
TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

Scott Perkins
TVTC Chair
Vice Mayor
San Ramon
(925) 973-2544

SPECIAL TVTC MEETING

Monday, December 13, 2021
4:00 p.m.

Jean Josey
TVTC Vice-Chair
Councilmember
Dublin
(925) 833-2530

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://cityofsanramon.zoom.us/j/93959546584>

Renee Morgan
Mayor
Town of Danville
(925) 918-3999

Meeting ID: 939 5954 6584

One tap mobile

+16699006833, 93959546584# US (San Jose)

+12532158782, 93959546584# US (Tacoma)

David Haubert
Supervisor District 1
Alameda County
(925) 551-6995

Pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order N-29-20 (dated March 17, 2020), and Executive Order N-08-21, members of the Board may participate via teleconference. Teleconference locations are not open to the public pursuant to California Governor Executive Order N-29-20. For this meeting, there will be no physical location from which members of the public may observe/comment.

Candace Andersen
Supervisor District 2
Contra Costa
(925) 957-8860

There will be no physical location for members of the public to participate in the meeting. We encourage members of the public to shelter in place and access the meeting online using the web-video communication application, Zoom.

Brittini Kiick
Councilmember
City of Livermore
(925) 960-4019

Zoom participants will have the opportunity to speak during the Public Comment period (for topics not on the agenda), in addition to each of the items on the agenda.

Karla Brown
Mayor
City of Pleasanton
(925) 931-5001

If you are submitting a public comment via email, please do so by 12:00 p.m. on Monday, December 13, 2021 to lbobadilla@sanramon.ca.gov. Please include "Public Comment 12/13/2021" in the subject line. In the body of the email, please include your name and the item you wish to speak on. Public comments submitted will be read during Public Comment and will be subject to the regular three-minute time restriction.

Members of the Public may participate and provide public comments to teleconference meetings as follows:

If you have any questions related to the Tri-Valley Transportation Council meeting agenda. Please contact Lisa Bobadilla, TVTC Administrative staff at (925) 973-2651 or email at lbobadilla@sanramon.ca.gov.

Public testimony will be taken at the direction of the Chair and members of the public may only comment during times allotted for public comments. If you wish to request a disability-related modification or accommodation, please contact the Administrator by email at lbobadilla@sanramon.ca.gov.

TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call and Self Introductions
3. Public Comment
4. Consent Calendar
 - a. APPROVE Resolution No. 2021-15 to continue conducting remote teleconference meetings for all meetings of the legislative bodies of the Tri-Valley Transportation Council ("TVTC"), pursuant to the authority set forth in AB 361 (Government Code Section 54953[e][1]), due to a proclaimed state of emergency and imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees if meetings are held in person*
5. Old Business
6. New Business
 - a. PARTICPATE in Study Session regarding the Tri-Valley Transportation Council Strategic Expenditure Plan and Proposed Changes to Tri-Valley Transportation Development Fee Program.
7. Informational Items
8. Adjournment

* *Attachment(s)*

Item 4.a

TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

Scott Perkins
TVTC Chair
Vice Mayor
San Ramon
(925) 973-2544

To: Tri-Valley Transportation Council (TVTC)

From: Steve Mattas, General Counsel

Date: December 13, 2021

Jean Josey
TVTC Vice-Chair
Councilmember
Dublin
(925) 833-2530

Subject: Resolution to continue conducting remote teleconference meetings for all meetings of the legislative bodies of the Tri-Valley Transportation Council, pursuant to the authority set forth in AB 361 (Government Code Section 54953[e][1]), due to a proclaimed state of emergency and imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees if meetings are held in person

Renee Morgan
Mayor
Town of Danville
(925) 918-3999

David Haubert
Supervisor District 1
Alameda County
(925) 551-6995

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt a resolution to continue conducting remote teleconference meetings for all meetings of the legislative bodies of the Tri-Valley Transportation Council ("TVTC"), pursuant to the authority set forth in AB 361 (Government Code Section 54953[e][1]), due to a proclaimed state of emergency and imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees if meetings are held in person.

Candace Andersen
Supervisor District 2
Contra Costa
(925) 957-8860

BACKGROUND

On March 4, 2020, Governor Newsom declared a State of Emergency in response to COVID-19. On March 10, 2020, Contra Costa County similarly declared a state of emergency. On March 17, 2020, Alameda County also declared a state of emergency, and Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-29-20, which suspended certain provisions of the Brown Act in order to allow local legislative bodies to conduct remote meetings. Pursuant to this executive order, TVTC's legislative bodies have been conducting teleconference meetings to carry out TVTC business from remote locations while ensuring the public's continued access to meetings in a safe manner.

Brittini Kiick
Councilmember
City of Livermore
(925) 960-4019

Karla Brown
Mayor
City of Pleasanton
(925) 931-5001

On June 11, 2021, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-08-21, extending the term of Executive Order N-29-20 to September 30, 2021. Since the Governor issued Executive Order N-08-21, the highly contagious Delta variant has emerged, causing a spike in cases throughout the state and within Alameda County and Contra Costa County. Both the Alameda County Health Officer and Health Officer of Contra Costa County have issued public health orders requiring all people, regardless of vaccination status, to wear face coverings in public indoor settings. The Division of Occupational Safety and Health of the California Department of Industrial Relations ("Cal/OSHA") has also imposed similar requirements and recommendations for physical distancing in response to the spread of the virus, which are described in further detail in the accompanying resolution.

TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

On September 16, 2021, Governor Newsom signed Assembly Bill 361 (2021) ("AB 361"), which amended the Brown Act to allow local legislative bodies to continue meetings by teleconference during a declared State of Emergency by following specific rules regarding notice and attendance. AB 361 takes full effect on October 1, 2021.

DISCUSSION

During the Governor's declaration of a State of Emergency, AB 361 allows local legislative bodies to continue to meet remotely after the expiration of Executive Order N-29-20.

Under AB 361, TVTC will be allowed to continue to meet remotely when:

1. The local agency holds a meeting during a declared state of emergency;
2. State or local health officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing;
3. Legislative bodies declare the need to meet remotely due to present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

TVTC meets the requirements to continue holding meetings remotely in order to ensure the health and safety of the public:

- The Governor has declared a state of emergency, and the Alameda County and Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors each adopted resolutions proclaiming a state of emergency due to COVID-19, pursuant to Section 8625 of the California Emergency Services Act;
- County health officer orders for both Alameda County and Contra Costa County require that individuals in indoor public spaces wear face coverings, and Cal/OSHA and the CDC recommend social distancing of at least six feet due to COVID-19;
- The highly-infectious Delta variant of COVID-19 has resulted in a significant increase of COVID-19 cases within the state and throughout Alameda County and Contra Costa County;
- Meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees.

Under AB 361, TVTC is required to make certain findings, by majority vote, in order to continue teleconferencing without complying with the pre-AB 361 Brown Act provisions (i.e. posting agendas at each teleconference location and allowing such locations to be accessible to the public):

- (1) The Board has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency.
- (2) Either of the following circumstances exist:
 - (i) The state of emergency continues to directly impact the ability of the members to meet safely in person.
 - (ii) State or local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing.

TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

If TVTC makes these findings, TVTC's legislative bodies may continue to hold meetings in the current remote manner with opportunities for the public to observe and address the legislative bodies in real time. TVTC is required to revisit these findings within every 30 days in order to continue holding teleconference meetings while the proclaimed state of emergency is in effect.

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt resolution to continue conducting remote teleconference meetings for all meetings of the legislative bodies of the Tri-Valley Transportation Council, pursuant to the authority set forth in AB 361 (Government Code Section 54953[e][1]), due to a proclaimed state of emergency and imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees if meetings are held in person.

5029125.1

**TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL
RESOLUTION NO. 2021-15**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL (TVTC)
FINDING PROCLAIMED STATE OF EMERGENCY AND THAT MEETING IN
PERSON WOULD PRESENT IMMINENT RISKS TO THE HEALTH OR SAFETY OF
ATTENDEES IF MEETINGS OF THE LEGISLATIVE BODIES ARE HELD IN
PERSON; AND AUTHORIZING TELECONFERENCE MEETINGS FOR ALL
LEGISLATIVE BODIES**

WHEREAS, all meetings of the legislative bodies of the Tri-Valley Transportation Council (“TVTC”) are open and public, as required by the Ralph M. Brown Act, Government Code Section 54950, *et seq*, and any member of the public may observe, attend, and participate in the business of such legislative bodies;

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2020, Governor Newsom declared a State of Emergency as a result of the rapid spread of the novel coronavirus disease 2019 (“COVID-19”);

WHEREAS, on March 4, 2020, the Alameda County Health Officer declared a local emergency due to COVID-19;

WHEREAS, on March 17, 2020, the Alameda County Board of Supervisors adopted a Resolution ratifying the Health Officer’s Declaration of Local Emergency;

WHEREAS, on March 10, 2020, the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors adopted a Resolution proclaiming a state of emergency to deal with the potential spread of COVID-19;

WHEREAS, on March 17, 2020, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-29-20 suspending certain provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act (“Brown Act”) in order to allow local legislative bodies to conduct meetings telephonically or by other means, after which TVTC staff implemented virtual meetings for all meetings of legislative bodies within the TVTC;

WHEREAS, all legislative bodies of TVTC established remote meetings, which have allowed the bodies to continue to conduct TVTC business from remote locations while ensuring the public’s continued access to government meetings in a safe manner;

