

TRANSPAC Transportation Partnership and Cooperation

Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek and Contra Costa County
2300 Contra Costa Boulevard, Suite 110, Pleasant Hill, CA 94523 (925) 969-0841 FAX (925) 969-9135

AMENDED

TRANSPAC TAC MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 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. Continued Action Plan Development/Discussion. Presentation by Deborah Dagang from CH2MHill. Items to be discussed include:

- **Refine MTSO standards by location for arterials and freeways**
- **Identify MTSO standards for Bailey Road**
- **Decide on whether to include additional MTSOs**
- **Identify additional actions to include in the Action Plan (build upon 2009 actions)**

Additional handouts will be provided at the meeting to assist with the discussion which will include summaries of 2009 MTSOs as well as actions. If handouts are available before the meeting, they will be distributed electronically. It is anticipated that a draft Action Plan will be available for the October TAC meeting. The July 9, 2009 Action Plan may be viewed/downloaded from www.transpac.us under "Other Documents and Information."

Attachments: July 25, 2013 TAC meeting minutes (**electronic**). Updating the Central County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance handout (dated September 26, 2013) (**electronic**).

ACTION: As determined

2. Review/approval of the 2014/15 TRANSPAC/TRANSPLAN TDM Workplan and Estimated Budget. The 2014/15 workplan includes the Countywide Transit and Carpool programs, Street Smarts School programs, Electric Vehicle program, Community Outreach, and Employer Outreach, which will support employers with the implementation of SB 1339 which requires employers with >50 employees to provide pre tax benefits to employees. New program elements will also include a public agency Commute Assistance Program in support of Municipal Climate Action Plans and compliance with SB 1339; a pilot Carsharing program and research/determination of locations for a future Bike Sharing program.

Attachment: 2014/15 TRANSPAC/TRANSPLAN TDM Workplan and estimated Budget.

ACTION: Review and recommend approval to TRANSPAC

3. Briefing to explain that the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Terraces of Lafayette Development Project indicates there would be an exceedance of the MTSOs in the Lamorinda Action Plan that relate to the Delay Index on Pleasant Hill Road.

Attachment: Memo dated September 18, 2013 from Leah Greenblat, City of Lafayette.

ACTION: As determined

4. The next TAC meeting is scheduled for October 24, 2013 at 9:00 A.M. in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room unless otherwise determined.

TRANSPAC Technical Advisory Commission (TAC) Meeting Summary Minutes

MEETING DATE: July 25, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT: Laramie Bowron, County Connection; Corinne Dutra-Roberts, 511 Contra Costa; Steve Goetz, Contra Costa County; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; John McKenzie, Caltrans; Tim Tucker, Martinez; and Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager

GUESTS/PRESENTERS: Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill; Matt Kelly, Associate Transportation Planner, CCTA; Andrew Kluter, TJKM Consultant; Bill Loudon, DKS Associates

MINUTES PREPARED BY: Anita Tucci-Smith

The meeting was convened at 9:10 A.M. Self introduction followed.

1. Presentation on the County Connection Access Improvement Study with Laramie Bowron, Manager of Planning County Connection and TJKM Consultant Andrew Kluter

TRANSPAC Manager Barbara Neustadter introduced Andrew Kluter of TJKM to present the County Connection Access Improvement Study.

Andrew Kluter, TJKM, presented some initial results from the system-wide Access Improvement Study and reported that the TJKM team had been hired along with Transpo and Kott Planning Consultants to look at bus stops in the County Connection's system and to identify the top 50 stops to be designated for improvements. He presented handouts to identify the new ranking and all of the stops ranked by jurisdiction and by an improvement score.

Mr. Kluter highlighted the general concerns of access to bus stops in the system, identified some of the types of improvements to be considered for the project, explained that the top 50 rankings had been identified and distributed, and asked for input on the list that had been developed. He explained that the improvements would be funded by a Caltrans grant with a requirement to look at fixed-route bus stops throughout the system and consider bicycle and pedestrian access improvements, focusing on areas of high ridership, low income, and high density where there was a potential for increasing ridership; addressing disabled rider access such as wheelchair access, gaps in, and lack of sidewalks particularly in older neighborhoods, and discontinuous pathways that create a barrier to wheelchairs; and considering opportunities for improvements at the stops with benches, shelters, lighting, seating, and the potential for bicycle parking. Some improvements would also include crossing signals, cross walks, solar shelters to improve on energy consumption at bus stops, and the like.

Mr. Kluter reported that system ridership had been evaluated, pedestrian access had been documented through Geographic Information Systems (GIS) analysis, and available amenities and household and socio-economic data had been considered to identify types of access, with particular attention to pedestrians and bicyclists. That analysis had created a priority ranking with input from County Connection staff, constituents, and riders which included customers, drivers, city staff, and district staff familiarity with stops and locations of routing in terms of how people are able to get to the stop. A statistical analysis had been produced to identify how people were getting to the stop and reasons for low ridership such as considering directness of the route to the stop, whether there were barriers or walls separating that commercial area from residential areas prohibiting a direct path, a safety index based on collision history, housing density, and access improvements. The list had been sent to County Connection staff to see what the drivers and schedulers were hearing about the stops; all factors had been weighted and a composite score had been identified as shown in the handouts.

Mr. Kluter presented the location of stops, noted that this had been the first cut of primary stops ranking the top 50, and explained that the majority of the top 50 were located in the TRANSPAC area in the north part of the system in Martinez, with a number of stops in the Concord area, and with fewer stops in Walnut Creek in general although more of those locations were low in ridership in higher income areas and fewer made the cut in that case. He asked the TAC if they were hitting the mark with the rankings and whether there were any stops that were not really problem areas that could be replaced with other problem areas. Given that the list had been handed out today he stated that comments could be submitted in the next couple of weeks. He reported on feedback from the Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) and expected further feedback from operators in the system headquarters. Staff would incorporate that information and make a final decision so that the list could be refined and the design work could start with field investigation of the top 50 stops, to identify conceptual improvements to create a grand application for the next round of funding.

Tim Tucker stated that the City of Martinez had been working with Mr. Bowron on bus stops in Martinez, and browsing the list he noted that some of the bus stops in Martinez had been ranked but were not on the list. He referred to the area of a specific stop where there was a 95 percent design with bidding in September, and expressed a desire to add additional stops. He asked if there was additional funding to improve the stops.

Ms. Neustadter reported that she knew of no available funding.

Laramie Bowron emphasized the goal of having a strong application should funding become available and be able to coordinate with the TAC on a list of projects that would be good for cyclists and good for transit. He sought support in the application process.

Ms. Neustadter agreed and suggested that a list should be created and be ready to go and potentially be considered for possible Measure J funding.

Mr. Kluter noted that if there were some projects in process, these should be identified so that the list could be adjusted accordingly.

