

## MEASURE J GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST

### Instructions

#### 1. Action Plans

- a. **Is the jurisdiction implementing the actions called for in the applicable Action Plan for all designated Routes of Regional Significance within the jurisdiction?**

The Measure J Growth Management Program requires each jurisdiction to implement the actions outlined for it in the most recent *Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance*. The Action Plans, as their name implies, outline actions, policies and procedures for addressing impacts on the designated Routes of Regional Significance in the subareas of Contra Costa.

**ATTACH ....Detailed information on implementation steps taken during the reporting period.**

The most recent Action Plans can be downloaded from the Authority's website at:

<http://www.ccta.net/EN/main/planning/358/actionplans.html>

- b. **Has the jurisdiction implemented the following procedures as outlined in the *Implementation Guide* and the applicable *Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance*?**

i. **Circulation of environmental documents**

Measure J requires that jurisdictions circulate environmental documents for certain developments to nearby or affected agencies. The Authority's *Implementation Guide* outlines which environmental documents for which developments are affected and the basic requirements for circulation of these documents. The *Implementation Guide* may be downloaded here:

<http://www.ccta.net/assets/documents/Available~Publications/GMP~and~CMP~Publications/Implementation%20Guide%20Adopted%202010-06-16.pdf>

The most recent Action Plans can be downloaded from Authority's website at:

<http://www.ccta.net/EN/main/planning/358/actionplans.html>

**ii. Analysis of the impacts of proposed General Plan amendments (GPAs) and recommendation of changes to Action Plans.**

Jurisdictions must determine whether proposed GPAs would:

- Conflict with Action Plan policies, or
- Prevent attainment of the Multi Modal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) included in the Action Plan.

If the answer is “yes” to one of the above issues, the jurisdiction has the option of proposing changes to the applicable Action Plan to avoid impacts to the regional transportation network caused by the proposed GPA. These proposed changes will be considered by the respective Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC).

**ATTACH ....Any GPAs approved during the reporting period. If an RTPC review was requested, include a description of the process undertaken.**

The most recent Action Plans can be downloaded from the Authority’s website at:

<http://www.ccta.net/EN/main/planning/358/actionplans.html>

**iii. Conditioning the approval of projects consistent with Action Plan policies?**

The jurisdiction should review its applicable Action Plan to determine if any conditions exist for the approval of projects.

**ATTACH. ...A summary of projects approved during the reporting period and the conditions required for consistency with the Action Plan.**

The most recent Action Plans can be downloaded from the Authority’s website at:

<http://www.ccta.net/EN/main/planning/358/actionplans.html>

**c. Has the jurisdiction followed the procedures for Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC) review of General Plan Amendments as called for in the *Implementation Guide*?**

RTPC review of a General Plan Amendment (GPA) is required if it exceeds the threshold size established in the applicable Action Plan or creates more than 500 net new peak hour vehicle trips. Section 4.2 of the Implementation Guide explains the RTPC review procedures. If no development projects or GPAs were considered during the reporting period, a “N/A” response is appropriate.

**ATTACH ....Any GPAs approved during the reporting period should be listed in the attachments, noting those requiring RTPC review.**

The *Implementation Guide* may be downloaded here:

<http://www.ccta.net/assets/documents/Available~Publications/GMP~and~CMP~Publications/Implementation%20Guide%20Adopted%202010-06-16.pdf>

## **2. Transportation Mitigation Program**

- a. Has the jurisdiction adopted and implemented a local development mitigation program to ensure that new development pays its fair share of the impact mitigation costs associated with that development?**

Measure J requires jurisdictions to adopt a local development mitigation program to ensure that new development will not be essentially subsidized by Measure C funds. The mitigation program must (1) require new development to pay its fair share of costs, and (2) stipulate that no funds from Measure C will be used address impacts caused by new development.

Furthermore, mitigation projects that are identified in traffic impact studies of proposed development should be incorporated into the jurisdiction's mitigation program, and identified in the jurisdiction's five-year Capital Improvement Program, specifying the funding arrangements for the mitigations.