WHEREAS, on June 11, 2021, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order N-08-21, which terminated the provisions of Executive Order N-29-20 that allows local legislative bodies to conduct meetings telephonically or by other means effective September 30, 2021;

WHEREAS, on September 16, 2021, Governor Newsom signed Assembly Bill 361 (2021) (“AB 361”), which amended the Brown Act to allow local legislative bodies to continue to conduct meetings by teleconference under specified conditions and pursuant to special rules on notice, attendance, and other matters;

WHEREAS, AB 361, pursuant to Executive Order N-15-21, takes full effect on October 1, 2021 and requires the Board of Directors to make specific findings to continue meeting under special teleconference rules;

WHEREAS, in addition to finding the Governor has declared a State of Emergency pursuant to Government Code section 8625, such findings include that state or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote physical distancing, or, in the alternative, that the legislative body determines that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees;

WHEREAS, Governor Newsom has declared a State of Emergency due to COVID-19, the Counties of Alameda and Contra Costa have similarly proclaimed states of emergency, state and county officials have imposed or recommend measures to promote physical distancing, and TVTC has determined that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees;

WHEREAS, in response to the emergence of the highly contagious Delta variant of COVID-19, which caused an increase in COVID-19 cases throughout the United States, State, the Alameda County and Contra Costa County Health Officers have issued orders for nearly all individuals to wear masks when inside public spaces;

WHEREAS, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (“CDC”) continues to recommend physical distancing of at least six feet from others outside of the household;

WHEREAS, Title 8, Section 3205, subdivision (c)(5)(D) of the California Code of Regulations, promulgated by the Division of Occupational Safety and Health of the California Department of Industrial Relations (“Cal/OSHA”), requires employers to provide instruction to employees on using a combination of “physical distancing, face coverings, increased ventilation indoors, and respiratory protection” to decrease the spread of COVID-19;

WHEREAS, “Protecting Workers: Guidance on Mitigating and Preventing the Spread of COVID-19 in the Workplace,” promulgated by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (“OSHA”) under the United States Department of Labor, provides that “[m]aintaining physical distancing at the workplace for [unvaccinated and at-risk] workers is an important control to limit the spread of COVID-19” and recommends that employers train employees about the airborne nature of COVID-19 and importance of exercising multiple layers of safety measures, including physical distancing, and that employers implement “physical distancing in all communal work areas for unvaccinated and otherwise at-risk workers,” including physical distancing from members of the public, as a “key way to protect such workers”;

WHEREAS, due to the continued threat of COVID-19, TVTC continues to implement multiple layers of protection against COVID-19, including physical distancing, for the safety of Board members, employees and members of the public;

WHEREAS, TVTC recognizes the recommendations by state and local officials to use physical distancing as a layer of protection against COVID-19 and desires to continue to provide a safe workplace for its Board members, employees and a safe environment for the open and public meetings of all legislative bodies of TVTC;

WHEREAS, TVTC hereby finds that the presence of COVID-19 and the increase of cases due to the Delta variant present imminent risks to the health or safety of attendees should meetings of the legislative bodies of TVTC be held in person; and

WHEREAS, TVTC shall ensure meetings of all legislative bodies comply with the special teleconference rules under the Brown Act, as amended by Assembly Bill 361.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Tri-Valley Transportation Council, as follows:

Section 1. Recitals. The above recitals are true and correct and hereby incorporated into this Resolution.

Section 2. State of Emergency and Imminent Risks to Health and Safety. In compliance with the special teleconference rules of Section 54953 of the Government Code, as established by Assembly Bill 361 (2021), TVTC hereby makes the following findings:

- a. TVTC has considered the circumstances of the state of emergency; and
- b. The states of emergency, as declared by the Governor, Alameda County, and Contra Costa County continue to impact directly the ability of all legislative bodies of TVTC to safely meet in person; and
- c. The CDC, Cal/OSHA, and OSHA continue to recommend physical distancing of at least six feet to protect against transmission of COVID-19; and
- d. Meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health and safety of meeting attendees due to the continued presence and threat of COVID-19.

Section 3. Remote Teleconference Meetings. All legislative bodies of TVTC are hereby authorized and directed to take all actions necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of this Resolution including, conducting open and public teleconference meetings in accordance with Government Code section 54953, as amended by Assembly Bill 361 (2021), and other applicable provisions of the Brown Act, in order to protect the health and safety of the public.

Section 4. Effective Date of Resolution. This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption and shall be effective until the earlier of January 12, 2021, or such time TVTC adopts a subsequent resolution in accordance with Government Code section 54953(e)(3) to extend the time during which the legislative bodies may continue to teleconference without compliance with paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of section 54953.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED at the meeting of December 13, 2021 by the following votes:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

Scott Perkins, Chair
Tri-Valley Transportation Council

ATTEST:

Lisa Bobadilla, TVTC Administrative Staff

Item 6.a

TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

Scott Perkins
TVTC Chair
Vice Mayor
San Ramon
(925) 973-2544

Jean Josey
TVTC Vice-Chair
Councilmember
Dublin
(925) 833-2530

Renee Morgan
Mayor
Town of Danville
(925) 918-3999

David Haubert
Supervisor District 1
Alameda County
(925) 551-6995

Candace Andersen
Supervisor District 2
Contra Costa
(925) 957-8860

Brittini Kiick
Councilmember
City of Livermore
(925) 960-4019

Karla Brown
Mayor
City of Pleasanton
(925) 931-5001

To: Tri-Valley Transportation Council

From: Strategic Expenditure Plan Sub Committee
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Date: December 13, 2021

Subject: Study Session – Tri Valley Transportation Council Preliminary
Strategic Expenditure Plan and Proposed Fee Program

INTRODUCTION

This study session is being conducted to: (1) provide TVTC Board Members with an update on the current status of the development of the TVTC Strategic Expenditure Plan (SEP); (2) provide an update on a proposed Fee Program; and (3) receive input and feedback from the TVTC Board Members on the preliminary SEP and proposed Fee Program.

After staff has received input and feedback from the TVTC Board on the preliminary SEP and proposed Fee Program, such input and feedback will be incorporated into a final version of the SEP and Fee Program, which will be presented to the TVTC Board for consideration and adoption at a meeting in January of 2022. As this is a study session, staff is not requesting that the Board take any action on the preliminary SEP or the proposed Fee Program, at this time.

BACKGROUND

Nexus Study Requirements - The California Mitigation Fee Act law (Government Code §66001) requires jurisdictions to identify certain information and make certain statutory findings when establishing, increasing or imposing a development impact fee. Specifically, jurisdictions are required to:

1. Identify the purpose for collecting development impact fees;
2. Identify the use to which the fee is to be put, including identifying the facilities to be built;
3. Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed;
4. Determine that there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed; and

TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

5. Determine that there is a reasonable relationship (proportionality) between the amount of the fee and the cost of public facilities or portion of the public facilities attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed.

In addition, Government Code §66001(d)(1) requires jurisdictions to make the following statutory findings every five years in relation to any unexpended funds collected pursuant to the fee:

1. Identify the purpose to which the fee is to be put;
2. Demonstrate a reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged;
3. Identify all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to complete financing in incomplete improvements;
4. Designate the approximate dates on which the funding referred to in subsection (3) above is expected to be deposited into the appropriate account of fund.

Background and History - TVTC Nexus Study, Strategic Expenditure Plan (SEP)

In 1991, the seven jurisdictions of Alameda County, Contra Costa County, Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore, Danville, and San Ramon signed a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) that established the Tri-Valley Transportation Council (TVTC). The purpose of the JPA was for the joint preparation of a Tri-Valley Transportation Plan/Action Plan (TVTP/AP) for Routes of Regional Significance (RRS) and cost sharing of recommended improvements. The TVTP/AP was prepared and presented to all member jurisdictions in April 1995, and updated in 2000. The TVTP/AP created a common understanding and agreement on the Tri-Valley's transportation concerns regarding prioritizing projects for funding and implementation.

Completed and adopted in early 2008, the *TVTC Nexus Study: Fee Update* ("2008 Nexus Study") identified 22 projects that the TVTC approved to receive funding from the TVTDF. The first 11 projects ("List A" projects) were adopted into the original program in 1995. The second set of 11 ("List B" projects), were new projects that were included in the 2008 Nexus Study. The travel demand modeling documented in the 2008 Nexus Study projected that these projects would reduce the congestion created by new development within the Tri-Valley.

With respect to the TVTC JEPAs, in October 2013 TVTC entered into a new Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JEPA) comprised of seven member agencies: the County of Alameda, the County of Contra Costa, the City of Livermore, the City of Pleasanton, the City of San Ramon, the City of Dublin, and the Town of Danville. The purpose of the new JEPA agreement was to establish the TVTC as a **separate agency** responsible for planning, coordinating, and receiving disbursement of traffic impact fee revenues from member agencies to help implement transportation improvement projects within the Tri-Valley Area.

SUMMARY OF 2021 NEXUS STUDY

Since 2008, there have been changes in the funding, planning and traffic conditions under which the TVTDF was originally developed. In addition, many of the original 22 projects have been completed and the TVTC has identified 23 new projects (List C) to be considered.

TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

Based on these factors an updated nexus study was prepared to support updates to the TVTDF. The 2021 Nexus Study was adopted by the TVTC on August 16, 2021. A summary of the 2021 Nexus Study is as follows:

Forecast Growth

New development within the Tri-Valley is forecast to add 33,312 household and 63,947 jobs between 2018 and 2040. This growth will produce an increase of 57,596 average AM/PM peak hour trips.

