

**Summary Minutes
TRANSPAC – April 13, 2006**

ATTENDANCE:

Elected Officials: Julie Pierce, Clayton, CCTA Representative, TRANSPAC Vice-Chair; Bill Shinn, Concord, TRANSPAC Chair; Mark Ross, Martinez; David Durant, Pleasant Hill; Charlie Abrams, Walnut Creek, CCTA Representative. Absent: Mary N. Piepho, Contra Costa County [Excused].

Planning Commissioners: Joe Odrzywolski, Clayton; Bill Brumley, Concord; Robert Simmons, Walnut Creek. Absent: Donnie Snyder, Contra Costa County [Excused]; David Mascaro, Pleasant Hill [Excused]. Vacant Seat: Martinez.

Staff: John Templeton, Concord; Steve Goetz, Contra Costa County, Martin Engelmann, CCTA; Cindy Dahlgren, CCCTA; Richard Pearson, Martinez; Steve Wallace, Pleasant Hill; John Hall, Walnut Creek; Deidre Heitman, Tom Matoff, Marianne Payne, BART; Lynn Osborn, 511ContraCosta Program Manager; Barbara Neustadter, Julia Fuller, TRANSPAC staff.

Public: Rich Spatz, Pleasant Hill.

Meeting convened with a quorum by Chair Shinn at 9:00 a.m.

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

2. Public Comment

Chair Shinn summarized a letter dated 4/5/06 from Phyllis Roff, which stated: “Dear Chair Bill and Colleagues: Happy Spring, Passover and Easter! Have any of you had the courage to check your toes for webs? I am a coward. Once again campaign season is upon us. Yes, I am already involved. A guest column has been sent to Concord Transcript. I consider it to be a two-person race so deal only with Canciamilla and DeSaulnier. Often I have commented on candidates whether or not I can vote for or against them. Board of Supervisors race is another case in point but I chose not to comment on this one except to say to you that I am very upset that religion has entered this campaign. I just wrote a letter to the Times’ editor to make comments on Sunne Wright McPeak’s Sunday column (4/2/06). I was supportive of the governor and not nearly as brutal to the Legislature as I would have preferred. I listen to Gene Burns on KGO from time to time. He had heard an interview Ronn Owens had recently with Angelides. Gene’s reaction was to call Phil a political hack. Not to show favoritism, Gene said he was underwhelmed by Westly and he did not vote for the governor. Isn’t politics a fun but dirty game? (Signed) Phyllis

Chair Shinn encouraged other participation and reminded all present that the meeting was intended to be interactive. Pierce reiterated Shinn’s request adding that comments from staff and Planning Commissioners always adds more dimension to the discussion and she hoped that all would contribute to the dialogue.

CONSENT AGENDA: Pierce/Abrams/unanimous

3. Approved March 9, 2006 TRANSPAC meeting minutes

END CONSENT AGENDA

4. Presentation on the Regional Rail process by Tom Matoff, Director, Transportation Planning, LTK Engineering Services

Mr. Matoff presented a quick overview of the Regional Rail process in advance of community meetings scheduled for May. This is an opportunity for TRANSPAC to raise issues/concerns and share comments on this topic.

Mr. Matoff thanked TRANSPAC for allowing the presentation. He gave a quick overview of the Regional Rail Plan set in motion by Regional Measure Two (RM2) which increased the bridge tolls and provided funding for a study to revisit the issue of a California High Speed Rail project in the Bay Area. The high speed rail program has been underway for a decade or more and the environmental documents have been completed for all parts of it except the Central Valley to Bay Area link. The original plan was to come up through the San Joaquin Valley over Pacheco Pass to San Francisco or Oakland. There are also advocates who would like to see it come over the Altamont Pass to the Tri Valley area. There are plusses and minuses associated with both approaches. RM2 provided funding for a re-evaluation of the two approaches as well as environmental clearance. A Steering Committee including members from CCTA, MTC, California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA), BART and Caltrain is overseeing the study.

Mr. Matoff distributed a handout which demonstrated how the Steering Committee intends to pull together all entities involved in rail planning for the Bay Area to try to address the issues of high speed rail alignment and regional rail integration at the same time. The purpose of the project is to prepare a Bay Area Regional Rail Plan for MTC Consideration and Adoption.

There are four components of Regional Rail: Regional Rapid Transit (BART); Railroad-based Passenger Systems (Caltrain, ACE, Capitol Corridor); Bay Area High-Speed Segments; and other extensions of rapid transit or railroad-based passenger services like eBART. Regional Rapid Transit systems are fully grade separated and maintain frequent operation all day long. Railroad passenger systems are distinct with separate needs including a regulatory and cost system. Railroad-based systems may operate on publicly-owned trackage or tracks of privately-owned railroad companies and may require freight capacity increases as part of a passenger service development. Railroad systems must accommodate freight needs.

