

**Summary Minutes**  
**TRANSPAC – September 11, 2008**

**ATTENDANCE:**

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

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

**Staff:** Deidre Heitman, BART; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; John Greitzer, Contra Costa County, Martin Engelmann, CCTA; Jack Hall, CCTA; John Hall, Walnut Creek; Anne Muzzini, County Connection; Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager; Barbara Neustadter, Connie Peterson, TRANSPAC staff.

1. **Meeting convened with a quorum by Chair Durant at 9:24 a.m. Pledge of Allegiance – completed**
2. **Moment of Silence to remember all those who died as a result of the September 11, 2001 attacks and to honor the late Martinez police Sgt. Paul Starzyk.**
3. **Public Comment - None**
4. **CONSENT AGENDA: Silva/Pierce/unanimous**

**Approved July 10 and July 24, 2008 TRANSPAC meeting minutes.**

**END CONSENT AGENDA**

5. **Consider Approval of Resolution 08-01 authorizing the TRANSPAC/TRANSPAC TDM Program (aka 511 Contra Costa) to deliver two bicycle lockers (2 bicycles may be stored in each locker) to Contra Costa County.**

511 Contra Costa customarily provides bike lockers and racks to private and public entities for use by bicycle commuters. The County has requested two bicycle lockers (two bicycles may be stored in each locker) to be placed at the County Detention Center. For several years, bike racks and lockers have been provided to jurisdictions, including the County, using an Agreement drafted by TRANSPAC's counsel, the City Attorney of the City of Pleasant Hill.

For this bicycle locker donation, County Counsel's Office has requested that the lockers be "gifted" to the County using a Resolution approved by TRANSPAC for the 511 Contra Costa program. The Resolution which has been approved by TRANSPAC's attorney is attached. TRANSPAC is requested to approve the Resolution so that the bicycle lockers may be delivered to the County and installed for use.

**ACTION: Moved to adopt Resolution 08-01 providing for the donation and installation of two bicycle lockers to Contra Costa County. Pierce/Bjerke/Unanimous**

**6. County Connection Request for TRANSPAC's Support to Seek Measure C Funding for the Pacheco Transit Hub Project**

County Connection is requesting TRANSPAC's support in seeking additional Measure C funding for the Pacheco Transit Hub project. The total project cost is approximately \$2.9 million. Secured funding is approximately \$2.6M leaving a \$300,000 shortfall. CCTA Project staff believes that Measure C funds may be available and suggested that CCCTA staff seek TRANSPAC's approval for a Measure C funding request. Due to the timing of this request, the TRANSPAC TAC has not had an opportunity to forward a recommendation to TRANSPAC.

**ACTION: Moved to approve County Connection's request for TRANSPAC's support to seek Measure C funding for the Pacheco Transit Hub project.  
Pierce/Silva/Unanimous**

**7. Report of CCTA Planning Committee consideration of TRANSPAC's request to not include MTSOs in the Central County Action Plan.**

Member Pierce attended the September 3, 2008 Planning Committee meeting for Chair Durant and reported on a number of Planning Committee items that relate to TRANSPAC's Action Plan, the Draft Implementation Guide and the Growth Management Program, as well as TRANSPAC's Regional Transportation Mitigation Program.

At its July 10, 2008 meeting, TRANSPAC approved the TRANSPAC TAC's "Plan A" recommendation which included an Action Plan without Multi-Model Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) and a +/- 18 month review of the Growth Management Program including the Draft Growth Management Program Implementation Guide, Technical Procedures as well as implementing Resolutions 95-06-G and 92-03-G. These documents need to be updated, aligned for consistency and repackaged into a single document for Authority adoption for use by local jurisdictions for Growth Management Plan compliance purposes.

Prior to the July 24, 2008 meeting, TRANSPAC was advised by CCTA staff that the Plan A recommendation was acceptable and could be completed in 3 months. At the July 24, 2008 meeting, TRANSPAC approved a motion to revise its request from 18 to 3 months and CCTA staff indicated that the Planning Committee would consider TRANSPAC's request at its September 3, 2008 meeting.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Durant thanked Member Pierce for attending this meeting on his behalf and conveying TRANSPAC's position on MTSOs.

