

**Summary Minutes
TRANSPAC – May 11, 2006**

ATTENDANCE:

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

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

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

Public: None

Meeting convened without a quorum by Chair Shinn at 9:06 a.m.

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

2. Public Comment

Chair Shinn summarized a letter from Phyllis Roff, which stated: "Dear Chair Bill and Colleagues: It is a little late to wish you a Happy May Day. Perhaps you may think I am spending your time too fast if I wish you a pleasant Memorial Day weekend but I am doing it anyway! Last month I told you about KGO's Gene Burns' comments about the three most prominent candidates for governor. Well, I sent him a copy of my response letter to Sunne Wright McPeak's commentary and I asked him if he planned to vote for a Libertarian with no plan? I will get no answer but who cares? Since I have been personally active in politics in this County for more than 20 years, I think the changes in campaigning have been remarkable. My mail box is no longer overflowing each day with literature. Nobody rings my door bell nor asks to put up lawn signs. True, it may be a bit early for this season but a pattern has developed, don't you agree? With the change, will we see less electorate involvement when we need much more? Will the change in local newspaper ownership become a negative? I am just raising some ugly questions with no answers to go along. Have a happy summer, walk more, drive less and use our good transit system., (Signed) Phyllis

CONSENT AGENDA: Pierce/Abrams/unanimous

3. Recommended approval of April 13, 2006 TRANSPAC meeting minutes be forwarded for action at the next TRANSPAC meeting

END CONSENT AGENDA

4. Presentation on the Caldecott Tunnel Improvement Project by Cristina Ferraz, Project Manager Project Management- East Region, California Department of Transportation, District 4

Ms. Ferraz provided a status report on the Tunnel Improvement Project, the release of the environmental document, overall schedule and funding. Neustadter circulated visual simulations of the Caldecott now and in the future.

Ferraz thanked TRANSPAC for allowing her to make a presentation. She gave an overview of tunnel operations and noted that the bore direction for the center bore is switched daily around 11:30 am – noon. Sometimes the traffic flow control zones are switched up to 15 times during the weekends. Based on Caltrans forecasting, traffic will increase significantly in the next twenty years. Congestion in the off peak direction will grow faster than the peak direction.

The 4th bore of the tunnel will increase and improve the mobility of the traveling public, reduce off peak delays, eliminate daily lane reversals and enhance the safety of maintenance workers as well as the public. MTC first looked at possible improvements to the traffic flow on Route 24 back in 2000. One of the recommendations of the study was to construct a two-lane fourth bore in the tunnel. The bore will have a two foot left shoulders, twelve foot lanes and emergency wall plates on both sides. The scope of the work in Alameda includes the westbound Route 24 connector to northbound Route 13, Kay Street Overcrossing, Caldecott Lane off ramps, the eastbound ramp R-24 improvements, sound and retaining walls. The scope of work on the Contra Costa side includes Fish Ranch Road off ramps and retaining walls.

Available funding in future dollars is \$245M including STIP, IIP, RIP, TCRP, Measure J, Regional Measure 2 and federal funds. A shortfall is projected. Public hearings are scheduled for June 7th and 15th with the goal of selecting a preferred alternative in the summer of 2006. Caltrans hopes to approve the final environmental document in the Spring/Summer of 2007. With the design complete by summer 2008, construction should start spring 2009 and construction is estimated to be completed in 2013/14. The contractor will be working 24/5 and digging from both sides of the hill.

Snyder asked if the Bond Measure will make up some of the funding. Caltrans hopes to get \$140-145 M but no dollar amount is tied to this project specifically from the Governor's Bond Measure. Neustadter said in the connector to Highway 13, will the u-turn curve be eliminated westbound on SR 24? Ferraz said no changes are proposed to the southbound loop. After the 4th bore is complete though the three lanes northbound on SR 13 will be free flow in the am which should help. Brumley asked about Caldecott Lane and Ferraz responded that it will be adjusted to bring the ramps to a standard configuration and will remain pretty much the same. It is not a retaining wall. The only retaining walls are at the entrance to the portal.

Noise abatement may be needed so a soundwall has been included in the project. The soundwall may be on top of a berm to be more effective. Caltrans will meet with the condo board reps to discuss whether or not the sound wall is necessary. The top of the soundwall is definitely above the first and second floors of the condo. Pierce asked about the specs of the sound wall and was told it is 20-25 feet high.

Engelmann said the positive results that were shown in the evaluation for the 2001 RTP indicated that when this project is constructed it eliminates all congestion in the off peak direction. That reduction is equivalent to all of the congestion in the peak direction. It is a very good project in terms of congestion relief. The bad news is that the operations analysis showed that the queue on southbound I-680 builds a little faster in the am because this metering section on eastbound 24 is no longer in effect. There's always another bottleneck somewhere. Ferraz indicated that there is also a secondary bottleneck in downtown Lafayette as well.