When asked, Mr. Kluter explained how the composite score had been developed considering all the demographic, GIS, and statistical factors that Transpo had gathered along with the additional feedback which had been reflected in the improvement score, which had a mathematical basis. Because some of the top 50 did not have a lot of ridership potential, the additional score had been added to the improvement score to take into account the low ridership condition which allowed other stops to ride to the top. He added that the score also took into account safety concerns, such as sidewalk gaps and safety crossings.

Steve Goetz asked how the improvement score had been determined and if there was anything that described what had been proposed at each location, to which Mr. Bowron noted that would be done after the top 50 had been selected when the need would be identified after physical review of the locations and what was needed to make them safer, improved locations.

Ray Kuzbari asked if bus shelters had been included. He noted that sometimes the bus shelter was the problem, and suggested that might be the overriding reason to include it on the list, and Mr. Kluter stated that those would be the type of improvements considered, not necessarily included in the score, but would be an improvement to consider.

In response to John McKenzie whether consideration would be to the routes themselves, Mr. Kluter explained that the high-rider locations served by other routes would be part of the model, and generally speaking locations had been screened out where the amenities were already good, such as at BART transfer areas.

Mr. Bowron explained that was why San Ramon and Walnut Creek stops had not been included because they were in better condition.

Jeremy Lochirco asked if the jurisdiction would know about the top 50 improvements in that a jurisdiction could apply for its own grant monies to provide for those improvements, to which Mr. Bowron stated there was nothing to stop a jurisdiction from doing that although the goal was to create a grand application so that when funds were being sought the information would be available.

Mr. Lochirco noted that Walnut Creek had six locations out of the 100 on one of the lists and generally appeared to be doing well although he suggested there could be bus stops on roadways where future development had been proposed and where there may be opportunity to require a developer or someone else to make the improvements. He emphasized the need to know the kind of improvements proposed and asked if there had been any on-site analysis or if the top 50 list would identify the location, identify each proposed improvement, and provide an estimated cost.

Mr. Bowron stated that for the top 50, TJKM would identify the work to be done and identify the costs. He added that there were a hundred different factors that impacted the score of the stops and he asked the type of information desired.

Mr. Tucker suggested that minimum standards had to be identified so that the jurisdictions could see the types of improvements required.

Mr. Tucker recommended that a spreadsheet be developed to identify the potential improvements and explained that in Martinez, for instance, there was a dirt area between the sidewalk and the curb and it would take little effort to improve. He emphasized that each bus stop was different.

Mr. Kluter explained that the staff report had included a methodology as to how the score had been determined and the weighting of each variable including pedestrian crashes near bus stops and demographic information, a composite of those factors, in addition to the input from the transit district scheduler and rider experience. He explained that there were over 1,600 stops in the system and the attempt was to identify the worst ones and then identify the improvements to be made.

Mr. Lochirco recommended targeting the high-ride locations to be able to target the critical mass as opposed to targeting one rider, suggested the ons/offers column on the list be a weighted criteria because that would weigh significantly when it affected a higher number of people, and wanted to target improvements for the stops that would affect the most people.

Mr. McKenzie suggested that the criteria could be weighted with a mean score of all the stops to identify a baseline and then look at growth potential. He asked if there was a median improvement score, to which Mr. Kluter stated that could be determined.

Ms. Neustadter recommended identifying the stops with the biggest ridership number first and then figuring out a way to get a list by jurisdiction of the stops, and then secure funding to get those fixed and work down to places where the ridership had not picked up yet but might have improved. She agreed with the need to maximize the effort to address the highest ridership areas to keep those riders and determine if riders would remain in the long term.

Mr. Lochirco expressed concern with a change to a service level or route; he did not want to expend a lot of money on a stop that could potentially be vacated in the near term. He suggested that the improvements should also look at capacity, verified that the information related to daily average, and suggested that who was using each stop and the capacity of each stop had to be determined.

Mr. Bowron noted that the composite score had taken into account the near-term planning effort and while there was no formula the scenario focused on increased ridership; he agreed with the need to make that a priority.

Mr. Kuzbari commented that Concord had a number of bus stops included in the top 100 list and he wanted to know the complaints from the public that had not been reflected in the information provided. He appreciated the analytical work but noted that ultimately the process would have to work with the jurisdictions to make the improvements and he wanted to know about the complaints, and Mr. Kluter stated that the improvement score included weighting from rider input which would fuel the types of improvements to consider.

Corinne Dutra-Roberts asked if the goal was to increase ridership, and if so, something should be factored into the score that there was intent to improve a low-rider site; she questioned whether school stops had been included and she asked if there had been a focus on school trips.

Mr. Bowron advised that school sites had been omitted.

Ms. Neustadter suggested there was an opportunity to consider a list of sites and if there was a minor improvement needed there could be coordination with a jurisdiction that could provide the necessary improvements and then drop the site from the list.

Mr. Lochirco agreed that cooperation would be required and that small improvements could be addressed separately and easily. He referred to a situation where cooperation with a developer had addressed the need and he suggested that more information would be very helpful to the jurisdiction in that regard. He suggested that some locations might require the relocation of a bus stop altogether.

Mr. Bowron suggested that the GIS data could be made available on the website at the end of the project to make all the back end data available to the public.

Mr. Goetz advised that he would have to provide comments later given that the County Public Works Department handled modifications in the public right-of-way. He too expressed the need for additional information to better identify the scoring and the proposed improvements and asked for a colored version of the file in PDF format.

Mr. Kluter stated that there was a spreadsheet that had weighted the factors, which information could be shared, and he agreed that some refinement could be made to the ridership portion of the proposal. In response to Mr. Goetz, he explained that the final score had been based on improvements for those locations with higher density and lower income, and with high ridership there was opportunity to strengthen the ridership, recommending more outreach in those areas to increase ridership. He added that those areas had not been placed in the top 50 because those stops had already been determined to have adequate access.

Eric Hu referred to the prioritizing criteria and asked if regional destinations had been considered given that the highest ridership was near downtown Walnut Creek and Diablo Valley College (DVC), and most of the stops did not have a high ridership score. He referred to the bus stops at DVC which did not have shelters or benches in some cases and which did not score well even though the on/off riders were in the hundreds where one bench or shelter would be insufficient. He suggested there was a reason why certain bus stops had such a high ridership and even though it might meet certain criteria there were always enhancements that could increase ridership, which he suggested would not show up on the list. He recommended that the rankings mirror what the program was looking for.

Mr. Kluter stated that part of the project was to address low-income communities where there was ridership potential while balancing that with ridership; the list was the first cut to identify the top priorities.

Ms. Neustadter suggested there could be a variety of priorities in terms of providing information that would be useful in the grant context along with a County Connection list of priorities in its own context, and that each jurisdiction could make its own determination as to what project it wanted to see first.

Mr. Hu recommended that the number of riders needed to be more heavily weighted and based on that looking at the top 50 sites and the specific improvements that would be needed at those locations.

