

TRANSPAC Meeting Summary Minutes

MEETING DATE: October 10, 2013

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT: Julie Pierce, Clayton, CCTA Representative (Chair Pro Tem); Karen Mitchoff, Contra Costa County; Loella Haskew, Walnut Creek; and Edi Birsan, Alternate for Ron Leone, Concord

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: John Mercurio, Concord; Bob Pickett, Walnut Creek; and Diana Vavrek, Pleasant Hill

STAFF PRESENT: John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa; and Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager

GUESTS/PRESENTERS: Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill; and Matthew Kelly, Associate Transportation Planner, CCTA

MINUTES PREPARED BY: Anita Tucci-Smith

1. Convene Meeting/Pledge of Allegiance/Self-Introductions

The meeting was convened at 9:00 A.M. by Chair Pro Tem Julie Pierce in the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair, the Pledge of Allegiance was observed, and self-introductions followed.

2. Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

CONSENT AGENDA

3. Approve September 12, 2013 Minutes

ACTION: Approved. Haskew/Mitchoff/Unanimous

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

4. Matt Kelly, CCTA Transportation Planner, Presentation/Review/Discussion of the Administrative Draft of the Congestion Management Program (CMP) and review of proposed Chapter 6 edits proposed by Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa to Chapter 6, the Transportation Demand Management Element of the Draft CMP

Matt Kelly, Associate Transportation Planner, CCTA, presented the 2013 update of the Congestion Management Program (CMP), a state required document which had been established in 1991, and which had been based upon the Contra Costa Transportation Authority's (CCTA's) Growth Management Plan (GMP). He explained that the CMP is updated every two years as required although most of what affected local jurisdictions was found in the GMP. The CMP served to document the activities in the County in relation to transportation and land use. He addressed each chapter and advised that Chapter 1 documented consistency with the current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which had been approved and adopted by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in July 2013. The CMP would document consistency with the RTP, sharing the same financial assumptions.

Mr. Kelly identified Chapter 2 as the CMP network and standards, a subset of Routes of Regional Significance (RORS), with several routes in Central County where intersections are monitored along the CMP network to determine level of service (LOS), a standard for each intersection (usually E or F depending on location), and where intersections which fell below the standard are checked to verify conditions. Specific intersections are rechecked and if found to be LOS F, an exceedance study would be required where various factors might be able to be excluded, one of which is regional traffic. He stated the CCTA was in the process of checking exceedance standards and would publish a report showing LOS across the County, and would monitor freeways where Caltrans would be responsible for exceedance. Chapter 3 was identified as the performance element where performance standards being used throughout the County are documented, and where Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) in the Action Plans are documented.

Mr. Kelly explained that Chapter 4 is the main focus of the update; the seven-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) where MTC required that any project seeking federal, state, or local funding over the next seven years would have to be identified. He encouraged City and County staff within the next two weeks to review the project list and add new, eliminate completed, or update existing projects. He noted that the project list with over \$10 billion in projects was unconstrained so more could be added. Chapter 5 is the land use transportation evaluation program where the GMP (the connection between land use and transportation) is documented, with a GMP Compliance Checklist required to be completed every other year. Chapter 6 is the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) element. He thanked Lynn Overcashier for overhauling the chapter which had been a great help and explained he was still trying to work the comments into the document, which after a four-week extension would then be submitted to MTC.

Lynn Overcashier explained that in the last few years the number of electric vehicle infrastructure and charge stations had been increased, which was a huge element, especially when jurisdictions had to document how they were complying, and had foraged in more depth with the school-based programs and other infrastructure type programs, which she had expanded upon and overhauled in her recommendations for Chapter 6.

Mr. Kelly explained that Chapter 7 is travel demand modeling which had been updated last year and which would incorporate the Plan Bay Area, about to be released. Chapter 8 documented the deficiency planning, where a deficiency plan had to be prepared if traffic could not be excluded through the exceedance study.

