy or projects. Members suggested that parts of San Pablo Ave need to be rebuilt to provide safety for motorists, that planning transportation for healthy communities is a process that encompasses multiple modes and facilities, and that a study of San Pablo Ave could be useful for all the jurisdictions with general plans and specific plans pertaining to it.

Addendum:
Pinole staff at the Jan 13, 2011 TAC meeting requested that this be added to the above summary:

Pinole staff voiced opposition to dedicating any funds to study San Pablo Ave. as described by staff, but supported looking into whether such a task may be undertaken for free by graduate students.
TO: WCCTAC Technical Advisory Committee  DATE: Jan 20, 2011
FR: John Rudolph ✓
RE: Summary of Jan 13, 2011 WCCTAC-TAC Meeting

1. Meeting Summary from the Nov 18 Meeting: On Item #2, Complete Streets Next Steps, Dean Allison, Pinole, asked that his objection to using any portion of 28b funds to study San Pablo Ave. be included in a revised summary.

2. I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility Project Update: John Hemiup, ACTC, and Cristina Ferraz, Caltrans, provided an update on the project delivery schedule and reviewed status of key deliverables and action items. (a) ACTC expects to receive an allocation from CTC for construction of Project #6 (San Pablo Ave, Arterials, Transit) in Jan 2011. A draft environmental document for Projects #1, 2, 4, and 5 is expected to be released in Mar 2011, at which time public meetings will be announced. A draft outline of the Project Implementation Plan has been provided to TAC members; comments are due Jan 21, 2011, to WCCTAC staff or to project staff. A draft O&M MOU is expected to be released in February 2011: WCCTAC staff in consultation with West County stakeholders noted their preparation of a letter with suggestions on the MOU to be sent to project staff on Jan 14. An O&M Plan is expected in Feb 2011, and a draft Incident Response Plan is expected in May 2011. (b) Encroachment permits will not contain a statement about a city’s responsibility to maintain the devices, but will ask only whether the contractor can be within a city’s ROW to install them. (c) Project staff have been meeting one-on-one with cities and are in the process of setting up presentations to city councils where they have been requested. (d) Locations of end of queue detectors have been indicated in 95% PS&E drawings; cities are asked to confirm locations. (e) Agencies have been submitting comments on project plans; project staff will post tabulated comments and responses on a project web site; in the meantime, project staff will email the tabulated comments from all cities to all stakeholders by late Jan 2011. (f) Staff suggested that there should be mechanism for addressing system impacts of roadways as they change over time, akin to how a Configuration Management Plan identifies the protocol for managing software and hardware system changes over time. (g) An intersection analysis was conducted on 30 intersections associated with areas where congestion is expected to increase with project; this analysis will be included as an appendix in the Traffic Operations Analysis Report, which will be included as part of the environmental document. Cities requesting additional intersection analyses may include the request as a comment on the environmental document. (h) ACTC does not maintain user data on their CCTV cameras. (i) TAC members expressed concern with LOS on cross streets during implementation of flush plans.

3. Street Smarts 2011 Campaign and Update: (a) Nancy Baer, CCHS, reviewed the 2011 Street Smarts educational campaign and asked the TAC to approve a $14,000 funding request for FY 2010-11 activities. Staff noted that the project may be eligible for Measure J 28b funds, none of which has been programmed to date, but that the TAC had been eyeing as a means to potentially fund recommendations out of the two grant efforts underway (transit enhancement and wayfinding). The TAC agreed by consensus to recommend up to $14,000 of 28b funds for the Street Smarts effort this
year. (b) In a separate discussion, Ms. Baer asked the TAC to approve a request for $250 to supplement funding for food at a March 16, 2011 day-long workshop in Richmond on bicycle and pedestrian planning. The TAC offered its conceptual endorsement of the workshop, noting that the Board had already endorsed it; but with respect to the funds, staff asked for documentation about the event, noted that it may be eligible to be funded with TDM program funds.

4. Grants Available – Calls for Projects: Staff asked jurisdictions to respond to a request for information, about which grant programs agency staff may be targeting, and what projects are planned, in order to coordinate applications and maximize opportunities for leveraging funding sources.

5. Transit Enhancement Strategic Plan & Wayfinding Plan: The Working Group continues to meet at 10:30 a.m. following the TAC.

6. Adjournment until February 10, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

The next regular WCCTAC-TAC meeting will be:
- Thursday February 10, 2011 at 9:00 a.m.
- Thursday March 10, 2011 at 9:00 a.m.

The next WCCTAC Board meetings will be:
- Friday January 28, 2011 at 8:00 a.m.
- Friday February 25, 2011 at 8:00 a.m.
TO:      WCCTAC Board

FR:    Christina Atienza, Executive Director

RE:      Program and Projects Status Report for January 2011

The following provides updates on programs and projects in the adopted FY 2011 Work Program.

Advisory Committee

1. Planning

   a. Regional express lane network – Staff continues to monitor the first express lane installation in the Bay Area on I-680 in Alameda and Santa Clara Counties. Following Board’s direction in Dec 2010, staff met with CCTA staff to discuss impacts of a possible study to flesh out local concerns as a tool for advocacy.

   b. SB 375 – Led by MTC and ABAG, the Regional Transportation Plan 2040 is under development in parallel with the Vision Scenario of the Sustainable Communities Strategy. At the staff level, including WCCTAC and CCTA, the Regional Advisory Working Group meets monthly to review targets and performance measures. On the policy level, draft performance targets were reviewed by the Joint MTC Planning Committee/ABAG Administrative Committee/Joint Policy Committee on Jan 14. In coordination with the CMAs, MTC will issue a Call for Projects for the RTP in March 2011.

   c. I-80 ICM & O&M of San Pablo Av Smart Corridor – In January, met with West County technical staff to prepare suggestions for MOU; reviewed suggestions with TAC and forwarded to project staff on Jan 14.

   d. West County casinos – Continuing to monitor status of proposed projects.

   e. Ferry planning efforts – At its meeting on Jan 20, the TCC approved the Marina Bay Parkway Grade Separation Phase II Design Peer Review.


   g. Richmond Pkwy Transit Center improvements – Met with project manager to ensure project’s continuity against backdrop of severe funding cuts at AC Transit. Composed a letter for WCCTAC approval requesting allocation extension from CTC for project’s STIP funding. AC Transit is pursuing preliminary engineering funding through RM2.

   h. West County Safe Routes to School and Countywide Safe Routes to School Master Plan – CCTA selected Parisi Associates as the primary consultant for the Master Plan.

   i. Corridor Management Plan for State Route 4 – Staff provided information pertaining to rail studies and transit priorities to project consultant. Board appointed three members to Policy Advisory Committee on Dec 10 – next steps for the PAC include a presentation on March 22 on draft strategies. Project TAC met on Jan 11 – next steps for the TAC include a workshop on April 5 to review MTSOs and potential Action Plan amendment.
j. Mobility management studies – Staff attended January 27th meeting.
k. General Plan Updates for Pinole, Richmond, and San Pablo – Staff have been monitoring development of the general plans, attending meetings of the GPACs, and preparing comment letters as appropriate and timely.
l. Local plans
   i. San Pablo Av Specific Plan, San Pablo – A San Pablo Ave Specific Plan has been developed as part of the City of San Pablo General Plan Update; city staff will present the specific plan at a future meeting of the TAC.
   ii. 23rd St. – San Pablo presented its proposed plan to the June TAC and received comments pertaining to the Action Plan and transit operations.
   iii. Pinole Draft Three Corridors Specific Plan, and Draft Zoning Code Update – City has adopted plan as part of its adoption of the General Plan Update.
   iv. Richmond Pedestrian Plan and Bicycle Plan – Both plans have been presented at public meetings; the bicycle plan was presented at the Oct 2010 Board meeting; the pedestrian plan will be presented at future TAC and Board meetings.
m. Complete Streets – The TAC and Board received presentations in October. At its November meeting, the TAC agreed to further study complete streets before recommending an audit of a particular facility in West County. County Health Services is developing a training workshop on March 16 for bicycle and pedestrian design and safety, to be held in Richmond, with potential WCCTAC sponsorship.
n. Central/I-80 Rail study – Study is led by Alameda County CMA. No activity to report.
o. SB 83 – Measure O failed in Contra Costa County on Nov 2.
p. I-80/Central Avenue – Continuing to monitor.

2. Programming and Administration
   a. TLC – The TAC determined in July to add West County Additional TLC funding (25b) to the West County share of the countywide TLC funding program (12), subject to similar processes and criteria in the countywide TLC Call for Projects, expected this autumn. Guidelines for TLC are under review by the TCC for review and adoption by the PC and Authority in March 2011.
   b. Pedestrian, Bike, and Trail Facilities – Guidelines for PBTF are under review by the TCC for review and adoption by the PC and Authority in March 2011. Staff attended the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee meeting on January 24 to provide a description of the scope and schedule of the West Contra Costa/Albany Wayfinding Plan. Staff attended a local Bay Trail meeting in Point Richmond addressing the trail connection from Castro Street to Point Molate.
   c. Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities, and Paratransit Study – Following the Board’s direction in Dec 2010, staff met with Peter Engel of CCTA to further define the process for annual allocation of 20b funds.
   d. Low-Income Student Bus Pass Program – WCCUSD has identified a sub-group of the current SBPP participants to launch a Clipper demo program. About 250 students who are active Clipper card holders are being transitioned in February to Clipper. The goal is to load the student Clipper cards and track the issues related to the transition to this new fare medium. Transitional paper passes are still being offered to all SBPP
enrolled students until a Clipper loading process can be defined. Related to this program is discussion on outreach for 2011-12 school year as well as the projected fare increase by AC Transit, as determined at its Jan 12 Board meeting.

e. Subregional Transportation Needs – On Jan 13, the TAC recommended use of $14,000 for the 2010-11 Street Smarts educational campaign, which consists of banners, bumper-stickers, and advertisements targeted at increased traffic safety in West County.


4. Subregional Needs – Enhancement of commuter rail in West County is under technical review at the SR 4 Corridor TAC. Contra Costa Health Services has requested $14,000 from 28b for its 2010-2011 Streets Smarts traffic safety education campaign, and the TAC has recommended this request to the Board.

5. Grant opportunities – Staff are currently coordinating applications from West County agencies to three announced grant opportunities/calls for projects – Caltrans Bicycle Transportation Account, Caltrans Planning Grants FY 11-12 Cycle, and MTC Station Area and Land Use Planning Program.


Transportation Demand Management

Staff continued to manage the administration and implementation of the Guaranteed Ride Home, Employer Outreach, and Commute Incentives Program, and to interface with the larger regional and countywide 511 programs. Additional highlights for the month include:

- Reconciliation work for the FY 10 audit
- Attendance at Richmond Chamber of Commerce mixer at Ford Point to promote TDM
- Work on the launch of a new application that allows the downloading of free audiobooks on all WestCAT buses – see attachments
- Worked with Richmond staff to flesh out implementation of grant-funded shuttle service

Subregional Transportation Mitigation Fee Program – No activity to report.

Other Reimbursable Projects – Continuing to convene meetings, review work products, and conduct walk/bike audits of select West County transit centers through the Transit Enhancement Strategic Plan and Wayfinding Plan Working Group.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT: Yvonne Morrow
Title: Marketing Coordinator
Office: (510) 724-3331
Email: yvonne@westcat.org

Transform your Commute, Download Free Audiobooks on all WestCAT Transit Buses

Pinole, January 5, 2011—WestCAT Transit is pleased to partner with the Contra Costa County Library to provide instant access to free audiobooks and library services on the bus. With WestCAT’s new "En route Entertainment" you can now listen to over 600 audiobook titles on the bus with Contra Costa County Library’s “Snap & Go” mobile library access. Wirelessly download audiobooks directly to your cell phone for FREE. It is a great way to pass time on the bus!