Ms. Neustadter asked whether the TAC wanted to reconsider the item over the summer and consider it again in September to craft a list for each jurisdiction given that there might also be projects on the list where the jurisdictions were running pavement and could address the improvements now rather than later.

Mr. Kuzbari requested more information on the scoring approach.

Mr. Lochirco asked if there was a point where the scoring was negligible and commented that jurisdictions might question what County Connection knew that the jurisdiction didn't know because of the scoring; he asked if there was a point where some of the lower scoring stops would not require a lot of time because they were pretty good.

Mr. Kluter agreed that the focus would only be on the top 50.

In response to Mr. Goetz as to whether or not the list had been developed without site visits, Mr. Kluter stated that the list had been based on physical information, on the GIS database, and on the street files in terms of connections. Viewing aerial photographs and work in the field would be pursued as part of the design. He reiterated that this was the first cut in an initial screening process. As to when the detailed information would be available, he stated that would include a re-evaluation of the scoring in terms of the ridership factor, and while similar ridership had the same weight of the other factors, he acknowledged the TAC's desire that ridership be considered with greater emphasis, and he would identify how the scores had been achieved.

Mr. Tucker stated that ADA was also important and he wanted to see which stops were not ADA accessible, which in his opinion would affect priority given exposure to ADA liability.

Ms. Neustadter asked how many stops were not ADA accessible, and when Mr. Kluter stated that information was not available at this point, she expressed a desire to be provided that information at some point. She reiterated that the item would be discussed again in the fall.

2. Review/Discussion of the Administrative Draft of the 2013 Congestion Management Program (CMP) by Matt Kelly, CCTA Associate Transportation Planner

Matt Kelly, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Associate Transportation Planner, stated that the CMP had been established by State legislation in 1991 and this would be the CCTA's eleventh update of the CMP, required to be updated every two years and last updated in 2011. This update focused primarily on updating elements that needed updating since the 2011 CMP and the seven-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) project listing that went along with the CMP as one of its primary required components.

Mr. Kelly stated that the CCTA had established its Growth Management Program (GMP) several years ago and most of the required elements of the CMP had been incorporated into the GMP. He characterized the CMP as more of an exercise documenting the CCTA's positions, policies, and performance measures. He highlighted the components of the CMP and stated that one of the main requirements was the monitoring of the CMP network established in 1991 and that had not been changed since there were requirements to maintain level of service (LOS) which was required under the Action Plans; explained that every two years the system was monitored which included state highways and Routes of Regional Significance (RORS); and 70 intersections had been monitored in April and May with a report brought to the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) on the CMP monitoring results which compared the 2013 CMP with the 2011 CMP monitoring results. One of the elements is a performance element documenting performance measures used by the CCTA and the transit agencies (using their mission statements, frequency, density and the like) for Central County, which along with the CIP, was a primary focus of the update culled from the Comprehensive Transportation Project Listing (CTPL) that included 1,200 projects, or \$30 billion in projects. The CIP included \$10 billion in projects.

Mr. Kelly reported that the CTPL had been opened for updating, 200 new projects from 14 different sponsors had been received, and old projects had been edited. He explained that only 14 out of the 20 plus project sponsors updated projects and he encouraged the TAC to review the CTPL and update projects with needed updated cost information and updated estimated completion dates, emphasizing the importance of project status. He noted there were hundreds of projects that had been completed but had not been updated, which ended up in the CIP when they had actually been completed. Given that state and federal funds needed to be in the CIP, it was very important to have a clean CIP for projects. He urged members to review the project listing, which was available on the website or the CTPL website, to make sure they were up-to-date, with jurisdictions to add new projects.

Mr. Kelly stated that jurisdictions were also required to have a land use transportation evaluation program to evaluate land use impacts on the transportation system, document the GMP program that addresses impacts due to development, and maintain a travel demand model and document the update of the model in the CMP. In addition, a model consistency document had to be prepared, to be submitted to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to document consistency with the MTC regional model, its assumptions, and to document consistency with the current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The CMP would be updated during this period to reflect the currently adopted RTP Plan Bay Area.

Mr. Kelly clarified that the primary focus was to get the CIP up-to-date and funding is an issue; he did not want to lose out on funding. When asked, he advised that the CMP is out for comment and the CTPL project database would be open until September 20, 2013, when comments would have to be incorporated and submitted to MTC in October.

Mr. Lochirco expressed his understanding that the reopened CMP is for updates only and no additional projects could be added, to which Mr. Kelly stated that there was no limitation and projects could be added even if no new project was being put into the CIP. He urged jurisdictions to fill out each field with best estimates in the database and stated he would request more information, if needed.

Ms. Neustadter thanked Mr. Kelly for his presentation.

3. Continued Action Plan Development/Discussion. Plan Completion is Anticipated Near the End of Calendar 2013

Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill, referred to the Action Plan status presentation at the July 11, 2013 TRANSPAC Board meeting and stated that Bill Loudon would present the monitoring results from the 2009 Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs). She noted that the presentation to the Board had highlighted the tenets, goals, and RORS and the Board had generally agreed, although interest was expressed in potentially changing the order of the Action Plan tenets. The Board had also been interested in seeing the monitoring results. She identified the revised Action Plan schedule and reported that the MTSO monitoring would be submitted to the TRANSPAC Board in September, with the overall target of submitting the Draft Action Plan to the TAC in November, although it was noted that the TAC did not meet in November. She expressed concern to be able to finalize the Action Plan by December.

Ms. Neustadter explained that November meetings had been moved to the third week of the month in the past although the review could be done electronically, if needed.

Bill Loudon, DKS Associates, presented the monitoring results for 2013 to 2040 forecasts and the MTSOs for freeways that included the delay index and average speed. He spoke to segmentation and how that was defined and whether that should be broken up and evaluated over smaller segments, which could be the same as arterials as well which had segment speed, intersection signal cycle delay, and a large number of the intersections for which a V/C ratio was the measure. He presented new information on forecast, which started with the average values for the freeways in the corridor. As background, he reported that material had been presented at the CTP Task Force meeting, and some diagrams offered more summaries of forecast information both for population and employment forecasts for different areas. He reported that between 2010 and 2040, Central County expected a 20 percent increase in households and a 35 percent increase in jobs which compared to 30/45 percent for the County and 45/90 percent for East County. In the PM peak in both directions, that captured SR4 and parallel facilities across Central County, a growth of 63 percent in the PM peak period travel was expected which is higher than either growth forecast; the same at the far edge of SR4 of 66 percent and across I-680 and SR242 where there would be a growth of about 42 percent. He offered that information to give some context to how the growth numbers had come about noting that in most reviews for the five areas, the 2040 forecast was not all that different than the 2030 forecast had been from the last Action Plan.

Mr. Kuzbari commented that the numbers suggested reverse commute for SR242 probably because of the Concord Naval Weapons Station (CNWS) Project.

