

**SUMMARY MINUTES  
TRANSPAC  
December 13, 2007**

**ATTENDANCE:**

**Elected Officials:** Julie Pierce, Clayton, TRANSPAC Chair, CCTA Representative; David Durant, TRANSPAC Vice-Chair, Pleasant Hill; Bill Shinn, Concord; Charlie Abrams, Walnut Creek, CCTA Representative. Absent: Susan Bonilla, Contra Costa County, Mark Ross, Martinez.

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

**Staff:** Hisham Noeimi, CCTA; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; John Greitzer, Contra Costa County, Erick Cheung, CCTA Staff; Brad Beck, CCTA; Richard Pearson, Martinez; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; John Hall, Walnut Creek; Deidre Heitman, BART; Joe Story, DKS; Lynn Osborn, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager; Corinne Dutra-Robert, 511 Contra Costa; Barbara Neustadter, Connie Peterson, TRANSPAC staff.

**Public: None**

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

Chair Pierce convened the meeting at 9:05 a.m. without a quorum.

**2. Public Comment - None**

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

**3. Approval of the October 11, 2007 minutes**

**END CONSENT AGENDA**

**ACTION: Approval of Consent Agenda - Abrams/Durant, unanimous**

**4. Discussion of Updated Action Plan Goals/Tenets/Objectives/Multimodal Traffic Service Objectives (MTSOs)/Actions Chart with Joe Story, DKS Associates, Action Plan Consultant, TRANSPAC Manager and TAC**

**DISCUSSION:** Neustadter introduced Joe Story, the Action Plan Consultant who was present to provide an update on the new Action Plan tenets as developed by the TAC and summarized in the Action Plan. The new document is based on the 2000 Action Plan (in packet). The TAC recommended that the final element, the MTSOs, should be addressed when new forecast results are available.

Chair Pierce noted the absence of one of the basic tenets of the previous update that described the theory about contributors to congestion and reservoirs. She asked why the TAC chose to eliminate this tenet. It enabled us to be more strategic by expecting everyone, including flow-through traffic, to also abide by the tenet (i.e., metering).

Story said that the TAC in general believed the tenets of the 2000 update were more specific and wanted to include issues such as this in the Actions, keeping the overall tenets more simple.

Pierce thought TRANSPAC might not want to lose the "reservoir" tenet altogether and asked if it would be appropriate to make this an action instead of a tenet.

John Hall stated that the TAC felt that this tenet was too detailed, but acknowledged the validity of Pierce's comment. He suggested adding language to the second action of the third tenet, expanding and restating the ideas about reservoirs and who should deal with that.

Abrams noted that there was no tenet that referred specifically to capacity at intersections and asked if this was a deliberate omission.

Hall said that this was discussed at length by the TAC. He discussed how Measure C's local level of service analysis was dropped in Measure J. The intention of the opening statement was to convey that Central County has reached a point at which new roads don't seem to be feasible and we can't build our way out of congestion. The recommendation to TRANSPAC is to drop this topic and focus only on Routes of Regional Significance.

Lynn Osborn spoke about the earlier comment on reservoir capacity. Since there was much discussion of TOD in core downtown areas, it is less likely that reservoirs will be available to collect that traffic.

Pierce said that the reservoir concept is something that should be used as a tool to manage those Routes of Regional Significance.

Story highlighted the objectives and the major strategies to achieve each goal. During the discussion of freeway management, he stated that there was an emphasis on maximizing HOV lane usage versus SOVs for "person throughput." He noted that this was a deliberate term.

Bob Armstrong believed that "person throughput" was a term that would elicit a negative response from the general public. In further discussion, it was pointed out that the term "person throughput" will appear in the public record when it goes to the Authority and could be in the Growth Management Compliance Checklist, but it is not a term that will be generally seen by the public. "Person throughput" aptly describes the measuring characteristics for the number of persons who are getting from one place to another rather than the number of vehicles.

