

**Summary Minutes (corrected)**  
**TRANSPAC – August 10, 2006**

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

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

**Staff:** Jim Haggerty, Qamar Kahn, Alison Ryan, Nolte Engineers, Concord; Steve Goetz, Contra Costa County, Martin Engelmann, Matt Kelly, Paul Maxwell, CCTA; Cindy Dahlgren, CCCTA; Richard Pearson, Martinez; Steve Wallace, Pleasant Hill; John Hall, Walnut Creek; Deidre Heitman, BART; Lynn Osborn, 511ContraCosta Program Manager; Barbara Neustadter, Julia Fuller, TRANSPAC staff.

**Public:**

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

1. **Convene meeting: Pledge of Allegiance/Self-Introductions - completed**  
Matt Kelly, new CCTA Planner was welcomed.
2. **Public Comment - none**

**CONSENT AGENDA: Pierce/Abrams/unanimous**

3. **Approved April 13, 2006 minutes [action held from May 11, 2006 and June 15, 2006 meetings]**
4. **Approved May 11, 2006 minutes [Action held from June 15, 2006 meeting]**
5. **Approved June 15, 2006 minutes**

**END CONSENT AGENDA**

6. **Closed Session – Not called**

Neustadter noted that the City of Pleasant Hill Attorney was not pleased with the language used to announce the possibility of a closed session. The language will be updated on future agendas. This format has been used since 1994 upon the advice of the City Attorneys from Walnut Creek. By consensus, the closed session was skipped.

7. **Discussion of TRANSPAC Consultant Services/Contracts (TRANSPAC Services [funded by TRANSPAC jurisdictions pursuant to established formula], 511 Contra Costa Support Staff Services [funded by Measure C] and the RM2 I-680 Express Bus Access and HOV System Study Administrative Management Services [funded by RM2]**

Neustadter explained the two contracts for TRANSPAC consideration. The 2% cost of living increase is based on City of Pleasant Hill Personnel policies. The City of Pleasant Hill is TRANSPAC's legal, fiscal and personnel agent. The City is anticipating a 2% increase for employees and TRANSPAC follows this guideline in establishing a COLA for Neustadter. Neustadter's contract remains at 25 hours per week although it will be a struggle to stay within that parameter given additional responsibilities as a result of Measure J.

Neustadter is scheduled to work 156 hours under RM2 funding over the next year; Fuller is scheduled to work 234 hours; John Hall is working the most at approximately 312 hours. Hall's time is covered by a separate agreement between CCTA and the City of Walnut Creek.

After TRANSPAC takes action on the agreements the Pleasant Hill City Council will take action. Abrams asked if the COLA could be changed.

**Pleasant Hill Councilmember Durant arrived at 9:08 a.m.**

Neustadter explained that the TRANSPAC budget was based on a 2% COLA (which is expected to be used by the City of Pleasant Hill) and includes a COLA and merit increase for the Administrative Assistant who works 50% for TRANSPAC and 50% for 511 Contra Costa. A contingency line item was added after an accounting error inside the City resulted in a serious deficit for the TRANSPAC budget. We continue to have problems estimating benefit costs which continually increase and the Personnel Department is not always aware of the amount of the increase until after the start of the new fiscal year. The contingency helps prevent a deficit when benefit costs exceed our predictions.

Neustadter thanked TRANSPAC for giving her the authority to work on this problem without having to come back to TRANSPAC each time an estimate was exceeded.

No charges against the RM2 study budget have been made, although work has been done on its behalf. Neustadter did not feel it appropriate to submit any charges for her time since July 1<sup>st</sup> because her contracts expired June 30<sup>th</sup> and have not yet been renewed.

Abrams moved to approve the budget as presented but requested some opportunity to discuss the 2% cost of living adjustment. Chair Shinn suggested appointing a Budget Committee to discuss this issue and address budget planning in the future. Abrams and Pierce volunteered to serve on the Committee. Neustadter indicated two straight weeks off is an issue. Pierce suggested that the two consecutive weeks off might be another consideration for this committee.

