

**Summary Minutes
TRANSPAC – December 14, 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.

Planning Commissioners: Bob Armstrong, Clayton; Donnie Snyder, Contra Costa County; David Mascaro, Pleasant Hill; Robert Simmons, Walnut Creek. Absent: Bill Brumley, Concord (Excused); Vacant Seat: Martinez.

Staff: Qamar Kahn, Concord; Steve Goetz, Contra Costa County, Brad Beck, CCTA; John Hall, Walnut Creek; Deidre Heitman, BART; Lynn Osborn, 511ContraCosta Program Manager; Barbara Neustadter, Julia Fuller, TRANSPAC staff.

Public: Jay Lutz, Walnut Creek resident, Simin Timuri, City of Walnut Creek

Meeting convened with a quorum by Chair Shinn at 9:02 a.m.

1. **Convene meeting: Pledge of Allegiance/Self-Introductions - completed**
2. **Public Comment - none**

CONSENT AGENDA: Pierce/Abrams/unanimous

3. **Approved September 14, 2006 minutes. Notes from the October 12, 2006 “Committee of the Whole” meeting were attached for information.**

4. **Authorized submittal of the TRANSPAC/TRANSPLAN TDM PROGRAM Grant Application to CCTA for 2007/08 Measure C, Carpool, Vanpool and Park and Ride Lot Funds and to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District for 40% Transportation Fund for Clean Air Funds (TFCA) and to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for Congestion Management Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for the Employer Outreach Program; as well as execution of required grant contacts when funding is approved by the respective agencies.**

5. **Appointed Eric Hu, Associate Engineer, City of Pleasant Hill to the CCTA Technical Coordinating Committee. As a result of personnel changes, a representative in the engineering category was needed to complete the current term to March 31, 2007. TRANSPAC will consider appointments for the April 2007 to March 2009 term next spring. Mr. Hu was nominated by the TAC.**

END CONSENT AGENDA

6. **Presentation on the Contra Costa Crossover Project by Steve Kappler, Project Manager, BART**

The purpose of the crossover project is to add trackway between the Walnut Creek and Pleasant Hill BART stations to allow a train to cross from one track to the other track. The original BART system track plan provides two parallel trackways between the Walnut Creek and Pleasant Hill stations. Currently, the closest existing crossovers to the project site are at the Lafayette Station and between the Pleasant Hill Station and the Concord Yard. This deficiency reduces operational flexibility during a train failure, and requires that the District dispatch an extra train to maintain published headway times for service between the Pleasant Hill Station and San Francisco.

The project site is bounded by I-680 and the City of Walnut Creek's corporation yard to the west, Jones Road to the east, Treat Boulevard to the north, and Parkside Drive in the south. The Crossover is funded with \$25 million in Regional Measure 2 monies.

It's been almost a year since the last update by Mr. Kappler on the Crossover project (February 9, 2006). The environmental review (Mitigated Negative Declaration) was in process at that time and BART staff responded to comments from seven public agencies and 57 individuals. While the comment topics were varied, the aesthetics of the traction power gap break stations received the most individual comment and as a result, BART initiated an investigation into relocating the gap breaker station.

Mr. Kappler updated TRANSPAC on recent project activities and the schedule for completion. He had a video presentation showing the elements of the crossover project and provided an overview of the project elements and location. The key issue is that this project allows trains coming from San Francisco to crossover to the San Francisco bound track before the Pleasant Hill Station. The only other time the crossover will be used is for storing bad order trains when maintenance is required. When there are problems between Lafayette and Pleasant Hill it really affects the commute time. Currently, the car has to be taken to the Concord yard and a replacement train pulled from there and this process is time consuming.

The environmental document was completed for \$1M and now the project is moving on to the final design. Eighty percent of the design on the systems end is complete, and eighty percent of the train control and communications system is complete. It is not a complex section of track work. It is the systems element that takes the greatest amount of time and money. The BART Board took action in January to buy a certain type of train control equipment which is the same as is installed at Concord South and which has functioned very well.

