## Agenda Items:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Call to Order and Introductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Pledge of Allegiance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Public Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>APPROVE Record of Action for April 22, 2019 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>RECEIVE Presentation on Contra Costa County Transportation Expenditure Plan and Sales Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>CONSIDER Recommendation to Board of Supervisors to Support Local and Regional Non-Profit Groups Regarding CCTA Transportation Expenditure Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>RECEIVE Presentation on Public Involvement Strategy and Environmental Justice Issues in the General Plan and Climate Action Plan and PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS, as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>RECEIVE Presentation on Climate Action Plan Vulnerability Assessment and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets and PROVIDE DIRECTION as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>ADOPT Environmental Justice Rubric Developed by the Commission’s Environmental Justice Working Group and RECOMMEND Its Use in Updating the County’s General Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>RECEIVE UPDATE on proposal from Member, District 1, to Recommend the Use of Carbon-Neutral Building Materials in County Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>AMEND Sustainability Commission Bylaws to Extend Term of Service for 60 days or Until an Appointment Is Made to a Vacant Seat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>DISCUSS Proposed Polystyrene Ordinance, and PROVIDE DIRECTION as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>RECEIVE Reports from Sustainability Commission members and alternates, and PROVIDE DIRECTION as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>RECEIVE Report from Sustainability Coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>RECEIVE Report from Sustainability Commission Chair and IDENTIFY TOPICS for next...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTRA COSTA COUNTY SUSTAINABILITY COMMISSION**  
An Advisory Body to the Board of Supervisors

June 24, 2019  
5:00 P.M.  
30 Muir Road, Martinez

Howdy Goudey, Chair, At-Large, Community Group  
Nick Despota, Vice-Chair, Member, District 1  
Shoshana Wechsler, Alternate, District 1  
Victoria Smith, Member, District 2  
Ryan Buckley, Alternate, District 2  
John Sierra, Member, District 3  
Gretchen Logue, Alternate, District 3  
Wes Sullens, Member, District 4  
Travis Curran, Alternate, District 4  
Charles Davidson, Member, District 5  
Vacant, Alternate, District 5  
Harry Thurston, At-Large, Community Group  
Russell Driver, At-Large, Business  
Nicholas Snyder, At-Large, Business  
Doria Robinson, At-Large, Environmental Justice  
Kim Hazard, At-Large, Education

Items may be taken out of order based on the business of the day and preference of the Committee.
report to Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability.

16. The next meeting is currently scheduled for August 26, 2019.

17. Adjourn

The Sustainability Commission will provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities planning to attend Commission meetings. Contact the staff person listed below at least 72 hours before the meeting.

Any disclosable public records related to an open session item on a regular meeting agenda and distributed by the County to a majority of members of the Commission less than 96 hours prior to that meeting are available for public inspection at 30 Muir Road, Martinez, CA during normal business hours. Staff reports related to items on the agenda are also accessible on line at www.co.contra-costa.ca.us.

Public comment may be submitted via electronic mail on agenda items at least one full work day prior to the published meeting time.

For Additional Information Contact: Jody London, Commission Staff
Phone (925) 674-7871 · Fax (925) 674-7250

Glossary of Acronyms, Abbreviations, and other Terms (in alphabetical order): Contra Costa County has a policy of making limited use of acronyms, abbreviations, and industry-specific language in meetings of its Board of Supervisors and Committees. Following is a list of commonly used abbreviations that may appear in presentations and written materials at meetings of the Ad Hoc Sustainability Committee:

AB Assembly Bill
ABAG Association of Bay Area Governments
ACA Assembly Constitutional Amendment
ADA Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
BAAQMD Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BART Bay Area Rapid Transit District
BAYREN Bay Area Regional Energy Network
BGO Better Government Ordinance (Contra Costa County)
BOS Board of Supervisors
CALTRANS California Department of Transportation
AO County Administrative Officer or Office
CAP Climate Action Plan
CARB California Air Resources Board
CCA Community Choice
CCE Community Choice Energy Aggregation
CCWD Contra Costa Water District
CEQA California Environmental Quality Act
CSA County Service Area
CSAC California State Association of Counties
DCC Delta Counties Coalition
DCD Contra Costa County Dept. of Conservation & Development
DPC Delta Protection Commission
DSC Delta Stewardship Council
DWR California Department of Water Resources
EBEW East Bay Energy Watch
EBMUD East Bay Municipal Utility District
EIR Environmental Impact Report (a state requirement)
EIS Environmental Impact Statement (a federal requirement)
FTE Full Time Equivalent
FY Fiscal Year
GHG Greenhouse Gas
GGRF Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds
GIS Geographic Information System
HSD Contra Costa County Health Services Department
IPM Integrated Pest Management
JPA/JEPA Joint (Exercise of) Powers Authority or Agreement
LAMORINDA Area of Lafayette-Moraga-Orinda
MAC Municipal Advisory Council
MBE Minority Business Enterprise
MOA Memorandum of Agreement
MOE Maintenance of Effort
MOU Memorandum of Understanding
MTC Metropolitan Transportation Commission
NACo National Association of Counties
NEPA National Environmental Protection Act
PDA Priority Development Area
PV Photovoltaic
PWD Contra Costa County Public Works Department
RDA Redevelopment Agency or Area
RFI Request For Information
RFP Request For Proposals
RFQ Request For Qualifications
SB Senate Bill
SGC Strategic Growth Council
SR2S Safe Routes to Schools
TWIC Transportation, Water, and Infrastructure Committee
U.S. EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency
Meeting Date: 6/24/2019

Subject: APPROVE Record of Action for April 22, 2019, Sustainability Commission Meeting.

Department: Conservation & Development

Presenter: Jody London, DCD          Contact: Jody London, (925) 674-7871

Referral History:
County Ordinance (Better Government Ordinance 95-6, Article 25-205, [d]) requires that each County Body keep a record of its meetings. Though the record need not be verbatim, it must accurately reflect the agenda and the decisions made in the meeting.

Referral Update:
Any handouts or printed copies of testimony distributed at the meeting will be attached to this meeting record. Links to the agenda and minutes will be available at the Committee web page, to be announced.

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):
Staff recommends approval of the attached Record of Action for the April 22, 2019, Sustainability Commission Meeting with any necessary corrections.

Fiscal Impact (if any):
N/A

ATTACHMENT(S)

04-22-19 Record of Action
1. Call to Order and Introductions

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Public Comment

   Andrew Chahour commented that there are new weed abatement standards in Contra Costa County that he believes could impact fire prevention efforts. The new standards increase the setback requirement. Will Nelson said that the updated General Plan, expected to be complete by the end of 2020, will include measures related to fire, and pointed out that some codes are mandated by the State. Michael Kent said that the County’s Integrated Pest Management Advisory Board looks at issues related to roadside maintenance in the unincorporated County.

4. APPROVE Record of Action for February 25, 2019 meeting.

   The Record of Action was approved unanimously.

   Motion: Smith   Second: Hazard
5. RECEIVE Presentation on Emissions Inventory for 2019 Climate Action Plan Update

Tammy Seale and Eli Krispi from PlaceWorks, the consultants on the County’s General Plan and Climate Action Plan (CAP) updates, discussed the importance of the CAP as a strategic implementation document that complements the General Plan. The General Plan provides vision and goals and extends through 2040; the CAP is focused on a 5-10 year horizon and is more action-oriented. The CAP should be flexible and easy to revise, providing more opportunity for impact.

Seale noted that the scope of the CAP Update has expanded to include an update to the County Operations CAP.

Seale reviewed the timeline for CAP activities. In April and May the team will host community meetings for the General Plan and CAP. They are all listed at EnvisionContraCosta2040.org and will include information and gather community input on issues related to the CAP. There also will be community meetings on specific topics, including climate action, later in Q2 and Q3.

This evening PlaceWorks is presenting the initial emissions inventory. At the June Sustainability Commission meeting PlaceWorks will present the preliminary results of the vulnerability assessment, which looks at areas of particularly sensitivity. At the August meeting will begin opportunities to identify specific measures for the CAP.

Krispi reviewed the process for developing the emissions inventory. Overall, emissions in the unincorporated County using the new baseline year of 2017 are down 13% from the first inventory conducted in 2005. He observed that emissions in most sectors have decreased, and that on-road transportation continues to be by far the largest source of emissions. He also noted that the non-residential building data is incomplete because of challenges obtaining the data from PG&E. PlaceWorks is using 2013 building data as a placeholder. Jody London observed that this is an ongoing, statewide problem.

On the question of emissions from large industrial sources, the County has little control over these stationary sources, which are regulated by the State and regional agencies including the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and Regional Water Quality Control Board. The State does not require that local CAPs include large stationary sources. Commission members expressed interest in seeing them included for comparison.

Krispi reviewed the process and methodology for developing the emissions forecast. He noted that there are some reductions mandated by the State that are factored in to the inventory. In terms of setting target dates, PlaceWorks recommends setting targets for 2030 and 2050, consistent with State targets and guidance.

Commission members asked for data on sensitive communities, which would allow the Commission to consider how to ensure those communities are able to take advantage of programs that can reduce emissions, for example energy efficiency. Commission members suggested they might form working groups to collaborate with the consultants on recommendations for specific sectors.

Marti Roach offered public comment, suggesting the Commission might want to discuss options for higher targets and what has been done elsewhere.

6. CONSIDER proposal from Member, District 1, to Recommend the Use of Carbon-Neutral Building Materials in County Projects.

Nick Despota described a proposal for the Board of Supervisors to use the County’s procurement
process to specify the use of manufactured limestone aggregates that contain captured and sequestered carbon dioxide for concrete in County-funded projects. Warren Lai, Deputy Director, Contra Costa County Public Works Department, that the County uses concrete in horizontal projects (i.e., roads) and vertical projects (i.e., buildings). Lai described the process of adopting materials specifications and the County’s reliance on standard-setting entities like CalTrans. Lai also described the process the County uses to vet new materials. He said the County looks for opportunities to use recycled materials on-site and avoid transportation costs.

Commission members discussed potential opportunities to learn from work occurring in other counties, particularly Alameda and Marin. They also expressed concern about the wording of the current proposal.

The Commission voted unanimously to direct Nick Despota and Wes Sullens to explore the proposal with County staff.

Motion: Smith       Second: Sullens

7. ADOPT Environmental Justice Rubric Developed by the Commission’s Environmental Justice Working Group and RECOMMEND Its Use in Updating the County’s General Plan.