Abrams couldn't understand why it takes 4.5-5 years to construct the bore. BART's tunnel under the Bay didn't take that long. Ferraz described the process which is very slow and methodical due to the shape of the opening not being round. A large piece of equipment will be shoring up the ceiling as the excavation is done. Anchor bolts will be put in place as the work progresses and work will commence from both ends of the tunnel. Caltrans is trying to expedite the construction by using different methods of procurement so the contractors can work alongside the designers and get on board earlier.

The work will be ongoing 24 hours a day for five days, with the 6th and 7th day reserved for equipment maintenance. Caltrans will construct a temporary noise barrier and staging will be done in front of the condos on the west side of the tunnel. Abrams said without any detours, the work should speed up. Ferraz said the only time there will be a need to detour traffic will be when they are working on the ramps. It will be minor and most of the work will take place away from the roadway. Fortunately the right-of-way was secured when the third bore was built in the '60s.

Ferraz showed the location of the tour on her map. Take Old Tunnel Road to the gate, push the button and drive through to the parking lot. Neustadter will send directions and details by e-mail. The tour will last about 1.5 hours and includes a museum and short film of the construction of bores 1 and 2. The tour includes the ventilation tunnel of the third bore and watching the center bore switch from westbound to eastbound. The tour was scheduled for 10:00 a.m.

No Action Taken: Information Item

5. Presentation of the County Connection Lifeline Transportation Program Grant Application to Restore Saturday and Initiate Sunday service on Route 111 by Celinda Dahlgren, Director of Administration, County Connection

TRANSPAC approved a letter of support for County Connection's Lifeline Transportation Program grant application as an urgency item at its April 13, 2006 meeting and requested a full presentation on the project at this meeting. TRANSPAC's letter of support to the CCTA, a current Route 111 map and schedule were included in the packet.

The City of Concord and County Connection worked together on the Monument Corridor Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP). The CBTP addressed transportation issues affecting the Monument Corridor and expanded bus service was identified as a high priority need for Corridor residents. Route 111 provides service between the Concord and Pleasant Hill BART stations with a transfer stop (Route 114) at Monument Boulevard. Route 111 weekend service will provide improved mobility and access to the regional rail system for low income residents in the Monument Corridor and surrounding areas.

Dahlgren said the route map in the packet shows service lines for the bus routes. One bus goes down Oak Grove and the other goes to San Miguel where there is a Mobile Home Park. This provides about 20 new hours of service including Sundays and it is anticipated that it will serve 175-250 passengers a day. The Union was consulted and supported the new service. This was a proposal that came out of the meetings for the Monument Blvd. Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP). When the Route was originally cut it was during the budget crisis. Productivity was not high enough (it did not include Sunday service) for CCCTA to keep it at that time. CCCTA is now hoping that by getting the word out, people in the area are

enthusiastic and hopefully productivity can be boosted on that route. CCCTA is asking for lifeline program funding for three years.

Pierce said it looks like a great service. The service cuts through the heart of the corridor and connects two BART stations and provides access to nine different bus routes. Route 114 runs 24/7 down Monument Blvd. and this one cuts through the middle.

Deidre Heitman added that BART supports this program as well. Abrams added that Walnut Creek and Concord both certainly appreciate these changes.

Chair Shinn accepted the report with thanks to Ms. Dahlgren

6. Request for a Letter of Support for a Lifeline Transportation Program Grant Application from Debbie Toth, Executive Director, RSNC Mt. Diablo Center for Adult Day Health Care

On April 18, 2006 Ms. Toth requested a letter of support for a Lifeline Transportation Program grant application to be filed by her agency. This request is similar to the urgency item requests from the City of Concord and County Connection for letters of support at the April TRANSPAC meeting.

The Mt. Diablo Center for Adult Day Health Care application will include two different routes and goals: 1) County Connection recently reduced their area of paratransit service to less than a mile and a half radius from fixed route stops. The Mt. Diablo Center will provide morning pick up and afternoon drop off for people who do not reside inside the paratransit service boundaries. Additionally, service will be provided to those spending in excess of an hour and a half on a one way trip with County Connection Link.

2) The Mt. Diablo Center Adult Day Health Care program begins at 9:30 am and ends at 3:00 pm. As a result, there will be time during which the bus is not transporting the Center's clients. To fully utilize the availability of the van, a shopping shuttle will be operated in areas in Concord (including the Monument Corridor) where home bound seniors need service to get to the grocery and drug stores. These are low income seniors who can either not afford to ride the Link, or do not qualify for it. Service will be provided Monday through Friday with two rounds per day with 8 folks per round (total of 16 each day).