To get started, riders will first need to download a QR reader to their cell phone (one time only). The Library has information and instructions located at https://snapngo.ccclib.org. Once that’s done you can scan the QR barcode with your camera phone and you’ll automatically be connected to library services including hundreds of great audiobook files you can download for free!

Just look for the Quick Response (QR) Code on board all WestCAT Transit buses to access all your favorite titles. QR codes are available on an information poster located above the windows on most of the WestCAT Transit buses, in a smaller version in announcement holders inside of the Lynx and Dial-A-Ride buses without overhead displays, and on the front desk at the WestCAT Administration office.

A valid library card is required to use Snap & Go. For information about obtaining a library card visit: https://ecard.ccclib.org/index.php?do=english. For additional information about free audiobooks and Snap & Go contact the Contra Costa Library at 1-800-984-4636 or visit http://guides.ccclib.org/qr

Wait, wait, there’s more! The Library has recently announced that riders will now also be able to download and read eBooks in the EPUB format in addition to the already available downloadable audiobooks. OverDrive just launched an updated version of their software which the Library announced on their website and eNewsletter. http://ccclib.org/

This work was generously supported by funding for 511 Contra Costa projects provided by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s Transportation Fund for Clean Air.

###

5-4
Snap & Go QR Technology: Presented by WestCAT and the Contra Costa County Library.
Get access to over 600 audiobooks...instantly!

It's your personal HOV lane through the Library

With WestCAT's new "En route entertainment" you can now listen to over 600 audiobook titles on the bus with the Contra Costa County Library's Snap & Go mobile Library access. Wirelessly Download Audiobooks directly to your cell phone for FREE. It is a great way to pass the time on the bus. Just Snap and Go!

How it Works
1. Scan the code
2. Select a title
3. Enjoy

For additional information visit guides.cocclib.org/qr
## General Ledger
### Detailed Trial Balance

**User:** BradW  
**Printed:** 01/18/2011 - 1:17PM  
**Period:** 06, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Beginning Balance</th>
<th>Debit This Period</th>
<th>Credit This Period</th>
<th>Ending Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>770 REVENUE</td>
<td>WCCTAC Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-0000-33403</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-0000-34010</td>
<td>STMP Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-0000-34111</td>
<td>Var: 10,000.00 Member Contributions</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-0000-36102</td>
<td>Var: 113,756.00 Interest State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-0000-36102</td>
<td>Var: -520.95 Other Revenue</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-520.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-0000-39906</td>
<td>Var: 30,035.51 Other Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-0000 REVENUE Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>505,460.00</td>
<td>-352,189.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-352,189.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-0000-42001</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-0000-42001</td>
<td>Var: -9,964.49 EXPENSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-0000 EXPENSE Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>505,460.00</td>
<td>-352,189.44</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-352,189.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700 WCCTAC Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41000</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>228,932.00</td>
<td>8,908.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/2010 PR</td>
<td>6  38 Computer Checks Batch 2010 12 015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/2010 PR</td>
<td>6  84 Computer Checks Batch 2010 12 031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Beginning Balance</th>
<th>Debit This Period</th>
<th>Credit This Period</th>
<th>Ending Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41903</td>
<td>Employee Assistance Program</td>
<td>199.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>58.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/2010 AP</td>
<td>6 11 CSACEXCE - CSAC Excess Insurns Ck# 99092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41904</td>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>769.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>226.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/2010 PR</td>
<td>6 38 Computer Checks Batch 2010 12 015</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41905</td>
<td>Var: 140.35</td>
<td>199.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>58.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>58.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41904</td>
<td>Var: 542.86</td>
<td>769.00</td>
<td>188.44</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>226.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41905</td>
<td>Var: 12,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-41904</td>
<td>Var: -436.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>436.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>436.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-42001</td>
<td>Var: 1,952.25</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-43500</td>
<td>Var: 3,519.92</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>221.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>221.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-7700-43600</td>
<td>Var: 48,400.00</td>
<td>48,400.00</td>
<td>1,259.01</td>
<td>221.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,480.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL</td>
<td>Detailed Trial Balance (01/18/2011 - 1:17 PM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>Debit This Period</td>
<td>Credit This Period</td>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771</td>
<td>Richmond Intermodal Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771-0000-33403</td>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771-0000-33404</td>
<td>Federal Flood Reimbursement</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771-0000-36102</td>
<td>Interest State</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771-0000-39906</td>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771-0000-39906</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771-0000 REVENUE Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSE</td>
<td>WCCTAC Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771-7710</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771-7710-43600</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771-7710 EXPENSE Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSE Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771 Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>Debit This Period</td>
<td>Credit This Period</td>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-41800</td>
<td>LTD Insurance</td>
<td>1,770.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/2010 PR</td>
<td>6 38 Computer Checks Batch 2010 12 015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/2010 PR</td>
<td>6 84 Computer Checks Batch 2010 12 031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-41800 Totals:</td>
<td>Var: 1,412.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>3,244.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/2010 PR</td>
<td>6 38 Computer Checks Batch 2010 12 015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/2010 PR</td>
<td>6 84 Computer Checks Batch 2010 12 031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-41900 Totals:</td>
<td>Var: 2,015.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Assistance Program</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-41903 Totals:</td>
<td>Var: 607.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life Insurance</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/2010 PR</td>
<td>6 38 Computer Checks Batch 2010 12 015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-41904 Totals:</td>
<td>Var: 697.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits in Lieu</td>
<td>8,347.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/2010 PR</td>
<td>6 38 Computer Checks Batch 2010 12 015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/2010 PR</td>
<td>6 84 Computer Checks Batch 2010 12 031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-41905 Totals:</td>
<td>Var: 4,192.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bonds</td>
<td>8,347.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-41906 Totals:</td>
<td>Var: 1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-41911 Totals:</td>
<td>Var: 1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-43000 Totals:</td>
<td>Var: 4,934.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memberships/Subscriptions</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-43300 Totals:</td>
<td>Var: 4,934.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-43500 Totals:</td>
<td>Var: 4,934.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TDM Postage</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/3/2010 AP 6 11 XEROXCCA - Xerox Corporation Ck# 99167</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td>65.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>65.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/2010 AP</td>
<td>6 11 XEROXCCA - Xerox Corporation Ck# 99167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/3/2010 AP</td>
<td>6 11 XEROXCCA - Xerox Corporation Ck# 99167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>Debit This Period</td>
<td>Credit This Period</td>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-49000</td>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-49001</td>
<td>Building Maintenance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-49004</td>
<td>Comm/Util/Copies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720-49004</td>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7720 EXPENSE Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>458,418.00</td>
<td>130,814.07</td>
<td>29,558.43</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>160,279.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7730</td>
<td>STMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7730-41000</td>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7730-41000</td>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772-7730 EXPENSE Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSE Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>458,418.00</td>
<td>130,814.07</td>
<td>29,558.43</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>160,279.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>772 Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24,516.89</td>
<td>29,558.43</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>53,982.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>Debit This Period</td>
<td>Credit This Period</td>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773-7730-41902</td>
<td>FICA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773-7730-43500</td>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773-7730-43600</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>343,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773-7730-43600</td>
<td>Var: 262,155.63</td>
<td>343,100.00</td>
<td>80,944.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>80,944.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773-7730-43900</td>
<td>Rent/Building</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773-7730-43900</td>
<td>Special Department Expense</td>
<td>87,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773-7730-44000</td>
<td>Var: 87,000.00</td>
<td>87,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773-7730-44320</td>
<td>Travel/Training</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773-7730-49001</td>
<td>Building Maintenance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773-7730 EXPENSE Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>430,100.00</td>
<td>80,944.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>80,944.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSE Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>430,100.00</td>
<td>80,944.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>80,944.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>773 Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>-237,920.00</td>
<td>37,600.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37,600.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>Debit This Period</td>
<td>Credit This Period</td>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774-7740-43600</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>159,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774-7740-44000</td>
<td>Special Department Expense</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774-7740-44000 Totals:</td>
<td>Var: 159,500.00</td>
<td>159,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774-7740-44320</td>
<td>Travel and Training</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774-7740-44320 Totals:</td>
<td>Var: 14,000.00</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774-7740-49001</td>
<td>Building Maintenance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774-7740-49001 Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774-7740 EXPENSE Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>173,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENSE Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>173,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>774 Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-21.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-21.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**FEHR & PEERS**  
TRANSPORTATION CONSULTANTS  
100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 600  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
(925) 930-7100  
Fax (925) 933-8007  
Fed. ID 68-0065540

Christina Atienza  
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee  
13831 San Pablo Avenue  
San Pablo, CA 94806  

October 18, 2010  
Project No: SF10-0512.00  
Invoice No: 72027  
Project Manager: Robert Grandy

**Project SF10-0512.00 WCCTAC Transit Enhancement Strategic Plan**  
**Invoice Period: August 28, 2010 to September 24, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Phase Fee</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>Fee Earned</th>
<th>Prior Billing</th>
<th>Current Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Administration</td>
<td>3,008.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>3,008.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,008.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Toolbox</td>
<td>44,154.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Needs Assessment</td>
<td>97,360.00</td>
<td>17.5431</td>
<td>17,080.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>65,002.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>40,476.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fee</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,088.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,088.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20,088.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Invoice Amount</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$20,088.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

770-7700-43600-732 $44,848.00  
Enhancement: Dela 1a, 1b, 1c, 3c, 2a, 5a

EMc 12-17-10
# MILESTONE BUDGET PAYMENT SCHEDULE (V.1)
## TRANSIT ENHANCEMENT STRATEGIC PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>BUDGET SUMMARY</th>
<th>Billed This Period</th>
<th>Previously Billed</th>
<th>Budget Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fehr &amp; Peers</td>
<td>Nelson Nygaard</td>
<td>Eisen Letunic</td>
<td>M. Lee Corp.</td>
<td>DELIVERABLE BUDGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 - Project Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. Draft Project Management Plan</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. Final Project Management Plan</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c. Technical Memo - Data Requests</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$268.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$558.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Task 1</strong></td>
<td>$1,040.00</td>
<td>$1,368.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,408.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 - Transit Toolbox</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Toolbox Workshop and Memo</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$1,080.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$12,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Draft Toolbox</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Final Toolbox</td>
<td>$4,330.00</td>
<td>$2,244.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$6,574.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Task 2</strong></td>
<td>$25,330.00</td>
<td>$17,244.00</td>
<td>$1,080.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$43,654.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 - Transit Needs Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Study Location Recommendations</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$9,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Memo - Needs Assessment Methodology</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$7,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Catchment Maps</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d. Walking and Biking Audits</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$23,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$24,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e. Transit Center, TDM and Parking Audits</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3f. Draft Needs Assessment Report</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3g. Final Needs Assessment Report</td>
<td>$2,620.00</td>
<td>$2,660.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Task 3</strong></td>
<td>$45,620.00</td>
<td>$48,660.00</td>
<td>$1,080.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$95,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 - Recommendations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Memo - Draft Priority Criteria</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Draft Priority List</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$810.00</td>
<td>$10,880.00</td>
<td>$24,190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. Draft Project Priority List</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,510.00</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$11,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d. Draft Recommendations</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$270.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$11,270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e. Final Recommendations - Working Group</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f. Final Recommendations - WCTAC Board</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g. Draft Board Presentation</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4h. Final Board Presentation</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Task 4</strong></td>
<td>$24,030.00</td>
<td>$26,010.00</td>
<td>$2,160.00</td>
<td>$11,880.00</td>
<td>$64,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 - Public Outreach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. Focus Groups - Round 1</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$2,430.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b. Focus Groups - Round 2</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$2,430.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c. Community Open Houses</td>
<td>$4,490.00</td>
<td>$2,156.00</td>
<td>$8,910.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15,556.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d. Web Site - Initiation</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5e. Web Site - Open House Updates</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$4,860.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6,860.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Task 5</strong></td>
<td>$12,490.00</td>
<td>$4,860.00</td>
<td>$2,330.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$38,476.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Task 1b</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Task 2b</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Task 3f</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Task 4c</td>
<td>$322.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$922.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Task 5a</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Task 5c</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$3,822.00</td>
<td>$1,200.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$6,622.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$20,088.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$229,912.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project SF10-0512.00 WCCTAC Transit Enhancement Strategic Plan