**ACTION:** After reviewing the development of the Draft Central County Action Plan Goals/Tenets and Actions chart, TRANSPAC affirmed the TAC's direction and should proceed with the development of Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives.

## **5. Continued Discussion of Revisions to the November 2007 Update to the "Summary Status Report of the Measure C Regional Transportation Mitigation Program"**

**DISCUSSION:** Neustadter began by saying that the Transportation Authority staff had developed a Summary Status Report of the Measure C Regional Mitigation Programs (RTMP). In its October meeting, TRANSPAC had robustly discussed this document. At that time, the report did not fully address the parameters of the Central County fee program, which is different from the other RTMPs in the other regions. TRANSPAC requested that the TAC review the document again and to suggest revisions that better represent Central County's perspective. These revisions are shown in the in the packet materials.

The TAC's revisions showed how Central County is both a generator of its own traffic and a receiver of other traffic, and described how Central County is already built out except for the CNWS. These factors have led to the conclusion that the Oakhurst model works best here. Because there are not many large development projects left in Central County, a program was established to specifically target the impact of those developments. Language was added to explain in detail how the Oakhurst model initially worked in the City of Clayton and describes examples of where this approach was used elsewhere. Additionally, the revisions show the agreements made with outside jurisdictions (for example, where Concord has paid Walnut Creek for impacts of its development). The TAC's recommendation was to update the RTMP, but not change it.

One of the issues arising from discussion of the report was whether or not TRANSPAC held its own in terms of regional fee generation compared to East County (where a residential fee per unit and commercial fee is assessed). Although this information is difficult to assemble, John Hall drafted and created the first version of the chart (in the packet). The chart shows the standard information that compares TRANSPAC with the other RTPCs. With the exception of Eastern Contra Costa, with its \$16,000+ residential fee per unit, the chart shows that TRANSPAC falls within parameters of the other RTPC fees. We would like the Authority to insert this chart in the report between Tables 2 and 3 and to use the text pages to replace the Central County portion.

Pierce clarified that both Measure C and Measure J requires a plan, but neither specifies assessment of a fee. Central County's program works because there are no new highways that we can build, so adding a fee on each dwelling unit is unnecessary. Furthermore, affordability of housing would be compromised when local and regional fees are added to the already high price of land in Central County. The result is contrary to the purpose of the fee and would likely increase housing costs so dramatically that people would be forced to live even further out in areas like Modesto and into the Central Valley. The current plan works and should remain as it is.

Abrams stated that he believes these revisions are steps in the right direction. The criticism of Central County's program was because of the incorrect comparisons with East County. A statement should be included in the beginning of the report to the effect that: "While East County does have a disproportionately larger fee just on residential units, the Central County program says that overall, in many of the other subareas, the development community is paying as much or more towards improvements." He noted that a balance must be shown. In Walnut Creek, for example, the largest portion comes from commercial properties, not housing.

Shinn noted that the comparison is important because many people are unaware of what's being paid out.

Armstrong brought up the cost of a new water meter on a property, even it involved a "granny unit" on existing property. That building would require a separate water meter at the cost of about \$18,000. He suggested that this cost might also be included in the chart for comparison.

Osborn suggested including a preliminary sentence that explains that because Central County is primarily doing infill development, it has already paid for the existing infrastructure over time. Greenfield development in East County is going to be more expensive and makes the fees necessary.

Pierce added that as Central County becomes denser, it is more likely that some of the other infrastructure will be inadequate and may need to be upgraded. For example, the water company charges a meter fee for every extra unit that goes towards upgrading the general system.

Abrams said that we should avoid the pressure to apply traffic impact fees to future Weapons Station development. The Naval Weapons Station will likely pay more than its fair share of the cost of development impact using the Oakhurst model, and that this is the appropriate method to generate funds.

Pierce agreed, pointing out how this further explains the advantage of the Oakhurst model over the flat fee program. With the Oakhurst model, regional impacts of development are studied and mitigated. The flat fee method requires determining how far a flat fee will go towards mitigation. The Oakhurst model probably costs more than what East County pays.