The Plan strategy is to meet future regional mobility needs through integration and expansion of the regional passenger rail system, improved interfaces between regional services and between regional and local services to have a level of seamlessness and connectivity in the future that presently doesn't exist, improved capacity on the regional railroad system and coordination of regional rail investments with transit-supportive land use.

To the degree that we operate on privately owned railroad systems, we have to recognize that we are essentially manufacturing a public good on privately owned property. The commercial needs of freight railroads have to be addressed. The study will look at the issues of Port traffic and innovative ways to handle local freight switching and distribution where there is a lot of daytime passenger service. Assessing the needs for passenger improvements to rail necessitates a look at future needs projections of traffic on and capacity of the rail system. Commercial confidentiality must be considered because of the competitive position of the various rail companies. Railroad capacity improvements may include multiple tracks, better signal and train control systems, new lines, new yards and terminals, grade separations and projects outside the 9-county Bay Area. These improvements are important as a way to meet peak needs.

There are four major rail systems coming into the Bay Area: Union Pacific Capitol Corridor Line, BNSF Stockton Line, Union Pacific Altamont Line and the Union Pacific Coast Line. The geographic study area of the project is extended beyond the 9 county MTC area because interaction with freight railroad systems is a given, and because the commuter-shed extends from Roseville to Modesto to Monterey to Santa Rosa. Because of major congestion points in this expanded area (the Donner Pass Line and San Joaquin Valley), the study area is a little more global than is usual in MTC studies.

Some institutional arrangements may emerge to improve the flow through the region's transit system while preserving local accountability. BART is viewed as a politically structured institution on one hand and a technology on the other.

Support strategies will be addressed later on in the study, including governance and institutions, right-of-way preservation, complementary land use strategy and funding strategies. The study will identify future needs to provide a technical basis for funds now to acquire rights-of-way that will only be more expensive in the future. Websites and workshops are scheduled in the fall and media relations work will be extensive in May and June.

Technical consultants Korve Engineers and Earth-Tech Engineering will report to the project management team. Many of the ideas that were listed at workshops are now being formulated around a series of themes for future development. These will be reviewed by the Steering Committee. About a dozen initial ideas will be created on how to develop regional rail in the future. Those will be subjected to fairly intensive technical analysis. In the end, the committee will recommend a plan to MTC which will consist of three potential outcomes: how to organize the regional rail system over a 50 year period in the event that high speed comes in through Pacheco Pass in the south; how to do it over Altamont Pass; and what to do with regional rail in the Bay Area if there is no high speed system. The Committee will address how regional needs can be met without a high speed system.

Ross asked why Martinez was not included on the map of the study area. He added that Martinez is extremely important to any regional rail plan. There is \$2M of BART's money in the Martinez Intermodal. Ross also asked for clarification of the term complementary land use planning. Pierce asked if the study was being coordinated with Resolution 3434, Transit Supported land use. Matoff responded that Resolution 3434 is taken as a starting point for the study. Pierce asked about the level of control, who is paying for it and how much local control is going to be usurped or attempted to be usurped.

Matoff said the plan will not usurp anything. It will go to MTC as a set of recommendations. If there are recommendations that involve leveraging transit investment, the process would be through normal land use procedures through ABAG and MTC and local agencies. The study is a vision of what could happen if the region wanted to develop that way. The study will not be proposing a regional land use mechanism unless the region wants it that way.

Brumley asked if the study addressed more railroad rather than so many trucks on the road which seems to be getting worse and worse. At BART, in the beginning of the study, there is clearly a lot of interest in Altamont and the I-580 corridor which has had a lot of freight/truck growth. There used to be a two line railroad over Altamont pass where one is now in operation. One line had the rails removed and the right-of-way is now publicly owned by Alameda County which is looking at ways to combine the return of freight with passenger

service and to incorporate more strategies to make it more palatable to ship by rail rather than truck over the Pass.

Ross asked about an environmental component and Matoff responded that any implementation levels will have to go through full environmental clearance. At this level, it is a strategic process and not yet subject to environmental screening.

Pierce asked who from CCTA is participating on this committee and was told that Bob McCleary attended one of the charrettes that had been scheduled as part of the outreach program. Neustadter asked if there is a policy steering committee at this time and was told no, that MTC overall is participating as the policy committee. MTC has also been in touch with Paul Maxwell. Durant asked who else is included and was told there are 30 members, including CCTA, the four lead agencies, CMAs, Railroads, and Ports. Durant asked if TRANSPAC could get a list of the participants.

