

# **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

## **TRANSPAC TAC MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA**

**THURSDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2013**

**NOTE DATE CHANGE**

**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. **Minutes of the November 21, 2013 TAC meeting and minutes of the November 14, 2013 TRANSPAC meeting are attached for information and use.**

**Attachments:** TAC Minutes of November 21, 2103 and TRANSPAC Minutes of November 14, 2013.

2. **Continued discussion of Action Plan Update including comments on the 2009 Actions and revisions to match Actions, Goals and to identify new projects.**
3. **Discussion of ideas for local jurisdiction review of Central County Action Plan; Request City Manager/County Administrator to forward the Action Plan to Council/Board Members for information and/or review/comment; OR request City Transportation or Planning staff through the City Manager/County Administrator to convey comments on issues of interest or concern to the TRANSPAC Chair or to TRANSPAC via its representative on TRANSPAC or request TAC members to convey issues/concerns and/or other ideas or as determined.**

**Attachments:** Tenants and Goals submitted to TRANSPAC for review; E-mail from Concord Council Member Edi Birsan regarding thoughts on TRANSPAC goals and vision in response to the discussion at the November 14, 2013 TRANSPAC meeting (attached); **and** 2009 Actions and Projects for TAC review/use; Minutes of the October 24, 2013 TAC meeting; and previous attachments for reference including MTSO values for 2009 and 2014; and Updating the Central County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance handout (dated September 26, 2013). **(All electronic).**

**ACTION: As determined.**

4. **Continued Discussion on Development of a TRANSPAC Measure J Line 28a Utilization Process.** Line 28a in Measure J reads as follows: “Subregional Transportation Needs – TRANSPAC will propose programming funds for any project identified in the Expenditure Plan, and to meet other future transportation needs of Central County under the eligible provisions of the Act.”

**Attachment:** Line 28a Protocol proposal crafted by Ray Kuzbari.

**ACTION:** Review, revise, forward recommendation to TRANSPAC and/or as determined.

5. **FY-12-13 Distribution of 2.09% Additional Measure J Funds to Local Jurisdictions for Local Street Maintenance (LSM) and Improvements**

**Attachment:** Table I Summary of Total Sales Tax Revenue Available to Distribution and Table II Distribution of Available Funds to Cities and Contra Costa County.

**ACTION:** As determined.

6. **Update on 511 Contra Costa and TRANSPAC JPA Formation to establish a JPA as the Administrative Construct for the two entities if there is any new information.**

### **Update on TAC Meetings Schedule**

7. **The Holidays are fast approaching** - The first TAC meeting in 2014 is scheduled for February 13, 2014. **Given the Action Plan schedule** - Please also note that the TAC may be requested to schedule an additional Action Plan “just in case” meeting for January 23, 2014, and possibly January 30, 2014.

TAC 12 19 13 agenda

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

**MEETING DATE:** November 21, 2013

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Corinne Dutra-Roberts, 511 Contra Costa; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; John McKenzie, Caltrans; and Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager

**GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill; Mario Moreno, Public Works Director, Pleasant Hill; Rafat Raie, Traffic Engineer, Walnut Creek

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

The meeting was convened at 9:09 A.M. Self introduction followed.

### **1. Continued Discussion of Action Plan Update Including Comments on the 2009 Actions and Revisions to Match Actions, Goals, and to Identify New Projects**

TRANSPAC Manager Barbara Neustadter distributed copies of Edi Birsan's comments related to the Vision, Goals, and Current Issues for the 2014 County Transportation Plan (CTP) that Martin Engelmann had presented at the TRANSPAC meeting on November 14, 2013, along with a draft letter to Mr. Engelmann to transmit the comments that had been compiled from that presentation on November 14.

Ms. Neustadter advised of the need to complete the Action Plan Update early in 2014 and reiterated as she had at previous meetings that anything desired to be included in the Action Plan would have to be identified as soon as possible.

Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill, reported that she had received some comments from her request to the TAC at its last meeting on October 24, 2013 for comments from the 2009 Action Plan, from Ray Kuzbari and Eric Hu. If there were additional comments, she asked that they be submitted as soon as possible.

Ray Kuzbari presented another update to Ms. Dagang at this time.

In response to Rafat Raie, Ms. Dagang verified the need for updates to the 2008 Action Plan Project List given that some of the actions had been implemented. She explained there was no intent to recreate the list from scratch but to identify completed projects and anything that had been changed or been added, or where the cost of projects had changed, particularly those in 2007 dollars. She characterized the list as a wish list focused on Routes of Regional Significance (RORS).

Given the possibility of a re-up of a sales tax measure, Ms. Neustadter emphasized that potential projects for Central County should be included on the list.

Ms. Dagang concurred and explained that one of the big messages for a new sales tax measure is the inclusion of specific concrete projects to be able to pursue a successful measure. She emphasized the need for projects to be eligible and reiterated that the project list was for RORS, projects only, and while the projects did not have to be well defined, they had to be identified. She verified, when asked, that the Comprehensive Transportation Project Listing (CTPL) overlapped and projects that are on RORS could be pulled from the CTPL.

John Cunningham stated that having non-motorized projects on regional routes or parallel regional routes would take pressure off of regional routes and those non-motorized projects were actions to support, which he verified would be specific in the packet and should be a countywide policy as well. He suggested there was miscommunication with respect to non-motorized plans between the consultants and the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs).

Ms. Dagang suggested that language should be included in the memo to Mr. Engelmann. She commented that there had been a tendency to avoid making non-motorized RORS although support for RORS had validity.

Ms. Neustadter explained that part of the problem continued to be Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) and non-motorized RORS, which she wanted to stay away from because she did not believe it could be pulled off countywide, although recognition of the routes conceptually was important to fold into the TRANSPAC Action Plan.

In response to Mr. Kuzbari as to what other RTPCs were doing, Mr. Cunningham stated that the Tri-Valley Transportation Council (TVTC) was pushing the Iron Horse Trail, the Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) wanted to raise the profile of the Lafayette/Moraga Trail, and the West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee (WCCTAC) had conversations but had been told that the other RTPCs were not addressing non-motorized roads or facilities at all.

Ms. Dagang stated that she would follow up on that situation.

Ms. Neustadter commented that except for the MTSOs, non-motorized routes are an interesting idea if it is possible to include in a reasonable way that did not create more problems for jurisdictions.

Mr. Cunningham explained that the Countywide Transportation Plan Task Force had a good discussion on non-motorized routes when the issue of MTSOs had been raised, although he suggested non-motorized routes could be addressed in another manner with some guidance to staff that non-motorized facilities would be economically beneficial.

Ms. Neustadter wanted to come together with something that was workable. She suggested getting the concept into the Action Plans to then roll it up into the rest of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority's (CCTA's) documents. While perhaps only two of the four RTPCs might want to move forward on the issue of non-motorized routes, she suggested that would at least set something in motion. In her opinion, the problem is that non-motorized routes had only been brought up in the discussion of Action Plans and they should be discussed separate from the Action Plans.

Mr. Cunningham concurred and suggested the RTPC specificity on priorities was great but in some areas it was a divide and conquer situation where there were different messages and one coherent message in some instances would be preferable. He noted that TRANSPLAN had discussed the inclusion of the Delta de Anza Trail.

Ms. Dagang advised that she would follow up on those discussions.

Mario Moreno suggested the issue was how consistent non-motorized is in the RTPCs given non-motorized goals and some non-motorized bicycle strategies in the Action Plan.

Ms. Dagang explained that while the Iron Horse Trail itself was not a RORS, the discussion could be about a project that benefitted non-motorized trails and other crossings since they benefitted RORS. In response to Mr. Moreno as to whether or not it could be included in the program, she stated that could be done although it would be more powerful if there was a consistent treatment with all the RTPCs.

Mr. Cunningham referred to the countywide network and the policies to guide non-motorized strategies which should allow a countywide approach. He commented that the Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee should have been asked to provide some guidance in the process although that had not occurred in that they had been excluded. He supported a countywide approach.

Ms. Neustadter commented it was unlikely that all the RTPCs would buy into the non-motorized strategies in this round. She suggested that TRANSPAC could make that move first, include SWAT if possible, and set up a non-motorized process for the next round. She suggested going to the CCTA for TRANSPAC support and potentially support to be used as a model in the future.

In response to Mr. Kuzbari as to schedule, Ms. Dagang advised of the ultimate goal to have the draft Action Plan approved by TRANSPAC at its February 13, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Neustadter stated that if getting to the point where it thinks it can achieve something, TRANSPAC could ask for an extension and figure out a concept to address non-motorized routes.

Mr. Dagang questioned how that would fit in with the CTP schedule in that the environmental document had to be completed in March or April 2014. She emphasized that the draft is not final and some things could be changed.

Mr. Cunningham referred to a list of comments from the county and asked Ms. Dagang if she had received them. When told that she had not, he stated he would transmit them as soon as possible.

Ms. Dagang supported a TAC meeting on December 19, 2013 to be able to pull together concepts at that meeting and wanted to talk about how the actions and the goals worked together in that part of the Action Plan where more of the concepts were communicated. She wanted an early preliminary draft to allow consideration of verbiage and re-emphasized the need for comments from the TAC.

With respect to Bailey Road and in response to Mr. Raie, Ms. Dagang explained that the date on the final document would be 2014 and anything either completed or well underway by next year should be removed from the project list unless there was a compelling need to retain it.

Mr. Raie asked if the new Action Plan would reference completed projects to provide a footprint of what had been accomplished, to which Ms. Dagang stated that had not been done but could be done to identify what had been completed since the last Action Plan.

Mr. Raie also referred to MTSOs, noted that Geary Road was a bike/ped project, and it seemed to him that in the recording of what had been done there should be a reference that the plan shall not exclude bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Ms. Dagang clarified that the projects had been broken down into bike, ped, roadway, and the like and some projects were repeated as a result. The goals and the projects were not meant to be exhaustive and was a way to include some broader-based projects, not meant to be interpreted that everything was mapped to a goal and they were all listed.

After the TAC meeting scheduled for December 19, 2013, Ms. Neustadter explained that the meetings had then been pulled until the end of January, and then only if needed.

Ms. Dagang suggested that one meeting in January might be needed to allow the TAC to review the plan that would be submitted to the CCTA.

In terms of coordinating a listing of wish list projects, Mr. Raie asked about the ongoing study for the Treat/Geary Ped/Bike project and the Treat/I-680 Overcrossing and Olympic Boulevard project, to which Mr. Cunningham advised that placeholders would be included for the Treat/I-680 Overcrossing and Olympic Boulevard project.

Ms. Dagang suggested that project listings could be very specific. She clarified that the Action Plan would include the same RORS map with one addition, Bailey Road, which is also a RORS in East County.

Mr. Raie suggested one way to include the bike/ped projects would be if there was an arterial that had some regional significance from a bicycle point of view, to which Ms. Dagang explained that had been discussed and there was nothing that met the regional criteria although Lamorinda had a concept of using the Action Plan to identify intra-routes of regional significance, and since Lamorinda wanted the MTSOs to apply on those roads there was a reason to include them. She added that if identifying more routes there would have to be MTSOs that would apply to them.

Mr. Raie referred to Olympic Boulevard which had a bicycle route of regional significance.

Ms. Dagang noted that in the next round a type of RORS would be additional miles that linked to RORS.

Mr. Kuzbari referenced the opportunity to reflect any non-motorized improvements when the actions in the project list had been included.