- b. Has the jurisdiction adopted and implemented the regional transportation mitigation program, developed and adopted by the applicable Regional Transportation Planning Committee, including any regional traffic mitigation fees, assessments, or other mitigation as appropriate?**

The regional transportation mitigation program (RTMP) is intended to address regional traffic impacts and fund regional and subregional transportation projects. Each regional mitigation programs addresses the process for setting fees and other mitigations for new development. The jurisdiction's adopting policy should require traffic impact reports for new development to (1) be consistent with the RTMP, (2) clearly indicate recommended mitigation measures, and (3) calculate through a transparent, repeatable method the project's contribution to regional mitigation costs.

The most recent RTMP can be downloaded from the Authority's website at:

<http://www.ccta.net/assets/documents/RTMPstatusFinal.pdf>

### **3. Housing Options and Job Opportunities**

- a. Has the jurisdiction prepared and submitted a report to the Authority demonstrating reasonable progress in providing housing opportunities for all income levels under its Housing Element? The report can demonstrate progress by**

- (1) comparing the number of housing units approved, constructed or occupied within the jurisdiction over the preceding five years with the number of units needed on average each year to meet the housing objectives established in its Housing Element; or**
- (2) illustrating how the jurisdiction has adequately planned to meet the existing and projected housing needs through the adoption of land use plans and regulatory systems which provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development; or**
- (3) illustrating how its General Plan and zoning regulations facilitate improvement or development of sufficient housing to meet the Element’s objectives.**

Measure J requires each jurisdiction to outline the progress it is making in achieving the objectives for providing housing for all income levels in its jurisdiction. The Measure J GMP gives jurisdictions three options for demonstrating progress in meeting those objectives, as outlined in its General Plan Housing Element. The progress report should clearly show how the jurisdiction is faring in meeting projected needs, and how its General Plan and/or zoning facilitate these ends. As described in Exhibit 6, this report may demonstrate progress by using one of three options:

- 1) actual units constructed,
- 2) adoption of land use plans and adequate regulatory systems, or
- 3) General Plan zoning regulations.

This report is consistent with State requirements that “each local government shall review its housing element to evaluate...the progress of the city, county, or city and county in implementation of the housing element.” (California Government Code §65588(a))

**ATTACH ....The jurisdiction’s Housing Element implementation progress report, which includes (1), (2), or (3) listed above.**

- b. Does the jurisdiction’s General Plan—or other adopted policy document or report—consider the impacts that its land use and development policies have on the local, regional and countywide transportation system, including the level of transportation capacity that can reasonably be provided?**

Each jurisdiction must address how housing development will affect the transportation system. A recently updated Circulation Element of the jurisdiction’s General Plan will most likely contain this information.

**c. Has the jurisdiction incorporated policies and standards into its development approval process that support transit, bicycle and pedestrian access in new developments?**

Measure J requires each jurisdiction to incorporate policies and standards into its General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, or other parts of its process for reviewing and approving proposed developments that support transit, bicycle, and pedestrian access in new developments.

**ATTACH ....Locally adopted policies and standards that ensure consideration of and support for walking, bicycling and transit access during the review of proposed development.**

Compliance with and enforcement of the State's Complete Streets Act (AB 1358) may be used to demonstrate adoption of such policies and standards.

#### **4. Traffic Impact Studies**

**a. Using the Authority's *Technical Procedures*, have traffic impact studies been conducted as part of development review for all projects estimated to generate more than 100 net new peak-hour vehicle trips? (Note: Lower traffic generation thresholds established through the RTPC's Action Plan may apply.)**

The traffic studies must be prepared in accordance with the Authority's *Technical Procedures*, and, if applicable, the Authority's Countywide Model.

**ATTACH ....A summary list of all projects during the reporting period that exceeded the applicable threshold, noting whether a traffic study was prepared consistent with the Authority's *Technical Procedures*.**

The Technical Procedures can be downloaded from the Authority's website at:

<http://www.ccta.net/assets/documents/techpro-002.pdf>

Information on the Authority's latest travel demand model is located here:

<http://www.ccta.net/EN/main/planning/1241/traveldemand.html>

Some of the responses to Question 4.a. may warrant a "N/A" response; for example, if no development projects generating more than 100 peak hour vehicle trips have been approved, check "N/A." Similarly, check "N/A" if your jurisdiction does not have any signalized reporting intersections or regional routes.