Mr. Kelly explained that a lot of traffic on Highway 4 in the reverse commute could be due to the CNWS but could also be due to a lot of jobs in East County. With the improved SR4 Bypass, the CCTA was seeing a lot of eastbound AM traffic out Highway 4 and continuing on the Bypass presumably to Livermore, as opposed to taking I-680 south and then to I-580.

A select link analysis had not been prepared although there was a lot of eastbound traffic on Highway 4 and a lot of southbound traffic on the Bypass.

Mr. Goetz noted the suggestion that with widening Vasco Road there would be less traffic on I-680 and I-580. Although Mr. Kuzbari suggested that wouldn't help given the congestion on I-680; he recognized that Highway 4 was getting critical growth in 2040.

Mr. Lochirco asked if the percentage of growth for SR4 would be more heavily traveled into West County, to which Mr. Kuzbari commented that some of those trips originated in Solano County, although he pointed out that the 7 percent projection at SR242 ballooned to 48 percent at SR4.

When asked what improvements had been assumed in the 2040 forecast, Mr. Kelly referenced improvements to the I-680/SR4 Interchange and High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, although he explained that the model did not address High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes.

Mr. Kuzbari confirmed with Mr. Kelly that the newly identified improvements of the Integrated Corridor Analysis for Highway 4 had also not been included.

Mr. Goetz referred to segmentation and asked if segments could be provided for the growth, to which Mr. Loudon stated that detail could be sent out and that the HOV information could also be provided.

Mr. Loudon identified some fairly high numbers for the RORS in terms of growth, up 100 percent on Geary Road with others in the 50 and 60 percent growth range. At 159 percent growth on Main Street and 127 percent growth on Pacheco Boulevard, he offered background to lead into the numbers for forecast values and a few more MTSOs that had not been available for the prior Action Plan. He stated that the four intersections for which there is a LOS MTSO with a target value of F, at or under now and in the future, showed that there was concern in that by 2040 there would be a LOS F during at least the PM period for all of them. When asked why just the secondary streets had been identified, he stated that those were the intersections identified for that MTSO value and only four intersections; Treat Boulevard at North Main Street, Treat Boulevard at Bancroft Road, Ygnacio Valley Road at Civic Drive, and Ygnacio Valley Road at Bancroft Road for which LOS was an MTSO, which had been expressed in V/C evaluation in addition to the MTSO LOS for those four, as defined in the 2009 Action Plan.

Ms. Dagang stated that those were the standards identified in 2009 and the question would be whether there was any change in how the standards had been addressed or applied.

Mr. Kuzbari explained that Concord used a methodology of how many cycles it would take to clear the intersection for the movements along the RORS and Concord intended to keep it that way, such as for Clayton Road, Treat Boulevard, and Ygnacio Valley Road.

Mr. Loudon referred to the 2040 forecast looking at both optimized signals and unoptimized signal settings, which did not make a lot of difference at the oversaturated levels where many were over 1.1 ratio and there would be a lot more LOS F's in the future.

When asked to clarify optimized and unoptimized, Mr. Loudon explained there were options to let synchro optimize the setting to reduce the delay, only done at individual intersections, and when asked why if optimized the delay had increased at some intersections, he explained that was probably optimized at delay and not the V/C ratio.

Mr. Loudon spoke to the freeway analysis and noted the 2013 values had previously been presented and were under the delay index, but the delay index for SR4 was 5.0, where observed or congested conditions would be less than 5 times the travel time on uncongested conditions, and a speed value on MTSOs of 13, which corresponded to the delay index; different ways to measure. There had been some increases in the forecast but not only did they not get anywhere near 5.0 but for the whole segment of SR4 in Central County would not get to what the other Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) used, a value of 2.0. He suggested it would be nice to evaluate that information by segment and he would provide some segment information and how that would differ.

Mr. Goetz verified it was just the delay for the mixed flow lanes.

Mr. Loudon stated that the I-680 delay index was 4.0 and the speed was 60, and the values both now and in the future hovered around 1.5; not particularly high values for the corridor as a whole. On SR242, the delay index was 3.0 and the MTSO speed was 22 and most of the delay index values hovered about 1.4 or 1.5 except southbound in the AM where there was a value of 2.3, which was the highest value of any in 2040, and the biggest change from any baseline from 1.4 to 2.3. When looking at segments on SR4 and I-680, he stated there were clearly bottleneck points and high values.

Mr. Goetz referred to SR242 PM peak hour comparing observed to forecast, southbound direction, and noted the southbound direction in the PM would be worse than the northbound direction, which was affirmed by 2040 by Mr. Loudon, and which Mr. Kuzbari suggested was when the reverse commute would come into play. Mr. Goetz wanted to understand the logic that what currently existed would be reversed in the future, although Mr. Loudon stated that even now the speed in the southbound PM was lower than the northbound, and Mr. Kuzbari agreed that it was odd for "observed," suggesting there was some congestion at I-680 but the rest was free flowing. Mr. Loudon would check that out.

Mr. Loudon reported that there were other roadway segments for which the MTSO was 15 MPH except on Contra Costa Boulevard where it was set at 10 MPH in the PM, and where almost all forecast speeds were above 25 MPH, except Contra Costa Boulevard where observed speeds were around 20 MPH and the PM southbound at 18 MPH; in the future three out of the four would be below 20 MPH.

Mr. Goetz suggested there was little change on Pacheco Boulevard although he referred to a forecasted 200 percent growth northbound, to which Mr. Kelly explained that the network showed a widening of Pacheco to four lanes, which should be done by 2040. Mr. Goetz asked for a list of improvements to help explain the information.

Mr. Tucker verified Pacheco Road improvements in two segments; one to I-680, and parallel to I-680, which were different, and for which Mr. Kelly affirmed that speed had not been evaluated in terms of the model.

Mr. Loudon referred to SR242, showed the detail by segment, identified the MTSO value showing both speed and delay index, and explained that even though it had one of the highest values in the forecast, the delay index in the northbound PM had a value of 2.0 and did not ever get particularly bad relative to the others. He advised that he would make that detail available. On SR4, he stated that the eastbound hot spots were between Pacheco Boulevard and Port Chicago Highway in the PM eastbound at 1.9 at Pacheco Boulevard, which was the greatest one. On I-680 the real story of bottleneck was in the northbound both AM and PM between North Main and South Main Streets with (observed) heavy congestion with values as high as 7.2, although with lots of 3.0s, 4.0s, and 5.0s.

Ms. Dagang explained that the prior Action Plan had not defined how to apply delay indexes and this brought up the fact that it was difficult to use the delay index on actual segments, and for this Action Plan to identify the delay index for the entire freeway or for specific segments. She noted that looking at the entire corridor it was so far away from the delay index that it was not a practical tool.

Mr. Goetz sought something that was more meaningful and questioned whether the information being presented was meaningful. His understanding of the purpose of Action Plans was to evaluate the growth on the regional system and if this was not a meaningful way to do it he asked how Caltrans would want the impact of growth to be identified on the I-680 freeway, by segment, and if it would care about the delay index or if it would want vehicle speeds or some other kind of evaluation.

