

**SUMMARY MINUTES  
TRANSPAC  
April 10, 2008**

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Elected Officials:** David Durant, City of Pleasant Hill, TRANSPAC Chair, Julie Pierce, Clayton CCTA Representative, TRANSPAC Vice Chair; Guy Bjerke, Concord; Cindy Silva, Walnut Creek; Charlie Abrams, former member Walnut Creek. **Absent (excused):** Susan Bonilla, Contra Costa County, Mark Ross, Martinez

**Planning Commissioners:** Bob Armstrong, Clayton; Diana Vavrek, Pleasant Hill; Bob Hoag, Concord; Jon Malkovich, Walnut Creek; Vacant Seat: Martinez. **Absent:** Donnie Snyder, Contra Costa County

**Staff:** Cindy Dahlgren, CCCTA; Martin Engelmann, CCTA; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; John Greitzer, Contra Costa County, Tim Tucker, Martinez; John Hall, Walnut Creek; Lauren Hole, Contra Costa County (Supervisor Bonilla); Lynn Osborn, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager; Barbara Neustadter, Connie Peterson, TRANSPAC staff.

**Meeting convened without a quorum by former Chair Pierce at 9:05 a.m.**

**1. Convene meeting: Pledge of Allegiance/Self-Introductions – completed**

New members were welcomed to TRANSPAC: Guy Bjerke, City of Concord Councilmember, who is replacing Bill Shinn (Mr. Bjerke's alternate) and Robert (Bob) Hoag, the new Planning Commissioner representative from the City of Concord.

Julie Pierce presented former member Charlie Abrams with a proclamation acknowledging his many contributions to transportation during his years of service on TRANSPAC. He was also presented with a mini golf sand trap for his desk as a remembrance. Mr. Abrams expressed his appreciation and said he will miss being part of this group.

The Consent Agenda was held until a quorum was present.

**2. Public Comment - None**

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

**3. Approved the February 21, 2008 minutes: Silva/Durant/Unanimous**

**END CONSENT AGENDA**

**4. Review of the Draft Revised Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (RTMP) and Continued Discussion of RTMP Trip Thresholds**

As part of the update to the TRANSPAC Action Plan, the TAC reviewed the RTMP and is proposing a number of minor clarifying edits including adding the word "cumulative" in key paragraphs, adding two notes at the bottom of the first page – one note to state the continuation of project notifications at the 100 net new peak hour vehicle trip level and a second note to make clear that a jurisdiction may request a project impact analysis and mitigation from a proposed development outside that jurisdiction regardless whether the established thresholds have been met.

At the request of the TAC at the February 21, 2008 TRANSPAC meeting, TRANSPAC clarified the definition of "trips" and approved a new 1,000 net new peak hour vehicle trip threshold (rather than 500 suggested by the Planning Committee) for major development impact evaluation and

General Plan Amendments (GPAs) assessments. The 1,000 net new peak hour vehicle trip threshold was to be incorporated into the RTMP.

The TAC appreciated TRANSPAC's support of the 1,000 trip suggestion but reconsidered aligning the TRANSPAC requirement with the Planning Committee recommendation of 500 net new peak hour vehicle trips, which while a more conservative increase, is more likely to be approved by CCTA than the 1,000 trip threshold.

The proposed revisions to the RTMP include raising the interregional trip threshold for the application of RTMP requirements 50 net new peak hour vehicle trips to 100 trips net new peak hour vehicle trips.

**DISCUSSION:** Barbara Neustadter reported that the TAC has been working on updating this document. The RTMP has been the subject of some controversy in other parts of Contra Costa because Central County uses a different type of fee program that does not establish a per unit or square foot fee for development the others use. Instead, it uses the Oakhurst model in which projects and mitigations are determined by impacts in the home jurisdiction as well as other jurisdictions. As a result, the TAC has only made minor changes to this document. The word "cumulative" has been added in a couple of locations to make it clear that not only is a single development that is assessed, but the cumulative proposed development impact in the area of the proposed project is reviewed as well.