The Commission discussed the proposed rubric. Will Nelson, County staff, clarified that the General Plan is a land-use planning document. Michael Kent, County Hazardous Materials Ombudsman, recalled that when the County adopted an Environmental Justice policy in 2003, there was someone in the County Administrator’s Office who was charged to work with all departments on how to implement the policy. That position was not refilled after the Great Recession. Kent noted that the Hazardous Materials Commission has investigated and reported back to the Board of Supervisors on this topic several times. After further discussion, the group determined that it will further refine this proposal and bring it back at the next meeting.

8. DISCUSS Community Organizations to Consult in Preparation of the County’s General Plan Update and PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS to Staff.

The group discussed the importance of having broad participation in the General Plan and Climate Action Plan updates. Will Nelson said there is interest in identifying more contacts with non-governmental organizations, etc. The group directed the Sustainability Coordinator to set up an online document where members can post suggestions.

9. RECEIVE Reports from Sustainability Commission members and alternates, and PROVIDE DIRECTION as needed.

Victoria Smith reported that she participated in the first meeting of the Technical Advisory Working Group for the General Plan Update.

Gretchen Logue reported that Tanya Drlik, the County’s Integrated Pest Management Coordinator, has retired. A search is ongoing for her replacement.

Ryan Buckley reported that the outreach working group is organizing to conduct an inventory of environmental groups in the County and will report back.

10. RECEIVE Report from Sustainability Coordinator.

Jody London summarized the written report included with the agenda. The Commission directed London
to send a letter of support from the Sustainability Commission to the California Public Utilities Commission regarding the value of the Bay Area Regional Energy Network.

11. RECEIVE Report from Sustainability Commission Chair and IDENTIFY TOPICS for next report to Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability.

The group recommended the following items be highlighted for the Board of Supervisors Sustainability Committee:

- Environmental justice rubric and potential applicability to the Climate Action Plan and General Plan updates.
- Emissions inventory presentation. Note that the Commission is still working on this and will want more detailed demographic information.

12. The next meeting is currently scheduled for June 24, 2019.

13. Adjourn
Contra Costa County
Sustainability Commission

Meeting Date: 6/24/2019
Subject: RECEIVE Presentation on Contra Costa County Transportation Expenditure Plan and Sales Tax

Department: Presenter: Tim Haile, Deputy Executive Director, Contra Costa Transportation Authority
Contact: Jody London, Department of Conservation and Development

Referral History:

Referral Update:
The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) has initiated the development of a Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) for inclusion in a potential transportation sales tax measure. CCTA’s concept is to propose an additional half cent sales tax, over and above the current Measure J, as was the case with Measure X (2016). Measure X did not garner the required 2/3 support from the voters. CCTA is considering placing the new measure on either the March or November 2020 ballot. Either date requires a significantly compressed TEP development process.

The Board of Supervisors at its May 21, 2019 meeting discussed the potential transportation sales tax and TEP. The Board directed staff to convey County priorities for a potential new sales tax and TEP, and declined to take a formal position. The Transportation, Water, and Infrastructure Committee (TWIC) of the Board is monitoring this matter. The staff report provided at the June 10, 2019 TWIC meeting is included as Attachment A and provides background on the engagement to date by the Board of Supervisors.

CCTA staff have provided numerous reports to the CCTA Board about the TEP and potential sales tax. Links to those reports can be found as indicated below. A fact sheet that outlines the components of the TEP is included as Attachment B.

Policy Discussion
https://ccta.granicus.com/MetaViewer.php?view_id=1&event_id=961&meta_id=43970

Work Plan

Public Opinion Research
**Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):**
RECEIVE Presentation on Contra Costa County Transportation Expenditure Plan and Sales Tax.

**Fiscal Impact (if any):**
N/A.

**ATTACHMENT(S)**

*Transportation Sales Tax – Report to TWIC*
*Transportation Sales Tax – CCTA Fact Sheet*
TRANSPORTATION, WATER & INFRASTRUCTURE
COMMITTEE
Meeting Date: 06/10/2019
Subject: RECEIVE report, DISCUSS County priorities for CCTA's 2020 Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)/Sales Tax and DIRECT staff as appropriate.
Submitted For: John Kopchik,
Department: Conservation & Development
Referral No.: 3
Referral Name: Monitor the Contra Costa Transportation Authority including efforts to implement Measure J
Presenter: John Cunningham, DCD
Contact: John Cunningham (925)674-7833

Referral History:
The Contra Costa Transportation Authority's (CCTA's) effort to bring a sales tax/transportation expenditure plan (TEP) to the ballot in 2020 has not been taken up by the Transportation, Water, and Infrastructure Committee (TWIC). The full Board of Supervisors discussed the item at their May 21, 2019 meeting, and directed staff to use the 2016 Measure X TEP and the County's priorities for that effort to guide input for the current 2020 effort.

Staff has developed input based on that direction and is bringing it to TWIC for discussion, refinement, and further direction including how to communicate the County's position to CCTA.

Referral Update:
[Staff Note: As this agenda was being posted, CCTA posted an Authority Board Special TEP Meeting Agenda. Given the time constraints this process is operating under, the CCTA packet in its entirety is attached to accomodate a complete discussion.]

Listed below are 1) the County's priorities/input for the 2016 Measure X and how those priorities were ultimately reflected in the Measure, and 2) Those priorities updated for the 2020 effort. Categories include Local Road Funding Needs, Transit Service Improvements, Improved Land Use Coordination/Community Development Transportation Program, and an expanded, improved Safe Routes to School Program.

Local Road Funding Needs ("Local Streets Maintenance & Improvements" in Measure J, aka "return-to-source")
2016 Measure X: The BOS supported the recommendations of each Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPCs): SWAT: 25%-30%, TRANSPAC: 30%, TRANSPLAN: 30%, WCCTAC: 28%. The BOS cited increasing complete streets and storm water design requirements in their argument for increased funding.

Ultimately, the Measure X TEP had 23.79% for this program.

2020 TEP Update/Recommendation: RTPC recommendations are not yet consistently available. However, the Contra Costa County Public Managers have communicated a preference for 24%.
Discussion: The passage of Senate Bill 1 (2017 - various gas tax increases), which increased gas tax revenue for local jurisdictions, has been cited as an reason to reduce the funding levels for this program. Counter argument: 1) SB 1 did not completely address the substantial shortfall, and 2) as evidenced by CCTA's polling and observing the relevant policy framework (complete streets, vision zero, active transportation) there is a growing need for "first mile/last mile" connections and active transportation projects. These are inherently local projects requiring increases in local funding.

Transit Service Improvements:

2016 Measure X

Accessible Transit: The County successfully advocated for additional funding and "fundamental administrative" changes to be addressed in the TEP.

Ultimately this program was funded at 4% and required the Accessible Transportation Strategic (ATS) Plan be conducted (which is currently underway).

Fixed Route/Conventional Transit: The County's letter cited the recent (at that time) passage of SB 743 (2013, Transition from Level of Service [LOS] to Vehicle Miles Traveled[VMT]) and speculation that transit service would be a critical mitigation measure in this new environmental review paradigm.

Ultimately, Measure X included the following program category, "Improving our BART, Bus, Ferry and Train Networks" funded at 26.79%. This category included 5 sub-programs targeting different types/locations of transit service.

2020 TEP Update/Recommendation

Accessible Transit: Given that the ATS Plan is underway, and it had its origins in the 2016 Measure X process, the 2020 TEP could reference the existing planning process and commit to funding the recommendations. 

Discussion: During the process to initiate the ATS Plan staff conducted a substantial amount of outreach to gather feedback and secure commitments for collaboration. Staff witnessed a considerable amount of resistance and tension relative to the effort. A successful ATS Plan is critical for the 2020 TEP to result in material improvements to accessible transit systems.

Fixed Route/Conventional Transit: Again, CCTA polling indicated an interest in increased travel options and "first mile, last mile" connections. The public transit system, as it evolves in response to various pressures, should be well-positioned to provide these connections. 

Discussion: In addition to the rationale above, pressures from AB32, SB375, SB743 are only increasing. These legislative initiatives, focused on greenhouse gas and vehicle miles traveled reduction, increase the need for for improved/expanded public transit. This need comes at a time when transit districts are reducing service and facing operational challenges.

Improved Land Use Coordination/Community Development Transportation Program (CDTP): This would be a new program, Measure J does not have an equivalent program. The CDTP would focus on "making more efficient use of our transportation infrastructure". Put more directly, the goal was to incentivize land use changes that would result in the surplus, off-peak transportation capacity being used. Co-benefits would be increased local jobs and housing.

2016 Measure X: Ultimately, the BOS proposal "Improved Land Use Coordination" resulted in the "Community Development Transportation Program" being included in the TEP. That program description can be seen in the attached 2016 TEP.

2020 TEP Recommendation: Conservation and Development staff have marked up the 2016 Measure X "Community Development Transportation Program" which is attached for review/discussion.

Discussion: Since the 2016 Measure X effort the housing crisis has grown much more acute with the need for infill and affordable units also increasing. The off-peak (reverse) commute capacity remains an underutilized investment.
**Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program:** As mentioned during the 5-21 Board discussion, this concept did not get much traction during the Measure X effort.

2016 Measure X: The County's proposal was to capitalize on a "Safe Routes to School Master Plan" conducted by CCTA and implement a comprehensive effort to increase the bike/walk rate for students during the home/school/home trip. At the time, the State had recently adopted a formal Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Curriculum, the proposal was to work with the school districts to consistently implement the curriculum on a consistent, countywide basis.

Ultimately, Measure X included a conventional SR2S program funded at %2.23.

**2020 TEP Recommendation:** Staff believes that the concept continues to be valid.

**Discussion:** SR2S programs have been in existence for approximately 20 years. These programs are typically grant funded and support both ongoing programs and activities in response to specific opportunities and catastrophic events. The proposal is for a more proactive, systematic program.

In summary the program would: 1) systematically examine all 285 public K-12 schools in the County, determine what the capital and programmatic needs are at each site and fund implementation, and 2) fund the implementation of the states adopted bicycle/pedestrian curriculum in cooperation the 19 school districts in the County. A substantial amount of the research and data collection was already done as a part of CCTA's SR2S Masterplan which never moved to an implementation phase. A new TEP could leveraging the existing work and fund that phase.

**Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):**
RECEIVE report, DISCUSS County priorities for the Contra Costa Transportation Authority's 2020 Transportation Expenditure Plan/Sales Tax and DIRECT staff as appropriate.