Invoice Period: September 25, 2010 to October 29, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Phase Fee</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>Fee Earned</th>
<th>Prior Billing</th>
<th>Current Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>3,008.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>3,008.00</td>
<td>3,008.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Toolbox</td>
<td>44,154.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Needs Assessment</td>
<td>97,360.00</td>
<td>24.73</td>
<td>24,080.00</td>
<td>17,080.00</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>65,002.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>40,476.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fee</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,088.00</td>
<td>20,088.00</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Fee: 7,000.00

Total Current Invoice Amount: $7,000.00

Outstanding Invoices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72027</td>
<td>10/18/2010</td>
<td>20,088.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 20,088.00

Total Now Due: $27,088.00
## MILESTONE BUDGET PAYMENT SCHEDULE (V.1)

### TRANSPORT ENHANCEMENT STRATEGIC PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Budgeted Rate</th>
<th>Actual Rate</th>
<th>Billed This Period</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Project Admin</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Project Management Plan</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Final Project Management Plan</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Trans-Task Box 1</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Trans-Task Box 2</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Billed This Period</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fehr &amp; Peers</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Niggl</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elred Lutnic</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Luce Corp.</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Services through October 29, 2010*
100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 600  Walnut Creek, CA 94596  (925) 930-7100  Fax (925) 933-8007
Fed. ID 68-0065540

December 09, 2010
Project No: SF10-0512.00
Invoice No: 72842
Project Manager  Robert Grandy

Project SF10-0512.00 WCCTAC Transit Enhancement Strategic Plan

Invoice Period: October 30, 2010 to November 26, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Phase Fee</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>Fee Earned</th>
<th>Prior Billing</th>
<th>Current Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>3,008.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>3,008.00</td>
<td>3,008.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Toolbox</td>
<td>44,154.00</td>
<td>27.3588</td>
<td>12,080.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Needs Assessment</td>
<td>97,360.00</td>
<td>24.7329</td>
<td>24,080.00</td>
<td>24,080.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>65,002.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>40,476.00</td>
<td>14.033</td>
<td>5,680.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fee</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,847.95</td>
<td>27,087.95</td>
<td>17,760.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Fee $17,760.00

Total Current Invoice Amount $17,760.00

Outstanding Invoices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Total Now Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72027</td>
<td>10/18/2010</td>
<td>20,088.00</td>
<td>$44,848.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72483</td>
<td>11/17/2010</td>
<td>7,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,088.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DUE AND PAYABLE UPON RECEIPT
# MILESTONE BUDGET PAYMENT SCHEDULE (V.1)
## TRANSIT ENHANCEMENT STRATEGIC PLAN

**Services through November 26, 2010**

**SF10-0512.00**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>BUDGET SUMMARY</th>
<th>DELIVERABLE BUDGET</th>
<th>Billed This Period</th>
<th>Previously Billed</th>
<th>Budget Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fehr &amp; Peers</td>
<td>Nelson Nygaard</td>
<td>Eisen Letunic</td>
<td>M. Lee Corp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 -</td>
<td>Project Administration</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1a. Draft Project Management Plan</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1b. Final Project Management Plan</td>
<td>$290.00</td>
<td>$268.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$558.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal Task 1</td>
<td>$1,040.00</td>
<td>$1,388.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,408.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 -</td>
<td>Transit Toolbox</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$1,080.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$12,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2a. Toolbox Workshop and Memo</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2c. Technical Memo - Data Requests</td>
<td>$4,330.00</td>
<td>$2,244.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6,574.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal Task 2</td>
<td>$25,330.00</td>
<td>$17,244.00</td>
<td>$1,080.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$43,654.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 -</td>
<td>Transit Needs Assessment</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$9,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3a. Study Location Recommendations</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$7,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3b. Memo - Needs Assessment Methodology</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3d. Walking and Biking Audits</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$24,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3e. Transit Center, TDM and Parking Audits</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$27,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3f. Draft Needs Assessment Report</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3g. Final Needs Assessment Report</td>
<td>$2,620.00</td>
<td>$2,660.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal Task 3</td>
<td>$45,620.00</td>
<td>$48,660.00</td>
<td>$1,080.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$95,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 -</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,540.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4a. Memo - Draft Priority Criteria</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$810.00</td>
<td>$10,880.00</td>
<td>$24,190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4b. Draft Project List</td>
<td>$5,030.00</td>
<td>$5,510.00</td>
<td>$540.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$11,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c. Draft Project Priority List</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$270.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$11,270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4d. Draft Recommendations</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4e. Final Recommendations - Working Group</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4f. Final Recommendations - WCCTAC Board</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4g. Draft Board Presentation</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4h. Final Board Presentation</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal Task 4</td>
<td>$24,030.00</td>
<td>$26,010.00</td>
<td>$2,160.00</td>
<td>$11,880.00</td>
<td>$64,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 -</td>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$2,430.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5a. Focus Groups - Round 1</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$2,430.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,680.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5b. Focus Groups - Round 2</td>
<td>$4,490.00</td>
<td>$2,156.00</td>
<td>$8,910.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15,556.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5c. Community Open Houses</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$2,700.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5d. Web Site - Initiation</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$4,860.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6,860.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal Task 5</td>
<td>$12,490.00</td>
<td>$4,856.00</td>
<td>$21,330.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$38,476.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal Expenses</td>
<td>$3,822</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$6,022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

- $250,000.00
- $17,760.00
- $27,088.00
- $205,152.00
TO: WCCTAC Board  
DATE: January 21, 2011

FR: Christina Atienza, Executive Director

RE: Sponsorship of Workshop on Designing for Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety

Contra Costa Health Services (CCHS) requests WCCTAC’s sponsorship of an all-day event to be held on March 16 in Richmond. The workshop is open to all interested parties with a focus on West County planning and public works professionals. Sponsorship would entail use of the agency’s logo on informational items and a contribution of $250 toward the cost of snacks and refreshments on the day of the workshop. Staff recommends approval of the request using TDM grant funds. The workshop is an allowable use of those funds and is in keeping with the intent of the TDM program of promoting alternatives to solo driving.

Background

CCHS staff, during public comment at the Board’s Dec. 2010 meeting, announced the upcoming workshop and requested the Board’s support. Board members inquired whether the requested support included funding, to which CCHS at the time responded in the negative. Board members noted their approval of the workshop’s concept, and asked that the requested action be agendized for a future meeting.

CCHS staff subsequently described the workshop at the Jan. 2011 meeting of the TAC, and asked the TAC to additionally endorse a request for $250 to defray the cost of food and refreshments. The training session is to be led by persons who are renowned for their expertise in the subject area and for their ability to lead productive training sessions. The topics covered during the workshop are consistent with efforts the TAC and Board are making to design streets for safe bicycling and walking. The workshop is free for advocates, staff, and citizens, and is presented by the Healthy Transportation Network, a collaboration of the Local Government Commission, Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, California Bicycle Coalition, and California Department of Health.

The TAC expressed support for the workshop and use of the WCCTAC logo. One TAC member suggested, to general assent, that WCCTAC might consider contributing $500 instead, to cover the complete cost of food for the event and to ensure that West County staff would not be asked to pay to attend the event. CCHS said that they were working with another sponsor for the remaining $250, and their request from WCCTAC is for $250. WCCTAC staff noted that the cost may be eligible to be funded through TDM program funds. The TAC agreed that if funding could be identified, WCCTAC could fulfill the request by CCHS. Staff’s recommendation is to support the request for no more than $250.

CCHS’s request is attached. Also attached for the Board’s information are the announcement and agenda for a similar workshop held in Burbank, as the Richmond workshop announcement and agenda were in development as of this writing.
January 20, 2011

Christina Atienza, Executive Director
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee
13831 San Pablo Avenue
San Pablo, CA 94806

Dear Christina,

Per our discussion at the WCCTAC TAC on January 13, I am writing to request WCCTAC sponsorship of the West County Pedestrian and Bicycle Design Workshop to be held in Richmond on March 16, 2011. This is an all day workshop that will help build the capacity of local jurisdictions to plan and implement bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Similar trainings are being offered across the State by the Healthy Transportation Network, Local Government Commission, and Rails to Trails and we are fortunate to have been offered the opportunity to hold one in West Contra Costa County.

WCCTAC sponsorship would include allowing the WCCTAC logo to be used on outreach materials, conducting outreach to local jurisdictions to encourage a variety of representatives from each jurisdiction to attend, and contributing $250 towards the purchase of a light breakfast and box lunch for the training. Approximately 40 participants are expected and the total cost of food is estimated at $500; in addition to this request to WCCTAC, I am looking in my own budget and soliciting requests from other parties.

Having listened to discussions at both the WCCTAC TAC and Board level about “Complete Streets”, I believe that this workshop will be very useful to West County jurisdictions in clarifying the Complete Streets concept, implementation, and policy implications. I am familiar with the work of some of the presenters and would expect this workshop to be very high quality, practical, and interactive.

I would very much appreciate the WCCTAC Board’s approval of this sponsorship request at its January 28 Board meeting. I will be on hand to answer any questions they might have. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Best regards,

Nancy Baer, MSW, Manager
Injury Prevention and Physical Activity Promotion Projects
The Healthy Transportation Network presents:

Designing for Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety

Complete Streets Training Workshop

Join us for an interactive workshop sponsored by the Healthy Transportation Network and the City of Burbank aimed at providing the latest bicycle and pedestrian design tools to community advocates and practicing transportation, planning, engineering and design professionals.

Highlights include:
A one-hour “walkabout” with instructors to discuss design concerns and solutions.

Presentations on:
• Complete Streets, Safe Routes to School and Pedestrian Safety
• Innovative designs, including bicycle boulevards, trails, road diets, roundabouts and crossing treatments.

Please join us!
Wednesday, December 8
Training Workshop

8:30 a.m. – 5 p.m.
City of Burbank Community Services Building
Community Room, Room 104
150 North Third Street
Burbank, CA 91502

Workshop Instructors:
Paul Zykofsky, AICP
Local Government Commission

Laura Cohen, JD
Rails-to-Trails Conservancy

Timothy Bustos, LCI
California Bicycle Coalition

Morning coffee/snacks & lunch will be provided.

