



# AGENDA

## *PDA / OBAG Working Group Meeting #4*

---

**Date** Monday, March 11, 2013

**Time** 1:30 PM to 4:30 PM

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

---

1. **Welcome and Greeting .....1:30 pm**
2. **Public Comment .....1:35 pm**
3. **Review of Previous Meeting.....1:40 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 26, 2013*

4. **Outlining the PDA Strategy .....1:50 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 Issues Memo*

5. **Next Steps .....4:00 pm**  
*Staff will review the next steps in the OBAG process and set a tentative date for a meeting in late April or early May to review initial scoring.*
-

**6. Adjournment .....4:30 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.

## **PDA / OBAG WORKING GROUP**

# **Meeting Summary**

*26 February 2013*

This is a brief summary of PDA/OBAG Working Group comments on draft scoring criteria received at Meeting #3, held on February 26, 2013. The Working Group was asked to provide input that will be considered by the TCC in their recommendation to the Authority's Planning Committee. This summary is intended to capture the variety of opinions expressed and the key points of the discussion. This summary does not imply that the Working Group reached consensus unless specifically stated.

### **Introductory Discussion**

Staff and the consultant team made the following points of clarification regarding the process for developing the screening and scoring criteria to be used in evaluating applications for OBAG funding in Contra Costa:

- At today's meeting, the Working Group is being asked to provide input that will be used in developing the Project Selection Criteria for the OBAG program.
- The TCC will consider the Working Group's comments and make a recommendation to the Authority's Planning Committee.
- The Planning Committee will make a final decision on scoring and screening criteria as well as other OBAG guidance documents at a meeting on March 6, prior to public release
- Working Group input will be summarized and transmitted to both the TCC and PC. Additionally, Working Group members are invited to attend the TCC meeting on February 27 and the PC meeting on March 6 and re-emphasize their opinions regarding the award of OBAG funding in Contra Costa during the time set aside for public comment at those meetings

### **Agenda Item 4a - Recap of February 21 TCC Meeting**

At the request of the Working Group, staff summarized key decisions made by the TCC on February 21 regarding the OBAG funding process in Contra Costa:

- TCC decided to recommend that all remaining STP funds should be dedicated for street preservation and that consequently the total available for OBAG funding be reduced to \$24.4 million
- In view of this, the TCC decided to recommend a maximum project size of \$6 million
- Additionally, the TCC decided to recommend keeping an evaluation of project readiness in both the screening and scoring criteria, whereas the Working Group had previously recommended having it only in the screening criteria
- The Working Group requested that staff include a summary explaining where TCC recommendations differ from the opinions expressed by the Working Group in the Staff Report prepared for the March 6 PC Meeting. The Working Group Meeting Summaries should also be included as appendices to the Staff Report. There was consensus on this point.
- A majority of Working Group members felt that at least a portion of the street preservation funds be awarded on the basis of the OBAG scoring criteria or another set of criteria that favors PDA investment, rather than by formula. Not all Working Group members agreed; citing the urgent need for street repairs outside of PDAs and also the relatively low percentage of urbanized land within PDAs in Contra Costa as important considerations.

***ACTION ITEMS:***

1. Staff to summarize differences between Working Group and TCC recommendations in the Staff Report to the PC and append working Group meeting summaries
2. Staff to circulate spreadsheet that explains reallocation of STP funds in detail to Working Group

**Agenda Item 4b - Review of February 11 Working Group Meeting Summary**

- One group member requested that it be noted in the meeting summary that the Working Group did not reach consensus on a given point unless specifically stated.
- One group member requested that the record indicate his suggestion that whether a Complete Streets Implementation Plan is in place should be part of the

scoring criteria. Other group members requested it be noted that this was not a point of consensus.

- Another group member preferred the term “anti-gentrification strategies” be replaced with “affordable housing strategies” in the Meeting Summary #2, but other group members did not agree with this suggestion. This was not a point of consensus.