Ms. Dagang asked for more comments and strongly urged members of the TAC to look at the list to see if any costs needed to be updated. When asked for a copy of the updated lists, she explained that was being done in track change format. She also verified that Mr. Cunningham would be submitting a list from the County.

## **2. Preliminary Review of the Calendar Year 2012 and 2013 Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP) Biennial Compliance Checklist**

Ms. Neustadter explained that the item had been included on a previous TAC agenda when Jeremy Lochirco had asked the CCTA to advise of the changes to the Calendar Year 2012 and 2013 Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP) Biennial Compliance Checklist. She verified that the only changes were the dates, which had raised the question of whether there were any comments to the CCTA on the Biennial Compliance Checklist. She emphasized that those who worked with the Checklist should advise if there were any changes to be submitted to the CCTA.

Mr. Kuzbari commented that while he had no comments on the Checklist, he expressed concern for the mechanics of the program itself to be able to enter information in that the program did not work well, the windows were not expandable, and the whole report could not be printed out. While it had been partially fixed, there remained problems. It was his hope that the program would work better. He clarified that the program was not yet available on line.

Mr. Neustadter referred to the edits to the Biennial Compliance Checklist recommended by Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager that had been submitted for TAC review.

Corinne Dutra-Roberts had nothing to add to Ms. Overcashier's comments but questioned why housing was in the section it was in. She realized that changing things probably came with a lot of grief.

Mr. Kuzbari referred to many places where the term "transportation systems" appeared and which should have read *transportation demand management* (TDM). He asked for that change throughout the entire document for consistency.

Ms. Neustadter asked Ms. Dutra-Roberts to make that change and return the document to her.

Ms. Dutra-Roberts clarified that 511 Contra Costa had worked with SWAT, WCCTAC, and TRANSPAC to wordsmith the Draft Model Transportation Demand Management Ordinance, which had been submitted to Martin Engelmann in May or July. She would verify the status of the document with Mr. Engelmann.

Mr. Raie referred to Page 7 of the checklist and the Transportation Mitigation Program which asked to *Describe progress on implementation of the regional transportation mitigation program*. He took issue with the format of that section because it was not a checklist format.

Ms. Neustadter suggested that Mr. Raie's comments could be taken to TRANSPAC.

Mr. Kuzbari commented that the section had not been a problem in the past in that there was a mechanism, the Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP), which mechanism was usually cited. He suggested that those working with the Checklist could continue to do what had been done in the past.

Ms. Neustadter explained that the STMP had been approved by TRANSPAC and forwarded to the CCTA, and the STMP had been included in the Action Plan.

Mr. Engelmann suggested that the STMP be labeled more robustly.

### **3. Continued Discussion on Development of a TRANSPAC Measure J Line 28a Utilization Process**

Ms. Neustadter referenced the City of Pleasant Hill's recent request for Line 28a funds which had been approved with the statement that a process for the allocation of Line 28a funds in the future would have to be discussed. She wanted to see if anyone had ideas as to how to move forward. She noted the healthy discussion of whether or not a serious protocol was needed and whether to divide the funds equally among the jurisdictions or to leave the fund as is pending future requests. During the course of discussions, there had been a suggestion that consideration be given to the ability to use those funds for a local share requirement on a grant request, for instance. She wanted to get an initial take on the thoughts of the purpose for which the dollars would be used, thoughts on what kind of process would be needed, formal or otherwise, and what a formal process would look like.

Mr. Cunningham suggested that the request for funds had worked well in the short term for the City of Pleasant Hill but he did not think that would work for a long-term strategy. He recommended some process and suggested for efficiency sake doing what SWAT had been doing with a similar pot of money, in which case a population and road miles basis had been used. He suggested their approach was reasonable but there should be a discussion of priorities since the money was not all available now. He added that a leveraging of funds should also be considered.

Ms. Neustadter clarified, when asked, that the difference between Line 20a funds and Line 28a funds was that Line 28a funds would have to be used for some emergency where there was no other alternative, no other funds for a project that could be lost. She suggested from a process standpoint that since the future is unknown creating a financial process, a divvying up protocol, was not preferable and the best thing to do would be to wait until a jurisdiction had an emergency and requested the use of the funds at which time the details, with a recommendation, would allow TRANSPAC to decide whether to approve the request.

Mr. Moreno stated from the City of Pleasant Hill's point of view, there might need to be a cap in the future where an agency had to make a request each time there was a need for the funds to ensure that a jurisdiction was not taking more than its fair share. He recommended a cap and asked if that cap should be based on available funds which currently totaled \$2 million but was expected to total \$16 million over the life of the measure. He recommended that a fair share process be considered over a period of time.



Mr. Kuzbari stated that the purpose was clear in the Expenditure Plan. As far as process, he recommended a distribution similar to the 18 percent return to source the CCTA used for its local streets maintenance improvement allocation, and recommended the creation of a spreadsheet of distributions to keep track of how much each city was getting over the life of the program.

Mr. Kuzbari explained that if there was a cap, a cap on any individual project could be considered, which cap could be based on the allocation available through the distribution. He offered to write up a proposal and return that proposal to the TAC for discussion.

Mr. Raie asked how the emergency would be defined, whether a jurisdiction could plan for an emergency, and whether a project would have to be in jeopardy. If there was an emergency, he recommended that the emergency be defined as not occurring before the initiation of the project.

Mr. Moreno described the emergency in the City of Pleasant Hill's case where there were no other funds available for a project that had come in over the Engineer's Estimate. He suggested leaving the situation as is pending another emergency.

Mr. Kuzbari wanted to keep the process as flexible as possible to allow a review of each request on a case-by-case basis, and recommended a process where the fair share distribution would be well defined.

Mr. Raie commented that if the fund was to solve an emergency, fair share did not fit, and the question was either to save the project or not. He stated fair share had its place elsewhere in the plan but in his opinion a Line 28a process would not be fair share. The purpose of the fund was to get a project out of an emergency and in a fair share process everyone would have an emergency to get the funds.

Mr. Cunningham suggested that fair share would be a guideline and not an explicit cap. If a fair share process was preferred, the line item would be converted to a contingency line item.

Mr. Kuzbari stated that was what he had in mind, a guideline to review requests on a case-by-case basis. He did not want too many rules and preferred to keep it at the common sense level since TRANSPAC, and not the TAC, would approve the use of the funds.

Ms. Neustadter clarified that TRANSPAC relied greatly and valued greatly the opinion of the TAC and if overruling a recommendation from the TAC there would have to be a compelling reason to do that. She emphasized that the City of Pleasant Hill's issue had been important; an emergency for a project that was important to Central County.

Mr. Raie recognized the desire to keep the fairness and not fair share. If fairness was what the TAC wanted then it would be a good idea to attempt to define fair. Fair share meant to him that each jurisdiction would get a similar amount.

John McKenzie suggested that a percentage system similar to return to source should identify a percentage of the total cost of the project which would represent a fair aspect, a contingency.

Mr. Moreno understood that SWAT had used the return to source formula that Mr. Kuzbari had suggested as a guideline and not a rule.

Mr. Kuzbari reiterated that he would put his proposal in writing and return it to the TAC for discussion.

Ms. Neustadter raised the need to figure out a process for the Action Plan, and once done, to work its way back through the TRANSPAC jurisdictions to allow the city councils to look at it. She suggested it would be helpful if there was a more formal process to document that the Action Plan was provided to the city councils/city managers, and she asked TAC members to think about the best way to do that for their jurisdictions.

Mr. Cunningham commented that the County Board of Supervisors would just end up reviewing the draft CTP as opposed to reviewing the Action Plan for each RTPC.

Mr. Moreno suggested taking it back to each city council/city manager to advise them of its existence.

Mr. Kuzbari clarified that the jurisdictions did not need to sign the document in that they just had to be aware that it existed.

Ms. Neustadter expressed her presumption that TAC members were keeping their colleagues informed of the status of the Action Plan throughout the process. She noted that Martin Engelmann wanted to make sure that the documents were being distributed.

Mr. Raie stated that Mr. Engelmann could make a presentation to the city councils/city managers.

#### **4. Update on 511 Contra Costa and TRANSPAC Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Formation to Establish a JPA as the Administrative Construct for the Two Entities**

Ms. Neustadter reported that TRANSPAC had authorized the hiring of an attorney to assist in determining the appropriate way to address a CalPERS [California Public Employees Retirement System] issue that had arisen on 511 Contra Costa. She advised that the process of hiring an attorney was ongoing and there were any number of issues that needed to be addressed up to and including the financials of the attorney. She explained that she had met with a member of the Walnut Creek City Council on that City's take of the issue and would be talking with the Walnut Creek City Manager. She commented that Walnut Creek had a similar problem with its Solid Waste staff because Walnut Creek was doing the financials for the Solid Waste Authority. She explained that while this was happening with more frequency there were different paths of resolution, which she was pursuing, and expressed her hope to be able to bring something together for approval at the December meeting.

There were no comments or questions.

Ms. Dutra-Roberts took this opportunity to announce that 511 Contra Costa would be outreaching in early 2014 to advise of electric vehicle offerings.

Mr. Cunningham advised that there was both an Existing Conditions Report and a Complete Streets Analysis on the I-680 CSMP website, with comments expected by December 4, 2013. He also advised that the public outreach meeting for the Olympic Corridor Trail Connector Study had been scheduled for 5:00 P.M. on December 5, 2013 at Parkmead.

Ms. Neustadter referred to the draft letter to Martin Engelmann transmitting TRANSPAC comments on the Vision, Goals, and Current Issues for the 2014 CTP, and reiterated the need for TAC members to advise of anything that needed to be added or removed from the Project List.

## **5. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 A.M. The next meeting of the TAC is scheduled for December 19, 2013. Given the Action Plan schedule, additional Action Plan “just in case” meetings have been designated for January 23, 2014 and January 30, 2014, if needed.

## ***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 Livorno 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 Pittsburgh 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.

## 2014 Central County Action Plan Update

### *Wording for TRANSPAC Board Review*

#### **Action Plan Tenets**

TRANSPAC has established six tenets to guide the development of region-wide objectives and actions for managing the efficiency of the transportation network. The tenets recognize that, because capacity-expansion projects are limited, as Central County continues to grow, improvements to the transportation system will need to focus more on demand and efficiency, rather than solely on capacity improvements.

The tenets were developed under two key assumptions, based on the adopted general plans of Clayton, Concord, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek, and Contra Costa County.

Central County is 85 to 90 percent “built out” and most development will be infill.

Although infill development that occurs near transit facilities and downtowns will generate fewer new vehicle trips, this development will add both ridership to public transit and traffic to already-congested roadways.

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

## Goals – list as bullets not numbers

1. 3. Encourage land use decisions that address the increase in overall traffic demand
2. 2. Support the enhancement and expansion of an efficient transit system
3. 9. Support use of HOV and express lanes
4. 8. Work to improve freeway flow
5. 5. Manage arterial traffic flow
6. 6. Support the implementation of Complete Streets, including the improvement of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
7. 7. Increase participation in the 511 Contra Costa TDM Program
- 8.
9. 1. Maintain existing transportation system and infrastructure
10. 4. Support the use, enhancement, and expansion of low emission technologies

## Goals

- Maintain existing transportation system and infrastructure
- Support the enhancement and expansion of an efficient transit system
- Encourage land use decisions that address the increase in overall traffic demand
- Support the use, enhancement, and expansion of low emission technologies
- Manage arterial traffic flow
- Support the implementation of Complete Streets, including the improvement of bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Increase participation in the 511 Contra Costa TDM Program
- Work to improve freeway flow
- Support use of HOV and express lanes



Edi Birsan  
950 Alla Ave,  
Concord, CA 94518  
510-812-8180 (cell)

**SENT BY E-MAIL**

*Transpac is the long term commitment of local city representatives coming together in a regional effort to achieve transportation goals that will be beneficial and fair to all concerned. By cooperation and integration of local priorities we can build the infrastructure needed and wanted for this century's prosperity and growth. We will establish and support projects that originate in our local communities bringing a network of transportation solutions through all the dimensions of current and future challenges.*

Goals and initial strategies:

**1. Constant Relevance**

First and foremost we will always maintain a constant communication with our local communities both to identify and hear their concerns and modify our transportation priorities as needed. We will be updating local neighborhoods on the prospective approaches and make data available to understand their transportation picture. This is to be done by open meetings, transparent data sourcing, public workshops and review locally.

