

**Summary Notes**  
**TRANSPAC – October 12, 2006**

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

**Planning Commissioners:** Bob Armstrong, Clayton; Guy Bjerke, Concord (Alternate); Donnie Snyder, Contra Costa County; David Mascaro, Pleasant Hill; Robert Simmons, Walnut Creek. Vacant Seat: Martinez.

**Staff:** Qamar Kahn, Alison Ryan (Nolte), Concord; Hillary Heard, Contra Costa County; Hisham Noeimi, Martin Engelmann, CCTA; Richard Pearson, Martinez; Troy Fujimoto, Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; John Hall, Walnut Creek; Deidre Heitman, BART; Lynn Osborn, 511ContraCosta Program Manager; Barbara Neustadter, Julia Fuller, TRANSPAC staff.

**Public:** None.

**Meeting convened as a Committee of the Whole without a quorum by Chair Shinn at 9:08 a.m.**

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

Chair Shinn explained that we anticipated a quorum until late yesterday afternoon when Councilmember Ross was called to an Air Board meeting which had been rescheduled due to a lack of quorum the previous day. He suggested we proceed with the meeting and determine if there is a need to hold a special meeting or defer some actions to a subsequent meeting date. Snyder noted that all Planning Commissioners were present.

Shinn noted that the City of Martinez doesn't have an alternate for Ross and suggested that each member ensure that an alternate is appointed and try to enlist the help of that alternate to attend meetings so that TRANSPAC can conduct business with the appropriate quorum.

Armstrong suggested that the City Councilmember appoint the Planning Commissioner as an alternate. Neustadter responded that the TRANSPAC Joint Agreement would have to be revised and all TRANSPAC Councils and the Board of Supervisors would have to concur in that idea. Shinn thought it was an idea worth looking into. Snyder said there might be a problem because the Planning Commissioners are appointed and the Councilmembers are elected. Some Councilmembers might have concerns about Planning Commissioners making decisions with regard to issues that can be raised at TRANSPAC. Neustadter said City Attorneys may have concerns because Planning Commissioners would be involved in financial decisions (public dollars). Shinn said something needs to be done to ensure that there is a quorum to conduct business. A first step might be for each Councilmember to enlist the assistance of his/her alternate when missing a meeting is unavoidable.

Shinn said there is a need to take a look at continuity and representation. An alternate needs to attend the meeting if for no other reason than to vote. Staff does all the grunt work and sometimes action is needed. He would like to see attainment of stability for the next few months. He suggested future discussion and thought to foster organizational efficiency and recognition of the importance of getting business done. Alternates in attendance would be very helpful. Perhaps the appointments to Chair or to CCTA could be rotated to encourage more participation. This is something to consider.

## **2. Public Comment**

Chair Shinn distributed copies of the 10/12/06 article in the Contra Costa Times honoring Phyllis Roff for her public service with a very nice picture of her holding her TRANSPAC gavel. He read into the record a phone comment from Roff, which stated: "Sunne McPeak called me and told me about John Nejedly's passing. I was very sorry to hear about that. He and I were very good friends although I often disagreed with him but I loved him for his honesty and for his knowledge. I was also pleased to hear from Bob Armstrong that he is the new Clayton representative on the Planning part of TRANSPAC. I have known Bob over the years and he writes good letters to the editor. I hope he will continue to do it. He can take up the slack I'm going to be leaving one of these days. It was great to hear from Bob and I appreciated his effort." Another call on 9/25 asked if TRANSPAC could include her name on any condolences sent to John Nejedly's family. She tried to call and was unable to leave a message.

Armstrong noted that he wrote a letter to the editor about Roff and those letters are how their friendship began many years ago.

### **CONSENT AGENDA: Unable to approve minutes due to lack of quorum**

#### **3. Reviewed September 14, 2006 minutes**

**END CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **4. Discussion of Measure J Strategic Plan Final Submission to CCTA – (attachment included the September 29, 2006 draft submission to CCTA)**

The development of the first Measure J Strategic Plan is an important step in planning for the use of bond sale proceeds expected in 2009 (\$300M) and a second possible bond sale in 2012 (\$150M). Based on direction to the TAC at the September TRANSPAC meeting, a draft was submitted to the CCTA on September 29, 2006 as requested. TRANSPAC reviewed the latest draft project list/ Fact Sheet submission and provided direction on any revisions to be incorporated prior to the final submission to CCTA by October 16, 2006, as follows:

Neustadter noted that the group went through all projects identified at the last TRANSPAC meeting and had had a serious discussion about the placement of projects, how to position the projects relative to the bond packet. TRANSPAC's share of the 2009 and 2012 bond money is \$172M. The amount of money in each category cannot be exceeded. That amount was allocated to TRANSPAC and approved by the voters. We have more projects than money in the Arterial Projects Category so we will have to leverage other sources of funds.