Mr. Kuzbari stated that when the traffic study for the CNWS had been prepared the City of Concord had looked at MTSOs and V/C ratios between interchanges given that was Caltrans' expectation. Concord had done it segment by segment, and he suggested that both should be utilized.

Mr. Goetz was not married to MTSOs and questioned the need for both. He sought something suitable for the purpose of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) evaluation, although Ms. Dagang did not know that the Action Plan and MTSOs were being tied to CEQA.

Mr. Goetz referred to the 2010 Growth Management implementation documents and how MTSOs had been used. For traffic impact analyses, he explained that the sponsoring jurisdiction would conduct a transportation analysis for CEQA review using thresholds related to MTSOs and the Action Plan, although Ms. Dagang stated that had been included but was not comprehensive, and while that could be done it would need to be clarified if adding MTSOs for freeways. She added that CEQA included MTSOs but not the other way around.

Mr. Kuzbari referred to the 2010 conversations and had looked to the MTSOs as part of the traffic studies which did not preclude the conventional V/C analysis for freeway segments.

Mr. McKenzie referenced the 2009 discussions related to MTSOs because the MTSOs would be used for downstream traffic analysis for CEQA and if there was a desire to get more complex it would be something to take further down each segment, interchange to interchange, change in facility, change in volume, or V/C change, which would give a better idea of jurisdiction to jurisdiction CEQA analyses.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that would not replace the V/C analysis which was more intuitive, more apparent, easier to discuss with Caltrans, and easier to discern.

Mr. Loudon stated that MTSOs were important for planning and for development to review. He stated it could always be measured over the whole segment and could be used at the planning level and still not require developments to be evaluated at that more specific level.

Mr. McKenzie stated that what he had described had already been done to some degree regarding planning analyses by Caltrans for the transportation corridor; a 25-year planning forecast which included a V/C ratio, which data existed and had been done for SR242 as a corridor plan, was being done for I-680 as a CSMP, and had been done for SR4 as a CSMP, and that some TAC members had participated in that process. If taking that kind of planning approach, he stated that information was on the Caltrans district website for district planning and for which some construct could be built.

Ms. Neustadter stated that in 2009 the then TRANSPAC TAC had been adamant about having MTSOs that were achievable, which was why it had taken so long and when a working relationship had been established with the TRANSPLAN TAC, which had ultimately been concerned with not meeting the MTSOs and misleading the public because they could not be achieved. She is leery of tying to the protocols of the State of California because from her perspective the State's approach could be changed.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested it be left to the sponsor agency doing the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) given impacts on the freeway system. He suggested it would be up to the jurisdiction and up to the TAC to determine the significance of criteria, and if Caltrans reviewed the EIR and was not happy with it Caltrans would so advise the jurisdiction.

Mr. Goetz questioned the need for another measure for EIRs given that it would not be submitted to Caltrans in that Caltrans would not accept an MTSO analysis for the purpose of volumes on its freeway and would use the V/C analysis. He wanted something simple that the public could understand.

Ms. Dagang explained that if a standard was set it would be part of the environmental analysis. She was concerned about determining all the measures that Caltrans wanted and including those as MTSOs, suggesting that the delay index was useful, and it was the value of the delay index to ensure that it was achievable and could be used to evaluate development.

Mr. Kuzbari stated that everyone knew where the pinch points were when looking at the impacts on the MTSOs and knowing that 5.0 is the upper limit and where the improvements would have to occur. He suggested that was useful information.

Mr. Loudon stated with respect to the development review comment that Martin Engelmann had pointed out at a meeting that the Measure J language related to Action Plans and MTSOs had to evaluate new development with respect to MTSOs on RORS only for a General Plan Amendment or a development that was not consistent with the General Plan. Any development consistent with the General Plan at the time the Action Plan was developed did not require that review.

While he understood the argument, Mr. Kuzbari disagreed and stated that an analysis was required if a project exceeded 500 trips or more than 50 trips on a RORS. He suggested that it should be left to the jurisdiction to decide and did not think it was a big deal.

Mr. Goetz supported the ability for each jurisdiction to do what it wanted to do. Regarding the freeways, he suggested the MTSO make it easy to calculate; for I-680 the whole segment the average for the freeway, for SR242, and for SR4, and using that for the environmental documents and then analyze the impact of a development and what would need to be done to mitigate those impacts.

Mr. Dagang stated that had not been stated explicitly in the Action Plan, which she would do, and for the values for each of those roadways to make sure they were talking about the entire segment.

On the question of looking at pinch points, Mr. Kuzbari suggested looking at the whole segment and basing the value on the pinch point, which had been done in 2009 and which was what he wanted to continue to do. He recommended leaving the values alone for now and discussing it further if there was time to do so.

Ms. Dagang acknowledged the desire for calculations or reporting for the entire segment.

Ms. Neustadter cautioned that there were other entities making investment decisions that could impact the Action Plan. When asked to clarify, she explained the TAC was relying on an agency or agencies making their own set of decisions on their own freeway network, and while the TAC would be consulted, the state would do what it wanted to do regardless of the MTSOs established.

Mr. Goetz noted that most projects in Contra Costa County were funded by the CCTA, although Ms. Neustadter commented that could change in the future. He was not seeing a direct relationship between the information and how the actions would result in a better future although Ms. Dagang suggested that the actions could show how the MTSOs had improved.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that if looking at all the improvements combined the index could be reduced to below 2.0, which were the actions and which could be shown to the public.

Ms. Dagang stated that the next set of columns would be the forecasts with the actions.

In the interest of time and with no meeting in August, Ms. Dagang stated that the actions would have to be finalized in September given no November meeting. She urged everyone to go back to the Action Plan, consider actions to be forwarded to Ms. Neustadter in the interim, and stated that MTSO results would go to the TRANSPAC Board in September. She asked if it made sense to show the TRANSPAC Board more detail or remain with what was in the packet at a higher level.

Ms. Neustadter suggested more detail and stated that information could always be submitted electronically, which could be done without violating any laws.

Ms. Dagang stated she would craft a list of actions and urged members to think about actions; a wish list not financially constrained.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that the MTSO values that had been questioned be addressed and asked to be able to review the information one more time to verify the information was the best available.

Ms. Dagang stated that would be done even if the numbers did not change. When asked, she explained that everything in the 2009 Action Plan had not been included in the current draft because it was not funded. She urged thinking about things that were a higher priority.

Mr. Kuzbari verified that the CCTA would take the actions identified and include them in the EIR for the CTP, which Mr. Kelly stated would happen before the end of the Action Plan.

Mr. Goetz wanted to know that before putting the Action Plan together.

Mr. Kelly stated that the new actions were needed and Ms. Dagang noted that circumstances had changed in the last four years and it was her understanding that the plans for the CNWS were in the early enough process and represented one example of something that was not in the Action Plan that would need to be added.