**Chair Shinn asked for self introductions for members who arrived after the meeting was in session: Maxwell, Dahlgren, Goetz, Pearson and Durant introduced themselves.**

**ACTION: Abrams/Durant/unanimous**

- a) Approved TRANSPAC Staff Services, RM2 I-680 Express Bus Access and HOV System Study Administrative Management Services and 511 Contra Costa Management contracts for 2006/07 and 2007/08;**
- b) Established a Budget Committee of Members Abrams and Pierce to discuss COLA and budget planning issues for the future;**
- c) Adopted the TRANSPAC 2006/07 Budget and Regional Measure 2 I-680 Express Bus Access and HOV System Study as recommended by the TAC.**

**8. Consideration of the 2006-07 TRANSPAC and 2006-07 the Regional Measure 2 I-680 Express Bus Access and HOV System Study Budgets**

Item was held over from the May 11, 2006 meeting. The TRANSPAC TAC reviewed the draft budgets at its March and April meetings. The proposed draft budget is built on City of Pleasant Hill updated benefit and salary rates including a 2% COLA assumption which is also

applied to the consultant rate. Increases for salary and benefits for TRANSPAC's Administrative Assistant are also included. No increase in postage or printing is proposed. The TAC recommended adoption of the draft TRANSPAC and RM2 budgets in the packet. There have been no charges as yet to the RM2 Study budget and costs have been aggregated into 2006-07.

### **ACTION taken under Item 7**

#### **9. Regional Measure (RM) 2 I-680 Express Bus Access and HOV System Study (note new name)**

The I-680 Express Bus Access and HOV System Study funded by RM 2 is getting underway. Participating agencies have been requested to appoint representatives to the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the Study. TRANSPAC is a member of the PAC for the Study and is requested to appoint two representatives and an alternate to the PAC. All members of the TRANSPAC TAC are expected to participate in the Study. Study managers will provide an oral report on actions to date.

TRANSPAC's agreement with CCTA for conducting the previously named I-680 Gap Closure Study terminates on December 31, 2006. TRANSPAC is requested to approve a request to CCTA to extend the term of the agreement to March 2008 to provide sufficient time to complete the study and proceed to agreement closeout activities. No additional funding is requested.

Neustadter said TRANSPAC has been advised that Caltrans will proceed with a Project Study Report for both southbound and northbound HOV lanes on I-680 so we can eliminate the technical aspects of the southbound extension from the RM2 Study which will save money. This project is proceeding into a project development process which indicates that it will be built in the next ten years.

Letters were sent out over Chair Shinn's signature requesting participation in the Study by Solano Transportation Authority, CCTA, CCCTA, SWAT, City of Fairfield, LAVTA, BART, CCTA CAC, Caltrans, and the City of Benicia. Some responses have already been received. TRANSPAC is the lead on the study at the request of CCCTA and is requested to appoint two representatives and an alternate. We are also requesting an extension on the agreement because we thought we'd be done with the study by now but no work has yet been done. The request is to extend it until March, 2008.

#### **ACTION: Ross/Durant/unanimous**

**a) Appointed Councilmember Abrams and Councilmember Durant as the two TRANSPAC representatives and Councilmember Shinn as an alternate to the I-680 Express Bus Access and HOV System Study Policy Advisory Committee (PAC); & b) Authorized the extension of TRANSPAC's Agreement with CCTA to March 2008.**

#### **10. Consideration of CCTA's Overall Work Plan for Transitioning from the Measure C to the New Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP) and Authorization to Release Related RFPs**

CCTA staff developed the attached overall work program to assist the transition from the Measure C to the Measure J GMP by April 1, 2009. The work program encompasses updates to the GMP Implementation Documents, the Action Plan for Routes of Regional

Significance and the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP). There is a significant amount of front end technical work required including the 2006 traffic monitoring, updating the Land Use Information System and Comprehensive Transportation Project List. An RFP for the Traffic Monitoring work was released in July 2006.