Project Benefits

Based on forecast projection, the vehicle hour of delay is expected to increase by 60 percent during the AM and 88 percent during the PM peak. With the 38 improvement projects, this delay is expected to decrease by 15 percent during the AM peak and 23 percent during the PM peak when compared to the 2040 No-Build Scenario.

In addition, these projects will result in other benefits to the Tri-Valley Area including improving roadway safety, improving roadway operations, and increasing bicycle ridership.

Figure E-1: Future Build vs No Build Scenario Vehicle Hours of Delay (VHD)



Note: Hours of delay are based on trips with origin or destination in the TVTC region.

2021 Nexus Study – Proposed Updated Fee

The total investment for projects eligible to receive TVTDF funding is estimated to be \$4.573 billion, where \$3.702 billion is unfunded. An additional reduction was applied to account for external “cut-through” trips on roadway congestion projects. Future development within the Tri-Valley area is not responsible to pay for these cut-through trips since these trips are caused by growth outside of the

TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

Tri-Valley area. This reduces the total unfunded cost to be covered by the maximum TVTDF to \$2.698 billion. Note that this did not change the overall project costs.

The \$2.698 billion unfunded cost was allocated across future development land use type based on the proportion of forecast peak-hour trips to determine the Total Fee per Land Use. Then, the maximum fee schedule was determined by dividing Total Fee per Land Use by the 2020-2040 Growth as shown in Table E-1.

Table E-1: Maximum Fee by Land Use Category

Land Use Type	Growth	Maximum Fee
Single-Family Residential	15,857 DU	\$40,250 per DU
Multi-Family Residential	17,456 DU	\$23,890 per DU
Retail	5,117,500 SF	\$77.88 per SF
Office	6,796,800 SF	\$54.10 per SF
Industrial	9,289,800 SF	\$31.15 per SF
Other	12,441 trips*	\$46,844 per trip*

* Average AM/PM trip

The maximum fee schedule shown in in **Table E-1** would generate sufficient revenues to fund the total unfunded cost of all selected projects, *however, TVTC is not obligated to apply this fee schedule.* For instance, past practice of TVTC has been to set rates at approximate one-third of the maximum fee calculated in the 1995 and 2008 Nexus studies to help foster growth within the Tri-Valley area, while providing a regional funding source that could be used to match and help compete for Federal and State transportation grants and funding programs.

Strategic Expenditure Plan (SEP)

In January 2015, the TVTC adopted Resolution No. 2015-01 – Adopting the updated Tri-Valley Transportation Development Fee Schedule as a two-year phase-in plan, with no change during the initial year (FY 14-15), an increase to 25% of the maximum allowable rate by the fee nexus study in the second year (FY 15-16) and a final increase to 35% of the maximum allowable rate by the third year (FY 16-17). The new fee was based on the Fee Nexus Study adopted in 2008.

In January 2017, the TVTC approved the *2008 TVTC Nexus Study Validation Review* and adopted the *2017 Strategic Expenditure Plan (SEP)* Update*. At that time, the TVTC elected to maintain the current fee rate (only annual CCI adjustment). The 2017 SEP update incorporated and built upon the updated project descriptions, funding programs, and progression of the TVTDF over the previous six years. Some of the transportation improvement projects on the original list were completed and schedules and funding for others had changed. The JEPA, adopted in 2013, required approval, for the SEP, by a supermajority of the TVTC – six members.

TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

2022 Strategic Expenditure Plan

Section 8(a) of the JEPA requires the TVTC to adopt or update the SEP every five years. With the adoption of the 2021 TVTC Nexus Study, the TVTC embarked on updating the SEP, which establishes the funding level and allocation of the TVTDF among the identified projects. . A SEP subcommittee was formed, with board members Perkins, Josey and Kiick to assist Kimley-Horn and the TVTC TAC with updating the SEP. The SEP update process included the following major activities:

1. Project Prioritization;
2. Revenue Forecasting; and
3. Project Allocation.

Project Prioritization - All projects (List A, List B, and List C) were prioritized using five criteria: 1) Project Urgency, 2) TVTDF Allocation, 3) Project Readiness, 4) Project Funding, and 5) Project Effectiveness. Each criterion was given a score between 0 and 3 points based on the scoring criteria

Revenue Forecasting - The revenue forecast estimate for the next 10-year is calculated based on the development forecast and TVTDF rate schedule.

Development Forecasting - Kimley-Horn received 10-year development forecast from agency staff Table 3.

Table 3. Total 10-Year Development Forecast

Land Use	Fiscal Years										2022-2032 Total	20-Year Growth	% 20-Year Growth
	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32			
Single Family (DU)	586	639	657	664	631	554	554	554	1,713	554	7,110	15,857	45%
Multi-Family (DU)	921	1,459	1,011	726	697	763	795	774	2,876	1,038	11,065	17,456	63%
Retail (KSF)	264	281	264	325	264	270	279	264	1,109	264	3,583	5,118	70%
Office (KSF)	402	302	302	302	412	302	583	302	302	302	3,511	6,797	52%
Industrial (KSF)	395	387	387	387	387	387	387	387	387	387	3,878	9,306	42%
Other (KSF)	231	158	138	121	113	113	113	113	113	113	1,325	12,441	11%

DU = Dwelling Unit, KSF = 1,000 Square Feet

TVTDF Rate Adjustments and Scenario Analysis - With the previous Nexus update, the TVTC capped the rate at 35% of the maximum rate, with a retail cap of 15%. The rates were adjusted in two increments over two consecutive years. To determine how the TVTDF rate should be adjusted as part of the 2022 update, several potential rate adjustment scenarios were considered by the SEP subcommittee. These scenarios considered the following:

- Revenue should fund at least 10% of the total project costs (approximately \$106,000,000) for the projects ranked 1 through 15 (Top 15). In addition to funding the Top 15, the total revenue brought in must also account for 20% that is returned to local source, as well as a 0.1% allocation for administrative costs.
- Various adjustment increase approaches, including a two-step increase scenario similar to the previous iteration, as well as a one-step, four-step, and annual increase variations.

TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

- Consideration of capping the rate between 15% and 20% of the maximum fee rate.

Some of the scenarios also assumed a reduction for retail based on the SEP Subcommittees review of these draft scenarios, a recommended approach to rate adjustments and allocation was identified

Proposed Rate Adjustments

The proposed rate adjustments which resulted from the analysis undertaken by the SEP Subcommittee are presented in Table 4. The recommended rate adjustment is 15% of the maximum fee rate for the duration of the SEP for all uses except retail and "other" land uses:

Table 4: FY 2022/2023 Rate Adjustment

Land Use	Current 2021 Rate	% of Maximum	FY 2022/23 Rates	Change from 2021 Rates	% Change
Single Family (DU)	\$5,057	15%	\$6,596.40	\$1,539.40	30.4%
Multi-Family (DU)	\$3,484	15%	\$3,889.20	\$405.20	11.6%
Retail (SF)	\$3.74	6%	\$5.07	\$1.33	35.6%
Office (SF)	\$8.59	15%	\$8.81	\$0.22	2.5%
Industrial (SF)	\$5.00	15%	\$4.97	-\$0.03	-0.6%
Other (avg AM/PM trips)	\$5,620	12%	\$6,100.68	\$480.68	8.6%

DU = Dwelling Units; SF = Square Feet

Similar to the prior SEP, it is proposed that retail continue to have lower cap to help encourage retail growth, especially since local retail has been greatly impacted by the global pandemic.

Retail is proposed to initially be established at 6% and then increase to 7% in funding year 23-24. In addition, it is proposed that a lower increase be made for the "other" land use category. "Other" land uses consist of developments that do not fall into the other five land use categories such as theaters, motel/hotels, day care facilities, and gas stations. Given the unique nature of these uses, it is recommended that the rate be to 12% of the maximum fee rate for the duration of the SEP.

It is also proposed that the TVTDF rate continue to increase on an annual basis based on the annual Construction Cost Index (CCI) adjustment to reflect changes in regional construction costs. Similarly, to how the SEP has been implemented in the past, the CCI adjustment will not be applied for years when there is a prescribed rate increase planned. Essentially this means that the CCI adjustment would not be applied for any use in FY 22-23 and also not to retail in funding year 23/24.

Summary of the major milestones, related to the Nexus Study and SEP to date, is as follows:

October 2019 - TVTC approved the Nexus Study Project List (List C).

April 2020 - TVTC adopted Resolution 2020-03 and awarded a Professional Services Agreement to Kimley-Horn for the TVTC Nexus Study in the amount of \$172,930.

TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

October 2020 - TVTC received an update on the Nexus Study which included completion of the Nexus Study Scope of Work and Schedule, and completion of Growth Forecast refinements for employment and population to calculate the increase in traffic demand attributable to forecasted growth within the Tri-Valley. The consultant also advised that the total growth forecast would be converted into land use types to ease the administration of the impact fee at the local level.

January 2021 - TVTC received a verbal update from the consultant detailing the land use assumptions submitted by the member agencies. The consultant shared the next steps, including running the Travel Demand Model, to determine performance measures of the roadway network.

April 2021 - TVTC received a verbal update from the consultant detailing the tasks completed, including the land use assumptions, travel demand model, and the performance evaluation.

