

## ***TRANSPAC Meeting Summary Minutes***

**MEETING DATE:** November 14, 2013

**ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT:** David Durant, Pleasant Hill (Chair); Mark Ross, Martinez (Vice Chair); Julie Pierce, Clayton, CCTA Representative; Loella Haskew, Walnut Creek; and 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; Martin Engelmann, CCTA Deputy Director for Planning; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Andy Smith for Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; Diedre Heitman, BART; Lynn Overcashier, Program Manager 511 Contra Costa; and Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager

**GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Edi Birsan, City of Concord

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:** Anita Tucci-Smith

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

The meeting was convened at 9:09 A.M. by Vice Chair Mark Ross, the Pledge of Allegiance was observed, and self-introductions followed.

### **2. Public Comment**

There were no comments from the public.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

### **3. Approve October 10, 2013 Minutes**

**ACTION:** Approved. Pierce/Haskew/Unanimous

### **END OF CONSENT AGENDA**

### **4. Martin Engelmann, CCTA Deputy Director for Planning to brief TRANSPAC on the Vision, Goals, and Current Issues for the 2014 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and Action Plan Updates. The vision and goals in the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) outline the themes and aims to be pursued by the Authority**

Martin Engelmann, CCTA Deputy Director for Planning, referred to the Vision, Goals and Current Issues for the 2014 CTP and Action Plan updates, which outlined the themes and aims to be pursued by the CCTA, and presented a document entitled *What is an Action Plan?* because the Action Plan of each Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC) is the cornerstone of the Countywide Transportation Plan. He described the Action Plan as a transportation planning document that identifies Routes of Regional Significance (RORS), sets performance objectives for those routes, and establishes actions for achieving those objectives.

Mr. Engelmann explained that the voters of Contra Costa County had approved Measure J in 2004, which measure included a Growth Management Program (GMP) that requires multi-jurisdictional, cooperative planning in which each jurisdiction shall participate in an ongoing process to create a balanced, safe, and efficient transportation system. Through the RTPCs, Measure J requires that local jurisdictions work to identify RORS, establish performance objectives in the form of Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) and Actions for achieving them, use the model to evaluate General Plan Amendments (GPAs), create a development mitigation program, and help develop plans and studies to address other transportation issues. He explained that a Route of Regional Significance, as defined in the Implementation Guide to Measure J, is to connect two or more subareas of Contra Costa, enter or leave the County, carry a significant amount of through traffic, or provide access to a regional highway or transit facility (e.g., a BART station or freeway interchange).

Mr. Engelmann displayed the current map of the RORS, a 500-mile system of routes comprising 15 percent of the roadways in the County representing 90 percent of the congestion on 10 percent of the roads, which were arterial streets and freeways. He referred to routes in Central County parallel to I-680 such as Contra Costa Boulevard and Pleasant Hill Road and asked if the objectives for those routes were to encourage through traffic on I-680 without accessing arterial routes, which led into the discussion of objectives and what was intended to be accomplished. Referencing West County, he explained that I-80 was consistently the most congested corridor in the region and West County's Action Plan had indicated that those deciding to ride on I-80 in single-occupancy vehicles would have to suffer the consequences since West County's focus was on transit. He used that as an example of the Action Plans and where the focus was intended. He noted that traffic modeling had been projected to the year 2040 and the traffic anticipated at that time, and the model was used to determine whether or not the established objectives could be met.

Mr. Engelmann explained that Action Plans were not only about roadways in that they were multimodal in nature. One of the objectives of the GMP is to support infill and redevelopment in existing urban and brownfield areas. Some RTPCs are discussing designation of BART and the Iron Horse Trail as Regional Routes. An RTPC may identify segments of regional routes that are subject to specific MTSOs; those that accommodate Transit Oriented Development (TOD), accommodate infill development, adopt or propose Traffic Management Programs, or address conflicts with regional, statewide, or federal programs. Many agencies were involved with local jurisdictions to identify specific actions. The RTPCs developed Action Plans, the CCTA compiled all those Action Plans into a Countywide Transportation Plan, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) offered forecasts and policies, and the State of California required a Congestion Management Program (CMP).