The advantage of buying the train control equipment ahead of the contract is that when a contractor is onboard he will install the furnished equipment rather than having to go out to buy the equipment. It improves the overall success of the project. BART staff is currently evaluating how the contractor is going to install the switches to be built on Jones Road. One will be completed before starting the other to minimize disruption to the neighborhood. This is something they do often when they do maintenance in that area. The Contractor will tie up a section of the street for about a month. This activity will be coordinated with the City of Walnut Creek. At this point BART staff is not yet certain how big a section will need to be barricaded and how big the cranes will be.

The gap breaker station is located at the southern crossover. Kappler showed the new placement of the gap breakers station by the Walnut Creek maintenance yard and explained the logistics of accomplishing that task. It is an 18' x 28' building which is about 12' high. The controls for the crossover will be located on the east side just north of the channel. The focus on the west side location created the possibility of locating the gap breaker station further to the north than they usually would like. Cable is \$500 per foot for the 12 cables that serve the components of the third rail sections. BART likes to have the gap breaker stations as close to the crossover as possible to minimize the cable cost. There is a steep embankment which will require a high retaining wall and difficult construction with steel beams, timber and finally a concrete wall.

The cable option seems to be more feasible than the longer, larger retaining wall close to the railroad system. Work on a retaining wall would have to be done in the middle of the night

which increases its cost. Walnut Creek staff has provided other ideas which may present an approach that produces even more cost savings. BART staff is still considering details of the cables approach versus the high risk and costly retaining wall systems. Negotiations with Walnut Creek are moving forward. The final design is still under consideration.

BART is targeting March to have the project out on the street. Staff is meeting with the City of Walnut Creek in January to discuss easements, construction encroachments and to present BART's concept of how the project will look and what will be necessary in terms of taking over the street and working with the neighbors. Kappler said he hoped the aesthetics will work because the building will be fenced for the most part. The project is geared to take the most part of the summer, 2007 with about 18-20 months required to complete the project.

Building the new crossover while keeping existing operation of the system is a major concern. There is a fiber optic plate in the middle of this project which must be protected. The relocation of that plate underground is in the neighborhood of \$800K to \$1M. One of the last tasks is to decide to bury or protect the place in place. Both approaches involve a lot of risk. There was no insulation on the original cables and this has caused a lot of problems when there is a short. This project will improve the reliability of the cable as it will be replaced from the project site to the end of the line.

Chair Shinn thanked Steve Kappler for his presentation.

No Action Taken:

7. Review of the Measure J Draft Model Growth Management Element

Both Measure C and Measure J Growth Management Programs (GMP) require each jurisdiction to adopt a Growth Management Element (GME) in its General Plan. The Measure J GMP is different from the Measure C GMP in that Level of Service (LOS) and performance standards have been eliminated and an Urban Limit Line (ULL) requirement established. To assist local jurisdictions in achieving compliance with the Measure J GMP, CCTA staff, its planning consultant, Dyett & Bhatia, and a Growth Management Task Force, a subcommittee of the CCTA's Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), developed a Draft GME which is ready for review and comment by local jurisdictions and the RTPCs. John Hall, Barbara Neustadter and Steve Goetz serve on the Growth Management Plan Task Force.

The TRANSPAC TAC reviewed the Draft GME at its October 26, 2006 meeting and forwarded the following comments/recommendations to TRANSPAC for its consideration as part of this review. Brad Beck, Senior Transportation Planner from CCTA, was at the meeting to give a brief overview of the growth management element and to address the TAC recommendations.

a) The Growth Management Program for Measure C and Measure J is a policy document. The Growth Management Element has been used as a mechanism to compile information on mandated Measure J requirements and to make the assessment of local jurisdiction compliance easier for CCTA staff.

The TAC supports flexibility for jurisdictions in the documentation of General Plan policies which address Measure J GMP requirements. Page 5-5 of the Model Growth Management Element in the packet includes footnote 1 which states "Local Growth Management Elements must substantially comply with the intent of this model element; but need not reflect its exact language or organization. Applicable policies that are contained in other elements of the

jurisdiction's General Plan should also be referenced here within the Growth Management Element."