July 2021 - TVTC held a Study Session to receive update on all completed tasks associated with the Nexus Study:

1. Confirm Growth Forecast and Travel Demand Model - Completed.
2. Methodology and Approach – Completed.
3. Household Growth – Confirmed.
4. Employment Growth – Confirmed.
5. Improvement Project and Nexus Analysis Methodology – Confirmed.
6. Non-Fee Funding Source – Completed.
7. Fee Estimation and Nexus Burden Analysis – Completed.
8. Draft Nexus Study – Completed.

August 2021 – TVTC adopted the Final Nexus Study.

August 2021 – TVTC formed an ad hoc Strategic Expenditure Plan Subcommittee.

September 2021 through December 2021 – TVTC ad hoc Subcommittee held six meetings to create the preliminary SEP and proposed Fee Program for review by TVTC.

NEXT STEPS

1. The SEP subcommittee will meet December 16, 2021 to ensure the comments received from the TVTC Board during the December 13 Study Session are incorporated into the draft final SEP and Proposed Fee Program.
2. TVTC Board holds public hearing to adopt an updated Fee Program in January 2022.
3. TVTC member agencies consider adoption of the TVTC SEP and Fee Program (February through May).

TRI-VALLEY TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

4. TVTC implements new SEP and Fee Program - July 1, 2022.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the TVTC Board receive the update on the preliminary SEP and proposed Fee Program and provide the SEP Subcommittee and staff with feedback and input.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Technical Memo from Kimley-Horn – SEP
- B. Proposed Fee program

5028827.1

Attachment A

MEMORANDUM

To: Tri-Valley Transportation (TVTC) Board
 From: Michael Schmitt, AICP CTP, PTP, RSP₁
 Elizabeth Chau, P.E.
 Date: December 7, 2021
 Subject: TVTC SEP 2021 Update – Technical Memorandum #2 TVTDF Rate Adjustment Scenario Analysis

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize the methodology and assumptions on which the recommended rate adjustment for the Tri-Valley Transportation Development Fee (TVTDF) was developed. Note that the final adopted rate may be different than those described in this memorandum based on adjustments made by the TVTC board.

Background

2020 NEXUS STUDY

TVTC recently completed the 2020 Nexus Fee Update Study which determined that maximum fee rates that could be allocated to the unfunded cost to complete projects selected to receive funding from the TVTDF. The results are presented in **Table 1**.

Table 1: 2020 Nexus Fee Update Study Maximum Fee

Land Use	2022 Maximum Fee Rate
Single Family	\$43,976 per DU
Multi-Family	\$25,928 per DU
Retail	\$84.52 per SF
Office	\$58.72 per SF
Industrial	\$33.15 per SF
Other (avg AM/PM trips)	\$50,839 per average AM/PM trip

DU = Dwelling Units; SF = Square Feet

Similar to the 1995 and 2008 Nexus studies, it was recommended that a percentage of the maximum fee be applied in order to provide a regional transportation funding source to offset development related impacts. The most recent iteration was capped at 35% of the maximum rate, with a retail cap of 15%. For reference, the current 2021 TVTDF rates are approximately 12% of the 2022 maximum fee rates shown in **Table 1**.

2022 STRATEGIC EXPENDITURE PLAN

The TVTC is currently updating its Strategic Expenditure Plan (SEP) which establishes the funding level and allocation of the TVTDF. A SEP subcommittee was formed to assist Kimley-Horn and the TVTC TAC with updating the SEP.

The SEP update process includes the following major activities:

- Project Prioritization
- Revenue Forecasting
- Project Allocation of Forecasted Funding

Project Prioritization

All projects (List A, List B, and List C) were prioritized using the following five criteria: 1) Project Urgency, 2) TVTDF Allocation, 3) Project Readiness, 4) Project Funding, and 5) Project Effectiveness. Each criterion was given a score between 0 and 3 points based on the scoring criteria presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Project Prioritization

Funding Criteria	Description	Scoring Criteria
Project Urgency	How urgent is the project? Is the project expected to move forward in the ten-year SEP horizon?	Low Urgency = 1 Medium Urgency = 2 High Urgency = 3
TVTDF Allocation	What is the % TVTDF allocation does the project currently have?	>30% = 0 >20%-30% = 1 >10%-20% = 2 ≤ 10% = 3
Project Readiness	How ready is a project is to expend capital funds? What stage the project is in?	Score 0.5 – 3 based on what current stage (e.g. PSR = 1, Construction = 3)
Project Funding	How much total funding is committed for the project?	Score = (Total Funding Committed / Total Cost) x3
Project Effectiveness	How well does the Project aligns with Lead Agency Policy/Goals	Well aligned with agency policy (e.g. In General Plan) = 3 Aligned with agency policy = 2 Not well aligned with agency policy = 1

The score for each funding criteria was totaled and normalized to a 10-point scale to calculate the project's priority score. Projects eligible to receive funding were then ranked base on their resultant priority score. It should be noted that this priority ranking was provided to help the TVTC TAC and SEP Subcommittee make informed decision on how to prioritize project funding and are provided to facilitate the decision-making process. The ultimate prioritization will be determined by the TVTC board and may include considerations beyond those included in this analysis.

The results of the project prioritization are included as **Attachment A**.

Revenue Forecasting

The revenue forecast estimate for the next 10-year is calculated based on the development forecast and TVTDF rate schedule.

DEVELOPMENT FORECAST

Kimley-Horn received 10-year development forecast from agency staff, which is presented in **Table 3**.

TVTDF RATE ADJUSTMENTS SCENARIO ANALYSIS

With the previous Nexus update, the TVTC capped the rate at 35% of the maximum rate, with a retail cap of 15%. The rates were adjusted in two increments over two consecutive years.

To determine how the TVTDF rate should be adjusted as part of this update, several potential rate adjustment scenarios were considered by the SEP subcommittee. These scenarios considered the following:

- Revenue should fund at least 10% of the total project costs (approximately \$106,000,000) for the projects ranked 1 through 15 (Top 15).
- In addition to funding the Top 15, the total revenue brought in must also account for 20% that is returned to local source, as well as a 0.1% Admin Fee.
- Scenarios considered various numbers of adjustments increases, and included a two-step increase scenario similar to the previous iteration, as well as having a one-step, four-step, and annual increase variations.
- Scenarios considered capping the rate between 15% and 20% of the maximum fee rate
- Some of the scenarios also assumed a reduction for retail

Based on the SEP Subcommittees review of these draft scenarios, a recommended approach to rate adjustments and allocation was identified.

Table 3: Total 10-Year Development Forecast

Land Use	Fiscal Years										2022-2032 Total	20-Year Growth	% 20-Year Growth
	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32			
Single Family (DU)	586	639	657	664	631	554	554	554	1,713	554	7,110	15,857	45%
Multi-Family (DU)	921	1,459	1,011	726	697	763	795	774	2,876	1,038	11,065	17,456	63%
Retail (KSF)	264	281	264	325	264	270	279	264	1,109	264	3,583	5,118	70%
Office (KSF)	402	302	302	302	412	302	583	302	302	302	3,511	6,797	52%
Industrial (KSF)	395	387	387	387	387	387	387	387	387	387	3,878	9,306	42%
Other (KSF)	231	158	138	121	113	113	113	113	113	113	1,325	12,441	11%

DU = Dwelling Unit; KSF = 1,000 Square Feet

RECOMMENDED RATE ADJUSTMENTS

The recommended rate adjustments which resulted from the analysis undertaken by the SEP Subcommittee are presented in Tables 3 and 4. The recommend rate adjustment is 15% of the maximum fee rate for the duration of the SEP for all uses except retail and “other” land uses.

Similar to the prior SEP, it is recommended that retail continue to have lower cap to help encourage retail growth, especially since local serving retail has been greatly impacted by the global pandemic. Retail is recommended to initially be established at 6% and then increase to 7% in funding year 23/34.

In addition, it is proposed that a lower increase be made for “other” land use category. “Other” land uses consist of developments that do not fall into the other five land use categories such as theaters, motel/hotels, day care facilities, and gas stations. Given the unique nature of these uses and it is recommended that the rate be to 12% of the maximum fee rate for the duration of the SEP.

It is also recommended that the TVTDF rate continue to increase on annual basis based on the annual Construction Cost Index (CCI) adjustment to reflect changes in regional construction costs. Similarly, to how the SEP has been implemented in the past, the CCI adjustment will not be applied for years when there is a prescribe rate increase planned. Essentially this means that the CCI adjustment would not be applied for any use in funding year 22/23 and also not to retail in funding year 23/24.