The TAC was not comfortable with the a new 1,000 net new peak hour vehicle trip threshold that TRANSPAC approved in February, and after reconsidering the issue decided that it would be more prudent to proceed with the 500 net new peak hour vehicle trip threshold for evaluation of GPAs and projects, if necessary. The CCTA Planning Committee suggested the higher threshold for project notification will remain at a 100 net new vehicle trip threshold. The TAC also suggested that the interregional trip threshold for the application of RTMP should be raised from 50 to 100 net new peak hour vehicle trips.

Abrams commented that he agreed that the TAC's decision was appropriate and that 1,000 was too high.

Bjerke suggested that Note 1 might be more appropriate as Paragraph 2.5. He asked for clarification on Note 2 with regard to what does the requested agency have to do.

Neustadter said the notes were Ray Kuzbari's idea, to provide additional information in the RTMP about other policies and actions. Note 2 advises the jurisdiction doing development that there is an issue of concern which may or may not require action on its part, even if thresholds are not tripped.

Kuzbari stated that a project might take place that does not generate 500 trips, but there may be circumstances where that project could have a significant impact on an intersection, for example. If that takes place, we should have the right to ask for a traffic study and look at the regional impacts even if the project generates fewer trips.

Neustadter noted that the RTMP is intended to go in both directions--from Central County out and from outside in.

Silva questioned the need for the note. It creates the possibility of one jurisdiction impacting another with no real course of action laid out when thresholds are not tripped. It seems that there is some other step that is missing. It isn't clear what the note accomplishes that wouldn't be possible without it being there.

Kuzbari said that he views Notes 1 and 2 as a restatement of points that are covered elsewhere. Note 1 is in the Action Plan as a requirement and Note 2 restates what CEQA requires about notification. The restatement of those two points that can be read in context with the rest of the RTMP. It does not make a new requirements.

Neustadter added that it involves the initiation of a process where the jurisdiction proposing the development and the one that believes that it is impacted come to some agreement on mitigation. She suggested it might be better at the top of the document and more clearly tied to the CEQA analysis.

Silva asked if this sentence should be rephrased to say that does not preclude a jurisdiction from seeking an analysis of mitigation from a project that does not trip the numbers because the intent is not clear.

Osborn said that since this document will be read by other RTPCs, they may have concerns about when actions are triggered. This is a restatement of what's already required by CEQA. We are not changing the opportunities to request additional analysis or mitigating, even if we are raising the number to 500.

Pierce suggested that it might help to move Note 2 in between the first two paragraphs in Item 3 to clarify that we are raising the standard, but an impacted jurisdiction can still make a request for analysis and mitigation, and that we would continue to encourage interjurisdictional agreements. She noted that it isn't necessary to come up with final changes today—we are giving feedback to staff and the TAC will go back to look at it.

Bjerke asked if jurisdictions that been requested to do this are not keeping faith with the RTMP or the County Plan if they were to say no. Is it implicit that if Concord requests Pittsburg to do something that Pittsburg is required to do so? Pierce answered that part of the requirement to get approval for return to source money is the requirement that jurisdictions work together on issues.

Bjerke asked if when we deal with other RTPCs we play by our rules, and they play by theirs when deal with us? Yes. Tucker pointed out that we want to clarify to other RTPCs what our rules are, and provide assurance that they do not lose the opportunity to make a request for mitigation.

Bjerke clarified that East County jurisdictions do not mitigate development impacts in Central County. Since East County has no component in its fee program for the upstream side and we are the only RTPC that has a methodology for discussion of mitigation, why would we do it if others don't?

Engelmann explained that the others have a uniform regional mitigation fee program set up for a set number of projects. Initially there was a countywide fee developed in 1994 which proved very unpopular because nobody wanted the fee money that was generated in their area to fund projects in other areas. The program was quickly abandoned in favor of the subarea program where each RTPC developed its own mitigation fee program and fees stay in the subareas unless a special reciprocity agreement is entered into.

Pierce said that we can call out that CEQA requires these things but it is understood that we will continue to work together and embrace the model that we use that says you pay for the direct impacts of any project regardless of where the impacts occur. It puts everyone on notice that we expect everyone to work with us in good faith to mitigate the impacts of their projects as we in turn assume the same responsibilities for our projects beyond our borders.

