

**Summary Minutes
TRANSPAC – July 10, 2008**

ATTENDANCE:

Elected Officials: David Durant, Pleasant Hill, TRANSPAC Chair; Mark Ross, Martinez, Vice Chair; Julie Pierce, Clayton, CCTA Representative, TRANSPAC Vice-Chair; Guy Bjerke, Concord; Cindy Silva, Walnut Creek, CCTA Representative. Absent: Susan Bonilla (excused).

Planning Commissioners: Bob Armstrong, Clayton; Bob Hoag, Concord; Diana Vavrek, Pleasant Hill; Jon Malkovich, Walnut Creek. Vacant Seat: Martinez. Absent: Donnie Snyder, Contra Costa County (excused).

Staff: Deidre Heitman, BART; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Martin Engelmann, CCTA; Tim Tucker, Martinez; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; John Hall, Walnut Creek; Lynn Osborn, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager; Barbara Neustadter, Connie Peterson, TRANSPAC staff.

Anne Muzzini representing the County Connection was introduced to the TRANSPAC Committee.

Meeting convened with a quorum by Chair Durant at 9:20 a.m.

- 1. Convene meeting: Pledge of Allegiance/Self-Introductions - completed**
- 2. Public Comment** – Mark Ross congratulated the 511 Contra Costa staff on its successful applications (totaling \$800,000) to the Air District.

CONSENT AGENDA: Pierce/Silva/unanimous

- 3. Approved the June 19, 2008 minutes**

END CONSENT

The order of agenda was changed to discuss Item #5 first.

- 4. Draft Growth Management Program Implementation Guide for Measure J-Proposal for Adoption**

On June 18, 2008, the Transportation Authority, on the recommendation of its Planning Committee, released the revised Draft Growth Management Program Implementation Guide and released it for a 45-day review period (comments due September 19, 2008). The CCTA may consider adoption in September and the CCTA Technical Coordinating Committee, subject to comments received, may request an opportunity to review the Guide again prior to final adoption, and to reassess procedures for Action Plan development/implementation based on the lessons learned from the current experience with the Action Plans.

DISCUSSION: Neustadter said that at its meeting on June 26, the TAC determined that comments on the Draft Growth Management Implementation Guide, which is "built" in large part on the Technical Procedures, should wait until the Technical Procedures Update has been completed as well as a review/update of all other relevant documents including Resolutions 95-06-G and 92-03-G. The TAC also noted that because there are so many different guides and other documents for the Growth Management Program, combining the documents into one handbook would be a worthwhile goal.

ACTION: Approved a request to the Transportation Authority to delay action on the Draft Growth Management Program Implementation Guide until the Technical Procedures and any other ancillary Growth Management Program documents such as Resolutions 95-06-G and 92-03-G have been reviewed, updated, and circulated to the RTPCs and TACs for review/comment prior to adoption. **Pierce/Bjerke/Unanimous.**

5. MTSOs in the TRANSPAC Action Plan

The TRANSPAC TAC has continued its discussions on how to address MTSOs in the Central County Action Plan. At its June 26, 2008 meeting, the TAC developed two options for TRANSPAC's consideration. Both of these options are predicated on the premise that the Transportation Authority's 2030 model includes the General Plans adopted by Central County local jurisdictions and no additional MTSO analysis is required for a development project of any size which is consistent with an adopted Central County General Plan. This premise addresses the issue of development projects in adopted local jurisdiction General Plans. General Plan Amendments (GPAs) remain subject to MTSO analysis.

The TAC is recommending "Plan A". The proposal is to request that the Authority concur that TRANSPAC may proceed with an Action Plan without MTSOs to allow more time (up to +/-18 months) to develop some other solution(s) to the MTSO dilemma. This would allow CCTA to complete its Countywide Transportation Plan prior to the initiation of Measure J.

During the +/-18 month period, all of the documents regarding the Growth Management Program should be reviewed, aligned for consistency and repackaged into a single document for Authority consideration and ultimately for use by local jurisdictions for Growth Management Plan compliance purposes. The TAC also noted that a General Plan Amendment for the Concord Naval Weapons Station is not expected to be proposed within the 18 month period.

It may be that a review and update of the implementing Resolutions 95-06-G and 92-03-G as well as the Implementation Guide and Technical Procedures will be sufficient to address MTSO issues. It is also possible that a recommendation to amend the Measure J Growth Management Program to reflect how transportation planning is conducted today (intentional inducement of delay, TOD, etc.) could be determined to be required during the review period.