This workshop is free but registration is required.
Please register online before November 12 at http://burbankbikepedworkshop.eventbrite.com

Questions? Contact Rails-to-Trails Conservancy’s Darrow VW at 415.814.1100 or Darrow@railstotrails.org

Sponsors: The Healthy Transportation Network and the City of Burbank

The Healthy Transportation Network is a project of the California Active Communities program of the California Department of Public Health with funding from the federal Transportation Enhancements program.
Lunch is sponsored by the City of Burbank.
Workshop Agenda -
Designing for Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety

Presented by the Healthy Transportation Network
Instructors: Paul Zykosky; Laura Cohen; Timothy Bustos

Community Room, 150 North Third St., Room 104
Burbank, CA
December, 2010  8:30 – 5:00

8:15 – 8:30  Registration and Coffee/Pastries

MORNING SESSION

8:30-10:00  Introductions and course overview (instructor and participants)

Complete Streets: What are they? Why should we care?
➢ Defining Complete Streets; examples of tools and strategies
➢ Complete Streets Policies – state and federal

Bicycling and Pedestrian Trends and Research
➢ If we build it, will they come?
➢ Bikeable Community profiles; National Trends

10:00-10:10  BREAK

10:10-12:30  Safe Cycling: Education and Design Part I
➢ Bicycle Rules of the Road
➢ Bicyclist Training
➢ Major causes of bicycle crashes
➢ Facility types

Safe Cycling: Education and Design Part II
➢ Intersections: at grade and grade separated
➢ Innovations in Bike Facility Design: Cycle Tracks; Sharrows; Roundabouts;
   Colored Bike Lanes; Bicycle Boulevards
➢ End of Trip facilities: bike parking, lockers

Programs, Policies and Planning to Improve Pedestrian Safety
➢ Land use; street connectivity; access management; site design

12:30-1:00  LUNCH
AFTERNOON SESSION

1:00-2:15  Walkabout/Field Exercise and Debrief

2:15-3:40  Designing Safe Sidewalks
  ➢ Basic sidewalk design: zones, width, clearances, accessibility, buffers, driveways

  Crossing the Street — General Principles
  ➢ Principles of human behavior; mid-block vs. intersection crossing safety
  ➢ Crosswalks and crosswalk markings, improving effectiveness of crosswalks
  ➢ Medians and islands: breaking long crossings into two steps

  Crossing the Street at Intersections
  ➢ Geometric concerns: intersection size; curb radius; skewed intersections
  ➢ Curb extensions: reducing crossing distance
  ➢ Crosswalk placement, islands; right turn slip lane design
  ➢ Countdown signals

3:40-3:50  BREAK

Roundabouts and Road Diets
  ➢ Proper design of roundabouts, essential pedestrian safety considerations

Funding, Programs and Policies supporting Bikeable, Walkable Communities
  ➢ California and national policies
  ➢ Funding: federal, state and local support for infrastructure and programs

Questions/Discussion/Evaluation Forms

5:00 pm  Adjourn
TO: WCCTAC Board  DATE: January 21, 2011

FR: Christina Atienza, Executive Director

RE: Programming of Up to $14,000 in Measure J West County Subregional Transportation Needs (Program 28b) Funds for the West Contra Costa Street Smarts Campaign

Street Smarts is a traffic safety education campaign started by Contra Costa Health Services (CCHS) in 2004 to remind West County travelers to exercise caution while walking, biking, and driving, particularly around children. Campaign messages are delivered via multiple-language media including signs on public property, displays at community events, newsletter inserts, cable television and cinema ads, and community group presentations.

CCHS is seeking $14,000 to fund proposed FY 10-11 program activities. The approved FY 10-11 budget assumes that this initiative would be funded through Measure J, in lieu of WCCTAC dues, which were used to fund activities in prior years.

At the January 2011 TAC meeting, staff explained that Measure J Program 28b – West County Subregional Transportation Needs – provides broad latitude to WCCTAC to designate use of the funds for programs and projects that affect West County as a subregion. To date, none of the available 28b funds have been programmed, but preliminary discussions with the TAC indicate consensus that funds should be reserved for regionally significant uses, such as forthcoming recommendations from the two grant-funded West County-wide planning efforts currently underway, viz., transit enhancement and wayfinding signage plans.

The TAC asked how long the BART ads run, and whether, if El Cerrito Theatre could be persuaded to run cinema ads for free, the cost of the $14,000 campaign might be reduced. CCHS staff said the BART ads run for 8 weeks, and suggested that instead of reducing the budget if a cinema provided free time, they would increase their outreach and run more ads in other cinemas, such as Hilltop, where they pay a fee for public service announcements. The TAC asked whether the budget included hardware for fitting banners to existing utility poles. Hardware was included in previous budgets, but not in this one, as utility poles identified in the program have already been fitted with the appropriate brackets. Next year, CCHS would like to procure additional hardware for other cities. The TAC asked whether the banner fabric was sturdy enough to be installed and re-installed in multiple locations over the course of a year, and if design and installation had been included in the budget. The banners are made of heavy-duty reinforced vinyl fabric selected for its durability, and designs are complete; the cost of installation is in the budget. The TAC suggested that CCHS seek other grant opportunities to sustain Street Smarts in future years when 28b becomes more competitive; CCHS staff said that they have already done so, as the campaign grows with multiple funding sources. CCHS staff noted that the program is currently underfunded, as much more remains to be done in traffic safety. Based on the discussion, the TAC determined that the project is eligible for Program 28b funds, and recommends approval of CCHS’ request. The attached Resolution 11-01 summarizes the recommended Board action.
WEST CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
RESOLUTION 11-01

PROGRAMMING OF DEDICATED MEASURE J FUNDING
FOR WEST COUNTY SUBREGIONAL TRANSPORTATION NEEDS
TO FY 2010-11 STREET SMARTS TRAFFIC SAFETY EDUCATION CAMPAIGN

WHEREAS, Contra Costa voters approved at the November 2004 general election the
continuation of a half-cent local transportation sales tax for 25 years beginning on April 1, 2009
(“Measure J”), and an expenditure plan for those sales tax revenues; and

WHEREAS, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) is the designated authority for
administering the Measure J sales tax revenues; and

WHEREAS, the Measure J Expenditure Plan allocates 0.3 percent of annual sales tax revenues
to west Contra Costa’s subregional transportation needs (“Program 28b”); and

WHEREAS, the Measure J Expenditure Plan for Program 28b stipulates the following: West
Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee (“WCCTAC”) will propose programming the
funds to any project or program eligible under the provisions of the Act, and WCCTAC will
coordinate with appropriate local jurisdictions/agencies to plan and implement the projects in this
category; and

WHEREAS, the Measure J Expenditure Plan for Program 28b describes a list of sample projects
that includes: (1) planning work or environmental studies for a project; (2) implementation of
recommended transportation projects in a regional study or plan (including, but not limited to,
the El Sobrante Transportation and Land Use Plan, the Richmond-Area Community-Based
Transportation Plan, the El Portal Gateway Plan, the Montalvin Manor Community Plan, the
Safe Communities Program, etc.); (3) bus and/or BART improvements; (4) neighborhood traffic
calming improvements; (5) transportation/transit information in languages other than English;
and/or (6) other eligible transportation investments; and

WHEREAS, Contra Costa Health Services (CCHS) manages “Street Smarts”, a traffic safety
education campaign designed to remind Contra Costans to travel safely as drivers, pedestrians,
and bicyclists; and

WHEREAS, CCHS requested funding from WCCTAC in the amount of $14,000 to implement
several Street Smarts activities in FY 2010-11 and provided estimated costs of each activity as
follows: staff costs for coordination - $2,535, BART ad printing and placement - $3,500, Hilltop
and Rialto Cinemas theater ads - $2,250, and printing and placement of light pole banners -
$5,715; and

WHEREAS, the WCCTAC Technical Advisory Committee discussed CCHS’ funding request,
deemed Street Smarts to be an eligible project under the Measure J Program 28b requirements,
and recommended to the WCCTAC Board that Street Smarts be funded for FY 2010-11 for the
actual costs of the activities with Measure J Program 28b funds in an amount not to exceed
$14,000; and
WHEREAS, there are sufficient Measure J Program 28b funds available to fulfill CCHS’ request.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, that all of the recitals set forth above are true and correct to the best of WCCTAC’s knowledge and by reference are incorporated herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that WCCTAC has determined that the Street Smarts Campaign as described in the Attachment A is an eligible use of Measure J Program 28b funds.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that WCCTAC has determined that the proposed Street Smarts Campaign would address a subregional transportation need in West County.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that WCCTAC proposes to CCTA to program up to $14,000 in Measure J Program 28b funds for the FY 2010-11 Street Smarts Campaign.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that WCCTAC directs staff to forward this resolution to CCTA for their consideration and approval.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that upon CCTA’s approval, WCCTAC authorizes its Executive Director to finalize, in cooperation with appropriate CCTA staff, the details of the administration of the Measure J Program 28b funding for the FY 2010-11 Street Smarts Campaign.

The foregoing Resolution was adopted by the WCCTAC Board at a regular meeting on January 28, 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

By: ____________________________

Roy V. Swearingen, Chair

Attest: ____________________________

Christina Atienza, Executive Director

Approved as to Form: ____________________________

Michael Rodriquez, General Counsel
West Contra Costa STREET SMARTS Campaign
Prepared for the
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee Technical Advisory Committee
(WCCTAC-TAC)
January 13, 2011

STREET SMARTS is a traffic safety education campaign designed to remind Contra Costans to travel safely as drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The West Contra Costa STREET SMARTS Campaign kicked-off in 2004 and has since been implemented in community and school settings. It addresses these traffic safety problems:

- Stop Sign Compliance
- Red Light Violations
- Pedestrian Injuries
- School Zone Safety
- Speeding

West Contra Costa was the first East Bay region to adopt STREET SMARTS, which originated in San Jose and won the 2004 Pedestrian Project Award from the national Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). Funding to purchase, launch and support STREET SMARTS comes primarily from West Contra Costa Cities and the County through their participation in the West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee. To help increase the impact and reach of the campaign, Contra Costa Health Services, which implements STREET SMARTS, often includes a STREET SMARTS component in other funding applications.

Local activities have consisted of bus shelter ads, displays at festivals and events, newsletter inserts, cable television ads, bumper stickers on city and county vehicles, theatre ads, and posters displayed in local businesses. STREET SMARTS materials and incentive items are also used in conjunction with traffic safety presentations in local schools and distributed at local events — as reminders to drive, walk, and bicycle safely. At the October 14th WCCTAC-TAC meeting, CCHS received input on proposed 2010-11 activities and followed up with an email survey to members in December. The following is a proposal for WCCTAC-supported 2010-2011 campaign activities:

Proposed Activities
(Based on a $14,000 budget. Actual costs may differ slightly)

❖ **CCHS Staff costs for coordination**

Approximate Funds: $2,535

❖ **BART ad printing and placement:**

Approximate Cost: $3,500

- 2 STREET SMARTS Ads – “See Eye to Eye with Drivers,” “Put the Other Pedal to the Metal”
- BART station locations: Richmond, El Cerrito Del Norte, and El Cerrito Plaza

❖ **Hilltop and Rialto Cinemas Theater Ads:**

Approximate Cost: $2,250

- 1 STREET SMARTS Ad – “See Eye to Eye with Drivers”
  English and Spanish versions available

❖ **Light Pole Banners (Sierra Display):**

Approximate Cost: $5,715

- Printing of 15-20 light poles banners. Banners will be available for one 30 day placement in each jurisdiction.