**2. Alternatives to single occupant car travel**

Expand the transportation options so as to be able to reduce the dependence on single occupant vehicles as the most viable transportation solution. This is to be done by developing a network of alternatives such as rail, tram, bus, shuttles, bicycle and pedestrian modes that overlay on a web of locations that are geared towards work, homes, school and play destinations.

**3. Reduce the combined metric of: time/length/cost (both financial and environmental) of transportation relative to desired destination.**

By looking at where our communities want to go to, when and why, we may be able to bring those purposes closer and thus present a transportation solution. In this regard we need to develop a web area pattern of route solutions rather than the spoke system of current main thoroughfares with its focus outside of Contra Costa.

**4. Maintain and protect the transportation infrastructure**

By responding in both planning and construction to known recurring negative events such as storm surges, floods, earthquakes and normal wear and tear, as well as prospective challenges and opportunities from shifting technologies and material sciences, we can create solutions that can provide a long term commitment to transportation accessibility. We will do this by shifting transportation assets away from destructive trend areas and provide alternative routes and methodologies where needed.

2009 Actions and Projects for TAC Review

# **CENTRAL COUNTY ACTION PLAN**

**for**

**Routes of Regional Significance**

**Adopted July 9, 2009**



Figure 1-1

<b>GOAL 1</b>	Encourage land use decisions that manage the increase of overall traffic demand
<b>ACTIONS</b>	1-A: Continue to support implementation of the Measure C/J Growth Management Program.
	1-B: Continue to support higher-density development around transit hubs and downtowns.
	1-C: Continue to require each jurisdiction to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Notice the initiation of the environmental review process for projects generating more than 100 net-new peak-hour vehicle trips.</li> <li>b) For projects that require a General Plan Amendment, identify any conflicts with Action Plan MTSOs and then, if requested, present the analysis results and possible mitigation strategies to TRANSPAC for review and comment.</li> </ul>
	1-D: Include the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists in the design, construction, and maintenance of development projects.
	1-E: Continue to implement the TRANSPAC Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.

<b>GOAL 2</b>	Increase HOV lane usage
<b>ACTIONS</b>	2-A: Support the completion of a continuous HOV system on I-680.
	2-B: Support consistent occupancy requirements for toll-free HOV lanes on the Benicia-Martinez Bridge and I-680.
	2-C: Support additional incentives for HOV users.
	2-D: Provide additional park-and-ride lots.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC will continue to advocate for funding and phasing to complete the HOV lane system and to encourage incentives.
<b>TIMELINE</b>	Depending on funding availability, Action 2-A in the southbound direction is intended to be completed by 2014. Other actions are ongoing.

<b>GOAL 3</b>	Work to improve freeway flow
<b>ACTIONS</b>	3-A: Continue to monitor and evaluate operational improvements at freeway interchanges on I-680, SR-242, SR-24, and SR-4.
	3-B: Continue to support the completion of the fourth bore of the Caldecott Tunnel (SR-24).
	3-C: Support the study and implementation of potential regional freeway management strategies.
	3-D: Consider a multi-agency approach to freeway ramp metering.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing. Depending on funding availability, target completion of the Caldecott Tunnel fourth bore is 2014.

<b>GOAL 4</b>	Manage arterial traffic flow
<b>ACTIONS</b>	4-A: Seek funding for traffic and transit improvements along Regional Routes.
	4-B: Continue to implement the Central Contra Costa Traffic Management Program.
	4-C: Where feasible and appropriate, address the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists along Regional Routes.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.

<b>GOAL 5</b>	Support an efficient and effective transit system
<b>ACTIONS</b>	<p>5-A: Support the development of real-time information and better connectivity for regional transit and local and feeder bus service.</p> <p>5-B: Promote coordination of transfer times among Express bus, feeder bus, BART, and park-and-ride lots.</p> <p>5-C: Support the expansion of BART service and BART station and parking facilities.</p> <p>5-D: Support the construction and maintenance of accessible bus stops, park-and-ride lots, and transit hubs.</p> <p>5-E: Support improvements that increase the efficiency of local transit on Regional Routes.</p> <p>5-F: Support increased access to BART stations for buses and other alternative modes.</p> <p>5-G: Support innovative approaches to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of transit services for seniors and disabled persons through the allocation of Central County's Measure J \$10 million for Additional Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities. These funds are in addition to Measure J Other Countywide Programs and total \$35 million in Central County.</p> <p>5-H: Support expansion and use of park-and-ride facilities using Express and local buses.</p>
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.

<b>GOAL 6</b>	Increase participation in the 511 Contra Costa Program to improve multi-modal mobility and decrease single-occupant vehicle use in Central County
<b>ACTIONS</b>	<p>6-A: Support the 511 Contra Costa Program to educate and encourage Contra Costa residents, students and commuters to use multi-modal alternatives by promoting transit, shuttles, carpooling, vanpooling, walking, bicycling, alternative work schedules, and telecommuting.</p> <p>6-B: Develop TDM programs at K-12 schools and colleges to encourage carpooling, transit ridership, walking, and bicycling.</p> <p>6-C: Promote alternative work opportunities including employer pre-tax benefit programs, compressed work-week schedules, flex schedules, and telework.</p> <p>6-D: Encourage commuters to make local trips or trips linked to transit by walking, bicycling, or carpooling instead of driving alone.</p> <p>6-E: Promote park-and-ride lot use to potential carpoolers, vanpoolers, and transit riders, including shuttle services, where applicable.</p> <p>6-F: In cooperation with Central County jurisdictions, develop TDM plans and provide consultations to improve mobility and decrease parking demand for new development and redevelopment.</p> <p>6-G: Explore innovative new technologies to improve mobility and reduce SOV trips.</p> <p>6-H: Seek funding to provide bicycle parking infrastructure at employment sites and activity centers throughout Central County.</p> <p>6-I: Encourage "green" commuting, including ZEV and NEV vehicles, clean fuel infrastructure, and car sharing.</p>
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	511 Contra Costa, TRANSPAC, and TRANSPAC jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.



## Interstate 680

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<p>I-680 is a north-south eight- to twelve-lane divided freeway. It begins north of the TRANSPAC area at the I-80–Cordelia interchange and travels south through Solano County, entering TRANSPAC’s region after it crosses the Benicia-Martinez Bridge. From the bridge, it extends south through the SR-4 and SR-242 interchanges. The I-680/SR-24 interchange is near TRANSPAC’s southern boundary in Walnut Creek. I-680 continues south through the Southwest Regional Transportation Planning Committee (SWAT) area.</p> <p>I-680 is a major commute route for Solano County and for Central and East Contra Costa County travelers. The Walnut Creek, Pleasant Hill, and Concord BART Stations; the Martinez Intermodal Facility; and the soon-to-be-built Pacheco Transit Hub are accessed from I-680.</p>
<b>ISSUE STATEMENT</b>	<p>The 1995 Action Plan projected that from 1990 to 2010 traffic growth on I-680 south of SR-242 would increase from 175,000 to 303,600 vehicles per day. By 2006, Caltrans data indicated that volumes on I-680 just south of Treat Boulevard/Geary Road had reached 296,000 vehicles per day.</p> <p>Between years 2007 and 2030, traffic volumes on I-680 are projected to increase by approximately 30 percent, reaching 400,000 vehicles per day.</p> <p>TRANSPAC’s tenets support completion of an HOV-lane system in Central County for carpoolers and buses to bypass peak-period congestion.</p>

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO: 4.0 Delay Index

- Continue to support investment in and implementation of HOV lanes on I-680.
- Continue to support planned improvements to the I-680/SR-4 interchange and to SR-4.
- Continue to work with Solano County to manage traffic in the I-680 corridor.
- Complete the I-680 HOV Express bus access study funded through Regional Measure 2.

## Interstate 680

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Southbound HOV Lane Gap Closure from North Main to Livorna Road
- Improvements to I-680/SR-4 freeway interchange
- Improvements to SR-4 (see subsequent section on SR-4)

## State Route 242

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	State Route 242 is a four-mile north-south freeway that connects SR-4 west of Port Chicago Highway to I-680 just south of Willow Pass Road. It is a three-lane road in each direction.
<b>ISSUE STATEMENT</b>	As a connector between I-680 and SR-4, SR-242 is a link between East and Central County. SR-242 is anticipated to experience a 30 percent increase in traffic volumes during the peak hours by 2030. Today, traffic on southbound SR-242 in the AM peak period backs up from the I-680 Interchange to north of Clayton Road.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO: 3.0 Delay Index

- Support the study and design of Clayton Road interchange improvements.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Construction and modification of southbound ramps at the Clayton Road interchange
- Construction of northbound Clayton Road on-ramp
- Construction of the third lane of the southbound Commerce Avenue off-ramp

## State Route 4

### DESCRIPTION

State Route 4 is an east-west freeway that runs from East Contra Costa and San Joaquin County to I-80 in West Contra Costa through Central Contra Costa. West of the SR-242 Interchange in Concord, it has four to six lanes; east of the interchange, it has eight to ten lanes, including an HOV lane in each direction. SR-4 provides access to the North Concord/Martinez BART Station, the Martinez Intermodal Facility, and the soon-to-be-constructed Pacheco Transit Hub.

### ISSUE STATEMENT<sup>1</sup>

By 2030, traffic volumes are projected to increase between 40 and 80 percent, depending on the segment, during the AM and PM peak hours. In addition, congestion at the westbound SR-4/SR-242 Interchange will increase because carpools and buses must transition from the westbound HOV lane to the mixed-flow lanes on both SR-4 and SR-242.

The highest volume segment of SR-4 is on the Willow Pass grade. Traffic at this location is projected to increase by 40 percent with no planned widening at this location. Additionally, SR-4 experiences delay at the I-680/SR-4 Interchange because of short weaving sections.

The cost of the phased reconstruction of the I-680/SR-4 interchange is estimated at more than \$320 million in 2007 dollars. To accelerate the reconstruction, TRANSPAC is working with CCTA to re-phase the project, including the completion of the third travel lanes on SR-4 from Solano Way/Port Chicago Highway on the east to Morello Avenue on the west.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

**MTSO: 5.0 Delay Index from Cummings Skyway (WCCTAC boundary) to Willow Pass (TRANSPLAN boundary)** This MTSO is expected to be revised upon completion and adoption of the Corridor Management Plan by TRANSPAC, TRANSPLAN and WCCTAC (see Action below).

#### ACTIONS

- Partner with TRANSPLAN and WCCTAC to develop a Corridor Management Plan for SR4 from East County through Central County

<sup>1</sup>As of July 2008, the City of Concord is planning for the development at the Concord Naval Weapons Station but has not yet incorporated these plans into its General Plan. As a result, development on that site is not assumed in this Action Plan.