Action Plans identified long-range assumptions, overarching goals that articulated the RTPC's vision, RORS, MTSOs, Implementation Actions, and a Regional Development Review Process. With respect to the Regional Development Review Process, Mr. Engelmann stated that was where jurisdictions consulted with each other to share information in that the process required consultation on environmental documents along with procedures for review of impacts resulting from proposed local General Plan Amendments (GPAs). The Action Plans may outline in further detail how the process will be implemented.

Mr. Engelmann identified the process for environmental review and adoption in that each RTPC developed its draft Action Plan which is then combined with all others in the CCTA's CTP. The CCTA will then prepare a full Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the CTP and the Action Plans, and after certification of the EIR, the RTPCs could then adopt the final Action Plans.

With respect to the Vision, Goals and Current Issues for the 2014 CTP and Action Plan updates, Mr. Engelmann referred to the *Discussion Paper: Refining the Vision and Goals for the 2014 Countywide Transportation Plan* in its CTP. The current vision adopted in the 2009 CTP was to *strive to preserve and enhance the quality of life of local communities by promoting a healthy environment and a strong economy to benefit the people and areas of Contra Costa, sustained by 1) a balanced, safe, and efficient transportation network; 2) cooperative planning; and 3) transportation to meet the diverse needs of Contra Costa.* That vision included four goals: *1) enhance the movement of people and goods on highways and arterial roads; 2) manage the impacts of growth to sustain Contra Costa's economy and preserve its environment; 3) expand safe, convenient, and affordable alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle; and 4) maintain the transportation system.* He stated that the 2009 adopted vision and goals were being updated and the question was whether any changes were desired given changes in the environment and the recent adoption of the Sustainable Community Strategy.

Mr. Engelmann referred to discussions of sustainability related to climate change, economic vitality, and public health and the region's ability to achieve all of its needs from now into the future. He advised that one of the suggestions is to incorporate sustainability into the 2014 CTP's vision and goals, and offered a possible revision to read: *Strive to preserve and enhance the quality of life of local communities by promoting a healthy environment and strong economy to benefit the people and areas of Contra Costa, through (1) a balanced, safe, sustainable, and efficient transportation network, (2) cooperative planning, and (3) growth management.* He stated, however, that there was some confusion as to the use of the word 'sustainable' and offered examples, such as a change in technology, noting that some people confused sustainability with no change. He also described proposed changes to the goals: *(1) Support the efficient and reliable movement of people and goods; (2) manage growth to sustain Contra Costa's economy, preserve its environment and support its communities; (3) expand safe, convenient, and affordable alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle; (4) maintain the transportation system; and recommended a new goal to (5) continue to invest wisely to maximize the benefits of available funding.*

Mr. Engelmann emphasized the intent of the goals to incorporate concepts of sustainability and explained that the rest of the Discussion Paper had gone into further depth about the economy, the environment, and equity opportunities for the 2014 CTP.

Member Pierce commented that the Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) had expressed concern with the inclusion of the term 'sustainable,' and she had recommended a way to search for a sustainable plan without the use of that terminology. She explained that what had been done over the last two plans was entirely sustainable in the classic sense of the word although there was antagonism attached with the word sustainable that seemed to distract from the mission. She preferred to avoid the use of that terminology.

With respect to affordable alternatives to the use of vehicles, Member Pierce emphasized the need for transit for able, non-driving seniors, not just for paratransit, but for those who chose not to or could not drive, which she suggested would need to be addressed. In addition, however sustainability was termed related to future growth, there was a need to highlight the preservation of existing community values, integrity, qualities, and the like that were important to maintain. With respect to sea level rise, she noted that was another controversial issue and she suggested pointing to the data that indicated that over the last sixty years the frequency and severity of storm surges in the Bay Area had risen over ten times what it was six decades ago. She suggested that those storm surges, when combined with a King Tide and sea level rise would swamp major areas of the region, which she suggested also needed to be addressed in the document to help people understand that even if one didn't believe in sea level rise, the need to protect ourselves from storm surges that occurred several times a year was important.

Member Pierce also spoke to alternatives for the Complete Streets construction and suggested that due to funding issues the discussion of school buses, which she stated no longer existed except in specific areas, also needed to be considered. While not a priority for school districts, she suggested it was a priority for transportation planners. With no school buses, there should be an exemption from the federal restriction of running bus trips to schools. She recommended focus trips. As a result of those comments, she suggested that some of the document needed to be rewritten.

