



April 20, 2016

TO: Ross Chittenden, Chief Deputy Executive Director, Projects

FR: William R. Gray, Principal

**RE: Review of the Draft TEP (dated April 8, 2016)
Identified Issues and Recommendations**

The CCTA Authority Board (Authority), in a special meeting session on April 6, 2016 reviewed, discussed and authorized staff to release the Draft TEP (dated April 8, 2016). The Draft TEP considers the collective input received from the Regional Transportation Planning Committees, the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC), the Public Manager's Association (PMA), and the public through a comprehensive outreach program. In addition, correspondence was received just prior to the April 6, 2016 meeting from two subgroups of EPAC members with recommendations related to the proposed TEP programs, projects and policies.

Concurrent with the Board's release of the Draft TEP, the Gray-Bowen-Scott team (GBS) was asked to review the Draft TEP (April 8, 2016 version) in relation to the input received from all sources, including the two recent letters from the EPAC subgroups. Our team was asked to provide the Board with recommendations related to changes and/or modifications to the draft TEP that might improve public support of the TEP as relates to a possible November 2016 ballot measure.

Considering all of the input received to date, including that received during the Authority's extensive public outreach efforts as well as public opinion surveys and input received through the EPAC and at various Authority and RTPC meetings, the GBS team recommends consideration of the following proposed changes/edits to the draft TEP and that these changes be incorporated into the next version of the TEP (anticipated to be released May 4, 2016). Because a number of the recommendations propose increased funding for projects and programs, it is recommended that the Authority extend the term of the proposed measure from 25-years to 30-years.

Corridors / Projects:

1. Increase the total allocation to the I-680 corridor to \$250 million. Additional funding in this corridor is warranted. As noted above, it is recommended the Authority revise the TEP to reflect a measure with a 30-year term to provide the necessary capacity to increase the allocation on the 680 corridor to \$250 million.

2. Allocate additional funds to improve commutes in the I-80 corridor. Shifting to a 30-year term provides sufficient capacity to increase funding in the High Capacity Transit category to \$55m. In addition, our team would recommend that the two I-80 related items (High Capacity Transit Improvements along the I-80 corridor and the I-80 IC Improvements) be merged (as they were in an earlier version of the TEP) providing a total of \$115m for this category. WCCTAC's recommendation to 'split out' the IC improvements from the I-80 Corridor Improvements could be interpreted as prioritizing one mode over another. In this regard, the TEP should make it clear that the IC improvements are eligible for funding and their completion is a priority for WCCTAC.
3. Allocate additional funds to the 242/4 corridor category. Shifting to a measure with a 30-year term provides sufficient capacity to increase funding to this important corridor.

Programs:

4. Increase funding in the Transportation for Seniors & People with Disabilities category to 4% total and allocate the additional funds in a manner that better balances the program countywide. Honor the various RTPC requests as 'minimums' in this category.
5. Provide additional funding for the Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities program and allocate the additional funding in a manner that better balances the program countywide. Shifting to a 30-year term measure provides sufficient capacity to increase funding in this category to 4%. As previously noted, it is recommended that the Authority honor the existing RTPC requests per sub-region as minimums in this category.
6. Reallocate a portion (3%) of the funds now allocated to the CDI program to the Major Streets/ Complete Streets/ Traffic Signal Synchronization Grant Program to better balance the program countywide. As with the other categories, the existing RTPC requests per sub-region should be treated as a minimum allocation per sub-region. In central county, additional funds should be allocated to Improve Traffic Flow along the SR 242 and SR 4 Corridors in Central and Eastern Contra Costa County funding category.

Policies:

7. The CDI program as proposed in the Draft TEP (dated April 8, 2016) has received little support from stakeholders with some suggesting dropping the program and others suggesting a reduced program focused on job creation. The GBS team recommends 3% of the total revenue be allocated to the proposed new CDI program (compared to the 6% identified in the Draft TEP). We recommend that the Authority consider combining this new program with a restructured Measure J TLC program. This would allow the Authority to focus a significant amount of resources on an enhanced program with the goal of pro-actively assisting jurisdictions with the development of transportation infrastructure that can be demonstrated to incentivize the development of housing and jobs within their communities. It is recommended that the Authority make funds from this category available to jurisdictions seeking funding from the State's Strategic Growth Council (SGC) for Affordable Housing

Sustainable Communities (AHSC) grants from this program as well as other similar programs. CCTA staff should work with PMA and other stakeholders to refine the proposal for an updated / combined CDI/ TLC program. The TEP should require the Authority to define and adopt this new program within 12 months of the passage of the new measure.