Contact: Nancy Baer, nbair@hsd.cccounty.us, or Shannon Ladner-Beasley, sladner-beasley@hsd.cccounty.us
This report describes Senate Bill 375, the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and the effect of the law on local governments as well as the Bay Area as a region. The “template” for this report was initially prepared by staff from the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The “template” report was revised by CCTA staff to provide the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and local jurisdictions with an overview of the SCS in relation to subregional and local policy considerations.

The SCS will be developed in partnership among regional agencies, local jurisdictions and Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) through an iterative process. The regional agencies recognize that input from local jurisdictions with land use authority is essential to create a feasible SCS. The SCS does not alter the authority of jurisdictions over local land use and development decisions.

PURPOSE AND APPROACH

Senate Bill 375 became law in 2008 and is considered landmark legislation for California relative to land use, transportation and environmental planning. It calls for the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in all metropolitan regions in California. Within the Bay Area, the law gives joint responsibility for the SCS to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). These agencies will coordinate with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC).

The SCS integrates several existing planning processes and is required to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Provide a new 25-year land use strategy for the Bay Area that is realistic and identifies areas to accommodate all of the region’s population, including all income groups;
2. Forecast a land use pattern, which when integrated with the transportation system, reduces greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks and is measured against the regional target established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

The SCS is a land use strategy required to be included as part of the Bay Area’s 25-year Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). By federal law, the RTP must be internally consistent. Therefore, the over $200 billion dollars of transportation investment typically included in the RTP must align with and support the SCS land-use pattern. SB 375 also requires that an updated eight-year regional housing need allocation (RHNA) prepared by ABAG is consistent with the SCS. The SCS, RTP and RHNA will be adopted simultaneously in early 2013.
The SCS is not just about assigning housing need to places or achieving greenhouse gas targets. The primary goal is to build a Bay Area which continues to thrive and prosper under the changing circumstances of the twenty-first century. By directly confronting the challenges associated with population growth, climate change, a new economic reality and an increasing public-health imperative, the SCS should help us achieve a Bay Area which is both more livable and more economically competitive on the world stage. A successful SCS will:

- Recognize and support compact walkable places where residents and workers have access to services and amenities to meet their day-to-day needs;
- Reduce long commutes and decrease reliance that increases energy independence and decreases the region’s carbon consumption;
- Support complete communities which remain livable and affordable for all segments of the population, maintaining the Bay Area as an attractive place to reside, start or continue a business, and create jobs.
- Support a sustainable transportation system and reduce the need for expensive highway and transit expansions, freeing up resources for other more productive public investments;
- Provide increased accessibility and affordability to our most vulnerable populations;
- Conserve water and decrease our dependence on imported food stocks and their high transport costs.

In recognition of the importance of these other goals, ABAG and MTC will adopt performance targets and indicators that will help inform decisions about land use patterns and transportation investments. These targets and indicators will apply to the SCS and the RTP. The targets and indicators are being developed by the Performance Targets and Indicators Ad Hoc Committee of the Regional Advisory Working Group (RAWG), which includes local planning and transportation staff, non-profit organizations, and business and developers’ organizations. The targets are scheduled for adoption early 2011 and the indicators will be adopted in spring 2011.

BUILDING ON EXISTING EFFORTS

In many respects the SCS builds upon existing efforts in many Bay Area communities to encourage more focused and compact growth while recognizing the unique characteristics and differences of the region’s many varied communities. In Contra Costa, the effort began with “Shaping Our Future,” which was completed in 2007 and which laid the groundwork for the designation of FOCUS Priority Development Areas (PDAs) – the locally-identified and regionally adopted infill development opportunity areas near transit. The PDAs provide a strong foundation upon which to structure the region’s first Sustainable Communities Strategy. PDAs are only three percent of the region’s land area. However, local governments have indicated that based upon existing plans, resources, and incentives the PDAs can collectively accommodate over fifty percent of the Bay Area’s housing need through 2035.
PDAs have been supported by planning grants, capital funding and technical assistance grants from MTC. The current RTP allocates an average of $60 million a year to PDA incentive-related funding. Future RTPs, consistent with the SCS, will be structured to provide policies and funding that is supportive of PDAs and potentially other opportunity areas for sustainable development in the region.

PARTNERSHIP

To be successful, the SCS will require a partnership among regional agencies, local jurisdictions, Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs), transit agencies, and other regional stakeholders. MTC and ABAG are engaged in an intense information exchange with County-Corridor Working Groups throughout the Bay Area. These Groups are organized by county, by subregions within counties, and by corridors that span counties. They typically include city and county planning directors, CMA staff, and representatives of other key agencies such as transit agencies and public health departments. Working Group members are responsible for providing updates and information to their locally elected policymakers through regular reports like this one and eventually through recommended council or board resolutions which acknowledge the implications of the SCS for each jurisdiction.

Each county has established an SCS engagement strategy to their needs and ongoing planning efforts. In Contra Costa, our working group includes the RTPCs, the Planning Directors, the Authority’s TCC, and an RTP/SCS Task Force. These groups provide an opportunity for all of the region’s jurisdictions to be represented in the SCS process and to provide ongoing information to, and input from, local officials through staff reports by working group members (local planning staff) to their city councils and/or boards of supervisors as the SCS process evolves through 2011.

The first County-Corridor Working Group meeting (a.k.a. “the SB 375 Leadership Roundtable”) for Contra Costa was held on September 27, 2010 at the CCTA offices in Walnut Creek. The focus of this meeting was to establish an SCS engagement strategy that best suited Contra Costa. At the meeting, it was determined that the most effective channel for communication with the local jurisdictions was through the RTPCs. It was further suggested that from time to time, expanded meetings of the RTPCs should be held to provide an opportunity for all elected officials in each subarea to weigh in at key decision points throughout the SCS-process.

In addition to the County-Corridor Working Groups, a Regional Advisory Working Group (RAWG), composed of local government representatives and key stakeholders provides technical oversight at the regional level.

PROCESS – SCS SCENARIOS

The final SCS will be the product of an iterative process that includes a sequence of growth and supportive transportation scenarios. Starting with an Initial Vision Scenario (February 2011), followed by more detailed SCS scenarios that refine the initial vision scenario (Spring and Fall
2011), and final draft (early 2012). For more information about the timeline, see SCS Schedule – Attachment A.

Initial Vision Scenario

ABAG and MTC will release an Initial Vision Scenario in February 2011 based in large part on input from local jurisdictions through the county/corridor engagement process and information collected by December 2010. The Vision Scenario will encompass an initial identification of places, policies and strategies for long-term, sustainable development in the Bay Area. Local governments will identify places of great potential for sustainable development, including PDAs, transit corridors, employment areas, as well as infill opportunities areas that lack transit services but offer opportunities for increased walkability and reduced driving.

The Initial Vision Scenario will:
- Incorporate the 25-year regional housing need encompassed in the SCS;
- Provide a preliminary set of housing and employment growth numbers at regional, county, jurisdictional, and sub-jurisdictional levels;
- Be evaluated against the greenhouse gas reduction target as well as the additional performance targets adopted for the SCS.

Detailed Scenarios

By the early spring of 2011 the conversation between local governments and regional agencies will turn to the feasibility of achieving the Initial Vision Scenario by working on the Detailed Scenarios. The Detailed Scenarios will be different than the initial Vision Scenario in that they will take into account constraints that might limit development potential, and will identify the infrastructure and resources that can be identified and/or secured to support the scenario. MTC and ABAG expect to release a first round of Detailed Scenarios by July 2011. Local jurisdictions will provide input, which will then be analyzed for the release of the Preferred Scenario by the end of 2011. The County/Corridor Working Groups as well as the RAWG will facilitate local input into the scenarios through 2011. The analysis of the Detailed Scenarios and Preferred Scenario takes into account the Performance Targets and Indicators.

REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION

As described above, the eight-year RHNA must be consistent with the SCS. Planning for affordable housing in the Bay Area is one of the essential tasks of sustainable development. In the SCS, this task becomes integrated with the regional land use strategy, the development of complete communities and a sustainable transportation system. The process to update RHNA will begin in early 2011. The county/corridor engagement process will include discussions of RHNA, since both the SCS and RHNA require consideration of housing needs by income group. Cities will discuss their strategies for the distribution of housing needs at the county level and decide if they want to form a sub-regional RHNA group by March 2011. The distribution of housing needs will inform the Detailed SCS Scenarios. Regional agencies will take input from local jurisdictions for the adoption of the RHNA methodology by September 2011. The final
housing numbers for the region will be issued by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) by September 2011. The Draft RHNA will be released by spring 2012. ABAG will adopt the Final RHNA by the end of summer 2012. Local governments will address the next round of RHNA in their next Housing Element update.

This is a condensed description of the RHNA process. Additional details about procedural requirements (e.g. appeals, revisions and transfers) and substantive issues (e.g. housing by income category and formation of subregions) will be described in a separate document.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

The SCS brings an explicit link between the land use choices and the transportation investments. MTC and ABAG's commitment to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and provision of housing for all income levels translates into an alignment of the development of places committed to these goals and transportation, infrastructure and housing funding. The regional agencies will work closely with the CMAs, transportation agencies and local jurisdictions to define financially constrained transportation priorities in their response to a call for transportation projects in early 2011 and a detailed project assessment that will be completed by July/August 2011; the project assessment will be an essential part of the development of Detailed SCS Scenarios. The RTP will be analyzed through 2012 and released for review by the end of 2012. ABAG will approve the SCS by March 2013. MTC will adopt the final RTP and SCS by April 2013.

Regional agencies will prepare one Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for both the SCS and the RTP. This EIR might assist local jurisdictions in streamlining the environmental review process for some of the projects that are consistent with the SCS. Local jurisdictions are currently providing input for the potential scope of the EIR. Regional agencies are investigating the scope and strategies for an EIR that could provide the most effective support for local governments.

ADDITIONAL REGIONAL TASKS

MTC, ABAG and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District are coordinating the impacts of CEQA thresholds and guidelines recently approved by the Air District. The Air District is currently developing tools and mitigation measures related to the CEQA thresholds and guidelines to assist with development projects in PDAs. The four regional agencies will be coordinating other key regional planning issues including any adopted climate adaptation-related policy recommendations or best practices encompassed in the Bay Plan update recently released by BCDC.

BENEFITS FOR ALL

The SCS provides an opportunity for the local jurisdictions of Contra Costa to advance local goals as part of a coordinated regional framework. By coordinating programs across multiple
layers of government, the SCS should improve public sector efficiency and create more rational and coordinated regulation and public funding. The SCS connects local neighborhood concerns—such as new housing, jobs, and traffic—to regional objectives and resources. As such, it is a platform for cities and counties to discuss and address a wide spectrum of challenges, including high housing costs, poverty, job access, and public health, and identify local, regional, and state policies to address them. It gives local governments a stronger voice in identifying desired infrastructure improvements and provides a framework for evaluating those investments regionally. In this way, the SCS rewards those cities whose decisions advance local goals and benefit quality of life beyond their borders—whether to create more affordable housing, new jobs, or reduce driving.

Regional agencies are exploring the following support for the SCS:
- Grants for affordable housing close to transit
- Infrastructure bank to support investments that can accommodate housing and jobs close to transit
- Transportation investment in areas that can significantly contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions through compact development
- Infrastructure investments in small towns that can improve access to services through walking and transit.