## State Route 4

(boundaries to be defined) including connecting and/or supporting arterials. This process will identify an MTSO(s) for SR4, actions, projects and define an approach to managing arterials in the corridor. TRANSPAC, TRANSPLAN and WCCTAC jointly will seek funding for the Corridor Management Plan from CCTA and other available sources.

- Support improvements to the I-680/SR-4 interchange

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Improvements to the I-680/SR-4 interchange, including construction of a third lane between Solano Way/Port Chicago Highway to Morello Avenue
- Construction of the Pacheco Transit Hub

## Alhambra Avenue

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	Alhambra Avenue is a north-south roadway that extends from downtown Martinez south, under SR-4, to Taylor Boulevard in Pleasant Hill, where its name changes to Pleasant Hill Road. It is generally a four-lane roadway. Only the portion south of Arch Street is designated as a Regional Route. It serves as a parallel route to I-680 and a shortcut around the I-680/SR-24 Interchange.
<b>ISSUE STATEMENT</b>	By 2030, traffic volumes are projected to increase approximately 5 percent during the AM peak hour and 10 percent during the PM peak hour. Proposed improvements along the I-680 corridor are necessary to manage the traffic on this roadway.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO:

- Martinez: 15 MPH Average Speed for both directions during AM and PM peak hours
- Pleasant Hill: 15 MPH Average Speed for both directions during AM and PM peak hours

#### ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Pursue planning and funding for Alhambra Avenue improvements and widening.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Construction of a second southbound lane on Alhambra Avenue from Walnut Avenue to Franklin Canyon Road with other necessary signal, ramp, and median modifications
- Completion of the Alhambra Avenue Widening Phase III project

## Clayton Road

**DESCRIPTION** Clayton Road is a four- to six-lane, east-west roadway that connects Marsh Creek Road east of Clayton to SR-242 in Concord. Between Ygnacio Valley Road/Kirker Pass Road and Treat Boulevard, it is a Regional Route. It is the east-west traffic spine for Central Contra Costa and provides direct access to the Concord BART station and connection to the Pleasant Hill and Walnut Creek BART stations.

**ISSUE STATEMENT** By 2030, AM peak-hour traffic volume is projected to increase 6 percent with the percentage of traffic with East County origins projected to increase to 19 percent of total volume. For the PM peak hour, total traffic volume is projected to increase 8 percent, with the percentage of traffic with East County destinations projected to increase to 16 percent of total volume. TRANSPAC and TRANSPLAN must continue to work together on the East-Central Traffic Management Program.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO:

- Clayton: 15 MPH Average Speed for both directions during AM and PM peak hours
- Concord: Average Stopped Delays for the following intersections:
  - Kirker Pass Road/Ygnacio Valley Road: 3
  - Treat Boulevard/Denkinger Road: 3

#### ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Complete Clayton Road/Treat Boulevard/Denkinger Road intersection capacity improvements.
- Work with TRANSPLAN on Clayton Road/Marsh Creek Road corridor operation and management.
- Seek funding to improve vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access at the Concord BART Station.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Clayton Road /Treat Boulevard/Denkinger Road intersection capacity improvements
- Implementation of various vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access improvements at the Concord BART Station

## Contra Costa Boulevard

**DESCRIPTION** Contra Costa Boulevard is a north-south roadway that begins at 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue in Pleasant Hill as an extension of Pacheco Boulevard. It runs south through Pleasant Hill to become North Main Street at Oak Park in Walnut Creek. It runs parallel, to the west, to I-680 and varies in width from four to six lanes and serves as a bypass to I-680.

**ISSUE STATEMENT** By 2030, traffic volumes on Contra Costa Boulevard are projected to increase by 15 percent during the AM peak hour and by 10 percent during the PM peak hour. System-efficiency improvements are underway.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

**MTSO:**

- Average Speed, AM Peak Hour: 15 MPH northbound and 12 MPH southbound
- Average Speed, PM Peak Hour: 10 MPH in both directions

**ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:**

- Complete Contra Costa Boulevard improvement project.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Between 2nd Avenue and Monument Boulevard, construction of additional right and left turn lanes, modification of intersection lane alignments, and addition of a new class II bike lane
- Improvement of traffic operations throughout corridor



## Geary Road

**DESCRIPTION** Geary Road runs east-west, connecting North Main Street at I-680 to Pleasant Hill Road to the west. East of I-680, Geary Road becomes Treat Boulevard. Over half its length, Geary Road is two lanes with center turn lanes. It serves as an access route to the Pleasant Hill BART station.

**ISSUE STATEMENT** As traffic volumes increase on Treat Boulevard, traffic volumes are likely to increase on Geary Road, because it serves as an alternate route to SR-24 in Lafayette.

Completion of the Phase III widening project and bus, bike and pedestrian improvements will improve access for the Pleasant Hill BART Station.

### MTSOs, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

**MTSO:**

- LOS F at North Main Street intersection

**ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:**

- Complete widening.
- Seek funding to improve vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access at the Pleasant Hill BART Station.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Geary Road Widening Phase III
- Implementation of various vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access improvements at the Pleasant Hill BART Station

## North Main Street

**DESCRIPTION** North Main Street is a north-south roadway in Walnut Creek that is the continuation of Contra Costa Boulevard. It is a four-lane roadway that is a Regional Route from Oak Park to San Luis Road. It runs parallel to I-680 and provides access to the interstate at both Treat Boulevard/Geary Road and San Luis Road. It connects two BART stations and serves local traffic.

**ISSUE STATEMENT** By 2030, peak-hour traffic volumes are projected to increase by 5 to 10 percent.

### MTSOs, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

**MTSO:**

- LOS F at Treat Boulevard/Geary Road intersection

**ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:**

- Assess possible application of the Central Contra Costa Traffic Management Program.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- None

## Pacheco Boulevard

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	Pacheco Boulevard is a two- to four-lane north-south roadway connecting Pine Street south of downtown Martinez, under SR-4 and along I-680, to 2 <sup>nd</sup> street in Pleasant Hill, where it becomes Contra Costa Boulevard.
<b>ISSUE STATEMENT</b>	Peak-hour traffic volumes on Pacheco Boulevard are projected to increase by 10 percent in the AM and 15 percent in the PM by 2030. Widening for a portion of Pacheco Boulevard is currently programmed, which will improve traffic flow and vehicle, bus and bicycle access to the Pacheco Transit Hub at the I-680/SR-4 interchange.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO:

- Martinez: 15 MPH Average Speed in both directions in the AM and PM peak hours
- Contra Costa County: 1.5 V/C for all intersections

#### ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Assess possible applications of the Central Contra Costa Traffic Management Program.
- Complete Pacheco Transit Hub.
- Seek funding to widen Pacheco Boulevard to four lanes and make related improvements.
- Coordinate proposed improvements to the I-680/SR-4 interchange with surrounding arterials and local streets.
- Assess the need for improvements at the Pacheco Boulevard/Arnold Drive intersection.
- Work with Contra Costa County staff on coordination of the implementation of the Buchanan Airport Master Plan.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Construction of Pacheco Transit Hub
- Widening of road segments to four lanes and construction of a new railroad over-crossing for Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (likely to occur in phases)

## Pleasant Hill Road

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	Within TRANSPAC's region, Pleasant Hill Road is a north-south, two- to four-lane roadway that connects Geary Road and Taylor Boulevard into Lafayette and, through SWAT's region, to SR-24.
<b>ISSUE STATEMENT</b>	Pleasant Hill Road and Taylor Boulevard currently serve as a parallel route for drivers through Central County to SR-24. The CCTA model indicates that there will be an increase in peak-hour traffic on Pleasant Hill Road.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO:

- Pleasant Hill: 15 MPH Average Speed in both directions in the AM and PM peak hours
- Contra Costa County: 1.5 V/C for all intersections

#### ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Work with SWAT/City of Lafayette on corridor issues and, if feasible, consider development of a traffic management plan and other operational strategies for Pleasant Hill Road.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- As may be determined in concert with SWAT/City of Lafayette

## Taylor Boulevard

**DESCRIPTION** Taylor Boulevard is a four-lane, north-south roadway that connects Contra Costa Boulevard to Pleasant Hill Road and, effectively, SR-4 to SR-24. Local traffic travels this route as a bypass to I-680 and the I-680/SR-24 interchange.

**ISSUE STATEMENT** By 2030, peak-hour traffic volumes are projected to increase by 5 to 10 percent.

### MTSOs, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

**MTSO:**

- Pleasant Hill: 15 MPH Average Speed in both directions in the AM and PM peak hours
- Contra Costa County: 1.5 V/C for all intersections

**ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:**

- Assess possible application of the Central Contra Costa Traffic Management Program.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Improvement of traffic operations through the corridor

## Treat Boulevard

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	Treat Boulevard is a divided four- to eight-lane arterial that serves as a main commuter route from Clayton Road in Concord to I-680 and the Pleasant Hill Bart Station. It runs parallel to Ygnacio Valley Road.
<b>ISSUE STATEMENT</b>	By 2030, peak-hour traffic volumes are projected to increase between 15 and 25 percent. Improving vehicle, bus, bike and pedestrian access for the Pleasant Hill BART Station will be necessary.

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO:

- Concord: Average Stopped Delays (signal cycles to clear) at the following intersections:
  - Clayton Road/Denkinger Road: 3
  - Cowell Road: 5
  - Oak Grove Road: 5
- Walnut Creek: LOS F at Bancroft Road intersection
- Contra Costa County: 1.5 V/C for all intersections

#### ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Seek funding to improve vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access at the Pleasant Hill BART Station.

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Implementation of various vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access improvements at the Pleasant Hill BART Station

## Ygnacio Valley Road/Kirker Pass Road

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	Ygnacio Valley Road is a four- to six-lane divided roadway that extends from I-680 in Walnut Creek to Clayton Road. Beyond Clayton Road, Ygnacio Valley Road becomes Kirker Pass Road, a four- to six-lane roadway that then becomes Railroad Avenue in Pittsburg and connects to SR-4. It is a primary alternate route for SR-4 commute traffic to and from East County.
<b>ISSUE STATEMENT</b>	<p>Commute traffic flow is bi-directional but primarily westbound in the morning and eastbound in the evening. Peak-hour traffic volumes on the route generally have been stable over the last decade, in part because TRANSPAC and TRANSPLAN adopted the East-Central Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>In the future, Ygnacio Valley Road peak-period and daily traffic volumes are expected to increase modestly. In contrast, peak-hour peak-direction traffic volumes on Kirker Pass Road are projected to increase by 36 percent during the AM peak hour and 57 percent during the PM peak hour.</p> <p>The Walnut Creek BART station is adjacent to I-680 in the downtown area. The station parking area will be reconfigured as part of the Walnut Creek BART Station transit village project.</p>

### MTSO, ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES

#### MTSO:

- Concord: Average Stopped Delays as follows:
  - Clayton Road/Kirker Pass Road: 3
  - Alberta Way/Pine Hollow Drive: 4
  - Cowell Road: 4
- Walnut Creek: LOS F at both Bancroft Road and Civic Drive intersections
- Contra Costa County: 1.5 V/C for all intersections

#### ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

- Continue to support implementation of the East-Central Traffic Management Plan.
- Seek funding from Measure J/STIP for a truck-climbing lane on Kirker Pass Road toward East County.
- Seek funding to improve vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access at the Walnut Creek BART Station.