8. A number of stakeholders have suggested that a portion of the funding proposed to be allocated to the jurisdictions for Local Streets and Road Maintenance and Improvements be allocated based on the number of housing units permitted by that jurisdiction over some period of time (3 years) with 'bonuses' for certain types of housing and/or proximity to 'quality transit'. The GBS team does not recommend this approach, but as noted above would suggest that 3% of the total revenue from this measure be allocated to the proposed new CDI program.
9. A number of stakeholders have suggested the inclusion of meaningful 'Performance Criteria' to 'screen' project alternatives. The GBS team recommends that the TEP require projects with a capital cost of over \$25m be subject to review using defined performance criteria. The TEP should include provisions requiring the Authority to adopt and apply said performance criteria within 12 months of the effective date of this measure.
10. The language in the current Draft TEP reflects efforts by the Authority to respond to previous comments regarding the ULL and should be maintained. Our team does recommend removing the proposed 5-year 'cap' on the number of non-voter approved amendments to the ULL.
11. Require jurisdictions that might be considering a non-voter approved amendment to their ULL that would impact defined Agricultural lands outside of the ULL to adopt an Agricultural Protection Ordinance and/or mitigate the loss of designated Agricultural lands by permanently protecting farmland.
12. With respect to the Growth Management Program, the GBS team recommends that the Authority add additional disclosure items (not requirements) to its Growth Management Checklist to include whether or not a jurisdiction has adopted any or all of the following – a Hillside Development Ordinance, a Ridgeline Protection Ordinance, an Open Space System with Ridgelines defined, protections for wildlife corridors, a plan to conserve buffers around open space and agriculture, prohibitions on the culverting of 'blue-line creeks' for anything other than road crossings and prohibitions on development in designated 'non-urban Priority Conservation Areas.
13. In addition, the GBS team would recommend that provisions be added to the TEP requiring the Authority to establish policies requiring the payment of prevailing wages on all projects funded using measure funds, apprenticeship programs where appropriate and a helmets to hardhats program.
14. A number of stakeholders have suggested the inclusion of a more comprehensive vision statement in the final TEP. As part of a task to revise the format of the TEP into a more voter

friendly/ modern looking document, we recommend that the Authority direct the staff/ consultant team to include a vision statement into the final draft for consideration by the Authority.

The attached tables reflect the changes recommended herein and indicates how the allocations to the various projects and programs (as well as the allocations to the regions) would change.

Attachment

April 20, 2016

RE: Review of the Draft TEP (dated April 8, 2016)

Identified Issues and Recommendations

Attachment (Page 1 of 2) - Summary of Draft TEP with Inclusion of Proposed Revisions (30 years of revenue)

TABLE OF EXPENDITURE PLAN FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

No.	Funding Category	\$ millions	%	Distribution of Funding By Subregion			
				Central (a)	Southwest (b)	West (c)	East (d)
1	Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements	663.5	23.09%	192.0	147.5	145.6	178.4
1a	Add'l Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements	20.0	0.70%	20.0			
2	Major Streets and Complete Streets Project Grants	290.0	10.09%	108.4	46.4	56.6	78.6
3	BART Capacity, Access and Parking Improvements	300.0	10.44%	88.1	57.4	69.8	84.7
4	East Contra Costa Transit Extension	70.0	2.44%				70.0
5	High Capacity Transit Improvements along the I-80 Corridor in West County	55.0	1.91%			55.0	
6	I-80 Interchange Improvements at San Pablo Dam Road and Central Avenue	60.0	2.09%			60.0	
7	Improve traffic flow & implement high capacity transit in the I-680 corridor & SR 24	250.0	8.70%	125.0	125.0		
8	Improve traffic flow along the SR 242 & SR 4 Corridors in Central and Eastern County	122.0	4.25%	44.0			78.0
9	Interstate 680 and State Route 4 Interchange Improvements	60.0	2.09%	60.0			
10	East County Corridor (Vasco Rd and/or Byron Highway Corridors)	117.0	4.07%				117.0
11	Bus and Non-Rail Transit Enhancements	295.0	10.26%	61.5	61.5	110.6	61.5
12	Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities	115.0	4.00%	30.8	19.3	28.2	36.8
13	Safe Transportation for Children	64.0	2.23%	8.7	20.0	26.1	9.1
14	Intercity Rail and Ferry Service	50.0	1.74%	8.0		35.0	7.0
15	Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities	115.0	4.00%	28.3	30.3	26.4	29.9
16	Community Development Transportation Program	86.0	2.99%	25.3	16.4	20.0	24.3
17	Innovative Transportation Technology / Connected Communities Grant Program	65.0	2.26%	22.1	11.0	16.7	15.2
18	Transportation Planning, Facilities & Services	28.7	1.00%	8.4	5.5	6.7	8.1
19	Regional Transportation Priorities	18.7	0.65%	5.0	3.7	5.0	5.0
20	Administration	28.7	1.00%	8.4	5.5	6.7	8.1
	TOTAL	2873.5	100.0%	843.9	549.6	668.3	811.7