**Fiscal Impact (if any):** None.

---

**Attachments-Y**

2016 Measure X: CDTP - Revised DRAFT
2016 MeasX TEP
CCTA 6-4-19 TEP Special Meeting
History
Suggested Language
MISSION
To advance transportation, ease congestion, and prepare Contra Costa County for future safe mobility.

VISION
Strive to preserve and enhance the quality of life of local communities with integrated, reliable, and accessible transportation that optimizes the existing transportation system, leverages emerging technologies and provides seamless multimodal choices.

BUILDING A NEW TRANSPORTATION FUTURE
We strive to achieve this vision and fulfill our mission by focusing on the following goals:

- **Ease traffic congestion**, improve freeway traffic flow, and reduce bottlenecks.
- **Make public transportation more accessible**, convenient, and affordable for seniors, students, commuters, and the disabled; and provide better mobility options for all.
- **Optimize the transportation system**, enhance local, regional, and express bus service; improve connections between modes; and leverage technology.
- **Improve air quality, create jobs, and generate economic benefits**; increase personal quality time and overall quality of life.
- **Repave local streets, repair potholes, and synchronize signals**; smooth traffic flow, improve neighborhood streets and intersections, and enhance bike and pedestrian connections.

A ROADMAP TO THE FUTURE
The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (Authority) will apply the following principles to meet the goals of a potential new local transportation sales tax measure for Contra Costa County:

- **Defined Benefits**. Use transportation sales tax to achieve defined outcomes and benefits.
- **Public Participation**. Conduct a public outreach program to collect input from stakeholders, residents and the communities throughout Contra Costa County.
- **Accountability and Transparency**. Protect and monitor the public’s investment.
- **Balanced Approach**. Balance the needs and benefits for all people and areas of Contra Costa County to provide an equitable and sustainable transportation system.
Principles for Development of a Transportation Expenditure Plan

The Principles for Development of a Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) will guide the preparation of a TEP. The mission, vision, goals, and principles will be identified, as well as potential benefits from the TEP investments.

Deliverables:

Key Milestones:
- Draft Principles were presented to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (Authority) Board for input at the April 17, 2019 Authority Board meeting.
- Receive comments, revise and approve Principles for Development of a TEP at the May 15, 2019 Authority Board meeting.

Outreach Plan

The Outreach Plan graphic shows the general flow of information among the participants involved in the development of a TEP.

Deliverables:
✔ Outreach Plan graphic.

Key Milestones:
- Draft Outreach Plan graphic was presented to the Authority Board for input at the April 17, 2019 Authority Board meeting.
- Receive comments and revise Outreach Plan graphic for the May 15, 2019 Authority Board meeting.

Schedules, Budget, and Funding

1 Schedule | A schedule has been developed in consideration of the March 2020 election. The schedule includes key dates and milestones for a TEP development process and placing it on the ballot.
2 **Budget for TEP Development** | Estimated costs and budget have been developed for consideration of the March 2020 election. The costs include consultant support services and outreach efforts.

3 **Budget to place a TEP on Ballot** | Estimated costs and budget have been developed to place a potential TEP on the March 2020 ballot.

4 **Funding** | A potential funding source has been identified to support the budget for potential TEP Development and to place a TEP on the March 2020 ballot.

Deliverables:
- ✔ March 2020 election schedule
- ✔ Cost estimate for TEP development
- ✔ Cost estimate for placing a TEP on the ballot
- ✔ Proposal for funding necessary activities

Key Milestones:
- ✔ The schedule for the March 2020 ballot was presented to the Authority Board for input at the April 17, 2019 Authority Board meeting.
- ✔ The schedule, budget, and funding will be presented to the Authority Board for approval at the May 15, 2019 Authority Board meeting.

**Public Outreach**

1 **Community Conversations** | The Authority will use an innovative approach to reach residents and seek input from the public through a variety of methods throughout the County.

2 **Public Opinion Research** | The Authority will conduct public opinion research including focus groups and polling.

3 **Informational Materials** | Informational materials will be created to educate residents and the public about the proposed TEP.

Deliverables:
- ✔ Public Outreach Plan
- ✔ Public Opinion Research
- ✔ Informational Materials

Key Milestones:
- ✔ A focus group update was presented to the Authority Board at the April 17, 2019 Authority Board Meeting.
An update on public opinion research will be presented to the Authority Board at the May 15, 2019 Authority Board Meeting.

**Stakeholder Outreach**

The Authority will reach out to key stakeholder groups and key elected officials to schedule meetings and not form an Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee.

1. **Key Stakeholder Groups** | Authority Board members, staff and other designated individuals will reach out early in a TEP development process to groups representing various interests.

2. **Key Elected Officials** | Authority Board members, staff and other designated individuals will reach out throughout a TEP development process to key elected officials to provide updates for the development of a proposed TEP.

**Deliverables:**

- Stakeholder Toolkits (including overview of Work Plan and schedule, informational materials, etc.).

**Key Milestones:**

- Initial Stakeholder Toolkit with work plan and schedule to be available after the May 15, 2019 Authority Board meeting, and updated throughout the TEP development process.

**Regional Input**

1. **Public Managers Association (PMA) and Contra Costa Engineers Advisory Committee (CCEAC)** | Authority staff will provide updates on TEP development and seek input from the PMA (and CCEAC through the PMA) through regularly scheduled monthly PMA meetings.

2. **County** | Authority staff will coordinate outreach, seek input and provide updates on TEP development to the County Board of Supervisors and County staff, including presentations as requested at scheduled Board of Supervisors meetings.

3. **Cities/Towns** | Authority staff will coordinate outreach, seek input and provide updates on TEP development to the Cities/Towns in Contra Costa County including presentations as needed at City/Town Council meetings.

4. **Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs)** | Authority staff will coordinate outreach, seek input and provide updates on TEP development to the RTPCs at scheduled Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) and Board meetings. When possible, the outreach will be coordinated with the Authority’s effort to seek input on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) development.
RTPC Review/Comment on subsequent Draft TEPs | Authority staff will make presentations and solicit input from RTPC TACs and Boards throughout a TEP development process.

5 Transit Operators | Authority staff will coordinate outreach, seek input and provide updates on TEP development to transit operators through Authority Standing Committees (such as the Bus Transit Coordinating Committee).

Deliverables:

✓ As needed Presentations.

Key Milestones:

✓ Initial Presentations and materials to be developed and presented for regional input after the Authority Board approves an initial Draft TEP.

TEP Development

1 Authority Board, Staff and Designated Individuals | If the Authority Board approves the TEP Guiding Principles and Work Plan at the May 2019 Authority Board meeting, Authority staff and other designated individuals will begin development of an initial draft of a TEP. The Authority will hold Special Authority Board meetings to guide the development and approve a TEP. An initial draft TEP will be presented to the Authority Board for consideration and input. After input is received on the initial draft TEP, Authority staff and other designated individuals will seek regional input into the draft TEP through outreach efforts including presentations to Cities/Towns, County, RTPCs, PMA, Transit Operators and Stakeholders. A final TEP will be presented to the Authority Board at a special meeting in August 2019 for consideration and approval.

2 Consultant Assistance | Consultant resources will be used to support Authority staff efforts for development of a TEP, schedules and budget; informational materials, technical support for projects and programs costs and schedules, presentations, and administrative tasks.

3 Updates to Transportation Needs and Funding Outlook | The Authority will update the 2016 TEP and prepare an initial draft TEP based on unfunded transportation needs, focus group and survey data received in April/May 2019, and anticipated funding amounts of recently approved transportation funding programs such as Senate Bill 1 (SB1), Regional Measure 3 (RM3), etc.

TEP Strategies | Authority staff will review other recently approved TEPs, new methods for balancing flexibility and accountability, investing for new mobility solutions, planning for emerging technologies, and maximizing funding leverage opportunities. Staff may present information regarding strategies to developing a TEP, such as:
Programmatic funding categories of project and program investments (i.e. transit, return to source)

Performance-based and incentive-based funding programs

Emerging mobility and technologies

Intelligent transportation systems

4 Final TEP | Authority staff will update a draft TEP based on Authority Board, regional and stakeholder input. A final TEP will be presented to the Authority Board for consideration and approval at a special meeting in August 2019.

5 Update Revenue Forecast | Authority staff will update revenue forecasts for various scenarios of a possible new sales tax measure.

6 Update Costs/Schedules for Current and Future Projects/Programs | Authority staff and project sponsors will update costs and schedules for projects and programs to be considered for inclusion in a TEP. When possible, this task will be coordinated with the RTP Call for Projects currently underway.

Deliverables:

Authority staff report on Transportation Needs and Funding Outlook (may be consolidated with other staff report topics).

Authority staff report on TEP Strategies for consideration (may be consolidated with other staff report topics).

Draft and final TEP.

Revenue forecasts for various scenarios.

Updated projects and programs costs and schedules.

Key Milestones:

Draft Work Plan was presented to the Authority Board for input at the April 17, 2019 Authority Board meeting.

Final Work Plan will be presented to the Authority Board for approval at the May 15, 2019 Authority Board meeting.

Initial draft TEP will be presented to the Authority Board for consideration and input at the June 19, 2019 Authority Board meeting.

The final TEP will be presented to the Authority Board for approval at a special meeting of the Authority Board in August 2019.
March 2020 Ballot Election Schedule

Authority Board Actions

April 17, 2019  Provide input on Guiding Principles and Work Plan.

May 15, 2019  Approve Guiding Principles, development of a TEP, Work Plan and funding.

June 19, 2019  Approve circulation of initial and subsequent draft TEP for review and comment.

August 2019  Adoption of proposed TEP, approve circulation to Cities/Towns and County for approval - SPECIAL AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING in August 2019.

Oct. 30, 2019  Approve TEP, authorization to put Measure on ballot - SPECIAL AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING on October 30, 2019.

Other Agency Actions

Sep. – Oct. 2019  City/Town and County Consider Proposed TEP | Cities and Towns with majority population and the County Board of Supervisors must approve the TEP.

Nov. 19, 2019  County Board of Supervisors Considers County Ordinance to Place a TEP on Ballot | County Board of Supervisors would consider and adopt potential County Ordinance to consolidate special election on Authority Tax measure for the March 2020 election.

December 6, 2019  Registrar of Voters | If approved by Cities/Towns and Counties, consolidate election, place Measure on Ballot.