The TAC suggested that footnote 1 on page 4 provides the opportunity for jurisdictions to include a "Table of Compliance" in their respective General Plans as an alternative to a stand alone GME in their General Plans. The "Table of Compliance" would document the location of specific GMP policies in the various General Plan elements to ease the compliance assessment without the need for a stand alone GME. Since jurisdictions use a variety of formats for their General Plans, the individual jurisdictions could integrate the Table of Compliance into the existing formats of their General Plans with more flexibility. This would avoid adding an Element which uses one-size-fits-all format which is inconsistent with the balance of their General Plans. The Table of Compliance would be adopted by the local jurisdiction's Board or Council as part of the General Plan. The City of Walnut Creek has used such an approach since the GME requirement was established as part of Measure C. Relevant excerpts from the City of Walnut Creek General Plan were in the packet under this item.

CCTA staff does not believe that such flexibility is found in the footnote and that an amendment to Measure J will be required to allow the "Table of Compliance."

The TAC recommended that if it is found that Measure J won't allow the use of a Table of Compliance that TRANSPAC request that Measure J be amended to allow the use of such an alternative. The TAC views the Table of Compliance proposal as an alternate means to achieve compliance with Measure J in much the same vein as the recent amendment to provide an alternative mechanism through which jurisdictions may comply with Measure J's Urban Limit Line (ULL) requirement.

Beck stated that both Measure C and Measure J contain a requirement for a growth management element. Measure C directed that it be in the development review process. Measure J outlines jurisdictional goals and polices for managing growth and contains requirements for compliance. Measure J gets rid of LOS (level of service) but adds the ULL (Urban Limit Line).

A circulation draft of the Model Growth Management Element was included in the packet. It was developed in conjunction with the Growth Management Task Force and is being sent out for local review and comment like the original Measure C. Proposed text is on the left and commentary is on the right in order to allow for some flexibility. CCTA is looking forward to hearing comments from all RTPCs before adopting a final model. There is some flexibility in how this is incorporated into the General Plan.

Neustadter reported that there was a spirited discussion at the TAC meeting, particularly regarding the flexibility in the growth management requirements of Measure J. The TAC has forwarded comments.

Pierce thought that the suggestion by the TAC is an absolutely wonderful idea which will save a lot of time for rewriting what Walnut Creek has already done. Pierce suggested Authority staff ask for a legal opinion from the Authority's attorney. She thought the second sentence in the first footnote (page 4) dealt with this issue. Beck wanted to make the distinction between the draft footnote and adopted language in Measure J which calls explicitly for a growth management element which maybe was drafted to be a little tighter than intended.

Beck agrees with Engelmann that if we are to have consistent implementation in what the measure has and the TAC wants that flexibility, then we should probably change the language in Measure J to allow that.

Durant said this feels like a solution begging for a problem and asked that Neustadter read the language which she did. Sections 2-7 deal with Goals and Policies, Section 3.2 addresses housing options, Section 3.3 Multi-Jurisdictional Transportation Planning, Section 3.4 the Urban Limit Line (ULL), and Section 3.5 the Five Year Capital Improvement Project.

Durant said the footnotes really do sound like a solution: Here's your Local Growth Management Element which must comply with the intent of this model element and you incorporate applicable policies that are contained in other elements of the jurisdiction's General Plan and reference them here within the Growth Management element document. Durant didn't see a need to ask the Authority's legal staff for anything.

Abrams fully agreed and has expressed the opinion that this is overcomplicating something that was never intended to be this complicated. He suggested moving forward and not requesting that any attorneys take a look at it. Abrams asked what the consequences would be of not getting a lawyer to review it, what can be done to the cities? Neustadter said the ultimate penalty is that jurisdictions could be found out of compliance and lose return to source funds over this kind of administrative detail.

Armstrong asked about penalties which include the possible loss of Measure J "return to source" money. Pierce said we are the ones who decide on the compliance for return-to-source funds so this is a non-issue.

The issue seems to be the ease of compliance review by the Authority staff. The TAC argues that their approach actually allows that review to be done very easily. Armstrong asked if someone has a bur under the saddle to keep raising the issue.