Neustadter reviewed the spreadsheet in the packet in detail to ascertain if there are any changes anyone would like to make. This spreadsheet version is the result of the discussion at the last meeting.

Chair Shinn reminded everyone to please speak freely and jump in with questions or comments at any time. He noted that without a quorum we can use this meeting as a forum for Planning Commissioners.

Neustadter began with the Caldecott, explaining that the share amount assigned to Central County for the project is \$62.5M. So far, no one has suggested we take this project off the list. She was asked via e-mail to advise everyone that the two lane tunnel alternative has been

chosen by various committees in and among the various agencies including Caltrans, Contra Costa and Alameda County and others.

The Martinez Capitol Corridor Improvements Project has been around for 15 years. This is the rail portion of this category. The City of Martinez has two allocations in for this project in Measure J: \$7.5M in the Countywide and \$2.5M in the subregional category totaling \$10M proposed to be included in the 2009 bond issue. Other money available for this project includes \$400K in Measure C and \$5.5M in 06/07 STIP funds. The funding is needed to acquire property north of the railroad tracks for more parking.

The Interchange category includes \$36M for various projects. An original proposal was to allocate all \$36M to I-680/24 and hopefully the balance of funds can come from the state bond which is on the ballot. At the last TRANSPAC meeting, the consensus was to reallocate \$3M of the \$36M to the 242 Concord Ave. I/C SB off project which provides an additional ramp to improve the operation of Commerce. Ave. Three additional interchange projects: 242 Clayton Rd. I/C NB on, SR4/Willow Pass and Marina Vista I/C SB off are proposed for project development funding which may be bond or accrued funds.

The I-680 Carpool Lane Gap Closure project is in Measure J for \$75M and in RM2 with funding of \$1M for the Study plus \$14M capital. This project is not expected to be ready in 2009 and so may move to the 2012 bond list depending on project readiness. With \$75M in Measure J and \$14M in RM2, there is a total of \$89M available for this project. It is also a good STIP candidate.

Armstrong asked who is doing the RM2 Study and what are they studying? Neustadter responded that Regional Measure 2 was approved by the voters in March, 2004 and included \$15M for the north I-680 corridor with up to \$1M to be used for a study by CCCTA to develop project recommendations to facilitate the operation of Express Bus service and an HOV system in the I-680 corridor. The remaining funds are to be used by the Authority for the extension of the southbound I-680 HOV lane into the San Ramon Valley or an HOV Connector into the Pleasant Hill or Walnut Creek BART stations. CCCTA asked TRANSPAC to be the lead on the Study, TRANSPAC accepted and is now in process of requesting appointments from various agencies to be on the Policy Advisory and Technical Committees. Hall is the Technical Manager and Neustadter is the Administrative Manager. The first Study meeting will be convened at the TAC level and will proceed to develop the scope of work. The Study will identify the kinds of projects to support Express Bus Service in the north I-680 corridor.

TRANSPAC spent a long time getting the State of California to agree to the need for HOV lanes in Central Contra Costa. Caltrans worked on an HOV connector ramp to the Pleasant Hill BART station but were asked to cease by TRANSPAC which they did. The problem is with the logistics of getting an HOV lane into the Walnut Creek BART station.

The RM2 legislation only addresses the southbound operation of the HOV lanes. Ryan asked is there is a schedule for completion of the Study. Hall responded that the scope hasn't been determined yet but there is a draft of ideas for the scope which will be used to open the discussion at the PAC and TAC level. An RFP for consultants will be developed soon. TRANSPAC has already funded some work in the corridor. Noeimi said Caltrans will do the PSR between North Main and SR242 which Caltrans projected to be completed by February of next year. The PSR was just issued for the southbound lane from North Main which is anticipated to be completed in December, 2007.

The Open Road Tolling Plan on the Benicia Bridge will take out about one mile of the NB I-680 HOV lane for FasTrak. TRANSPAC did ask Rod McMillan at the September TRANSPAC meeting if MTC would fund a replacement of that mile at the southern end of the NB HOV and he didn't say no.

Neustadter continued to report that BART has identified a number of projects it would like to implement with these dollars. BART's requests are split between 09 and 12 and will use up all of the money in its category at the front end of the measure. All will be spent by 2015 which is when the 2009 bond money has to be spent.

The Major streets and arterials category is the most difficult and that is why it was included in Measure J. It is very hard to get state or federal money for arterials. The projects included are "TAC level gotta have's".

The Marsh Creek Road upgrade is estimated at \$1.3M and is in the 2012 bond measure. The Pine Hollow Road upgrade needs \$300K in 2009. Pacheco Blvd. project includes both portions in the County and Martinez. The County coordinated with the Authority and determined \$35m is needed for all phases. \$27M is included in Measure J for all phases. \$8M is planned for the 2009 bond and the balance of the funding for the project is in the 2012 backup bond project list.

The Kirker Pass Truck lanes project is of great interest to TRANSPAC members and the \$14M cost is split with \$7M for the northbound section on the 2009 bond fund list and the remaining \$7M in the 2012 bond list.

The City of Martinez is very interested in getting Phase 1 of the North Court/UPRR Overpass project funded. The \$9.7M project will include emergency vehicle access as well as bike and pedestrian access. Phase 2 will include auto access and is in the 2012 backup bond list. Abrams asked if this is a new project that has been added to the list or has the price escalated dramatically. The TAC supports this project. Abrams thought the project doesn't rise to the level of spending this much money, and seems to be no longer cost effective.

Pearson said there is only one access to the waterfront area and this is a problem for Marina and other recreational users, especially during special events such as the fireworks celebration on the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. However, it is a safety issue every weekend. Chair Shinn noted that if the City was able to move forward with development, then this would help the problem.

Abrams agreed that the project is good but felt the relationship and cost of this project to the others represented a huge piece of the pie. He thought Martinez should have some other projects that would be more cost efficient but no response was forthcoming.

The City of Pleasant Hill does not know yet when it will be ready to go with the southern portion of the Buskirk Realignment project. The project is tied to the southern end of the shopping center redevelopment which also may be a reasonable location for a Park and Ride lot.

The Geary Road Phase 3 project in Walnut Creek and Pleasant Hill has been around for a long time and is ready to go. Walnut Creek is ready to move forward and will contribute \$1M for the implementation. A contribution is also anticipated from Pleasant Hill. Snyder asked

where the project is located and Hall responded that it is the section of Geary Road between Main Street and Pleasant Hill.

Concord is prepared to contribute \$75K in planning dollars for project development of the Waterworld Parkway project and \$2.98M for implementation.

Relative to bond projects in 2009, the list is about \$17M under with some difficult decisions to make relative to the arterials in 2012. The arterials were \$17M over in 2012 and in order to rearrange the dollars in the various categories Measure J would have to be amended. It is a little soon to be talking about that. However there is a ULL amendment for Measure J underway right now. The first hurdle is the State Bond Measure in November. Depending on what the voters do in November, we may be back at the table going over all this once again. Basically all of the categories are ok except for the arterials which is what was expected.

Simmons asked why Caltrans hasn't dealt with the Pleasant Hill Contra Costa Blvd. southbound onramp southbound which has a horrendous weaving problem. He avoids it because of the weaving difficulty. Abrams responded that it is because there is no practical improvement. There was an Oak Park Over crossing project but the City of Pleasant Hill didn't want to do it. Neustadter said that project was de-funded in 2000. Abrams said it should be redone because it is a huge problem. Neustadter asked if this should be included in the RM2 study. Hall said the Walnut Creek staff has looked at that many times and proposed a couple of projects. Major improvements would take out the left turn access in and out of the businesses on Main Street and there is some political reluctance to do that. Engelmann noted that removal of the BevMo shopping center would provide a great solution; however that would definitely impact revenues to the City of Walnut Creek. Abrams noted that something could be built there that would solve the problem but the solution in itself is problematic. Abrams said a big flyover ramp is very expensive and requires a lot of right-of-way.

Osborn added that the weaving problem for northbound cars getting off at Treat might also be consistent with the RM2 study. Engelmann raised the issue of counter flow in examining any way possible to get buses or HOV lanes from I-680 to the BART station. That area stands as the best example of Level of Service (LOS) 'F'. Abrams said it appears that the consensus is in favor of doing something to break the logjam on this project and he understands that to be direction to include it in the RM2 Study.

Neustadter said her summary was TRANSPAC's proposal based on the September meeting. The document was submitted to the Transportation Authority as a draft. The final version is due October 16<sup>th</sup>. She asked if those present wanted to make any changes. She noted that Fact Sheets were included in the packet for all the projects.

Bjerke asked if the Kirker Pass project included putting a third lane all the way across the hill. The project was in two phases with Phase 1 being Kirker Pass from Clayton Road to Buchanan but with the third lane only in the areas where truck climbing occurs, not on the downgrade after the trucks crest the top of the hill. Abrams noted it is not a capacity enhancement; it is a safety improvement.

Armstrong asked if the BevMo solution involving HOV and Express Buses would be included in the RM2 study rather than being a separate issue in a separate study. Neustadter responded that there is an opportunity in the RM2 Study to use up to \$1M to look at issues in the corridor. This kind of money has not been available for a very long time and so it is an

opportune time to get all those issues on the table. Snyder suggested Chair Shinn had the authority to provide this kind of direction for inclusion in the scope of the study.

Abrams said he was fine with the total dollars and allocations; however a couple of the project Fact Sheets concerned him. BART's \$12M for parking access and other improvements could include a lot of good projects. The TOD and access improvements proposed as part of the Walnut Creek Village, is BART's substitution of a request for money for a lousy deal with the developer. That was always to be done as part of the development itself and for BART to come in now for a couple of million dollars to supplement that means to him that BART has not been a very good negotiator with project developers. Heitman said the \$2M set-aside was for public improvements. BART left the language vague without specifying individual projects with the intent of getting as much as possible out of the developer. All the details are there for projects which can be developed and possibly done in 2012. BART will continue to negotiate with the developer.

Bjerke suggested that the project description include a recommendation that BART first maximize all opportunities with developers in the private sector before this money is spent. Abrams suggested a reference to additional parking as well.

Heitman said BART is not precluding the bike facility and wayfinding being done as part of the development. BART doesn't want to pay for anything it can get the developer to pay for. Abrams said that two or three years ago this money was not allocated for BART and that is what concerns him now. If BART keeps its total amount then the project should be one of station access improvement. Neustadter said that under Measure J, TRANSPAC's approval is required for BART's use of Measure J funds. Abrams asked if Walnut Creek's TOD is in 2012. Heitman said there are capacity issues at both Pleasant Hill and Walnut Creek stations. BART currently increased the vertical circulation to \$5M. There are other improvements needed but whether there is a \$2M or \$3.6M project, she would have to go back and look.

Abrams suggested keeping the total the way it is. Neustadter noted that it is important that approval or disapproval is clear in TRANSPAC's submission to CCTA. Perhaps BART's project should be revised to be more generic so as negotiations evolve, the project description can get more specific. Abrams wanted to make it more generic and describe specific projects rather than make it part of the TOD project. Heitman will go back and change the details. Heitman asked if she should make one fact sheet for public access at four BART stations in Contra Costa and then as time gets closer she can refine her numbers and corresponding projects. Kahn and Abrams both agreed with Heitman's approach.

Abrams was concerned about the County's Pacheco Blvd. project to upgrade Pacheco from Morello all the way through to Pacheco Blvd. He felt a disproportionate amount of that cost goes into rebuilding the railroad over crossing. It is not a capacity problem. Somebody wants to do this but 75% of this project is to build that bridge. Neustadter said this is the issue of the floating \$10M for the realignment for the railroad. It was originally included in the HOV project and was not financially feasible inside of that project. The Transportation Authority has grappled with this as well. Noemi said it is definitely not in the cost estimate in the Phase 1 of I-680/SR4. Abrams said except for that bridge it can't be a \$35M project. It is just a two lane road. None of these numbers make sense to Abrams unless there is a huge number in there for the railroad crossing. This project is not as critical in his mind as many other things we can do and it may not meet current design standards for shoulders. This project has been hanging on for 20 years and with the development of mostly single family homes in the area, the road

seems to work well now without a delay. The amount of traffic once predicted will never be realized. He agrees that it would be prudent to keep the money in there as a placeholder but he still has reservations about spending it on the bridge when the traffic that was projected hasn't and won't materialize.

Neustadter will take direction from the discussion and will make comments in a cover letter to the Authority.

Abrams said he was glad to see \$150M for the 2012 bond list. Armstrong asked what the cost estimate escalation reference on each of the project sheets meant. Was there an original estimate? On arterial projects and some of the state highway submissions, project estimates were done in 2002-04. Those project estimates were really old. In addition, escalations were made at the TAC meetings to bring those arterial projects to current dollar levels. Projects that in 2002 looked relatively inexpensive are far more expensive now. There isn't enough money to do the projects within the existing funding.

**ACTION by Consensus:**

**Reviewed the Draft Strategic Plan submission to CCTA; provided direction on revisions for the final submission to CCTA by October 16, 2006.**

**5. TRANSPAC and CCTA Representatives' Reports.** The minutes of the July 19, 2006 CCTA meeting were included in the packet.

a. Planning Committee meeting

Member Abrams reported that the Planning Committee meeting was brief. There was a transmittal of the land use forecasts for the area which has been transmitted on to the various individual jurisdictions for review. ABAG released the draft housing projections for 2007 which is another opportunity for jurisdictions individually or as a group to comment on the ABAG assumptions for that area.