Attachments

✓ Outreach Plan graphic
Meeting Date: 6/24/2019  
Subject: CONSIDER Recommendation to Board of Supervisors to Support Local and Regional Non-Profit Groups Regarding CCTA Transportation Expenditure Plan  
Department:  
Presenter: Nick Despota, Vice Chair and Member, District 1  
Contact: Jody London, Department of Conservation and Development  

Referral History:  

Referral Update: TransForm, a non-profit organization focused on transportation and land use policy, is circulating the attached draft letter to the Board and staff of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA), urging CCTA to consider priorities for a potential 2020 sales tax measure. As an advisory body to the Board of Supervisors, the Sustainability Commission can advise the Board on the Commission’s recommendations regarding the letter.  

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s): CONSIDER Recommendation to Board of Supervisors to Support Local and Regional Non-Profit Groups Regarding CCTA Transportation Expenditure Plan  

Fiscal Impact (if any): N/A.  

ATTACHMENT(S)  

DRAFT Letter from Advocacy Groups to CCTA Board
June 5, 2019

Board and Staff
Contra Costa Transportation Authority
2999 Oak Road
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Re: New Transportation Expenditure Plan

Dear Board and Staff:

As local and regional non profit organizations, we have come together to actively participate in the Contra Costa County Transportation Authority’s (CCTA) process to develop a potential new transportation sales tax measure to be placed on the ballot in March 2020. Our goal is to help ensure diverse voices are heard and community-supported transportation solutions are considered, resulting in stronger outcomes. We will be actively working to engage and empower Contra Costa residents, particularly low-income families, people of color, youth, seniors, people with disabilities, transit users, and people who walk and bike to get around.

Vision:
We envision affordable, safe, sustainable, convenient, and healthy communities that enable people of all ages, incomes, places, and abilities to be easily connected to homes, jobs, schools, recreation, and other destinations in a manner that significantly surpass existing state and regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction and air quality improvement goals.

Since the failure of the CCTA’s 2016 Measure X, climate change, housing and transportation costs, inequality, and traffic congestion have all gotten worse, with growing concern on all these issue areas among the public and voters. As such a 2020 measure demands a radical shift from Measure X, one that is transformational for Contra Costa County’s transportation system.

Outcomes and priorities: We urge CCTA Board and staff to consider the following recommendations for a 2020 measure:

1. **Meaningfully engage the community.** After a failed attempt to pass a half-cent transportation sales tax (Measure X) in 2016, we are concerned with the aggressive timeline to develop the TEP for a new 2020 measure. A draft set of expenditures are already being presented to the Board in June, just weeks after the Board agreed to proceed with the development of the measure in May, with a final TEP to be voted on in August. That said, we suggest several strategies that may help mitigate this issue:
   - Allocate a significant amount of the $700,000 that the CCTA has allocated for outreach to provide funding for Contra Costa County community-based organizations to engage in the process and provide meaningful input. The latest
staff proposal references the inclusion of community based organizations (CBOs) as part of the subregional outreach process but does not identify the amount available to fund CBOs.

- Ensure that a major focus of the outreach will be on identifying the needs (through linguistically and culturally appropriate best practices) of low-income families, people of color, youth, and other transit-dependent populations, given that polling, surveys, and public input meetings tend to under-represent these populations.
- The staff proposal plans for one in person community meeting in each subregion with additional meetings possible given time and budget constraints. Any meaningful outreach process will require more than one community meeting in each subregion.
- Ensure that this outreach is not a one-way communication with the community/public, but rather a back-and-forth where community input helps shape the priorities in the ballot measure. TEP changes that are made based on this feedback should be clearly documented and communicated.

2. **Commit to performance-oriented and outcomes-focused project and program selection.**

- We strongly recommend that the plan include a clear prioritization process to develop projects and programs that meet forward-thinking principles and performance measures.
- It’s critical that the measure be able to adapt over time to respond to changing needs, as well as innovations and disruptions in transportation as we know it, avoiding locking in projects that could become obsolete over the life of the plan.

3. **The measure must significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) and vehicle miles of travel (VMT) and commit to no new GHG and VMT-inducing projects.** Projects and programs in the measure should help the county surpass state and regional GHG and VMT reduction targets, rather than making it more difficult to attain those goals. As such, the measure must:
  - Allocate a large majority of ballot measure funds (we recommend ¾) for high-quality, affordable, and environmentally sustainable public transportation improvements and other active transportation improvements.
  - Focus roadway funding on moving more people with fewer cars, as well as maintenance, repair, and safety improvements. The approach to congestion relief must be on strategies the result in less driving and fewer cars on the road such as transit lanes, zero emission express bus services, and carpool programs.

4. **Prioritize social equity and improve transportation options for all.** Given growing inequality, rising poverty, homelessness, barriers to accessing employment and other necessities, and the fact that sales tax measures place a greater burden on the poor, the TEP must have a strong emphasis on advancing social equity. Disadvantaged populations must benefit the most from the measure’s spending. Key principles and strategies include:
○ Providing better mobility options for everyone, especially those with the greatest transportation barriers, including youth, seniors, people of lower incomes, and people with disabilities.

○ Improving safe access to essential destinations for all people, with an emphasis on protecting vulnerable populations and on traffic collision hot-spots.

○ **Increasing transportation and housing affordability** in order to increase transit use, walking, and biking rates, and help address the county’s rising cost of living. Strategies include:
  - Increasing the affordability of transportation options such as through means based fares, and
  - Providing more affordable opportunities to live near transit and jobs. Strategies may include incentivizing affordable transit oriented development by including affordable housing production as a key criterion for allocation of sales tax funds or setting aside funding to assist local jurisdictions in getting more affordable homes built near transit.
  - The latest staff proposal contains important language on addressing the housing crisis through housing element of the general plan and the regional needs allocation process. However, these policies need to go further and should include incentives structured similar to those in MTC’s Housing Incentive Program (HIP) and focus on the deepest levels of housing affordability.

○ **Supporting community stabilization efforts** in cases where projects and new investments lead to displacement pressures.

○ **Supporting quality jobs for working people**, including ensuring that all capital projects are built under project labor agreements (PLA) between the CCTA and the Contra Costa Building Trades.

5. Protect and strengthen the Urban Limit Line and protections for open space, and commit at least 6% of all funds to a Regional Advanced Mitigation Fund to offset any negative environmental impacts (mitigations) of the measure up front.

**Allocations:** Considering the above proposed outcomes and recommendations, we propose the following starting point for Transportation Expenditure Plan investments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects and Programs</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit, Services for Seniors, People with Disabilities, and Youth, Means Based Fare Programs, and Innovative First-Last Mile Connections</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Local and express bus transit improvements - 35%
- BART service, maintenance, safety, and access improvements - 15%
- Services for youth, seniors, and people with disabilities - 6%
- Innovative first-last mile connections - 4%
- Means based fare programs, including outreach and incentives for low income micro mobility memberships and programs - 4%

| Local Street and Road Maintenance and Improvements (5% dedicated to incentives for affordable housing near transit) | 15% |
| Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities and Programs | 11% |
| Highway Improvements | 10% |
| Regional Advanced Mitigation Fund (6% of entire measure) |  |

Thank you for the opportunity to share our initial concerns and recommendations. We look forward to working with you over the summer on developing a plan that moves all people in Contra Costa County forward safely, conveniently, sustainably, and equitably.

Sincerely,

Bob Allen  
Policy and Advocacy Campaign Director, Urban Habitat  
bob@urbanhabitat.org

Brian Schmidt  
Program Director, Greenbelt Alliance  
bschmidt@greenbelt.org

Chris Lepe  
Regional Policy Director, TransForm  
clepe@transformca.org

Dave Campbell  
Advocacy Director, Bike East Bay  
dave.campbell62@gmail.com

Juan Pablo Galván  
Land Use Manager, Save Mount Diablo  
jpgalvan@savemountdiablo.org
Meeting Date: 6/24/2019

Subject: RECEIVE Presentation on Public Involvement Strategy and Environmental Justice Issues in the General Plan and Climate Action Plan and PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS, as needed

Department: Conservation & Development

Presenter: Joanna Janson, PlaceWorks  Contact: Jody London, DCD

Referral History:
The County is updating its General Plan and Climate Action Plan. Throughout 2019, the Sustainability Commission will engage with the consultants on this project to provide feedback and suggestions.

Referral Update:
The County has completed the first round of community meetings for the General Plan and Climate Action Plan updates. Staff and the consultants from PlaceWorks are stepping back to identify strategies for building on the community engagement going forward. This is an opportune time for the Sustainability Commission to provide additional ideas and consider whether it wishes to conduct additional outreach specific to the Climate Action Plan.

The General Plan and the Climate Action Plan will each consider goals, policies, and actions that address the needs of “disadvantaged”, or “frontline”, communities most impacted by exposure to pollution. The consultants and staff seek preliminary input from the Commission on environmental justice goals, policies, and actions. See attached presentation.

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):
RECEIVE Presentation on Public Involvement Strategy and Environmental Justice Issues in the General Plan and Climate Action Plan and PROVIDE SUGGESTIONS, as needed.

Fiscal Impact (if any):
N/A.

ATTACHMENT(S)

Presentation on Public Involvement Strategy and Environmental Justice Issues
Envision Contra Costa 2040

General Plan

Zoning Code

Climate Action Plan

Environmental Impact Report
Introductions

» PlaceWorks Team

• Joanna Jansen, Principal-in-Charge
• Tammy Seale, Associate Principal, CAP Lead
• Eli Krispi, Associate, Climate Action and Resilience
• Tanya Sundberg, General Plan Project Manager
Opportunities for Public Involvement

» Community-Based Meetings
  • Identify community-specific issues and vision (spring 2019)
  • Formulate guiding principles, policies, and actions (summer - fall 2019)
  • Review community profiles, policies, and actions (late 2019)

» Countywide Meetings
  • Open houses to identify issues, hopes, and concerns (May 2019)
  • Respond to ideas for General Plan, Zoning Code, and CAP (fall 2019)
  • Present Draft General Plan and Draft CAP (spring 2019)
Opportunities for Public Involvement

» Envisioncontracosta2040.org
» Online questions
» Focused Meetings
» Sustainability Commission
» Planning Commission
» Board of Supervisors
COMMUNITY HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

Community Health Overview
Community members, planners, and public health experts increasingly understand that policies regarding where and how communities develop have a direct effect on physical and mental health. Planning and development decisions affecting proximity of different land uses, how roadway networks connect (or don’t), and access to parks, trails, and grocery stores, affect residents’ day to day opportunities to eat healthy food, walk, bike, play outside, breathe clean air, and enjoy social interaction. See the Environmental Justice and Hazards & Safety sections of this Briefing Book for discussions of air quality and other risks to health. Over the long term, these factors influence a person's overall health and likelihood of developing certain diseases.