Pierce verified that the Center is non-profit. She asked what kind of oversight is there on these grants once they are given out. What kind of accounting, efficiency, and value analysis is performed after the grant is awarded. Pierce wanted to make sure that there was accountability for the money. Engelmann said non-profits can be funded directly through job access reverse commute funding which is federal and focused on access to jobs. In this case, the project is not for employment mobility, it is for senior mobility so another possible funding source would be under that funding source. A non profit would have to find a partner to accept the funds to pass through.

Once the project is in motion, MTC set up monitoring and reporting requirements so CCTA expects to get information about ridership, productivity, cost effectiveness as the program gets underway. At the mid point of the process, CCTA will do an evaluation to see if this program is effective at all.

Pierce wondered if only a fixed amount of money is available, is this project in direct competition with County Connection for the funds. Engemann said the senior access to health care is not while the shopping on Monument is. There is another application for a Monument shuttle service. Dahlgren said if you mean in terms of funding, this is regional discretionary funding that MTC doesn't give to operators anyway. Pierce noticed CCCTA had a map of the route but the RSNC doesn't have a map. Engemann said they have not partnered with anyone.

Concord also put in an application for the Monument shuttle and is working cooperatively with CCCTA to service some of the areas that CCCTA is not providing service, so Concord is not in direct competition with CCCTA.

Pierce would like to have all the applications together for consideration and Abrams agreed. Without knowing what other applications are in competition, it is difficult to give support. It appears to be a great project but the determination has to be made who is the best to serve and who is most accountable. The competitive analysis will be done by CCTA and MTC,

Engemann can give an update on the project selection process because the task force is forwarding a recommendation to the Technical Coordinating Committee tomorrow. The recommendation will be released and the initial scoring of the projects for all applicants will be available. The appeals process will be available to everyone before the TCC review meeting on the 18th. TCC will then make recommendations to the Planning Committee for approval in June. Pierce said TRANSPAC can send approval for what the applicants are trying to do through Charlie at the Planning Committee meeting but one can't be chosen above the other until the competition is revealed. Abrams will take the elements of this discussion to the Planning Committee meeting where the best proposal can be determined out of the multiple applicants for this pool of money.

No Action Taken: Direction given to Abrams for his review of the projects at the Planning Committee meeting.

7. Review of the Proposed Measure J Expenditure Plan Growth Management Program (GMP) Urban Limit Line (ULL) Amendment

The TRANSPAC TAC reviewed the CCTA's draft proposed amendment in depth at its April 27, 2006 meeting. The proposed amendment does not change the requirement for an Urban Limit Line or equivalent urban growth boundary, etc. as a condition for the receipt of the 18% Local Street and Road Maintenance funding and the 5% Transportation for Livable Community (TLC) funds.

Rather, given the difficulties experienced since 2004 in creating a "Mutually-agreed upon Countywide Urban Limit Line" (MAC-ULL), the proposed amendment establishes additional mechanisms through which jurisdictions can achieve compliance with the ULL requirement.

To facilitate TRANSPAC review of "Part III Revised Growth Management Program", a "clean" version of the proposed amendment is in the packet and has been annotated with the TAC's suggested revisions as well as comments for discussion. A Strike-Out Version of the proposed amendment to the Revised Growth Management Program is in the packet behind the TAC annotated version to assist comparison with the original Measure J text.

Assuming approval of an amendment, the CCTA will use the established Measure C amendment process. Comments on the proposed amendment are due to the CCTA by May 30, 2006.

Neustadter reviewed the details of the proposed amendment and agreed with the TAC that it is important that the amendment set up what needs to be done. On page 2 of 6, it shows a jurisdiction may adopt what is now called a County-ULL (Urban Limit Line) and use for compliance with Measure J. There are a couple of ways in which jurisdictions may wish to establish a ULL and the County Line is available for use.

It is possible that a jurisdiction in the future may ask to get a local voter approved ULL. A jurisdiction may ask its voters to approve such a line that would then become the ULL for that jurisdiction and will be used for Measure J requirements. This must be very clear to jurisdictions to guard against future problems or misunderstandings.

Snyder asked if this was the original language in Measure J which was approved by the voters. If so, how do we have the authority to go back and change this without voter approval? Pierce said we are just defining options, not changing anything. The basic requirement is not changed. The methodology through which a jurisdiction can establish a ULL has been revised to provide more options for local jurisdictions because what was originally assumed to be available (MAC-ULL) may not be.