Population Based Share	843.9	549.6	668.3	811.7
Population Share (2030 Estimate) of Total	29.37%	19.13%	23.26%	28.25%

TABLE OF EXPENDITURE PLAN FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

No.	Funding Category	\$ millions	diff. from 25-Yr TEP	%	diff. from 25-Yr TEP	Distribution of Funding By Subregion			
						Central (a)	Southwest (b)	West (c)	East (d)
1	Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements	663.5	123.5	23.09%	-	192.0	147.5	145.6	178.4
1a	Add'l Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements	20.0	3.0	0.70%	-	20.0			
2	Major Streets and Complete Streets Project Grants	290.0	90.0	10.09%	1.54%	108.4	46.4	56.6	78.6
3	BART Capacity, Access and Parking Improvements	300.0	-	10.44%	-2.39%	88.1	57.4	69.8	84.7
4	East Contra Costa Transit Extension	70.0	-	2.44%	-0.56%				70.0
5	High Capacity Transit Improvements along the I-80 Corridor in West County	55.0	35.0	1.91%	1.06%			55.0	
6	I-80 Interchange Improvements at San Pablo Dam Road and Central Avenue	60.0	-	2.09%	-0.48%			60.0	
7	Improve traffic flow & implement high capacity transit in the I-680 corridor & SR 24	250.0	110.0	8.70%	2.71%	125.0	125.0		
8	Improve traffic flow along the SR 242 & SR 4 Corridors in Central and Eastern County	122.0	52.0	4.25%	1.25%	44.0			78.0
9	Interstate 680 and State Route 4 Interchange Improvements	60.0	-	2.09%	-0.48%	60.0			
10	East County Corridor (Vasco Rd and/or Byron Highway Corridors)	117.0	-	4.07%	-0.93%				117.0
11	Bus and Non-Rail Transit Enhancements	295.0	55.0	10.26%	-	61.5	61.5	110.6	61.5
12	Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities	115.0	37.4	4.00%	0.68%	30.8	19.3	28.2	36.8
13	Safe Transportation for Children	64.0	12.0	2.23%	-	8.7	20.0	26.1	9.1
14	Intercity Rail and Ferry Service	50.0	-	1.74%	-0.40%	8.0		35.0	7.0
15	Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities	115.0	48.3	4.00%	1.15%	28.3	30.3	26.4	29.9
16	Community Development Transportation Program	86.0	-54.0	2.99%	-2.99%	25.3	16.4	20.0	24.3
17	Innovative Transportation Technology / Connected Communities Grant Program	65.0	11.8	2.26%	-	22.1	11.0	16.7	15.2
18	Transportation Planning, Facilities & Services	28.7	5.3	1.00%	-	8.4	5.5	6.7	8.1
19	Regional Transportation Priorities	18.7	-	0.65%	-0.15%	5.0	3.7	5.0	5.0
20	Administration	28.7	5.3	1.00%	-	8.4	5.5	6.7	8.1
	TOTAL	2873.5	534.5	100.0%	0.0%	843.9	549.6	668.3	811.7

Population Based Share	843.9	549.6	668.3	811.7
Population Share (2030 Estimate) of Total	29.37%	19.13%	23.26%	28.25%

Categories with recommended increase in dollars amounts and/or percentages
 Category with recommended reduction in dollars amount and percentage

Mayor's Information: Brentwood's Vision for Open Space, Farming and Agriculture

How much funding has the City of Brentwood provided to Brentwood Agriculture Land Trust (BALT) and to Agricultural-Natural Resources Trust (ANRT) for Ag preservation?

A total of over \$9.9 million has been paid by the City of Brentwood for the purchase of conservation easements in the Ag Core.

BALT: \$7.7 million
ANRT: \$2.2 million

How many acres have been preserved with the funding provided to BALT?

Total easements purchased for all land trusts: 992 acres (all in the Ag Core).

BALT: 790 acres
ANRT: 202 acres

The City of Brentwood has an Agriculture Preservation Program Ordinance as well as a Right to Farm Ordinance.

The Agricultural Preservation Program ordinance is contained in Chapter 17.730 of the Municipal Code (separate attachment). This ordinance established the agricultural conservation easement fee (today is approximately \$6,200 per acre).

The City's Right to Farm ordinance is in Chapter 8.01 (separate attachment). This ordinance establishes that agricultural operations in the city may not be deemed a public nuisance and cannot be the subject of public nuisance complaints.

How much money/funding, if any, have we provided to the Marsh Creek House or trust?

The John Marsh Home Rehabilitation, CIP project # 352 52340 was completed in 2011. The amount of City funds for this project was \$1,098,992.

How many miles of bike lanes and/or trails do we have in Brentwood?

17.5 miles of trails
60 miles of bike lanes

How many city parks do we have?

69 parks, plus
17 pocket parks and trail heads