

TRANSPAC Meeting Summary Minutes

- MEETING DATE:** April 21, 2011
- ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT:** Bill Shinn, Concord (Chair); Julie Pierce, Clayton (Vice Chair); Mark Ross, Martinez; David Durant, Pleasant Hill; Karen Mitchoff, Contra Costa County
- PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Bob Armstrong, Clayton; Diana Vavrek, Pleasant Hill; John Mercurio, Concord; David Powell, Walnut Creek; Richard Clark, Contra Costa County.
- STAFF PRESENT:** Ray Kuzbari, Ron Leone, Concord; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Martin Engelmann, Brad Beck, Hisham Noeimi, CCTA; Steve Goetz, Contra Costa County; Deidre Heitman, BART; Tim Tucker, Martinez; Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa; Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC.
Members of Public: Sally Germaine; John Frankel; Wes and Mary Lou Laubscher; Douglas Gary
- MINUTES PREPARED BY:** C. L. Peterson, TRANSPAC Staff

Chair Shinn convened the meeting at 9:04 a.m. with a quorum.

- 1. Pledge of Allegiance/Self introductions - Completed**
- 2. Public Comment** – Bob Armstrong expressed his disapproval of the BART Board of Directors’ failure to follow the Brown Act in a recent personnel action, and he called on TRANSPAC to disapprove. Julie Pierce agreed that everyone disapproves of BART’s lack of adherence to the Brown Act as it was a very costly oversight.

Consent Items

- 3. Approval of the March 10, 2011 TRANSPAC minutes – Pierce/Mitchoff/Unanimous**

End Consent Agenda

- 4. Presentation/discussion on the SR4/I-680 Interchange Project with Ray Kuzbari, Transportation Manager, City of Concord**

Ray Kuzbari presented an overview of the I-680/SR4 Interchange Improvement Project and discussed in detail issues concerning the third eastbound lane on SR 4 between I-680 and 242. The interchange project will address safety and capacity issues through five phases (shown on page 4-3 of the packet). The TAC suggests that the following four scenarios should be analyzed:

Scenario 1 – Extend HOV to east of the interchange to where the future HOV to HOV connector would be; no lane extensions through the interchange.

Scenario 2 – Extend HOV lane back to Glacier Drive (the end limit for the “sooner/cheaper” project); have all as HOV lanes until the HOV to HOV direct connector is constructed when the segment west of the connector would be eliminated as a throwaway cost.

Scenario 3 – Construct a mixed flow lane from Glacier through the interchange and transition into an HOV lane half way between I-680 and 242. When the HOV to HOV direct connector is constructed, the segment west of the connector would be eliminated. The remaining lane would be an HOV for its entirety.

Scenario 4 –Install an HOV lane where the HOV to HOV direct connector would be, plus a separate mixed flow lane from Glacier through the interchange which would merge halfway between 680/242. When the future HOV to HOV connector is constructed, it would not impact the additional mixed flow lane. This scenario has no throwaway cost and is addresses the need to add capacity through the interchange.

The TAC will work with TRANSPAC to determine its preferred scenario. The TAC believes that the current phasing of the project should be reviewed and consideration given to moving Phases 3 and 2 ahead of Phase 1. The TAC proposes that this focused analysis be included with the Integrated Corridor Analysis Project and an amendment made to the project consultant’s scope of services to include the analysis of the four scenarios as well as a qualitative analysis of possible re-phasing. Mr. Kuzbari noted that the TAC has worked closely with CCTA staff whom generously given their time, and added that it has been great to work with Ross Chittenden, Susan Miller and Martin Engelmann.

The TAC recommends that TRANSPAC consider and approve this proposal. If approved today, the TAC would begin working with CCTA and return in a few months with an update on the findings of the analysis.

Ron Leone commented on the dangerous conditions faced by drivers getting from westbound SR4 to southbound I-680, and asked in which Phase the westbound flyover would be. Mr. Kuzbari said that Phase 1 calls for an overhead connector from northbound I-680 to westbound SR4. In Phase 5, addition of an auxiliary lane here would increase capacity and eliminate weaving.