ABAG's regional housing needs assessment discussion was mostly about ABAG and other staff authorizing the process where some jurisdictions can team together to afford the housing process. There were regulations on how to do it, however the deadline expired on September 30<sup>th</sup>. Nobody has established this kind of teaming relationship throughout the whole region and ABAG has extended the time period because of some other delays.

b. Administration and Projects Committee meeting

Neustadter reported for Member Pierce that the Administration and Projects Committee thankfully was shorter than the September meeting. The City of Concord received its 65% Peer Review approval for Commerce Avenue. There was also discussion about some Measure J allocations for project development advancements. Two items were forwarded from the Citizen's Advisory Committee regarding traffic circulation and BART exchange of tickets. APC discussed proposed changes to the Citizen's Advisory Committee Charter which will be updated along with the other administrative documents that have been updated at the Authority over the past few months.

**Reports Received; No Action Taken**

## **6. Reports from Staff/Committees – Accepted**

a) The City of Pleasant Hill intends to submit an application for a Caltrans Community Based Transportation Planning (CBTP) grant for a Contra Costa Boulevard corridor Specific Plan (includes a small section in Concord). City staff has requested a letter of support from TRANSPAC for its application which is due October 13<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Simmons suggested sending a draft approval letter because there was a lack of a quorum to take action. Commissioner Bjerke suggested staff could be directed to send such a letter by the Chair. Neustadter said that this issue was raised in a previous TRANSPAC meeting when Concord sought a letter of support and TRANSPAC was supportive of the Community based projects discussed at that time. Neustadter said TRANSPAC has directed letters of support in the past when a quorum was lacking. Jurisdictions are seeking funding from a source, no TRANSPAC money is involved and administratively it is an acceptable practice.

Troy Fujimoto, City of Pleasant Hill Planning, explained that the grant is for capital and operational improvements to a Route of Regional Significance. He entertained questions from the group.

Chair Shinn was pleased at the level of participation by Planning Commissioners and followed through on the suggestion to direct staff to send the letter.

### **ACTION by Consensus:**

**Bjerke noted that Pleasant Hill's application for a CBTP grant could bring additional resources that benefit the entire Central County region. He suggested and all other Planning Commissioners and Elected Officials agreed that it would be expeditious for the Chair to direct staff to write a letter of support from TRANSPAC for the City of Pleasant Hill's CBTP application for a Contra Costa Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan.**

## **7. Correspondence/Copies/Newsclips/Information - Accepted**

9/25/06 TRANSPAC status letter to CCTA; Items Approved by the Authority on September 20, 2006 for Circulation to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and items of interest; 9/1/06 WCCTAC Status letter to CCTA; County Connection August 2006 Fixed Route Reports; **511 Contra Costa: October Monthly Status Report ; RM 2 I-680 Express Bus Access and HOV System Study:** PAC and TAC appointments still in process; **CCTA:** September 30, 2006 Project Status Report; **San Francisco Chronicle:** 7/16/06 "RIDING THE RAILS: Far-flung Bay Area towns hope commuters will hop out of bed and onto the train"; **Oakland Tribune:** 10/2/06 "Drivers may be able to pay to zip through I-580 traffic"; **Hammacher Schlemmer:** "The 120 mph Electric Car"

## **8. For the Good of the Order – (clip and save attachment under this item)**

Commissioner Simmons noted that his travels to Europe included use of an "all purpose" access card to transportation which was very convenient, especially since one didn't have to fumble for change to get new tickets at each station. He asked if BART has considered some kind of smartcard that could be used like FasTrak for commuting on public transportation. Heitman responded that BART's TRANSLINK pass has been in the works for years but there are some operations issues among the various agencies participating in the program. BART employees do have new ID cards which can be used by waving the cards over a transponder at the fare-gates. Heitman was not sure of the TRANSLINK schedule but



did know that it is in the works. Simmons voiced support for this recommendation and requested that it be expedited.

The 2007 TRANSPAC meeting schedule was attached. Neustadter asked everyone to annotate calendars for next year in big red letters and not to schedule anything else for TRANSPAC Thursday! The schedule for the Martinez –Benicia Bridge Redux Tour for next year was discussed and the consensus was to plan the trip for April, 2007.

**9. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 10:25 a.m. in honor of Senator John Nejedly. The next TRANSPAC meeting is scheduled for November 9, 2006. The next TAC meeting is scheduled for October 26, 2006 at 9:00 am unless otherwise determined, in the Community Room, City of Pleasant Hill City Hall, 100 Gregory Lane, Pleasant Hill.