NEXT STEPS
- Regional agencies expect to release an initial Vision Scenario in early February 2011.
- City (or County) staff will subsequently provide a report to their Councils/Boards describing the overall approach, regional context, and local implications.
- Local staff will seek Council feedback and response to the initial Vision Scenario to be share with regional agencies. This feedback will serve as a basis for the development of Detailed SCS Scenarios through July 2011.
- Testing and development of SCS Scenarios: Late 2011.
- Develop draft RTP/SCS for analysis 2012.
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AB 32 Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006

- AB 32 establishes the first comprehensive program of regulatory and market mechanisms in the nation to achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions

- AB 32 sets GHG emissions limit for 2020 at 1990 level
  - Acknowledges that 2020 is not the endpoint
  - Points way towards 80% reduction by 2050

- Air Resources Board (ARB) adopted a Scoping Plan to achieve AB 32's GHG emissions reduction target
California's Three Pronged Approach to Reducing Transportation Greenhouse Gases
(with AB 32 Scoping Plan estimates for GHG reductions in 2020)

- Cleaner vehicles (Pavley Rules) - 38 tons
- Cleaner fuels (Low-Carbon Fuel Standard) - 15 tons
- More sustainable communities (SB 375) - 5 tons

SB 375 Basics

- Directs ARB to develop passenger vehicle GHG reduction targets for California's 18 MPOs for 2020 and 2035
- Adds Sustainable Communities Strategy as new element to RTPs
- Requires separate Alternative Planning Strategy if GHG targets not met
- Provides CEQA streamlining incentives for projects consistent with SCS/APS
- Coordinates RHNA with the regional transportation planning process
ARB Adopted Targets — September 2010

Percent Reduction in Per Capita Emissions from 2005 to Target Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Valley</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bay Area GHG Scenarios
(% per capita - 2005 vs 2035)

-18%  -15%  -2%  0%  +2%
Planning Scenarios Combined  Adopted Target  T-2035 w/ Projections 09  T-2035 w/ Projections 07

More aggressive
How Do Planning Scenarios Address GHG Targets (2035)?

- TDM -3%
- Road Pricing -8%
- Focused Growth -12%

Combined -18%

Location Matters

- Compact Growth: Compared to sprawl, compact development results in a 20 to 40 percent reduction in VMT and hence in CO₂
PDAs in Contra Costa

The SCS for Contra Costa
Resources to Local Government Are Key

- State and regional capital grants
- New federal funding models (e.g. joint HUD/DOT/EPA programs)
- Self-help tools (e.g. value-capture such as tax increment financing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>$ billions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Public Facilities</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Development Activities</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>12.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engagement Strategy

**CCTA Board and Planning Committee:**
- Standing monthly reports/Action items

**Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs):**
- Ongoing technical and policy input
- Feeds input to TCC and RTP/SCS Task Force

**Planning Directors Forum:**
- Meets quarterly; provides detailed input for SCS

**Regional Advisory Working Group:**
- MTC/ABAG staff, CMAs, local officials, stakeholders
Basecamp

- Collaborative website for each SCS County/Corridor Working Group
- Purpose:
  - Share information
  - Collect feedback
  - Facilitate engagement
- Local government and CMA planning directors will be invited to log-in

Place Types

- Tool for exchanging information on the places and policies necessary to create a sustainable development pattern
Vision Scenario Timeline

November – December 2010:
- Local input on Vision Scenario

December 2010 – January 2011:
- SCS Performance Targets released
- SCS overview presented to RTPCs

February 2011 – March 2011:
- Vision Scenario released; assessed against Performance Targets

April 2011 – December 2011:
- Local input on Detailed Scenario(s) & Preferred Scenario

SB 375 Overview

Questions and Comments

http://www.Onebayarea.org
Sustainable Communities Strategy Planning Process: Phases 3 & 4 Details for 2012-2013

Phase 3: Housing Need Allocation, Environmental/Technical Analyses and Final Plans

Phase 4: Plan Adoption

**Local Government and Public Engagement**

**Policy Board Actions**

- **Meeting for Discussion/Public Comment**
  - JOINT meeting of the ABAG Administrative Committee, the Joint Policy Committee, and the MTC Planning Committee for Discussion/Public Comment

- **Decision**

- **Document Release**

**Milestones**

- **March**
  - EIR Kick-Off (Scoping) Public Meeting
  - ABAG Regional Planning Committee
  - MTC Policy Advisory Council
  - Regional Advisory Working Group
  - Executive Working Group
  - County and Colleague Working Groups

- **April**
  - Draft RHNA Plan
  - Close of Comments/Start of Appeals Process
  - ABAG Executive Board

- **May/June**
  - Public Hearing on RHNA Appeals
  - Response to Comments from RHNA Appeals
  - ABAG Executive Board

- **July/August**
  - Release Final RHNA
  - ABAG Adopts Final RHNA
  - State Department of Housing and Community Development Reviews Final RHNA
  - ABAG Executive Board

- **September/October**
  - Response to Comments on Draft RTP EIR
  - ABAG Executive Board

- **November**
  - Release Draft EIR for 30-Day Review
  - ABAG Executive Board

- **December**
  - Release Draft EIR for 30-Day Review
  - ABAG Executive Board

- **January**
  - Release Draft Conformity Analysis for 30-Day Review
  - ABAG Executive Board

- **February**
  - Review Draft Conformity Analysis
  - ABAG Executive Board

- **March**
  - ABAG Adopts Final RTP
  - ABAG Executive Board

- **April**
  - Final EIR
  - ABAG Executive Board

- **Final RHNA**

**Phase Three Decisions**
- Draft RTP Plan
- Final EIR
- Draft RHNA Plan

**Phase Four Decisions**
- Final Scoping Plan
- Final EIR
- Final Conformity
- Final RHNA

**Subject to change**
Final
Contra Costa’s Principles for Collaborative Development of the SB 375
Sustainable Communities Strategy

PREAMBLE:

SB 375 (Steinberg) was signed into law by the Governor on September 30th, 2008. The bill changes the regional transportation planning process “to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so,” greenhouse gas (GHG) emission targets set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The intent of the bill is to help forestall climate change through the comprehensive integration of land use and transportation planning.

Responsibilities for SB 375 implementation are assigned to state and regional agencies. In the Bay Area, explicit responsibility is assigned to MTC and ABAG to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of the 2013 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The SCS, in concert with transportation investments included in the RTP, is intended to achieve the GHG reduction targets set by the CARB for 2020 and 2040. The bill specifies that MTC and ABAG shall conduct outreach efforts to a broad range of stakeholders, including the congestion management agencies (CMAs).

While the statute does not mandate a formal role for Bay Area CMAs, the Authority expects to be fully engaged with the process as it relates to Contra Costa. The following principles have been developed to help guide Contra Costa’s elected officials, whose roles at the local, regional, and State level will help shape the SCS.

Building upon the foundation of the Authority’s Growth Management Program, and the earlier Shaping Our Future effort, the principles are intended to support collaborative decision-making that will result in a feasible SCS that meets GHG reduction targets while supporting the Authority’s mission, vision, and core values.

PRINCIPLES:

The following principles are considered as a living document. The Authority may, from time to time, revisit them to make course corrections that will support a collaborative decision-making process among local, regional, and state agencies as the SCS process evolves:

1. **Forge a Positive Relationship with the Regional Agencies.** At both the elected official and staff level, the Authority intends to work with the regional agencies to support development of an SCS by facilitating a dialogue between the regional agencies and local jurisdictions regarding land use plans in Contra Costa.

2. **Consensus-Based Planning.** The Authority will seek to achieve an SCS as it applies to Contra Costa that reflects agreement between local jurisdictions and the regional agencies regarding land use assumptions, along with a Contra Costa-based plan for supportive transportation investments.
3. **Consideration of General Plans.** The long-range (2040) vision for the SCS will specify where new growth is to occur. This vision may conflict with currently adopted General Plans. Local jurisdictions that are in agreement with the land use assumptions in the SCS would undertake subsequent General Plan Amendments to reflect the agreed-upon SCS, and such action may take place subsequent to adoption of the 2013 RTP. Local jurisdictions that are not in agreement with the proposed land use assumptions in the SCS will be given the opportunity to work at the subregional level in collaboration with the regional agencies to develop an alternative land use proposal that contributes towards achievement of the Bay Area’s GHG emissions target. Where mutual agreement on the proposed SCS is not achieved, the role of the Authority will be to acknowledge the conflict and to identify other factors or impacts that may be relevant for the protection of the environment, furtherance of GHG goals by alternative means, or the sustainability of a local jurisdiction.

4. **Local Control of General Plans and Zoning Maps.** Each local jurisdiction shall retain full control of local general plans and zoning within its municipal boundary.

5. **Ensure the Participation of all Local Jurisdictions and Partner Agencies.** Beyond a focus on the priority development areas (PDAs) as the core of the SCS, efforts will also be made to ensure that all cities and towns can successfully participate in the process, so that their land use and transportation needs can also be addressed. Furthermore, the Authority welcomes and encourages participation by other agencies, such as the transit operators.

6. **Facilitative Role.** Working in partnership with local jurisdictions and the regional agencies, the Authority, as a transportation agency, should play a facilitative role by providing resources, information and policy insights to cities, towns and Contra Costa County, while recognizing that local jurisdictions have sole discretion with respect to land use decisions. A working group of Contra Costa planning directors will be established to monitor the development of the SCS and any issues raised during that process.

7. **Urban Limit Line.** The SCS needs to respect the Measure J mandated Urban Limit Line (ULL) for Contra Costa, which represents an agreed upon “urban growth boundary,” and shall direct all urban development to areas within the ULL.

8. **Sustainable Transit.** Ensure that the SCS includes feasible transit service that is adequately funded to provide reliable and convenient service for Contra Costa, while encouraging walking and bicycling.

9. **Rural Sustainability Component.** Recognizing SB 375's overall goal of achieving more focused growth, the SCS also needs to consider transportation investments for the safety and preservation of roads serving farm to market and interconnectivity transportation needs.

10. **Public Health.** The Authority recognizes that there are multiple public health benefits to transportation policies that both reduce GHG emissions and increase mode share of walking, cycling, and transit, and will consider these health co-benefits in planning decisions.

11. **Reflect Contra Costa's Continuing Commitment to Growth Management and Resource Conservation.** Development of the SCS shall incorporate Contra Costa's existing efforts and programs that would help reduce GHG emissions. These include the Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP), the establishment of PDAs and PCAs,
and the East Contra Costa Habitat Conservancy. The GMP, in particular, has much in common with the objectives of the SCS, including the ULL provision noted above, local jurisdiction compliance with State Housing and Community Development (HCD) Department requirements, 511 Contra Costa Clean Fuel Infrastructure and transportation demand management programs funded by Measures C and J, and a general plan amendment (GPA) review process to address the impacts of growth and promote appropriate mitigation.

12. **Shaping Our Future.** Continue the collaborative process that began with Shaping Our Future, where Contra Costa jurisdictions collectively developed the Shaping Our Future land use plan, and which provided a springboard to the PDAs and PCAs that are now being incorporated into the SCS and which has significant transportation benefits.

13. **Common Voice.** The Authority in collaboration with the cities, towns and Contra Costa County should provide a unified voice and advocate for all Contra Costa jurisdictions in working with the regional agencies and adjacent CMAs.