## Ygnacio Valley Road/Kirker Pass Road

### PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

- Widening of Ygnacio Valley Road to six lanes between Cowell Road and Michigan Road
- Continued implementation of the East-Central Traffic Management Plan
- Construction of a truck-climbing lane on Kirker Pass Road from Concord toward Pittsburg
- Implementation of various vehicle, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian access improvements at the Walnut Creek BART Station



TABLE 5-1 2008 ACTION PLAN PROJECT LIST				
	CENTRAL COUNTY PROJECTS	Project	Secured	Prospective
Agency	Project Name	Cost (2007\$)	Funding	STIP Requests (estimate)
<b>FREEWAY PROJECTS</b>				
CCTA/CALTRANS	Caldecott Tunnel 4th Bore	\$420,000,00	TRANSPAC Measure J:\$62M	
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680 SB HOV Lane Restriping; Extend the Southbound HOV lane from north of Rudgear to Livorna Rd .	\$3,000,000	Measure J: \$3M	
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680 SB HOV Lane Gap Closure: Close the HOV gap between N. Main and Livorna.	\$44,000,000	Measure J: \$29M RM2: \$15M	
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680 NB HOV Lane Extension: N. Main to SR242	\$44,000,000	Measure J: \$4M	
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR4 Phase 3: Complete SR 4 missing lane	\$52,000,000	STIP-RIP: \$1.3M, Measure J: \$35.7	\$15M
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR 4 NB to WB	\$76,200,000		\$5M
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR4 EB to SB	\$44,000,000		\$2.5M
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR4 SB to EB	\$40,500,000		
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR4 WB to NB	\$26,000,000		
CCTA/TRANSPAC	I-680/SR4 HOV Flyover	\$82,000,000		
Martinez	I-680/Marina Vista Interchange Modifications	\$6,000,000	Measure J: \$1.3M	\$4.7M
Concord	SR242/Clayton Road On- and Off-ramps	\$31,000,000	Measure J: \$4.5M	\$26.5M
Concord	SR4/Willow Pass	\$32,800,000	Measure J: 2.8M:Developer Fees: \$20M	\$10M
Concord	SR4/Port Chicago Highway Interchange Improvements	\$35,000,000		
<b>ROAD PROJECTS</b>				
Clayton	Marsh Creek Road Upgrade	\$1,000,000		
Clayton	Pine Hollow Road Upgrade	\$300,000		
Concord	Waterworld Pkwy Bridge, to connect to Meridian Park Blvd.	\$12,500,000	Measure J: \$3M; Local: \$6.1M	\$3.4M
Concord	Clayton Rd. /Treat Blvd./Denkinger Rd. Intersection Capacity Improvements		Measure J: \$2M	
Concord	Commerce Avenue Roadway Extension and Bridge at Pine Creek	\$6,887,668	Measure C I-680: \$3.92M; TE Bill:\$1.36M; Local:\$1.60M	
Concord	Panoramic Dr. Extension	\$18,000,000		
Concord	Galaxy Way Bridge over Walnut Creek	\$11,000,000		
Concord	Ygnacio Valley Road Lane Ext. (Cowell to Michigan Widening)	\$11,000,000		
Concord	Bailey Road Traffic Improvements	\$4,790,026	Developer Fees: \$.123M; Local ROW:\$.039M	
County/Martinez	Pacheco Blvd: Widen to 4 lanes, construct new RR overcrossing for Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway. Can be phased	\$35,000,000	Measure J: \$4.9M; Measure C: \$3M; City Fees: \$1.5 M; TOSCO/Solano Fund \$3.6M	\$22M
County	Alhambra Valley Road realignment and safety projects to straighten curves and improve operational and safety characteristics	\$5,080,000	Martinez AOB: \$0.7M, Local \$1.5M	\$3M
County	Kirker Pass Rd Northbound Truck Climbing Lanes from Concord to Pittsburg . Note southbound truck lanes are not planned at this time.	\$8,500,000	Measure J: \$5.8M; Prop. 42: \$1.2M	\$1.5 M
County	Arnold Drive Extension	\$15,000,000		

	CENTRAL COUNTY PROJECTS	Project	Secured	Prospective
Agency	Project Name	Cost (2007\$)	Funding	STIP Requests (estimate)
Martinez	Alhambra Avenue Safety Improvements, Walnut Avenue to Franklin Canyon Rd; Construct a second southbound lane on Alhambra Ave from Walnut Ave to Franklin Canyon Rd with other necessary signal, ramp, and median modifications.	\$1,750,000	Local: \$.25M	\$1.5M
Martinez	North Court/UPRR Overpass	\$19,000,000		
Martinez	Alhambra Avenue Widening (Phase 3)	\$6,000,000	Other: \$1M	
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Blvd Improvement; Between 2nd Ave and Monument Blvd, construct additional right and left turn lanes at various intersections, modify intersection lane alignments, add new class II bike lane, improve traffic operations throughout corridor.	\$8,248,000	Local: \$1M, STP: \$.54M	\$7M
Pleasant Hill	Buskirk Avenue Realignment, Phase 2	\$10,000,00	Measure J: \$8M; City: \$1M	\$1M
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill Road Improvement project - phases iii,iv,v	\$1,800,000		
Pleasant Hill	Monument Boulevard Widening	\$12,000,000		
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Boulevard Widening at Gregory Gardens , Doris to Doray	\$425,000		
Pleasant Hill	Gregory lane right turn lane at I-680 off-ramp	\$275,000		
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Boulevard at Oak Park Blvd. south bridge connector	\$200,000		
Pleasant Hill	Mayhew Way Widening	\$562,000		
Pleasant Hill	Mayhew Way Frontage Improvements	\$88,000		
Pleasant Hill	Paso Nogal Improvements	\$200,000		
Pleasant Hill	Cleaveland Road widening and sidewalk improvements	\$325,000		\$1M
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill Road installation of new pedestrian and bicycle facilities, drainage improvements, traffic calming measures , and intersection improvements			
Pleasant Hill	Taylor Boulevard extend signal interconnect Pleasant Hill Road to Grayson Road			
Pleasant Hill	Taylor Boulevard eliminate free right turn lanes at Taylor Boulevard/Pleasant Hill Road intersection			
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road (YVR) Rehabilitation - Phase 1; Overlay YVR from California Blvd to Civic Drive, including ADA upgrades, safety, intersection and traffic operations improvements.	\$2,849,000	Local: \$.4M	
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road (YVR) Rehabilitation - Phase 2: I-680-California; Phase 3: Civic to Bancroft; Phase 4: Bancroft to Oak Grove; Phase 5: Oak Grove to City Limits	\$20,500,00		
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road @ Walnut Blvd. Left Turn Extension	\$400,000		
Walnut Creek	Bancroft/Ygnacio Valley Road New Eastbound Right Turn Lane	\$4,500,000		
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road @ Homestead Ave. Left Turn Extension (350 feet)	\$350,000		
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road @ Oak Grove Road Southbound Left Turn Lane	\$2,500,000		
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road @ Marchbanks/Tampico Left Turn Extension	\$300,000		
Walnut Creek	Parkside/Buena Vista Ave Intersection Improvements	\$1,150,000		
Walnut Creek	Ygnacio Valley Road @ San Carlos Left Turn Extension	\$500,000		
<b>TRANSIT PROJECTS</b>				
BART	BART Walnut Creek Station Capacity Expansion - includes new paid area, platform expansion, new vertical circulation, additional fare gates, and fare collection equipment. etc.	\$30,000,000		
BART	BART Pleasant Hill Station Capacity Expansion - includes expansion of existing paid area, new paid area, platform expansion, new vertical circulation, additional fare gates and fare collection equipment, etc.	\$50,000,000		

	CENTRAL COUNTY PROJECTS	Project	Secured	Prospective
Agency	Project Name	Cost (2007\$)	Funding	STIP Requests (estimate)
County Connection	Pacheco Transit Hub	\$2,031,922	PTMISEA:\$800k; Measure C: \$550k;RM2: \$1.089M; TFCA:\$92,922	
County Connection	DVC Transit Center	\$4,318,530	PTMISEA: \$2,231,030; T-Plus:\$350k; \$253k;FTA 5303:\$1,237,500; RM2:\$500k	
County Connection	Trunkline Transit service capital improvements from Pacheco Boulevard (Martinez) to Main Street (Walnut Creek) - Buses:	\$2,100,000		
County Connection	Infrastructure Improvements (bulb outs, queue jump lanes, passenger shelters, signage)	\$6,000,000		
County Connection	IT: (real time information, signal priority)	\$3,900,000		\$3.9M
Martinez	Martinez Intermodal Station (Phase 3)	\$12,600,000	Measure J: \$2.6M	
Martinez	Martinez Ferry Terminal	\$5,000,000		
511 CC/TRANSPAC	Clean Fuel Vehicle infrastructure	\$10,000,000		
<b>BICYCLE, PEDESTRIAN AND TRAIL PROJECTS</b>				
Clayton	Concord-Clayton Bikeway Clayton Town Center to Treat Boulevard in Concord	\$362,000		
Clayton	Mitchell Canyon Road, Pine Hollow to Clayton Road & South of Pine Hollow Road -Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$100,000		
Clayton	Oak Street , south of High Street, Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$50,000		
Clayton	Pine Hollow Road, West of Pine Hollow Estates Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$300,000		
Concord	Concord Boulevard Sidewalk Gap Closure Phase II	\$1,270,000	Bike/Ped Grant: \$0.82M; Local:\$0.45M	
Concord	Port Chicago Highway Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$270,000		
Concord	Treat Blvd Sidewalk - Coco's Restaurant to Cobblestone Drive Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$125,000		
Concord	Treat Boulevard-Cobblestone Drive to Cowell Road Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$800,000		
Concord	Monument Blvd & Meadow Ln Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements	\$4,044,000	TLC:\$2.2M; CDBG:\$0.275M; Local: \$1.569M	
County	Pleasant Hill BART Shortcut Pedestrian Path	\$2,169,000	CCCO: \$600K; SRTS:\$300K; TLC:\$25K	
County	Pleasant Hill BART Station Bicycle and Pedestrian Access	\$1,000,000		
County	Alhambra Valley Road Shoulder Widening. East of Castro Ranch	\$2,000,000	Prop1B:\$1.05M; HRS:\$900K; Briones AOB: \$25K	
County	Delta-De Anza Class I Trail from Evora Road to Port Chicago Hwy	\$500,000		
County	Delta-De Anza Class I Trail from Port Chicago Hwy to Iron Horse Trail			
County	Delta-De Anza Class I Trail from Port Chicago Hwy to Iron Horse Trail			
County	Iron Horse Trail Overcrossing at Treat Blvd. /Jones Road	\$12,200,000	TEA21 CMAQ:\$500K; Meas C Reg:\$887K;MeasC CCTA:\$400K;Trans. Impact Fees (SAP Fees) \$2.26M;RDA \$605K;MTC HIP:\$2.5M;MeasC TLC County:\$1M	Unfunded: \$401k