Further discussion brought forth some additional suggestions for changes to the document: define the CEQA tie; emphasize the impacts of cumulative projects; strike "if residential" in the last line of

4C, take out “non-residential”, move increased services up by small infill projects and put a period after job-housing balance; and strike “within the foreseeable future” from paragraph 3d.

**ACTION: Reviewed the draft revised RTMP and suggested further changes to be considered by the TAC.**

## **5. Central County Action Plan – the Multi-Modal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs)**

The TRANSPAC TAC is seeking TRANSPAC’s guidance on how to address the requirement to establish MTSOs in the TRANSPAC Action Plan. Because of its complexities, this issue has been dubbed the MTSO dilemma.

The TAC has spent hours over the last several months attempting to craft performance measures (called Multi-modal Traffic Service Objectives [MTSOs]) for inclusion in the TRANSPAC Action Plan. To date, the TAC has not been able to develop a proposal which in its view meets the CCTA’s Action Plan requirements. At its February 28, 2008 meeting, and after another lengthy discussion at its March 13, 2008 meeting and again at its March 27, 2008 meeting, the TAC determined that this dilemma should be discussed with TRANSPAC at its April meeting. The TAC would like to share its views with TRANSPAC and seek its guidance on how to proceed.

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority defines a Multi-Modal Traffic Service Objective (MTSO) as a flexible quantifiable transportation performance measure with a target date for attainment. These measures were originally established in the 1995 and 2000 Action Plans. In those Action Plans, the performance measures were defined as peak hour travel speed, Delay Index (DI), transit mode share and average vehicle occupancy (AVO).

CCTA requires that local jurisdictions analyze the traffic impacts of General Plan Amendments (GPA) and depending on circumstances, some development proposals, to assess violations of any established MTSOs. From the TAC’s perspective based on almost twenty years of experience with this program, this CCTA requirement has proven to be costly, time-consuming, and of little value because it is difficult to predict and then assign a future (forecasted) violation of a traffic standard to General Plan Amendment (unless it is a very large general plan amendment).

Central County GPAs are usually relatively small, infill in nature or Transit Oriented Development (TOD) projects. Central County jurisdictions generally are interested in projects which result in higher densities (and therefore more traffic congestion) in downtown/activity areas with the idea of supporting /increasing transit ridership as well as bicycle and pedestrian activity. The same is true of Central County freeways – congestion will continue – it can be managed and monitored, not eliminated. Central County’s focus is no longer on reducing traffic congestion everywhere, at all costs.

The TAC and the Action Plan consultant have been unable to identify MTSOs which do not require expensive data collection and in some cases time-consuming analyses, and which can fairly or accurately be attributed to one GPA.

In the TAC’s view, use of the MTSOs as performance measures for the required traffic studies provides little useful additional information to that already required by a CEQA traffic analysis and identification of mitigation measures. As a result, the TAC believes that the required assessment of GPAs for impact on MTSOs is not needed because the original goals of decreasing congestion and maintaining speeds no longer apply. The CCTA’s Growth Management Program Implementation Guide does indicate that MTSOs do not have to be related to congestion.

Instead of continuing the past practice of establishing MTSO's for GPAs, the TAC would prefer to establish "State of the System" performance measures which would provide an overall regional "report card" on the operation of the Central County transportation network. This information would be compiled and reported to TRANSPAC periodically, perhaps annually or biennially. Such information is already collected in CCTA's "Traffic Service Objective Monitoring Report" (excerpt from Draft report attached), and by Caltrans in its annual state highway monitoring reports. The information will be useful in determining the accomplishments of the proposed Action Plan actions. If acceptable to TRANSPAC and CCTA, this would preclude the need for an assessment of MTSOs in development project traffic studies for development applications and GPAs.

## **DISCUSSION:**

Neustadter said as part of the development of the updated Action Plan we are to establish new TSOs. The TAC doesn't want to use the old (current) TSOs, but the underlying dilemma is that the MTSOs, which are quantifiable performance measures, no longer apply given how we have changed transportation planning.