For many common health factors, residents in Contra Costa County fare better than others in California and the nation, including diabetes, heart disease, and high blood pressure. However, for asthma, obesity, and breast, colorectal, lung, and prostate cancers, rates are higher in Contra Costa than in the rest of California, and in some cases, the nation. The map to the right highlights the locations in the county where asthma rates are highest – mainly, west of Interstate 80 and throughout the northern portion of the county along the Highway 4 corridor and shoreline.

In 2018, Contra Costa County ranked #13 out of the 58 counties in California for what's called the "triple death rate," which accounts for the number of deaths from all causes per 1,000 people in the
Focused Meetings

- Intent: to “roll up our sleeves” for review and discussion of proposed draft policies, actions, and CAP content with knowledgeable and well-connected stakeholders, experts, and advocates familiar with environmental justice and sustainability
- Convene a countywide meeting
- Solicit volunteers for ongoing involvement
- Provide draft content for group review and convene follow up meetings for discussion and feedback
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| June 2019 (today)| • CAP: vulnerability assessment, targets, measures  
                 • Environmental justice intro, disadvantaged communities mapping, community input review |
| August 2019      | • CAP: measure development  
                 • Environmental justice policies and actions – preliminary input |
| October 2019     | • CAP: draft measures, implementation program  
                 • Environmental justice policies and actions – review draft |
| December 2019    | • CAP: review Draft CAP  
                 • Revised environmental justice policies and actions  
                 • General Plan update status report |
Environmental Justice in the General Plan
What is Environmental Justice?

The fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.

CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE §65040.12(E)
Pollution Sources

- Freeways & High-Traffic Roads
- Distribution Centers
- Railyards
- Refineries
- Gas Stations

EMITS:
- Diesel particulate matter & ozone precursors
- Diesel particulate matter & ozone precursors
- Diesel particulate matter & ozone precursors
- Particulate matter & ozone precursors, various toxic air pollutants
- Benzene & ozone precursors

HEALTH RISKS:
- Increased risk of cancer and premature death
- Respiratory illnesses, including asthma
- Increased risk of cancer and premature death
- Respiratory illnesses, including asthma
- Increased risk of cancer and premature death
- Respiratory illnesses, including asthma
- Increased risk of cancer
- Respiratory illnesses, including asthma
- Nervous system depression
- Nausea, tremors, drowsiness, dizziness, headaches, intoxication, and unconsciousness
Highest Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) Emitters

1. Shell Martinez Refinery
2. Chevron Products Company
3. Tesoro Refining & Marketing Company LLC
4. West Contra Costa County Landfill
5. Phillips 66 Company - San Francisco Refinery
6. Phillips 66 Carbon Plant
7. Los Medanos Energy Center
8. Delta Energy Center
9. Air Liquide Large Industries US LP
10. Criterion Catalysts Company LP
Disadvantaged Communities

» CalEnviroscreen Rankings based on 20 indicators:

- Air Quality: Ozone
- Air Quality: PM$_{2.5}$
- Diesel Particulate Matter
- Drinking Water Contaminants
- Pesticide Use
- Toxic Releases from Facilities
- Traffic Density
- Cleanup Sites
- Groundwater Threats
- Hazardous Waste Generators & Facilities
- Impaired Water Bodies
- Solid Waste Sites & Facilities
- Asthma
- Cardiovascular Disease
- Low Birth Weight Infants
- Educational Attainment
- Housing Burden
- Linguistic Isolation
- Poverty
- Unemployment
Disadvantaged Communities

Populations of Color

Low-Income Populations
Disadvantaged Communities

CalEnviroscreen Rankings
Senate Bill 1000

General Plan must include goals, policies, and actions that:

- Reduce the unique and compounded health risks in disadvantaged communities
- Reduce pollution exposure and improve air quality
- Promote public facilities
- Promote food access
- Promote safe and sanitary homes
- Promote physical activity
- Promote meaningful community engagement in the public decision-making process
- Prioritize improvements and programs that address the needs of disadvantaged communities
Community Input

» Concerns:
  • Proximity of refineries/heavy industrial uses to homes, associated acute and long-term risks
  • Poor air quality along high traffic corridors
  • Illegal dumping
  • Inaccessibility to jobs and amenities

» Suggestions from the Community:
  • Make public transit more accessible and user-friendly
  • Encourage green technologies
  • Support clean energy industries and jobs
  • Raise illegal dumping penalties
  • Incentivize infill development through zoning
  • Increase outreach to and education for communities of color and low-income households
Sustainability Commission Discussion

» Input on disadvantaged communities mapping
» Preliminary input on environmental justice goals, policies, and actions
» Feedback on the focused meetings/outreach plan
Next Steps

» Second round of community meetings: July 2019
» Planning Commission Meeting: July 10, 2019
» Board of Supervisors Meeting: TBD
» Focused meetings: TBD
» Next Sustainability Commission Meeting: August 26, 2019
» Monitor website for updates: Envisioncontracosta2040.org
Contra Costa County
Sustainability Commission

Meeting Date: 6/24/2019
Subject: RECEIVE Presentation on Climate Action Plan Vulnerability Assessment and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets and PROVIDE DIRECTION as needed

Department: Conservation & Development
Presenter: Tammy Seale, PlaceWorks  Contact: Jody London, DCD

Referral History:
The County is updating its General Plan and Climate Action Plan. Throughout 2019, the Sustainability Commission will engage with the consultants on this project to provide feedback and suggestions.

Referral Update:
PlaceWorks, the consultants on the General Plan and Climate Action Plan updates, will provide an overview of the CAP planning process and the climate change vulnerability assessment, as well as initiate a discussion of greenhouse gas reduction targets and existing measures adopted in the 2015 CAP. Please see the attached presentation for details.

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):
RECEIVE Presentation on Climate Action Plan Vulnerability Assessment and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets and PROVIDE DIRECTION as needed.

Fiscal Impact (if any):
N/A.

ATTACHMENT(S)
Presentation on Vulnerability Assessment and GHG Reduction Targets
Overview
Presentation

• Overview of CAP Update Planning Process
• Overview of Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment
• Discussion of GHG Reduction Targets
• Discussion of Existing GHG Reduction Measures
• Discuss next steps
Climate Action Plan Update

CAP Update Process

Community and Staff Engagement

Inventory → Forecast → Target setting

Existing accomplishments → New and revised measures → Environmental Review

ENVISION CONTRA COSTA 2040

Climate Action Plan Update
Climate Action Plan Update

Guiding Principles

- Ambitious
- Inclusive
- Fair
- Comprehensive and integrated
- Relevant
- Actionable
- Evidence-based
- Transparent and verifiable

Image from UN Habitat Guiding Principles for Climate Action Planning
Climate Action Planning

**CAP**

*Climate change mitigation* seeks to reduce the amount of GHG emissions from cities to slow global warming.

*Cities emit GHGs into the atmosphere. These trap additional heat and cause global warming.*

*Global warming changes the local climate (temperature and precipitation) and drives sea-level rise, which may impact cities.*

*Climate change adaptation* seeks to address the impacts of climate change on cities.

Image from California Adaptation Planning Guide
Vulnerability assessment
Vulnerability Assessment

» Review of how Contra Costa County may be harmed by the effects of current and future hazards, including climate change.

» Required component of ongoing General Plan update.
**Vulnerability Assessment**

- Agricultural pests and diseases
- Air quality
- Coastal flooding
- Drought
- Extreme heat
- Flooding
- Fog
- Human health hazards
- Landslides and debris flows
- Seismic hazards
- Severe storms
- Sea level rise
- Wildfire
Vulnerability Assessment

- Populations
- Infrastructure
- Buildings
- Important economic assets
- Ecosystems and natural resources
- Key community services
Vulnerability Assessment

» **Impact**: How significant the effects of the hazard are, and will be, on the population or asset.

» **Adaptive capacity**: The ability of the population or asset to resist or recover from the effects of the hazard.
# Vulnerability Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Adaptive Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Little or no change.</td>
<td>No means of adapting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minor but noticeable effects.</td>
<td>Adaptive solutions are expensive, difficult, or unpopular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Clearly evident impacts. May be chronic and substantial.</td>
<td>Solutions available, but not always feasible. There may be significant challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Impacts are permanent and substantial. Current activities may not be possible.</td>
<td>Solutions are feasible for most of all of an affect population or asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Severe risk of widespread damage, mortality, ecosystem loss, and loss of functions.</td>
<td>Little or no effort needed to adapt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Vulnerability Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptive Capacity Score</th>
<th>Impact Score IM 0</th>
<th>Impact Score IM 1</th>
<th>Impact Score IM 2</th>
<th>Impact Score IM 3</th>
<th>Impact Score IM 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC 0</td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>V5</td>
<td>V5</td>
<td>V5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC 1</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>V5</td>
<td>V5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC 2</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>V5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC 3</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>V3</td>
<td>V4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC 4</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>V2</td>
<td>V3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Results: Populations

» Economic burdens and reduced access to resources.
   » Examples: Persons experiencing homelessness, undocumented persons, households in poverty.

» Physical and behavioral health challenges.
   » Examples: Senior citizens (especially living alone), persons with chronic illnesses.

» Physical or social isolation.
   » Examples: Persons living on single-access roads, persons without access to lifelines.
Draft Results: Infrastructure

» Impact varies substantially with location.
» Vulnerability increased by few alternatives to critical infrastructure.
» Major roads and railways, flood control infrastructure, and electricity lines are most vulnerable.
Draft Results: Buildings

- Some industrial buildings in hazard-prone areas.
  - Damage may cause hazardous materials releases.
Draft Results: Economic Assets

» Agriculture is highly vulnerable to changing conditions.
  » Temperatures, precipitation, and pests.

» Ecosystem changes and flooding threatens the Delta.

» Some industrial centers may be damaged by seismic activity or landslides.
Draft Results: Natural Resources

» Most vulnerable ecosystems are woodlands, wetlands, and aquatic areas.
  » Fire, coastal flooding, pests, and fog can harm woodlands.
  » Extreme heat, flooding, and sea level rise are dangerous to wetlands and aquatic areas.
  » Landslides can block lakes and streams in hilly locations.
Draft Results: Community Services

» Water, wastewater, and energy service is highly vulnerable to disruption.
  » Sea level rise, flooding, severe storms, wildfires, landslides, and extreme heat may all be harmful.