Simmons asked for clarification of the language proposed to be changed. Pierce said it is to clarify how the ULL can be defined jurisdiction by jurisdiction. During the writing of Measure J, it was assumed that we could arrive at one countywide ULL which everyone could support. That did not happen. Most of the cities in the county could be served by the county's line. Some jurisdictions did not agree with the county ULL. Options now are: the county ULL, a separate voter approved ULL, a county ULL that other jurisdictions may use. Simmons asked if this change is supposed to be approved by CCTA then did Measure J give CCTA that authority? Pierce said yes, the Authority had it with Measure C and it allows a 45 day appeal period after CCTA takes amendment action(s) where the majority of the jurisdictions representing a majority of the population can challenge the decision.

Templeton asked what the Authority's approval process is and Pierce thought it was 8 out of 11, the same as the Expenditure Plan. Engelmann thought the Expenditure Plan was a simple majority and this requires a super majority. Neustadter clarified that amendments to the Expenditure Plan require a majority and amendments to the Ordinance require a two thirds vote. This is an amendment to the Expenditure Plan which is a majority with a 45 day appeal period.

Abrams said this has become so technical and so detailed as more and more people try to anticipate the combination of events that might occur in each city. The bottom line is that if there is a challenge to this in four years from now it will be the CCTA Board at that time that will make a decision as to whether or not a city meets the requirements to get its return to source funds. Fourteen of nineteen cities just want to get through this. There are small changes for Clayton and Concord with the Naval Weapons Station.

Pierce said she hopes to convey what the ordinance intended. She thought it would be easier to put the actions in bullet form so each jurisdiction can choose the option that best meets its needs. Abrams noted that everyone seems to be adding clauses to be able to challenge

Brentwood. Pierce disagreed. She thought what was being done is to try to clarify and prevent challenges. Templeton discussed the issue with the Concord City Attorney who was concerned that the City get clarification now. If the amendment is too ambiguous then Concord may be caught in some loophole down the road. One concern was when does the City Council say which approach is appropriate for the City. Is the action taken prior to an election or after? Concord's concern is to ensure that if the City goes along with the County's vote now, two years down the road the City can have its own vote. This should be clarified now.

Pierce agreed that is the concern in East County as well. Pittsburg and Antioch had their own election and their voters have spoken. Behind the scenes, environmental groups were going to the Board of Supervisors and asking to exclude the voter approval saying there would be a challenge. Pierce said it should be made clear that the most local election is the one that is the prevailing rule. Nobody can override approval in a citywide election. People were trying to overturn the elections in East County through a countywide election and CCTA is trying to ensure preservation of local control by clarifying the process.

It was suggested that items six and seven on page 5 be reversed to ensure that options follow related issues. Neustadter said the numbering will be cleaned up. The word alternative will be removed because it no longer makes any sense. Neustadter summarized the remainder of the changes in the packet.

The essence of the question is if a jurisdiction signs on to the County ULL, do the provisions that accompany the county ballot measure proceed to then apply to the jurisdiction? For instance, if a jurisdiction decided to use the County ULL and that Measure on the ballot includes a periodic five year review for the ULL, and then within the time frame of the five year periodic review, the County changes the ULL, then does that change apply to the jurisdiction as well or does the original County ULL stand? The answer is unknown.

Snyder asked when can the County change? Does it have to be every five years? The answer was that a city can change it at any time and so can the County. The County does have to have a five year review as that provision is currently included in its measure. Neustadter suggested forwarding these questions to the Authority for clarification.

Pierce suggested that the advisory measure should be stricken because it makes no sense to her. Although it is either a voter approved line or county line that the jurisdiction signs on to, the cost of the election is the same. The Advisory may have been created to clarify that when a jurisdiction signs on to the County line it may be asked to pay for the vote.

The County is trying to get something on the ballot without having to do a full environmental assessment. The intent clearly is to have a measure on the ballot in November which requires no EIR. Pierce said one issue is who pays for the EIR. Supposedly it is the County but it could come back to CCTA. That is something that still needs to be determined. If a jurisdiction signs on with the County then the jurisdiction is not subject to later changes by the county within the five year review. The jurisdiction can decide if their line is the city limit and then there could be no change later.

Snyder agreed with Pierce on the advisory measure. This would be a difficult concept to explain to voters. The City of Lafayette is the only jurisdiction which thinks it's a good idea.

Action by Consensus: Advise the Authority to eliminate the 'Advisory' Measure clause and make other changes/clarifications as noted in documents and discussed.