Guy Bjerke added that the concept of Levels of Service, although now outdated, recognized that downtowns in certain areas were going to be and are congested. We wouldn't try to reduce congestion or save the world when it came to certain areas, but for other areas there are still salvation possibilities. We know we are not going to reduce or prevent congestion in certain areas. It is not inconsistent with the beginning of the Measure in 1988 when we recognized that we were not going to reduce congestion everywhere but we may prevent it from getting worse in certain locations.

Neustadter said that those activities continue in terms of management. However, based on the model output, no matter what is done, we've lost. The issue is if you can't do anything to make it better, why are you doing the analyses required to demonstrate that you can?

Hall said that the TAC's struggle is that we don't want to go down the MTSO road. The TAC decided it would be best to present this dilemma to TRANSPAC and asked for guidance on how to proceed. One unknown factor is whether the CCTA would accept an alternative means. We are looking for guidance and are asking if we should come up with an MTSO, realistic or not, or look at some other alternative that may or may not be accepted as it goes through the Authority's approval process. Maybe we will establish some numbers that are so incredibly huge that we'll never have a problem meeting them.

Silva asked for an example of the dilemma, such as a General Plan Amendment. Hall described the John Muir Hospital expansion project as a General Plan Amendment that triggered the process. They had to evaluate the project according to the Delay Index for Ygnacio Valley Road, so there's an additional step in the process, at a significant additional cost, in addition to the CEQA requirements. He did not believe that this second analysis had provided any helpful information as the impact and the mitigation has been noticed in the normal CEQA analysis of traffic impact. Adding on the Delay Index is an extra burden that wasn't helpful in decision making. He estimated that the cost of both staff and consultant time would be about \$5,000 (noting that he was speculating about the cost).

Malkovich asked how important it was for the average citizen to understand this. The Level of Service is a difficult concept to understand, while Delay Index is relatively easy to understand. Is there any meaningful rationale to keep it for that reason? Hall said LOS is well defined and easy to calculate. The Delay Index is not easy to calculate but it is understandable. The Delay Index, however, doesn't necessarily find all the impacts.

Greitzer said the difference for a calculation like the Delay Index for a major facility, freeway or major arterial, even for a GPA that meets the threshold ends up not worth measuring when you get through the process. For a very big project it could make a noticeable difference. The CEQA analysis that must be done anyway is contextual. It looks at the impacts of that project in that area, on those roads, and it can give more meaningful read of what the impacts might be. There are no predetermined performance standards that must be met. These MTSOs are predetermined targets to be met, and it is difficult to pin a change in one of these indicators to one particular GPA or project. The CEQA analysis is more useful.

Pierce pointed out we are focusing on the Delay Index as only one of the MTSOs. We also have average traffic speeds that are impacted significantly by incidents. This is hard for a project to mitigate.

Engelmann stated that the definition of an MTSO is that it has a quantifiable measure and has a target date. It has nothing to do with congestion nor is it mode-specific. He noted how West County's Action Plan had no congestion MTSOs for I-80, but that their Action Plan focused on getting the HOV constructed, getting buses into the HOV lane and getting the buses into the BART stations, vehicle occupancy within the carpool lanes, and usage of carpool lanes. TRANSPAC may be at that point now where I-680 corridor is saturated and there is little hope of mitigating the congestion on it. The I-680 MTSOs could focus on the HOV network, including getting it constructed and getting the best utilization of it. If you come up with a quantifiable measure for carpool usage or HOV usage on I-680, it would be an acceptable MTSO for that corridor.

Engelmann continued, in response to Hall's comment, saying that when a GPA comes along, we evaluate the Action Plan out to 2030, we look at the MTSOs, and hopefully say you've met them all by 2030 based upon all your approved land use and approved General Plans. You have a plan and can achieve the plan with your actions. When a GPA comes along it changes the mix as it is more development than we anticipated, and undergoes a GPA review procedure at TRANSPAC. If the lead jurisdiction says their General Plan has no impact on the Action Plan, your MTSOs, it is the end of discussion. If you can give as a threshold of significance an MTSO that is flexible and reflects what you want to achieve with this route, the CEQA process embraces that. On regional routes 80% of the congestion is on 20% of the routes and you can't set LOS. That's the purpose of having these flexible objectives. Decide what you want for each regional route, make it quantifiable and assign a target date.