Member Mercurio concurred with the need for a discussion of the school bus issue.

Lynn Overcashier stated that at last week's Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Task Force meeting, she had raised that issue as something to consider, perhaps a marquee project for school and senior transportation which might get more support and more attention in a future reauthorization of Measure J.

Vice Chair Ross agreed and suggested a case could be made to combine children and seniors, particularly since children used buses twice a day for the same hours and the buses could be used on the off times for seniors and the general public. He suggested that might be something TRANSPAC could pioneer; a hybrid demonstration project. He agreed with the issues with respect to the term sustainable and suggested an economically, and environmentally sound policy should be pursued. He also suggested that casual carpooling could be augmented, combining existing cars on existing pavement using technology along with telecommuting, which he suggested would have a higher magnitude of importance by removing commuters from the road, and employers might be more receptive to telecommuting given new tax benefits and the need for less office space. He recommended that telecommuting be actively promoted to give employers the incentive to make telecommuting more successful and to get more cars off the road in a more cost-efficient manner.

Edi Birsan offered a different anti-bureaucratic, anti-political approach. Referring to each goal, he suggested as a rational goal shifting transportation to a web network. He was concerned with the use of terms such as sustainable, convenient, safe, affordable, maximize, and wisely which implied that someone was not doing those things. For goals, he recommended moving transportation away from coastal hazards, as an example. He did not support sufficiently reliable maximum benefits of available funding as a goal, which he suggested would open the region to a maximum amount of satire, and he recommended goals that were easy to explain.

Member Mercurio suggested that the value of the words were meant to reassure.

Member Leone suggested that terms to improve, or make better were important. He recommended a plan to improve or look for ways to improve the transportation system.

Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager, agreed on the issue of safety in that no jurisdiction ever set out to build an unsafe facility, but facilities had been built in the past that were not as safe as they used to be given that the environment had changed. She stated that facilities needed to be kept up-to-date.

On the sea level rise issue, John Cunningham noted that SWAT had discussed that issue and wanted to address it from an infrastructure-based update standpoint. There had also been discussions on SR2S and he referred to international, national, and local data that had shown the biggest reason that kids were not riding and walking to school was driver behavior in and around schools, and without addressing that a return on investment of SR2S projects would not be possible.

Lynn Overcashier noted that one thing to increase opportunities for expanding alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles, especially in terms of SR2S and emissions regulations, was the example of electric vehicle structure, which related to updating the current infrastructure in terms of keeping up with the times. She referred to the expansion of available electric charging stations to the public such as public garages, hotels, and other private and public availability of charging stations.

Member Pierce suggested that the narrative was fine but inclusion in the goal itself might be problematic, although Ms. Overcashier emphasized that including electric vehicle infrastructure somewhere was important to help secure funding.

Member Pickett referred to the issue of sea rise, noted that areas might be subject to more flooding, and suggested that specifics needed to be softened, although he agreed with the need to identify the problem of future flooding which would add more credibility and tone down statements that were not universally accepted. With respect to school buses, he recognized the need for vague references in such documents but noted that there were specifics in the document that referred back to school buses.

Vice Chair Ross agreed that sea level rise was an issue for some areas but not necessarily for others. He suggested the problem was not so much sea level rise but King Tides that affected the City of Martinez, for example, and suggested the problem would really be the sudden downpours, the increased volatility of individual storms that would overwhelm drainage systems that could overcome roadways, which were serious problems given the need to keep the roadways clear and available.

In the future, Vice Chair Ross suggested rather than prolonged rain over a season there would be more bursts that could overwhelm the transportation systems.

Chair Durant suggested the danger would be giving into the philosophy by turning it into a social engineering exercise given that it was a transportation exercise, and if focusing ultimately in the document on the transportation system, the plan, and the intent, he noted that some of the words, such as sustainability were problematic. He also noted the reality of what was being done was responding to the voters who passed Measure J and who would need to support the next measure to improve the transportation system with local dollars. He stated therefore that many would not respond without including some of the problematic things to ensure support. He suggested those terms had to be in the plan to identify the goal and he suggested the downside of eliminating those terms would make some feel good but could lose the needed support in the long term. With respect to sustainability, he found the use on Page 5 of the document to be “creepy,” the use on Page 4 to be unnecessary and recommended that sustain be changed to another word, such as mobility. He did not want to change the sentences.