Neustadter asked if there were other issues for discussion or final comments to transmit to the Authority. Templeton asked about the next procedural step. Neustadter said the TAC would look at this again. Technically speaking, the TAC would not be proposing changes in language. The TAC and TRANSPAC are asking the Authority to clarify the language. Neustadter asked Engelmann if the document would circulate again and he responded that it depends on how significant the changes are. There is the option of redoing comments, responding to them and then adopting an amendment to the Expenditure Plan which could then be appealed. Neustadter said it seemed to her advisable that if recirculation eliminates a possible future challenge, then it would be worthwhile. Templeton agreed that he would like to see it come back. Comments are currently due to CCTA on May 30, 2006.

Engelmann said he heard that the Board of Supervisors may run into trouble putting this on the ballot in November which would mean that if a jurisdiction doesn't have a county line, it can't do the county ULL and can't do an advisory ULL so everyone is on their own. This simplifies matters considerably.

Pierce noted that the meeting she attended was erroneously reported in the Contra Costa Times. She was at Brentwood where issues were raised regarding having three specific plan areas included in the ULL. After having failed with its own voters, Supervisor Piepho wants the county to include these things in a negative declaration that gets circulated in the next thirty days. The Supervisors were advised by attorneys of two developers in the Brentwood area that they could add these things into a negative declaration in the initial study when they come back. If there are significant objections to those sections by Brentwood then a full EIR would be required. Those items could be pulled out and the rest placed on the ballot without recirculating. Pierce thought that would be illegal.

Skaggs swears it can be done. If that is the case, time has been lost that can't be made up. Pierce had been excited at the beginning of the meeting because Clayton and the County had worked out a compromise. This was thrown on the table at the Board of Supervisors meeting which has flushed other agreements down the toilet. Our Supervisor voted against it because of the Brentwood addition.

Pierce asked the Supervisors for their reasons and asked their reconsideration for a future vote which could still get it into the November election instead of waiting for the June, 2008 primary, which is starting to push the boundaries. Pierce will know more this afternoon when she speaks with DeSaulnier and asks if he can convince one of the other Supervisors. The county attorney didn't speak up and the direction was to come back and give information on Brentwood with no indication of whether or not it was legal to pull the Brentwood amendment.

Neustadter said if the Brentwood amendment is pulled then Brentwood falls back to the original county line. Abrams said that the Brentwood voters could have another vote. Part of the reason that the Brentwood line failed with the voters is that the farmers were mad because it didn't include enough. They joined in opposition with the environmentalists who thought it was too much. The result was that it failed.

Pittsburg and Antioch voters did approve a City ULL.

No Action Taken: Direction from TRANSPAC given to Pierce and Abrams who will ask for recirculation if it looks like a significant change is made to the Proposed Amendment to the Measure J Expenditure Plan GMP ULL.

8. Adoption of the TRANSPAC 2006-07 and Regional Measure 2 I-680 HOV Gap Closure Study Budgets

The TRANSPAC TAC reviewed draft budgets at its March and April meetings. The proposed draft budget is built on City of Pleasant Hill updated benefit and salary rates as well as a 2% COLA assumption. The TAC recommended adoption of the draft budget in the packet.

Because there was no quorum, action on the budget could not be taken. This item will be moved to the next meeting.

9. Discussion/Review of Amendments to the Measure C (1988) Expenditure Plan and Ordinance 88-01

The CCTA has released proposed amendments to the original Measure C Expenditure Plan and Ordinance (88-01) which will be adopted in Ordinance 06-1 (not yet drafted) on June 21, 2006. Both Measure C documents have been amended over the years. At this juncture, the CCTA staff is intending to draft a new ordinance (06-01) to separate the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan, insert Measure C-related expenditure items from Ordinance 88-01 into the Expenditure Plan and other changes. The CCTA staff report to the May 4, 2006 APC meeting includes a request for RTPCs, local jurisdictions and transit operators to respond with comments by May 30, 2006.

Due to the timing of this request, the TRANSPAC TAC had not had an opportunity to review the documents. Staff suggested that response to CCTA's request be delegated to the Chair and Vice Chair. Comments, suggested revisions, etc. from today's meeting may then be forwarded to the TAC for incorporation into a response to CCTA.

Neustadter noted that there is now another new version of this document. In 1988 the voters approved the Measure C Expenditure Plan and Ordinance 88-01 as a single document. The documents in the packet detail every single amendment that has been made to Ordinance 88-01 without defining which was which. Neustadter had a second version of the revised Ordinance 88-01 which she was going to distribute but now another version is expected.

Neustadter said the document takes currently applicable provisions from 88-01 and amendments including the 04-02 Measure J Extension and is compiled into Ordinance 06-01. Pierce said this item is coming back to the Authority at the June meeting with the intent that it will be adopted in July. There would be an opportunity at the July meeting for one last review. Most of the work will have been done by then and intervening iterations will be considered in June.