Hall said that we haven't been able to come up with an MTSO at this point that addresses Engelmann's concerns. For example, if the MTSO is a measurement of HOV lane usage on the freeway, that means that every project that comes in that meets the thresholds has to evaluate its impact on the HOV ridership on I-680. This is a complex and potentially expensive exercise and he isn't even sure how to direct a consultant to do it.

Engelmann noted that all projects are covered by the Action Plan but it's the GPAs that rock the boat. If you have a project that is consistent with your General Plan, it has already been evaluated relative to the MTSOs in the Action Plan.

Pierce suggested that as we go through this process we should think about the Naval Weapons Station, the only really big GPA that any of us is likely to have, and consider a realistic way to address that.

Hall asked if Measure J required analysis of major development that meets the threshold. Engelmann responded that the language in Measure J states that the lead jurisdiction shall evaluate the impacts of project developments and general plans on the MTSOs. We are now formulating the implementation guides that say if there is clearance of your adopted General Plans through the Action Plan that would cover evaluation of each individual project. GPAs are different. The

analysis of the existing General Plans is underway being done by DKS and it is expected in 3-4 weeks. The analysis will report whether the existing TSOs since you don't have new ones, can be achieved. He noted that it is not required to meet the TSOs but if you may need to change the target date. We are also looking at technological innovations by 2030, such as increased telework arrangements which would change the number of trips in 2030.

Greitzer noted that today's discussion has mirrored previous TAC discussions and still brings us back to the central question: should we have to do this at all? Do we need to have predetermined, specific numeric targets for some future year 10-20 years from now, and analyze every GPA that meets the threshold to see if it would cause a violation of that future numerical target. This has proven difficult, time consuming, costly, and it doesn't seem to add anything useful over what is being analyzed for CEQA.

Hall requested clarification from Engelmann concerning his comments on changing the implementation documents. Engelmann responded that the CEQA analysis is still required, as is the traffic study, but there would be a way to clear the MTSO analysis through the Action Plan to avoid having to go through the complex calculation for each development project. The proposed final draft of the Implementation Guide includes that language.

Armstrong asked if the Concord General Plan currently accommodates the worst case scenario of CNWS, and was told it did not. He commented that if we're at the point of gridlock it means we give up and there is no impact because it can't get any worse. We should not do studies if we are in fact at gridlock. The only measure he sees is that once cities get to a certain percentage of land available, it might indicate when reports are required. We are at infill and have no projects except for CNWS.

Osborn noted an additional problem is that we are going to be getting constant pressure from the state, from HCD, from ABAG, with respect to increased RHNA numbers, and there's no way we can go with General Plans that were developed 10 years ago.

Pierce said if you could make the MTSO relative to how you get around the county with implementation methods such as using signal interconnects, encouraging flex time, and encouraging rules that all houses should have internet connectivity—requirements like these that are not concrete and but might make it easier to accomplish these things. We could encourage more investment in better and smarter transit, including some kind of transit that works efficiently in lower density areas.

Hoag posed the questions: Is the only purpose of the MTSOs to satisfy CCTA's requirements? If they serve no useful purpose, what is the benefit to undergo expensive, time-consuming analyses to prove we hit our imaginary numbers. What is the value of establishing objectives that you know you can meet? If CEQA is driving most of what we are doing, why should we layer another process with what seems to be arbitrary information? Of what value is the target and justification for the expense of going through the analysis to prove the target has been met? He noted in Item 5 in the second paragraph that the objective is to meet CCTA's Action Plan requirement. We could look at what are we attempting to do with TSOs that we could already meet through other means and determine where are the CEQA exceptions, and then define the CEQA exceptions and those could be the MTSOs.

*David Durant arrived at 10:30 a.m.*

Kuzbari noted that the TSOs rely heavily on the travel demand model and theoretical projections and estimates. With CEQA we are adding one or more layers of human intervention in assessing what's realistic. With the TSOs we get estimates and projections from the models, and we have little control how to influence those factors on Caltrans facilities. With the TSOs we always run into

this disconnect between what the model says and what is realistic in terms of taking action. The MTSOs are not realistic.