	CENTRAL COUNTY PROJECTS	Project	Secured	Prospective
Agency	Project Name	Cost (2007\$)	Funding	STIP Requests (estimate)
County	Carquinez Scenic Trail design/construction between Port Costa & Martinez	\$4,00,000	SAFETEA-LU: \$1M	
County	Clyde Union Pacific Right of Way Trail	\$1,500,000	Navy Mit. Funds \$1.5M	
County	Reliez Valley Road Pedestrian Path	\$1,400,000	STIP:\$342K Reliez Valley SP Fund: \$1.06M	
County	Alhambra Valley Road Realignment and Shoulder widening Bear Creek Road to 2,200 feet east	\$1,512,000	HR3:\$810k; Briones AOB	Unfunded: \$702k
County	Marsh Creek Road Curve Realignment between Aspara Drive and Deer Valley Road	\$3,630,000	Marsh Creek AOB: \$350K	
County	Marsh Creek Road Widening - 1 mi. East of Russelmann Park Road	\$2,210,000	HR3:\$810K; Prop1BL \$1.4M	
County	Rudgear Road/San Miguel Drive/Walnut Boulevard/Mountain View Boulevard Safety Improvements	\$350,000	Central Co. AOB	
County	Willow Pass Road Widening to 4 lanes / Gap Closure from Bailey Road to Pittsburg City limits	?		
County	Marsh Drive Widening	\$2,471,000	West Concord Fees:\$2,472,000	
County	Center Avenue Widening: Pacheco Boulevard to Blackwood Drive	\$5,300,000	West Concord Fees:\$588,000	
County	Evora Road/Willow Pass Road Intersection - West	\$1,700,000	Navy Mit Funds: \$1.3M	Unfunded: \$400k
County	Boulevard Way Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$62,000		
County	Mayhew Way Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$80,000		
County	Pacheco Boulevard (from 3785 to 3795) Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$335,000		
County	Pacheco Boulevard Sidewalk Gap Closure - Camino Del Sol to Windhover Way	\$589,000	SRTS: \$311k; TDA \$70k	
County	Pacheco Boulevard Sidewalk Gap Closure - Windhover way to Goree Court	\$621,500		
County	Arnold Industrial Way Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$80,000		
County	Springbrook Road Sidewalk Gap Closure			
County	Pacheco Blvd. (from 4101 to 4285 ) Sidewalk Gap Closure			
County	Alhambra Valley Road Pedestrian Bridge	\$500,000	Prop 1B: \$400K; Alhambra Valley Fees: \$60K	
County	Treat Boulevard Reconstruction	\$2,500,000		
Martinez	Bay Trail (all unconstructed Phases)	\$1,000,000		
Martinez	Contra Costa Canal Trail: Extend, Muir Rd. to Martinez Reservoir			
Martinez	Howe Street Bicycle Lanes			
Martinez	Marina Vista Bike Lanes: Extend	\$500,000		
Martinez	Morello Avenue Bicycle Lanes Gap Closure , Pacheco Boulevard top Petit Lane	\$265,000		
Martinez	Morello Avenue Bicycle Lanes Gap Closure	\$322,000		
Martinez	Vine Hill Walkway (2 phases)	\$702,000		
Martinez	North Court Street Bicycle Lanes	\$195,000		
Martinez	Pacheco Blvd. Bike Lanes, Arnold Dr. to Muir Rd.	\$75,000		
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill Road Improvement project - phases iii,iv,v	\$1,800,000		
Pleasant Hill	Monument Boulevard Widening	\$12,000,000		
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Boulevard Widening at Gregory Gardens , Doris to Doray	\$425,000		
Pleasant Hill	Gregory Lane right turn lane at I-680 off-ramp	\$275,000		
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Boulevard at Oak Park Blvd. south bridge connector	\$200,000		
Pleasant Hill	Mayhew Way Widening	\$562,000		

	CENTRAL COUNTY PROJECTS	Project	Secured	Prospective
Agency	Project Name	Cost (2007\$)	Funding	STIP Requests (estimate)
Pleasant Hill	Mayhew Way Frontage Improvements	\$88,000		
Pleasant Hill	Paso Nogal Improvements	\$200,000		
Pleasant Hill	Cleaveland Road widening and sidewalk improvements	\$325,000		
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Canal Trail realignment at Taylor Blvd.	\$60,000		
Pleasant Hill	Morello Avenue Bike Lanes	\$60,000		
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill Road Pedestrian Bridge, Diablo View Road to Barnett Terrace	\$200,000		
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill Road Pedestrian Improvements, Boyd Road to Geary Road	\$1,100,000		
Pleasant Hill	Taylor/Morello Pedestrian Improvements			
Pleasant Hill	Grayson Road/Gregory lane Bike Route	\$18,000		
Pleasant Hill	Grayson Road/Gregory Lane Bike Route	\$375,000		
Pleasant Hill	1636 to 1736 Ruth Drive (Ardith Dr. to Taylor Blvd.) Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$33,000		
Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa Boulevard (Harriet to Ellinwood/Gregory Gardens School) Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$54,000		
Pleasant Hill	Maureen Lane to Strandwood School (1900 Rose Lane) Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$87,000		
Pleasant Hill	2200 Pleasant Hill Road, replace pedestrian bridge near Diablo View Drive	\$196,000		
Pleasant Hill	Brandon Road near Allen Way to Christ the King school Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$91,000		
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Hill Road to Taylor Boulevard (700 Grayson) Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$318,000		
Pleasant Hill	Chilpancingo Parkway at Oak Creek Court Sidewalk Realignment	\$10,000		
Pleasant Hill	Lucille Drive, Maureen to Taylor Boulevard Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$100,000		
Pleasant Hill	Pleasant Valley Drive Neighborhood Sidewalk Installation	\$104,000		
Pleasant Hill	Morello at Paso Nogal Park Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$23,000		
Walnut Creek	Olympic Boulevard Pedestrian Improvements, Bridgefield Road to Boulevard Way			
Walnut Creek	Community School Improvements, various locations in the TRANSPAC area			
Walnut Creek	Buena Vista Pedestrian Improvements, all phases	\$507,000		
Walnut Creek	Parkside Drive Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$200,000		
Walnut Creek	Walnut Boulevard Pedestrian Improvement Project, Ygnacio Valley Road to Homestead Avenue	\$500,000		
Walnut Creek	Ped/Bike Overcrossing of Ygnacio Valley Road at Walnut Creek BART	\$10,000,000		
Walnut Creek	Walnut Blvd./Pedestrian Pathway	\$7,200,000		
Walnut Creek	Mt. Diablo/Iron Horse Trail Crossing	\$250,000		
Walnut Creek	Rudgear/Palmer Pedestrian Improvements	\$300,000		
Walnut Creek	Buena Vista/First St. Pedestrian/Bike Improvements	\$800,000		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$926,480,646</b>	<b>\$247,243,952</b>	<b>\$109,535,000</b>
	<b>Unfunded</b>	<b>\$679,236,694</b>		

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

**MEETING DATE:** October 24, 2013

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Corinne Dutra-Roberts, 511 Contra Costa; 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; Matthew Kelly, Associate Transportation Planner, CCTA; Mario Moreno, City Engineer, City of Pleasant Hill; Elena Idell, Dyett and Bhatia

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

The meeting was convened at 9:03 A.M. Self introduction followed.

### **1. Continued Discussion of Action Plan Update. Presentation by Deborah Dagang from CH2MHill**

Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill, reported on her meeting with TRANSPAC on October 10, 2013, when the recommendations from the TAC had been presented for the MTSOs along with the recommended values. TRANSPAC had been pleased with the TAC recommendations and had accepted the report.

Jeremy Lochirco raised a concern with the general education of TRANSPAC given that some members did not appear to understand all the factors involved, especially the Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs).

Ms. Dagang acknowledged that an educational session had been discussed given the compressed schedule, although now that the Draft Action Plan would need to be approved by TRANSPAC in February as opposed to December, there could be at least one more meeting in the schedule to address the issue of clarifying and educating TRANSPAC.

Mr. Lochirco expressed a preference to schedule an educational session to serve the mission and goals of the TAC and to provide some context to the discussion.

Matt Kelly suggested the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) could do that.

Ms. Neustadter concurred and noted that Martin Engelmann could do that at the November meeting as part of his presentation of the Vision, Goals, and Current Issues for the 2014 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and Action Plan updates or could do it at the December 12, 2013 meeting.

Ms. Dagang commented that Mr. Kelly's presentation of the Congestion Management Program (CMP) update had also served to help educate TRANSPAC.

John Cunningham agreed that an educational session was much needed, and that staff was still coming to terms with the role of the Action Plan in terms of some of the imperatives and that it would be important to make sure that the elected officials were well educated in the process.

Ms. Neustadter concurred and noted that Action Plans were difficult, and in some ways this one was more difficult, and an educational session would be instructive and helpful.

Ms. Dagang explained that the actions to be included in the Action Plan would be identified and a draft Action Plan would be submitted to the TAC at its November meeting. One of the key next steps would be to come up with the actions themselves. The Action Plan was scheduled to be submitted to TRANSPAC in December with a preliminary draft of the Action Plan for review, and while the document might not be fully flushed out at that time, in January there were some tentative dates for another TAC meeting if there was a need to spend more time on the action list. The completed plan would have to be adopted by TRANSPAC in February 2014.

Ray Kuzbari expressed the need to discuss the 2008 Action Plan Project List.

Ms. Neustadter referred to the issue of identifying major non-motorized routes in the TRANSPAC area as part of the Action Plan and was not interested in establishing MTSOs for non-motorized trips or for the BART system in this Action Plan. She suggested placing it on the list for the future to work on between now and the time of the next Action Plan. She also suggested that non-motorized routes were becoming useful for recreational and trips to work and the question became how to create that in such a way that it is useful to the reader but would not require the establishment of more MTSOs that could not be achieved.

Mr. Cunningham referenced a CCTA CTP meeting on October 23 when that issue had been discussed along with the brief history of non-motorized routes in the context of the Action Plan, particularly since MTSOs were a congestion based issue that would not be appropriate for non-motorized routes. He suggested a good alternative would be to characterize them in the context of the roadway network such as the Iron Horse Trail as an alternative to I-680. Actions that addressed increasing the use of the Iron Horse Trail and the functionality of that trail, or function of access important to the trail, would be actions that would also benefit the north/south corridor.

Ms. Neustadter noted that Leah Greenblatt of Lafayette had raised an issue of safety at the crossing of a trail at a road which is where an MTSO could be identified.

Ms. Dagang agreed that issue could be identified with a future Action Plan update including the routes without calling them Routes of Regional Significance (RORS) label, or identifying the non-motorized routes specifically without depiction on the roadway. She referred to the 2009 Action Plan and actions that did not tie into a specific MTSO and noted there was flexibility to do that.

Tim Tucker asked if that discussion could be isolated in the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP).

Mr. Cunningham suggested that at some point a future work piece to address non-motorized routes more specifically would have to somehow be counted in the Countywide Bike/Ped Plan.

Ms. Dagang reminded the TAC that one of the goals was to *Improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities*. Thinking about how the Action Plan had been structured, she suggested there could be a broad mention of support for the Countywide Bike/Ped Plan, which could be a general action although specific actions could be included as a goal even if not a RORS with MTSOs. There was also a goal to *Support the enhancement and expansion of an efficient transit system*, which had incorporated ferries.

Ms. Neustadter commented that the ferry issue had been discussed and needed to be recognized. She wanted to be careful to acknowledge that ferry service was something desired although that was about as far as it had gotten to this point.

Ms. Dagang stated the actions and how tied into the goals needed to be identified.

Mr. Lochirco suggested there needed to be something in the plan that recognized non-motorized and that a project list be included in the action to maintain the existing MTSOs given that some had already failed. He suggested that the difference between the Action Plan, specific bike and ped, and the Countywide Action Plan is that there were broad policies that were not location specific. The Countywide plan had incorporated all the facilities that all local jurisdictions had incorporated. He recognized the opportunity to include non-motorized projects or the importance of helping to maintain the goals established, and recommended the establishment of not only a motorized list but a non-motorized list as well since the non-motorized would increase in the future. Those kinds of general shifts established new MTSO values and maintained existing roadway MTSOs.