Bob Armstrong asked how much money the re-phasing would save. Mr. Kuzbari said that would be part of the upcoming discussions with CCTA staff about the expanded tasks and costs estimates proposed by the consultant.

**ACTION: Accepted the TAC recommendation to proceed with the analysis and directed staff to work with CCTA and come back with a proposal for an expanded scope of work.
Mithoff/Durant/unanimous**

5a. Report on the RTP Outreach Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) for the Bay Area and an update on SB 375 Implementation presented by Martin Engelmann, CCTA Deputy Executive Director, Planning

Martin Engelmann reported that the Authority is in the process of responding to the Initial Vision Scenario (IVS) that was released by ABAG and MTC in March. The Authority Board has approved sending a letter to MTC and ABAG with some preliminary comments. The IVS assumes an unconstrained vision for housing growth and transit improvements. Unconstrained means the forecast is not subject to economic or market constraints. The forecast can go wherever it needs to go; in this case, there is a need to build enough housing so that people can afford to live in closer

proximity to their jobs in the Bay Area. During the IVS process, all jurisdictions provided information to MTC and ABAG that specified where and how much they could grow. This information will be used in the development of a detailed SCS, which is an element of the Regional Transportation Plan.

Bob Glover, Executive Officer of the Building Industry Association, said we should keep in mind that GHG emissions will increase as population increases, and we are trying to decrease them on a per capita basis. The Bay Area grows slower than the other regions of the state. Under the IVS, we still don't meet the 15% target for cars. The business community had argued for a lower target as 15% is unrealistic without other mechanisms in place. There is a group of Bay Area business entities that are getting together to make sure that the economy is a primary focus of this planning scenario.

Mary Lou Laubscher, a spoke on behalf of various senior groups. She appreciates the work currently being done on congestion management, but she came to this meeting to suggest that TRANSPAC begin to consider strategies to deal with the issues of a senior population that will double by 2035. Mrs. Laubscher said that she has to rely on her husband for all transportation. She reminded everyone that today's Baby Boomers could find themselves in a similar situation by 2035. It is important to have policies and procedures in place now that will provide affordable housing for seniors as well as affordable, accessible transportation that goes where people need to go. She asked that as funding becomes available, TRANSPAC will begin to plan for the future of seniors, including establishing working groups to engage seniors and the frail who are underserved on paratransit.

ACTION: Report accepted

5b. Presentation on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) by Hisham Noeimi, CCTA Engineering Manager

Hisham Noeimi gave a brief presentation on the RTP. He said that in February 2011, MTC issued a "Call for Projects" for the 2013 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). MTC updates the RTP every four years, and has been working on the 2013 RTP. For a transportation project to receive State or Federal funding, it must first be included in the RTP. There is a requirement that the RTP be financially constrained, or, in other words, the total of funding requests for all projects in the RTP cannot exceed projected available revenues. For Central County, the amount was \$262 million, as MTC hasn't released current fund estimates yet. The Committed Project list includes locally funded projects, the Financially Constrained list includes projects seeking Federal and State funding, and the Vision list serves as a "wish list" for future projects and project phases that are not yet ready to be programmed for funding.

ACTION: Report received

5c. Review of TRANSPAC Jurisdiction Updates for the Committed, Financially Constrained and Vision Project lists for the 2013 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) by the TRANSPAC Manager

Ms. Neustadter said that the agenda referenced a color-coded protocol for the RTP lists, but late revisions were made to the list after packet production and those references don't apply. She noted that Project 230596 on the Committed list shows County Connections as the project sponsor for the Pacheco Transit Hub. Currently under discussion is transferring the sponsor from the County Connection to the City of Martinez. She also noted that WETA is a direct sponsor, but

TRANSPAC and TRANSPLAN were asked to include this project on their respective lists. The study that WETA is requesting cannot be split between Martinez and Antioch. The biggest addition to the Financially Constrained list was the Walnut Creek TOD project.

Mr. Kuzbari asked Mr. Noeimi how he would resolve the redundancy issues on the Vision List, specifically, where TRANSPLAN has listed CSMP projects that are also listed under TRANSPAC. In addition, TRANSPLAN has listed a project that TRANSPAC hasn't approved. Mr. Noeimi answered that at some point these issues should be discussed with the TRANSPLAN TAC. He went on to say that when the final lists are submitted to MTC, a project will be listed only once and redundancies will be omitted. Projects listed on the Vision List should not be a concern as the Vision List serves as a back-up list of all projects we would like to complete if we had funding. The RTPCs were asked to identify their top priorities on the Vision List.

