



AGENDA

PDA / OBAG Working Group Meeting #3

Date Tuesday, 26 February 2013

Time 1:00 PM to 3:30 PM

Place Authority Boardroom
2999 Oak Road, Suite 110
Walnut Creek CA 94597

1. **Welcome and Greeting 12:00 pm**
 2. **Review of Ground Rules..... 12:05 pm**
 3. **Public Comment 12:10 pm**
 4. **Review of Previous Meeting..... 12:20 pm**
Staff will recap comments made at the previous Working Group meeting as well as comments on the OBAG program made at other forums.
Attachment: *Summary Notes from February 11, 2013*
 5. **Draft Scoring Criteria 12:35 pm**
The Working Group will continue its discussion of the proposed scoring criteria and their weighting.
Attachments: *Tables 2a and 2b – Draft OBAG Scoring Criteria*
 - Break..... 2:15 pm**
 6. **Outlining the PDA Strategy 2:30 pm**
Staff and the consultant team have begun filling in the outline for the Contra Costa PDA Investment and Growth Strategy. The Working Group is asked to comment on the policy aspects of the proposed
-

strategy, including the role of PDAs in the update of the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan, the selection of PDAs for planning grants, and the update of the PDA Strategy itself.

Attachment: PDA Strategy Outline

7. Next Steps3:20 pm

Staff will review the OBAG process with the Working Group and set a tentative date for a meeting in late April or early May to review project applications.

8. Adjournment3:30 pm

ANY WRITINGS OR DOCUMENTS pertaining to an open session item provided to a majority of the Committee less than 72 hours prior to the meeting shall be made available for public inspection at 2999 Oak Road, Suite 100, Walnut Creek, California, during normal business hours.

PUBLIC COMMENT: The public may comment on any matter on the agenda, or related matters not on the agenda, by completing a speaker card (available in meeting room), which should be provided to a CCTA staff member. Public comment may be limited to three minutes (or other such time period as determined by the Chair), in accordance with CCTA’s Administrative Code, Section 103.4(b).

TRANSLATION SERVICES: If you require a translator to facilitate testimony to the Authority, please contact Danice at (925) 256-4722 no later than 48 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting. *Si usted requiere a un traductor para facilitar testimonio a la Authority, por favor llame Danice al (925) 256-4722, 48 horas antes de la asamblea.*

ADA COMPLIANCE This Agenda shall be made available upon request in alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12132) and the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal. Govt. Code Sec. 54954.2). Persons requesting a disability-related modification or accommodation should contact Danice Rosenbohm (925-256-4722) during regular business hours, at least 24 hours prior to the time of the meeting.

Summary Notes from February 11, 2013

PDA / OBAG Working Group Meeting

Table 1 - Screening Criteria

- The Working group recommended a lower minimum request size: \$300k - \$400K. (MTC requirement is that average request amount is at least \$500K)
- The group agreed that maximum request size should be in the range of \$8M-\$10M as this would get at MTC desire to see some larger projects proposed
- One group member suggested using percentage of available OBAG funding, rather than dollar figures
- The group generally agreed that project readiness should be reviewed in the screening stage, rather than the scoring stage.
- Readiness screening criteria should be a clearly designed on/off switch to evaluate whether an application demonstrates a clear pathway to project completion
- The group requested "robust and defined" guidance on screening criteria for project readiness

Table 2a Context Criteria for Scoring

- Expand definition of CARE area to include corridors with high concentration of freight traffic. Clarify proposed metric language to reflect MTC requirement for mitigation framework to be in place.
- Regarding item 2c, some group members questioned whether past performance is truly a good indicator of market future, especially given the volatility in the period from 2000–2012.