14. **Final SCS.** The Authority will support the final SCS provided it is consistent with each local jurisdiction’s mission, vision and sustainability goals.
Intentionally Blank Page
TO: WCCTAC Board  DATE: January 21, 2011
FR: Christina Atienza, Executive Director
RE: Mid-Year FY 10-11 Budget Review

As part of routine fiscal administration, staff have conducted a review of the current year budget against year-to-date expenditures. The attachment shows the actual expenditures in FY 2009-10 for comparison, the original FY 2010-11 as adopted by the Board in June 2010, the actual year-to-date expenditures (for the period beginning July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2010), and the analysis including variance and the fraction of the budget expended versus time expired. Overall, expenditures are tracking reasonably close to the budget. Below are highlights of the review for specific items. These findings, as well as those from the FY 2009-10 audit, which is being presented to the Board this month, will inform future budget amendments.

1. The TDM grants do not include reimbursement for costs incurred in November and December. Invoices have been delayed as a result of issues with San Pablo’s accounting system, which requires manual reconciliation of General Ledger entries. When included, the amounts received will be closer to expected.
2. AC Transit, Pinole, and WestCAT have not paid member agency dues for the year. Pinole has requested an extension due to cash flow issues. Staff will follow up with AC Transit and WestCAT.
3. STMP fees may need to be adjusted downward, as only Richmond has submitted any fees to date.
4. Salaries and benefits are slightly lower than expected due to a vacancy in the agency.
5. The Other Reimbursable expenses include charges by the consultant for the grant-funded Transit Enhancement and Wayfinding Plans, as well as staff time that has been designated for the local match portion. The reimbursement requests will be forwarded this quarter, and charges will net to zero.
6. The budget for audit services needs to be increased slightly.
7. The expenditures in TDM incentives and marketing efforts are slower than originally expected. Staff will increase efforts in this regard.
8. The budget for the Student Bus Pass Program administration will be slightly lowered to match expected revenues.
9. The Street Smart line item is on this month’s agenda for approval.
10. The East Bay Smart Corridor line item is awaiting resolution with Alameda County Transportation Commission.
11. The TDM budget for travel and training needs to be increased to better match actual expenditures.
12. It was an oversight in 2009 that San Pablo did not charge the agency its share of liability insurance. This will be corrected in 2010.
13. Adjustments need to be made to the TDM budget for office supplies, rent, printing, postage, and equipment lease in order to better reflect actual expenditures.
## WCC TAC FY 2010-2011 Mid-Year Budget Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY 2009-10</th>
<th>FY 2010-11</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grants</td>
<td>(500,926)</td>
<td>(617,918)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 STMP Administration</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>(106,297)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Member Contributions</td>
<td>(455,460)</td>
<td>(455,460)</td>
<td>(341,704)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 County STMP Fees</td>
<td>(12,176)</td>
<td>(68,000)</td>
<td>(159,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 El Cerro STMP Fees</td>
<td>(2,595)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>(1,180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hercules STMP Fees</td>
<td>(335,925)</td>
<td>(17,100)</td>
<td>(1,180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Piolet STMP Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Richmond STMP Fees</td>
<td>(138,851)</td>
<td>(90,000)</td>
<td>(4,447)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 San Pablo STMP Fees</td>
<td>(5,190)</td>
<td>(7,000)</td>
<td>(9,646)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Interest State</td>
<td>(11,325)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(44,036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Other Revenue</td>
<td>(2,814)</td>
<td>(54,000)</td>
<td>(9,646)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>(1,460,260)</td>
<td>(1,329,558)</td>
<td>(458,418)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **EXPENSES**                                  |            |            |          |
| 18 Salary & Benefits                          |            |            |          |
| 19 PERS Side Fund (not inc in total)          | 27,029     | 17,700     | 1,010    |
| 37 GASP 45 PERS Side Fund (not inc in total)  | 1,207      | 5,000      | 5,000    |
| 38 Total Salaries and Benefits                | 585,211    | 665,118    | 348,300  |
| 39 Consultants                                |            |            |          |
| 40 Professional Services                      | 122,961    | 551,000    | 48,400   |
| 41 Regional Studies/Projects                  | 82,196     | 512,600    | 10,000   |
| 42 Finance Services                           | 9,624      | 9,700      | 9,700    |
| 43 Audit                                      | 10,070     | 9,000      | 9,000    |
| 44 Attorney Services                          | 20,728     | 18,000     | 18,000   |
| 45 Web Site                                   | 1,079      | 1,200      | 1,200    |
| 46 Information Technology Services            | 264        | 500        | 500      |
| 47 Other                                      |            |            |          |
| 48 Special Dept. Expense                     | 156,546    | 245,000    | 50,000   |
| 49 Contingency                                | -          | 10,000     | 10,000   |
| 50 Reserve                                    | -          | -          | -        |
| 51 TDM Incentives                             | 125,515    | 94,000     | 94,000   |
| 52 Street Smart                               | -          | 24,000     | 24,000   |
| 53 East Bay Smart Corridor                   | -          | 87,000     | 87,000   |
| 54 Student Bus Program Admin                  | 31,031     | 40,000     | 40,000   |
| 55 TDM Marketing                             | -          | 15,000     | 15,000   |
| 56 Total Consultants                          | 279,507    | 811,000    | 98,400   |
| **TOTAL Travel/Training**                     | 12,898     | 11,500     | 10,000   |
| **Office Expenses & Supplies**                |            |            |          |
| 61 Liability Insurance                        | -          | 12,000     | 12,000   |
| 62 Office Supplies                            | 15,632     | 10,000     | 5,000    |
| 63 TDM Printing                               | 4,603      | 7,000      | 7,000    |
| 64 TDM Postage                                | 388        | 7,000      | 7,000    |
| 65 Rent/Building                              | 18,196     | 19,000     | 10,000   |
| 66 Printing, Postage, Machine Lease           | 11,142     | 3,000      | 3,000    |
| 67 Total Office Exp & Supplies                | 49,961     | 58,000     | 30,000   |
| **Publications & Communications**             | 749        | 3,500      | 2,000    |
| **FUND BALANCE**                              |            |            |          |
| 74 Beginning of Year                          | 1,198,483  | 1,198,483  | 59,471   |
| 75 End of Year                                | 1,730,417  | 978,923    | 77,831   |
| **TOTAL EXPENSES**                            | 928,326    | 1,549,118  | 458,418  |
MEMORANDUM

To: Barbara Neustadter, TRANS PAC
    Andy Dillard, SWAT, TVTC
    John Cunningham, TRANSPLAN
    Christina Atienza, WCCTAC
    Richard Yee, LPMC

From: Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director

Date: December 16, 2010

Re: Items approved by the Authority on December 15, 2010, for circulation to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs), and items of interest

At its December 15, 2010 meeting, the Authority discussed the following items, which may be of interest to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees:

1. Approval to Release RFP No. 11-1 to Conduct the 2011 CMP Traffic Monitoring Program. As the designated Congestion Management Agency for Contra Costa, the Authority is responsible for developing and updating a Congestion Management Program (CMP) every other year. As part of the 2011 CMP, traffic monitoring of freeways and principle arterials is required to determine whether CMP Level of Service Standards and multi-modal performance measures are being met. This RFP would seek qualified engineering firms to conduct the Spring 2011 CMP traffic monitoring program and document the results. The Authority authorized staff to release the 2011 CMP Traffic Monitoring Program RFP.

2. Modifications to Scope of Work and Budget for Consultant Agreement No. 310 with Parisi Associates for the Development of the Contra Costa Safe Routes to School Program (SR2S). In November the Authority approved the agreement under the condition that resources previously allocated to Contra Costa Health Services for SR2S outreach and survey assistance be reallocated to Parisi Associates. Accordingly, staff seeks authorization to increase the initial agreement amount for Phase I from $72,500 to $100,000 and incorporate revisions to the scope of work for Task 1. The Authority authorized modifications to Agreement No. 310 with Parisi Associates for an initial amount not to exceed $100,000 to complete Task 1.

to Request for Proposal (RFP) 10-8 released in October 2010, three planning consulting firms responded. A selection committee comprised of city and County staff chose Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. ("EPS") as the most qualified consultant. The Authority authorized Agreement No. 312 with EPS to provide ongoing technical support for development of the SCS at a cost not to exceed $100,000.

4. **Initiation of Regional Dynamic Ridesharing Pilot Project with Sonoma and Marin CMAs.** The Authority is eligible to receive approximately $500,000 in federal funds for participation in a three-county regional Dynamic Ridesharing Pilot Project made possible through MTC’s Climate Initiative grant program. The Authority authorized staff to proceed with the development of an inter-agency agreement with the Sonoma County Transportation Authority and the Transportation Authority of Marin to participate in the Regional Dynamic Ridesharing Pilot Project.

5. **Congressman John Garamendi’s Fiscal Year 2012 Appropriation Requests.** Staff will report on efforts by Congressman Garamendi's office related to Federal Fiscal Year 2012 appropriation requests. Staff will discuss timelines and opportunities for the Authority in submitting requests, developing support and consensus, and coordinating with other elected State and federal officials. The Authority approved staff’s recommendation to continue with the priorities that were established in March 2009.
December 21, 2010

TO: Christina Atienza – WCCTAC
    John Cunningham – TRANSPLAN
    Barbara Neustadter – TRANSPAC

Transmitted via e-mail

FR: Martin Engelmann, Deputy Executive Director, Planning

RE: Request for Appointments to the SR 4 Integrated Corridor Analysis Policy Advisory Committee (C-PAC)

The SR 4 Integrated Corridor Analysis (ICA) is currently underway. The purpose of the study is to coordinate the Action Plans for SR 4 (West, Central and East) into a cohesive plan that: 1) identifies and prioritizes previously identified projects along the corridor; 2) develops and evaluates new projects, including transit options and arterial operational improvements; 3) advances local community goals for Priority Development Areas (PDAs) along the corridor; and 4) to the extent possible establishes an integrated set of Multi-Modal Transportation Services Objectives (MTSOs) for incorporation into future Action Plan updates.

As described in the attached document, two committees are being formed: 1) a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) comprised of local staff from each jurisdiction along the corridor, plus staff from CCTA, the transit operators, Caltrans, and MTC; and 2) a Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) comprised of two elected officials from each of the three participating RTPCs.

The purpose of this letter is to requests that each RTPC appoint two elected officials to serve on the C-PAC, along with an alternate, if necessary. Serving on the C-PAC will entail two meetings; the first has been scheduled for March 21, 2011 and the second for July 19, 2011.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 925-256-4729 or email me at mre@ccta.net.

Thank you.

Attachment
SR-4 Integrated Corridor Analysis
(I-80 to SR-160)
Committee Structure

Two committees have been proposed for the SR-4 Integrated Corridor Analysis. These committee structures are outlined below.

1. Corridor Technical Advisory Committee (C-TAC)
   - **Committee Purpose:** To ensure full local participation in the preparation of the SR-4 Integrated Corridor Analysis.
   - **Committee Composition:**
     - At least one transportation planner or engineer from each affected jurisdiction along the corridor:
       - Hercules
       - Martinez
       - Concord
       - Pittsburg
       - Antioch
       - Oakley
       - Brentwood
       - Representative from Contra Cost County
     - Staff member from the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA)
     - Staff member from Caltrans
     - Staff member from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
     - Representatives from the following Transit Agencies will be invited:
       - Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)
       - Alameda-Contra Costa Transit (AC Transit)
       - Tri Delta Transit
       - County Connection
       - WestCAT
C-TAC Coordination Structure and Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Planned Date</th>
<th>Work Product</th>
<th>Planned Date</th>
<th>Review Cycles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kick-off Meeting</td>
<td>11/10/2010</td>
<td>Kick-off meeting notes</td>
<td>11/18/2010</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Corridor Strategies Workshop</td>
<td>1/11/2011 2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Technical memorandum</td>
<td>2/14/2011</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop to Review Draft Plan</td>
<td>10/11/2011 2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Draft Plan</td>
<td>1/3/2012</td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Corridor Policy Advisory Committee (C-PAC)

- **Committee Purpose**: To ensure full local participation of the three Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) in the decisions made regarding the SR-4 Integrated Corridor Analysis.