**ACTION ITEM:**

3. Staff to edit Meeting #2 Summary on the basis of above comments.

**Agenda Item #5a - Comments on Scoring Criteria**

**TABLE 2A, SECTION 1**

- At the request of the Working Group, staff clarified that both 1a and 1b are specifically required by MTC Resolution 4035
- One group member suggested clarifying that criteria 1b, BAAQMD Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Area, applies only to projects with a housing component and requested that projects for which this criteria is not applicable be awarded 1 point. There was general consensus on this point
- Via email, another group member recommended using the term “best management practice (BMP)” instead of mitigation in the metric for 1b. There was consensus on this point

**TABLE 2A, SECTION 2**

- Staff clarified that only criteria 2b, Consistency with TLC Guidelines, is specifically required by MTC resolution 4035, but that all the others have been developed by staff and the consultant team in an attempt to recognize projects that are consistent with the objectives of the resolution
- Some group members voiced concern about criteria 2c, Local government and community support for PDA development, because it does not adequately recognize communities that take the long view and support projects which are consistent with the aims of MTC resolution 4035 even where there may not be broad based community support. This was not a point of consensus. Other

members appreciated the recognition in the scoring criteria of community support for a project.

- Several group members reiterated concerns about criteria 2d, Market potential of PDA, because past performance is not necessarily a good indicator of future market potential.
- Some group members objected to criteria 2d, Market potential of PDA, on the grounds that obstacles are inherent to infill development; however, this was not the majority opinion and there was not consensus.
- Some group members raised questions about the financing plan evaluated in criteria 2f, Public and private financing in place, and whether financing should be a scoring criteria at all

**TABLE 2A, SECTION 3**

- Staff clarified that the following criterias: 3a: Parking Management; 3c: Affordable housing preservation and creation strategies; 3d: Housing Density (current and future) within PDA; and 3e: Job Density (current and future) within PDA, are all specifically required by MTC resolution 4035
- Group agreed that definition and metric text for 3c, Affordable housing preservation and creation strategies, should be edited to clarify “net loss of AFFORDABLE housing.”
- There was also general consensus that the metric for 3c, Affordable housing preservation and creation strategies, should be widened to a gradient in order to incentivize affordable housing development and reward communities that have an array of strategies to promote affordable housing
- The group also generally agreed that affordable housing displaced by job growth should not result in a scoring penalty if the loss is mitigated with replacement affordable housing.
- One group member recommended a gradient for criteria 3d, Housing Density (current and future) within PDA, in order to incentivize meeting or exceeding the top end of range for place type

**TABLE 2B, SECTION 1**

- One group member requested that text of criteria 1d, Project readiness, first bullet be edited to reflect the fact that the 35 percent level is not appropriate for all projects; points should be awarded for being far enough along
- Also, metric for criteria 1d, Project readiness, fourth bullet should reflect that CEQA not required for all projects; 1 point if CEQA n/a

**TABLE 2B, SECTION 3**

- One group member made the general comment that volumes should be considered for all criteria in this section
- There was disagreement regarding criteria 3b, Transit network, with one group member objecting on the grounds that cities often don't have jurisdiction over transit service. Several other group members pointed out that there are actions that could be taken to complement or improve transit service and that the criteria should remain.

**TABLE 2B, SECTION 4**

- Staff clarified that none of the criteria in this section are specifically required by MTC resolution 4035, but that all have been developed by staff and the consultant team in an attempt to recognize projects that are consistent with the objectives of the resolution
- Working Group members requested the metric for 4c, Employment centers/Educational centers, be revised as follows: 1/2 mile = 1; 1/4 mile = 2; 1/8 mile = 3

**TABLE 2B, SECTION 5**

- No clear consensus regarding whether criteria 5b, Safe Routes to Schools, should address vehicular safety or not. Mix of opinions.

**TABLE 2B, SECTION 6**

- There was a mix of opinions regarding criteria 6c, Congestion management. Some group members pointed out that congestion management generally includes transportation demand measures aimed at getting people out of cars.

Other group members wanted to add the qualifying phrase “without increasing VMT” but there was no clear agreement on that edit.

**TABLE 2B, SECTION 7**

- Some group members requested the definition be edited to clarify that this was a measure of “bang for buck.” It was suggested that the metric show a formula to illustrate the concept.