- Regarding item 2e, change wording to indicate the public and private funding would be considered
- The group recommended adding a broader evaluation of affordable housing in Table 2b:
 - Some group members recommended providing a menu of options that cover creation and preservation
 - One group member suggested that OBAG funding be conditioned on removal of regulatory obstacles to development in PDAs
 - Another suggested that anti-gentrification policies should be required to be in place now to ease pressures that will result from PDA investment
- One group member recommended relating the scoring ranges for housing density to the MTC place types instead of a range of low/med/high

Table 2b

- The group recommended project readiness criteria be moved to Table 2a screening, except community involvement, which should stay in the scoring. Community involvement should be scored on the basis of the planning process in place and whether it has council approval and support from identified stakeholders in the community.
- The group generally agree to delete matching funds as a scoring criteria
- Regarding item 4b, group members suggested clarifying whether this applies to existing, entitled, or applied housing, or all of the above
- One group member suggested that scoring also evaluate the purpose and benefit of the project as well as the number of people it would serve.
- Clarify how a project proximate to two PDAs would be treated and ensure that such a project would not get double points.

Action Item: Authority staff to create and distribute a weighting worksheet. Working group members will return it with recommendations.

Table 3 – Draft Funding Categories

- Authority staff clarified that table 3 categories are potential ideas and that the actual categories would be developed during the screening and scoring process. Developing funding "silos" in this way will allow for flexibility in accounting for perceived imbalances or limitations imposed by federal or MTC requirements.
- The group recommended street preservation and carbon emissions reduction also be considered as potential funding "silos"
- Some group members felt strongly that 30 percent of the available OBAG funds should be reserved for projects outside of PDAs because bike projects and street preservation projects would be located outside of PDAs

DRAFT

Table 2 — OBAG Project Scoring Criteria

Table 2a — Context Criteria

<i>Proposed Scoring Criteria</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
1. Location of PDA within or partially within "special consideration areas"						
a) Community of Concern (COC)	Is the project located in a PDA and one of MTC's COCs? MTC created this label from a metric including transportation availability and choices, accessibility, affordability, safety and environment.		Out = 0 In = 1			
b) BAAQMD Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Area	Is the project located within a PDA and one of BAAQMD Air Risk Evaluation Areas or adjacent to a corridor with a relatively high concentration of freight traffic?		Out = 0 In with approved BAAQMD mitigations = 1 In without approved mitigations = -1			
2. Readiness of PDA for Development						
a) Are land use planning and regulations consistent with regional PDA development policies and growth targets?	Estimate of new development capacity of PDA as percentage of the 2040 One Bay Area Regional Plan housing forecast		< 50% = 0 51% - 80% = 1 81% - 100% = 2 > 100% = 3			
b) Consistency with TLC Guidelines	Has the jurisdiction adopted design standards and guidelines that are consistent with MTC's TLC guidelines?		Yes = 2 Partially = 1 No = 0			

Table 2a — Context Criteria

<i>Proposed Scoring Criteria</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
c) Local government and community support for PDA development	Have there been expressions of support from community or stakeholders?		Yes, written expressions of support = 2 Council support = 1 None = 0			
d) Market potential of PDA	1. Percentage growth between 2000 and 2012 in housing units and square feet of commercial space , or 2. The ratio of approved and currently active development (pipeline) projects to existing development in the PDA.		0 -- 5 % = 0 6% -- 10% = 2 > 10% = 3			
e) Presence of major obstacles to development	Are there major physical impediments to development including hazardous materials sites or environmental constraints?		Yes = 0 No = 1			
f) Public and private financing in place	Is there a financing plan in place that demonstrates funding sources for the full range of major public improvements required in the PDA (beyond funding for the proposed project)?		Yes = 1 No = 0			
3. Supportive Policies in Place within PDA						
a) Parking Management	Has applicant adopted parking management policies within the PDA? (Policies could include reduced off-street parking requirements, parking management program, and pricing.)		Yes = 1 No = 0			