The CCTA approved the overall effort and directed its staff to circulate the work plan and schedule to the RTPCs which assumes development of a scope of services for the Action Plans by October 31, 2006. The CCTA will provide \$100K for consultant services to update the Action Plans. The RTPCs Managers have expressed serious concerns about the impact of this schedule on regional workloads. In addition to regular TRANSPAC work activities and the 511 Contra Costa Program, the TRANSPAC Manager also is committed to the Measure J Strategic Plan in the same time frame as well as GMP work, the Pacheco Transit Hub and the Diablo Valley College Transit Center in cooperation with County Connection and the Regional Measure 2 I-680 Gap Closure and Express Bus Access Study. All of these work items require additional meetings, staff time for preparation and completion of requested deliverables.

Engelmann said the RTPC budgets have increased to \$100K. Neustadter said the Action Plans have been helpful. Neustadter and Osborn have prepared the conditions of compliance reports on an annual basis which are used by local jurisdictions for GMP compliance. TRANSPAC has done a pretty good job in actually implementing the actions that were identified.

Durant questioned the anticipated cost of \$400K for consultants and Engelmann said that represents \$100K per RTPC for Action Plan updates spread over two fiscal years. The RTPC Managers agreed that the Authority should prepare a Request for Proposal and then figure out which consultant. Abrams asked if it is likely to be four different consultants rather than one consultant doing the work for all four RTPCs. Engelmann said the Scope of Work will be done by CCTA, as Neustadter calls it, an RFQ on steroids...to ask qualified consultants a little more detail than a regular RFQ allows. Each of the regions will choose a consultant and then negotiate the contracts.

Neustadter noted that all of this is happening in the same time frame as working on the Measure J Strategic Plan which is the last item on the agenda today. It is going to be busy until the end of this year. The Strategic Plan will carry over to next year. If the group wants to hear more about it, the item can be carried over to September 14<sup>th</sup>. Pierce said it can be acted on now and moved approval.

**ACTION: Pierce/Abrams/unanimous**

**Considered the impact of CCTA requested work items on TRANSPAC activities and approved TRANSPAC's participation in the selection of a consultant for updating the Action Plan.**

**11. TRANSPAC and CCTA Representatives' Reports.** The minutes of the June 21, 2006 CCTA meeting were included in the packet.

a. Administration and Projects Committee meeting

Member Pierce reported that the Administration and Projects Committee held a special meeting in August to review the new Admin Code and procedures for rewriting. She felt the end product would be very thorough so any one of the cities could lift the verbage and use it once it is finalized. There will be one more meeting. Last week's meeting lasted 2 1/2 hours.

b. Planning Committee meeting

Member Abrams reported that the Planning Committee discussed the same items as were on the full Authority meeting agenda. Concord's request for money was approved and TLC was discussed. Pierce asked if the piece of legislation being sponsored by Loni Hancock was approved.

Abrams said it was a bicycle routine accommodation request to add another level of review and approval on just about all projects to assure that there is accommodation to bicyclists. The end result was that this process has been toned down greatly and makes much more sense. It is something reasonable that everyone can live with. Pierce noted that the Authority goes through all of these questions at every stage of every project and we accommodate bikes when we can but we can't promise that in every situation we have enough space to do everything.

## **Reports Received; No Action Taken**

### **12. Reports from Staff/Committees - Accepted**

**a) Proposed Measure J Expenditure Plan Growth Management Program (GMP) Urban Limit Line (ULL) Amendment.** TRANSPAC and the TAC spent a considerable amount of time reviewing the CCTA's draft proposed Measure J Urban Limit Line Amendment and sent many comments to CCTA which were incorporated into the proposed amendment. Additional changes have now been proposed by CCTA staff. The CCTA proposed revisions were in the packet and TRANSPAC reviewed the document and provided guidance to the TAC on the proposed changes. The TAC briefly reviewed the revisions at its July 27, 2006 meeting and will review the changes again at its August 24, 2006 meeting and forward a recommendation to TRANSPAC for consideration at its September 14, 2006 meeting. Comments are due to the Authority at the end of October.

Neustadter said if there are any issues to be conveyed to the TAC, now is the time. Pierce had a question on the ULL language that actually went forward. She wondered if there were any changes made to the text of the Measure because the information in the packet was from May and she was out of town when the action was taken.

