

# TRANSPAC Transportation Partnership and Cooperation

Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek and Contra Costa County  
2300 Contra Costa Boulevard, Ste. 360 Pleasant Hill, CA 94523 (925) 969-0841 FAX (925) 969-9135

## TRANSPAC TAC MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

**THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 2013**

**9:00 A.M. to 11:00 A.M.**

**COMMUNITY ROOM**

**CITY OF PLEASANT HILL CITY HALL**

**100 GREGORY LANE**

**PLEASANT HILL**

**(925) 969-0841**

1. Discussion of TRANSPAC jurisdiction submission of grant applications for Cycle 2 SR2S funding. **Please bring a scope and proposed financial plan for any project your jurisdiction is planning to submit for this fund source.** Central County has \$899,900 to prioritize and allocate. So far, one TRANSPAC jurisdiction is planning to submit an application. CCTA will adopt a proposed SR2S list on July 17, and it is due to MTC by July 31, 2013. The federal funds must be obligated as of March 31, 2015.

The City of Pleasant Hill is proposing a SR2S project to install a sidewalk along Boyd Road with direction access to two schools (Sequoia Elementary School and Sequoia Middle School) and along Elinora Drive with access to Strandwood Elementary School. The total project cost is estimated at \$521,700, and the City has already secured \$180,000 in TDA Article 3 Grant Funding. The City still needs \$341,700 to fully fund the project. Because of the two sites, the project can be split based on the amount available. The City would prefer to keep the amount over \$300,000 to justify having to contend with the federal process. The project is tentatively scheduled for design in 2014 and construction in summer 2015.

511 Contra Costa has received no other TRANSPAC jurisdiction applications as of packet production.

It is expected that the TAC recommendation will proceed to TRANSPAC in May, prior to the CCTA's June 4 deadline. If any funds remain "unclaimed" by Central County jurisdictions, the Central County 511 Contra Costa TDM Program will submit an application to use any remaining funds to extend the Street Smarts Diablo Region bike/ped safety program to serve all Central County schools.

**Action:** Review applications, funding options and develop a recommendation for TRANSPAC consideration and/or as determined

2. **Continued Action Plan Discussion with Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill and Bill Loudon, DKS Associates** The TAC convened after the April 11, 2013 TRANSPAC meeting to continue its work on the Action Plan Update. The minutes of that meeting are attached for information.

**ACTION: As determined**

**Attachment:** Minutes of the TAC April 11, 2013 discussion on TRANSPAC Action Plan. The July 9, 2009 Action Plan may be viewed/downloaded from [www.transpac.us](http://www.transpac.us) under “Other Documents and Information.”

3. The next TAC meeting is scheduled for May 23, 2013 at 9:00 A.M. in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room unless otherwise determined. Discussion topics will include the CCTA Strategic Plan Update and the TRANSPAC Action Plan.

## ***TRANSPAC Technical Advisory Commission (TAC) Meeting Summary Minutes***

**MEETING DATE:** April 11, 2013

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Martin Engelmann, CCTA; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Corinne Dutra-Roberts, 511 Contra Costa; Tim Tucker, Martinez; and Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC;

**GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Deborah Dagang, CH2MHILL; Bill Loudon, DKS Associates

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:** Anita Tucci-Smith, Minute-Taker

The meeting was convened at 10:30 A.M at the conclusion of the TRANSPAC meeting

### **1. Continued Initial Action Plan Discussion with Deborah Dagang, CH2MHILL**

Deborah Dagang, CH2MHILL, opened the working session to an update of the Tenets, Goals, and Actions of the Action Plan as part of the update to the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP), to see if there were recommendations for revisions to Routes of Regional Significance (RORS), to Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs), and to identify coordination items with other Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs). She presented handouts to aid in the discussion. The first handout was the County Connection System Map, which could be included in a portion of the Action Plan; the second was a Summary of MTSOs for the TRANSPAC Subarea, which had been identified in the previous Action Plan for TRANSPAC to 2013 (current conditions).