Pierce noted that there are two items on the agenda that could use a June meeting and the ULL is more important than a tour of the Caldecott, especially since the best tour guide will not be directing the tour. Neustadter agreed that it is important that Measure J is properly launched. It was agreed that the June meeting would be held on June 15th and Neustadter would set up a new tour date for the Caldecott with the gentleman who has worked there forever. The meeting will be scheduled for June 15th subject to room availability and

availability check with Durant, Ross and Piepho. The ULL and the Budget will be on the agenda.

Snyder said if there is a problem with room availability, TRANSPAC can most likely use the Union Hall in Martinez. Pierce also offered the meeting hall in Clayton and Dahlgren offered the County Connection Board Room. Neustadter thanked everyone for the offers and said she might take them up on it for the December TRANSPAC meeting since Pleasant Hill needs to use the room on our regularly scheduled date.

No Action Taken: Comments for CCTA to be transmitted by Pierce and Abrams

10. TRANSPAC and CCTA Representatives' Reports – Received. The minutes of the March 15, 2006 CCTA meeting were included in the packet.

a. Administration and Projects Committee meeting

Member Pierce reported that the Administration and Projects Committee mainly discussed a lot of the topics raised today. The Ordinance was pitched back to staff to clarify. Pierce said that the APC received a presentation from Caltrans on the SHOPP Program (State Highway Operations and Protection Program). SHOPP identified a need for \$29.72 B and only \$1.73 M per year is proposed for funding – statewide. Neustadter noted that there is a bond deal in the works. Abrams said unfortunately there isn't much for transportation compared to what is needed.

The need is in the billions and available dollars are in the single millions with actual allocations being even less than that. Pierce noted that the 2006 storm damage issues have completely decimated state maintenance budgets. Repair costs will have to come out of available dollars. Maintenance will go forward on Highway 24, Route 4 from Willow Pass to Cummings Skyway and some segments way out in East County. The 2006 Storm damage will take precedence over a lot of projects in the works. Clearing the slides is the first priority. One very important fact to emerge from this situation was that Caltrans has no protocol for contacting local jurisdictions to report problems with the state network. When all of the traffic was diverted through Pinole and Hercules on San Pablo (which is a state highway taken care of by local safety people), police officers had to be put to work directing traffic because the schedule for bus service was delayed and congestion was overwhelming. It seemed obvious to Pierce that Police Dispatch should have been called; however, Caltrans Director of District 4 was busy trying to call City Managers at City Halls on Sunday morning. Contra Costa is making a list of 24/7 numbers for future emergencies and sharing the list with Caltrans as well as other jurisdictions within the County. In this way, City Managers and Police can participate in decisions that need to be made. Chair Shinn was surprised that Caltrans didn't have OES Protocol Emergency contacts. He said they could have called the Sherriff's Department and the proper contacts would have been made.

Pierce suggested that any jurisdiction with a state highway adjacent should call Caltrans and provide proper emergency call numbers.

Pierce added that the Caltrans Director talked about other slide areas where real problems have occurred in Marin and at Devil's Slide and said that repairs would come out of the same budget as Pinole. It's going to be an ugly year.

Snyder asked about Prop 42 money funding local projects and Abrams said it hasn't worked itself down to the local level yet. Pierce said that people need to understand why we don't have what we think we need. The Geyserville bridge is off its foundation and has to be completely redone which is anticipated to take six months.

Templeton reported that Caltrans has been out to look at the slide on Ygnacio Valley Road and said it would cost about \$1.3M to repair which Caltrans will fund. Unfortunately that's just for the repair work and has nothing to do with taking care of the slide itself which is another expensive project. Pierce added that's what the city of Pinole wanted to know because they didn't know how they could pay for emergency repairs they needed to get done. The roadway repairs will be paid for by Caltrans and will put the road back into operation but the permanent fixes to the adjacent slide areas are not funded. The Concord Council has an upcoming meeting to declare this situation an emergency so the City can deal directly with one contractor instead of going out to bid. In order to use the money, the work has to be done by the end of August which won't allow the hillside to dry out enough to fix the slide.

Osborn asked if MTC allocates the prioritization for SHOPP funding and Pierce said no, Caltrans is doing a great job of trying to spread those dollars around. Caltrans is completely missing the public relations boat by not acknowledging that it is true that a million dollars extra is coming from the gas sales tax; however it doesn't go near covering the amount required to fix the storm damage.