Pierce asked what is envisioned at this point as part of the plan in terms of coordination of regional rail investment with transit supported land use. What does that mean?

The response was that the rail system needs to provide for the location of lines and stations in a way that reflects where development is zoned or planned or likely to occur, i.e. Hercules would be an important station on the regional rail system. Similarly if a station located at point X turns out to be a good place for an interchange for two lines, the land use potential for development could be identified and might be very promising. The study doesn't go beyond identifying the potential. The study provides a vision of what might be in the future and whether or not the region wants to take advantage of that would be a policy decision.

Durant said this study is looking at a 50 year horizon and he wondered who would be making land use decisions 50 years out. He felt it was rather speculative. Matoff said the basis for land forecast and identification of development opportunities is the ABAG land-use projections. The methodology and relationship with local transit systems would occur as the plan becomes more detailed. Dahlgren asked if they are looking into extensions of existing routes and identifying where funding will come from. Matoff said the study would provide a financial strategy for funding.

Goetz said information developed might be useful in reducing the level of subsidies needed to operate what is being proposed. The EIR for the Countywide Transportation Plan had an assumption that the Capitol Corridor will be electrified. Will this study look at the feasibility of that actually occurring during the planning period? The response was yes, the engineering team will look at the cost benefits of electrification of the main line.

Templeton asked how much money is being used to fund this study. The technical work for the Regional Rail Plan is being done by Korve. Engelmann heard that \$4.5M is available in the RM2 for this. There is \$2.5M for the high speed demand forecast. Pierce wondered if a full comprehensive review of the high speed rail program component was required. She had just traveled Highway 5 and wondered if there is any consideration being given to get the trucks off Highway 5. That might be a way to pay for the rail system and would improve the flow of Highway 5 thus saving everyone else time and fuel and frustration.

Matoff responded that high speed can handle express freight at night. Heavy freight is not compatible with high speed systems and would have to remain on the conventional freight railway system. This is not a statewide freight management system.

No Action Taken: Chair Shinn thanked Mr. Matoff for his presentation.

5. Presentation of the Pacheco Transit Hub project by Celinda Dahlgren, Director of Administration, County Connection and Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager

Last summer, County Connection was advised by the owner of a potential park and ride lot on Muir Road across from the Martinez Veterans' Hospital that the parcel would not be available. Since then County Connection and TRANSPAC staff have worked diligently to develop a new transit facility/park and ride lot at the I-680/SR 4 Interchange and TRANSPAC has received monthly updates on the actions taken to develop that project.

County Connection and TRANSPAC staff were appreciative of Caltrans' cooperation in the use of the land and for Nolte Associates engineering services for conceptual project plans and cost estimates which were made available by CCTA. TRANSPAC, WCCTAC and TRANSPLAN had contributed \$92,922 in TFCA funds for project development and RM2 included \$1.089 million for the Muir Road project. The RTPCs and MTC agreed that the funds could be transferred to a similar project at the I-680/SR 4 location.

In the course of developing conceptual layouts for the project, Nolte Associates determined that due to additional environmental analysis requirements and increased materials costs, there was significant increase in the project's cost. In March 2006 TRANSPAC approved a request to CCTA for Measure C funding to cover an estimated \$550,000 shortfall in the project budget. TRANSPAC and County Connection letters requesting Measure C funding for the project were in the packet. The CCTA Administration and Projects Committee (APC) considered this request at its April 8, 2006 meeting and approved the request. Once the project is completely approved, the work scope for environmental work can be better defined. Currently, the agreement with Nolte to come up with a set of final plans including landscaping, lighting, etc. is being completed.

Dahlgren said the idea is to construct a Transit Hub that will accommodate up to six buses and 150 park and ride spaces so buses from east and West County will have a central location for transfers without having to go into downtown Martinez. The Regional Express Bus Plan identified the dearth of park and ride facilities in the County. The lack of hubs for connections between systems has made bus express systems very challenging for transit operators.

CCCTA wanted to take advantage of the opportunity offered by Caltrans to get some free land in a location that is excellent in terms of access for transit and carpooling. It is visible from the freeway so hopefully commuters stuck in traffic might be encouraged to participate. This site is better than the original site that didn't work out.

Steve Goetz has a great interest in the project and has been very helpful pursuing a TETAP grant to do some traffic and circulation studies for getting in and out of the facility. CCCTA is very appreciative of his efforts. Dahlgren will be working with the Pacheco Municipal Advisory Committee and has had many meetings with Caltrans. The plan for the project is to phase it. This funding is for the first phase and a conceptual plan for the second phase that can be put into place at the same time the slip ramps go in. The intent is to design a hub so there is minimal amount of disruption to transit operations when the slip ramp construction starts later.