Mr. Kelly added that there was a lot to the CMP which documented the activities of CCTA and what the jurisdictions and the transit agencies were doing to reduce congestion. He asked for comments, noted that most comments to date had been in the form of an updated Chapter 6 and the project lists from local staff, stated that the CMP would then go to MTC for its comments, return to the CCTA which would incorporate the comments, and then be adopted by the CCTA in December 2013.

In response to questions, Mr. Kelly explained the comments received to date were just those to make sure that Contra Costa County had touched all the bases; if there were locations in common there would be an attempt to collect the information for the CMP and the GMP at the same time; and the Actions Plans could address local traffic with more jurisdictional cooperation where different types of standards could be set and where jurisdictions could be more creative as to how to control impacts on local roads.

Jeremy Lochirco stated that cities like Walnut Creek had established MTSOs along Ygnacio Valley Road and Treat Boulevard. He asked if the intersection was reflecting an LOS F how it would be out of compliance with what had been established for the corridor.

In response, Mr. Kelly noted that the standards were different; it was a state legislated program with little control and once the standards had been established it was difficult to change. In 1991, it had been set as low as possible, although things had changed since then. He suggested that could be addressed better in the Action Plans, although it was an issue because the exceedance studies had to be addressed along potentially with deficiency plans.

Mr. Lochirco noted that looking at the MTSOs established in the Action Plan, he did not understand the disconnect although he knew that the state had a different threshold than the region, and while Mr. Kelly suggested an evaluation to see if the standards could be adjusted, Mr. Lochirco explained that Walnut Creek was impacted now and expressed concern spending money to come up with the exceedance studies only to find no impact which would waste a fair amount of resources.

In response to John Cunningham's comment that over time the focus of congestion based planning had diminished and as such had questioned the longevity of the CMP requirement at this point, Mr. Kelly advised that he had heard no talk of eliminating the requirement, suggested it would remain and perhaps change over time, and the CCTA saw it more as an exercise where most of the work was done in the GMP, avoiding the spending of unnecessary consultant dollars.

Chair Pro Tem Pierce commented that the CMP had been imposed on other agencies that didn't and still don't have a GMP. While duplicative in Contra Costa County, in some counties it was the only requirement they had. She added that Contra Costa County had attempted to maximize the benefit from the expended dollars to do the GMP and CMP as much simultaneously as possible using the same monitoring and incorporating that into the Action Plans as much as possible.

With thanks to Mr. Kelly, TRANSPAC accepted the report.

5. Presentation/Discussion on the Update of the TRANSPAC Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance by Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill, Action Plan Manager

Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill, Action Plan Manager funded by the CCTA, noted that Action Plans are updated every five years, to be adopted in 2014. She explained that she had worked closely with the TRANSPAC TAC and the overall Action Plan schedule, explaining that originally all the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) needed to have approved the overall draft Action Plans in January but since TRANSPAC did not meet in January it would have had to been done by TRANSPAC by its meeting on December 14, although she had since learned from Martin Engelmann that because TRANSPAC did not meet in January, it could submit its Action Plan with all other RTPCs in February, which offered more time to complete the draft.

With respect to the monitoring results, Ms. Dagang presented a quick summary with a focus on Delay Index and average speed on the freeways, with arterials to differ by jurisdiction. She identified the SR4, I-680, SR242 freeway analyses for both observed as well as future conditions; reported that the Delay Index on SR4 was 5 with the highest 2040 forecast a 1.7; on I-680 the Delay Index was 4 with a 2040 forecast high of 1.6; and on SR242 the Delay Index was 3 and the highest in 2040 in any direction was 1.6, so the monitoring results noted that the standards had not been exceeded. She explained that the purpose of the Action Plan monitoring was big picture planning.

Ms. Dagang highlighted the Intersection analyses and since the standard was 1.5, she explained there were no locations in 2013 or 2040 where the volume capacity was 1.5. She explained that the CMP standards had been set at an operational level that was desired to be achieved while the MTSO standards were not a goal but set at what it was desired to be achieved. She added that many intersections were operating in a congested condition that would produce complaints and there were some that could keep getting worse.

When asked about the differences between optimized versus unoptimized in the MTSO monitoring results, Mr. Kelly noted the settings used in the synchro software to determine the LOS, optimized for the free right turns having to do with the geometry of the intersection, with unoptimized more reflective of signal timing. Optimized would balance turns and through movements.