Neustadter noted that the APC agenda did approve the Measure J Financial Framework and TRANSPAC's comments were included. She asked Pierce if she wanted to report on the discussion on eminent domain. Pierce said basically the ruling is that we can have the power of eminent domain if we form a JPA but there is a question about the desirability of this action. The County is our contact which has eminent domain powers if we wish to do a roadway project right now. It's an ongoing discussion. One approach was to have the 20 jurisdictions become a JPA. This was discussed early on in Measure C but there was so much paranoia about what a JPA could do and how it could run over everybody that everyone felt it was undesirable to bestow the designation upon CCTA. If we use Caltrans' eminent domain, it can add six months to getting a project done. CCTA got a legal opinion which stated that it could have eminent domain but would have to be a JPA to do it.

b. Planning Committee meeting

Member Abrams reported that the Planning Committee was cancelled this month.

11. Reports from Staff Committees - Accepted

a. The Meeting with BART Board Director Gail Murray and BART staff to discuss joint TRANSPAC BART projects and other issues is scheduled for May 22, 2006 at 11 am in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room, 100 Gregory Lane, Pleasant Hill.

b. Overview of MTC's Current Planning and Operations activities was discussed at the April TRANSPAC meeting. CCTA's detailed letter to MTC Chair Jon Rubin was in the packet.

c. Distribution of the updated Commuter Resource Guide and Employer Services brochure by Lynn Osborn, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager. Neustadter noted that the City of Concord Police Department exercised great creativity when dealing with the anticipated congestion due to immigration rallies on May 1st by calling 511 Contra Costa to discuss a press release warning the public of areas which might be most affected by congestion. Osborn and staff were able to get the press release out immediately to help drivers better plan routes home.

511 Contra Costa staff from both WCCTAC and the TRANSPAC/TRANSPLAN TDM Programs created a press release in cooperation with Caltrans District 4 Public Information Office regarding alternative means of commuting to avoid the congestion caused by the Pinole slide on I-80. Osborn had several conversations with Caltrans about the increase in traffic volume over the Benicia Bridge. She said there was a 5% increase in Bridge traffic and the shoulders of the peak have expanded. A press release was also distributed to Solano and Sonoma County news agencies and radio stations to suggest ways commuters could find alternative routes through the Bay Area. Pierce noted that there are definitely more trucks in the mix of traffic coming across the Benicia Bridge. She noted that there is a huge difference in traffic patterns as a result of the slide on Ygnacio. Most commuters are choosing Highway 4 and are now avoiding Marsh Creek Road which is desirable. Treat Blvd. isn't even as crowded as it could be.

Osborn distributed copies of the new Transportation Resource Guide prepared by her staff. The first Guide had been distributed about 4-5 years ago and needed updating. It was a popular item because it provides comprehensive transportation information including Transit Agency addresses, websites and phone numbers. Changes will be posted to the website as the book is expensive to produce. A new Employer Services brochure has also been created to educate employers about the services available through 511 Contra Costa. Chair Shinn asked if these brochures go to Chambers of Commerce and Osborn responded yes. She noted that she would also be meeting with Economic Development Directors of the Central and East County jurisdictions to ensure that these staffers are familiar with services available through 511 Contra Costa. Heitman asked if the Transportation Resource Guides were distributed to social service agencies and Osborn responded that can be done, depending on how many agencies could use them. Something similar used to be provided to the Social Service Agencies by the Regional Rideshare Program.

Osborn announced a new "WOW" piece which will be distributed at the June meeting. It was created to attract attention to the services 511 Contra Costa provides and will be distributed to active employers and employees.

TDM Staff contacted the District Manager for Starbucks and received permission to include materials on the company's public bulletin boards on a regular basis. Staff is determining what should be displayed to take advantage of this opportunity.

d. County Connection requested appropriation of the \$550,000 in Measure funds for the Pacheco Transit Hub by TRANSPAC in March and the CCTA in April, 2006. The CCTA APC Committee is scheduled to consider this request at its May 4 meeting.

e. At the March 9, 2006 TRANSPAC meeting as part of an information item on the 2006/2007 Conditions of Compliance report for the Growth Management Checklist prepared by TRANSPAC and 511 Contra Costa staff, Member Pierce suggested that the TAC review the Route of Regional Significance designation for Clayton Road, Bailey Road and Marsh Creek Road. The TAC discussed this issue at its April 27, 2006 meeting. There were questions about the extent to which these routes meet designation criteria as well as different viewpoints on the appropriateness of designation given local operations and conditions. The TAC suggests that these routes be reviewed as part of the Action Plan Update scheduled to begin this fall.

f. Based on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decision, Caltrans issued letters indicating the need to change to a Race-Neutral DBE Program until a more detailed assessment can be made to determine if there is sufficient evidence of discrimination or, if so, its effects on transportation contracts. [E-mail included in packet which shows distribution as well by the League of California Cities].