**If the answer to 4.a. above is "yes", did the local jurisdiction notify affected parties and circulate the traffic impact study during the environmental review process?**

**ATTACH ....Note whether notification and circulation was undertaken for each project on the attached list for 4.a.**

## 5. Participation in Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning

- a. **During the reporting period, has the jurisdiction's Council/Board representative regularly participated in meetings of the appropriate Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC), and have the jurisdiction's local representatives to the RTPC regularly reported on the activities of the Regional Committee to the jurisdiction's council or board? (Note: Each RTPC should have a policy that defines what constitutes regular attendance of Council/Board members at RTPC meetings.)**

Each Council/Board should have a designated member who represents their jurisdiction at the RTPC meetings. Regular attendance at RTPC meetings by elected officials is one of the GMP compliance requirements. Each RTPC is responsible for defining what constitutes "regular" attendance. Should an absenteeism issue persist, it is the RTPC's responsibility to address it, and to notify the Authority if lack of participation has infringed on that RTPC's regular attendance policy. Check "yes" to Question 6.a. if your designated Council/Board member has regularly attended and reported on RTPC meetings.

- b. **Has the local jurisdiction worked with the RTPC to develop and implement the Action Plans, including identification of Routes of Regional Significance, establishing Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) for those routes, and defining actions for achieving the MTSOs?**

The jurisdiction is expected to have participated in updates to the applicable Action Plan to identify Routes of Regional Significance, establish MTSOs for those routes, and actions for achieving those MTSOs.

- c. **Has the local jurisdiction applied the Authority's travel demand model and *Technical Procedures* to the analysis of General Plan Amendments (GPAs) and developments exceeding specified thresholds for their effect on the regional transportation system, including on Action Plan MTSOs?**

The jurisdiction is required to disclose the transportation impacts of proposed projects and General Plan Amendments through use of the Authority's Countywide Model and application of a uniform set of traffic analysis procedures. This answer should be consistent with and consider the responses to Questions 1.b.ii and 1.c, which also cover this topic.

The *Technical Procedures* can be downloaded from the Authority's website at:

<http://www.ccta.net/assets/documents/techpro-002.pdf>

- d. **As needed, has the jurisdiction made available, as input into the countywide transportation computer model, data on proposed improvements to the jurisdiction's transportation system, including roadways, pedestrian circulation, bikeways and trails, planned and improved development within the jurisdiction, and traffic patterns?**

Local staff are expected to provide, on an as needed basis, land use and traffic data as input into the Authority's model. A "yes" response indicates that local staff has responded to these requests.

## **6. Five-Year Capital Improvement Program**

**Does the jurisdiction have an adopted five-year capital improvement program (CIP) that includes approved projects and an analysis of project costs as well as a financial plan for providing the improvements? (The transportation component of the plan must be forwarded to the Authority for incorporation into the Authority's database of transportation projects)**

The Authority's *Implementation Documents* require that the CIP be amended annually, taking into account changes in project cost, funding sources, project development, and timing. If jurisdictions wish to avoid annual updates to the CIP, they may elect to develop longer range CIPs. For example, a jurisdiction could adopt a seven-year CIP. This would allow the jurisdiction to perform updates every two years, instead of annually. Consequently, the jurisdiction must have not only adopted a CIP to receive a "Yes" answer, but must also have updated the CIP within the proper timeframe.

The CIP must include approved projects, their estimated costs, and a financial plan for providing the improvements. If funds allocated to any project for the previous year were not spent during the year, and the funds will be needed in the future, that should be reflected in the most recent version of the CIP.

**ATTACH ....The transportation component of the most recent CIP version, if the Authority does not already have it.**

## **7. Transportation Systems Management Program**

**Has the jurisdiction adopted a transportation systems management ordinance or resolution that incorporates required policies consistent with the updated model ordinance prepared by the Authority for use by local agencies or qualified for adoption of alternative mitigation measures because it has a small employment base?**

The transportation systems management (TSM) program must be (a) adopted as an ordinance or resolution and (b) substantially based on the Authority's model TSM ordinance. The TSM program should promote carpools, vanpools, and park and ride lots.

To address recent climate change legislation (AB 32 and SB 375) the Authority expects to update its Model TSM Resolution. Jurisdictions should use the updated TSM ordinance for a new TSM program, or update their existing TSM ordinance based on the updated model resolution. Until the model resolution

is updated, jurisdictions should include actions within their adopted TSM resolution that provide vehicle trip and greenhouse gas emissions reduction elements and mitigation measures.