Ms. Dagang stated there were not huge differences between optimized and unoptimized numbers.

Edi Birsan referred to Oak Grove Road at Treat Boulevard and a recent City of Concord change in speed limits, which Ms. Dagang noted would not affect intersections. She referenced a different measure for average speed and explained whether it had a positive or negative impact was site specific. She also stated that if looking at a broad level, it was expected that in the next 30 years there would be more traffic and more congestion and a number of programs and actions had been included to address that fact. She also clarified that the measurement was all ways, measuring the capacity of the intersection in all directions.

On the discussion of the projections to 2040 and whether a change in population would change those projections, Ms. Dagang noted there is always a lag in projection counts although over time populations traveled differently. She stated that kind of information would be included in the Action Plan, and suggested that not just population but job and employment centers and retail moved around and people moved in multiple directions.

Mr. Kelly explained that the model was based on ABAG's projections to 2040, and Countywide between 2010 and 2040, there was expected to be a 35 percent increase in the number of households. In Central County it was in the low 20 percent increase range.

Ms. Dagang referred to projected speeds, how things were operating on a segment of the arterial, and stated that TRANSPAC had set measurements for average speed on those roadways at roughly 15 MPH, and in 2013 and forecasted speeds it had been projected that all the speeds would be above 15 MPH, some of which would be affected by signal timing. Signal cycle delays were identified with a standard between 3 and 5, the number of times required to sit through a signal cycle to be able to proceed through.

Ms. Dagang reported that general findings were that overall the 2040 forecast was consistently below MTSO standards other than some intersection LOS. She reported that the TRANSPAC TAC had recommended the development of MTSOs for Bailey Road, but that no additional MTSOs be identified for the 2014 update although there were suggestions for inclusion in the next cycle, such as HOV lane usage, transit mode share, transit ridership, multimodal LOS measures, total bike facility mileage on or connecting to RORS, and an inverse of average vehicle ridership. She noted the general recommendation not to change the standards, with few exceptions; for Contra Costa Boulevard where one standard speed had been recommended and for Pacheco Boulevard. With respect to Bailey Road a standard of 3 was recommended, which was a consistent value that the City of Concord had used at many locations. Recognizing that some of the streets ran through multiple jurisdictions, it was recommended that if a developer was doing a traffic study there would be only one type of measurement with the suggestion that both jurisdictions use a volume to capacity ratio when crossing jurisdictional lines.

With respect to Ygnacio Valley Road and Oak Grove Road, Chair Pro Tem Pierce explained that although it was not listed, she expressed a need to acknowledge that it was a metering site with an identification of what it would take in 2040 to keep the traffic flowing and how much the delay would have to be increased for that pinch point.

Mr. Lochirco did not want to change the City of Walnut Creek's measurement, and Ms. Dagang commented the fact that something was not listed did not mean that it wasn't important. She stated that signal cycle delay at Oak Grove Road and Ygnacio Valley Road might be evaluated over time but did not have to be formalized in the Action Plan.

Mr. Lochirco recommended more discussion before changing an MTSO value.

Chair Pro Tem Pierce suggested considering the projection to 2040 but not changing the MTSO to offer an idea of the impact of the changes taking place Countywide and whether that would adversely or advantageously affect the RORS, which traveled from far East County in many ways all the way to I-680. She suggested with the completion of Highway 4 that might get better, but she wanted to know whether or not that would be the case.

Ms. Dagang clarified that the CMP looked at a broader range over time while the Action Plan was more a snapshot document.

Mr. Birsan clarified that the standards set would be reviewed every five years, and with the development of the Concord Naval Weapons Station there would be major changes to some intersections, although Ms. Dagang stated there had been some discussion of West Leland Road and whether that should be a RORS and while it did not make sense to do that now it should be identified for a potential designation in the future.

Ms. Dagang asked for detailed questions about the measures, stated that the update was being presented in pieces, and reported that the next steps would be to continue working with the TRANSPAC TAC to identify specific actions, to then begin drafting the Action Plan Update and return the draft to TRANSPAC.