Pierce said this is an easier approach and there is no reason to seek legal counsel. She was struggling to see the utility of rewriting the element if things are already in reference.

Pierce suggested sending a strongly worded letter that this is an incredibly simple process and should not be made more complex and difficult. It should include Durant's quote. Simmons suggested keeping this as simple as possible and not cause a problem with strong language.

Everyone felt a letter was better than a motion. The letter should state this is TRANSPAC's interpretation and we would like to provide direction to the Authority in this regard.

b) The TAC also recommends that on page 11, Item 3.2 Address Housing Options, Commentary adjacent to item 3.2.1, add "Redevelopment Agency Reports for Project Areas" as an additional type of report which may be submitted to demonstrate Housing Element compliance progress.

Durant's response was applicable to this section as well. Abrams said whatever needs to be stated, go ahead and do it. Beck's concern was that the redevelopment report should not be added as the sole report unless the jurisdiction is entirely composed of a redevelopment area. The Authority wants to take credit for the whole jurisdiction's efforts in this area. This was a request from the County to specifically address their redevelopment areas.

Durant said it can be a component of the element and if it is sufficient to cover a City's entire effort then that should be sufficient in and of itself. Pierce and Durant agreed that a City/County should be able to submit the Redevelopment Agency's report as part of its report instead of writing a separate report, in the effort of trying to save time. Simmons asked if the report would be biannual and Durant responded it would be biennial. Durant said that we don't need to reference anything about biennial reporting on the actions. Just say the cities report biennially and that means that a Redevelopment reference is not needed.

c) The TAC appreciates that CCTA staff is hoping to use the current GMP implementation documents without substantial changes. However, the TAC recommends that all documents used for the implementation of the Measure C and Measure J Growth Management Programs be reviewed and revised as necessary to reflect today's land use and traffic management perspectives (transit –oriented development, land use densification, induced delay for better traffic management, etc.). We need to be clear that the overall requirements match those new management practices and techniques.

The TAC recommended review of all implementation documents to make it more flexible so we don't paint ourselves into a corner.

ACTION by Consensus: Send a letter to CCTA with TRANSPAC's comments supporting the TAC recommendations, adding that this is TRANSPAC's interpretation and TRANSPAC would like to provide direction to the Authority in this regard.

8. Review of Model Action Plan Work Program

The Model Action Plan Work Program is to be used by TRANSPAC and the other RTPCs to develop a scope of work to update the Central County Action Plan. The current Action Plan was originally adopted in 1995 and updated in 2000.

Approximately \$100,000 will be available for each of the five Action Plan Updates. The CCTA also will have \$200,000 for on-call modeling support using the new Countywide model. The RTPCs will provide policy and technical direction for the respective Action Plans. The CCTA will serve as fiscal and contract administrator for each consultant agreement. In addition, CCTA will release a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to prepare the Action Plan Updates. Each RTPC will choose the consultant for its Update.

The TAC reviewed the Model Action Plan Work Program and RFQ at its October 26, 2006 meeting and forwarded the following recommendations to TRANSPAC.

a) This Update will be completed under Measure C Action Plan requirements and will set the stage for the development and implementation of the 2008 Countywide Transportation Plan, the Congestion Management Program (CMP) and Measure J. The development of this Action Plan Update will be completed very close to the initiation of Measure J. The TAC suggests that the focus of the Update should look to the initiation of Measure J rather than the completion of Measure C.

b) This Action Plan needs to be examined and revised to incorporate current land use and transportation planning methodologies. Care needs to be exercised that actions reflect new approaches to transit-oriented development, traffic management (intentionally induced delay and signal coordination with other areas of the County), infill opportunity zones, and possible CMP Level of Service (LOS) violations on Routes of Regional Significance. All Action Plan

procedures such as the required review of General Plan Amendments that generate more than 100 peak hour trips and the TRANSPAC Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (RTMP) need to be assessed in light of new planning and management procedures.

c) The Action Plan also needs to ensure that the Traffic Service Objectives (TSO), now called Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSO), can be easily used by staff and consultants in traffic impact studies.