Given the concerns, Member Pierce recommended that the use of the term sustainability be eliminated.

Chair Durant emphasized the intent of the roadway to move people and goods in an effective and safe manner using methodologies to continue to make the system work. He liked the discussion of storm surges, agreed to eliminate the matrix, and noted the reality of the infrastructure to deal with increased flooding would only get worse, and if the transportation infrastructure was impacted that was what needed to be addressed and not the science. With respect to buses, he noted that most people hated buses and didn’t want to put their children on them and the issue really had to do with child abductions and the lack of trust parents had with their children in a transportation system. He suggested, when asked, that the popularity of the Lamorinda system was likely given the fact that it was a safer area or a perception of a safer area. He noted a history, a pattern, and a habit in Lamorinda with buses that did not exist elsewhere in the area and suggested that busing was great in areas where it worked. He suggested most glaringly missing was that the overarching Countywide transportation problem would never be solved until the employment centers were not centered in San Francisco and Oakland. That pattern had to be changed by placing employment centers in more local areas and focusing some transportation investments on other alternate job locations.

Vice Chair Ross agreed that jobs should be mentioned and job centers should be enticed into closer areas, such as taking the jobs to the house (telecommuting), and enticing employers to bring the jobs to the homes.

Chair Durant commented that many businesses did not promote telecommuting given that it was difficult to monitor employees.

Vice Chair Ross emphasized that reducing traffic by two to three percent would have an enormous effect on the infrastructure. He asked Mr. Engelmann how many cars would have to be removed from the roadway to make a difference. He noted that while telecommuting was not for everyone, getting any vehicles off the road would be a benefit.

Mr. Engelmann reported that telecommuting had increased five-fold in the County since 1980 and suggested that the removal of 5 to 10 percent of the cars off the road (for telecommuting) in Contra Costa County could reduce the 300,000 work trip vehicles a day. Speaking to the sea level rise numbers, he suggested that sea level rise could be left out of the CTP itself since the EIR would be tiering from MTC's EIR, which had firm numbers with respect to sea level rise and which would have to be retained.

Member Leone supported Chair Durant's comments related to increasing jobs and telecommuting but had trouble understanding what that would look like given that most of that was employee, company, and business driven, and people could not be forced to build in a particular area. He asked how those businesses could be attracted to the region.

Chair Durant referenced how the Tri Valley employment centers had developed with cheap land at the time where businesses had developed followed by infrastructure, housing, and transit, making sure that the transportation infrastructure was available to support what was there and what was coming. He added that the second BART station had removed significant vehicles from the roadways. He suggested that improved freeway accessibility and the use of express buses in the Walnut Creek/Concord corridor, for instance, would help facilitate people moving to businesses, although a lot had to do with fees to attract employers, the other things that were available nearby to make it easier on employees, and helping companies avoid having to spend money on certain things. He suggested the easiest thing in Central County would be to add three more lanes to southbound I-680 to the SR 24 ramp to allow better access.

Ms. Overcashier noted that with SB 1339, which required employers with more than 50 employees to provide pre-tax commuter benefits or other options to promote commute alternatives, there might be an opportunity for suburban employers who did not have transit as an option, to provide some other alternative, which could be promoted for those businesses to encourage telecommuting where it made sense. She noted that the federal government had required 10 percent of all its departments to telecommute in the DC area, which had now been increased to 20 percent and which had made a huge difference in the DC area. She suggested that some of the larger employers could be encouraged to support telecommuting. In addition, the BAAQMD no longer allowed Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funds to support pilot programs, or telecommuting programs, and she encouraged more incentives and suggested that employers also had to be incentivized.

Edi Birsan agreed with the remarks related to telecommuting but suggested if taking that kind of position it should be modeled in that half of the TRANSPAC meetings should be scheduled by telecommuting. He agreed that transportation had to move work to outside the current system but suggested that shifting transportation from a spoke system to a web network was a viable goal which could de-emphasize transportation to Oakland and San Francisco allowing a BART ridership to Antioch and San Ramon, or support the idea of BART systems locally with a BART track from Concord and Walnut Creek down to San Ramon and Danville, which he suggested should be a goal.