Table 4: FY 2022/2023 Rate Adjustment

Land Use	Current 2021 Rate	% of Maximum	FY 2022/23 Rates	Change from 2021 Rates	% Change
Single Family (DU)	\$5,057	15%	\$6,596.40	\$1,539.40	30.4%
Multi-Family (DU)	\$3,484	15%	\$3,889.20	\$405.20	11.6%
Retail (SF)	\$3.74	6%	\$5.07	\$1.33	35.6%
Office (SF)	\$8.59	15%	\$8.81	\$0.22	2.5%
Industrial (SF)	\$5.00	15%	\$4.97	-\$0.03	-0.6%
Other (avg AM/PM trips)	\$5,620	12%	\$6,100.68	\$480.68	8.6%

DU = Dwelling Units; SF = Square Feet

Table 5: FY 2023/2024 Rate Adjustment

Land Use	Current 2021 Rate	% of Maximum	FY 2023/24 Rates	Change from 2021 Rates	% Change
Single Family (DU)	\$5,057	15%	\$6,596.40	\$1,539.40	30.4%
Multi-Family (DU)	\$3,484	15%	\$3,889.20	\$405.20	11.6%
Retail (SF)	\$3.74	7%	\$5.92	\$2.18	58.2%
Office (SF)	\$8.59	15%	\$8.81	\$0.22	2.5%
Industrial (SF)	\$5.00	15%	\$4.97	-\$0.03	-0.6%
Other (avg AM/PM trips)	\$5,620	12%	\$6,100.68	\$480.68	8.6%

DU = Dwelling Units; SF = Square Feet

Table 5 presents the summary of the revenue generated by the recommended rates. Over the 10-year SEP horizon, the recommended rate adjustment will result in a total revenue of \$162,733,410. After accounting for 20% that is returned to local sources and admin fees, there is \$130,023,995 available for TVTDF allocation, which can fund 12.3% of the total project cost for Top 15 Projects. It should be noted that these estimates do not account for CCI rate adjustment or increase in construction cost.

Table 6: Revenue Summary

Estimated Total Revenue*	\$162,733,410
Return to Local Source (20%)	\$32,546,682
Admin Fee (0.01%)	\$162,733
Revenue for TVTDF Allocation	\$130,023,995
Top 15 Total Project Cost (2021 \$)**	\$1,058,477,852
Percent of Top 15 Total Project Cost	12.3%

* Estimated total revenue does not account for CCI rate adjustments

**Project cost are in 2021 dollars and may increase over time due to changes in regional construction costs

Kimley»Horn

Attachment A – Project Prioritization

Rank through 2/1	Priority Score Rata	Project Type	ID	Project	Agency	Sponsor/Lead Agency	Phenomenon										Unfunded TVTDF Adorable (\$M)	Unfunded External Unfunded (\$M)	Unfunded Identified in 2016 SEP Update (\$M)	Total Cost (\$M)	Min-TVDF Funding (\$M)	TVDF Funding Identified in 2016 SEP Update (\$M)
							A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J						
1		Pedestrian/Bicycle	C-11a	Non Horse Trail Bicycle-Pedestrian Overcrossing - Bulliger Canyon Road	AC - Alameda County CCC - Contra Costa County DAM - Danville DUB - Dublin LVR - Livermore PLS - Pleasanton SAN - San Ramon	TVTDF Allocation 0%	TVTDF Allocation 3	Current Project Stage P&LE	Readiness Score 3	Funding Score 1.88	Effectiveness Score 3	Score Total 12.88	Priority Score 6.58	22.88	14.38	0.00	0.00	0.00				
2		Pedestrian/Bicycle	C-11c	Iron Horse Trail - Dublin	DUB		0%	3	P&LE	2	2.84	3	12.84	6.56	11.60	0.00	0.00	0.00				
3		Roadway Capacity	C-8	San Pablo Widening	PLS		0%	3	PAED	1.8	1.87	3	11.52	7.48	9.00	0.00	0.00	7.00				
4		Roadway Capacity	C-3	Dublin Boulevard - North Canyons Parkway Extension	DUB/LVR		0%	3	P&LE	2	0.48	3	11.48	7.65	104.39	25.48	0.00	51.33	134.91			
5		Safety	C-2	North Canyon Road Safety Improvement - Segment 1	CCC		0%	3	PAED	1.5	0.87	3	11.47	7.65	5.38	1.74	0.00	0.00	3.63			
6		Roadway Capacity & Safety	B-8b	Contra Costa/Tassajara Rd Widening Project (Dublin Segment)	DUB		0%	3	P&LE	3	1.37	3	11.37	7.58	14.50	0.82	0.00	4.51	9.99			
7		Roadway Capacity	C-13	Valero/Chemo Interchange	PLS/DUB/LVR		0%	3	PR	1	1.28	3	11.28	7.81	34.51	14.98	0.00	11.04	16.96			
8		Roadway Capacity	C-7b	I-680 Express Lanes - Hwy 84 to Alvarado (Northbound)	PLS/ACTC		0%	3	P&LE	3		3	11.00	7.33	211.94	26.00	0.00	67.82	151.94			
9		Pedestrian/Bicycle	C-11e	Iron Horse Trail to Shadow Cliffs	PLS/ACTC		0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	2.45	3	10.94	7.30	1.88	1.35	0.00	0.00	0.00			
10		Roadway Capacity	B-5	I-580/Greenville Rd Interchange Modification	LVR/Caltex		0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	2.34	3	10.84	7.23	86.00	67.01	0.00	27.32	16.92			
11		Roadway Capacity & Safety	B-4a	Contra Costa/Tassajara Rd Widening Project (Contra Costa County Segment)	CCC		14%	2	PAED	1.5	1.38	3	10.80	7.20	44.78	11.05	6.38	7.73	36.87			
12		Intersection	C-8	Santa Rosa-560 Interchange	PLS		0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	2.24	3	10.74	7.16	18.33	7.70	0.00	0.00	2.63			
13		Roadway Capacity	B-4	I-680/Vasco Road Interchange Modification	LVR/Caltex		0%	3	PR	1	2.86	2	10.64	7.10	88.65	69.04	0.00	37.41	16.81			
14		Technology	C-10	Innovate 680	DAMS/AMCC/CCA		0%	3	PAED	1.5	0.13	3	10.63	7.09	37.21	2.55	0.00	0.00	54.64			
15		Pedestrian/Bicycle	C-11d	Iron Horse Trail - Livermore	LVR		0%	3	PAED	1.5	0.00	3	10.50	7.00	26.89	0.00	0.00	0.00	23.89			
15		Transit	C-14	Valley Link Rail (Phase 1)	DUB/LVR/PLS/AC		0%	3	PAED	1.5	0.00	3	10.50	7.00	258.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	258.25			
17		Roadway Capacity	C-9	Strangeton-680 Interchange	PLS		0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	1.98	3	10.48	6.90	11.98	7.90	0.00	3.53	4.06			
18		Safety	C-1	Yield Road Safety Improvements	AC		0%	3	PR	1	0.00	3	10.00	6.67	13.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.19			

Rank / Priority Score Rank	Project Type	ID	Project	Sponsor/Lead Agency	Prioritization								Unfunded External Allowed (\$M)	Unfunded TVTDF Allowable (\$M)	
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G				
					Project Urgency	TVTDF Allocation	TVTDF Allocation Score	Current Project Stage	Readiness Score	Funding Score	Effectiveness Score	Score Total			
19	Pedestrian/Bicycle	C-11f	Iron Horse Trail Connection Improvements at Santa Rita Road	PLS	0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	1.36	3	0.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
20	Roadway Capacity	C-3	El Chero Widenng	PLS	0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	1.32	3	0.42	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
21	Pedestrian/Bicycle	C-11b	Iron Horse Trail Bicycle-Pedestrian Overcrossing - Crow Canyon Road	DMVCCDCCTA	0%	3	PAED	1.0	0.80	3	0.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
21	Trend	C-16	660 Express Bus Service	ACTVCCCTA	0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	0.90	3	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
22	Roadway Capacity	B-1	L400A-680 Interchange (Westbound to Southbound)	Dubn	0%	3	PER	1	0.84	3	0.84	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
24	Safety	A-10a	Vasco Road Safety Improvements Phase 1	AC	0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	2.18	2	0.88	0.78	0.32	0.00	11.14
25	Pedestrian/Bicycle	C-11h	Iron Horse Trail Safety Improvements	COCCVWVACVCCVWVPLS	0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	0.80	3	0.50	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.00
25	Technology	C-15	Feasibility Study of Technology Enhancements to Connected Transit with Alerts and Annals with Fireways for Connected and Autonomous Vehicles and Vehicle-to-Infrastructure Technologies	DUBPLSACVLRVAVTA	0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	0.90	3	0.50	0.67	0.00	0.00	0.00
27	Roadway Capacity	C-12	680 Interchange Improvements at Hectors Drive	DUBPLS	0%	3	PER	1	0.35	2	0.35	0.57	0.00	0.00	34.50
28	Roadway Capacity	B-3	I-580/FM Street Interchange Modification	LVR/Caltrans	0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	2.81	1	0.11	0.41	0.00	0.00	7.93
29	Pedestrian/Bicycle	C-119	Iron Horse Trail Bicycle-Pedestrian Overcrossing - Sycamore Valley Road	DMVCCDCCTA	0%	3	PAED	1.0	0.80	2	0.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
29	Intersection	C-4	Vasco Road at Dublin Avenue Intersection Improvements	LVR/AC	0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	0.90	2	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
31	Roadway Capacity	B-9	Jules London Blvd., Extension	LVR	0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	1.93	1	0.43	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.00
32	Safety	A-10b	Vasco Road Safety Improvements Phase 2	AC	0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	0.21	2	0.75	0.50	0.00	0.00	20.02
33	Trend	A-11	Express Bus/Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) - Phase 2	DUB/VAVTA	0%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	0.15	2	0.45	0.44	1.14	0.00	31.21
34	Safety	A-9b	Crow Canyon Improvements Phase 2	AC	2%	3	PRE-PD	0.5	0.29	2	0.59	0.39	0.00	0.00	0.00
35	Roadway Capacity	A-2b	SR 84/I-580 Interchange - Phase 2	LVR/Caltrans	25%	1	PRE-PD	0.5	2.92	1	0.42	0.20	0.15	0.00	0.00