Neustadter said the intent is to move this project ahead with the speed of light. She was grateful to County Connection lawyers who approved the soul source contract and was grateful to CCTA and Nolte for providing so much help.

ACTION: Durant/Pierce/unanimous

Accepted report with thanks to Ms. Dahlgren, Caltrans and CCTA for assistance in developing the project.

6. Review, Discussion and Development of Recommendations to CCTA on the Draft Measure J Financial Framework and Associated Policies

CCTA staff developed and the CCTA approved circulation of a financial framework and set of associated policies for the implementation of Measure J. To facilitate TRANSPAC's review and discussion of the framework and policies, CCTA draft policy documents were in the packet. The TRANSPAC TAC reviewed this document at its March 23, 2006 meeting. TAC comments are noted below. The documents were discussed separately in the following order:

a) Transmittal memo from Chief Deputy Executive Director Paul Maxwell set the context for this review as the first step in formulating policy for Measure J implementation and his memo requested comments to CCTA by April 28, 2006.

b) The Summary of Proposed Policies is a quick overview of the basic elements of the financial framework which defines Measure J activities. Policies 5 and 6 establish the procedures for the advance of funds and possible reimbursement for planning for "operating programs" (pages 1-2).

The TRANSPAC TAC recommended adoption of items 1 through 6 of the Proposed Policies and specifically item 6 for reimbursement of advance planning efforts for Measure J Operating Programs for the Town of Danville (note: On March 15, 2006, the CCTA adopted this policy only for the Town of Danville request to initiate planning for the San Ramon Valley School Bus program. When the full complement of policies for Measure J are adopted, other jurisdictions and agencies will be able to seek a commitment for future reimbursement of advance planning efforts for operating programs).

c) Pages 3-9 of the Circulation draft explores key issues and factors in establishing an overall policy framework for capital projects, operating programs and "hybrids" which have both operating and capital components, and the reimbursement of locally funded, pre-2009 planning studies for eligible operating programs.

d) Attachment A is a summary of Operating Programs and Hybrid Elements (pages 10-15) and defines the methods through which these funds might be drawn down over the life of Measure J including the establishment of operating reserves.

e) Proposed Policy for Advancement of Measure J Project Development Work defines the process through which project sponsors may request the commencement of project development work for projects that are both in Measure C and Measure J AND projects that are not in Measure C but in Measure J only.

The TRANSPAC TAC had the following recommendations/comments under "Authority Advancement of Project Development Work for Project (sic) not in Measure C Expenditure Plan" on page 3 of the Proposed Policy for Advancement of Measure J Project Development

Work.

1) Paragraph (b) should be revised to require that the sponsor must obtain concurrence from the relevant RTPC(s) that a project is a high priority in the region. 'High priority in the region' should be defined as a project on the Bond Expenditure Plan or Back Up Bond Expenditure Plan list. A final Bond Expenditure Plan will be developed prior to bond issuance in the fall of 2009.

2) Paragraph (f) should be revised to add that consultant services costs will be paid and that sponsor staff oversight costs will not be reimbursed.

3) Paragraph (h) should be revised to include a requirement that projects must be ready to go to construction to be eligible to use bond funds. Within that context, geographic equity should be defined as the percentage of capital projects by region in Measure J.

Neustadter reviewed the differences in Measure C and Measure J projects' eligibility for funding to be sure everyone was clear on the distinctions between the kinds of activities and money available under the framework. Everything that follows pertains to what kind of money you're talking about. Decisions relative to hybrid elements need to be made early especially regarding how much is expected for operating and capital expenses. This is a difficult early decision to make and it doesn't mean that it can't change. Operating programs generally have a revenue stream that is spread out over the life of the measure. Capital projects come in lump sums. The Authority staff has done a great job smoothing out those large capital investments that fall in a long line. The TAC, TDM staff and TRANSPAC Manager are all working on how to lay this out for Central County projects, capital projects and hybrid elements. In the background are two bond measures, \$300M in 2009 and \$150M in 2012.

Should a project on the big part of the list not go forward, such as the Caldecott, a project would be ready to bring in, such as the arterial projects, to expend the bond dollars which must be spent within a time frame. In order to get backup projects ready on the bond list, project development must be done. A 10% hit is carried to be on the Bond Expenditure Plan right now which means any project needs to be ready to go and must really be needed within the time frame of the 2009 Bond Measure or the 2012 Bond Measure. Any number of projects might be good candidates for the bond or back up bond list.

The process was initiated when the Town of Danville made a benign request to CCTA for future reimbursement of funds for doing pre-planning work for San Ramon Valley School Bus Program. It was an out of order request, in essence, backwards because the Town of Danville had already issued an RFP and already had a bidder's conference before it went to the Authority to ask for future reimbursement. The Authority has never approved a retroactive request. A project sponsor may use its own funds to undertake early planning activity at its own expense but there is no guarantee of future reimbursement.