**Agenda Item #5b - Comments on Weighting**

- Staff and the consultant team clarified that assigning points via metric does not do weighting; it only allows for spectrum. Weighting is determined in a separate column which contains a multiplier for the purpose of assigning a relative importance.
- One group member commented that looking from broad categories is too coarse and doesn't yield a meaningful weight distribution as there may be individual items that are important but don't rise to the fore because they are buried within a section. It was suggested that MTC requirements get higher weight and there was general agreement on this point.
- Several group members also wanted to see issues highlighted in MTC resolution 4035 (such as housing / affordable housing production, VMT reduction) get higher weighting.
- A majority of the Working Group wanted to weight projects higher than context, but there was a variety of opinions about the correct split in favor of projects. Several members felt 40/60 in favor of projects is a fair split, but a few others wanted more weight in favor of projects - as much as 80/20.
- The Working Group also generally agreed that care should be taken with the weighting of context versus project to avoid a situation where a good project is excluded from funding because it is not in a highly ranked PDA (or vice versa).

**ACTION ITEM**

4. Staff to send doodle poll for Working Group Meeting #4 in early March to discuss the first draft of the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy



# MEMO

---

**Date** March 11, 2013

**For** PDA / OBAG Working Group

**RE** Policy Discussion on Contra Costa PDA Investment and Growth Strategy

---

## Issues for Discussion

The following outlines issues for the Working Group to help guide its discussions on the development of the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy.

## OBJECTIVES AND ACTIONS

### Objectives

1. Establish a process for allocating OBAG funds that gives priority to projects that support and encourage the development of designated PDAs in Contra Costa

*The screening and scoring criteria and definition of “proximate access” described below are designed to direct OBAG funding towards projects that would most effectively support the development of PDAs in Contra Costa.*

2. Identify the infrastructure needed in the PDAs, both transportation and non-transportation, to support and encourage the development of designated PDAs and other barriers to the development of PDAs within Contra Costa

*Through the PDA Planning Grants and other planning activities involving local jurisdictions and monitoring of development with Contra Costa, the Authority will gather information on the extent of capital investment needed to foster the development of the infill development envisioned in PDAs in Contra Costa. The Authority can use this information to refine the criteria for selecting projects and advocate for new funding sources and approaches to supporting PDA development.*

3. Support local efforts to refine development policies within designated PDAs to better respond to market conditions, community objectives and available resources

*Through its ongoing CMA planning efforts, the development and refinement of planning support tools, and the PDA planning grant program, the Authority will work with local agencies to create PDAs that provide transportation choices and serve all income levels.*

4. Coordinate the investment in projects that support and encourage the development of PDAs with investments in the maintenance and improvement of the broader transportation system

*The OBAG program provides funds for both the maintenance and improvement of the transportation system, with an emphasis on those investments that support PDA development. Other funding sources are also available, including Measure J, for supporting a transportation system that serves the county and the region. The Authority will look for ways to coordinate the various resources so that transportation investments are used as effectively as possible to create a well-maintained, multi-modal transportation system.*

## **Actions**

1. Establish a priority-setting process that focuses the majority of OBAG funds on projects that support PDA development and transportation alternatives, with a secondary emphasis on the maintenance of the transportation system

2. Integrate support for the development of PDAs and the policies of the 2013 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy into the 2014 Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan

*The Authority has begun the process of updating its Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). One of the objectives of the 2014 update will be incorporate the SCS and transportation investments into the CTP and to set priorities for future updates to MTC's Regional Transportation Plan.*

*The goals in the Authority's CTP already address many of the issues by the SCS and the Regional Transportation Plan. These include support for alternative modes of travel and cooperative planning to address county-wide issues. The SCS, however, will call for a closer integration of land use and transportation planning. The 2014 CTP will need to address how best to balance this regional direction with its goal of cooperative planning and the limitations of Measure J.*

3. Monitor the planning and development of designated PDAs in Contra Costa to understand infrastructure needs, market conditions and other barriers to their development

*The information collected will be used to refine the criteria for selecting projects and updating the housing components of the PDA Strategy*

4. Support local planning efforts, including the implementation of the PDA planning grant program and other CMA planning activities

*The PDA planning grants will be used to fund more detailed local plans for PDAs within Contra Costa. These plans will help local jurisdictions develop a more focused strategy for achieving the aims for their PDAs and provide the Authority with detailed information on infrastructure needs, market demand and policy approaches that work in Contra Costa.*