Goetz didn't observe the discussion but the week before they approved it they responded to public comments about the changes in the ULL in Pittsburg and Antioch and whether the Board of Supervisors thought those were good changes. Pierce asked if they adopted any special language to deal with that and any other changes they might make. Goetz didn't know what the actual substance of the final action was.

Abrams said Concord was really the only one who has a dog in this fight with regard to the Naval Weapons Station. The rest of Central County would like to make sure that the process is not confused for those cities that don't have any changes in the ULL. His opinion is that these requirements are being put on Pittsburg, Antioch and Brentwood and the rest of the cities don't need to get into that process.

Pierce said this is something the Authority will discuss and will not have a final draft until after the election is over with regard to what conditions are for each of the individual cities. If the County makes a change, does it affect you? Some of these questions still need to be resolved. CCTA is waiting for the County to determine its decision. Can each individual city decide or will it have to be countywide. Pierce said they are waiting until after the election so

that they can act with certainty. There is still a technical possibility that it won't pass.

Ross asked if there is any forum or plan to explain to cities what this is in campaign form. Will there be an actual source of information for the voters before the election? Pierce said each city pretty much knows what's going on. Ross wondered how a voter would discern what's going on. Chair Shinn said none of the public has been contacting Concord but the staff is keeping up to date should inquiries come in.

Abrams is concerned that when 2009 comes, the return to source money will be available and the cities will not be caught up in some process that requires a vote of the people. He thinks the process should be set now to save trouble later on. Pierce suggested that a certain amount of publicity would be valuable: Be sure you vote for this because it means we qualify for our return-to-source money. Ross agreed that someone should say vote yes because it means dollars for your city. Pierce would be more concerned about someone saying vote no. Ross said that could happen in a vacuum of yes supporters.

Pierce said TRANSPAC should probably take a stand because it means return-to-source dollars for each of the jurisdictions. Ross thought someone should campaign for a yes vote because it is one of the biggest issues affecting almost everyone. Shinn thought it might be good for each official to go back to his/her jurisdiction and ask for a press release to take a positive view of this from a public relations standpoint. It doesn't have to be political.

Abrams thought it might be appropriate for TRANSPAC to vote on an official resolution of support at the September TRANSPAC meeting and generate some publicity. Shinn suggested each go back to the cities and do individual press releases in favor as well.

Durant asked what was the rationale for using the language that the Board of Supervisors may conduct a cyclical review of the ULL every five years as opposed to using 'will'. It doesn't make a lot of sense to him to use the term 'may' even if it never happens and even if it is never cyclical. Pierce said on page 11 if there is new information the Board may look at it again to see if there is a need for review. The Board has the possibility to do it but is not mandated to do it because it is expensive. It is permissive rather than mandatory so that if there were no big changes the Board did not necessarily have to review it. The environmental community encouraged no review except every ten years.

Pierce would like to see the new language that was finally adopted at the September meeting.

## **No Action Taken**

**b) At the CCTA Administration and Projects Committee (APC) meeting on July 6, 2006, the City of Concord requested approval of a 2005 Strategic Plan amendment to add the Ygnacio Valley Road Slide Repair project.** This project is to be funded by reprogramming \$1,020,000 from the Commerce Avenue Extension Project (C-Project 1214) to the Ygnacio Valley Road Slide (now C-Project 1220) repair project. The City has secured \$3.51 million in Emergency Relief funds; however, a local match is required. The City's Off-Site Street Improvement Program (OSIP) funds may not be used for the local match but Measure C funds may be used. As a result, the City has requested that the Measure C funds be reallocated to the slide repair project. The OSIP funds will then be used to backfill the Commerce Avenue Extension Project. The CCTA staff report requested TRANSPAC concurrence on this action. Qamar Kahn, City of Concord explained the problem caused by the three slides on Ygnacio.

One is in the Concord city limits and it pushed Ygnacio up. The other slide is in Walnut Creek in an area that started sliding about four years ago. The City put in a small buttress so that the slide would not move but that did not work. Concord applied to Caltrans and an emergency was declared which netted Concord \$1.3M for the emergency repair. Now Caltrans has agreed to let Concord do the full repair which will cost an additional \$5M. The repair cannot be completed before winter so winterizing will be done and the project should be completed by April or May of next year.