Armstrong asked if the fees collected actually go to mitigation or if the fees are ever redirected to the General Fund. It was confirmed that targeted fees are closely monitored by each city and cannot be

used for another purpose. The extra fees in East County are expensive (over \$16,000 per unit) and go towards Highway 4, Route 4 Bypass, and other East County Projects. However, it was noted that local fees vary.

Abrams remarked that financing transportation projects through a flat fee per residential unit or commercial square foot does not guarantee that the actual fees collected will build a project if all the projected units are not built.

Pierce said that the points discussed today can be forwarded to the Authority, and added that TRANSPAC's will continue to convey the message to their committees. The TAC was thanked for all its work.

**ACTION:** By general affirmation, TRANSPAC approved the TAC's proposed revisions to the CCTA's "Summary Status Report of the Measure C Regional Transportation Mitigation Program" and requests that CCTA insert the revised Central County pages and chart into the final version of its report.

#### **6. Twenty-five (25) Year Program for Contra Costa's "County Share" Funds for the 2009 Regional Transportation Program (RTP) presented by Hisham Noeimi, Senior Engineer, CCTA**

**DISCUSSION:** Hisham Noeimi briefed TRANSPAC on the Twenty-Five Year Program for county share funds. In the past, MTC had given each CMA a funding target and asked for list of priorities that fit within the financial target. However, this time MTC will not be giving a funding target but will instead issue a Call for Projects at the end of January. MTC will use its own subjective performance criteria to pick and choose projects to be put in the RTP with no weight given to CMA priorities. This process would take away the CMAs' discretion over future STP funds. He noted that projects not in the RTP cannot get State and Federal funding.

The Authority is proposing a 25-year STIP list. It would estimate the share Contra Costa would be getting over the next 25 years through the RTP period and a prioritized list of projects within that funding target would be submitted to MTC before the Call for Projects is issued at the end of January. The Authority is asking the RTPCs to review the new list, verify the accuracy of project descriptions, costs, and secured funding sources and to prioritize projects. Because list is over the target, some projects will need to be deleted. The Transit Operators are also involved and have been asked to work with the RTPCs on their projects. Also to be considered are countywide projects like BART car replacement and countywide express bus projects.

Neustadter noted that the jurisdictions are working feverishly to prepare their lists, and she has also been in touch with the County Connection. She asked for clarification on how the list of projects for Highway 4 reflect the moratorium on STP projects from East County from 2014 through 2023 and how does it relate to the Measure J Strategic Plan adoption that establishes priority funding for the three major projects in the county? Another question concerned what had been done by the Transportation Authority to pare down the list for East County.

Noeimi said that this relates to the next agenda item (Measure J Strategic Plan). He discussed how Authority's approval to issue a third bond for eBART in East County resulted in an agreement that East County would not be submitting any STIP projects for about 10 years, or five STIP cycles. East County is not expected to have any projects on this list between 2014-2023, but can still add projects to the list for the period after that. There is no advantage in putting Highway 4 on the list because the project will be done by 2424. Authority staff will have to go to East County to determine the timing issue and which of their projects have to be removed from this list.

Neustadter believed that the East County projects should be out because the list sends a confusing message to the rest of the RTPCs.

Osborn suggested that there could also be some annotation on the chart to provide clarity in the future.

Noeimi added that the Authority is asking RTPCs to advise which projects are to happen in the first ten years and for the period after. East County does not anticipate having projects in first ten year period. When the list is finalized, the list will be broken down into a ten year list (showing no major STP requests) and another list for the following 12 years.

Deidre Heitman commented that BART was invited to the February 14 TRANSPAC meeting to report on the transit capital funding shortfall. The new General Manager is meeting with the CMA directors to discuss BART car replacement and infrastructure.

Greitzer identified one additional County road project that they wanted added to an inclusive list, which is for improvements at Alhambra Valley Road (\$5-6 million) and can provide further details on the project.