The CCTA staff report entitled "Release Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to Prepare Action Plan Updates" is also included in the packet under this item. To facilitate consultant selection for the RTPCs, CCTA will release an RFQ on behalf of the RTPCs. The RTPCs will select from qualified responding consultants and with CCTA staff assistance negotiate a scope and budget for the Action Plan Update.

Beck stated that this is a non-issue. The difference between Measure C and Measure J are non-existent. The important thing is that the Action Plans are updated to address changed conditions, intentional delay, TOD. That is what is really important. If you do it under Measure C or Measure J guidelines, you're really doing it under the same policies.

Neustadter said the TAC perspective was to look forward instead of looking backward. Hall respectfully disagreed with Beck. He said there is a difference between Measure C and Measure J Growth control. Measure C Growth Control was expected to be able to deal with traffic congestion. Measure J realizes that congestion is probably something that can never be eliminated. We need to look at land use, elimination of sprawl, like the ULL addresses. There is an overall difference about what we are trying to achieve. Hall wants to look at Measure J types of policies rather than the restriction of Measure C. It doesn't make a difference to do Measure C and then come back and look at Measure J.

Pierce said it makes total sense to look at what we're doing now, to focus on that and move forward.

Neustadter said that the second recommendation was that the entire Action Plan needs to be revised to incorporate current land use and transportation planning methodologies. Pierce agreed noting that doing otherwise will cause us to end up doing Deficiency Plans. Abrams agreed that we shouldn't get caught up with that.

Durant admired the TAC in terms of its forward thinking and the practical approach that the members take to doing the work that needs to be done. It's so rational and he wished to compliment them on their effectiveness. He said there is this marvelous thing that we're trying to comply with Measure C while trying to comply with Measure J. The concept of Measure J is to deal with real issues by taking a proactive approach to the spirit of what was intended in the Measure and that is the principle on which doing the work is based which moves us forward. Clearly the voters for Measure J wanted us to move forward and not be constrained by how the people twenty years ago thought about Measure C when it was voted in.

Pierce added that the voters think the components of Measure J are already in place because they already voted for it. Pierce, Abrams and Shinn supported Durant's compliment to the TAC for their excellent approach. In the Action Plan using the new methodology for Measured Delay sets up traffic service objectives in a way that can be understood by lay people: at 3am a trip takes you 'x' minutes and at 5pm the same trip takes you 'y' minutes. Unfortunately it is

a very expensive traffic service objective to analyze when it needs to be included in traffic studies.

The TAC recommended picking objectives that can be inexpensively analyzed as we move forward in order to be incorporated in traffic studies. All agreed with TAC recommendations and complimented the work accomplished on this item.

ACTION by Consensus and with Compliments:

Reviewed the Draft Model Action Plan Work Program and Action Plan Workslope and authorized transmittal of comment letters to the CCTA.

9. TRANSPAC and CCTA Representatives' reports. The minutes of the September 20, 2006 and October 19, 2006 CCTA meetings were included in the packet

a. Administration and Projects Committee meeting

Member Pierce reported that the Administration and Projects Committee paid the bills and reviewed the fiscal audit. No Management Letter was received because the audit was so clean; there was nothing on which to comment. The Committee actually had some concern over the absence of a Management Letter so the clean review was reflected in the minutes for posterity.

The Committee spent most of the time looking at the legislative platform for 2007. Pierce felt a ripple go through the room when the environmental cost for the crossover project was discussed. There is a \$1M environmental cost for a \$25M project. Talk centered about legislative reform to streamline the process so that super valuable dollars are not being spent recklessly. The Committee is going to be pursuing the discussion on fuel taxes. In light of the advent of clean fuel vehicles and hybrids, gas taxes may fall. Options to recapture that revenue include higher taxes on clean fuels, however most of the committee members didn't like that approach because it discourages the use of clean fuel vehicles. As less gas is used, the tax dollars will drop and yet there will still be many transportation projects to fund.