In recognition of the magnitude and ramifications of the "Plan A" recommendation, the TAC also developed a "Plan B" recommendation which proposes that one MTSO be established in the Action Plan. That MTSO is "Implement as many Action Plan actions as financially and institutionally feasible by 2030". This MTSO is tracked in the Conditions of Compliance report which is developed by TRANSPAC and 511 CC staff for use by TRANSPAC jurisdictions when filing Growth Management Compliance Checklists.

The TAC recommends that a review/update of Resolution 95-06-G and Resolution 93-03-G as well as the Implementation Guide and Technical Procedures also be undertaken under "Plan B".

Motion 1: Approved the Plan A recommendation by the TRANSPAC TAC. Prior to the meeting, CCTA staff had communicated that the Plan A recommendation was acceptable.

Plan A is based on the premise that the Transportation Authority's 2030 model includes the General Plans adopted by Central County local jurisdictions. Inclusion in the 2030 model means that these General Plans have been analyzed by the Transportation Authority for effects on the regional transportation network. As a result, no additional MTSO analysis is required for a development project of any size which is consistent with an adopted Central County General

Plan. This premise is proposed to be stated in the Central County Action Plan to make clear that no additional MTSO analysis will be required for development projects that are consistent with an adopted General Plan.

Plan A includes a TRANSPAC request to the Transportation Authority to concur that TRANSPAC may proceed with an Action Plan without MTSOs to allow more time (up to +/-18 months) to develop some other solution(s) to the MTSO dilemma. During the +/- 18 month period, all of the documents regarding the Growth Management Program (the Draft Growth Management Program Implementation Guide, its Technical Procedures, implementing Resolutions 95-06-G and 92-03-G) should be reviewed, aligned for consistency and repackaged into a single document for Authority adoption to be used by local jurisdictions for Growth Management Plan compliance purposes.

TRANSPAC approved consideration of the redefinition of Routes of Regional Significance as super segments and/or future corridor management plans areas. The TAC believes that the definitions for freeways address this issue and that the application of super segments/corridor management plan areas for arterials should be addressed after the review of the Growth Management Program and related documents is completed.

Motion 2: TRANSPAC also approved a motion that its elected representatives, Planning Commissioners and Technical Advisory Committee staff intend to fully participate in the review of the Measure J Growth Management Program and its implementing documents (the Implementation Guide and Technical Procedures) and Resolutions.

Motion 3: TRANSPAC will release the revised Action Plan to the Transportation Authority for use in the development of the Countywide Transportation Plan EIR after the completion of its review at this meeting.

DISCUSSION: Neustadter noted that the Authority concurred that TRANSPAC may proceed with an Action Plan without MTSOs and allow up to +/-18 months to develop some other solutions to the MTSO dilemma as well as review all documents relating to the Growth Management Program (GMP) that are used for compliance purposes. Incorporated into the Action Plan is a note that the GPA is not expected for the Concord Naval Weapons Station during that period. The Authority has accepted the Plan A recommendation. The Action Plan Subcommittee (including Diana Vavrek, Cindy Silva, Julie Pierce and Neustadter) completed revisions of the Actions which have been distributed and will be discussed later in detail.

TRANSPAC is being asked if it is prepared to accept the TAC's recommendation for Plan A and to release the Actions to Transportation Authority staff for use in the Countywide Transportation Plan EIR.

Bjerke restated his understanding of staff's recommendation, of which Transportation Authority staff has agreed in concept, that TRANSPAC will not put MTSOs in the Action Plan pending a thorough review of the GMP and review of the basis for MTSOs. This is a result of recent thinking that MTSOs may no longer be valid given where we are in development of Transportation Plan and how we deal with transportation issues. We will be asking Authority over next 18 months to undergo that thorough review.

Neustadter stated Authority staff has advised that they are prepared to start after the August break and believe it can be done in fewer than 18 months.

Bjerke said that the other basic premise is that because the Authority has already taken into account all development envisioned in our jurisdictions' General Plans, any project that is consistent with an adopted General Plan in theory has already been accounted for in modeling and in planning. Only extraordinary issues/projects that would require a GPA need a higher a level of scrutiny that would merit additional review by TRANSPAC, RTPCs or the Authority.

Pierce stated she would second the motion with the inclusion of a minor adjustment in the last paragraph of Item 5 to allow redefining of Routes of Regional Significance into "super segments". Plan A should include consideration of corridor management plans rather than just Action Plans for arterials.

Neustadter noted that supersegments had not been reviewed by the TAC and there could be issues associated with the amalgamation of arterials creating MTSO GPA analysis problems in the future. She also suggested that there may be administrative adjustments and it might be advisable to include language allowing for GPAs that have no traffic impact, such as changes in height limitations. The height issue was brought up by Hall with regard to the BART TOD development. He suggested that this sort of technicality should be defined and given an exemption.