Table 2a — Context Criteria

<i>Proposed Scoring Criteria</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
b) Travel Demand Management	Has applicant adopted travel demand management policies? (e.g., adopted ordinance to implement transportation demand management (TDM) policies that encourage balanced multimodal access to the priority development area)		Yes = 1 No = 0			
c) Affordable housing preservation and creation strategies	Has the applicant adopted the appropriate range of affordable housing programs (inclusionary zoning, density bonus incentives, financial incentives, etc.)? And will there be a net loss of housing due to redevelopment?		Yes = 1 No but no project-related affordable housing demolition = 0 Net loss of housing = -1			
d) Housing Density (current and future) within PDA	Are PDA housing densities allowed under existing planning and zoning regulations consistent with the density ranges indicated for the “place type” of the subject PDA?		Yes = 1 No = 0			
e) Job Density (current and future) within PDA	Is PDA employment capacity allowed under existing planning and zoning regulations consistent with the employment density ranges indicated for the “place type” of the subject PDA?		Yes = 1 No = 0			
PDA Score Total						

Table 2B — Project Criteria

		<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
1. General Project Criteria						
a) Community Involvement	Does the project have council approval and support from identified stakeholders and the community (e.g. letters of support)?		Yes =1 No = 0			
b) Ability to meet applicable deadlines and funding requirements	Does the Applicant have a demonstrated track record of meeting deadlines set in the federal aid process and to actual delivery of projects similar to the proposed project as defined in the application?		Yes =1 No = -1			
c) Removal of development constraint(s)	Does the proposed project remove an identified transportation deficiency or identified development constraint in the PDA?		Yes = 1 No = 0			
d) <u>Project readiness</u>	<u>Does the project have:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Design and engineering work complete at least to the 35 percent level?</u> ▪ <u>Does the sponsor have all right-of-way or a feasible plan to acquire needed right-of-way?</u> ▪ <u>Has the sponsor secured needed permits?</u> ▪ <u>Has the sponsor completed necessary environmental review?</u> 		<u>For each bullet:</u> Yes = 1 No = 0			

Table 2B — Project Criteria

		<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
2. Matching Funds (over federal minimum) --deleted by consensus						
a)						
3. Connectivity and Improvement Benefits						
a)	Streets and roadway network		Does project address an operational deficiency on the local street network?	Yes =1 No = 0		
b)	Transit network		Does project expand or improve the transit system or service?	Yes =1 No = 0		
c)	Bicycle and pedestrian networks		Does project expand or improve bicycle or pedestrian facilities?	Yes =1 No = 0		
d)	Regional significance (provide service to variety of users from multiple jurisdictions?)		Does project connect to or complete the regional transportation network?	Yes =1 No = 0		
4. Proximity Benefits						
a)	Public Transit Station		Is the project proximate to a public transit station?	1/8 mi =2 1/4 mi= 1 N/A = 0		
b)	Affordable housing / Senior housing / Disabled housing		Is the project is proximate to existing or planned affordable senior, or disabled persons housing?	1/8 mi =2 1/4 mi= 1 No = 0		

Table 2B — Project Criteria

		<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
c)	Employment centers / Educational centers	Is the project proximate to existing or planned employment center or educational center? (A center is equal to or greater than 1,000 employees or students and staff.)	1/8 mi = 2 1/4 mi = 1 No = 0			
5. Safety Benefits						
a)	Does project increase public safety (reduction of accidents and risk of accidents for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians?)	<p><i>High:</i> Project will address a demonstrated safety issue with a proven or demonstrated countermeasure.</p> <p><i>Medium:</i> Project will improve a situation with some safety issues (e.g. some reported collisions, conflicts, near-misses, or evidence of high vehicle traffic volume or speed.)</p> <p><i>Low:</i> Project will generally improve safety, even though there are no known problems. Project will reduce exposure/risk of conflicts between motor-vehicles and bike/pedestrians.</p>	High = 3 Medium = 2 Low = 1 None = 0			
b)	Safe Routes to Schools	Does the project improve safety for school children accessing their schools by walking and bicycle or improve vehicle safety and performance?	Yes, bike/ped = 2 Yes, vehicle = 1 No = 0			
6. Regional Benefits						
a)	Air quality improvement	Is the project expected to result in a measurable reduction in air pollutants?	Yes, substantial = 2 Yes, moderate = 1 No = 0			