Greitzer stated that Member Hoag's comment captured the essence of the TAC's views that the additional layer has not been as helpful as we thought it would be. The question is whether TRANSPAC should ask the Transportation Authority if we can do an Action Plan that does not have these MTSOs in it and explain the reasons why. Authority staff indicates that we do need to have them, but because of these unresolved issues and the difficulties it presents, should TRANSPAC ask the Authority if that requirement for MTSOs could be changed.

Pierce asked if we could craft something that is already an outgrowth from CEQA requirements and make that MTSOs from that, as it sets thresholds that must be cleared. Hall clarified that CEQA allows the agency to set the threshold, is more flexible, the standards are not set by CEQA.

Bjerke said that this discussion has been helpful and suggested that TRANSPAC 1) Wait to see the analysis that the Authority returns to us in a month and see what it looks like given the previous TSOs; 2) if the TAC hasn't already seen what WCCTAC did on I-80, it should review that; and 3) we continue talking about objectives, knowing that the Authority says they should be measurable, and move in the direction that the TAC has outlined where we look at setting up a process where, as a region, we review the state of network on a regular basis to assess whether or not the various General Plan Amendments for those things that are over and above what was in our baseline analysis whether those mitigations are addressing the network appropriately and set that as our standard and send to the Authority for review and discussion. It uses the information we are achieving through the CEQA process. That process has suggested mitigations on a project by project basis that have either been achieved or are in process and we have measurable network to see whether they work or not.

Pierce also agreed with the idea of waiting another month to see the results of the current TSOs which might indicate that some have been met and could and be kept in as goals. Pierce noted that from the sample of the monitoring report in the packet needs to provide more specifics that would show where problems arose and what specific measures could be taken.

Engelmann stated that Authority staff plan on bringing back a detailed report that provides the specifics concerning where and at what point TSOs are not being met. He responded to Member Hoag's question saying that the intent of MTSOs is for each region to use in the way it develops and how it views developments upstream. Commissioner Bjerke mentioned a concern about all the development in East County and that there is no requirement that East County mitigate impacts within Central County. If you have concerns like that, then you should set your MTSOs so that if there is a development in East County that adversely affects you, you would want to have that triggered by the threshold set in your MTSO. The Authority is not asking for MTSOs because it wants them; it is an objective set by you and is intended to help Central County jurisdictions grow. You should be able to meet the target in the existing General Plans. If someone does something outside the area that results in your being unable to meet that, you want to have some kind of threshold of significance that is qualitative.

Neustadter responded to Engelmann that it has not been TRANSPAC's position to make it difficult for anyone to travel from East County through Central County. We have been holding back our own projects so East County can get its projects done which will in turn deliver more cars to us. Which is true – are we continuing to move the traffic through from Eastern Contra Costa County or are we saying now that we've helped get you funding for your road and transit projects, there will be penalties if you tread on us?

Pierce said that when it impacts the local arterials, we need to have quantifiable data that holds them accountable for part of the impact. We need to wait and see the results of the TSOs from the last Action Plan and maybe some of the TSOs can be reworked.

Bjerke suggested that the TAC should still work on an alternative scheme. Hall added that this was a helpful discussion and he thanked the committee for its input. Durant said that we would not be forestalling the opportunity to go back to the Authority to say that what worked 13 years ago does not work today. This is the right tool for achieving the objectives of Measure C and Measure J.

**ACTION: The issues surrounding the establishment of MTSOs in the TRANSPAC Action Plan were discussed. By consensus, the TAC will follow Guy Bjerke's suggestions and report back to TRANSPAC in May or June.**

With the arrival of David Durant a quorum was met and the agenda was returned to the Consent Agenda for approval.

**6. Discussion/Comments on the Countywide Transportation Plan Vision, Goals and Strategies (CTP VGS)**

**DISCUSSION:** Neustadter asked if the committee wanted to hold this item for next the meeting given the time constraints and Supervisor Bonilla's particular interest in discussing this topic. Pierce stated that she wanted the word "manage" back in this document and "reduce future" removed.