There was no drainage on the site. A buttress was constructed in 2001. Concord unloaded some of the slope and strengthened the buttress and then put in instruments to measure the movement of the slides. They are going to have two buttresses which will go five feet deep into the rock layer and be filled with engineered soil. This gives two lines of protection with each buttress. Pierce asked how deep the shale is and was told 30 feet.

The area is still moving slightly and Concord will continue to monitor it during the winter. The water level has gone down so that is helpful.

**ACTION: Durant/Pierce/unanimous**

**Concurred in the City of Concord's reprogramming request and will notify CCTA of action in Status letter.**

**c) Caldecott Tunnel Tour Scheduling**

Documents need to get to the Authority in October, the TRANSPAC Christmas party is scheduled for December, and Neustadter asked if members wanted to arrange for a tour of the Caldecott Tunnel in November or wait until next year. Pierce suggested discussing it again next year because there is too much on TRANSPAC's plate at the moment.

Alison Ryan from Nolte distributed a flyer for an Open House/Public Hearing on the I-680\SR-4 Interchange Improvement Project. It is scheduled for August 22<sup>nd</sup> from 5 to 7:30 p.m. at the Pacheco Community Center. Questions can be directed to Susan Miller at (925) 407-0121.

Abrams asked if the issue of the slip ramps has been resolved on the Interchange. The slip ramps will be included. Neustadter said she has been working with CCCTA and Nolte, Caltrans and CCTA in an amazingly cooperative effort to define the Pacheco Transit Hub. Thanks to this great cooperative effort with Caltrans, this facility will be designed so that nothing has to be moved after the slip ramps are constructed. This is a major victory and everyone involved is very excited about it. Cindy Dahlgren is the lead for CCCTA and has been leading the charge very effectively.

Qamar Kahn and Jim Haggerty distributed a handout defining the efforts made on the Monument Corridor Community Based Transportation Plan. Kahn noted that this area is the most densely populated low income area in the county. It is ethnically the most diverse. The survey showed that 80% of the residents do not own a motor vehicle.

The study summary was prepared to reflect the city's involvement in implementing the study. CCCTA is the co-sponsor in the program and MTC has now put the entire plan as a PDF file online. CCCTA has expanded service on the 111 line which will greatly enhance access to transportation resources throughout the weekend.

Pierce said this study is focused on providing transportation around the clock to this

community. The residents need to get back and forth to medical facilities in Martinez and need improved transportation to jobs and connections to other transportation resources. She said the Authority has already approved this and it is just a spectacular effort. She congratulated CCCTA and the City of Concord for a marvelous job, well done with a wonderful cooperative effort by everyone.

Kahn said that there will be some corrections to the plan because there are figures within the plan that suggest that there is virtually no service provided by CCCTA and that is not true. Ross asked if that area was going to be annexed for redevelopment and Shinn said the redevelopment area may be extended to include it. Concord is looking at the North Commercial area as well.

Dahlgren said it was gratifying to CCCTA to see the extraordinary amount of community involvement in defining their own destiny, identifying their needs and being realistic about what they need and what can make their communities better. Shinn added that there is a lot of community group activity there and many of these groups have helped by doing a lot of work for the City of Concord to pull this effort together and make it so successful.

### **13. Discussion of Measure J Strategic Plan: Updated Revenue Projections and Development Schedule**

The TRANSPAC TAC reviewed the submission requirements of the CCTA's first Measure J Strategic Plan (2009-2015) effort and assigned responsibility for the requested information to the various project sponsors at its June 22, 2006 meeting. The Strategic Plan submission requires the development of Central County Measure J project priorities/expenditures through 2015 including identification of projects to be funded with bond proceeds, fact sheets with scopes, estimates and financial plans.

The development of the first Measure J Strategic Plan is an important step in preparing for new funding in Measure J and the planned bond sale proceeds expected in 2009 (\$300M) and possible bond sale in 2012 (\$150M). The TRANSPAC TAC developed an initial project list for discussion at this meeting which was in the packet. A draft submission is due to CCTA by September 29, 2006 and a final document by October 15, 2006.