Table 2B — Project Criteria

		<i>Project Value</i>	<i>Proposed Metric</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Weighted Score</i>
b)	Reduction in vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and/or greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions	Does the project result in absolute and measurable reductions in VMT (reduced vehicle miles) and/or GHG emissions (tons of CO2 reduction)?	Yes, substantial = 2 Yes, moderate = 1 No = 0			
c)	Congestion management	Is the project expected to result in a measurable reduction in vehicle congestion on local streets or the regional routes serving the PDA?	Yes =1 No = 0			
Project Score Sub-total						
7. Cost Effectiveness						
a)	Measure of cost effectiveness in a manner that is independent of project size	Calculate cost effectiveness by dividing raw score for “project scoring criteria” by total project funding request.				
Composite Score for Proposed Project						

Results of Survey on Weighting of Scoring Criteria

	<i>Respondents</i>								<i>Average</i>	<i>Std Dev</i>
	<i>#1</i>	<i>#2</i>	<i>#3</i>	<i>#4</i>	<i>#5</i>	<i>#6</i>	<i>#7</i>	<i>#8</i>		
CONTEXT										
Location of PDA within or partially within "special consideration areas"	30	10	20	5	15	5	10	—	13.6	9.0
Readiness of PDA/Project Area for Development	5	5	10	5	10	20	10	—	9.3	5.3
Extent of Supportive Policies in Place within PDA or Project Area	20	5	20	10	20	5	20	—	14.3	7.3
Total: Context	55	20	50	20	45	30	40	70	41.3	17.5
PROJECT										
Connectivity Benefits	10	25	15	20	5	5	15	—	13.6	8.2
Proximity Benefits	10	15	15	20	5	5	10	—	11.4	6.1
Safety Benefits	20	5	5	20	10	5	25	—	12.9	7.4
Regional Benefits	5	20	10	10	25	5	10	—	12.1	8.2
Cost Effectiveness	5	15	5	10	10	50	10	—	15.0	17.2
Total: Project	50	80	50	80	55	70	70	30	60.6	17.4

Attachment 6

Contra Costa PDA Investment and Growth Strategy

Draft Outline

1. Introduction

- a. Purpose of the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy
- b. Role in OBAG program
- c. Engagement process
- d. Next steps

2. The FOCUS Program and Priority Development Areas (PDAs)

- a. History of the FOCUS Program and role of PDAs in it
 - 1) What is a PDA?
 - 2) PDA place types
- b. Role of PDAs in the SCS process and Plan Bay Area
- c. Issues with supporting development in the PDAs
 - 1) Market
 - 2) Local policies
 - 3) Infrastructure needs

3. PDAs in Contra Costa

- a. Summary table of the 30 PDAs in Contra Costa, with maps
 - 1) Summary table listing jurisdiction, PDA name, place type, status (planned vs. potential), acreage, and forecast growth. (Appendix would contain this information plus more detailed information on existing amount and types of housing, number of jobs, and brief qualitative descriptions)
- b. Housing policies in PDAs: Overview of what housing policies are in effect in PDAs (full inventory of policies in Appendix — drawn from most recent ABAG survey)
- c. Transportation projects in PDAs
 - 1) Existing transportation assets in PDAs: e.g. how many roadways, transit assets, bike and pedestrian infrastructure

- 2) Quantify countywide totals and details about individual PDAs
- 3) List of future transportation projects and costs by PDA
- 4) Funding sources and what's funded

4. PDA Strategy

- a. Goals and Policies
- b. Implementation Activities: current and future
- c. Criteria
 - 1) OBAG criteria
 - 2) Readiness
 - a) Readiness of PDA for development
 - b) Readiness of projects for construction
- d. Updating the strategy
 - 1) Schedule
 - 2) Scope
 - 3) Engagement process