Mr. Kuzbari emphasized that the model needed to be sensitive to capacity improvements and if not very sensitive the CCTA would need more time to work on the model

Ms. Dagang reported that the information would be sent out electronically.

4. Budget Internal Processing Update and Thoughts on Issues that Need to be Addressed Over the Summer Break and/or in the Fall

Ms. Neustadter referred to Line 20a funds and reminded the TAC that the two grantees; Rehabilitation Services of Northern California, and the Golden Rain Foundation would be returning in September. In order to allocate the money quickly, she recommended that just the coops be updated. She also recommended a discussion of multi-year contracts to save time and money and suggested an allocation for three or four years.

TAC members present were very supportive of that recommendation.

5. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 A.M. The next meeting of the TAC is scheduled for September 26, 2013 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined.



UPDATING THE CENTRAL COUNTY ACTION PLAN FOR ROUTES OF REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

Discussion with the
TRANSPAC TAC

Facilitated By:
Deborah Dagang



In Association With:
DKS Associates
Fehr & Peers
Dyett & Bhatia
Eisen | Letunic

September 26, 2013

Agenda

- ▶ Updated Action Plan Schedule
- ▶ Refine 2009 MTSOs
- ▶ Identify additional MTSOs
- ▶ Begin Identifying Actions
- ▶ Next Steps

Updated Action Plan Schedule

- ▶ RTPC Approval of Draft Action Plan - January 2014
 - ▶ Present MTSO monitoring :TRANSPAC Board – October 2013
 - ▶ Draft Action Plan:TRANSPAC TAC Recommendation - November 2013
 - ▶ Draft Action Plan:TRANSPAC Board Approval – December 2013
- ▶ Countywide Transportation Plan – October 2014
- ▶ Final RTPC Adoption of Action Plans – December 2014

Refine MTSO Standards

- ▶ 2040 Forecasts are consistently below MTSO standard, other than some intersection LOS
- ▶ Should MTSO standards be revised to better reflect benefits of included actions
- ▶ Develop MTSOs for Bailey Road

Additional MTSOs To Consider

- ▶ HOV Lane Usage
- ▶ Transit Mode Share
- ▶ Transit Ridership
- ▶ Multimodal LOS Measures
- ▶ Total bike facility mileage on or connecting to RORS
 - ▶ Class 1 and 2, possibly Class 3
- ▶ Inverse of Average Vehicle Ridership
 - ▶ Vehicles per 100 travelers

Review Actions from 2009 Action Plan

- ▶ Identify completed actions
- ▶ Any 2009 Action Plan actions to be removed?

Identify Additional Actions

- ▶ Not financially constrained
- ▶ Actions not included in the 2009 Action Plan
- ▶ Can reflect changed circumstances
 - ▶ Development at Concord Naval Weapons Station

Next Steps

- ▶ Finalize MTSOs
- ▶ Continue to Identify Actions
- ▶ Begin Drafting Action Plan Update

Bullpen Slides – MTSO Forecast Data



Forecasts for Routes of Regional Significance

2013-2040 Average Forecasted Growth: Freeways

Route of Regional Significance	AM Peak Hour % Growth	PM Peak Hour % Growth
I-680	NB	16%
	SB	25%
SR-242	NB	7%
	SB	30%
SR-4	EB	48%
	WB	41%

Forecasts for Routes of Regional Significance

2013-2040 Average Forecasted Growth: Arterials

Route of Regional Significance		AM Peak Hour % Growth	PM Peak Hour % Growth
Alhambra Ave	NB	64%	29%
	SB	22%	18%
Clayton Rd	EB	60%	33%
	WB	19%	59%
Contra Costa Blvd	NB	27%	8%
	SB	25%	12%
Geary Rd	EB	50%	101%
	WB	34%	30%
Kirker Pass Rd	EB	69%	33%
	WB	56%	70%

Forecasts for Routes of Regional Significance

2013-2040 Average Forecasted Growth: Arterials

Route of Regional Significance		AM Peak Hour % Growth	PM Peak Hour % Growth
N Main St	NB	86%	28%
	SB	14%	159%
Pacheco Blvd	NB	237%	56%
	SB	29%	37%
Pleasant Hill Rd	EB	35%	45%
	WB	20%	18%
Taylor Blvd/Sunvalley Blvd	NB	57%	10%
	SB	16%	29%
Treat Blvd	EB	34%	17%
	WB	25%	37%
Ygnacio Valley Rd	EB	29%	9%
	WB	14%	15%

MTSO Monitoring Results

Intersection Analysis: Level of Service

Primary Street	Secondary Street	MTSO LOS	2013		2040 Optimized	
			AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
			LOS	LOS	LOS	LOS
Treat Blvd	North Main Rd	F	E	E	E	F
Treat Blvd	Bancroft Rd	F	F	F	F	F
Ygnacio Valley Rd	Civic Dr	F	D	E	E	F
Ygnacio Valley Rd	Bancroft Rd	F	F	F	F	F

MTSO Monitoring Results

Intersection Analysis: 2013 Volume/Capacity

Primary Street	Secondary Street	AM Peak	PM Peak
		V/C	V/C
Pleasant Hill Rd	Grayson Rd	1.05	0.91
Treat Blvd	North Main Rd	0.92	1.07
	Oak Rd	1.03	0.80
	Cherry Ln	1.02	0.75
	Bancroft Rd	1.13	1.17
	Carriage Dr	1.10	0.64
	Cowell Rd	1.08	0.97
	Ygnacio Valley Rd	N Broadway	0.79
Civic Dr		0.96	1.22
Walnut Blvd		1.04	0.98
Homestead Ave		0.93	1.09
Bancroft Rd		1.04	1.18
Wiget Ln		0.84	1.04
Montecito Dr		1.02	1.05
Ayers Rd		1.01	0.90

MTSO Monitoring Results

Intersection Analysis: 2040 Volume/Capacity

Primary Street	Secondary Street	Optimized		Unoptimized	
		AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
		V/C	V/C	V/C	V/C
Pleasant Hill Rd	Grayson Rd	0.99	0.95	1.01	0.93
Treat Blvd	North Main Rd	1.04	1.34	0.99	1.33
	Oak Rd	1.03	1.00	1.09	0.96
	Jones Rd	0.90	1.10	0.90	1.23
	Cherry Ln	1.08	0.88	1.12	0.82
	Bancroft Rd	1.24	1.31	1.26	1.34
	Carriage Dr	1.13	0.74	1.13	0.72
	Oak Grove Rd	1.07	1.10	1.09	1.09
	Navarone Wy	1.10	0.86	1.10	0.84
	Cowell Rd	1.26	1.19	1.26	1.21
	Clayton Rd	1.17	1.19	1.17	1.17