Abrams thought the process should stop there and Durant agreed. Durant said he didn't have a problem with a request that the Authority approve today a future reimbursement of the costs associated with planning efforts prior to incurring or expending any money. Before a jurisdiction does anything except to know what it is it wants to do, it should go to the Authority and make a request for future reimbursement which will take place after July 1, 2009. Pierce

said it would actually be after September when Measure J is fully operational and theoretically

there will be a revenue stream.

The circulation draft in the packet shows what is needed for approval: concurrence with the Policy Body, support from your RTPC, maybe more than one depending on what is proposed. The cost to be reimbursed cannot exceed one fourth of the first year annual revenue. If more than that is requested, the first year funding is effectively expended. Costs can only be used for consultants or service provider activity. There is a series of items listed in the packet for which funds can be used but sponsor staff costs for oversight of the project is not one of them. There are special rules and regulations for reimbursement which are very specific. The Authority has to make the determination as to whether or not the future payment is good under Measure J and the jurisdiction has to enter into agreement with the Authority to the terms of this future reimbursement.

Abrams feared that this system would cost more to manipulate than one gets from it. He thinks the system being created is untenable. Right now this only covers Danville but he anticipates a lot more requests if the system is approved. Pierce said once Danville did it then everyone else started thinking they could do that too so the Authority knew that rules and guidelines needed to be in place to deal with the various requests. Abrams thinks that is the big concession for this whole process; he thinks the maximum should be zero and that jurisdictions should put up their own money.

Pierce said there will be costs involved to manage these studies and agency staff time is not covered so the Authority has to decide whether or not it is worth going forward. Abrams felt this process is out of line with what Measure J is trying to do. He didn't think this project is the highest priority project to be moving forward to warrant this type of guideline being set up.

Pierce said some kind of work has to be done ahead of time for a project to be ready and that's what this process will address. If a jurisdiction can save $\frac{1}{4}$ of the cost of the first year's allotment to be able to get the project ready, then it is that jurisdiction's prerogative to spend their portion of Measure J in this way. It's up to the jurisdiction and its RTPC and the Authority has to have rules and guidelines for its participation in the process.

Durant asked for clarification of the costs to be reimbursed and the regional pots of money. Neustadter said it is one quarter of the set aside for whichever program you are attempting to implement. He was not keen on 6.e. along the same lines as Abrams' proposed no reimbursement at all. An outside study is different, but an inside study should not receive reimbursement. There could be some interesting challenges and the possibility of an inside person finding creative ways to pad the budget to fold the costs into this funding as a way of cost saving on a city's already stretched budget. Durant would not be comfortable with the kind of spending that would shift dollars from Measure J to offset operating costs.

Dahlgren said CCCTA rarely charges administrative time against grants; however, if the work is outside the scope of what staff normally does then a charge is made. Service planning is not something for which they charge extra. Nor would they charge extra for participating in the Express Bus Study.

Pierce had a problem with jurisdictions believing that only consultants could be charged against Measure J. Durant noted that everyone has budget problems but he asked which is the lesser evil: More consultants or augmented staff costs with padded budgets?

Goetz asked how this might apply to the County's participation in the traffic counts for the San

Ramon bus project. One of the first tasks will be traffic counts which County Public Works has a capacity to do in-house. However, the County conducts traffic counts for other purposes, not for determining school bus service. Instead of using the County's capability, must the cities of San Ramon and Danville contract out for that service? Durant responded he would be comfortable with the County being used as a subcontractor in this case because the County would not normally do that work. The County is providing a service for a fee. If the County is in the budget as a consultant, it would be reimbursable. This instance would be treated differently because it is not how the County usually performs traffic counts.

Abrams said this school bus program has created a lot of confusion and it goes back to the fact that the only part of the county that has a school bus program is asking that all kinds of trade-offs be made to expand the school bus program. A good argument could be made whether or not this is a suitable Measure J project. He felt that the funds should be regional and no particular city should have a specific allocation. Pierce said Danville is taking the lead in doing this for the region.

Shinn said this is a good example of the confusion. The issue is relative to the reimbursement of sponsor costs. Pierce said the Authority is also watching for return-to-source dollars and how much of a particular person's time can legitimately be charged to the project. There have been some abuses in the past.

Shinn thought the idea that there are concerns in both Measure J and return to source funding should be articulated. Is it a local funding option or a regional funding issue? There are concerns about the operating mechanism. Engelmann noted that Phyllis Roff resigned from the Citizen's Advisory Committee over the Lamorinda school bus issue. Children's transportation is 4.55% of the Measure. It is worth noting that .5% of that is for Central County Safe Transportation for Children and .7% is for West County Safe Transportation for Children's student bus pass. The Southwest portion is only 3.3%. Pierce noted that the only way that SWAT would buy into Measure J was if they could determine themselves how their traffic money was spent.