Neustadter proposed implementing as many of our actions by 2030 which could be the MTSOs. Pierce said that there needs to be the acknowledgement that times have changed.

Bjerke noted that at the Contra Costa Council Land Use Task Force, Bob McCleary spoke about Senate Bill 375 and how it could radically alter land use and transportation planning. If the bill is signed by the governor, MTSOs might not be as relevant as concerns about the bigger picture. We should come up with one or two MTSOs that meet the criteria and that satisfies the current political situation to move past this.

Neustadter noted that Lamorinda staff asked TRANSPAC to take closer look at a traffic management plan and addressing bus service on Pleasant Hill Road. This will be discussed with the TAC to see if it should be added to the Central County Action Plan.

**ACTION: Accepted the report on the CCTA Planning Committee meeting.**

**8. Report of Planning Committee Consideration of the Draft Growth Management Program Implementation Guide for Measure J-Proposal for Adoption**

In July, the TRANSPAC TAC advised TRANSPAC that the Draft Growth Management Implementation Guide is "built" in large part on the Technical Procedures. As a result, The TAC suggested, and TRANSPAC concurred, that any review/revision of the Implementation Guide should wait until the Technical Procedures Update is completed. TRANSPAC's request to the CCTA/Planning Committee requesting that action on the Implementation Guide be delayed until the Technical Procedures are updated and the Growth Management Program documents reviewed and revised is in the packet. This process also is expected to include circulation to the RTPCs, TACs and the TCC for review/comment prior to CCTA consideration. As noted above, this review is anticipated to be completed in 3 months per CCTA staff.

A memo commenting on the Implementation Guide, developed by John Greitzer and John Hall, was included in the packet along with an e-mail from Ray Kuzbari with additional comments. With TRANSPAC's approval, these comments will be transmitted to CCTA by its September 19, 2008 deadline.

**DISCUSSION:** Chair Durant again thanked Member Pierce for her attendance at this meeting. Pierce reported that the Authority agreed to delay adoption of the Implementation Guide until October to allow further review and comment. Some commented that the letters were harsh.

Neustadter noted that the Growth Management Program Task Force meeting took place yesterday that resulted in a productive review of the implementation documents. It was proposed that the two resolutions could be eliminated by incorporating the information into the Implementation Guide. The Guide would then be adopted by resolution and would supersede the previous two resolutions. The term "net new peak hour vehicle trips" is being used throughout all the documents. Also included was a 500 trip ceiling for GPA with project notification at 100 trips. There was additional discussion about processing notice and the MTSO/CEQA threshold.

Silva requested a more detailed explanation about General Plan Amendments, with specific reference to steps to the final EIR for Neiman Marcus. John Hall explained that under Measure C, notification is sent to all RTPCs, Caltrans and others for the GPA EIR preparation. CCTA Technical Procedures are followed for the Traffic Study that is part of the environmental document. Through the CEQA process, the project is evaluated. Another notice to be sent (but often missed) is the Notice of Completion. With regard to the 500/100 trips, Hall said the size of the Neiman Marcus project wasn't known at first, but the City initiated the Measure C process because it triggered the over-100 trip notification. Because this GPA was related to height and not intensification, it did not require the second step but was done anyway.

Neustadter said a statement should be added that exempts an administrative GPA from needing more than notification. She noted that the Technical Model Working Group that's working on the Technical Procedures is scheduled to meet next week

Durant said that he sent an e-mail to Chair Nix prior to the Planning Committee meeting addressing timelines and concerns about the Implementation Guide. The e-mail summarized the sense that the Guide emphasized form over substance, was too complex in structure and lacked a direction toward the appropriate audience. Further, there were recommended changes in parts of the plan that were not in the draft. The Implementation Guide doesn't take into consideration the last 50 years of traffic mitigation in Central County. It should recognize that Central County serves as a pass-through and its prior investments must be looked at because of the role those investments have played in East County's development. The focus on the assumption that Measure C was the beginning ignores the fact that Central County has made a significant contribution. A respectful conversation in a reasonable forum is necessary to discuss fairness and how it is presented in the draft Implementation Guide.