Priority Score Rank	Project Type	ID	Project	Sponsor/Lead Agency	Project Agency	Prioritization										Unfunded TVTDF Allowable (\$M)	Unfunded External Unallowable (\$M)	TVTDF Funding Amended in 2018 SEP Update (\$M)	Total Cost (\$M)	Non-TVTDF Funding (\$M)	TVTDF Funding Amended in 2018 SEP Update (\$M)
						A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J						
36	Safety	A-8a	Crow Canyon Improvements Phase 1	AC	AC	Project Agency: AC - Alameda County CCC - Contra Costa County DAR - Dublin DOB - Dublin LVR - Livermore PLS - Pleasanton SAN - San Ramon	Project Urgency: 1	TVTDF Allocation: 14%	TVTDF Allocation Score: 2	Current Project Stage: PRE-PID	Readiness Score: 0.5	Funding Score: 0.58	Effectiveness Score: 2	Score Total: 6.15	Priority Score: 4.12	16.37	0.90	1.55	0.42		
37	Safety	C-2	Warm Canyon Road Safety Improvement - Segment 3	AC	AC		Project Urgency: 1	TVTDF Allocation: 8%	TVTDF Allocation Score: 3	Current Project Stage: PRE-PID	Readiness Score: 0.5	Funding Score: 0.80	Effectiveness Score: 1	Score Total: 5.50	3.87	16.49	0.00	0.00	10.45		
	Roadway Capacity	A-2a	SR 84 Expressway (I-580 to I-680) - Segment 3 (FULLY FUNDED)	LVR/PLS	LVR/PLS		Project Urgency: 1	TVTDF Allocation: 0%	TVTDF Allocation Score: 0	Current Project Stage: N/A	Readiness Score: N/A	Funding Score: N/A	Effectiveness Score: N/A	Score Total: N/A	N/A	105.40	19.50	0.00	0.00		
	Roadway Capacity	A-2a	SR 84 Expressway (I-580 to I-680) - Segment 5 (FULLY FUNDED)	LVR/PLS	LVR/PLS		Project Urgency: 1	TVTDF Allocation: 0%	TVTDF Allocation Score: 0	Current Project Stage: N/A	Readiness Score: N/A	Funding Score: N/A	Effectiveness Score: N/A	Score Total: N/A	N/A	228.00	14.54	0.00	0.00		
	Roadway Capacity	A-2b	SR 84/I-680 Interchange - Phase 1 (COMPLETED)	LVR/Catara	LVR/Catara		Project Urgency: 1	TVTDF Allocation: 0%	TVTDF Allocation Score: 0	Current Project Stage: N/A	Readiness Score: N/A	Funding Score: N/A	Effectiveness Score: N/A	Score Total: N/A	N/A	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.70		
	Roadway Capacity	B-10	I-680 Southbound HOV Lane Closures (North Main St to Rutledge Rd) (COMPLETED)	SAN/OCTA	SAN/OCTA		Project Urgency: 1	TVTDF Allocation: 0%	TVTDF Allocation Score: 0	Current Project Stage: N/A	Readiness Score: N/A	Funding Score: N/A	Effectiveness Score: N/A	Score Total: N/A	N/A	96.78	75.26	0.49	17.81		
	Transit	B-11b	I-680 Transit Corridor Improvements (REMOVED)	SAN/OCTA	SAN/OCTA		Project Urgency: 1	TVTDF Allocation: 0%	TVTDF Allocation Score: 0	Current Project Stage: N/A	Readiness Score: N/A	Funding Score: N/A	Effectiveness Score: N/A	Score Total: N/A	N/A	277.85	1.00	2.00	274.85		
	Roadway Capacity	B-7	El Cerrito Rd Extension (Stanbridge District London Blvd to Stanley Boulevard) (INCORPORATED INTO C-5)	PLS	PLS		Project Urgency: 1	TVTDF Allocation: 0%	TVTDF Allocation Score: 0	Current Project Stage: N/A	Readiness Score: N/A	Funding Score: N/A	Effectiveness Score: N/A	Score Total: N/A	N/A	72.40	0.00	0.00	72.40		
	Roadway Capacity	C-7a	I-680 Express Lanes - May 84 to Alcosta (Southbound) (FULLY FUNDED)	PLS/ACTC	PLS/ACTC		Project Urgency: 1	TVTDF Allocation: 0%	TVTDF Allocation Score: 0	Current Project Stage: N/A	Readiness Score: N/A	Funding Score: N/A	Effectiveness Score: N/A	Score Total: N/A	N/A	315.64	315.64	0.00	101.00	0.00	

Total (Rank 3-37) \$1,456,950,164 \$492,882,739 \$29,610,000 \$441,191,141 \$1,001,957,145

Total (Rank 3-15) \$1,059,477,852 \$283,070,714 \$11,180,000 \$201,066,265 \$792,132,790

Attachment B

Land Use Projections

		Fiscal Years										2022-2032 Total	20 Yr Growth	Percent of 20 Yr Growth	
		22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32				
Alameda County	Dublin														
	Single Family (DU)	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	146	1,464	2,928	50%	
	Multi-Family (DU)	223	223	223	223	223	223	223	223	223	223	2,235	4,469	50%	
	Retail (KSF)	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	1,300	356	366%	
	Office (KSF)	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	280	2,800	1,131	248%	
	Industrial (KSF)	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	250	961	26%	
	Other (KSF)	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	113	1,129	2,257	50%	
	Pleasanton														
	Single Family (DU)		25		30						1,159		1,214	3,513	35%
	Multi-Family (DU)	305	486								2,115		2,906	2,804	104%
	Retail (KSF)		11							845			855	1,932	44%
	Office (KSF)	100						281					381	3,200	12%
	Industrial (KSF)												0	2,527	0%
	Other (KSF)												0	4,171	0%
	Livermore														
	Single Family (DU)	341	341	341	341	341	341	341	341	341	341	3,410	5,460	62%	
	Multi-Family (DU)	228	228	228	228	228	228	228	228	228	228	2,280	3,614	63%	
	Retail (KSF)	131	131	131	131	131	131	131	131	131	131	1,310	1,734	76%	
	Office (KSF)	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	220	1,170	19%	
	Industrial (KSF)	362	362	362	362	362	362	362	362	362	362	3,620	5,642	64%	
	Other (KSF)											0	4,250	0%	
	Unincorporated														
	Single Family (DU)	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	80	186	43%	
	Multi-Family (DU)											0	68	0%	
Retail (KSF)											0	43	0%		
Office (KSF)											0	81	0%		
Industrial (KSF)											0	31	0%		
Other (KSF)											0	95	0%		
Contra Costa	Danville														
	Single Family (DU)	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	250	536	47%	
	Multi-Family (DU)	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	48	480	457	105%	
	Retail (KSF)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30	83	36%	
	Office (KSF)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0%	
	Industrial (KSF)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	
	Other (KSF)											0	77	0%	
	San Ramon														
	Single Family (DU)	32	60	103	80	77						352	3,117	11%	
	Multi-Family (DU)	103	460	498	213	184	250	282	261	248	525	3,024	5,897	51%	
	Retail (KSF)		6		61		6	15				88	909	10%	
	Office (KSF)					110						110	1,187	9%	
	Industrial (KSF)	8										8	139	6%	
	Other (KSF)	118	45	25	8							196	1,513	13%	
	Unincorporated														
	Single Family (DU)	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	340	117	291%	
	Multi-Family (DU)	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	140	147	95%	
	Retail (KSF)											0	62	0%	
	Office (KSF)											0	27	0%	
	Industrial (KSF)											0	7	0%	
	Other (KSF)											0	78	0%	
	Total	Total													
		Single Family (DU)	586	639	657	664	631	554	554	554	1,713	554	7,110	15,857	45%
		Multi-Family (DU)	921	1,459	1,011	726	697	763	795	774	2,876	1,038	11,065	17,456	63%
Retail (KSF)		264	281	264	325	264	270	279	264	1,109	264	3,583	5,118	70%	
Office (KSF)		402	302	302	302	412	302	583	302	302	302	3,511	6,797	52%	
Industrial (KSF)		395	387	387	387	387	387	387	387	387	387	3,878	9,306	42%	
Other (KSF)		231	158	138	121	113	113	113	113	113	113	1,325	12,441	11%	

Preferred Scenario	Scenario Revenue Summary			2022 Maximum Fee Summary				
	Land Use	Total Revenue By Land Use	Total Revenue (\$) Return to Local Source 20%(\$)	Top 15 Total Cost (\$)	2021 TVTDF	2022 Max Fee	2022 - 10% of Max	2022 - 25% of Max
Single Family (DU)	\$46,900,404	\$32,846,882	Revenue for TVTDF Allocation (\$)	\$5,057,000	\$43,976	\$4,398	\$10,994	\$15,392
Multi-Family (DU)	\$43,032,053	Admin Fee -0.1%(\$)	\$130,023,896	\$3,484,000	\$25,928	\$2,593	\$6,482	\$9,075
Retail (SF)	\$20,976,518	\$162,733	Percent of Top 15 Funded	\$3.74	\$84.52	\$8.45	\$21.13	\$29.58
Office (SF)	\$30,924,888	Revenue for TVTDF Allocation (\$)	12.3%	\$8.59	\$58.72	\$5.87	\$14.68	\$20.55
Industrial (SF)	\$19,283,355			\$5.00	\$33.15	\$3.32	\$8.29	\$11.60
Other (avg AM/PM trips)	\$1,616,192	\$130,023,995		\$5,620,000	\$50,839	\$5,084	\$12,710	\$17,794