5. Refine the Authority's planning tools, including the Countywide Model, to provide technical support for PDA planning

*The new Countywide Model incorporates the PDAs as well as a component for estimating greenhouse gas emissions*

6. Investigate how Measure J funding programs can be better integrated with the OBAG and other regional funding programs to most effectively achieve the Authority's goals

*As both the CMA for Contra Costa and the agency in charge of implementing Measure J, the Authority is entrusted with ensuring that both federal funds and local sales tax funds are invested wisely and effectively. As part of the 2014 CTP, the Authority will look at expected revenues and how it can use those funds, from whatever source, to achieve its goals and support an effective, sustainable transportation system. This will include exploring the potential for new revenue sources for transportation investments in Contra Costa or the region. The Authority will also investigate the integration of the next cycle of OBAG funding with the next cycle of Measure J for TLC and pedestrian and bicycle funding.*

7. Work with regional agencies to ensure that their programs and policies reflect the market and community conditions in Contra Costa and support PDA development in the county

*Contra Costa is a diverse county with considerable diversity in PDAs. The Authority will work with MTC and ABAG to refine regional policies to reflect that diversity so that they will succeed in encouraging and supporting the development of PDAs in Contra Costa.*

8. Advocate for changes to laws and regulations and increased funding that support local efforts to develop their PDAs

*These changes might include relief from some CEQA requirements, streamlining of the local assistance process, and reducing the approval requirements for transportation sales tax measures.*

## **PDA Planning Grant Program**

MTC has allocated \$2,745,000 in federal STP funds to Contra Costa to support local jurisdictions in their planning and implementation of PDAs. CMA grants to local jurisdictions are to be aligned with the recommendations and priorities identified in the adopted PDA Growth and Investment Strategy. These funds may not be distributed by formula and must target PDAs that are high impact and capable of early implementation.

Staff proposes that the Authority implement the program by creating a list on on-call consultants that will provide support to local jurisdictions for developing plans and implementation programs for their PDAs.

The key planning goals of this program, building upon the original MTC Planning Grant Program goals, are as follows:

1. To increase both the housing supply, including affordable housing for low-income residents, and jobs within the PDAs.
2. By increasing land use intensities in PDAs, boost transit ridership and thereby reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by PDA residents, employees and visitors
3. Increase walking, bicycling, carpooling and car-sharing by effectively managing parking and driving while promoting multimodal connections for residents, employees and visitors within the PDA
4. Locate key services and retail businesses within PDAs thus further reducing VMT

The Authority will provide individual grants to local jurisdictions through a single program administered by the CMA.

## **PLANNING GRANT FUNDING DETAILS**

- Minimum grant: \$75,000
- Maximum grant: \$500,000
- No more than one third of the available funding in this cycle will be awarded to any one single jurisdiction.

## **REQUIRED PLANNING ELEMENTS**

At a minimum, applications should generally include or augment the following planning elements.

1. An **overview profile** of the planning area including demographic and socio-economic characteristics, transit/travel patterns and use, physical aspects of the PDA, as well as any known issues to be addressed in the planning process (2) a significant public outreach and community involvement process targeting traditionally under-served populations.
2. A **community outreach and community involvement process**.
3. The development of several detailed **land use alternatives**.
4. A **market demand analysis** for housing at all levels of affordability, jobs and retail in the planning area.
5. A **housing strategy** that promotes housing affordable to low-income residents and attempts to minimize displacement of existing residents.
6. A **multi-modal access and connectivity** component.
7. **Pedestrian-friendly design standards** for streets, buildings and open space.
8. An **accessibility analysis** for people with disabilities that ensures fully accessible transit stations, paths of travel between stations and surrounding areas, and accessible and habitable housing units.
9. A **parking analysis** to create a parking policy and management element that aims at reducing parking demand and supply through pricing, zoning, and support for alternative modes.

10. An **infrastructure development analysis and budget**.
11. An **implementation plan** along with a realistic financing strategy which describes all necessary actions needed to implement the plan.
12. Comprehensive and programmatic **environmental review** of the PDA (i.e. completion of a “program” environmental impact report (as defined in CEQA) for the PDA plan area.

Applicants may rely on a previously adopted precise or specific plan encompassing the planning area, if it has been completed or amended within the last 10 years, or ongoing planning studies to meet some of these planning elements. The applicant may outline how these plans satisfy these requirements. The Authority, at its discretion, may allow the applicant to forgo some of these elements if it commits to their completion within two years and demonstrates that it has funding committed to complete them.

## **SELECTION CRITERIA**

### **PART ONE: Screening Criteria**

1. Planning area is a planned or potential PDA under the FOCUS program or contains a Resolution 3434 transit station.
2. Applicant is partnering with local transit providers that serve the planning area
3. Applicant has committed minimum local match amount (11.47 percent of total project cost)
4. Applicant has a resolution from its/their respective Council or Board supporting: a) the proposed planning process for Resolution 3434 station areas OR b) the area as a Priority Development Area under the FOCUS program
5. Application is complete and responsive to these Guidelines.

**PART TWO: Evaluation Criteria (100 POINTS TOTAL)**

Planning Grant Applications will be scored and ranked using the following criteria:

***1. Location within a Community of Concern (yes or no), 5 points***

Project area includes a Community of Concern as defined by MTC's Lifeline Transportation Program – see <http://geocommons.com/maps/110983>

***2. Project impact on desired PDA metrics (gradient) up to 25 points***

(a) Potential to increase the following performance measures within the PDA:

- Housing supply, particularly affordable housing for low-income residents
- Employment, key services and retail
- Transit ridership and multi-modal transportation options

(b) If applicable, potential for the transit station and/or transit serving the station or planning area to be operational within 10 years

(c) Removal of a key constraint to implementation of the PDA plan

***3. The compatibility of existing policies with PDA development objectives (gradient) up to 15 points***

Jurisdiction has demonstrated a commitment to provide an increase in housing and transportation choices demonstrated through existing planning policies and development regulations, such as innovative parking policies, TOD zoning, transportation demand management strategies, existing citywide affordable housing policies and approved projects, supportive general plan policies, sustainability policies, including green building policies and alternative energy policies

#### **4. Planning Process (25 points)**

Potential for plan to address the planning elements described in Part 6 of the application based on Station Area Planning Principles in the Station Area Planning Manual. Narrative includes strong strategic approach to addressing all of the planning elements and highlights any local issues or conditions related to the elements, indicating how they may factor into the planning process. If any planning element(s) will not be included in plan because the jurisdiction has completed or updated a precise or specific plan in the last 10 years, applicant has demonstrated that policies, programs or analyses already exist that satisfy the intent of each element.

#### **5. Local Commitment and readiness, gradient up to 15 points**

- (a) Planning process is ready to begin – the jurisdiction will be able to enter into a funding agreement with CCTA within three months of grant award. Applicant is prepared to see the funded planning program through to implementation, including any associated updates to the jurisdiction’s general plan, zoning code, or other related municipal ordinances (e.g. development impact fees, affordable housing fees, etc.).
- (b) Demonstration of community, major property owner(s), City Council, relevant transit operator(s) and congestion management agency support for planning process (public involvement to date, letters of support, etc.).

#### **6. Implementation Feasibility, gradient up to 15 points**

- (a) Demonstrated feasibility of the plan from a political, market, and financial perspective.
- (b) *Existence of implementing resources and agreements including infrastructure funding commitments, development agreements, and other partnerships with public, non-profit, or private entities.*

## **Updating the PDA Strategy**

As the CMA for Contra Costa, the Authority must update its adopted PDA Investment and Growth Strategy annually. The first update will be due to MTC by May 1, 2014. In this first update and all subsequent ones, the Authority and other CMAs must assess local jurisdiction efforts in approving sufficient housing for all income levels through the RHNA process and, where appropriate, assist local jurisdictions in implementing local policy changes to facilitate achieving these goals. MTC has identified a number of potential policy changes, including inclusionary housing requirements, city-sponsored land-banking for affordable housing production, “just cause eviction” policies, policies or investments that preserve existing deed-restricted or “naturally” affordable housing, and condo conversion ordinances that support stability and preserve affordable housing. The Authority will need to work with local jurisdictions to examine these potential policy changes to determine which ones should be applied in Contra Costa.

What process should the Authority use in the update of the PDA Strategy? What information should it collect to augment the already available information collected by ABAG and other agencies?