Neustadter noted that Alhambra Valley Road is a Measure J project on the list for 2012 bond alternate (if another project falls off the 2012 bond list, this project can be used as a backup).

Armstrong asked if there was any chance of federal government funding ferry capital improvements from feds Martinez. Neustadter said that the City of Martinez got \$250,000 from 1024 ISTEAs. It's possible because money is available but it's competitive.

Abrams was not in agreement with putting East County's eBART Phase 2 project on the list. That's a number that's beyond 2023 and an asterisk needs to be on this sheet or should be expressed as a low priority on the list.

Pierce said since the list goes up to 2035, the project needs stay on it, but this is where prioritization or even a request for "after 2023" must be clear. East County has to decide on the order of its priorities.

Neustadter said that the next version of this list will show the annotations that were discussed and will clearly show that these projects will not come into play until 2023. One recommendation for priorities for the 2014-2023 STIP funding period was to replace the use of a dollar amount for a benchmark with a specific "outcome". Because project costs escalate over time and the project itself could change as project development gets underway, what becomes important is not the exact dollar figure but the outcome. She also believes that other RTPCs are interested in the same approach. It would be reasonable to ask for the same level of commitment relative to an outcome. She added that the 680 interchange could probably be pared down.

Pierce said that for this exercise, we should keep the entire project at the top dollar amount that we anticipate for complete reconstruction (not phasing) of the interchange.

Neustadter noted that neither of these financial programming exercises has been discussed with the TAC. She would suggest that priority #1 would be everything that is on the state highway system; priority #2 is everything on the arterial system (some version of the 680/4 interchange); and priority #3 would initiate Measure J project development of all other projects on the state highway system. Also discussed was the issue of the northbound 680 HOV lane that needs to be considered and to what extent should we make a commitment to the northbound HOV lanes given MTC's plans for HOT lanes, and see how MTC will fund the HOT lanes in the future.

Pierce mentioned getting the MTC reps to concur with the idea of completing the system in a HOT lane “donor” county and making of HOT lane funding a priority. It would fill in the gaps and produce the money they need to move forward with the HOT lane system. It might be a way to get the interchange fixed.

*David Durant arrived at 10:25 a.m.*

Ray Kuzbari suggested the addition of the Willow Pass interchange.

Neustadter acknowledged that there was some confusion because of dealing with two lists, and noted that it is on the next list. She assumes that when Concord forwards its comments to the Authority it will show up on this list. She also noted that with an improved Highway 4 shipping traffic to us from East County, we have an impacted system continuity problem they will directly impact this county.

Pierce clarified that this is the list for MTC consumption to make sure that we get a fair share of future STIP funds.

Abrams commented that from the Transportation Authority’s perspective, the list of priorities should be presented to look the most attractive to MTC in order to compete in this nine county region.

**ACTION:** Motion to forward this strategy to the Authority for the first round, subject to individual comments on the projects. **Abrams/Shinn/Unanimous**

**7. Adoption of the Initial Measure J Strategic Plan which Includes Full Funding of East County’s Three Priority Projects presented by Hisham Noeimi, Senior Engineer, CCTA**

**DISCUSSION:** Hisham Noeimi provided an overview of these projects with Measure J as the funding source. The Authority tried to put the top three RTPC priorities in the first seven years. For East County the issue was that BART wanted to have full funding from Measure J (to place order for vehicles and avoid escalation costs due to delays), but there was no way for East County do it without delaying the Bypass projects. The revised draft resolution (handout) outlines the commitments. The Authority expects eBART to go all the way to Antioch, debt service for the third bond, all service comes from eBART, and East County will give up future STIP funds, MTC’s bridge toll commitment, and contingent upon no objections from other RTPCs. They are recommending approval for the Authority to move forward with this approach.