Neustadter reported that the spreadsheet changes pretty much hourly. She discussed the short version of the financing of this effort with Paul Maxwell in attendance to ensure accuracy and answer questions. The overall construct is difficult to understand. Hall has spent a lot of time with Authority staff working on how to better present this information so that it doesn't confuse everyone.

The Authority is planning on two bond measures. One is targeted for \$300M in 2009. There is the possibility of a second bond for \$150M in 2012. The costs to finance a bond measure will be added to each project as a 10% Bond "hit". This is in fact the cost of financing and accelerating projects through the use of bond money.

There is no set-aside to fund bonding costs which is different from how it was done previously. The Authority has given each of the RTPCs a target number to program for the two bond measures.

TRANSPAC's target number is \$172M for the period 2009 to 2015. The spreadsheet was

created from the Measure J Expenditure Plan. Neustadter eliminated the projects of the other RTPCs to make it easier to derive TRANSPAC recommendations on priorities for use of both 2009 and 2012 bond proceeds. TRANSPAC was assigned \$62.5M for the Caldecott Tunnel so that is the first deduct. The City of Martinez wants all of its regional and subregional money for the Intermodal in the 2009 bond.

Interchange improvements for I-680 and SR242 will most likely be included in the 2012 bond. If the State Bond is approved by the voters in November, the TAC recommended setting aside \$36M for Phase 1 of the I-680/SR4 interchange (NB I-680 to WB SR 4). The jurisdictions are working on trying to get more precision relative to those dates. The Weapons Station development also plays quite a large role in this planning effort.

The I-680 Southbound Gap Closure Measure J \$75M also has \$1M in RM2 for a study and \$14M available to use on a preferred alternative. This may mean that other development money will not be needed for this project. Caltrans has started a PSR for the remaining I-680 south and northbound HOV lanes.

BART needs TRANSPAC approval for dollars expended in our area and the TAC is looking at a BART station capacity project. Heitman said she will have a list of projects by the next TAC meeting.

Neustadter said the TAC will have a more detailed proposal for TRANSPAC to consider in September. The TRANSPAC arterials category is seriously oversubscribed. The TAC is working through which projects might be in the 2009 bond, on the 2009 bond backup list, in the 2012 bond and on the 2012 bond backup list. If anyone has any thoughts relative to these projects, please so advise TAC members.

Durant asked if one could draw the conclusion that it is more likely that the 4<sup>th</sup> bore of the Caldecott might be built sooner. Neustadter responded yes that Caltrans is on top of the environmental assessment. If no major issues arise (i.e. if there is no environmental lawsuit and if bond money is available), the project will be usable by 2013. Durant said then if the Caldecott goes forward, it is better for us to get our projects done.

Neustadter said this is the initial planning process in which the TAC is using a variety of assumptions to work its way through a number of priorities. TRANSPAC and SWAT were assigned 50% of the project for the 2009 bond. At the very bottom of the spreadsheet the Subregional Transportation Needs for the future are listed. At the moment there has been no discussion of programming any of these funds. The TAC is looking closely at the central county school access program as a source of money which can be made available to the sidewalk gap closure projects near schools. We actually have a list of those projects from all of our jurisdictions. The TAC will be working through to see what might be financially feasible.

Again Neustadter asked for comments or directions to the TAC. Pierce asked about the Concord project to widen Ygnacio Valley Road. Kahn said money is not available for widening or for maintenance. Concord can't afford to build or maintain it.

Pearson said Alhambra Ave. is not needed until 2015-2020 and can be put at the bottom of the list.

Ross said given the vast increase in transit ridership for Spare the Air days, we might look at

511 getting more responsibilities and financial support. Pierce said we can only wait to see what happens but she doesn't believe the additional ridership will hold. Ross said there is no value in something that is free, so consideration is being given to reduced fares on BART in the a.m. on Spare the Air days. Osborn reported an increase of 72% in the carpool program. Ross felt that the demand from users as well as the policy side is likely to grow and he thought it might be worth discussing bumping up the 511 allocation using future subregional funds for 511 projects.