Mr. Engelmann added that the RTP doesn't include the Vision List, but the Vision List is captured in the Countywide Transportation Plan on the Comprehensive Transportation Project List. Cost estimates for Vision list projects far exceed available funding. Any new vision projects that come up through the RTP will be incorporated in the 2014 Countywide Plan.

Ms. Neustadter said that the TAC had considerable discussion with Caltrans about projects on the CSMP and the issue of ramp metering. The TAC determined that it didn't want capital projects from the CSMP or ramp metering on the Central County's list. Note the project on the Vision List called Feasibility Analysis of ITS and Ramp Metering Operations, which serves as a placeholder to indicate that it will be considered at some point in the future. As mentioned earlier, East County is putting projects on our list that our own TAC does not support and we need to work that out as this list goes forward.

Member Durant said that the Vision list assumes that enough money is available to get Constrained projects done or converts projects to Constrained. Because it's on a Vision List it does not mean we're in agreement with it.

Ms. Neustadter said both Central and East County staff have received a letter from Caltrans after the TAC discussions, which talks about the initiation of the new Caltrans process for installation of ramp metering and other ITS components. Ms. Neustadter has inquired of East County staff about whether this should be done collectively.

ACTION: Approved the RTP Committed, Financially Constrained and Vision lists with the caveat that there needs to be more coordination and agreement on projects placed on the Vision list by other RTPCs. Mitchoff/Ross/Unanimous

6. Presentation/Discussion of the CCTA's Proposed Guidelines for both the Measure J Transportation for Livable Communities and the Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities (PBTF) Proposed Guidelines by Brad Beck, CCTA Senior Transportation Planner

Mr. Beck provided an overview of the two Measure J programs. The TLC program receives 5% of Measure J revenues and PBTF receives 1.5% which is allocated to the Countywide Competitive Program and to the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD). The EBRPD is responsible for expanding and maintaining paved trails and must expend funds as equally as possible among the regions. It must get TRANSPAC's approval for Central County projects. The Authority will allocate the

Pedestrian/Bike funds either to the EBRPD or competitive program. For TLC funds, each RTPC will recommend how to allocate its share.

Staff proposes having an application process in which sponsors will apply and demonstrate why projects meet the program criteria. This will enable Authority staff to ensure that a) the best projects that meet the goals of the programs are chosen and 2) the projects will get built and be used by the public. Most will be projects, such as physical improvements, but the TLC program can also fund planning activities such as development of a specific plan for a more transit-friendly or walkable portion of a city. Bob Armstrong asked if these funds could be used for paseos in downtown sections. Mr. Beck believed that would be permissible.

Douglas Gary, a member of the East Bay Bicycle Coalition, stated that nationwide, approximately 12% of all trips taken are by pedestrian or bicycle, and it seems that the 1.5% going to bicycle/pedestrian programs is disproportionate. If the intention is to reduce GHG emissions, there needs to be different modes of transportation available for people to go where they need to go without using a car, including bicycling, walking, and transit. This will also help us reduce our dependency on foreign oil. Mr. Gary would like to see more cycling infrastructure as it encourages people to get out of their cars and onto bikes.

John Mercurio asked if the TLC funds can be used to revise a city's existing trail master plan for bikes and pedestrians. Mr. Beck answered probably, but added that it would have to compete with all the other projects that TRANSPAC would consider.

Mary Lou Laubscher spoke on behalf of the Monument Corridor community, which is a community where many people can't afford cars and have to ride buses that are expensive or walk or ride bikes. The community is thrilled to get a 3.5 mile trail that was funded by a grant written by Concord staff. Unfortunately a second grant to make it a park trail didn't get funding. She noted there is a lack of parks in this area and seniors were hoping for beautiful trail on which to walk, along with benches to accommodate the needs of senior walkers.