With thanks to Ms. Dagang, TRANSPAC accepted the report.

6. 511 Contra Costa staff is seeking approval and authorization for the 2014/15 511 Contra Costa Program Workplan and Estimated Budget

Lynn Overcashier, Program Manager, 511 Contra Costa, presented the request for approval of the 2014/15 511 Contra Costa Workplan and Budget, highlighted an overhaul of the TDM Ordinance, and noted that jurisdictions had last updated the TDM Ordinance in 1997. Given SB 1339, which required employers with more than 50 employees to provide pre-tax commuter benefits or other options to promote commute alternatives, she had proposed updates to the TDM Ordinance and submitted those updates to the Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) and the West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee (WCCTAC), along with CCTA staff for review. She noted that the CCTA would review it early next year, distribute it to the RTPCs, and each jurisdiction would have to update its ordinance or resolution.

Ms. Overcashier added that the TDM program implemented all the Action Plan TDM elements on behalf of the jurisdictions, an ongoing situation that was tracked. She reported that the electric vehicle infrastructure was being expanded and she advised that funding was available for electric vehicle charging stations for the jurisdictions, but not as an incentive program; 511 also provided bike infrastructure, and there was also funding to be provided to jurisdictions. She added that working with the Bay Area Air Quality and Management District (BAAQMD) and MTC as part of SB 1339, notifications had been sent to all city managers and the County Administrator identifying 511 as a resource to be able to assist in compliance with all the requirements with a pre-tax benefit. She emphasized that 511 was a resource and not a regulating agency.

Ms. Overcashier stated that the incentive programs continued supporting SchoolPool, carpool, and transit incentive programs. She had potentially a bike station pilot project and was leaving that open as a possibility to discuss with the staff of any interested jurisdiction. She requested approval of the Workplan and Budget.

Mr. Birsan referenced a bike program in Louisville, Kentucky which had been married with art funding where bike stations had been made in different shapes, using funding from the arts as well as transportation, which he suggested as a possibility.

In response to Diana Vavrek, Ms. Overcashier referred to bike-sharing stations, a nice name for a staffed bike cage, temporary or permanent, and explained that there was a pilot program on the Peninsula that might be considered here.

Chair Pro Tem Pierce thanked Ms. Overcashier for the compilation of everything that 511 was working on, in one place, and to learn that things were improving even with an increased population was impressive and should be forwarded to show that it worked.

ACTION: Approved the 2014/15 511 Contra Costa Workplan and Budget. Haskew/Mitchoff/Unanimous

7. TRANSPAC CCTA representative Reports

Chair Pro Tem Pierce reported that she had subbed for David Durant at the Planning Committee meeting when the City of Pleasant Hill Compliance Checklist had been approved and forwarded to the CCTA, as was the Compliance Checklist for the City of Martinez, and the progress report for the City of Hercules. The Central County Additional Transportation Programs for Seniors and People with Disabilities (Line 20a) funding, the Central County Safe Transportation for Children Program (Line 21a) funding, and an application for funding for the PDA Planning Grant Program had also been approved. The Committee had also discussed the vision, goals, and current issues for the 2014 CTP update, looked at the next issue of the Compliance Checklist to be issued in January with submittal by April for funding by July 1, 2014 for the 2015 fiscal year, and received a presentation on the SR239 Draft Feasibility Study with respect to configuring a back door for East County.

TRANSPAC Manager Barbara Neustadter advised that the TRANSPAC TAC would be looking at those Compliance Checklists at its next meeting.

8. Items Approved by the Authority on September 18, 2013 for Circulation to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and Related Items of Interest

Ms. Neustadter referred to the CCTA's Executive Director's Report in the TRANSPAC packets.

9. SB 375/SCS Report by Martin Engelmann, CCTA Deputy Executive Director, Planning

Mr. Engelmann was not available and there was no report.

10. 511 Contra Costa and TRANSPAC Staff Reports

a) 511 Contra Costa: Program Manager Report

Ms. Overcashier highlighted the SB 1339 outreach, and reported that staff would meet with city managers and the County Administrator to offer details about the array of programs provided by 511 Contra Costa.