- **Committee Composition**:
  - RTPCs will be asked to appoint two elected officials (and an alternate if necessary) from each of the three RTPCs:
    - West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee (WCCTAC)
    - Transportation Partnership and Cooperation Committee (TRANSPAC)
    - Transportation Planning Committee (TRANSPLAN)

C-PAC Coordination Structure and Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th>Planned Date</th>
<th>Work Product</th>
<th>Planned Date</th>
<th>Review Cycles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-PAC Presentation on Draft Strategies</td>
<td>3/22/2011 2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Meeting notes</td>
<td>3/28/2011</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Corridor Strategies and Potential Action Plan Amendments</td>
<td>7/19/2011 2:00 P.M.</td>
<td>Technical Memorandum</td>
<td>7/19/2011</td>
<td>5 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 14, 2010

Karen Schkolnick
District Grant Programs Manager
Strategic Incentives Division
BAAQMD
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco, CA  94109

RE: Confirmation of Matching Grant Funds for City of Richmond Shuttle Operation

Dear Ms. Schkolnick:

The West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee (WCCTAC) would like to take this opportunity to confirm its support for the City of Richmond’s successful application from the BAAQMD Transportation Fund for Clean Air Grant for shuttle operation within the City. WCCTAC’s support will provide grant matching funds in the amount of $10,000 for marketing and staff support.

The shuttle operation will provide a beneficial service to the City of Richmond including connections to the Richmond intermodal station, businesses, parks, medical facilities, the Bay Trail, and residential developments.

Shuttles connecting workers and residents to transit meet the following goals of the 2009 West County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance:

- Facilitate and encourage the use of mass transit and other alternative transportation choices such as ridesharing; and
- Improve environmental quality

WCCTAC appreciates the opportunity to support the City of Richmond in their efforts to provide convenient, efficient, accessible, and reliable commute alternative options to the residents and businesses of Richmond. Please feel free to contact me or Linda Young, Transportation Demand Management Program Manager, at 510.215.3008 if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

Christina M. Atienza
Executive Director

13831 San Pablo Avenue, San Pablo, CA  94806
Ph: 510.215.3035  ~  Fax: 510.237.7059  ~  www.wcctac.org
January 14, 2011

Via Electronic Mail

Mr. John Hemiup  Ms. Cristina Ferraz
Alameda County Transportation Commission  Dept. of Transportation – District 4
1333 Broadway Suite 220  111 Grand Avenue Room 12-205
Oakland CA 94612  Oakland CA 94612

RE: West Contra Costa County Suggestions for I-80 ICM O&M MOU

Dear Mr. Hemiup and Ms. Ferraz:

On January 6, west Contra Costa stakeholders met to review the I-80 ICM project goals and considerations expressed by the WCCTAC Board at its September 24, 2010 meeting, and to flesh out suggestions for how those may be incorporated in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for how to operate, maintain, and manage the project. To recapitulate, WCCTAC’s goals and considerations are:

- WCCTAC supports initiatives that improve mobility, safety, air quality, and efficiency and promote sustainability.
- WCCTAC through its support of the project has given tacit approval for the continued use of San Pablo Ave. as a bypass route for regional travelers in the event of an incident on I-80.
- WCCTAC supports the ramp metering element of the project, despite the imposition of additional delay to local traffic that does not now experience it, primarily because the project has combined that element with improvements to San Pablo Ave. and the crossing arterials.
- The I-80 corridor is a key regional route. The jurisdictions through which the corridor passes should not disproportionately bear the impacts and cost to mitigate conditions that are attributable to travelers throughout the region.
- The project does not include strategies for metering traffic from Marin and Solano Counties, which are equally major contributors of traffic on the corridor. It is WCCTAC’s understanding that Caltrans will actively pursue initiatives that seek to promote greater equity along the corridor.
- The local jurisdictions do not have any funds to pay for the incremental operations, maintenance, and management costs associated with the project. WCCTAC has already contributed $6 million in local funds and considerable staff time to the development of the project.

The group used as a framework existing ramp metering MOUs for San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. On behalf of the group, we respectfully submit the following suggestions for your consideration. The recommendations are intended only to highlight key issues for West County, and are not intended to be an all-inclusive listing of the desired terms in the MOU.
Scope and Format of the MOU
- The MOU should cover all of the elements of the project, and explain in plain language how each project element will be operated, managed, and maintained and by whom, how the elements would be integrated as an entire system, and which entities will pay for the costs.
- The format of the MOU should be simple and straightforward. Organization of the MOU in a manner akin to the San Mateo and Santa Clara MOUs, i.e. Goals, Governance, Operating Principles, Operational Parameters, Implementation Phasing, Capital Improvements, Monitoring and Maintenance, is acceptable.
- The MOU should differentiate as appropriate terms that apply to the system as a whole and terms that apply to individual project elements.
- The MOU should include a list of all of the various project elements in each jurisdiction.
- All relevant supporting detailed technical information should be included in the MOU by reference. Examples of such information include an inventory of all equipment and software by jurisdiction, which may be included in a Configuration Management Plan, the Incident Response Plan, and Ramp Metering Plan. It is expected that all reference materials will be approved prior to the MOU.

Project Goals – Should include, though not necessarily be limited to, the following:
- To operate, manage, and maintain all project elements in an integrated and coordinated manner to ensure equal benefits to users of I-80, San Pablo Ave., and crossing arterials.
- To ensure that the project does not result in adverse impacts on vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic on local arterials.
- To ensure that the project does not result in adverse impacts on the I-80 HOV lanes.
- In the event of any inadvertent adverse impacts, to ensure that those impacts are appropriately and completely mitigated in a timely fashion; or if mitigation is determined to be infeasible, to restore system operations to before-project conditions.

Key Operating Principles
- The project will not actively divert traffic onto local streets in the event of an incident on the freeway.
- The system will automatically adjust metering rates to ensure that queues at on-ramps do not extend beyond local agency-specified maximum back-of-queue locations, up to an “all-green” phase for as long a time as necessary if queues extend beyond that maximum.
- When as a result of ramp metering queues do not extend to the maximum back-of-queue location, a maximum wait time or minimum metering rate will be established and agreed upon by Caltrans and the local agencies.
- Ramp metering in Contra Costa County will not commence prior to ramp metering of I-80 in Solano County.
- Ramp metering will be operated in adaptive fashion only or else be off or “all-green”.
- Ramp metering will be operated so as to ensure that traffic is not diverted onto local streets to avoid the meters or to other on-ramps that may be operating with “all-green” phasing.
- All traffic signals along San Pablo Ave. and along the crossing arterials between I-80 and San Pablo Ave., including the off-ramps signals, will be coordinated for the same time periods as when ramp metering is expected to be in operation. Signal coordination plans will be updated at least once every five years. Local agencies may specify maximum allowable delay on side streets.
Local agencies may also specify locations for control point metering along San Pablo Ave. to discourage non-I-80-incident-related cut-through traffic.

- Trailblazer signs will be installed along San Pablo Avenue in advance of all crossing arterials leading to I-80 and at other key locations where there are long stretches in between arterials that provide freeway access, unless otherwise specified by a local agency. The trailblazer signs will be operated in such a manner as to direct motorists that have naturally diverted to the local streets due to an incident on I-80 back to the freeway at a location downstream of the incident as soon as possible. Trailblazer signs will be turned on whenever flush plans are turned on.

- The traffic operational system (including freeway and arterial traffic operations-related components, but excluding 511 and transit information) will be operated and actively managed at the Caltrans District 4 Traffic Management Center based on the approved O&M Plan. At a minimum, Contra Costa County will also be able to operate, actively manage, and if necessary override all arterial traffic operations-related components in Contra Costa County. Local agencies in Contra Costa will also be able to passively monitor traffic conditions on the freeway, on-ramps, and arterials.

Operational Parameters
Component or strategy-specific parameters to be included in the MOU will be as agreed upon in the O&M Plan.

Implementation Phasing
- Construction of the arterial-related improvements prior to the freeway-related improvements is acceptable. Local construction permits will be issued for components of the arterial-related improvements that have stand-alone benefits, i.e. those that are independent of freeway-related operational strategies; but permit issuance for all other components will be contingent upon approval of the MOU.

- Applications for construction permits in each jurisdiction will include a complete list of all activities and items to be constructed.

- This section of the MOU should specify intent for pursuing additional strategies that were envisioned in the original project but were not included in the initial phase, such as speed harmonization, as well as those specified as next steps in the Corridor System Management Plan, such as metering of I-580 west of I-80 and MacArthur Maze improvements.

Monitoring and Maintenance
The MOU should include terms for:
- A before-and-after study of ramp, crossing arterial, San Pablo Ave., and freeway operations
- Fine-tuning the system
- How impacts on local arterials will be measured
- Which agencies will maintain project components
- Periodic monitoring and reporting of project benefits

Cost-Sharing
It may be assumed that the local agencies will continue to pay for the cost to operate and maintain traffic controls and associated equipment and infrastructure along San Pablo Ave. and the crossing arterials that are within the agency’s jurisdiction and are owned by the agency. Local agencies will
not be able to bear any other incremental project-related operations, maintenance, and management costs.

**Governance**
A policy body comprised of elected officials from the cities of west Contra Costa and Alameda County, Contra Costa, Caltrans, AC Transit, WestCAT, WCCTAC, CCTA, ACTC, and MTC should be formed to make policy decisions with regard to implementation, ongoing monitoring, and continuation of the project. We envision the Executive Steering Committee (ESC) or its designee providing guidance to the policy body, as well as making all technical decisions with regard to operational strategies and parameters, after appropriate consultation with staff representatives from each represented agency.

**Parties to the MOU**
We recommend that all cities, Contra Costa County, transit agencies, WCCTAC, CMAs, Caltrans, and MTC be signatories.

**Additional Requests and Information**
- We request an updated project schedule.
- We request clarification on what elements, components, and functionalities of the East Bay Smart Corridors Program will be subsumed under the project.
- We request a presentation to the WCCTAC Board of the environmental document for the freeway components. The West County cities are not desirous of individual presentations at their councils.
- The West County cities request a coordinated presentation to each City Council consisting of the draft MOU and all supporting plans and documents; for the County, the same presentation is requested before the Transportation, Water, and Infrastructure Committee (TWIC). Please notify the appropriate staff at least one month prior to the desired meeting date for the presentation, and please provide all presentation materials at least three weeks prior to the desired meeting date. We further request that the presentations be pre-approved by the ESC.
- WCCTAC requests a preliminary presentation before the MOU is presented to the cities and the TWIC, and a final presentation after the MOU has been approved by the West County cities and the County. Please notify appropriate staff at least three weeks prior to the desired meeting dates, and provide all presentation materials at least two weeks prior to the desired meeting dates.

We hope you find this articulation useful as a springboard for our upcoming MOU negotiations, as it is in that spirit that we have endeavored to create it. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Sincerely,

Christina M. Atienza
Executive Director