» Damages to roads and buildings can interrupt public transit and health services.
GHG reduction targets
State GHG Reductions

Baseline: 1,403,610 MTCO$_2$e

- 2017: 1,219,340 MTCO$_2$e
- 2020: 1,090,450 MTCO$_2$e
- 2030: 1,015,750 MTCO$_2$e
- 2050: 994,210 MTCO$_2$e
GHG Reduction Targets

» Communities have flexibility in setting targets.
» Need to comply with state law and guidance to be used for CEQA purposes.
» Targets can be absolute or per-capita.
» Update will build on targets in existing CAP.
GHG Reduction Targets

» Existing targets:
  » 15% below 2005 levels by 2020 (1990 equivalent).
  » 50% below the 2020 target by 2035.
GHG Reduction Targets

» State targets:
  » 1990 levels by 2020.
  » 40% below 1990 levels by 2030.

» State goals:
  » 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.
  » Net climate neutral by 2045.
GHG Reduction Targets

» Executive Order B-55-18

“It is hereby ordered that:
A new statewide goal is established to achieve carbon neutrality as soon as possible, and no later than 2045, and achieve and maintain net negative emissions thereafter. This goal is in addition to the existing statewide targets of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.”
GHG Reduction Targets

» SB 32 Scoping Plan recommendations for local governments:
  » 15% below baseline levels by 2020.
  » 6.0 MTCO$_2$e per person by 2030.
  » 2.0 MTCO$_2$e per person by 2050.
GHG Reduction Target - Absolute (Existing Targets)

Baseline: 1,403,610 MTCO$_2$e

Emissions to be reduced by updated CAP
**GHG Reduction Target - Absolute**

**(New State Targets)**

Baseline: 1,403,610 MTCO$_2$e

Emissions to be reduced by updated CAP

ENVISION CONTRA COSTA 2040

Climate Action Plan Update
GHG Reduction Target – Per Capita

Baseline: 8.79 MTCO₂e per person

Emissions to be reduced by updated CAP
GHG Reduction Targets

» 35 other California communities have adopted post-2020 GHG reduction targets.
  » Three other Bay Area counties.

» Contra Costa County’s existing targets are in the middle of the range.
GHG Reduction Targets

- Range of reduction targets
- Contra Costa reduction trajectory
- Average local reduction trajectory
- New state reduction trajectory

Percent of baseline vs. years:
- 2005
- 2010
- 2015
- 2020
- 2025
- 2030
- 2035
- 2040
- 2045
- 2050

Climate Action Plan Update

ENVISION CONTRA COSTA 2040
Getting to the target
Existing GHG Reduction Measures

» Primary goal of reduction measures is to reach target.
» County has flexibility on measure design.
  » Issues addressed.
  » Level of implementation.
» Measures can be supportive as well.
## Existing GHG Reduction Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quantifiable</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency (EE)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable energy (RE)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use and transportation (LUT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste (W)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water conservation (WE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government operations (GO)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing GHG Reduction Measures

» Continue effective existing measures.
  » Update language as needed.
» Remove measures that are no longer viable.
» Develop new measures to fill gaps.
Existing Local GHG Reductions

» County can receive credit for GHG reduction activities since 2017.
  » Switch to MCE
  » Recent solar installations
  » Increased EV adoption
  » eBART extension
  » Other actions
Existing GHG Reduction Measures

» Measures can be quantifiable or supportive.
  » Quantifiable: We can estimate specific GHG reductions.
  » Supportive: GHG reductions cannot be effectively estimated.
Reduction Measure Monitoring

» Quantifiable measures should be trackable.
   » Clear metric.
   » Easy to collect.
   » Verifiable data.

» Helps measure progress to targets.

» Supportive measures do not need to be tracked.
Supportive Measures

» Affirmation of County preferences.

» Support GHG reductions that cannot be accurately calculated.

  » Example: embodied energy.
New GHG Reduction Measures

» Fill in gaps not covered by existing measures.

» Take advantage of new opportunities since 2015.
  » New regulations.
  » New technologies.
  » Changes in feasibility.
Examples of GHG Reduction measure topics

» Building electrification and fuel switching.
» EV charging in private buildings.
» First-mile and last-mile connections.
» Waste source reduction.
» Swimming pool energy efficiency.
Next steps
Next Steps

» Prepare government operations inventory.
» Conduct stakeholder engagement.
» Identify reductions from existing and planned local actions.
» Revise existing measures and develop new ones.
» Evaluate costs associated with GHG reduction.
» Update CAP document.
» Integrate with General Plan and EIR.
**CAP Timeline**

- GHG inventory: January 2019
- Forecast and target setting: Spring/Summer 2019
- Measure development: Summer/Autumn 2019
- CAP development and cost assessment: Winter 2020
- CAP adoption: End of 2020 (same as General Plan)
Meeting Date: 10/22/2018

Subject: ADOPT Environmental Justice Assessment Tool Developed by the Commission’s Environmental Justice Working Group and RECOMMEND Its Use in Updating the County’s General Plan.

Department: Conservation and Development

Presenter: Doria Robinson, Nick Despota, Wes Sullens, Sustainability Commission

Contact: Jody London, DCD

Referral History:
At the August 2018 retreat, the Sustainability Commission discussed its responsibility to advise the Board of Supervisors on opportunities to realize equity and fairness across the diverse communities of Contra Costa County in sustainability programs that support the Climate Action Plan. The Sustainability Commission had a presentation at its October 2018 meeting from Vivian Huang of the Asian Pacific Environmental Network on environmental justice.

Referral Update:
Nick Despota, Doria Robinson, and Wes Sullens have collaborated to better understand the history of environmental justice initiatives in Contra Costa County. The Sustainability Commission discussed the Assessment Tool at its February 25, 2019 and April 24, 2019 meetings. The attached version is the recommendation from the working group.

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):
ADOPT Environmental Justice Assessment Tool Developed by the Commission’s Environmental Justice Working Group and RECOMMEND Its Use in Updating the County’s General Plan.

Fiscal Impact (if any):
None.

ATTACHMENT(S)

Environmental Justice Policy Recommendation
Proposed assessment tool for inclusion in Contra Costa County General Plan. It purpose is to bridge the gap between the County’s Environmental Policy (2007) and day-to-day operations within each department.*

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ASSESSMENT TOOL
Do our county’s projects and policies meet environmental justice goals?

The following set of questions is proposed for internal use by all departments of Contra Costa County government. The questions are intended to help staff determine the degree to which its outreach, programs and policies align with the County’s environmental justice goals.

1. Are public materials and workshops presented in the languages of residents who may be affected by a project or policy?
2. Are meetings and workshops scheduled at times and locations that enable participation by working people and those without cars? Are notices of these events distributed through diverse media, not just online media?
3. Do all neighborhoods have opportunities to engage in decision-making conversations?
4. Has data collection reflected the economic, gender and racial diversity of the affected population?
5. Are the costs and benefits of a project or policy shared equitably by all who may be affected, or are there disproportionate impacts?
6. Are economic opportunities concentrated within one segment of a population or area, or are they available to all who may wish to take advantage of them?
7. What will be the indirect or unintended impacts on the quality of life of residents within different communities?

Proposal by
Nick Despota, Doria Robinson and Wes Sullens
Contra Costa County Sustainability Commission
June 9, 2019

* Cities and counties are required to adopt an Environmental Justice element, or integrate EJ-related policies, objectives, and goals throughout other elements of their General Plan. An Environmental Justice Element is required by the Government Code Section 65302(h) (1), which specifies requirements for a city or county’s General Plan. An environmental justice element is also required by under SB 1000.
Meeting Date: 4/22/2019

Subject: CONSIDER proposal from Member, District 1, to Recommend the Use of Carbon-Neutral Building Materials in County Projects

Department: Conservation and Development

Presenter: Nick Despota, Sustainability Commission

Contact: Jody London, DCD

Referral History:
One part of the Sustainability Commission’s mission is to “Advise the Board of Supervisors and staff on successful implementation of the Climate Action Plan, including suggestions on how that work can be performed more efficiently and effectively.” Climate Action Plan Measure EE 6: Energy-Efficient New Buildings, includes as an action item “Explore making new and significantly retrofitted County buildings zero net energy.”

Referral Update:
Nick Despota, Sustainability Commission member representing District 1, at the April 22, 2019 meeting suggested that the Sustainability Commission propose to the Board of Supervisors that County-funded construction projects specify the use of manufactured limestone aggregated, containing captured and sequestered carbon dioxide (CO₂). The Commission directed Despota to consult with County staff and report back. The attached memo provides that information.

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):
CONSIDER proposal from Member, District 1, to Recommend the Use of Carbon-Neutral Building Materials in County Projects.

Fiscal Impact (if any):
None.

ATTACHMENT(S)
Carbon-Neutral Concrete Update
Report on carbon-neutral building materials proposal with Public Works staff

At the April 22 meeting of the Sustainability Commission, Commission members authorized Nick Despota and Wes Sullens to meet with County staff to explore a proposal that the County use its procurement process to require the use of carbon-neutral or -negative building materials. In particular, those materials could include concrete made with manufactured limestone aggregates that sequesters carbon.

On May 13, Sullens, Jody London, and I met with Warren Lai, Deputy Director of the Public Works Dept., and Kevin Emigh, Division Manager of the Design/Construction Division, to discuss the proposal.

While supportive of efforts to reduce the county’s GHG emissions, Lai explained that it was not prudent for the County to “get out ahead” of CalTrans on the specification of concrete for roads and bridges. Emigh related a story illustrating that the County could be held accountable for replacement of faulty building materials, or face liability claims. These are significant deterrents.

Sullens noted that Marin County was developing a different approach to reducing GHG emissions from building materials. That county is amending its building codes to specify the use of low-carbon concrete for all residential and commercial building. Funded by a Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) grant, Marin is developing these specifications in a manner that would enable their adoption by other counties.

Asked what opportunities he saw for GHG reductions, Lai said that the Marin County approach seemed more promising than the procurement process outlined in our proposal.

Two days after our meeting, Marin County conducted a workshop on carbon-negative or -neutral building material. None of us were able to attend but to learn what was discussed, Despora talked to Ken Hines (of Blue Planet, a manufacturer of low-carbon aggregate), who did attend.

In a nutshell, Marin County will use two different approaches for reducing embodied carbon in concrete: prescriptive and performance-based.