Ms. Dagang identified the Action Plan tenets for 2009, which had been discussed at the previous TRANSPAC TAC meeting on March 28, 2013. The 2009 Action Plan Tenets were identified as follows:

- Support the planning for and management of the transportation system in coordination with other community interests
- Support the management of freeway corridors to facilitate regional travel and to encourage interregional travelers to use the freeways and transit network rather than local and arterial streets
- Support traffic management strategies for arterial Regional Routes, including use of signal timing to manage peak through-traffic volumes
- Support improved transit facilities and services to provide mobility choices and alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle
- Support 511 Contra Costa to reduce the number of single-occupant vehicles on the road network, increase transit ridership, and promote alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle

On the discussion of each tenet, TAC members offered the following comments:

- Cite additional alternatives to the use of a single-occupant vehicle, such as biking to work;
- Support and improve transit and all other non-transit alternative modes;
- Ensure the reduction of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gases (GHGs) consistent with the core mission of 511 Contra Costa;
- Support alternatives to single-occupant vehicles to improve mobility services;
- Consider use of the term “expand/expansion;”
- Consider whether or not to spell out the modalities;
- On the issue of ferries, particularly with respect to Richmond, Hercules, and Antioch, there was concern for the expectation a tenet or goal could imply and how quickly ferry service could actually be developed;
- As to a tenet for emergency management plans, given the number of plans in place there was a question of identifying what was available although it was noted that while most cities had emergency management plans, there was no coordinated emergency management plan.

After discussion, the TAC recommended the following changes and or rewrites to the Action Plan Tenets:

- Support the planning for and management of the transportation system in coordination with other community interests
- Support the **improvement and** management of freeway corridors to facilitate regional travel and to encourage interregional travelers to use the freeways and transit network rather than local and arterial streets
- Support traffic management strategies for arterial Regional Routes, including use of signal timing to manage peak through-traffic volumes
- **Support the enhancement and expansion of alternatives to single-occupant vehicles to improve mobility choices including transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities**
- **Support 511 Contra Costa’s mission to reduce mobile source greenhouse gas emissions**
- **Support the development and coordination of transportation-oriented Emergency Management Plans among local jurisdictions, regional agencies, and state agencies**

The Statement of Goals for 2009 was identified as follows:

- Encourage land use decisions that manage the increase of overall traffic demand
- Increase HOV lane usage
- Work to improve freeway flow
- Manage arterial traffic flow
- Support an efficient and effective transit system
- Increase participation in the 511 Contra Costa Program to improve multimodal mobility and decrease single-occupant vehicle use in Central County

On the discussion, Ms. Neustadter noted that jurisdictions had the opportunity to decide what transportation projects to approve and what not to approve, although Jeremy Lochirco noted that Caltrans had advised the City of Walnut Creek that any impact of any sort on the 680/4 I/C would require mitigation; he therefore questioned whether mitigation should be included in the goals.

Ms. Dagang suggested that traffic mitigation requirements could be addressed separately. She suggested that Central County was unique given the gaps in HOV lanes.

On the discussion of each goal, TAC members offered the following comments:

- Include Complete Streets;
- Referenced terms “manage,” “support,” and “use,” and the appropriateness of inclusion in the goals

The Goals were discussed, refined, and rearranged as follows:

- Encourage land use decisions that **addresses** the increase of overall traffic demand
- **Support an efficient and effective transit system**
- **Support use** of HOV lanes
- Work to improve freeway flow
- Manage arterial traffic flow
- **Support the implementation of Complete Streets**
- Increase participation in the 511 Contra Costa **TDM** Program
- **Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities**
- **Maintain existing transportation system and infrastructure**

For Routes of Regional significance, Ms. Dagang explained that RORS connected two or more regions, crossed county boundaries, carried a significant amount of through traffic, and provided access to a regional highway or major transit facility. She reported that RORS were being considered by other RTPCs such as Bailey Road, West Leland Road, and Olympic Boulevard. She identified other discussions of multimodal routes for the BART line, Iron Horse Trail, Canal Trail, and a regional trunk line route as shown in the Countywide Bike/Ped Plan. She also noted that Lamorinda was discussing intraregional routes.

Bill Loudon, DKS Associates, noted that Lamorinda was also looking at Mt. Diablo Boulevard and Tri-Valley and West County were looking more at function as to whether a RORS touched another region. He stated that along with Mt. Diablo Boulevard, Moraga Way, Moraga Road, St. Mary’s Road, and Olympic Boulevard were being evaluated as intraregional routes. As a subarea, they viewed it as a regional route carrying trips from one part of a region to another with a more local orientation and a neighborhood orientation. He added that Pleasant Hill Road was also being considered as an intraregional route.