12. Correspondence/Copies/Newsclips/Information - Accepted

Correspondence: 4/24/06 TRANSPAC status letter from Chair Shinn to CCTA Chair Freitas; 4/24/06 Letter from TRANSPAC Chair Shinn to CCTA Chair Freitas commenting on the Draft Measure J Financial Framework; 4/20/06 Items Approved by the Authority on April 19, 2006 for Circulation to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and items of interest; 4/14/06 TRANSPAC April meeting status letter to CCTA; 4/14/06 Phyllis Roff letter to the Editor "Governor's growth plan needs help"; 4/13/06 TRANSPAC Chair Shinn Letter to CCTA Chair Freitas supporting the City of Concord's Lifeline Transportation Program grant application; 4/11/06 WCCTAC Status letter from Chair Sharon Brown to Bob McCleary, CCTA Executive Director; March 31, 2006 CCTA Project Status Report; Regional Rail Steering Committee, Project Management Team Members provided by Deidre Heitman in response to Member Durant's request at the April TRANSPAC meeting; County Connection Fixed Route Operating Reports for March 2006.

511 Contra Costa recent clips: 4/13/06 and 3/23/06 Concord Transcript; 4/12/05 Contra Costa Times; 3/21/05 Tri-Valley Herald; KCBS News Links; KRON 4 News Links; Contra Costa Times 3/22/06 News Digest; City Newsletters for Brentwood, Clayton and San Ramon.

Newsclips: Business Wire: 4/14/06 "As 100th Anniversary of Earthquake Nears, 'Blue Ribbon Task Force' Urgently Calls for Disaster Recovery Water Transportation System to be Implemented"; S.F. Chronicle: 4/19/06 "Census: Americans are Fleeing Big Cities"; Contra Costa Times: 4/20/06 "Council favors two-lane bypass"; 4/18/06 "A billion cars to fill roads by 2020"; Martinez News Gazette: 4/5/06 "Busloads of help for local groups"; 4/6/06 "County Connection rolls out new volunteer program"; Oakland Tribune: 4/17/06 "Bart's airport monorail on track"; 4/10/06 "Commuter train system to expand, despite delays, riders still prefer Amtrak to traffic on Bay Area freeways".

13. For the Good of the Order

1) Abrams said that the Walnut Creek City Council received a report that changing the downtown free shuttle buses to Trolley Cars has been very positive and has created a significant change in ridership. It is remarkable to him how many people did not realize that the buses were running before and now there are many people asking about the new bus route. Chair Shinn said he has ridden the buses which are really neat. Concord may consider something similar for the Naval Weapons Station.

2) Chair Shinn reported that Concord has been getting some feedback on plans for the development of the Naval Weapons Station. Last May 6th a meeting of approximately 400 people produced a lot of very professional, thoughtful ideas about the use of the land. People were very courteous even though negative responses were represented. More meetings are planned for June and July, community information booths were set up for a number of meetings and two council members will be available at various stations to meet one-on-one with the citizens to answer questions. The meetings will be Wednesday evenings, Saturday

mornings and Sunday afternoons. Major outreach efforts are being planned by MIG, a planning consultant group. Michael Wright from Oakland has been hired as Project Manager who will coordinate the planning effort. Initially rumors were plentiful and harmful so the idea is to wipe the slate clean and extend the General Plan and Zoning update process by nine months to ensure that Concord residents will have an opportunity to be heard regarding what happens to this land. The positive effect of the rumors was to bring out neighbors to participate in the process. Concord has talked with EBRPD about a possible 50-80% open space area. Some neighbors are concerned about transportation overlay projections concerning roads running too close to the property lines.

Shinn also asked for participation by neighboring jurisdictions because of the regional nature of the impact of the end product. Pierce and Abrams had been called by reporters.

Pierce said she went to Portland and was very impressed at some of the things being accomplished there including mixed use residential/retail and greenbelt development. The City is revitalizing some of the ancient communities and the impact to the existing community has been very well received because they've done it so well. Portland has a light rail system with grade crossings and the work they have done is spectacular. The improvements blend into the existing community really well.

Shinn had visited some conversions of other training and government centers to see what has been done in other federal transfer areas. Concord's approach at this point in time is being complimented by other groups who have observed the process. Money is not available to do everything that all the coordinating government agencies want to do. Concord would like some joint planning with federal agencies as relocation of military housing and more permanent solutions to homeless housing in place of shelters is reviewed. Concord has met with homeless advocates, the Army, and Navy and has even taken into consideration use for a public safety training center. Shinn is excited about the dynamic process that is underway and the potential for creating something very unique and successful.

14. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 11:19 a.m. The next TRANSPAC meeting is scheduled for June 15, 2006 in the Community Room. Information about a new date for the Caldecott Tunnel tour participants will be distributed via e-mail.