Durant noted that there is a trust issue that still resounds from the original discussions surrounding Measure J. What we are really talking about is that the funds must be used as they were intended. There is a need for trust building and accountability and if people want to go through a complicated process to get there then that's ok.

Shinn thought it would be a good idea to give Neustadter some feedback to draft a letter and run it by the members of TRANSPAC.

Neustadter explained that one kind of capital project is a project that is included in Measure C and Measure J. A request to the Authority must include support from the RTPC and compliance with current Measure C policies. The assumption is that for a capital project you are initiating project development activities regardless of the project being in Measure C and J or just Measure J. This is a project you intend to be included in the Bond Expenditure Plan (most probably in 2009 but maybe in 2012). Because of the 10% interest payment you need to have very good reasons for wanting to do the project now. It is expected that those projects would be ones like the Caldecott and possibly eBART.

Central County is in an unusual position because it looks like we have \$15M for gap closure in

I-680 including a \$1M study. Once that study is finished and all parties have concurred then we have \$14M to proceed through the project development phase. We may not need to be in the position of asking for I-680 dollars out of the Expenditure Bond Plan. Right now, subject to change, we won't have to take the 10% hit on the top of that project.

The arterials discussion is entirely different. If we are in a backup position then it's a different situation and we're doing the Authority a favor and would expect some assistance.

The second kind of the capital projects is for the advancement of projects that are not in Measure C but only in Measure J. Most of those projects are under the Authority umbrella with occasionally other parties involved. Abrams asked if we have any projects in TRANSPAC that fit that and Neustadter responded that would be the arterials and the Authority staff is well aware of TRANSPAC's interest in arterials. These projects are significantly less complicated than the Caldecott and smaller than Highway 4 East and can be ready to go.

Some smaller jurisdictions have some projects which are very important to traffic circulation and don't have a huge impact on the region but are very important. Pierce said it might be worth the 10% to get the project done sooner rather than later. Maybe the two projects could be packaged as one project. Shinn had a project too, the widening of Ygnacio Valley Rd. Pierce said this might be the only way to get those two funded. Goetz thought pieces of Pacheco Blvd (everything except the Railroad piece) might be considered for the arterial projects. Pierce also raised the Kirker Road project.

Neustadter reviewed the series of steps needed to get projects advanced. On page three, project development work, one needs to read the titles very carefully. Different processes depend on which element is being considered. Neustadter reviewed the TAC recommendations. The recurring theme is that projects must be ready to go to construction to be eligible to use bond funds. Within that context, geographic equity should be defined as the percentage of capital projects by region in Measure J.

Durant agreed with the TAC recommendations and thanked Neustadter and the TAC for their fine effort and excellent staff work.

ACTION: Pierce/Abrams/unanimous

Transmit Comments and Recommendations from the discussion on the Draft Measure J Financial Framework and Associated Policies to CCTA. Neustadter will draft the letter and distribute it to TRANSPAC officials for comment and review.

7. TRANSPAC and CCTA Representatives' Reports. The minutes of the February 15, 2006 CCTA meeting were included in the packet. **Congratulations to Julie Pierce** on her election as Chair of the CCTA Administration and Projects Committee (APC).

a. Planning Committee meeting

Member Abrams reported that Member Pierce attended the Planning Committee on his behalf. Pierce said the discussion involved the review of legal counsel's analysis on the Urban Limit Line (ULL) which basically deteriorated into a discussion of what does 'yes' mean and what does 'no' mean. The County will put a measure on the ballot to be approved countywide. If it passes countywide but not in particular cities then the attorneys are raising issues of conflicting borders. Pierce said the Authority is looking at making sure that one of the recommendations is that if a city does put a measure on the ballot and gets approval from its

citizens then that decision cannot be overturned by a countywide measure. The environmental community testified at the Board of Supervisors meeting asking that city voted lines could be superseded by the County line. There is concern that lines approved by local voters in Pittsburg and Antioch will be unacceptable. The Authority is trying to get clarification that a local ballot would supersede the county regardless. This is still under discussion.

The Planning Committee suggested that the ruling by the attorneys be an easily read list of bullets instead of an eight page long complicated legal memo. The Committee also suggested that the growth management element be amended. It does take a super-majority of the Authority Board to do that but it can be done for clarification of the ULL requirement. This became a basic item of discussion because there were rumors that the requirements should just be thrown out altogether.