Ms. Dagang suggested that was consistent with the 2009 Action Plan. She encouraged TAC members to look through the list to ensure that those projects that had not been identified were included.

Mr. Cunningham suggested that might be the cursory linkage between the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and the Contra Costa County Bike/Ped Plan, that the linkages were the projects that would have to be highlighted to identify what would most benefit the RORS, with potentially other flags in terms of safety improvements.

Mr. Kelly agreed that if there were new projects to support MTSOs on bike projects it would be important to identify those projects.

Mr. Lochirco stated that pedestrians would not affect RORS but incrementally getting people in the mental mode shift not to be so dependent on vehicle trips, which linked indirectly into transit. Technically, he suggested that was motorized and there was value in that form of transportation because there were environmental and other values involved. Whatever could be done to support non-motorized or motorized transit would be important to include as policy.



Ms. Dagang noted that the MTSOs were not meant to be limited; there were goals and tenets, RORS, non-motorized, and the BART system, and as long as goals are supported they could be included.

Mr. Kelly stated that studies could come out to “look at this location and see what best improvements bike, ped, and motorized” things would look like.

Mr. Lochirco suggested it was a huge impediment to get around and within jurisdictions a bike lane would not be put on a RORS, such as Ygnacio Valley Road. He suggested the question was what other options were available and the need to do a study to support wholesale changes.

In terms of both BART and the major non-motorized routes, Ms. Dagang suggested inclusion in the graphics with the understanding that there were goals that addressed the area and actions to reflect those goals which could also be included because they supported roadway RORS. There was no TAC disagreement to that statement. With respect to actions, she explained that she had created all the pages that mentioned actions in a couple of ways that had been mentioned in the Action Plan. There were actions that were called proposed improvements that were linked to RORS and proposed improvements were broadly described, and at the end of the packet there were specific projects. She urged each member to go through the project list to update the list. She emphasized that what had been implemented should be crossed off, or projects no longer desired to be pursued should be eliminated, and projects could be added. She emphasized that the list was not financially constrained and it was always good to identify projects.

Mr. Kuzbari presented his modifications to the list at this time.

Mario Moreno verified that there was not a defined pot of money for the Action Plan Project List.

Ms. Dagang explained that the Action Plan Project List was intended to be a wish list and there was no prioritization of projects on that list.

Mr. Kelly concurred and stated that while not tied to specific funding it would poise a project for funding as part of the CTP, which would move projects forward.

Ms. Neustadter raised another element of the discussion in that whether or not the CCTA pursued a renewal of Measure J, which would mean more money, there was a need for Central County to get attention if there was a renewal; and while there is currently no available money, there could be money in the future and the jurisdictions needed to be in a position to identify and forward projects of interest in a potential renewal of Measure J. The question of what would sell in a ballot measure also needed to be part of the discussion in order to formulate a measure that voters would support and adopt. While Contra Costa County voters had approved Measures C and J, she urged caution of what to include in the future to be able to speak to the voters and listen to the voters in terms of what is needed and wanted.

Mr. Kuzbari summarized the changes that he had made to the project list, which included the SR4/Willow Pass Road project that had been replaced by the more recent SR4 Integrated Corridor Analysis Project with a \$260 million preliminary cost estimate, and potentially securing \$4.2 million in Measure J funding by shifting funds from the old Willow Pass Road Project to the Marina Vista Interchange Project. Given that Phase 3 of the I-680/SR4 Interchange Improvement project was now fully funded, he identified the effort to move funds from other projects to the SR4 Integrated Corridor Analysis Project. He sought any updates from other jurisdictions that may impact his recommended changes to the Action Plan Project List.

Tim Tucker referred to a seismic upgrade project currently under discussion.

Ms. Dagang referenced that as a good example of moving forward and asked Mr. Tucker to identify the project that had not yet been funded, which would be kept as a placeholder. She recommended focusing on the actions and the project cost, with a separate conversation of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) request.

Mr. Lochirco recommended a deadline for changes to the project list, with a return of the updated list to be able to line up with the new actions in the Action Plan.

Ms. Dagang requested comments no later than November 8, to allow her time to put it all together and send it out by November 14, to be able to discuss it at the next TAC meeting on November 21, 2013.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that any projects on the list should go to the Comprehensive Transportation Project Listing (CTPL) first, which was still open.

Since there was a master list, Mr. Lochirco asked if it would be easier for the CCTA to pull the list together, which Mr. Kelly stated could be done. Mr. Lochirco wanted to make sure that everyone was on the same page. He emphasized the regional effort and the need to look at the regional list, which was not limited to RORS and allow every jurisdiction to position itself for a potential renewal of Measure J in the future.

There were no objections.

John McKenzie noted that there would be scenarios but most would be previous plans, specifications, and estimate (PS&E) efforts and include projects at the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) and regional level. There could be some ideas there building upon previous efforts and studies.

Mr. Kuzbari stated it was not a programming list and if a project was to be listed as a prospective STIP request there would be no limit to what could be requested. He suggested there may be a project on the CTPL and there may be an opportunity to add to the CTPL, although that would only be for capital projects. He verified that the list did not include transit projects.

Ms. Neustadter commented that there were lists with different purposes and the same project might be on a number of lists; different lists for different purposes.

Mr. Kelly explained that the CTPL should include projects that had been included in other documents. He verified the request for a list of Central County projects for RORS with just capital projects.

Mr. Lochirco suggested that could also capture other agency improvements, such as County Connection bus stops, and there may be other capital projects that supported the actions.

Ms. Dagang urged jurisdictions to make changes to the list prior to the November 8, 2013 deadline.

Ms. Neustadter moved to Item 3 at this time.

### **3. Update on the Contra Costa Boulevard Improvement Project, Eric Hu, City of Pleasant Hill**

Eric Hu referenced a number of projects on Contra Costa Boulevard including one at Chilpancingo Parkway to Viking Road on the Measure J Local Streets and Major Streets and Roads Project List, with \$1.15 million in Measure J funds and \$1.2 million in federal grants towards that project, which had a completed design and which had gone out to bid. He reported that the bids had come in \$800,000 over the Engineer's Estimate and he sought additional funds to readvertise and start construction on the project. He explained that the project was now being value engineered to bring down the cost although the project was still \$750,000 short in terms of project funding.

Mr. Hu reported that he had approached the CCTA, had spoken with Hisham Noeimi, had been advised that Line 28a under Measure J *Subregional Transportation Needs* represented a "contingency fund" for Central County, and had learned that TRANSPAC had the ability to decide how to spend the money which had to be toward a Measure J eligible project or new projects to add to a list. Based on the time when the measure started from 2009 to the end of the 2012-13 fiscal year, there was \$2 to \$3 million accumulated in that fund, although over the life of the measure it was expected to accumulate \$16.2 million. He requested to be able to use some of that fund to cover the shortfall. He noted that he and Mario Moreno had approached most of the jurisdictions and wanted to start the conversation of how to utilize the funds in the future. He sought a collective discussion for the use of the Line 28a funds, and specifically requested \$750,000 from Line 28a to fully fund the shortfall in the Chilpancingo Parkway to Viking Road project. He explained that the final project cost numbers should be available in two weeks and would try to get that information available to TRANSPAC prior to its meeting on November 14, 2013. If not able to get the numbers by that time, he would return to the November 21, 2013 TAC meeting and to TRANSPAC on December 12, 2013. He emphasized the desire to have the request approved by the TAC by its November meeting to be able to go to the CCTA Board in December and readvertise the project by December 2013.

Mr. Moreno explained that the project was tied to two other grants, one of which expired in December, and he wanted to accelerate the process to avoid losing \$800,000. He expected that a \$750,000 allotment would be enough to fully fund the project.

Mr. Kuzbari urged the City of Pleasant Hill to get the information on a funding plan and schedule by next week to help accelerate the process. He did not see a problem concurring with the request but needed more information that would be submitted to TRANSPAC.

Mr. Cunningham referenced a conversation at the Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) where there was a similar situation where a jurisdiction needed funding and had come to the TAC and to the Board, and he too requested project specific information as to the need. He was willing to help accelerate the project but also wanted to address how to program the funds in the future, how it would be split, and how it would be prioritized so that all jurisdictions were treated equally.

Mr. Moreno requested the \$750,000 as an advance on the City of Pleasant Hill's fair share of Line 28a funds given the current immediate need. He referred to another project with the City of Walnut Creek and explained that he might have to come back again and ask for additional funds.

Mr. Kuzbari emphasized the need for a policy discussion in the future with respect to the use of Line 28a funds. He did not want to hold up the process and would be willing to move forward to review project specific information at this time.

Mr. Tucker agreed that sharing the funds would have to be clarified so that everyone had an opportunity to use Line 28a funds.

Ms. Neustadter concurred but suggested that an allocation of \$750,000 at this time would not be significant. She agreed with the need for a future discussion on the use of the funds.

Mr. Lochirco was comfortable that the discussion of policy be used on a case-by-case basis for emergencies. He was not comfortable without an understanding of how the funds would be used and sought a policy for unanticipated expenses without too much rigidity. He was pleased that there was a contingency fund to help cities when the need arose.

Mr. Kuzbari agreed with the need to be as flexible as possible and to think long term, particularly since Measure J was in place until 2034.

Mr. Moreno explained that Contra Costa Boulevard was one of the City of Pleasant Hill's main corridors and the project would bring in all the multi modes; a good project that the City supported. He appreciated the help to move the project forward and stated that the detailed information would be made available this week. He noted that the bids had been rejected in August.

Mr. Lochirco did not see the need to return to the TAC in that the City of Pleasant Hill would have to go through the CCTA to get the funds anyway and would have to follow the required mechanisms to qualify for that program. He was comfortable with the request as is.

It was clarified that the project detail was required because the request would have to go through TRANSPAC.

Mr. Hu noted that there were different options as part of value engineering which was the reason for the uncertainty given that the details were being worked out at this time. He commented that bids tended to be higher than the Engineer's Estimate, and since the economy had turned around costs had increased.

Ms. Neustadter clarified the City of Pleasant Hill's request for \$750,000 and that the TAC is supportive of moving the request to TRANSPAC at its next meeting, and that the TAC will develop a recommendation for future disbursements of Line 28a funds for TRANSPAC's consideration.

Mr. Lochirco sought the ability to use the funds as a local match for regional grants to make them more competitive regionally, part of the discussion for another day. He added that the ability to leverage would be important and it would be nice to have those resources in a situation where the remainder of funds had not been fully identified.

Ms. Neustadter recommended that with a renewal of Measure J, a Central County line item could be considered for use by jurisdictions for local share grant costs, which could serve a long-term purpose in addition to a contingency fund. She sought other thoughts on the subject and wanted the TAC to think through what a new set of projects would look like for Central County.

Mr. Lochirco noted a conversation with BART given facility improvement projects specific to Central County and the attempt to get a more regional approach to the projects, such as with the Pleasant Hill BART shortcut path between Concord and Walnut Creek, which had died for lack of maintenance monies. When starting to look at RORS, he suggested starting to look at routes of regional opportunity, not just in one jurisdiction, with jurisdictions working together on grant applications to leverage money. He suggested this might be an opportunity to do that. He referred to the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG), recognized the competitiveness, and in light of the geographic negative of Central County, wanted to better strategize to get better funding and be able to compete better.

Mr. Hu was fully supportive of a separate line item for local matches but suggested it would be equally important to have a line item for contingencies. He wanted to keep the line item but would hate to be in a situation and have a project without options to be able to proceed.