Ms. Neustadter called attention to the attachments and all that 511 and staff had done within a short period of time.

Ms. Overcashier advised that she would be attending the Transportation Research Board (TRB) Transportation Demand Management Institute in Washington in January, which is a research and data collection entity which helps keep her up to speed on advances. In other matters, she reported that Supervisor Glover had requested additional assistance for his Youth Summit when 511 had assisted with free bus tickets/summer youth passes in conjunction with Tri Delta Transit in East County, and she was now in negotiation with County Connection and WestCAT to see if they could assist in getting a universal summer youth pass for low income youth to offer them opportunities to get places where they would otherwise not be able to go. She suggested it might be time to consider a summer youth pass that would cover the entire County.

b) Street Smarts Report

Ms. Overcashier reported that a federal grant as well as 21a funding had been received in the last year and a half; the Street Smarts report identified the activities and successes in the 170 schools in Central and East County where that funding had been used. She described the specific staff, 10 different program elements; and the universally well-received “Mr. Beeps” robotic car for K-3, the “Heads Up” helmet program for fourth and fifth graders, and a “Rules of the Road” program currently in the final development stage for high schools. Staff had also done site assessments to come up with site improvements. She stated a lot had been accomplished this summer, a lot was going on, and she was pleased with stakeholder coordination and cooperation and thanked jurisdiction staff for their contributions. While some of the rural schools in East County had not participated, for those that had customized programs had been created to teach life skills.

11. TRANSPAC Staff Report

Ms. Neustadter stated she continued to work to successfully negotiate the Action Plan process.

12. TAC Oral Reports by Jurisdiction

Mr. Birsan noted that Ron Leone wanted to pass on information from a constituent regarding metering lights where some residents were having a problem understanding the concept. Metering lights were not being received well in certain areas.

Ray Kuzbari explained that complaints with respect to metering were to be expected; Caltrans was fine tuning the metering.

Eric Hu identified a number of Measure J projects in, or soon to be in, construction in Pleasant Hill. He reported that the Geary Road Connection Phase A was on schedule and on budget; Phase 3B was being advertised with bid opening in two weeks and there had been a lot of interest from contractors; and Buskirk Road was also proceeding on schedule and on budget with most of the work under ground and not visible although more and more improvements would be visible in the next couple of months.

Mr. Hu added that the Contra Costa Boulevard project had a bid opening in September and the bids were \$1 million over the Engineer's Estimate. He noted that the period for historically low bids appears to have passed. The Engineer's Estimate had been based on those low historical numbers and contractors were busy and not desperate for work, materials were more expensive, and staff was working with contractors to change bid language and make the process cheaper, and would work with the Board and TRANSPAC if it came to that.

Mr. Lochirco referenced projects funded through the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) grant of Measure J, and stated that the Walnut Creek City Council had approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Treat Boulevard/I-680 overcrossing and bike/ped study to look at options to the Iron Horse Trail and Contra Costa Center, with a Request for Proposal (RFP) to be issued in the next couple of months. A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for the Walnut Creek Master Plan had also been completed, to start work in late November or early December.

Chair Pro Tem Pierce reported that the City of Clayton would be installing flashing signals for Diablo View Middle School.

13. 2014 TRANSPAC Meeting Schedule

Chair Pro Tem Pierce referenced the 2014 meeting schedule in the TRANSPAC packet which reflected no meetings in January and August, as was tradition.

14. Agency and Committee Reports

Mr. Lochirco reported that the Safe Routes for Transit application process had closed; 30 applications had been received from the nine-county Bay Area, and the first evaluation from the Advisory Scoring Committee would start this month. Interest was high, and hope was high to be able to fund something in Contra Costa County.

15. For the Good of the Order

There were no comments.

16. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:29 A.M. The next meeting is scheduled for November 14, 2013 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined. CCTA Deputy Executive Director Martin Engelmann will discuss the Vision, Goals, and Current Issues for the 2014 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and Action Plan updates.