There was an interesting discussion on Engelmann's report regarding the overview of current MTC planning and Operations Activities. The full report is on the website. Engelmann gave a quick six second version: The Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) have recently undertaken the following planning and operations activities: 1) Transit Connectivity Study; 2) Parking Policies to Support Smart Growth; 3) Agency Strategic Plan; 4) Pedestrian Districts Study; 5) Revisions to MTC Resolution 3434 (the Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects); 6) Focusing Our Vision (formally ABAG & MTC's Regional Footprint/a.k.a Shaping Our Future in Contra Costa); and 7) The Regional High Occupancy/Toll (HOT) Lane Network Feasibility Study.

And how many of those programs will devolve into something and...that's our concern...

Chair Shinn congratulated Pierce and Abrams and lauded the fact that TRANSPAC holds both Chair Committee assignments.

b. Administration and Projects Committee meeting

Member Pierce reported that the Administration and Projects Committee amended the 2005 Strategic Plan to program funds for design activities on SR4 East widening from Somersville to SR160, right-of-way services on I-680/SR4, and \$550,000 for the Pacheco Transit Hub. Authorization was given to execute consulting service agreements for three segments of Route 4, widening from Somersville Road to State Route 160. Staff provided updates on legislative matters as well as current discussions related to the 2006 STIP and possible impacts on Contra Costa priority projects.

Reports Received; No Action Taken

8. Reports from Staff Committees - information – accepted

a) **BART Board Director Gail Murray and BART staff are interested in meeting with TRANSPAC to discuss station access and other issues.** There is a direct conflict between BART Board and TRANSPAC meetings. BART has requested scheduling a meeting at some mutually convenient time other than a regular TRANSPAC meeting.

Deidre Heitman, Senior Planner, BART Planning Department introduced herself and indicated it is her intention to attend TRANSPAC meetings on a regular basis to hopefully provide an appropriate and effective liaison between the two agencies. She noted that Director Murray would love to meet with TRANSPAC to look at short term as well as long term plans that affect Central County jurisdictions, transit agencies and BART. The goal is to establish a more

cooperative working relationship. She is planning to meet with jurisdictions' staff to come up to speed on projects in Contra Costa and would like to present some of the ideas BART has come up with in conjunction with staff to request approval by TRANSPAC in May. There are a number of funding opportunities and BART would like to work collaboratively with TRANSPAC jurisdictions on joint projects and ideas regarding TLC, Safe Routes of transit, bicycle and pedestrian needs.

Neustadter said she will work with Heitman to set up a time for the meeting.

b) Request to Transfer Measure C funds from the Martinez/ Walnut Creek Express Service to the Dougherty Valley Demonstration Project. The Martinez/Walnut Creek Express Service initiated in December, 2005 is funded currently with CMAQ funds. MTC has agreed to provide RM2 funds for this service through its 2012 termination date. Measure C funds (\$176,000) have been accruing for this service and currently are unexpended. County Connection has requested that the Bus Transit Coordinating Committee (BTCC) support a request to transfer the \$176,000 in Measure C funds to the Dougherty Valley Demonstration Project. Part of the funding for the Dougherty Valley Project will come from developer fees; however, the County's condition of approval requires that the developer funds cannot be drawn absent a fully funded financial plan for the entire 5 year demonstration period which begins in December 2007. BTCC was also requested to support the additional funding request to CCTA for the Pacheco Transit Hub.

Dahlgren explained that the "swap" of money is being undertaken in order to finish the financial plan for the Dougherty Valley Demonstration Project to satisfy developers, the County and the City of San Ramon. This is not new money; it is just changing the program name from which the money is being drawn. The start up date is planned for January, 2007. The report to the Board is on the meeting agenda for the 20th and the proposal and attachments are on the website. Basically BTCC gets together and meets about issues affecting transit. Bob McCleary attends these meetings and didn't seem to have a problem with the changes, but Dahlgren wanted to let everyone at TRANSPAC know what was going on.

c) Caldecott Tunnel Tour. About 11 people are interested in the trip so scheduling was discussed. Because several of the elected officials were interested in the trip, it was decided that the June meeting time would be set aside for the Caldecott Tour.

ACTION by Consensus: unanimous

Meeting and tour schedules were determined as follows: BART meeting date is to be determined; Caldecott Tunnel Tour will be scheduled on June 8th in place of the regular TRANSPAC meeting, if at all possible.