MTSO Monitoring Results

Intersection Analysis: 2040 Volume/Capacity

Primary Street	Secondary Street	Optimized		Unoptimized	
		AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
		v/c	v/c	v/c	v/c
Ygnacio Valley Rd	Civic Dr	1.05	1.20	1.02	1.19
	Walnut Blvd	1.12	1.07	1.14	1.07
	Homestead Ave	0.96	1.12	0.94	1.12
	La Casa Via	0.83	1.02	0.80	1.00
	San Carlos Dr	1.00	0.97	1.01	0.96
	Bancroft Rd	1.05	1.16	1.07	1.17
	Wiget Ln	0.88	1.12	0.85	1.12
	Oak Grove Rd	1.12	1.19	1.10	1.18
	Montecito Dr	1.18	1.23	1.18	1.22
	Crystyl Ranch Rd	1.18	1.06	1.21	1.03
	Ayers Rd	1.35	0.96	1.44	1.02
	Alberta Wy	1.28	1.00	1.30	1.04
	Clayton Rd	1.12	1.07	1.23	1.11

SR-4 Freeway Analysis

Freeway Analysis for 2013 & 2040 Conditions – AM Peak Hour

Direction	Free Flow Speed (mph)	MTSO		Observed		2040 Forecast	
		Speed (mph)	Delay Index	Speed (mph)	Delay Index	Speed (mph)	Delay Index
EB	65	13	5	62	1.0	60.8	1.1
WB	65	13	5	52	1.2	37.7	1.7

Freeway Analysis for 2013 & 2040 Conditions – PM Peak Hour

Direction	Free Flow Speed (mph)	MTSO		Observed		2040 Forecast	
		Speed (mph)	Delay Index	Speed (mph)	Delay Index	Speed (mph)	Delay Index
EB	65	13	5	46	1.4	42.5	1.5
WB	65	13	5	65	1.0	62.6	1.0

I-680 Freeway Analysis

Freeway Analysis for 2013 & 2040 Conditions – AM Peak Hour

Direction	Free Flow Speed (mph)	MTSO		Observed		2040 Forecast	
		Speed (mph)	Delay Index	Speed (mph)	Delay Index	Speed (mph)	Delay Index
NB	65	16	4	46	1.4	44.4	1.5
SB	65	16	4	40	1.6	39.4	1.6

Freeway Analysis for 2013 & 2040 Conditions – PM Peak Hour

Direction	Free Flow Speed (mph)	MTSO		Observed		2040 Forecast	
		Speed (mph)	Delay Index	Speed (mph)	Delay Index	Speed (mph)	Delay Index
NB	65	16	4	44	1.5	42.2	1.5
SB	65	16	4	56	1.2	48.2	1.3

SR-242 Freeway Analysis

Freeway Analysis for 2013 & 2040 Conditions – AM Peak Hour

Direction	Free Flow Speed (mph)	MTSO		Observed		2040 Forecast	
		Speed (mph)	Delay Index	Speed (mph)	Delay Index	Speed (mph)	Delay Index
NB	65	22	3	50	1.3	46.0	1.4
SB	65	22	3	48	1.4	28.8	2.3

Freeway Analysis for 2013 & 2040 Conditions – PM Peak Hour

Direction	Free Flow Speed (mph)	MTSO		Observed		2040 Forecast	
		Speed (mph)	Delay Index	Speed (mph)	Delay Index	Speed (mph)	Delay Index
NB	65	22	3	53	1.3	47.6	1.4
SB	65	22	3	49	1.3	40.9	1.6

Roadway Segment Analysis

Roadway	Direction	MTSO Speed (mph)	2013 Observed Speed		2040 Forecasted Speed	
			AM	PM	AM	PM
Alhambra Ave	NB	15	28.6	28.9	28.2	28.9
	SB	15	27.7	29.5	27.6	28.7
Clayton Road	NB/EB	15	33.2	27.2	28.9	26.9
	SB/WB	15	28.1	27.6	28.1	26.4
Contra Costa Boulevard	NB	15 (AM) 10 (PM)	23	20.0	20.6	18.6
	SB	15 (AM) 10 (PM)	20	18.0	18.8	16.6
Pacheco Boulevard	NB	15	32	21.0	31.4	21.0
	SB	15	25	25.0	25.2	25.2
Pleasant Hill Road	NB	15	30.4	26.0	28.5	24.6
	SB	15	30.6	27.3	29.8	23.7
Taylor Boulevard	NB	15	33.1	25.6	31.1	25.1
	SB	15	28.6	27.4	27.8	23.8



TO: TRANSPAC TAC

FROM: Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager

DATE: September 26, 2013

RE: Staff will be seeking approval in October from TRANSPAC and TRANSPLAN for the FY 2014/15 511 Contra Costa Program workplan and budget outlined below. Grant funding is provided by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA), CCTA Measure J (Commute Alternatives) and MTC CMAQ (Employer Outreach)

The Central/East County 511 Contra Costa staff implements programs and projects which fulfill each jurisdiction's Transportation Demand Management ordinance requirements within the Contra Costa Transportation Authority's Growth Management Program and Action Plan requirements under Measure J. With legislation (AB 32 and SB 375) requiring greenhouse gas emission (GHG) reductions, the 511 Contra Costa programs have a proven success record with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and Greenhouse Gas emissions.

The Workplan for FY 2014/15 includes trip reduction and emissions reduction projects and programs which focus on outreach to residents, students and commuters in Contra Costa. The program elements are refined and changed each year to ensure the maximum cost effectiveness, as determined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and CCTA.

The budget is expected to be similar to the 2013/14 allocations, with approximately \$755,000 in TFCA funding from the BAAQMD, \$383,500 from Measure J Commute Alternatives and \$39,970 in CMAQ funding from MTC.

Program elements include:

- TDM Ordinance Update – 511 CC staff will be updating the Measure J TDM Draft Model Ordinance. The CCTA Countywide Transportation Plan is currently being updated and as a result, it is necessary to update the model TDM Ordinance. Local TDM ordinances have not been updated since 1997. It will be necessary for each jurisdiction to approve an updated TDM Ordinance in 2014 prior to adoption of the

Countywide Transportation Plan. This is a requirement under Measure J in order for jurisdictions to continue to receive their annual M/J half cent sales tax transportation return-to-source funding.