Pierce added that as the Central County’s representative to the eBART policy committee, East County is extremely grateful for the opportunity to be able to complete the project and elected leaders understand clearly that if we agree to prioritize the eBART project above all, and allow a third bond issue in 2015 to pay for it, East County must give up STIP funds until everyone else is backfilled for what they have given up. Several suggestions by MTC were untenable, including deferring completion of the Bypass and transferring money to the eBART project. The Executive Director of MTC will put into writing this commitment if we include this in our Strategic Plan.

Abrams stated that he believes this program needs to go ahead because it’s best for the county. He expressed concern that this is built on a cost estimate that BART will be fully funded, and he added that additional costs of \$100 million were added to Highway 4 to make the median wider to accommodate BART.

Pierce added that the responsibility is on BART to live up to these dollars. Deidre Heitman said that BART appreciates this solution and will continually work on the cost estimate.

Pierce recommended making a commitment motion that is separate from the rest of the Strategic Plan.

**ACTION:** Approved advance programming for the East County commitment. **Shinn/Abrams/Unanimous**

Neustadter continued the discussion of the Strategic Plan and the suggested changes (handout - proposed changes in bold).

Durant asked what might be the downside to doing it (rather than following what's been done).

Neustadter said that based on previous information, the downside could be that we might not get the two movements that are the most problematic completed. The other issue we don't know is the Weapons Station (no traffic analyses have been completed at this time). We need to be nimble in position. Maybe tying the widening to the ramp configuration could give us a better project sooner.

TRANSPAC needs to decide what projects it would like to see funded within those five STEPS to be completed between 2014-2023.

Pierce suggested that instead of STIP dollars, this might be able to qualify for Caltrans Highway Safety Operational Project (SHOPP) dollars if Caltrans can be persuaded that these are good safety projects as they are relatively low in cost and do not involve new right of ways.

Neustadter confirmed that this was the list for the first 10 years list of the 25 year programming and the list for 2014-2023 STIP relative to the East County deal.

**ACTION:** Approved adoption of the first Measure J Strategic Plan which includes the proposed financial commitment to East County's three priority projects and the Central County list of projects expected to be funded by STIP and other fund sources between 2014 and 2023. **Durant/Shinn/Unanimous**

## **8. Resolution of Support for Continued and Expanded Funding of Local Streets and Roads through 2035**

**ACTION:** **Durant/Abrams/Unanimous**

Approved adoption of a Resolution of Support and recommendation to TRANSPAC jurisdictions and the Mayors Conference in January.

## **9. Bus to BART Promotion presented by Corinne Dutra-Roberts, Project Manager, 511 Contra Costa**

**DISCUSSION:** Corinne Dutra-Roberts presented a report on the Bus to BART Promotion. Its purpose was to increase awareness of the new Bus to BART sign headers and to increase bus ridership to stations. In May 2007, 511 Contra Costa, CCCTA, and BART staff flyered the Walnut Creek BART parking lot with an invitation to try the service. Results of the survey from the Walnut Creek promotion showed that 104 bus trips were offered, and 62 participants took advantage of the free bus pass. The findings showed that 80% of the Walnut Creek participants used all or part of the pass. Those who did not use cited deterrents such as distance to bus stops and frequency of service. Some of the benefits included not having to pay for parking or search for a parking space. Follow-up surveys will be conducted for Concord (72 participants), Pleasant Hill (133 participants), and Orinda (81 participants).

Pierce suggested that future surveys might also include questions about what time of day people were commuting if makes a difference heavy commute time versus midday. That would help show what should be bus route timing requirements and frequency.

**ACTION:** Report was accepted with thanks to the 511 CC staff for continuing to find ways to increase transit use.

**10. TRANSPAC and CCTA Representatives are requested to report on the most recent CCTA Administration and Projects Committee (Member Pierce), Planning Committee (Member Abrams), and CCTA meetings (Members Pierce and Abrams). The minutes of the September 19, 2007 and October 17, 2007 CCTA Board meetings are attached for information**

**DISCUSSION:** Pierce reported that the Authority received a clean audit. With regard to SB210 right of way issues, the language still needs to be cleaned up and sponsored through legislation. The California Transportation Committee Chair has encountered problems that affected its projects and recognizes that others are experiencing similar delays and cost increases as a result of this bill. The CTC Chair asked he Chair of the Appropriations Committee to remedy the problem and he agreed. Now that this issue has higher visibility it might have better chance of being changed.