Deidre Heitman explained that BART had long been interested in looking at job centers outside of San Francisco but noted that BART's plan had been to attempt to invest back into its stations and there had been meetings with cities that had BART stations to talk about that.

Ms. Heitman stated that she might have more information in that regard to report in six months. She referred to the Pleasant Hill BART station and a long-time office building pad that had yet to be built, and asked for input as to what BART could do to encourage the construction of offices around BART stations in that most development to date had been residential only.

Member Haskew expressed some discomfort that the discussion had evolved beyond transportation to areas above and beyond transportation. She wanted better roads, better modes, and suggested the discussion was outside the transportation realm. She suggested that job centers could stretch the problem and stated that moving job centers had consequences.

Member Pierce stated that Plan Bay Area touched all those issues and the focus was the transportation network which also involved land use. The primary goal was transportation although the process had been forced to consider transportation in connection with land use. She commented that the whole idea of BART to Walnut Creek to Dublin had been soundly defeated and Walnut Creek and Danville had bought property to keep that from happening. She also noted that rubber tire express buses would soon be implemented and the HOV network would be improved, although rail would not happen and the public would not accept it in those communities the same way a direct route from Alberta in Concord to Livorna in Walnut Creek had been blocked where property had also been purchased to stop that route. She explained that transportation planners had learned to move people within the constraints of the community, one of which was that convenience of employees had little to do with the way employers located their businesses which had been located where the employer wanted to live. She suggested that industrial land could not be built up with office buildings because industrial lands would always be needed for a healthy economy.

Member Pierce explained that part of the work in East County on Highway 4 was to improve the transportation infrastructure in East County to attract the job centers and keep East County from becoming a cul-de-sac, which would improve opportunities for all of Contra Costa County offering access to the job centers. In light of the fact that TRANSPAC is a transportation agency, she stated that TRANSPAC needed to keep in mind the land use picture to anticipate where the transportation infrastructure needed to go to facilitate the land use.

Chair Durant offered another example related to facilitating access to job centers where investments to the system could improve public transit access. He referred to express buses, noted the current express bus service, and stated that until the systems could be in place to facilitate a more flexible bus system it would be difficult to get to the job centers, which was why the idea of HOT lanes had been promoted since that would make it possible for an express bus to get to an existing job center.

Member Leone referred to the Concord Naval Weapons Station (CNWS) area which would be perfect for job centers and where some important improvements would be needed for Willow Pass Road to allow easy access to the Concord BART station.

Member Pierce explained that there would be rewrites to the document.

Mr. Engelmann added that if TRANSPAC had specific objections to the word sustainable, that word would be removed. He sought other comments by the end of November 2013 to be able to incorporate into the document. As to whether the document would return to TRANSPAC with the comments, he emphasized that any comments would be needed now and the CTP would return in April. He reiterated that any specific issues, recommended changes, or corrections with respect to the vision or goals needed to be identified prior to the end of November.

Chair Durant re-emphasized the need for comments or changes to any piece, part, or section would need to be submitted to the CCTA.

With thanks to Mr. Engelmann, TRANSPAC accepted the report and presentation.

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

The item was on the agenda in error in that it had already been unanimously approved by TRANSPAC at its October 10, 2013 meeting.

**6. Review of the City of Pleasant Hill Contra Costa Boulevard Improvement Project (Chilpancingo Parkway to Viking Drive) Project Description and Budget Summary**

Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager, highlighted the request from the City of Pleasant Hill for the Contra Costa Boulevard Improvement Program (Chilpancingo Parkway to Viking Drive), and reported that the TAC had reviewed the project at its meeting on October 24, 2013 and had recommended approval for the use of Line 28a subregional funds, TRANSPAC contingency funds that had never been previously used. The TAC had recommended the use of the funds and since this would be the first use of the funds, the TAC wanted to develop a protocol for the use of the funds going forward.

Eric Hu reported that the project had been advertised in September 2013 and the bids had come in higher than the Engineer's Estimate. While value engineering had saved \$400,000, there remained a shortfall of \$750,000 to fully fund the project. He explained that if approved, the project would be re-advertised in December 2013 and was expected to be constructed in 2014. All other federal, Measure J, and Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding options had been exhausted and the Line 28a funds were the only option that appeared to be available to the City.