Neustadter said Measure C money has been used to cover costs the Air Board doesn't cover under TFCA such as lights, rent, etc. She asked if there is a possibility that the Air Board might entertain an application for Spare-the-Air subsidies or activities which might meet the criteria. These are alternative modes that are hard to quantify in terms of cost effectiveness. Ross answered that it is possible but he also sees 511 Contra Costa coming up with ideas outside of the strict guidelines of the Air District. He applauds the local ingenuity in Contra Costa and suggested it shouldn't be overlooked. If there is money to plug into a successful program then that should be considered.

Osborn said her programs are constrained because two thirds of her funding is from Air District funds. The list of available projects is decreasing annually. There is concern regarding whether or not those funds will be available at all down the road. If the Air District continues to adjust the criteria for eligible projects, it may become more and more restrictive and the funds difficult to use. 511 staff does a lot of creative assistance for carpool and transit in the school based efforts and works with transit agencies to offset the costs by offering incentives. Her staff has been doing more and more on an annual basis to encourage alternative commute modes even to those from Solano County. 511 staff is being creative in the use of funds in demand maintenance and as a broad base for a variety of projects to get the cars off the road in the first place.

Ross said it makes sense to look at it from the user end. Instead of looking from the aspect of increasing the pavement where \$6M is not a lot of money, use these funds to encourage free expanded transit use during spare-the-air days. With the price of gas climbing, he thinks people will respond to commute alternative incentives. Neustadter asked if it was more important to do that now or wait until such time as we have a complete HOV system southbound on I-680. Ross said it is important to do it now because otherwise we'll never catch up and we keep chasing the dream.

Dahlgren said there is also the subregional projects category which could be considered as part of additional transit funding outside of the 511 Contra Costa project. Ross didn't think the pot is big enough to cover all of transit's needs. He thought it would be spent more effectively though the rideshare program. 511 seems to have more quantifiable data for the Air District that has to be assessed in the future. Transit is a possibility but it is more expensive than 511 support. Ross said it was a backfill number, more of a prevention program versus a treatment program.

Shinn asked if Ross had a number in mind. Pierce said that the subregional projects and programs are not completely defined yet and need to be analyzed before money is allocated. Ross just wanted to throw out his suggestion for consideration.

Neustadter continued that the primary focus was to define primarily capital projects in the 09

and 15 bonds. The TAC did not address the subregional transportation needs category. Pierce suggested waiting until the 09-15 bond issue is resolved before discussing the subregional transportation needs. TRANSPAC needs to look at the total picture to see what it looks like before allocating money somewhere else. But during this process we may achieve what Ross is asking for within Central County. Ross said he is trying to achieve making transportation more efficient here in Central County and he wants to know how to go about doing that.

Pierce said she would like more information on Capital Improvement Projects including more background on the widening project and more information on the issue of maintenance. Concord's widening program makes a whole lot of sense with Proposition 42 money.

### **No Action Taken**

**Reviewed the process, and provided direction to the TRANSPAC TAC on Measure J Strategic Plan project priorities.**

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

Engelmann wanted to take this opportunity to introduce Matt Kelly who is the newly hired Transportation Planner at the Authority. CCTA has successfully poached another excellent employee from Caltrans. Kelly will be working on projections 2005 for local review. He will be sending out packages with maps to review for land use growth through 2030. Pierce asked if packets will go to the Council and Engelmann replied that they would be sent to the land use transportation plan contacts for each city. A copy will go to the City Manager and CCTA can send out a copy to each Mayor as well. Pierce asked for a letter to be sent to Councilmembers indicating that the package has gone out in case Council has questions. Engelmann said he can cc the Mayors but basically this is a technical review piece. Pierce said it's important for Council to know this is going on in case questions arise.

Neustadter said Cyrus Minoofar will be at the September meeting and Rod McMillan wants to explain the open road tolling on the Martinez-Benicia Bridge. The Toll Plaza will look very different from what was planned when TRANSPAC toured the facility.

In October TRANSPAC will discuss the Strategic Plan.

**15. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 10:42 a.m. The next TRANSPAC meeting is scheduled for SEPTEMBER 14, 2006.