Armstrong asked if developer fees take into account only new road projects or include maintenance of existing roads. Bjerke said that in theory fees are one time, and when the building is up it should be generating ongoing gas tax or sales tax revenues to cover maintenance.

Durant noted that other avenues of traffic mitigation have been ignored because of the narrow focus on mitigation fees. For example, the Kohl's developer paid for improvements to Buskirk Avenue, which impacts a regional route, but it shows up nowhere.

Pierce mentioned again how the Oakhurst developers paid for building half of Clayton's infrastructure as well as improvements in Concord and Walnut Creek. This contribution does not show up because no mitigation fee was involved.

**ACTION: Motion was approved to a) Accept report on the CCTA Planning Committee meeting regarding TRANSPAC's request that action on the Draft Growth Management Program Implementation Guide be delayed 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; b) transmit comments prepared by TRANSPAC TAC members and staff to the CCTA by its comment deadline. Bjerke/Pierce/Unanimous.**

## **9. Central County Action Plan**

A revised Chapter 2 and revised Chapter 5, including a new Table 5-1, are in the packet. Table 5-1 has been expanded to include a variety of freeway, transit, street and bicycle/pedestrian/trail projects. TRANSPAC staff will continue to work with CCTA and the Action Plan Consultant on "presentation" version of the TRANSPAC Action Plan.

**DISCUSSION:** Neustadter asked to be notified of any additions, corrections or edits.

Silva thought that the Walnut Creek path project needed rethinking, citing its and distance, length and lack of lighting or exits in relation to its cost benefit. Heitman pointed out that this was a grant that can't be used for another project. This is a County project that BART supports. It needs more time to be reviewed.

Pierce noted that there were some County projects on page 4 for Pacifica Avenue and Bethel Island that do not belong on the list. Greitzer said that the County needs to change some projects on the list and will submit these changes as soon as possible. Pierce called attention to Page 1 of Chapter 2, where the population forecast in the chart in 2-1 had been calculated incorrectly. Planning Committee Chair Nix had noted a discrepancy between documentation that showed a 30,000 increase in Central County households, while the increase in the chart showed only 13,000.

Engelmann said that the amount of increase depends on which ABAG forecast is being used. ABAG shifted from a market-based forecast to a policy-based forecast that was heavy in housing. ABAG forecast number of 13,000 is based on the Projections Series 2005 (which had been closely reviewed by the jurisdictions). Projections 2007 goes out to a longer time frame of 2035 and up to 29,000. He added that all regions are using the same set of numbers and noted that the numbers do not include the CNWS.

Durant asked if the increase in numbers for Central County go up proportionately with other areas. He stressed the importance of having the real number when going back for discussions with the Authority.

Neustadter expected there will be changes to the table and hopes the last version of the Action Plan will be in October. Other RTPCs are eager to review the Action Plan. The current draft is on the website but it won't formally be circulated until approved by TRANSPAC for circulation.

**ACTION: Requested submission of Action Plan edits and additions.**

**10. 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).**

a) The attachment for this item also includes a September 3, 2008 CCTA staff report to the Planning Committee on a "Proposal for an Authority Workshop to Discuss Corridor Management and related Growth Management Program Issues". This proposal, in many ways, mirrors TRANSPAC's contention that "transportation business" has changed since voter approval of Measure C in 1988 and that the CCTA needs to keep pace with those changes to ensure the Contra Costa transportation network keeps pace with necessary physical improvements as well as advancements in the efficient operation of the system.

b) An additional attachment for this item is the September 3, 2008 CCTA staff report to the Planning Committee regarding the Measure C/J Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (RTMP).

**DISCUSSION:**

c. Planning Committee meeting

Neustadter reported that Chair Nix's concern was whether the regional transportation programs take into consideration the future needs for improvements. Three of the RTPC areas started analyses required to increase fees; however, not all of the analyses are expected to be completed. TRANSPAC had a chance to circulate its traffic impact fee chart. There was a lot of emphasis on single family dwellings, but commercial fees in TRANSPAC are significant and generate money arterial/street projects in the Central

County area. These are considered local and are not seen by anyone. The challenge is to find a way to communicate this to the Transportation Authority. We may need to develop another chart by jurisdiction to show local fees in detail.

Pierce said that East County's housing-based fee program is not generating any fees in the current economy. Durant noted the tendency toward a one size fits all solution which doesn't fit well in this diverse county. Central County's philosophy has been to mitigate impacts of projects whether in our jurisdictions or another RTPC. East County is correct in trying to mitigate potential harm, but there is a problem with an over-focus on the mitigation fee component. Some entities seem to be trying to create a punitive fee rather than a cooperative or mitigating fee.

Other discussion topics included holding a workshop to discuss Corridor Management and the Growth Management Program and GMP compliance issues associated with the incorporation of the Town of Alamo.

b. Administration and Projects Committee meeting

Member Pierce reported that the Administration and Projects Committee meeting discussed the new audit and is negotiating a contract for the new financial system. The Draft Strategic Plan 2008 would be adopted in October.

**ACTION: Reports accepted.**

**11. Reports from Staff and Committees - information accepted**

- a. WCCTAC press release announcing the appointment of Ms. Christine Atienza as its new Executive Director effective September 15, 2008. (attachment)
- b. Please visit [www.transpac.us](http://www.transpac.us) – thanks to Corinne Dutra-Roberts and the tech consultant crew, the web site has a new look and future changes are untended to make the site more informative and easier to use. All ideas welcome.

**DISCUSSION:** Neustadter stated that once the website is fully functioning, TRANSPAC members will be polled about their preferences for receiving their agenda packets. Member Pierce raised the issue of file size and efficient downloading. Staff is aware of the issue and is working on it.

- d. CCTA Notice of Availability (July 30) of the Issues and Options Report for the Update to the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Comments are requested by the end of September 2008. Given the schedule, the TAC will review the document at its September 25, 2008 meeting.
- e. As provided for in CCTA Agreement 192, I-680 HOV Express Bus Access Study (RM2) was administratively extended for the second time to March 31, 2010. The Agreement was originally executed on April 25, 2006, and then extended from December 31, 2006 to March 31, 2008.
- f. Tribute to Peter Hirano on this 30 years of service to the City of Concord by Dave Golick, APA California Planner Magazine, September – October 2008.

**ACTION: Reports accepted**

12. **Correspondence/Copies/Newsclips/Information - Received**  
7/9/08 Chair Durant letter to CCTA Chair Hudson re: TRANSPAC comments on the Countywide Transportation Plan draft Vision, Goals and Strategies; 7/14/08 TRANSPLAN status letter to CCTA; 7/17/08 Items approved by the Authority on July 16, 2008 for Circulation to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and items of interest; 8/26/08 TRANSPAC July status letter to CCTA (see Agenda Item 7 above); 7/21/08 John Cunningham, TRANSPLAN staff, to Michael Wright, CNWS Reuse Project Director regarding the travel time impacts of the project alternatives to East County commuters in SR 4 and Kirker Pass Road; County Connection, June 2008 Fixed Route Operating Statistical Reports; August 31, 2008 CCTA Project Status Report.  
  
**Bay Area Monitor:** August/September 2008 "Next Stop on the Line for High-Speed rail: November 4 Ballot"; **San Francisco Chronicle:** 7/30/08 "Emeryville firm pays employees to bike"; **San Jose Mercury News:** 8/19/08 Editorial "Make way for the Segway even if trails not built for it"; **LA Times:** 8/26/08 "Congestion pricing may not hurt the poor, study finds"; 8/21/08 "A smart bill for smart growth in California is on the verge of passage in Legislature"; the following articles believed to be those suggested by Member Ross; 6/18/08 "OCTA prepares for more riders"; 6/10/08 "MetroLink, bus upgrades are planned"; 6/10/08 "More rough roads ahead"; 6/10/08 "Leaders try to stall toll lanes".
13. **For the Good of the Order**  
Engelmann related his observation that people seem to be reducing their driving because of gas prices. He noted that on a recent trip on I-680 from Martinez to Walnut Creek at 11:30 p.m., there was no traffic at all on the freeway.
14. **The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.** The next TRANSPAC meeting is scheduled for October 9, 2008 at 9 a.m. in the Community Room, City Hall, City of Pleasant Hill.