**ACTION:** Information only.

**11. Reports from Staff and Committees - Accepted**

- a) 511 Contra Costa Monthly report by Lynn Osborn, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager

LO reported on closing out projects from Fiscal Year 06-07 while awaiting the new funding agreement from the Air District. This will be the first time Central County has had to extend use of the funds.

- b) Letter to Susan Heinrich-Beatty, 511 Regional Rideshare Program Manager indicating that 511 CC will not be participating in the 2008 Bike to Work Day.

Osborn commented on the decision to not participate in the next Bike to Work Day in May of 2008. The attached letter discusses the controversy that led to the decision to not participate in the event. It was also noted that the Bicycle Coalition intends to sue MTC over the fourth bore of the Caldecott Tunnel. Osborn has contacted the MTC representative about this issue and would like additional information and clarification.

TRANSPAC gave its full support to the decision to not participate and to sending the memorandum to MTC.

- c) Congratulations to County Connection! CCCTA has been recommended to receive \$800,000 for construction of the Pacheco Transit Hub project and \$1.2 million for construction of the Diablo Valley College (DVC) Transit Center Project in Proposition 1B funds. TRANSPAC has already taken an action to support a CCTA application (to be issued by CCTA in January) for \$253,000 in T-PLUS funds to complete the design for the DVC project.
- d) The TAC has planned two meetings in January devoted to continued development of the Action Plan and TRANSPAC programs. In addition to the Action Plan, the Regional Transportation Mitigation Program and the Central Contra Costa Traffic Management Program (CCCTMP) are under review.

Hisham Noeimi reported on the preparation of another urgent exercise. MTC has begun development of the 2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and is looking at all projects in the program. A project needs to be in it if state or federal funding is involved or have a regionally significant project that affects air quality. Staff has been working with the cities and TACs to send MTC a list of project coming up that could have STIP or federal funding. December 14 is the deadline, with another chance for review in January before MTC submits the list to the federal agency.

**ACTION:** Reports accepted.

## **12. Correspondence/Copies/Newsclips/Information**

11/28/07 and 10/18/07 Items approved by the Authority on November 28, 2007 and October 17, 2007 for Circulation to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and items of interest; 11/19/07 and 10/9/07 SWAT November Status letter; 11/16/07 Letter to Jason Burke, Assistant Planner, City of Pittsburg from the TRANSPAC Manager regarding the Notice of Preparation for the James Donlon Boulevard Extension; 11/16/07 Letter to Jason Burke, Assistant Planner, City of Pittsburg from Phillip Woods, Principal Planner, City of Concord regarding the Notice of Preparation for the James Donlon Boulevard Extension; 10/19/07 and 9/28/07 WCCTAC status letter; 10/30/07 TRANSPAC status letter from TRANSPAC Chair Julie Pierce to CCTA Chair Charlie Abrams; County Connection October 2007 Fixed Route Report and September 2007 Fixed Route Reports, Quarterly Report and Link Monthly Operating Reports; October 31, 2007 CCTA Project Status Report; 10/9/07 511 CC helps create a new bike to work cyclist.

**San Francisco Chronicle:** 11/21/07 "Coalition sues over Caldecott drilling"; **Contra Costa Times:** 11/29/07 Opinion, "Move ahead on tunnel"

## **13. For the Good of the Order**

Clip and save – TRANSPAC's 2008 Schedule

## **14. Adjournment at 11:32 a.m. The next TRANSPAC meeting is scheduled for February 14, 2008 at 9 a.m. in the Community Room, City Hall, City of Pleasant Hill.**