9. Correspondence/Copies/Newsclips/Information - Accepted

Correspondence: 3/22/06 TRANSPAC status letter from Chair Shinn to the CCTA Chair Freitas; 3/16/06 Items Approved by the Authority on March 15, 2006 for Circulation to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and items of interest; 3/15/06 SWAT March status letter to CCTA Executive Director Bob McCleary; 3/1/06 TRANSPLAN Chair Freitas letter to Concord Mayor Susan Bonilla regarding the Concord Naval Weapons Station Reuse Project; 2/28/06 TRANSPAC Chair Shinn Letter to BART Board Member Gail Murray regarding BART's parking programs; 2/27/06 WCCTAC Status letter from Chair Sharon Brown to Bob McCleary, CCTA Executive Director; TRANSPLAN staff John Greitzer letter to Phillip Woods, City of Concord Principal Planner regarding the Draft EIR for Concord's General Plan

and Zoning Ordinance Update; February 2006 CCTA Project Status Report; County Connection, February 2006 Fixed Route Operating Statistics.

Newsclips: S.F. Chronicle: 3/30/06 "Study pushes infill housing, Underutilized land in Bay area could have 350,000 units"; 3/22/06 "Agencies introduce All Nighter buses"; Contra Costa Times: 4/2/06 Sunne Wright McPeak, State of California Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing, Guest Commentary, "Roads investment plan must produce results"; 3/12/06 "East Bay growth linked with Central Valley"; 3/12/06 "City moves ahead with plan to annex 2,546 county acres"; Passenger Transport: "San Diego Buses traveling on Freeway Shoulders" (article courtesy of Cindy Dahlgren).

10. For the Good of the Order

Chair Shinn asked if there was anything for the Good of the Order. John Templeton wanted to advise the group that he had nothing to do with the "natural metering" that had been caused on Ygnacio Valley Road at the Concord border. The road slippage was caused by the recent deluge. One lane is closed in the eastbound direction and cannot be repaired until the rain has stopped. Templeton also wanted to revisit the project he brought up in discussions in November which supports a Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) that Concord has been developing for the Monument Corridor. This area is identified as one of twenty-five low-income and minority Bay Area communities eligible to apply for a Lifeline Transportation grant. A series of meetings was held to hear what the needs and priorities are in this corridor. Two things stood out: 1) better access to health care facilities, especially La Clinica on Monument Boulevard and the County health care facilities in Martinez; and 2) more affordable bus fares. A third issue raised was the possibility of getting to these locations a little more conveniently.

The City of Concord is proposing to submit this project to CCTA at the end of April as part of the Lifeline Transportation program. Concord is working in conjunction with CCCTA on a project to run a shuttle van through the Monument Corridor. The 15 passenger van would go to a lot of services through key spots in the corridor as well as Sun Valley Mall where CCCTA has a large transfer facility which would connect those using the van more directly with Route 980 which goes to Martinez and to the health care facilities there.

Templeton requested a letter of support for this project from TRANSPAC which could then be included in the application to CCTA.

ACTION: Pierce/Abrams/unanimous
Urgency item to place Concord request for a letter of support on the agenda.

ACTION: Pierce/Abrams/unanimous
Moved to authorize a TRANSPAC letter of support for the City of Concord's application to CCTA for a Lifeline Transportation grant for the Monument Boulevard Corridor.

Dahlgren has been working closely with Concord on the Community Based Transportation Plan and CCCTA will be proposing an application to the Lifeline program to restore service on County Connection Route 111 on Saturdays and add service on Sundays. This route travels down Meadow Lane and Saturday service had to be discontinued. The route runs right through the Monument Corridor. Another issue that was raised is the lack of connecting service on weekends. This route also connects Pleasant Hill and Concord BART stations so people who use it will have access to about 8 additional modes of transportation. Pierce noted that the application is due April 28th.

ACTION: Pierce/Durant/unanimous
Urgency item to place CCCTA's request for a letter of support on the agenda.

ACTION: Pierce/Abrams/unanimous
Moved to authorize a letter of support for County Connection's application to CCTA for a Lifeline Transportation grant for the restoration of service on Route 111 on Saturdays and the addition of service on Sundays.

ACTION: Pierce/Durant/unanimous
Moved to include on next month's TRANSPAC agenda, a presentation on the CCCTA application to CCTA for a Lifeline Transportation grant for the restoration of service on Route 111 on Saturdays and the addition of service on Sundays.

Abrams noted that lots more people seem to be using the free shuttle bus in Walnut Creek since the buses have a new "cable-car" appearance.

Pierce said she would be attending the e-BART meeting in East County that evening. The group is going to Portland to look at TOD stations there and to hear from local elected officials about the process they used to establish the system. Portland has a similar kind of mandate.

Chair Shinn expressed his appreciation for the involvement in discussion by all members of the Committee. He recently attended the TAC meeting and has a great respect for all the work the TAC accomplishes as well as the level of excellence achieved.

11. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Shinn at 10:58 a.m. The next TRANSPAC meeting is scheduled for May 11, 2006.