The Caldecott Tunnel, Route 4 East, Highway 80 operational improvements all made the Application for Corridor Financing list and the Caltrans list as well. Having the same things on the list will be really helpful to Caltrans. Caltrans also put the HOV project on the list. We are going forward and hoping all of these dollar issues work out. The list is still a little oversubscribed and there is a question about holding some back for future allocations. It is very clear in the projects that were accepted that having things environmentally cleared really made a difference. As we go forward with the strategic plan our thoughts are clearly correct to put money into getting things environmentally cleared and ready to roll. This is absolutely the right strategy.

The Committee got an update from Caltrans on the Caldecott Tunnel. Completion date is December, 2013. The project is still on budget and doing fine. The only real tension now is if there will be a legal challenge to the environmental document.

Some changes in accounting procedures are coming out of the audit for meshing Measure J and Measure C including documentation issues.

Neustadter noted there are two ramifications for the CMIA list: the HOV project on I-680 is in the northbound direction and TRANSPAC has focused on the southbound direction. This may be to prepare us for HOT lanes in the future. The other thing is that the Caldecott project was

in Measure C in fine print to get this project started. Neustadter thought the Authority should be lauded for getting this project started.

Beck said that MTC is studying HOT lanes in the Bay Area: where the gaps are and what kind of traffic impact it would have. One of the key issues will be governance and another key issue is that revenues have to go into the corridor in which collected. Preliminary findings of the study of a HOT lanes system in the Bay Area is that it works best if you can shift the funds around to use the funds received in one corridor to build HOT lanes in the other corridor. Ultimately, Beck said HOT lanes will become obsolete. There will be no price that you can charge to keep the HOV lanes flowing.

Armstrong asked how much was budgeted for the environmental study for the 4th bore of the Caldecott and Pierce responded that she believed it was \$5M for a \$300M project. Armstrong was comparing that relationship to the \$1M environmental cost for the \$25M Crossover Project. Pierce remembered that the \$5M was part of a \$17.7M package for development. There were a lot of comments on the document.

Armstrong said the gas tax in the state consists of the Federal Excise tax on gallons, not cost per gallon and the state sales tax is based on the sales price of gas. Pierce said that was correct, so the less gas we use, the per gallon return goes down drastically but the more gas costs, the higher state revenue becomes.

c. Planning Committee meeting

Member Abrams reported that the main issue discussed at the Planning Committee was approval of the TLC projects. The TAC evaluation subcommittee presented recommendations that were well done. The Planning Committee discussed methods of selecting those projects. In the end the conclusion was that the process used has worked well and provided good results. The bottom line was that the selection process was developed to make it a technical type of decision rather than a political one. Unfortunately some people are not comfortable with that approach.

The discussion took lots of time. Central County was very successful with this fund source. Martinez and the County got two, Concord got one. It is entirely possible that Martinez and Richmond projects might receive MTC funding rather than CCTA funding. If that \$1.7M goes to those two projects, additional projects can be funded in the County.

People at the Planning Committee meeting were concerned that the Authority was going to change the rules. Ultimately the Planning Committee did decide to forward the recommendation to the full Authority for consideration next week. Beck was asked to compile additional information on the 19 projects that were submitted so that the Planning Committee could review the various projects.

Basically this was a unanimous recommendation submitted from a cross section of technical staff in the county. Abrams thought it was a very successful process.

Reports Received; No Action Taken

10. Reports from Staff/Committees – Accepted

a) At its November 15, 2006 meeting, CCTA adopted Ordinance 06-04 Amending the Measure J Expenditure Plan to Clarify the Provisions for Local Adoption of an Urban Limit Line

(ULL). This amendment clarifies the provisions for local jurisdictions to adopt a "County ULL" or a "Local Voter ULL" to fulfill the Measure J requirement of the Growth Management Program that each jurisdiction must adopt a voter-approved ULL.

b) CCTA staff distributed a letter to be sent to local jurisdictions regarding the use of the County ULL by local jurisdictions which was placed on the ballot as Measure L. A copy of the draft was attached for information

c) An excerpt from the CCTA November 15, 2006 packet staff report "Measure J Strategic Plan: Summary of Regional Transportation Planning Committees' Priorities" was attached for information. The full document may be downloaded at www.ccta.net: click on "Meetings"; "CCTA Board Agendas"; the agenda for 11/15/06; the attachment for item 4.A.8.

d) Open Road Tolling on the Martinez-Benicia Bridge. Everyone was asked to please mark April 12, 2007 for a return visit to the Martinez-Benicia Bridge. Meet at 9:30 am at the Caltrans Construction Office, 4585 Pacheco Boulevard. Please **do not wear** shorts and **do wear** closed shoes.

e) Neustadter noted that there had been discussion about a tour of the Caldecott Tunnel and wondered if that is something the group would like to do this year, perhaps in June. Pierce said it depended upon the work schedule. Neustadter noted the items of most importance include the Action Plan update, the RM2 Study which is getting underway on scope development in February, updates on the Countywide Bike Plan and various and sundry issues which are part of the Measure J Strategic Plan and implementation of Measure J. Pierce felt that earlier was better and Shinn and Pierce agreed that June might be a very good time to schedule the tour.

11. Correspondence/Copies/Newsclips/Information - Accepted

12/14/06 Buchanan Field Airport, Winter Edition newsletter; 9/22/06 Letter from Patrick Roche, Principal Planner, Advance Planning Division to Susan Miller, CCTA, commenting on the Draft Environmental Assessment and Initial Study/Proposed Negative Declaration (EA/IS) for the proposed I-680/SR 4 Interchange Improvement Project; 10/12/06 Letter from Chair Shinn to Caltrans in support of the City of Pleasant Hill's Application for a Caltrans Community Based Transportation Planning Grant for the Contra Costa Boulevard Corridor; 10/19/06 TRANSPAC status letter to CCTA; Items Approved by the Authority on October 19, 2006 and November 16, 2006 for Circulation to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and items of interest; 9/29/06 and 11/8/06 WCCTAC Status letters to CCTA; 10/23/06 letter from the TRANSPAC Manager to Supervisor Piepho regarding TRANSPAC'S adjournment in memory of her father, John Nejedly; County Connection September 2006 Fixed Route Reports; CCTA November 30, 2006 Project Status Report.

511 Contra Costa: December and October 2006 Monthly Status Reports; Oakland Tribune, 11/30/06, "Extra Funding helps Zipcar to expand"; San Francisco Chronicle, 10/16/06 "Bay Area bucks trend for one driver, one car".

RM 2 I-680 Express Bus Access and HOV System Study: PAC and TAC appointments substantially completed; Study managers expecting first TAC meeting in February.

12. For the Good of the Order: The 2007 TRANSPAC meeting schedule was attached.

a) Neustadter announced that Julia Fuller, TRANSPAC Administrative Assistant, will be retiring as of March 30, 2007. Neustadter and Osborn are working on a job description for Fuller's replacement. The plan is to bring that person on board a month to six weeks ahead of time to facilitate cross training.

b) Neustadter said she will schedule an orientation for the Board of Supervisor's representative and Planning Commissioners as soon as appropriate appointments are made. Anyone who is interested is welcome to participate. Durant suggested including alternates in the orientation session.

c) Chair Shinn announced that Julie Pierce is running as a candidate for the MTC Board. Amy Worth is also running.

d) Chair Shinn said because of the potential appointment to MTC and the heavy workload that Pierce will have next year, he is suggesting that TRANSPAC hold the status of officers in place in lieu of rotation. Everyone has a full plate at this time and he is suggesting that the status quo be held in place unless there is a ceremonial need to rotate.

Because of the hit and miss attendance by representatives of the Board of Supervisor (BOS) who are appointed to TRANSPAC, Chair Shinn would like to approach the Board and request that Susan Bonilla be appointed as TRANSPAC's representative. Bonilla had indicated a potential willingness to be appointed to TRANSPAC when she was on the Concord Council and she lives close by, so it would be easier for her to make the meeting schedule. Shinn asked the other elected officials for direction and support to pursue this attempt to ensure representation at TRANSPAC by the BOS. It not only adds to the dimension and depth of discussion but it also makes it easier to obtain a quorum so that action can be taken at each meeting. Bonilla has not had a lot of transportation experience and this would be a perfect place for her to learn about it. Shinn would like to actively lobby the BOS for Bonilla's appointment. Pierce asked if Shinn is successful to include a request that Bonilla not be appointed to another committee which meets at the same time as TRANSPAC and therefore creates an automatic obstruction to her attendance at TRANSPAC. Shinn asked anyone who might have influence with the BOS to exercise that influence in this regard. No one objected to Shinn's request to proceed.

Shinn reported on Concord's issues with the development of the Naval Weapon's Station. The status is that Concord is taking the position that it will not meet with Shaw, the Navy's prospective developer, until further negotiations with the Navy take place. Concord made a strong effort to rebuild trust with the community while the Navy led Concord on for about a year. People had been distrustful of government not getting things right and so Concord brought together a diversity of groups within the community to maximize the input into final plans for development of the property. Disparate groups within the City have come together to work with the City in the spirit of openness and cooperation. From the Navy's perspective, it can get a billion dollar credit to do the infrastructure at a time when there is a concern about money going to Iraq and unavailable to the military at home. Some people want open debate on the forum but the Mayor's position is not to negotiate in public. A public debate can occur once the basic turnover process is somewhat structured between Concord and the Navy. The Mayor and Shinn as Vice-Mayor will meet with Shaw to find out what its proposals are. Concord officials don't want to give the impression that they are in bed with Shaw. All have agreed to a 30 day extension of the Notice of Surplus Transit which was supposed to take place in November but has now been pushed back to December 21st. Congressman Miller has strongly supported Concord's efforts to move forward and make sure that the Navy does what the process calls for by law.

Concord thinks this form of transfer is too quick and throws the community out of the planning process as the development plan moves to Shaw. Concord wants to include the community in the planning process and keep good faith. Right or wrong, Concord will have to deal with the

Navy and whomever ends up with development rights for a long time so the city wants to formulate a positive, long term relationship and get this thing back on project.

Armstrong asked if Concord has ever given any thought to a swap of the airport for the Naval Weapons Station where the city could then develop the airport property. Shinn said no from his perspective. It has come up to the Council several times and the Council has always said no. Concord believes there will be a tremendous amount of open space at some point in the Naval Weapons Station property. It is a natural terrain with lots of contaminants which will require restoration. A Restoration Advisory Board has been in place since 1985 and has looked at and expanded the identified points of contamination. Every month they are finding more items that they didn't know about because the military didn't keep good records. Concord has been identifying contaminated areas and is in process of deciding what needs to be done to neutralize them. Concord doesn't feel that an airport would logically fit into what they want to do. There are 140 acres including an inland portion that the Army will maintain. The National Guard wants to consolidate Walnut Creek, Pittsburg and Concord on 30 acres. There is a consortium of public safety people who want a consolidated training center and there is strong interest for a historical or interpretive center as well as research facilities. There is also interest for relocation of a UC State system campus. There are lots of good ideas out there and Concord wants to make sure it has its stakes in the sand before developers get there and move ahead without public input. Public conveyance issues are important to the City of Concord and a homeless assessment needs to be done to see if it is feasible to convert some of the military housing into affordable housing and homeless shelters. San Diego was able to convert some updated military housing into affordable housing and traded land and money to homeless providers to solve that particular problem. Contra Costa County has embarked on a three year effort to deal with homeless issues and there are plans in place for services and wraparounds that can tie to transportation and infrastructure. Concord could open itself up to federal and local litigation if this aspect of the development isn't handled properly.

Durant commented that Concord should be commended on the approach it is taking to assist in these community issues. Pierce agreed that being proactive is very important rather than dealing with the problems created by inactivity. Durant added that he was pleased with the inclusive nature of Concord's process.

13. Adjournment to February 8, 2007

This meeting was adjourned at 10:39 a.m. in memory of Phyllis Roff, the City of Walnut Creek's local government watchdog, a member of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority's Measure C Transportation Partnership Advisory Committee (TPAC) and TRANSPAC's very own Public Watchdog for Justice. The next TRANSPAC meeting is scheduled for February 8, 2007. Chair Shinn wished everyone a Merry Christmas, Happy New Year and God Bless.