- Action Plan Implementation - Both the TRANSPAC and TRANSPLAN Action Plans include actions and programs which are implemented by the Central/East County 511 Contra Costa Program. Staff will also be working with local jurisdictions in developing Transportation Demand Management strategies as part of the Sustainable Communities Strategies through SB 375.
- Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) Programs and Projects - Staff will work with local jurisdictions, school administrators, parents, PTAs, police departments and others to expand the SR2S programs to elementary, middle and high schools throughout East County. Program elements include: SchoolPool carpool ridematching; SchoolPool transit ticket program; Bicycle/pedestrian education and encouragement; Bicycle/pedestrian assemblies; Challenge Days to promote bicycling, walking, carpooling and transit ridership to schools; school site assessments and site access safety programs. Measure J funds will be used to provide bike racks, skateboard and scooter racks, paving and fences, as well as school access and infrastructure improvements to promote safer access to campuses.
- Employer Outreach – Recent legislation (SB 1339) was passed which requires employers with >50 employees to provide pre-tax commuter benefits, or other options to promote commute alternatives. 511 CC will provide assistance to employers to comply with MTC and BAAQMD regulation of this legislation. 511 CC will develop and provide a Commuter Assistance Program for Central and East County jurisdictions to assist city/county compliance with these new requirements. Additional offerings to employers include elements that reduce single occupant vehicle ridership, which is a requirement of the TFCA grant funding. Services include: distribution and analysis of transportation surveys; real-time-ridesharing; car-sharing programs; clean fuel infrastructure; transportation/health fairs; promotional support for shuttles; customized ridematch assistance; pre-tax transit benefit education; bicycle parking infrastructure; pledge program to encourage commute alternatives. Staff will also continue to work with transit agencies on special promotions.
- Electric Charging Program – TFCA and Measure J funds are used to provide mini grants to Central and East County jurisdictions for electric charging stations and lease of electric plug-in vehicles to promote the use of this technology. Staff is working to expand the network of charging stations in Central and East County to keep pace with the growing demand.
- COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROGRAM – Staff will be working with local jurisdictions to distribute more “green” transportation information and program elements at city

events to inform residents of ways to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and GHG emissions. Special promotions include providing transit passes to support the Discover and Go program through the libraries, and other community outreach events.

- BICYCLE/SKATEBOARD INFRASTRUCTURE AND GAP CLOSURE ASSISTANCE – Bicycle and skateboard parking infrastructure will be provided to local schools, jurisdictions, and employers upon request. Staff will work with the RTPC TACs to assist in project delivery of bicycle/pedestrian gap closure projects where feasible.
- WEBSITE DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE - The 511CC website continues to be a comprehensive one-stop location for Bay Area transportation information with an emphasis on Contra Costa transportation. 511 CC is also host to the TRANSPAC and TRANSPAN websites (www.transpac.us and www.transplan.us), in addition to the www.511contracosta.org site.
- AGENCY PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITIES - Staff participates in local and regional committees to ensure coordination, promotion and funding for TDM projects in Contra Costa County. The committees include: BART's Bicycle/ Pedestrian Access TAC, MTC's Regional Rideshare TAC, BAAQMD/MTC SB 1339 TAC, BWTD TAC, MTC's School and Youth Outreach TAC, CCTA's Safe Routes to School Task Force; TRB's TDM Committee and the TDM Institute.
- ASSISTANCE WITH GRANT APPLICATION DEVELOPMENT - Staff provides assistance to partner agencies for grant submittals.

Performance Measures: The BAAQMD requires that programs and projects maintain a minimum cost effectiveness performance measure. This minimum standard is \$90,000/ton of emissions reductions. Historically the 511 CC program has achieved results ranging from \$29,000-\$55,000/ton of emissions reductions, which is well below the required BAAQMD standard.

It is estimated that the 2014-15 workplan will achieve a minimum of \$44,000/ton of emissions reductions. Per the BAAQMD methodology, this equates to a reduction of 993,200 vehicle trips, 12,118,600 vehicle miles reduced and 5,820.8 tons of ROG (reactive organic gases), NOx (nitrogen oxides) and PM (particulate matter).



City Council

Mike Anderson, Mayor
Don Tatzin, Vice Mayor
Brandt Andersson, Council Member
Mark Mitchell, Council Member
Traci Reilly, Council Member

Date: September 18, 2013

To: LPMC, SWAT & TRANSPAC TACs

From: Leah Greenblat, City of Lafayette

RE: Lamorinda Action Plan and Proposed Multi-Family Housing Development at Pleasant Hill Road and Deer Hill Road

SUMMARY: The City of Lafayette is in the process of reviewing a proposed multi-family housing development at Pleasant Hill Road and Deer Hill Road. The FEIR has determined that the project has significant and unavoidable traffic impacts. These traffic impacts may impede the City's ability to implement the Lamorinda Action Plan. In the spirit of cooperative, multi-jurisdictional planning, the City of Lafayette is sharing this information for LPMC and SWAT's review and consideration.

PROPOSED PROJECT: Construction of 14 buildings (seven three-story and seven two-story) consisting of 315 apartments. The application also proposes to construct a two-story club house (13,300 sq. ft.), a one-story leasing office (950 sq. ft.) and 569 parking spaces. The property is located at 3233 Deer Hill Road and Pleasant Hill Road.

NOTICING REQUIREMENTS: The City notified LPMC, SWAT and TRANSPAC consistent with the CCTA's and the Lamorinda Action Plan's noticing requirements. The City received no comments from member agencies.

FINAL EIR: The Final EIR concluded that the Project would have 13 significant and unavoidable impacts that could not be mitigated to a less than significant level. There are three significant and unavoidable traffic impacts (LOS F at Deer Hill Rd. – Stanley Blvd./Pleasant Hill Rd., Northbound Pleasant Hill Road AM peak hour traffic would exceed the capacity of the left turn lane at Deer Hill Rd., and significant increase in the Delay Index for southbound traffic in the AM peak hour and northbound traffic in the PM peak hour.)

SUMMARY OF RELEVANT PORTIONS OF THE LAMORINDA ACTION PLAN:

The FEIR found that the Project created significant and unavoidable impacts due to increases in traffic delay on Pleasant Hill Road. The basis for these determinations is the Lamorinda Action Plan. Below is a summary of key elements of the Lamorinda Action Plan.

To comply with Measure J, the City of Lafayette, as part of its development review process, needs to review the proposed Project with the Action Plan and determine whether the Project will impede the Action Plan's implementation. Based on the FEIR's findings, Lafayette staff believes the Project would impede the implementation of the Lamorinda Action Plan. In the spirit of multi-jurisdictional, cooperative transportation planning, the City is sharing this information with LPMC and SWAT for its review and

consideration. The proposed Project is tentatively scheduled for review at TRANSPAC TAC on September 26 and LPMC and SWAT on October 7, 2013.

LAMORINDA ACTION PLAN'S RELEVANT MTSOs FOR PLEASANT HILL ROAD

1. Establish CCCTA bus service on Pleasant Hill Road and/or Taylor Boulevard that has a composite frequency of at least two buses per hour during peak commute and school times (6:30 AM – 9:30 AM and 3:30 PM – 6:30 PM) and direct connection to the Lafayette BART station.
2. Maintain school bus service on Pleasant Hill Road and Taylor Boulevard.
3. Maintain a maximum wait time for drivers on side streets wishing to access Pleasant Hill Road or Taylor Boulevard of one signal cycle or less.
4. Maintain peak hour peak direction delay index of 2.0 or lower.

In the FEIR for the Terraces Project, it is the exceedance of the Delay Index for Pleasant Hill Road that results in the determination of two significant and unavoidable traffic impacts.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES: Attached is an excerpt of the transportation and traffic section of the FEIR's Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures.