

**Summary Minutes
TRANSPAC – October 9, 2008**

ATTENDANCE:

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

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

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

1. **The meeting was convened by Chair Durant at 9:10 a.m. Pledge of Allegiance/Self-Introductions – Completed**
2. **Public Comment – None**
3. **CONSENT AGENDA: Pierce/Bjerke/Unanimous
Approved September 11, 2008 TRANSPAC meeting minutes
END CONSENT AGENDA**
4. **Review of the Draft Central County Action Plan with MTSOs**

Discussion: Chair Durant began the discussion by saying that this was an outstanding and remarkably well done document, and he thanked those involved. Neustadter noted that those who worked on the Action Plan over the course of the last several months included elected officials, Planning Commissioners, Authority staff, consultants and the TAC.

Neustadter highlighted the areas that needed minor corrections and asked to be informed of any other changes. The table of contents will be updated when the document is done. A new Chapter 1 has been inserted into the document. She thanked the Authority staff for revising Chapter 2 pursuant to TRANSPAC's request. She will rely on Member Pierce to confirm that the numbers in the charts are correct.

In Chapter 3, a question arose whether I-680/SR-24 should remain on the list of Completed Transportation Improvements as it was completed a long time ago. It was agreed it should remain on the list because it was under construction in 1995 when the first Action Plan was adopted. Pierce suggested its completion in 2000 could be noted to clarify that this is not a current project. Neustadter suggested that in the second paragraph under Land Use and Growth Management, the first sentence should be revised to read: "TRANSPAC works with its local jurisdictions and adjacent RTPCs and other agencies to encourage land use strategies that make efficient use of the transportation network, improved transit access and manage traffic congestion, e.g., Transit Oriented Development." The last sentence of paragraph should then be struck.

Ross asked if there should be some acknowledgement of the existence of SB 375 and conform to its guidelines. Pierce said that this topic has been discussed at the Planning Committee (PC) and is coming back to the Authority in the next month. Some major adjustments will be made to the Growth Management Program (GMP), and SB 375 will be a major topic over the next few months. It would be appropriate to make revisions after those discussions have taken place.

The PC and the Authority are working on changes to the GMP which might require an amendment to Measure J, and SB 375 plays a major role. Neustadter summarized SB 375 as being about sustainable community strategies, reduction of vehicle miles traveled, and going green. To paraphrase Robert McCleary of CCTA, it makes greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions the cornerstone of transportation planning.

Pierce agreed with Member Ross's comment about acknowledging SB 375 and suggested it could be done with a single sentence stating that the impact and effect of SB 375 is unknown and the GMP will be adjusted accordingly. Durant suggested that a footnote could be added in the introduction to acknowledge that this bill was passed and indicate that it is presently outside the scope of this document.

Neustadter said that because 511 Contra Costa (under its various names) has been in the business of reducing of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) since 1992, it might be appropriate to specifically mention it in that section of Chapter 3.

Engelmann said that there will be another opportunity to edit the document after it has been circulated and incorporated into the draft Countywide Plan and comes back with comments. In December or January more will be known about SB 375, and TRANSPAC will be able to further refine this document.

Overcashier said that while mobility management was an appropriate topic several months ago when this was written, it seems that some discussion about how these TDM programs affect VMT and GHG emissions would be appropriate now. Durant pointed out that there was already a reference to this in the second paragraph of that section on Page 5. Overcashier said that these programs currently have quantifiable GHG emission performance measures in place and it would make sense to tie them into the discussion of SB 375.

There was a consensus to add language that acknowledged passage of SB 375 but noting that its effect is not yet known.

Neustadter said that the County's letter (in front of Chapter 4) should be removed. A handout was distributed containing new text (underlined) and amended charts for the three interstates. The MTSOs have been inserted into the box called "MTSO Action and Responsibilities". The TAC has come up with the use of the Delay Index for I-680 is set at 4. For SR-242, the Delay Index used is 3.0. SR-4 has been made into a supersegment from TRANSPAC's western boundary with WCCTAC to its eastern boundary at Willow Pass with Eastern County (TRANSPLAN), and will be more clearly labeled relative to the MTSO. The supersegment Delay Index was set at 5, which was set high to ensure this MTSO could be met. The Authority prefers that the MTSOs and boundaries match. East County's is set at 2.5 Delay Index. WCCTAC will keep its MTSO and TRANSPAC will keep its own. If there is a problem, each will consult with the other.

Neustadter handed out replacement pages for the next section that included the County MTSOs which were not available when the packet went to production. Each jurisdiction established its own MTSOs for its Arterial Routes of Regional Significance and each road could have several MTSOs as it travels through different communities. The map in Chapter 4 was deleted and text was added to describe each MTSO used by the jurisdictions.

Neustadter described the MTSOs for arterials and discussed each of the arterial roadways. Pierce commented that for Ygnacio Valley Road in Concord, the Ygnacio Valley and Clayton Road intersection wasn't listed, but it was listed on the Clayton Road chart. She asked if it

should be put on both. She also raised the question of how traffic management plan meters are being addressed, and Durant answered that they are identified as metered intersections.

In Chapter 5, the Regional Transportation Mitigation Program is more accurately described as a Subregional Mitigation Program, which is how it is in the Measure. This sets up the tie in Central County between local and regional fee structures. Also included in the chapter is the updated traffic impact fee chart for Central Contra Costa that compares itself to the other jurisdictions across RTPCs. The Committee agreed that the name should be changed to the Subregional Mitigation Program.

Neustadter said the Kirker Pass southbound truck lanes are not currently planned because of boundary and financial issues, but listing it here this will acknowledge that it has been considered and may be doable in the future. The southbound truck lanes may end up in the East County Action Plan. East County was under the impression that all projects in their Action Plan needed to be funded, and the County had issues with putting it in because it is not funded.

Engelmann believed there may have been some miscommunication because Action Plan projects are a "wish list" and no funding is needed if there is a sponsor and cost.

Durant said there have been discussions at the Authority level on traffic impact fees. Traffic impact fees are not the only solution for getting roadway improvements that have regional impacts. Progress is being made in getting others to understand that there are other ways of attacking the same problem.

Pierce said that when Neustadter brought some of the numbers to the Planning Committee, many were surprised to learn of the difference in our commercial fees versus our residential fees and compared to their commercial fees. Central County is not building houses, it's building commercial, and whatever is being built is what has to be impacted.

Neustadter said there is a new Chapter 6 called Procedures for Notifications, Review and Monitoring which is also found in other Action Plans. This serves as a place to codify procedures that make the program work and to explain what is required. The description of how Concord intends to do its Average Stop Delay analysis; how to address MTSO exceedances; the schedule for the Action Plan review; and a statement about regional traffic management in Central County are included in this chapter.

Armstrong suggested that it would be helpful to any layperson who was reading this document to include a statement that outlines how cities use different measurements. Durant thought it would be useful to add such a statement on page 8 of Chapter 4.

ACTION: Motion was made to review the Action Plan, advise edits, authorize staff to make minor edits prior to production, approve the Action Plan for circulation and CCTA as well as TRANSPAC web posting. Bjerke/Bonilla/Pierce/Unanimous

5. 511 Contra Costa

511 Contra Costa staff provided brief updates on several of its green commuting programs and outreach efforts, including the 511 Contra Costa partnership delegation and transportation checklist offering as part of the Contra Costa Green Business Program; involvement with Climate Change Working Groups; graphics on the new reusable bags; a preview of the new and improved 511 Contra Costa website; and information about the bicycle commuter assistance program, including a CBS video of Matt Wood's experience on Bike to Work Day in 2007.

A video clip about the NBC Today Show's carpool group was shown to demonstrate changing commute habits. Dutra-Roberts commented that the entire staff of 511 Contra Costa had recently tried taking transit to work for one day to get to work.

Supervisor Bonilla suggested the possibility of considering programs through the school district for high school students who are on their way to college. It was noted that because of liability issues, a pilot program would need to include people over the age of 18. There is a Measure J line item for school transportation that could fund this kind of program. The partnership with DVC might also make it a good fit. Ross said these efforts are going in the right direction, and that increasing connectivity of trails and routes is key to making it work. Wood said that the League of American Bicyclists has been creating chapters for training different age groups and this could be reviewed as well.

ACTION: Presentation accepted with thanks to 511 Contra Costa staff for their continuing work.

6. 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. Planning Committee meeting

Member Durant reported that the Planning Committee approved geographic funding targets for the Lifeline Transportation Program; discussed Regional Transportation Mitigation programs; and plans to have a Growth Management Program Workshop at the November CCTA meeting. It's important for TRANSPAC and jurisdiction staff to be there.

b. Administration and Projects Committee meeting

Member Pierce reported that the Administration and Projects Committee received an update from financial advisors PFM on the status of investments. Also discussed was an update on the Caldecott Tunnel project status and budget, and it was noted that the Coalition's lawsuit is going to trial. The Authority voted to approve the Strategic Plan. Discussion on Policies for Implementing Measure J Projects was held over to November due to time constraints.

6A. BART Board President Gail Murray is scheduled to make a presentation at the November TRANSPAC meeting. At this meeting, Clayton Planning Commissioner Bob Armstrong would like to review TRANSPAC's views on the BART proposed commute period surcharge.

Neustadter said that Mr. Armstrong had contacted her to discuss reports of a possible commute period surcharge. BART President Murray was already scheduled to talk to the TRANSPAC Committee in November and this will be a timely topic for discussion. BART has been experiencing increased ridership, and one of the resulting issues is the need to consider congestion pricing and the possibility of a surcharge at peak commute hours. This is one of a number of items being reviewed by BART. There is a study underway with results expected next spring. Armstrong wanted to raise this issue with the Committee to determine its view about BART imposing such a surcharge, and suggested that a position should be taken after hearing from Ms. Murray.

Bjerke said it would be hard to take a stand until the study is available for review and before discussing the study with colleagues. Pierce believed that the BART study had been taken out of context and sensationalized by the media.

Heitman reported that this is one of several ideas that are being studied by BART. They are looking at which options should be modeled; however, no proposal is now before the BART board. BART has heard from the public on this issue and Director Murray will probably be able to comment on it next month. It would be helpful to think about ideas that will enable BART to deal with some of the capacity issues as well as to have the views of transportation officials.

Armstrong suggested that BART might also educate the public on the costs associated with increasing rush hour capacity, such as the cost for a car. Heitman will also recommend that Director Murray talk about the effects of the state budget. Overcashier wanted to hear about the impact on capacity and eBART, as well as an update on the status of eLockers. Durant said information can be gained from the experience of other areas' transit systems. It was requested that BART President Murray address the comments presented here.

ACTION: Reports received.

7. Reports from Staff and Committees - Accepted

a) See attached Notice extending the comment period for the Draft Proposal for Adoption of the Implementation Guide for Measure J to October 31, 2008.

b) Notice of Availability Draft Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Hearings for Rail Extension (eBART) from Pittsburg/Bay Point to Hillcrest Avenue

Neustadter distributed a handout of a letter from the County providing clarification to the Authority staff report about the Urban Limit Line (ULL) and General Plan Amendments in major developments. The staff report suggested that the proposal was to change the ULL or its administrative parameters, while its actual intent was to look at dealing with a GPA relative to its location inside or outside the existing ULL. Chair Durant added that the Planning Committee has worked on getting greater clarity with the document and progress is being made.

8. Correspondence/Copies/Newsclips/Information – Accepted

9. For the Good of the Order

To follow up on the Planning Committee report, Engelmann noted that there was a transfer of funds for \$1.2 million from East County to the Bike/Pedestrian overcrossing at Treat and Jones near the Pleasant Hill BART station. The initial cost of this project was \$4 million but has risen to \$12 million due to major issues with utilities and proximity to the existing building. The importance of this project was underscored in light of a recent accident involving a pedestrian being struck by a car at this intersection.

Other discussion involved the use of roundabouts in the Concord Naval Weapons Station projects, high speed trains and the economic bailout.

Neustadter announced that she would be unavailable from October 14-22 and that any questions should be directed to Lynn Overcashier during that time.

10. The meeting was adjourned at 10:53 a.m. The next TRANSPAC meeting is scheduled for November 13, 2008 at 9 a.m. in the Community Room, City Hall, City of Pleasant Hill unless otherwise determined.