**ATTACH ....A copy of the TSM ordinance or resolution.**

The Authority's latest model TSM ordinance can be found here:

<http://ccta.net/EN/main/planning/342/measurecompliance.html>

## **8. Maintenance of Effort (MoE)**

**Has the jurisdiction met the MoE requirements of Measure J as stated in Section 6 of the Contra Costa Transportation Improvement and Growth Management Ordinance (as amended)? (See the Checklist Instructions for a listing of MoE requirements by local jurisdiction.)**

The Measure J Expenditure Plan requires each jurisdiction to maintain a minimum level of local street and road expenditures using funds other than Measure J Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) Funds. This minimum level of non-LSM funding is called the jurisdiction's level of Maintenance of Effort (MoE). This provision is intended to ensure that the revenues from Measure J are used to supplement and not replace existing revenues being used to fund transportation improvements and programs.

A jurisdiction's MoE requirement represents the average annual amount of expenditures from its general fund, as reported to the Controller, that the jurisdiction used for transportation improvements and maintenance during the base period of Fiscal Year 1987–88 through Fiscal Year 1989–90. The resulting required MoE for Contra Costa jurisdictions is shown in the following table.

Jurisdictions may appeal to the Authority to use an alternative formula for determining their MoE requirement. This formula determines the jurisdiction's share of total countywide expenditures on transportation improvements and maintenance during fiscal year 1987–88 through fiscal year 1989–90 based 50 percent on the jurisdiction's share of population and 50 percent on its share of road miles during the period. The Authority may or may not approve the requested lower MoE requirement. The alternative MoE requirement is shown in the right-hand column of the following table.

*Compliance Checklist Instructions  
For Fiscal Years 2011-12 and 2012-13  
Reporting Period: Calendar Years 2010 & 2011*

<i>Jurisdiction</i>	<i>MoE based on Jurisdiction's Annual Average Expenditure (a)</i>	<i>MoE based on Jurisdiction Share of Road Miles and Population (b)</i>
Antioch	\$2,271,666	\$1,159,076
Brentwood	\$177,369	\$146,872
Clayton	\$0	\$172,329
Concord	\$4,374,420	\$2,183,881
County	\$420,064	\$3,920,003
Danville	\$185,742	\$661,930
El Cerrito	\$173,871	\$464,912
Hercules	\$85,423	\$338,152
Lafayette	\$329,600	\$527,872
Martinez	\$1,013,178	\$614,915
Moraga	\$123,808	\$326,140
Oakley	(c)	(c)
Orinda	\$95,823	\$472,306
Pinole	\$414,486	\$338,288
Pittsburg	\$961,877	\$860,639
Pleasant Hill	\$1,019,834	\$624,952
Richmond	\$1,420,937	\$1,649,140
San Pablo	\$201,641	\$377,316
San Ramon	\$1,053,697	\$747,292
Walnut Creek	\$2,309,350	\$1,201,784

- (a) Represents the average annual expenditure from jurisdiction's general fund on transportation improvements and maintenance during fiscal year 1987-88 through fiscal year 1989-90
- (b) Represents the jurisdiction's share of total expenditures on transportation improvements and maintenance during fiscal year 1987-88 through fiscal year 1989-90. The formula is based 50 percent on the jurisdiction's share of population during the period and 50 percent on its share of road miles. If the resulting MoE number is lower, the Authority may, on appeal, approve its use
- (c) Local jurisdictions incorporated after 1997 are not subject to the MoE provisions

While this checklist addresses Growth Management Compliance for the reporting period of Calendar Years 2008 and 2009, the reporting period for the MoE section of the checklist applies to the previous two fiscal years (FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09).

**ATTACH ....**The MoE requirement as listed above, and report the non-LSM expenditures on local streets and roads for each fiscal year in the reporting period.

The Measure J Expenditure Plan is located at:

[http://www.ccta.net/assets/documents/Available~Publications/Expenditure~Plans/Measure\\_J\\_ExPlan\\_asof\\_2009-07-15.pdf](http://www.ccta.net/assets/documents/Available~Publications/Expenditure~Plans/Measure_J_ExPlan_asof_2009-07-15.pdf)

## 9. Posting of Signs

**Has the jurisdiction posted signs meeting Authority specifications for all projects exceeding \$250,000 that are funded, in whole or in part, with Measure C or Measure J funds?**

**ATTACH ....**A list of all projects exceeding \$250,000 within the jurisdiction, noting which ones are or were signed according to Authority specifications.