The prescriptive approach specifies the minimum percentage of fly ash v. Portland cement in the concrete mix. Fly ash reduces the amount of Portland cement required, thus also reducing the concrete’s global warming potential (GWP). Use of a carbon-negative or neutral aggregate and/or recycled aggregates would allow for a higher percentage of Portland cement, desirable from an engineering perspective.

Under the performance approach, the maximum GWP is specified. How to meet the GWP is left up to the concrete supplier. It will be relatively easy for a government regulatory agency to then change the maximum GWP requirement for its concrete purchases in order to meet its greenhouse gas emission targets.

Based on what we heard from our own County’s staff, and what we learned about the Marin County approach, it appears that the Marin building code amendments and CalTrans evaluations are key. They may determine how or when Contra Costa County may elect to adopt lower carbon methods and materials in county construction.
Meeting Date: 6/24/2019

Subject: AMEND Sustainability Commission Bylaws to Extend Term of Service for 60 days or Until An Appointment Is Made to a Vacant Seat, Whichever Comes First.

Department: Conservation & Development

Presenter: Jody London, DCD Contact: Jody London (925) 674-7871

Referral History:
At the May 7, 2019 meeting of the Sustainability Committee of the Board of Supervisors, the Sustainability Committee directed that should a vacant seat on the Sustainability Commission not be filled by the date the term of service expires, the term of service shall extend 60 days or until an appointment is made to the vacant seat, whichever comes first.

Referral Update:
The Bylaws of the Sustainability Commission have been amended to reflect that if a vacant seat on the Sustainability Commission is not filled by the date the term of service expires, the term of service shall extend 60 days or until an appointment is made to the vacant seat, whichever comes first.

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):
AMEND Sustainability Commission Bylaws to Extend Term of Service for 60 days or Until An Appointment Is Made to a Vacant Seat, Whichever Comes First.

Fiscal Impact (if any):
None.

ATTACHMENT(S)
Revised Sustainability Commission Bylaws.
BY-LAWS
of the
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY SUSTAINABILITY COMMISSION

I. Name

The name of this commission shall be the “Contra Costa County Sustainability Commission” (hereinafter referred to as the “Sustainability Commission” or “Commission”).

II. Purpose

The general purposes of the Commission shall be as follows:

A. Advise the Board of Supervisors and staff on successful implementation of the Climate Action Plan, including suggestions on how that work can be performed more efficiently and effectively.

B. Advise the Board of Supervisors on opportunities to realize equity and fairness across the diverse communities of Contra Costa County in sustainability programs that support the Climate Action Plan.

C. Advise the Board of Supervisors and staff on how to better engage Contra Costa County residents and businesses on sustainability issues and implementation of the Climate Action Plan.

III. Membership

A. Members. The Commission shall consist of members as approved by the Board of Supervisors. Members serve at the pleasure of the Board of Supervisors and may be removed during their terms of office by a majority vote of the Board at its pleasure.

B. Status Changes. If a member’s work status or residence changes, the member must notify the Commission in writing, within thirty (30) days of the change in status. The Chair shall review the change of status and determine if the member is still eligible for membership. If the member is found to be ineligible, the Chair shall forward the appropriate information to the Board of Supervisors.

C. Terms. Members shall serve a four-year term, after the initial terms approved by the Board of Supervisors expire. There will not be a term limit and members may serve more than one (1) term if reappointed. If upon expiration of a term, a seat has not been filled by the Board of Supervisors, the term of service shall extend 60 days or until an appointment is made to fill the vacant seat, whichever comes first.
D. Resignation. Any member who desires to resign his or her position with the Commission should do so in writing and file it with the Clerk of the Board, the Chair, and staff to the Commission. Advanced notice is preferred to allow for a timely appointment to fill the vacancy.

E. Vacancies. A vacancy during the term of any member will be filled by the Board of Supervisors for the remainder of the then-current term.

F. Member Responsibilities. Each member is expected to:

1. Have an interest in and commitment to the Purpose of the Commission.

2. Attend meetings of the Commission. Members are expected to notify the Chair in advance of any absence from a meeting. Members may be excused by the Chair for authorized absences. A member that is absent from three (3) consecutive scheduled meetings without authorization from the Chair will be considered to have resigned his or her position with the Commission, and the Chair will notify the Board of Supervisors of the vacancy.

3. Comply with the Contra Costa County policy for Board Appointees concerning Conflict of Interest and Open Meetings, Resolution No. 2002/376.

G. Alternate Members. Alternate members are non-voting members except that alternates shall fill in for the regular district representative member appointed from the same district when the regular member is absent from part or all of a meeting, during which time the alternate member shall constitute a voting member.

IV. Organization

A. Officers. The officers of the Commission shall be the Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary. The Commission shall annually at its first meeting in the calendar year elect its Chair and Vice-Chair. The Sustainability Coordinator shall serve as the Secretary.

1. Duties of the Chair. The Chair shall conduct meetings, develop agendas, and serve as the official spokesperson for the Commission.

2. Duties of the Vice-Chair. The Vice-Chair shall act for the Chair in the Chair’s absence.

B. Subcommittees. The Chair may appoint subcommittees composed solely of members of the Commission. The Chair shall serve as an ex-officio member on all subcommittees.
C. Staff. The Sustainability Coordinator shall serve as staff to the Commission. Staff shall:

1. Prepare and issue agendas in accordance with the Brown Act and the County’s Better Government Ordinance.

2. Finalize minutes and distribute minutes to members and the Clerk of the Board after adoption by the Commission.

3. Prepare the annual report at the direction of the Commission for submission to the Board of Supervisors.


5. Keep meeting attendance records.

6. Send and retain copies of correspondence authorized by the Commission.

V. Meetings

A. All meetings of the Commission shall be open public meetings and shall be conducted in accordance with the Brown Act and the County’s Better Government Ordinance.

B. Regular meetings of the Commission shall be held on the fourth Monday in February, April, June, August, October, and December, at 5:00 p.m., at a location to be determined by the Commission and staff. The December meeting will occur prior to the fourth Monday in December, as approved by the Commission.

C. Six voting members constitute a quorum. A quorum must be present to hold a meeting. In the absence of a quorum, no formal action shall be taken except to adjourn the meeting to a subsequent date.

D. Only regular members and alternates filling in for absent regular members shall vote on matters before the Commission. The Commission may take action by approval of a majority of the voting members present.

E. The Commission may call a special meeting if the Commission’s business requires it to meet more frequently, but a quorum is required for any meeting to proceed.

VI. Annual Objectives

The Commission shall establish an annual work plan and a list of goals and priorities that will guide the work of the Commission over the year.
VII. Reports

The Commission shall submit:

   A. Regular reports to the Ad Hoc Sustainability Committee or its successor.

   B. An annual report to the Board of Supervisors as required by Resolution No. 2011/498 and as amended.

   C. Other reports to the Board of Supervisors as appropriate.

VIII. Conflicts with County Policies

To the extent there are any inconsistencies between these bylaws and the resolutions creating the Commission or countywide advisory body policies, the resolutions and countywide advisory body policies will govern.

IX. Bylaws/Amendments

These bylaws and any bylaw amendments shall be recommended by the Commission and be effective upon approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Adopted by Sustainability Commission August 28, 2017
Amended by Sustainability Commission June 24, 2019
Meeting Date: 6/24/2019

Subject: DISCUSS Proposed Polystyrene Ordinance, and PROVIDE DIRECTION as needed.

Department: Conservation & Development

Presenter: Jody London, DCD

Contact: Jody London (925) 674-7871

Referral History:
In 2017, the Board of Supervisors directed the Department of Public Works to proceed with developing a ban on polystyrene in the unincorporated County and County facilities. The Sustainability Commission received a presentation on the proposed policy at its April 2018 meeting and provided input to Public Works staff, prior to bringing the matter to the full Board.

Referral Update:
Public Works has developed the ordinance and is getting ready to shepherd it through the process of being adopted by the Board of Supervisors. The draft ordinance is attached, in the event that the Sustainability Commission desires to provide input to Public Works staff.

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):
DISCUSS Proposed Polystyrene Ordinance, and PROVIDE DIRECTION as needed.

Fiscal Impact (if any):
None.

ATTACHMENT(S)

DRAFT Polystyrene Ordinance
ORDINANCE NO. 2019-__ (DRAFT)

(Environmentally-Friendly Food Packaging)

The Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors ordains as follows (omitting the parenthetical footnotes from the official text of the enacted or amended provisions of the County Ordinance Code).

SECTION 1. Summary. This ordinance prohibits food vendors from using polystyrene food service ware, and it requires food vendors to use environmentally-friendly food service ware, unless the vendor obtains an exemption under this ordinance. This ordinance also prohibits the retail sale of polystyrene food service ware in unincorporated Contra Costa County. Pre-packaged food items and reusable polystyrene-based ice chests and coolers are exempt from the requirements of this ordinance.

SECTION 2. Chapter 418-18 (Environmentally-Friendly Food Packaging) is hereby added to Division 418 (Refuse) of the Ordinance Code to read:

Chapter 418-18
Environmentally-Friendly Food Packaging

418-18.002 Definitions. For the purposes of this chapter, the following terms have the following meanings:

(a) "Environmentally-friendly food service ware" means food service ware that meets one of the following criteria:

(1) Single-use, disposable containers and other products made from recyclable or compostable materials and used for selling, vending, or serving food or beverages, including but not limited to cups, bowls, plates, serving trays, and hinged or lidded containers (clamshells).

(2) Products that can be used more than once in their current form to serve or transport prepared, ready-to-consume food or beverages, including but not limited to cups, bowls, plates, serving trays, and containers made from ceramic, glass, porcelain, metal, or other composite or product intended to be reused.

(b) "Food vendor" means a person that does one or more of the following in unincorporated Contra Costa County:

(1) Sells prepared food to the public at retail, whether take-out, dine-in, or delivery, including sales of prepared food from food trucks.
(2) Provides prepared food to the public, including at organized or special events, whether or not for sale.

(3) Provides prepared food to clients or residents of private facilities, such as board-and-care facilities, senior centers, nursing homes, schools, hotels, or clinics, whether or not for sale.

(c) “Polystyrene-based” means and includes expanded polystyrene, which is a thermoplastic petrochemical material utilizing a styrene monomer and processed by any number of techniques including, but not limited to, fusion of polymer spheres (expandable bead polystyrene), injection molding, form molding, and extrusion blow molding (extruded foam polystyrene). The term “polystyrene” also includes polystyrene that has been expanded or blown using a gaseous blowing agent into a solid foam (expanded polystyrene (EPS)), and clear or solid polystyrene known as oriented polystyrene.