**ACTION:** Review of the CTP VGS to be held over until the May meeting.

**7. TRANSPAC and CCTA Representatives' Reports. The minutes of the January 16, 2008 and February 20, 2008 CCTA Board meetings were included in the packet.**

Administration and Projects Committee (APC) meeting

Member Pierce reported that the APC pulled several items off the Consent Calendar, including the RFQ for website services to improve the Authority's website and establishing a voluntary flexible spending account for employees. It was expected that both would go forward. The recommendation was made for the selection of a software consultant to upgrade the Authority's outdated accounting software and discussion about the implementation. The major discussion involved the salary and benefit study which is being held over to the next meeting.

Planning Committee (PC) meeting

Member Durant reported that the PC discussed the circulation draft of the Congestion Management Agency Budget for FY 08-09, and another draft is expected to be discussed at the next meeting. The PC again discussed the "Looking to the Future" brochure. CCTA staff outlined what the new brochure would look like, but the PC questioned the need for having the brochure and requested further refinements. A handout was distributed with regard to MTC's update to the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan. Recommendations by MTC staff appear to be inconsistent with Authority policy. Staff was looking for guidance on the policy approach and was advised to pursue the existing current policy. This MTC proposal needs to be more widely circulated to get feedback to decide how to deal with MTC and our representatives to MTC. The 2009 RTP needs additional discussion (note: now planned for May 8, 2008).

Bjerke asked if our MTC representatives were not supporting the Authority's position. Pierce answered that we need to be more firm in providing direction to our representatives.

**Reports received; no action taken**

## **8. Reports from Staff and Committees - Accepted**

511 Contra Costa Monthly Reports for March and April by Lynn Osborn, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager.

Osborn noted that an abbreviated report was included in the packet. The 2006-07 reports are being finalized and data for the 2007-08 program is being compiled. Next week we are going to the Authority for approval of 511 Contra Costa's 2008-09 TFCA projects. Recently, the Authority discovered an over-allocation of funds occurring twelve years ago in the Measure C Car Pool/Van Pool parking lot funds. We are working with Authority staff to determine a process to reimburse them for this amount over a four year period (longer if necessary). Authority staff has also advised us to plan on expending Measure C funds by a yet unspecified date next year. Based on data collected, it appears that 511 Contra Costa programs have done well this last year.

**ACTION: Reports Accepted**

## **9. Correspondence/Copies/Newsclips/Information – Accepted as listed on the Agenda**

- 10. Discussion of TRANSPAC Consultant Services/Contracts for a) TRANSPAC Services (funded by TRANSPAC jurisdictions pursuant to established formula), b) 511 Contra Costa Management Services (funded by Measures C/J) and c) RM2 I-680 HOV/Express Bus Access Study Administrative Management Services funded by RM2 via CCTA and MTC**

The contract with Neustadter Associates for TRANSPAC services expires on June 30, 2008. The TAC recommends a two-year contract extension, based as in years' past, on the City of Pleasant Hill 2008-2009 (3.5% percent management COLA increase for each year).

**ACTION: Approved TAC recommendation on Consultant contracts for 2009-2010 with a 3.5% compensation increase based on the City of Pleasant Hill management 2008-2009 COLA percent increase for each year). Bjerke/Durant/Unanimous**

- 11. Review of Draft 2008-09 TRANSPAC and Regional Measure 2 I-680 HOV Gap Closure Study Budgets**

**DISCUSSION:** Neustadter reviewed the 2008/09 Budget in comparison with the 2007/08 Budget. With regard to the topic of printing and postage costs, Neustadter announced that the next TRANSPAC TAC packet would be electronic. To transition to this method, staff will also provide copies of the agenda packet for each meeting to those who request a copy.

**ACTION: Adopted the TRANSPAC 2008-09 and Regional Measure 2 I-680 HOV Gap Closure Study Budgets and copier machine and color printer proposal in partnership with 511 Contra Costa. Durant/Silva/Unanimous**

- 12. For the Good of the Order – none**

- 13. Updated TRANSPAC Roster – changes accepted**

- 14. The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 a.m. The next TRANSPAC meeting is scheduled for May 8, 2008.**