*Note that all increases are calculated as percentage of the 2022 Max Fee

Land Use	Adjusted Rate Comparison									
	2022/23 Rate					2031/32 Rate				
	2022 Override - Percent of Max	2022 Increase over 2021	2022 Rate	2022 Increase over 2021	2022 Rate	2031 Override - Percent of Max	2031 Increase over 2021	2031 Rate	2031 Increase over 2021	2031 Rate
Single Family (DU)		\$6,596.40	\$1,539.40	30.4%	\$6,596.40		\$1,539.40	\$6,596.40	\$1,539.40	\$6,596.40
Multi-Family (DU)		\$3,889.20	\$405.20	11.6%	\$3,889.20		\$405.20	\$3,889.20	\$405.20	\$3,889.20
Retail (SF)	6%	\$5.07	\$1.33	35.6%	\$5.07	7%	\$2.18	\$5.92	\$2.18	\$5.92
Office (SF)		\$8.81	\$0.22	2.5%	\$8.81		\$0.22	\$8.81	\$0.22	\$8.81
Industrial (SF)		\$4.97	-\$0.03	-0.6%	\$4.97		-\$0.03	\$4.97	-\$0.03	\$4.97
Other (avg AM/PM trips)	12%	\$6,100.68	\$480.68	8.6%	\$6,100.68	12%	\$480.68	\$6,100.68	\$480.68	\$6,100.68

*Note that all increases are calculated as percentage of the 2022 Max fee

Land Use	Annual Adjustment														
	Annual Rate Adjustment														
	2022 Percent of Max	2022 Override - Percent of Max	2022/23 Rate	2023 Percent of Max	2023 Override - Percent of Max	2023/24 Rate	2024 Percent of Max	2024 Override - Percent of Max	2024/25 Rate	2025 Percent of Max	2025 Override - Percent of Max	2025/26 Rate	2026 Percent of Max	2026 Override - Percent of Max	2026/27 Rate
Single Family (DU)	15%		\$6,596	15%		\$6,596	15.0%		\$6,596	15%		\$6,596	15%		\$6,596
Multi-Family (DU)			\$3,889			\$3,889			\$3,889			\$3,889			\$3,889
Retail (SF)		6.0%	\$5.07		7.0%	\$5.92		7.0%	\$5.92		7.0%	\$5.92		7.0%	\$5.92
Office (SF)			\$8.81			\$8.81			\$8.81			\$8.81			\$8.81
Industrial (SF)			\$4.97			\$4.97			\$4.97			\$4.97			\$4.97
Other (avg AM/PM trips)		12.0%	\$6,101		12.0%	\$6,101		12.0%	\$6,101		12.0%	\$6,101		12.0%	\$6,101

*Note that all increases are calculated as percentage of the 2022 Max Fee

Land Use	Annual Adjustment																
	Annual Rate Adjustment																
	2027 Percent of Max	2027 Override - Percent of Max	2027/28 Rate	2028 Percent of Max	2028 Override - Percent of Max	2028/29 Rate	2029 Percent of Max	2029 Override - Percent of Max	2029/30 Rate	2030 Percent of Max	2030 Override - Percent of Max	2030/31 Rate	2031 Percent of Max	2031 Override - Percent of Max	2031/32 Rate		
Single Family (DU)	15%		\$6,596	15%		\$6,596	15%		\$6,596	15%		\$6,596	15%		\$6,596		
Multi-Family (DU)			\$3,889			\$3,889			\$3,889			\$3,889			\$3,889		\$3,889
Retail (SF)		7.0%	\$5.92		7.0%	\$5.92		7.0%	\$5.92		7.0%	\$5.92		7.0%	\$5.92	7.0%	\$5.92
Office (SF)			\$8.81			\$8.81			\$8.81			\$8.81			\$8.81		\$8.81
Industrial (SF)			\$4.97			\$4.97			\$4.97			\$4.97			\$4.97		\$4.97
Other (avg AM/PM trips)		12.0%	\$6,101		12.0%	\$6,101		12.0%	\$6,101		12.0%	\$6,101		12.0%	\$6,101		

*Note that all increases are calculated as percentage of the 2022 Max Fee

Project Rank (Top 15)

Rank	Project Type	Project	Project Sponsor/Lead Agency	Project Urgency	EITDP Allocation	EITDP Allocation Score	Current Project Stage	Risks	Funding	Eligibility Score	Score Total	Priority Score	Total Cost (MM)	Non-EITDP Funding (MM)	EITDP Funding in Approved EITDP Project (MM)	EITDP Funding in Unapproved EITDP Project (MM)	EITDP Funding in Construction Phase by Year 2022 (MM)	Comments
1	Photovoltaic	Non-Hwy Road Interchange Construction - Highway Capacity	AVANCECCTA	3	0%	3	PA&E	3	180	3	183	3	22.00	14.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	Project C-11a will be in Construction Phase by Year 2022 (MM)
2	Photovoltaic	Non-Hwy Trail - Dublin	DA	3	0%	3	PA&E	2	24	3	27	3	11.00	11.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Construction to start in early 2022
3	Photovoltaic	Intermodal	PLS	3	0%	3	PA&E	1.5	183	3	186	3	28.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Not 100% Updated project cost
4	Photovoltaic	Dual Business - Main Campus Parking Expansion	DA/PLS	3	0%	3	PA&E	2	60	3	63	3	108.00	25.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	Not 100% Updated project cost
5	Photovoltaic	Main Campus Road Safety Improvement - Segment 1	CCC	3	0%	3	PA&E	1.5	87	3	90	3	0.00	1.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Photovoltaic	County Transportation Planning Meeting Project (Dublin Segment)	DA	3	0%	3	PA&E	2	137	3	140	3	14.00	6.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Combined safety & widening project and will be based on jurisdiction 11/16/2021 - Updated Project Cost
7	Photovoltaic	Advanced Charge Messaging	PLS/DA/PLS	3	0%	3	PA&E	1	120	3	123	3	34.00	14.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
8	Photovoltaic	4800 Campus Lane - Hwy 64 to Avenue (Photovoltaic)	PLS/ACTC	3	0%	3	PA&E	2		3	11.00	3	211.50	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Sub C-7 placed on ACTC planning project
9	Photovoltaic	Non-Hwy Trail to Dublin City	PLS/PLS	3	0%	3	PA&E	0.5	24	3	27	3	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
10	Photovoltaic	4800 Campus Lane Interchange Modification	LWR/Campus	2	0%	3	PA&E	0.5	23	3	26	3	66.00	67.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
11	Photovoltaic	County Transportation Planning Meeting Project (Main Campus County Segment)	CCC	3	14%	3	PA&E	1.5	130	3	133	3	44.70	13.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	Combined safety & widening project and will be based on jurisdiction
12	Photovoltaic	Sandy Road-640 Interchange	PLS	2	0%	3	PA&E	0.5	23	3	26	3	10.25	1.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	
13	Photovoltaic	4800 Campus Lane Interchange Modification	LWR/Campus	3	0%	3	PA&E	1	24	2	26	3	66.00	66.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
14	Photovoltaic	Intermodal 680	DA/PLS/CCC/CTA	3	0%	3	PA&E	1.5	87	3	90	3	67.20	2.6	0.00	0.00	0.00	PA&E will start November 1, Start PA&E
15	Photovoltaic	Non-Hwy Trail - Limerick	LWR	3	0%	3	PA&E	1.5	80	3	83	3	26.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
16	Photovoltaic	Main Campus Road (Phase 1)	DA/PLS/PLS/DA/PLS	3	0%	3	PA&E	1.5	80	3	83	3	24.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	

Project Rank (Top 25)

Priority Score Rank	Project Type	Project ID	Project Sponsor/Lead Agency	Classification										Total Cost (\$M)	Non-TYIP Funding (\$M)	TYIP Project Approved in FY16-22P (\$M)	Unbudgeted Unallocated (\$M)	Unbudgeted Available (\$M)	Comments
				A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J						
1			AC of Stanislaus County CCO of Contra Costa County CJW of Elkhara DJB of DGSN LJS of PHS PLS of PHA/ASST SALN of San Ramon	Project Agency CJW of DGSN LJS of PHS PLS of PHA/ASST SALN of San Ramon	TYIP Allocation 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100%	Current Project Stage 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100%	Repeatability Score 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100%	Funding Score 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100%	Expertise Score 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100%	Score Total 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100%	Priority Score 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100% 100% of 100%	Total Cost (\$M)	Non-TYIP Funding (\$M)	TYIP Project Approved in FY16-22P (\$M)	Unbudgeted Unallocated (\$M)	Unbudgeted Available (\$M)	Comments		
<p>Total Rank 1-15: \$186,677,643 \$186,677,643 \$186,677,643 \$186,677,643 \$186,677,643 \$186,677,643</p>																			

Project Rank (All)