Durant pointed out that the exemption is already there because it is tied to net new peak hour trips. He suggested revisions to the Resolutions as follows:

Resolution 95-06-G: In Attachment A, paragraph 2, revise to read - "The process requires that a jurisdiction study the impacts of a proposed GPA on the Action Plan when the size of the GPA exceeds the threshold size established by the RTPC in the Plan; or and 500 net new peak hour vehicle trips if such threshold has not been established."

Resolution 93-02-G: In the fourth Whereas, revise to read - "Whereas as an interim measure, the Authority wishes to facilitate notification of affected jurisdictions of the preparation of environmental documents for proposed projects ~~or~~ and General Plan Amendments that generate more than 100 net new peak hour vehicle trips so that affected jurisdictions may comment on draft environmental documents; and ... "

ACTION: Approved Plan A with changes incorporated as discussed.

Bjerke/ Pierce/Unanimous.

6. Review of the Central County Action Plan

At the June 19, 2008 meeting, TRANSPAC established a subcommittee to rewrite the Action Plan. TRANSPAC is requested to review the document and note comments, revisions, etc. TRANSPAC may wish to schedule an additional meeting for July 24 in lieu of the TRANSPAC TAC meeting and/or schedule additional meeting(s) or determine another course of action.

DISCUSSION: Neustadter said that Authority staff has requested the addition of language in the last paragraph on page 1 of Chapter 4 (before the "therefore") that amplifies our concerns about how business has changed since the approval of Measure J and the 2000 Action Plan. Language should indicate that we are concerned about TOD development and its impact, possible advent of HOT Lanes, the reconsideration of ramp metering and other operational techniques. She suggested drafting a sentence or two that clarifies the reasons we have established the three key Actions at the bottom of the paragraph that address completion of the existing system, improved traffic management and operation and continuing of TDM programs.

Pierce added that the Action Plans need to show why we are purposefully not doing things the way we did before. Durant suggested including a sentence that describes changes in the environment in the intervening years since Measure C. Measure C was about reducing traffic delays, but the goal now is managing traffic. He noted the summary in Chapter 3 says this is what has developed over the past twenty years that causes us to look at the universe in a different way. Armstrong asked if we are now more interested in results than the process. Durant said we are more interested in identifying the real problem and trying to develop policies and plans to address it rather than being stuck in a concept from the past. It is the same dilemma that underlies the MTSO debate, that is, if the intention is to reduce traffic congestion but it cannot be done on certain routes, why have it under consideration. We should look at the whole system, the larger segments of system, and make sure we are managing the situation the best way to achieve the desired outcome.

Pierce said we are looking at it in new way because circumstances have changed since 1988 and the public recognizes that we have successfully accomplished what we set out to do. Twenty years later we have a track record and what we promise should be what is realistic to accomplish now and to not be hamstrung by the process.

Neustadter again thanked the subcommittee (members Silva, Vavrek and Pierce) for its hard work and many hours spent on revising the Action Plan. Member Pierce noted particular thanks to Member Silva and her writing capabilities. Durant thanked the subcommittee for the extraordinary effort that they had put forth. The revisions were crisply written and well done.

Malkovich requested clarification on Page 4 about the gap in Planned and Study. Engelmann explained that the original intent was to look at preliminary studies as potential projects being considered in the future. Planned improvements are projects. The headers were revised.

TRANSPAC continued its review of each section and noted additions, changes and corrections that need to be made.

ACTION: The subcommittee was given direction to make additional revisions to the Action Plan as discussed. TRANSPAC will meet again on July 24, 2008 to look over the edits and review the remaining chapters.

7. 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).

Neustadter reported that the July 3rd APC discussed I-80 and SR-4 projects; the purchase of a new photocopier and legislative issues. Member Pierce added that a closed session was held to conduct the Executive Director's annual review.

Member Durant reported that the Planning Committee's July 2nd meeting had been cancelled and the checklists were forwarded to the Authority Board.

ACTION: Reports accepted.

8. Reports from Staff and Committees

- a. 511 Contra Costa Monthly Report by Lynn Osborn, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager.

Osborn related her recent 12.5 mile commuting experience on an electric bike, and offered a ride to anyone interested after the next meeting. Staff is working with the County's Green Building program and was asked to draft a section on transportation that would qualify a business to be green. The West County Greenhouse Gas roundtable has invited staff to participate regularly. The 511 Contra Costa website is being updated and should be completed by end of summer.

ACTION: Reports accepted

9. Correspondence/Copies/Newsclips/Information - Received

- 10. For the Good of the Order** – Mark Ross suggested that the LA Times' four-part article on transportation system (published about a month ago) be reprinted and distributed. The article showed the effect that a 2% reduction in traffic had on the entire system.