The sign specifications are in Appendix C of the 2011 Measure J Strategic Plan, which can be found at:

<http://www.ccta.net/assets/documents/Available~Publications/Strategic~Plans~and~Amendments/2011StrategicPlanFINAL.pdf>

## 10. Adoption of the Measure J Growth Management Element

**Has the local jurisdiction adopted a final GME for its General Plan that substantially complies with the intent of the Authority's adopted Measure J Model GME?**

Each local jurisdiction is required to update the Growth Management Element (GME) to its General Plan based upon the new Measure J *Model Growth Management Element*, adopted by the Authority in June 2007. The updated GME must substantially comply with the intent of this Model Element, but need not reflect its exact language or organization.

**ATTACH ....**The jurisdiction's updated GME. This can be a draft if the update has not yet been adopted – note if this is the case along with the expected timeline for review and adoption.

The Authority's latest (2007) Model GME can be downloaded from:

[http://www.ccta.net/assets/documents/GME~Publications/Final%20Model%20Growth%20Management%20Element%2006-08-07%20Release\\_conv.pdf](http://www.ccta.net/assets/documents/GME~Publications/Final%20Model%20Growth%20Management%20Element%2006-08-07%20Release_conv.pdf)

## **11. Adoption of a voter-approved Urban Limit Line**

- a. Has the local jurisdiction adopted and continually complied with an applicable voter-approved Urban Limit Line as outlined in the Authority’s annual ULL Policy Advisory Letter?**

As set forth in Ordinance 06-04, local jurisdictions must continuously comply with a local-voter-approved ULL, or the County’s ULL (Measure L, 2006). At present, the County, San Ramon, Pittsburg and Antioch have each adopted a Local-Voter Approved ULL. For these jurisdictions, review their compliance with their locally-approved ULL. For all other jurisdictions, which have opted to adopt the County’s ULL, answer “N/A”.

The latest ULL Policy Advisory Letter can be found on the Authority’s website ([www.ccta.net](http://www.ccta.net)).

**If the jurisdiction has modified its voter-approved ULL or approved a major subdivision or General Plan Amendment outside the ULL, has the jurisdiction made a finding of consistency with the Measure J provisions on ULLs and criteria in the ULL Policy Advisory Letter after holding a noticed public hearing and making the proposed finding publically available?**

**ATTACH ....The resolution making the finding of consistency and a copy of the public hearing notice.**

## **12. Other Considerations**

**If the jurisdiction believes that the requirements of Measure J have been satisfied in a way not indicated on this checklist, has an explanation been attached below?**

## **Checklist of Attachments**

The following list summarizes all the attachments that must accompany the checklist:

- 1.a. Detailed information on implementation steps taken during the reporting period.
- 1.b.ii. Any GPAs approved during the reporting period. If an RTPC review was requested, include a description of the process undertaken.
- 1.b.iii. A summary of projects approved during the reporting period and the conditions required for consistency with the Action Plan.
- 1.c. Any GPAs approved during the reporting period should be listed in the attachments, noting those requiring RTPC review.
- 3.a. The jurisdiction's Housing Element implementation progress report, which includes (1), (2), or (3) listed above.
- 3.c. Locally adopted policies and standards that ensure consideration of and support for walking, bicycling and transit access during the review of proposed development.
- 4.a. A summary list of all projects during the reporting period that exceeded the applicable threshold, noting whether a traffic study was prepared consistent with the Authority's *Technical Procedures*. Note whether notification and circulation was undertaken for each project on the attached list for 4.a.
6. The transportation component of the most recent CIP version, if the Authority does not already have it.
7. A copy of the TSM ordinance or resolution.
8. The MoE requirement as listed above, and report the non-LSM expenditures on local streets and roads for each fiscal year in the reporting period.
9. A list of all projects exceeding \$250,000 within the jurisdictions, noting which ones are or were signed according to Authority specifications.
10. The jurisdiction's updated GME. This can be a draft if the update has not yet been adopted – note if this is the case along with the expected timeline for review and adoption.
11. The resolution making the finding of consistency and a copy of the public hearing notice.