(d) “Polystyrene food service ware” means polystyrene-based, single-use, disposable containers and other products used for selling, vending, or serving food or beverages. Polystyrene food service ware includes, but is not limited to, cups, bowls, plates, serving trays, and hinged or lidded containers (clamshells) that are made from expanded or extruded polystyrene. For the purposes of this ordinance, polystyrene food service ware does not include any of the following products: straws, splash sticks, stir sticks, soup lids, drink lids, utensils, tablecloths, egg cartons, liquid cartons, and raw meat trays.

(e) “Prepackaged food” means any properly-labeled processed food that is prepackaged to prevent any direct human contact with the food product upon distribution from the manufacturer.

(f) “Prepared food” means food or beverages that are serviced, packaged, cooked, chopped, sliced, mixed, brewed, frozen, squeezed, or otherwise prepared. Prepared food does not include raw eggs, fish, meat, or poultry, or any raw foods containing those raw materials.

(g) “Raw meat trays” means trays used for packaging raw meat, poultry, seafood, or other similar protein intended to be cooked or prepared offsite.

(Ord. 2019-__ , § 2.)

418-18.004 Polystyrene food service ware prohibited. Beginning on January 1, 2020:

(a) A food vendor shall not provide polystyrene food service ware to any person. A food vendor shall use only environmentally-friendly food service ware.

(b) A person shall not sell, at wholesale or at retail, polystyrene-based food service ware.

(Ord. 2019-__ , § 2.)
418-18.006 Use of polystyrene at County facilities.

(a) A lease or rental agreement between the County and a person for the occupancy or use of a County facility may require the use of environmentally-friendly food service ware at the facility being leased or rented.

(b) A contract with a person to provide services to or on behalf of the County may require the use of environmentally-friendly food service ware in connection with the provision of those services.

(Ord. 2019-__, § 2.)

418-18.008 Exempt products and food vendor hardship exemptions.

(a) Exempt products. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in this chapter, this chapter does not prohibit the sale or use of any of the following:

(1) Prepackaged food products that do not use environmentally-friendly packaging, or that use polystyrene-based packaging materials.

(2) Polystyrene-based ice chests and coolers intended to be reused.

(b) Food vendor hardship exemptions.

(1) Application for hardship exemption. A food vendor may request a hardship exemption from the requirements of this chapter by submitting a written request to the Public Works Director. The food vendor must establish to the satisfaction of the Public Works Director that use of polystyrene food service ware will cause an undue hardship to the vendor, or that no suitable alternative to polystyrene food service ware is available in the form of environmentally-friendly food service ware. The Public Works Director may require the food vendor to provide additional information in support of its request for a hardship exemption, including but not limited to a list of available alternative packaging materials and the reasons why those materials cannot be used without causing a hardship to the food vendor. A hardship does not exist solely on the basis that an environmentally-friendly food service ware product costs more than a similar polystyrene food service ware product.

(2) Determination. A food vendor that submits a written request for a hardship exemption will be issued a written decision by the Public Works Director indicating whether the hardship exemption is granted. A written decision denying a hardship exemption will explain the reasons for the denial.
(3) Term. A hardship exemption is valid for a period of one year from the date the Public Works Director approves the exemption.

(4) Successive exemptions permitted. A hardship exemption does not automatically renew, and a new application for a hardship exemption is required to obtain a successive one-year hardship exemption. There is no limit on the number of successive one-year hardship exemptions a food vendor may apply for under this section.

(Ord. 2019-__, § 2.)

418-18.010 Enforcement. The Public Works Director is responsible for enforcing the requirements of this chapter within unincorporated Contra Costa County. The County may seek compliance with this chapter by any remedy allowed under this code, including, but not limited to, administrative fines, infraction citations, and any other remedy allowed by law.

(Ord. 2019-__, § 2.)

SECTION 3. Effective Date and Publication. This ordinance becomes effective 30 days following its adoption by the Board of Supervisors. Within 15 days after passage, this ordinance shall be published in the East Bay Times, a newspaper published in this County, in a manner satisfying the requirements of Government Code section 25124, with the names of supervisors voting for and against it.

PASSED on ____________________________ by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:
ATTEST: DAVID J. TWA
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
and County Administrator

Board Chair

By: ________________________________
[SEAL]

Deputy

ORDINANCE NO. 2019-__ (DRAFT)
FINDINGS

The Board of Supervisors finds and determines as follows:

(a) Polystyrene, often referred to by the trademark “Styrofoam,” is a petroleum-based, lightweight plastic material commonly used as food service ware by retail food vendors operating in unincorporated Contra Costa County. Polystyrene has become a problematic environmental pollutant because it is non-biodegradable and nearly non-reusable. It can take hundreds of years for polystyrene to break down even in landfills.

(b) The County and the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District spend approximately $750,000 annually to remove litter from waterways and sensitive environmental areas within the County. Polystyrene, single-use food service ware constitutes a significant portion of that litter.

(c) Prohibiting the use of polystyrene food service ware and requiring the use of recyclable, compostable, and reusable food service ware will advance the County’s interests in protecting its waterways, environment, and taxpayers from the negative environmental and financial impacts associated with polystyrene food service ware. This ordinance also is intended to assist the County with meeting its trash reduction requirements under its regional stormwater permit issued by the regional water quality control board. By enacting this ordinance, the County joins the following cities within Contra Costa County that have enacted some type of ban on the use and/or sale of polystyrene: Concord, El Cerrito, Hercules, Lafayette, Martinez, Pittsburg, Richmond, and Walnut Creek.

(d) Food service vendors and businesses may have existing inventories of polystyrene food service ware, and they may need time to purchase environmentally-friendly food service ware. For those reasons, the prohibition against the sale and use of polystyrene food service ware will be effective January 1, 2020.

SMS
H:\Client Matters\Public Works\Ordinances\Polystyrene\Findings for Polystyrene Ord.docx
Meeting Date: 6/24/2019

Subject: RECEIVE reports from Sustainability Commission members and alternates, and PROVIDE DIRECTION as needed

Department: Conservation & Development

Presenter: Jody London, DCD  Contact: Jody London (925)674-7871

Referral History:
This is a standing item of the Commission.

Referral Update:
Commission members and alternates will provide updates to the full Commission.

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):
RECEIVE reports from Sustainability Commission members and alternates, and PROVIDE DIRECTION as needed.

Fiscal Impact (if any):
None.
Meeting Date: 6/24/2019
Subject: RECEIVE Report from Sustainability Coordinator
Department: Conservation & Development
Presenter: Jody London, Sustainability Coordinator

Referral History:
This is a standing item of the Commission.

Referral Update:
This report provides an update to the Sustainability Commission on the work of the County’s Sustainability staff since the Committee last met in February 2019. Key activities during this period are listed below.

- Participated in community meetings related to the General Plan and Climate Action Plan updates.
- Researched how other jurisdictions engage with their communities as they are updating Climate Action Plans.
- Attended several meetings focused on equity: the first, sponsored by the Urban Sustainability Directors Network, looked at how to ensure transportation planning is equitable, including vehicle electrification policies and strategies; the second, hosted by the Federal Reserve Bank, PolicyLink, Enterprise, and Northern California Grantmakers, looked at equitable resilience planning and disaster recovery; and the third, sponsored by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and the Governors Office of Planning and Research, focused on implementation of SB 1000 (environmental justice).
- Presented on the County’s sustainability work at the Sustainable Enterprise Conference, and at a monthly MCE staff meeting on sustainability work in Contra Costa County.
- Presented on the County’s work on Green and Healthy Homes, linking energy efficiency programs and health outreach programs, at the Bay Area Regional Energy Network Codes Forum.
- Received approval from the Board of Supervisors to execute 10 agreements for solar power on County facilities, with total capacity of 3.8 MW, at a cost of $0.134/kWh fixed for 25 years. Savings from the solar projects are expected to total $16,500,000 over the 25 years.
- Continued working with the Contra Costa Transportation Authority on the Electric Vehicle Readiness Blueprint. The Blueprint is due to be complete by July 1.
- Continued working on rollout of Cleaner Contra Costa Challenge. The June 5 Sustainability Exchange meeting focused on the Cleaner Contra Costa Challenge, particularly how jurisdictions can reach more residents and how cities that are not part of the grant can set up their own pages.
- Assisted the Board of Supervisors in filling four vacancies on the Sustainability Commission. There continues to be a vacancy in the District 5, Alternate seat (that position is filled by the District 5 Supervisor).
- Coordinated with Sustainability Commission members and Public Works staff on carbon-neutral building materials.
- County Transportation Planning staff are conducting a study of active transportation options for the Iron Horse Corridor, which runs 18.5 miles from Concord (Mayette Avenue) south to the County line. This Study will explore opportunities and constraints for further developing the active transportation...
features within the Iron Horse Corridor. The County is the lead agency on the Study. The Study will be developed collaboratively with stakeholders including the cities (Concord, Pleasant Hill, Danville, Walnut Creek, San Ramon), East Bay Regional Park District, Contra Costa Transportation Authority, utility companies, and advocacy organizations. The Study will include an extensive public outreach component, existing conditions analysis, transportation analysis and alternatives development and analysis.

- County Transportation Planning staff have received two grants that support active transportation goals. The first is a $477,000 grant from the CalTrans Sustainability Communities program to develop a bike/pedestrian plan for the unincorporated areas of the County. The grant will support data collection so we have a complete road inventory. The second grant of $133,400 is from the California Coastal Conservancy via MTC Bay Trail, and will support the Carquinez Strait Scenic Loop Trail Gap Closure Study.
- Collaborated with County staff working on topics including land use and transportation, hazardous materials, green business program, economic development, Planning Integration Team for Community Health (PITCH), codes, solid waste, energy, and related.
- Participated in regional activities.

**Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):**

RECEIVE report from Sustainability Coordinator.

**Fiscal Impact (if any):**

None.

---

**ATTACHMENT(S)**
Meeting Date: 6/24/2019
Subject: RECEIVE Report from Sustainability Commission Chair and IDENTIFY TOPICS for next report to Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability
Department: Conservation & Development
Presenter: Howdy Goudey, Chair
Contact: Jody London, DCD

Referral History:
This is a standing item of the Commission.

Referral Update:
The Sustainability Commission Chair provides an update at each meeting to Commission members on the administration of the Commission, meetings of the Board of Supervisors Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability, and other issues of interest to the Commission.

Recommendation(s)/Next Step(s):
RECEIVE report from Sustainability Commission Chair.

Fiscal Impact (if any):
None.