Ms. Neustadter brought to TRANSPAC'S attention the TAC's suggestions as listed on the bottom of page 3 of the staff report:

- Removing the referenced "Scoring" header and rely on the word "Ranking".
- RTPCs may be relied upon to exercise care and judgment in choosing projects TLC projects that meet the program's criteria;
- The CCTA Peer Review Process should be used for these projects;
- Applicants need to pay close attention to proposed schedules to ensure timely progress on the project and drawdown of funds;
- CCTA funding resolutions may be used as monitors of timely use of these funds;
- The Program Guidelines may be revised after the first and/or subsequent funding cycles.
- CC-TLC funds may fund (see page 4 of the Program Guidelines) "Plans", "Preliminary Engineering and Design" as well as "Design, development and construction of Projects". The project or requested phases require a local match which may be funded in whole or in part with staff time provided by the sponsor agency or agencies. The same is true for PBTF projects.

ACTION: Approved forwarding the TAC's comments to CCTA. Durant/Pierce/Unanimous

7. Presentation on the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program by Brad Beck, CCTA Senior Transportation Planner; Review of Staff discussion items by the TRANSPAC Manager and the TDM Program Manager

CCTA is responsible for \$2.47 million of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program money that is available from the federal government for Safe Routes to School projects. CCTA has been working with the SR2S Task Force and RTPC managers to determine how to use the funds. The initial proposal, which would have exchanged CMAQ federal funds for Measure J funds, was unworkable and an alternative was suggested. The alternative proposal asks for federal monies for *school programs* run by 511 Contra Costa because the funds are difficult to effectively use for *school capital projects*. Funding for school projects, especially sidewalk gap closures near schools, would then be funded with \$683,500 in Measure J funds which can be allocated with TRANSPAC approval from an existing capital Measure J category such as CC-TLC category, PBTF, or subregional future needs funds.

ACTION: Approved the recommendation to allow \$683,000 of Measure J money to be used to fund school projects. Pierce/Ross/unanimous

8. Allocation Request for TRANSPAC Measure J School Access funds (Measure J line 21a) presented by Lynn Overcashier, 511 Program Manager

Lynn Overcashier noted that a handout has been distributed at this meeting that reflects last minute recommendations for the CCTA allocation of MTC CMAQ SR2S funds. The request is for Central County's School Access funding in the amount of \$758,000, with changes as follows to the document in the packet:

- 1) Add local matching funds of \$88,555 for TRANSPAC's allocation of CMAQ SR2S.
- 2) Increase the funding for a pilot school closure program with Mt. Diablo Unified School District for middle school students to \$50,000. This is an estimated cost for one year of the pilot program, depending on final survey results of potential student bus riders.
- 3) Decrease to \$319,445 the amount allocated for school bike/pedestrian access improvements such as signage, striping, dynamic speed signage, site surveys or other site improvements.
- 4) Eliminate the \$10,000 contingency.

Member Pierce added that the program at Diablo View was well received, and she's heard many good comments from parents.

ACTION: Approved the 511 Contra Costa Program Manager's allocation request for \$758,000 in Measure J School Access funds. Ross/Pierce/Unanimous

9. Reports on CCTA activities. TRANSPAC and CCTA Representatives are requested to report on the most recent CCTA Administration and Projects Committee (Member Pierce), Planning Committee (Member Durant), and CCTA meetings (Members Pierce and Durant) Items approved by the Authority on March 16, 2011 for Circulation to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs), and items of interest; March 16, 2011 CCTA Executive Director's Report; February 16, 2011 CCTA meeting minutes were circulated with the packet.

a. Administration and Projects Committee (APC) meeting

Member Pierce said that in addition to what has already been discussed previously or in the packet, there was discussion on legislation and the California budgeting measures that Senators Wolk and DeSaulnier are working on.

b. Planning Committee (PC) meeting

Member Durant said the Authority Board approved adjustments to salary ranges for two Authority staff positions based on results of recent salary and benefits surveys. The Board approved extending Executive Director Randy Iwasaki's contract for a five-year term.