Member Pierce moved approval with the hope that the new bids would not increase in cost given that the construction climate was changing fast.

**ACTION:** Accepted the TAC recommendation to approve the request of the City of Pleasant Hill for the allocation of \$750,000 Measure J Line 28a funds to complete the financial plan for the Contra Costa Boulevard Improvement Project (Chilpancingo Parkway to Viking Drive), with a future discussion of a protocol for the use of Line 28 funds. Pierce/Durant/Unanimous

## **7. TRANSPAC CCTA Representative Reports**

Chair Durant left the meeting at this time which was chaired by Vice Chair Ross.

Member Pierce referred to the November 6, 2013 meeting of the CCTA's Planning Committee and reported that the City of Pittsburg was officially and legally back in the fold of East County and the City's Compliance Checklist for 2010/11 had been approved, although the City's money would be held next year to review the City's continued compliance. The Planning Committee had also appointed a representative from the Greenbelt Alliance to serve as an At-Large Member to the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC); approved a release of the introductory brochure for the 2014 CTP Update; and entered into agreement with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on value pricing with the FHWA and Caltrans.

With respect to the CCTA's Administration and Project Committee, Member Pierce report that the APC had approved the I-680 Southbound HOV Gap Closure and Express Lane Conversion project with HDR Engineering, Inc. to compare the scope and project report and to conduct a total compensation study for CCTA employees which had not been done in a few years. The APC also had an update on the Hercules Intermodal project and agreed to work with the City of Hercules and provide Construction Management services; reviewed the Draft 2013 Measure J Strategic Plan; and noted that projects were coming forward reflecting the additional amount of money from the bond issue allowing more funds for projects.

## **8. Items Approved by the Authority on October 16, 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 dated October 17, 2013 in the TRANSPAC packets, described it as the standard report from the Executive Director, and noted the report that the Planning Committee had indicated a preliminary review of the Calendar Year 2012/2013 Biennial Compliance Checklist would come back with proposals on possible changes which that TAC would review at its meeting on November 21, 2013.

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

There was no report.

## **10. 511 Contra Costa**

Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager, referred to the flowchart for the Street Smarts II Infrastructure Program to explain how projects were reviewed by schools and school districts and how the programs were coordinated between the schools and the local jurisdiction. She explained that the flowchart had been provided for information only. She thanked all jurisdictions and County staff and planning and traffic engineers who had been outstanding and helpful with respect to right-of-way issues and signage.

## **11. TRANSPAC Report on Legal Services for JPA Formation**

Ms. Neustadter referred to the special TRANSPAC meeting on October 24, 2013 when staff had been directed to work with Mala Subramanian of Best Best & Krieger (BBK) to begin the process of forming a Joint Powers Agency (JPA), which discussions were in process. An engagement letter had been received from BBK and more information would be submitted to TRANSPAC at its December meeting hopefully with a request for an agreement with BBK.

## **12. TAC Oral Reports by Jurisdiction**

John Cunningham reported on the first public outreach meeting on November 25, 2013 for the Olympic Corridor Trail Connector Study with the cities of Walnut Creek and Lafayette, and a Request for Proposal (RFP) released for a project for Treat Boulevard to the west of the Pleasant Hill BART station to identify bicycle and pedestrian improvements along I-680.

## **13. Correspondence/Copies/Newsclips/Information**

Thank you letters from Andy Cannon, Principal of Antioch Middle School dated October 2, 2013, and Guy Swanger, Concord Chief of Police dated October 8, 2013 related to Contra Costa 511's Street Smarts Programs, had been included in the TRANSPAC packet.

## **14. 2014 TRANSPAC Meeting Schedule**

Ms. Neustadter referred to 2014 TRANSPAC meeting schedule in the meeting packets and commented that she was receiving fewer agency and committee reports from the other Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) on a regular basis.

## **15. Agency and Committee Reports**

There were no reports.

## **16. For the Good of the Order**

Ms. Neustadter announced the ribbon cutting for the fourth bore of the Caldecott Tunnel which had been scheduled for November 15, 2013.

## **17. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:48 A.M. The next meeting is scheduled for December 12, 2013 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined. Michael Wright, Reuse Director, will provide an update on the Concord Naval Weapons Station project.