Priority Score Rank	Project Type	Project	AC - Alameda County CCC - Contra Costa County DUB - Dublin LVR - Livermore P.S. - Pleasanton S.S. - San Ramon	Project/Phase							Priority Score	Total Cost (\$M)	Risk (V12) Earning (\$M)	TVPF (M) Milestone (M) (M)	Unfunded (M) (M)	Unfunded (M) (M)	Unfunded (M) (M)
				A	B	C	D	E	F	G							
				Project Urgency	TVD/Abandon	Project Readiness	Project Funding	Project Effectiveness	Score Total								
				Urgency Score	%TVD/Abandon	Current Project Stage	Readiness Score	Funding Score	Effectiveness Score								
1	Pedestrian/Bicycle	San Jose Trail - Bicycle-Pedestrian Crossing - San Jose Canyon Road		3	0%	1	PALE	2	1.00	3	12.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
2	Pedestrian/Bicycle	San Jose Trail - Dublin	DUB	2	0%	3	PALE	2	2.04	5	13.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
3	Roadway Capacity	San Jose Trail - Whittier		3	0%	3	PALE	1.0	1.02	3	15.02	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
4	Roadway Capacity	Dublin Boulevard - North Canyon Parkway	DUB/LVR	3	0%	3	PALE	2	0.40	3	11.40	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
5	Utility	North Canyon Road Safety Improvement - Segment	CCC	3	0%	3	PALE	1.0	0.07	3	11.07	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Roadway Capacity & Safety	Camino Tassajara/Tranquero Rd Widening Project (Dublin Segment)	DUB	2	0%	3	PALE	2	1.37	3	14.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Roadway Capacity	Paloma/El Cerrito Interchange	PLB/DUB/LVR	3	0%	3	PALE	1	1.20	3	15.20	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
8	Roadway Capacity	6800 Express Lanes - Hwy 68 to Alameda (Atherstone)	PLB/ACTC	3	0%	3	PALE	2	11.00	3	211.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
9	Pedestrian/Bicycle	San Jose Trail to Dublin CIB	PLB/ACTC	2	0%	3	PALE	0.5	3.40	3	10.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
10	Roadway Capacity	6800/Contra Costa Rd Interchange Modification	LVR/Contra	2	0%	3	PALE	0.5	2.34	3	19.34	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
11	Roadway Capacity & Safety	Camino Tassajara/Tranquero Rd Widening Project (Contra Costa County Segment)	CCC	3	14%	2	PALE	1.0	1.00	3	10.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
12	Intersection	San Jose/680 Interchange	PLB	2	0%	3	PALE	0.5	3.24	3	10.24	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
13	Roadway Capacity	6800/Valero Road Interchange Modification	LVR/Contra	3	0%	3	PALE	1	3.00	3	10.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
14	Technology	Alameda 680	DUB/CCC/ACTC	3	0%	3	PALE	1.5	0.33	3	10.33	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
15	Pedestrian/Bicycle	San Jose Trail - Livermore	LVR	3	0%	3	PALE	1.0	0.00	3	10.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
16	Traffic	Valley Link Red (Phase 1)	DUB/LVR/ACTC	3	0%	3	PALE	1.0	0.00	3	10.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
17	Roadway Capacity	San Jose/680 Interchange	PLB	2	0%	3	PALE	0.5	1.00	3	10.00	7.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
18	Safety	Travis Road Safety Improvements	AC	3	0%	3	PALE	1	0.00	3	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
19	Pedestrian/Bicycle	San Jose Trail Connection Improvements at Santa Rita Road	PLB	2	0%	3	PALE	0.5	1.00	3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	

Project Rank (All)

Priority Rank	Project Type	ID	Project	Sponsor/Lead Agency	Project Urgency	Administration										Priority Score	Score Total	Un-allocated Available (FY21)	Comments			
						A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J							
						Project Urgency	% TUSD Allocation	TUSD Allocation Score	Carroll Project Stage	Readiness Score	Funding Score	Effectiveness Score	Score Total	Priority Score	Un-allocated Available (FY21)	TUSD Funding Available (FY21)	Un-allocated Available (FY21)	Comments				
28	roadway Capacity	C-8	Cherry Hillway	PLS	2	0%	3	0	0	0.0	1.32	3	0.32	0.00	21.79	20.00	20.00					
29	Pedestrian/Bicycle	C-10a	San Marcos Trail Bicycle/Pedestrian Crossing - Over Canyon Road	DMRCCCL215	2	0%	3	0	0	1.5	0.00	3	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	19.00				
30	Transit	C-10b	480 Express Bus Service	ACTOCCTA	3	0%	3	0	0	0.0	0.00	3	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
31	roadway Capacity	B-1	480 Interchange (Redesign to Suburbanize)	Quinn	2	0%	3	0	0	1.0	0.00	3	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1764.00			
32	Safety	A-10a	West Road Safety Improvements Phase 1	AC	1	0%	3	0	0	0.0	2.10	2	0.00	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.14	Change call are projected distributed based on amended 2018 SEP Update		
33	Pedestrian/Bicycle	C-11a	San Marcos Trail Safety Improvements	DMRCCCL215	2	0%	3	0	0	0.0	0.00	3	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
34	Technology	C-15	Feasibility Study of Technology Enhancements to Connect Transit with Airside and Airside with Transit (Including Shared Mobility Vehicles and Vehicle-to-Infrastructure Technologies)	DURA BACKUP LATA	2	0%	3	0	0	0.0	0.00	3	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
35	roadway Capacity	C-12	480 Interchange Improvements at Highway Drive	DMR / PLS	3	0%	3	0	0	1.0	0.00	2	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
36	roadway Capacity	B-3	480FF rd Street Interchange Modification	LVR / Quinn	1	0%	3	0	0	0.0	2.41	1	0.11	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	19.82	7.93		
37	Pedestrian/Bicycle	C-11g	San Marcos Trail Bicycle/Pedestrian Crossing - Over Canyon Road	DMRCCCL215	1	0%	3	0	0	0.0	0.00	2	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	19.79		
38	Intersection	C-4	West Road at Chain Avenue Intersection	LVR / AC	2	0%	3	0	0	0.0	0.00	2	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
39	roadway Capacity	B-8	Jack London Blvd Extension	LVR	1	0%	3	0	0	0.0	1.00	1	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.00		
40	Safety	A-10b	West Road Safety Improvements Phase 2	AC	1	0%	3	0	0	0.0	0.25	2	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.82	Change call are projected distributed based on amended 2018 SEP Update	
41	Transit	A-11	Express Shuttle Rapid Transit (ERT) - Phase 2	DMR / LATA	1	0%	3	0	0	0.0	0.15	2	0.00	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
42	Safety	A-9b	Over Canyon Improvements Phase 2	AC	1	3%	3	0	0	0.0	0.00	2	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
43	roadway Capacity	A-9c	DMR 1480 Interchange - Phase 2	LVR / Quinn	1	33%	1	0	0	0.0	3.00	1	0.42	4.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
44	Safety	A-9a	Over Canyon Improvements Phase 1	AC	1	14%	2	0	0	0.0	0.00	2	0.10	4.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
45	Safety	C-2	West Canyon Road Safety Improvement - Segment 3	AC	1	0%	3	0	0	0.0	0.00	1	0.00	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Project Rank (All)

Priority Score Rank	Project Type	ID	Project	Sponsor/Lead Agency	Performance										Total Cost (M\$)	Non-TVDF Funding (M\$)	TVDF Funding (M\$)	Unfunded Available (M\$)	Unfunded Available (M\$)	Comment/ID	
					A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J							
					Project Urgency	TVDF Allocation	Project Readiness	Project Funding	Project Effectiveness	Score Total	Priority Score	TVDF Allocation Score	TVDF Allocation Score	Current Project Stage	Readiness Score	Funding Score	Effectiveness Score				
	Residential Capacity	A-2b	SR M1 Expediently \$-500 to \$-800 - Segment 3 (FULLY FUNDED)	LWR / PLB	AD - Alameda County CCC - Contra Costa County LWR - LWR PLB - PLB SAN - San Ramon	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	Residential Capacity	A-2b	SR M1 Expediently \$-500 to \$-800 - Segment 6 (FULLY FUNDED)	LWR / PLB	AD - Alameda County CCC - Contra Costa County LWR - LWR PLB - PLB SAN - San Ramon	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	Residential Capacity	A-2b	SR M1 / \$-500 Interchange - Phase 1 (COMPLETED)	LWR / Carbu	AD - Alameda County CCC - Contra Costa County LWR - LWR PLB - PLB SAN - San Ramon	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	Residential Capacity	B-10	SR M1 Expediently (M1) Low Cost Change Over Main B to Redwood (COMPLETED)	BNA / CCTA	AD - Alameda County CCC - Contra Costa County LWR - LWR PLB - PLB SAN - San Ramon	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	Transit	B-11b	SR M1 Expediently (M1) Low Cost Change Over Main B to Redwood (COMPLETED)	BNA / CCTA	AD - Alameda County CCC - Contra Costa County LWR - LWR PLB - PLB SAN - San Ramon	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	Residential Capacity	B-7	SR M1 Expediently (M1) Low Cost Change Over Main B to Redwood (COMPLETED)	PLB	AD - Alameda County CCC - Contra Costa County LWR - LWR PLB - PLB SAN - San Ramon	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
	Residential Capacity	C-7a	SR M1 Expediently (M1) Low Cost Change Over Main B to Redwood (COMPLETED)	PLB / ACTC	AD - Alameda County CCC - Contra Costa County LWR - LWR PLB - PLB SAN - San Ramon	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Total Rank 1-377 \$4,645,978,254 \$46,818,719 \$79,616,000 \$46,818,719 \$1,061,971,140

Total Rank 1-131 \$1,648,077,242 \$16,478,714 \$11,316,000 \$16,478,714 \$761,112,700