ACTION: Reports accepted

10. Reports from 511 Contra Costa and TRANSPAC Staff

a) 511 Contra Costa Monthly Report

Ms. Overcashier reported on recent activities including the week-long bike/pedestrian event at Diablo View Middle School. She noted that participation rate in this event was 71.5% and said that it took 100 single occupant vehicles off the road. She also reported an increase in the number of carpoolers, bus riders and bicycle riders. This collaborative effort involved a school leadership group, staff/faculty club, parents, Clayton staff, and the Police Department. The Clayton Bike Center and Yogurt Shack provided gift certificates for the students and Starbucks provided refreshments for parent volunteers. Dr. Arthur Law, from John Muir Pediatrics, talked to parents about helmet safety and driving safely in school proximity. Parent surveys have involved them in the process of expressing specific needs of each school. For example, Walnut Creek Intermediate parents have indicated that there is a need for steps leading down from the Iron Horse Trail to improve access to campus. Based on this request, staff is now working with the East Bay Regional Park District to access funds for this purpose. In addition, quarterly follow up activities at the schools are being planned so that momentum is not lost. Upcoming events at other schools have been scheduled. On another topic, Ms. Overcashier said that at the last Authority meeting, a member commented about an event in Pittsburg to encourage biking and walking, with a reference made to the City's electric charging stations. Ms. Overcashier noted that these electric charging stations were provided by the 511 Contra Costa program.

Member Pierce thanked 511 Contra Costa staff for the hard work they put into the week-long school events.

b) TRANSPAC Report

Ms. Neustadter reported that she and Lynn Overcashier are working on an outreach program for the jurisdictions in East and Central County. After much work, the RTP list has been completed. Ms. Neustadter noted that throughout the SR2S discussions, the RTPC managers and the TDM program managers worked together to find solutions to common problems.

ACTION: Reports received

11. TAC Reports by Jurisdiction:

City of Martinez – Tim Tucker reported that the City is advertising for a Request for Qualifications for both the Court Street Overcrossing and Intermodal Phase 3 Parking Project.

Pleasant Hill – Eric Hu reported that a SR2S project has been awarded for construction of sidewalks on Lisa Lane providing direct access to Fair Oaks and Iron Horse Trail. A Request For Proposal is going out for the trail crossing project at eight crossing locations and that includes flashing systems, pedestrian signals and improvements along the trail.

Contra Costa County – Steven Goetz reported on a new version of SB710 that reduces the scope of parking requirements. He said it's better than the first version, but he would like other jurisdictions to contact him with their comments so that he can transmit them to Assemblymember Skinner by the end of the week. Member Pierce said she appreciated the update but still doesn't understand why this legislation is necessary given that any jurisdiction has the ability waive a parking requirement if deemed necessary. Mr. Goetz says this is an attempt to remove local discretion. Mr. Kuzbari said that Concord looked at the amended language and still has major concerns as it sets too many conditions, requires more work, and seems to be unnecessary. Ms. Neustadter added that in a discussion with Assemblymember Skinner's staff, its purpose was described as a way to "kick start" SB375, although it was pointed out that SB375 has already been started in Contra Costa. Ms. Neustadter suggested that it should be a goal instead of a mandate. Member Durant reported that he had talked to Assemblymember Skinner, too. It seems that this legislation was driven in response to some issues unique to a portion of that Assembly district. Unfortunately, its potential impacts on other areas were not considered. Mr. Goetz announced that he will be the interim replacement for John Greitzer, who has transferred to a job in the County's Water Agency.

Ms. Neustadter thanked the cities of Walnut Creek and Pleasant Hill for working together to move the Geary Road Improvement Project Phase 3 through the Authority's process.

ACTION: Information received

12. Correspondence/Copies/Newsclips/Information - Received

13. For the Good of the Order

Member Mitchoff said that the County Board of Supervisors is considering accepting a report on redistricting. There will be a minimum of two meetings with the public in each supervisorial district, and staff is working on the meetings for District 4. To get a copy of the redistricting maps, go to: www.co.contra-costa.ca.us. On another topic, Senator Steinberg has entered SB653 which would allow local counties to levy local taxes. Member Mitchoff does not support this legislation.

14. Next meeting Date: The next meeting is scheduled for May 12, 2011 at 9 a.m. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall. It was noted that May 12th is also Bike to Work Day.

15. The meeting was adjourned at 11:03 a.m.