Martin Engelmann referred to Lamorinda and commented that the region was realizing that the multiple jurisdictional planning process was not all that bad and making Moraga Road/Moraga Way RORS would bring in other concerns of subarea traffic on the routes that connected two or more cities.

Ms. Dagang noted that while those key routes might be RORS, there were others that did not connect but were intraregional routes.

Ms. Neustadter commented that cities had been engaged in collaborative studies and she was supportive of a regional level of cooperation. As to whether or not to identify additional routes, she noted that Bailey Road made sense given the new Priority Development Area (PDA) and the fact that Bailey Road was in the East County Action Plan.

Ms. Dagang asked if TRANSPAC was interested in designating Bailey Road as a RORS to open up a conversation between Concord and Pittsburg, which would apply to West Leland Road and Evola Road as well. In addition, since Lamorinda had requested Olympic Boulevard as a RRS, she verified that the TAC was also interested in discussions with Lamorinda.

Ray Kuzbari advised that he would discuss Bailey Road, West Leland Road, and Evora Road with the City of Pittsburg and report back to the TAC.

For Olympic Boulevard, John Cunningham referred to the Trail Connector Study which might heighten the implementation of that corridor as a regional route, and which would bear more discussion. With respect to trails, he recommended the use of the adopted Countywide Bike/Ped Plan as opposed to addressing individual facilities separately as an RTPC, and suggested incorporating that adopted plan into the Action Plan

Under the discussion of multimodal routes, Ms. Dagang noted that the BART line was a RORS.

In response to Corinne Dutra-Roberts as to whether the Carquinez Trail would help in terms of being a part of the intraregional multimodal network, Ms. Dagang added a note to look at the trunk line regional routes to see if there were other routes crossing.

With respect to the MTSOs, Ms. Dagang referred to the prior MTSOs and identified the goals and tenets that were multimodals, suggesting it was important to show the goals and examples of other MTSOs.

Mr. Loudon pointed out that there were no multimodal LOS measures other than the BART loading index. "Multimodal LOS Measures" was a new concept.

John Cunningham suggested a "Connectivity of the bicycle network" as an example of other MTSOs.

On the discussion, it was recommended that the following be eliminated as not applicable to TRANSPAC:

- Maintain School Bus
- On-Time Bus Performance

Mr. Loudon noted with respect to MTSOs that there were those that were goals for providing a facility or services where a goal was set for an overall plan; a goal for utilization like transit mode share which did not identify the quality of the service but could be a goal to achieve; and existing LOS, a function of both the facility types and what it produced in terms of quality of movement.

With respect to multimodal service measures, Mr. Loudon stated they were not flow related and other measures could be brought in but were more a service, so a bicycle included a traffic volume but not a flow for the mode in the calculation. He stated that a forecast increasing flow would not show up in the measure at all. There were measures that also brought in the volume on that facility but also the volume of pedestrian flow although that was not in the Highway Capacity Manual. He added there were others that could be used and referred to development service goals, utilization goals, and the true levels of service provided in the three types he had earlier mentioned.

Ray Kuzbari stated that from the perspective of the person who owned the bicycle, it was their perspective of the quality of service and safety.

Ms. Dagang noted the request to eliminate On-Time Bus Performance and referred back to the goal of supporting an efficient and effective transit system, explaining that on-time bus performance was one way of referring back to that goal. She emphasized the purpose of the goal to be other than what currently existed. As a result she recommended the retention of On-Time Bus Performance as a MTSO.

John Cunningham suggested that another MTSO could be headways in that the County had imposed a Transit Tax on certain developments to fund new transit service in perpetuity, providing ongoing funding for operations and capital investments.

Ms. Dagang clarified that the list was a compilation of all the RTPCs. She advised that she would send out the modified lists to TAC members prior to the next meeting. She asked Mr. Kuzbari to communicate with Pittsburg before that time and stated that the MTSOs and actions would be discussed at the next TAC meeting.

## **2. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:10 P.M. The next regular TAC meeting has been scheduled for April 25, 2013 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined.

TAC April 11 13 minutes revised BAN