Armstrong requested that we keep on the record a running tally of the cost of the bullet train. Today's estimate was \$45 billion.

- 11. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, July 24, 2008 at 9 a.m. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall.

**Summary Minutes
TRANSPAC – July 24, 2008**

ATTENDANCE:

Elected Officials: David Durant, Pleasant Hill, TRANSPAC Chair; Mark Ross, Martinez, Vice Chair; Julie Pierce, Clayton, CCTA Representative, TRANSPAC Vice-Chair; Cindy Silva, Walnut Creek, CCTA Representative. Absent: Susan Bonilla, Guy Bjerke (excused).

Planning Commissioners: Bob Armstrong, Clayton; Bob Hoag, Concord; Diana Vavrek, Pleasant Hill; Vacant Seat: Martinez. Absent: Donnie Snyder, Contra Costa County; Jon Malkovich, Walnut Creek (excused).

Staff: Deidre Heitman, BART; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; John Greitzer, Contra Costa County, Martin Engelmann, CCTA; Tim Tucker, Martinez; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; John Hall, City of Walnut Creek; Julie Campero, CALTRANS. Lynn Osborn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager; Barbara Neustadter, Connie Peterson, TRANSPAC staff.

Meeting convened without a quorum by Vice Chair Ross at 9:17 a.m.

- 1. Convene meeting: Pledge of Allegiance/Self-Introductions - completed**
- 2. Public Comment – None**
- 3. Continued Review of the Central County Action Plan**

At the July 10, 2008 meeting, TRANSPAC unanimously approved a series of motions regarding the Central County Action Plan, the Measure J Growth Management Program, its implementation documents and resolutions.

Chair Durant arrived at 9:27 a.m.

DISCUSSION:

Neustadter thanked the members of the subcommittee (Members Pierce, Silva and Vavrek) for rewriting the Action Plan and expressed appreciation for their time and effort. Neustadter noted the motions approved at the last meeting and asked to be made aware of any corrections or omissions. She requested clarification of what action would be taken at the next Planning Committee meeting on this matter.

Engelmann stated that at the September Planning Commission (PC) meeting staff will ask the PC to ask the Authority to consider TRANSPAC's request regarding the Action Plan and not to include MTSOs. CCTA staff's recommendation is to consider TRANSPAC's request. Subcommittees have been established by the TCC to look at the two resolutions cited here as well as Technical Procedures, the Growth Management Program Checklist, coming to the PC in September. The process should be completed in three months rather than 18 months.

ACTION: Approved changing the time allotted for the process from 18 months to plus or minus three months. **Pierce/Ross/Unanimous.**

TRANSPAC continued its review of the Draft TRANSPAC Action Plan. CCTA staff has been requested to revise the format of charts, tables (Chapter 2) and the Central County map. Comments and suggested revisions were discussed for Chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5.

ACTION: By consensus it was agreed that the TAC will work on updating the Central County Comprehensive Project List, and Member Silva will rewrite the language in Chapter 5.

4. For the Good of the Order

DISCUSSION:

Neustadter presented a new item to be added to the agenda. A request was received from the County Connection to send a letter of support to MTC for a New Freedom Grant. This request was for a \$150,000 planning grant to develop Mobility Management Centers that will disseminate information to riders. Most transit agencies in Contra Costa are involved in this as well as the Authority, AC Transit, Contra Costa County Health and Human Services, West County, and East County. The TRANSPAC committee is being asked for approval to send a letter of support for this grant.

Neustadter explained that this is a request for planning money to create an information outreach referral system that will assist people in determining what kinds of transit services are available for their particular condition.

Several members expressed concern that such a program could potentially create additional bureaucracy for each county involved; that it might be duplicating services already available; and the justification for the cost of such a study. The concept of the Mobility Management Centers involves having a designated person(s), possibly within an existing public agency, who would provide assistance and information to groups or individuals on the transit services available to them. It is in the interest of the transit operators to get everybody in the right kind of service and vehicle as it represents faster run times, smaller load times and will also ensure that people who are not able to ride the regular bus can get appropriate service through other means.

ACTION 1: By consensus approved agendaing this item.

ACTION 2: Approved sending letter of support for County Connection's New Freedom grant application to MTC. Armstrong/Ross/Unanimous.

Martin Engelmann was asked to describe the telecarpooling project for which he submitted a grant request to Caltrans in February. This project involves spontaneous carpooling, where a member uses a phone to request a ride from another member of the network. This network is based on affinity groups, such as employees of Walnut Creek or Hacienda Park, etc. A financial exchange is involved among members that also include a share for the local transit agency.

5. The meeting was adjourned at 11:08 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for September 11, 2008 at 9 a.m. in the Community Room, Pleasant Hill City Hall.