Ms. Neustadter stated that with a new measure anything could be included. She emphasized that Central County needed to address Central County issues.

#### **4. 511 Contra Costa Street Smarts Presentation Re: Project Methodologies with School Districts and City/County by Lynn Overcashier 511 Contra Costa**

Lynn Overcashier was not available. The information had been included in the TAC agenda packet.

#### **5. Briefing on 511 Contra Costa and TRANSPAC JPA Formation**

Ms. Neustadter referred to the special TRANSPAC meeting held this date when there had been agreement to proceed with a 511 Contra Costa/TRANSPAC Joint Powers Authority (JPA), and explained that while there may be some increase in costs as a result of addressing legal issues and how accounting and check writing would be done, there would be no new administrative construct. She stated that the issue had come about as a result of a CalPERS audit.

Noting that 511 Contra Costa secured grants for programs and paid for itself, Mr. Hu asked if a JPA would preclude that process, to which Ms. Neustadter explained that one of the upsides was that 511 Contra Costa could do that directly, as could TRANSPAC, in that with JPA status an agency could go after its own money. She reported that TRANSPAC had been directed to work with Mala Subramanian, the General Counsel for the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) who is also the City Attorney for the cities of Clayton and Lafayette, to assist it through the process with the idea that it would be done reasonably quickly although there were steps to follow in the establishment of a new construct. Day-to-day things would not change but how 511 Contra Costa and TRANSPAC did business would change.

Mr. Cunningham noted the need to move ahead quickly. He wanted to be ahead of the curve as much as possible in the process of the formation of a JPA.

Ms. Dutra-Roberts concurred with the need to move quickly on the JPA, primarily due to the CalPERS issue, and agreed that a JPA would be one way to resolve the situation.

Ms. Neustadter acknowledged that the process would be challenging but was a result of state actions that had determined that 511 Contra Costa employees were “erroneous employees,” and the situation should be rectified through the formation of a JPA.

## **6. Update on TAC Meetings Schedule**

Ms. Neustadter explained that January 23, 2014 and January 30, 2014 had been set aside for additional Action Plan sessions in the event additional sessions were necessary.

## **2. Preliminary Review of the Calendar Year 2012 and 2013 Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP) Biennial Compliance Checklist**

Ms. Neustadter noted that Martin Engelmann had crafted a Growth Management Program Biennial Compliance Checklist, and she asked if there were any issues with that version of the checklist that would be released to jurisdictions early in 2014.

Mr. Lochirco expressed concern with how the new checklist deviated from the previous checklist and asked if there had been substantial changes, and if so, requested that those changes be redlined.

Ms. Neustadter explained that the checklist had been working its way through the GMP Task Force and the Citizens Advisory Committee, as well as the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC). She advised that she would forward a request that Mr. Engelmann prepare a redline strikeout version of the new Compliance Checklist for TAC review at its November meeting.


## **7. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 A.M. The next meeting of the TAC is scheduled for November 21, 2013 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined.

MTSO Values by Location

2014 Central County Action Plan Update

MTSO		Standard		Notes
		2009	2014	
Freeways				
I-680	Delay Index	4.0	4.0	Applied to entire corridor
SR 242	Delay Index	3.0	3.0	Applied to entire corridor
SR 4	Delay Index	5.0	5.0	Applied to entire corridor
Arterial Roadways				
Alhambra Avenue				
	Average Speed	15 mph	15 mph	Martinez and Pleasant Hill
Clayton Road				
	Average Speed	15 mph	15 mph	Clayton Concord
	Average Stopped Delay (Signal Cycles)			
	Ygnacio Valley/Kirker Pass	3	3	
	Treat/Denkinger	3	3	
Contra Costa Boulevard				
	Average Speed			all jurisdictions
	AM Northbound	15 mph	15 mph	
	AM Southbound	12 mph	15 mph	
	PM both directions	10 mph	15 mph	
Geary Road				
	LOS			
	North Main Street	F	F	Walnut Creek
North Main Street				
	LOS			
	Treat/Geary	F	F	Walnut Creek
Pacheco Boulevard				
	Average Speed	15 mph	n/a	Martinez (2009)
	V/C Ratio	n/a	1.5	Martinez (2014)
		1.5	1.5	Contra Costa County intersections
Pleasant Hill Road				
	Average Speed	15 mph	15 mph	Pleasant Hill
	V/C Ratio	1.5	1.5	Contra Costa County intersections
Taylor Boulevard				
	Average Speed	15 mph	15 mph	Pleasant Hill
	V/C Ratio	1.5	1.5	Contra Costa County intersections
Treat Boulevard				
	Average Stopped Delay			Concord
	Clayton/Denkinger	3	3	
	Cowell Road	5	5	
	Oak Grove Road	5	5	
	LOS			Walnut Creek
	Bancroft Road	F	F	
	V/C Ratio	1.5	1.5	Contra Costa County intersections
Ygnacio Valley Road/Kirker Pass Road				
	Average Stopped Delay			Concord
	Clayton/Kirker Pass	3	3	
	Alberta/ Pine Hollow	4	4	
	Cowell Road	4	4	
	LOS			Walnut Creek
	Bancroft Road	F	F	Walnut Creek
	Civic Drive	F	F	
	V/C Ratio	1.5	1.5	Contra Costa County intersections
Bailey Road				
	Average Stopped Delay			
	Concord Boulevard	n/a	3	Concord
	Clayton Road	n/a	3	Concord

 - recommended change for 2014 Action Plan

Updated: October 2, 2013



# 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	26%	16%
	SB	9%	25%
SR-242	NB	58%	7%
	SB	20%	30%
SR-4	EB	26%	48%
	WB	68%	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	1.01
	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

**CENTRAL COUNTY**  
**MEASURE J PROGRAM 28(a) RECORD KEEPING**

	Use of Allocated Funds									Estimated Revenues <sup>1</sup> (Distributed by Population & Road Miles)				Estimated Reference Point for Each Jurisdiction (b)+(c)-(a)
	Prior	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20-34	TOTAL (a)	Population (b)		Road Miles (c)		
Clayton	-								\$0	3.47%	\$281,070	4.26%	\$345,060	\$626,130
Concord	-								\$0	38.75%	\$3,138,750	34.34%	\$2,781,540	\$5,920,290
County	-								\$0	15.24%	\$1,234,440	19.60%	\$1,587,600	\$2,822,040
Martinez	-								\$0	11.45%	\$927,450	11.18%	\$905,580	\$1,833,030
Pleasant Hill	-	\$750,000							\$750,000	10.53%	\$852,930	11.81%	\$956,610	\$1,059,540
Walnut Creek	-								\$0	20.56%	\$1,665,360	18.81%	\$1,523,610	\$3,188,970
TOTAL	NONE	\$750,000							\$750,000	100.00%	\$8,100,000	100.00%	\$8,100,000	\$15,450,000

<sup>1</sup> Program 28(a) receives a fixed percentage of actual annual revenues from Measure J. Figures in the table above assume \$2 billion in revenues over the life of Measure J (2034, in 2004 dollars), including \$16.2 million for Program 28(a) for Central County.

**Protocol for Utilization of Measure J Program 28(a) Funds:**

1. Requests for match funds for any project or program should be considered only to avoid losing outside grant funds for construction/implementation.
2. Requests for programming funds for any project or program should not exceed 50% of the available fund balance accumulated to date in Program 28(a) or the estimated reference point for each jurisdiction, whichever is less.
3. Requests exceeding the limits specified in item 2 must be considered on a case-by-case basis.
4. The number of requests made by each jurisdiction for programming funds cannot exceed one (1) request per fiscal year.
5. Requests for programming funds will be reviewed by TRANSPAC TAC and recommendations will be forwarded to TRANSPAC for consideration.

FY 2012-13 Distribution of 2.09% Additional Measure J Funds to  
Local Jurisdictions for Local Street Maintenance (LSM) and Improvements  
Distribution becomes available after June 30, 2013 based upon actual sales tax revenues

Table I - Summary of Total Sales Tax Revenues Available to Distribution

Total Actual Revenues	\$74,797,783
2.09% of Budgeted Revenues	\$1,563,274
Plus Local Street Funds	
adjustment from previous year	\$0
Actual Allocation	\$1,563,274

Table II - Distribution of Available Funds to Cities and Contra Costa County

Jursidictions	Allocation by Subregion per Expenditure Plan	Population as of January 2013	% of Population	Allocation Based on Population  (A)	Road Mileage from 2011 Report	% of Road Mileage	Allocation Based on Road Mileage  (B)	Total LSM 2.09% Allocation  (C)=(A)+(B)
<b>Central (47.84%):</b>	\$747,870							
Clayton		11,093	3.47%	\$12,984	42.0	4.26%	\$15,943	\$28,927
Concord		123,812	38.75%	\$144,914	338.2	34.34%	\$128,414	\$273,328
Martinez		36,578	11.45%	\$42,812	110.1	11.18%	\$41,797	\$84,609
Pleasant Hill		33,633	10.53%	\$39,365	116.3	11.81%	\$44,174	\$83,539
Walnut Creek		65,684	20.56%	\$76,879	185.2	18.81%	\$70,324	\$147,203
County **		48,683	15.24%	\$56,981	193.0	19.60%	\$73,283	\$130,264
Subtotal Central		319,483	100.00%	\$373,935	985	100.00%	\$373,935	\$747,870
<b>West (26.32%): ***</b>	\$411,454							
El Cerrito		23,910	10.04%	\$20,661	73.0	11.81%	\$24,289	\$44,950
Hercules		24,403	10.25%	\$21,086	56.5	9.14%	\$18,802	\$39,888
Pinole		18,664	7.84%	\$16,128	54.1	8.75%	\$18,006	\$34,134
Richmond		105,562	44.34%	\$91,215	264.5	42.81%	\$88,063	\$179,278
San Pablo		29,266	12.29%	\$25,289	48.9	7.91%	\$16,278	\$41,567
County **		36,279	15.24%	\$31,348	121.0	19.58%	\$40,289	\$71,637
Subtotal West		238,084	100.00%	\$205,727	618	100.00%	\$205,727	\$411,454
<b>Southwest (25.84%):</b>	\$403,950							
Lafayette		24,312	11.62%	\$23,469	93.2	12.67%	\$25,582	\$49,051
Moraga		16,238	7.76%	\$15,675	53.0	7.20%	\$14,548	\$30,223
Orinda		17,925	8.57%	\$17,303	159.6	21.70%	\$43,826	\$61,129
San Ramon		76,154	36.40%	\$73,513	145.0	19.71%	\$39,812	\$113,325
Danville		42,720	20.42%	\$41,238	140.9	19.15%	\$38,673	\$79,911
County **		31,882	15.24%	\$30,777	144.0	19.57%	\$39,534	\$70,311
Subtotal Southwest		209,231	100.00%	\$201,975	736	100.00%	\$201,975	\$403,950
Total	\$1,563,274	766,798		\$781,637	2,338		\$781,637	\$1,563,274

Sources:

Population: DoF website: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-1/view.php>

Road Miles: 2011 Caltrans California Public Road Data <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hpms/datalibrary.php>

\*\* County Allocation based on subregions population and road mileage as follows:

	Population	Road Mileage
State data for County	163,762	625.3
Subregions Percentages:		
Central	29.73%	30.81%
West	22.15%	19.33%
Southwest	19.47%	23.02%
	71.35%	73.16%

Subregion Allocation is based on County data multiplied by Subregions Percentages (163,762 \* 29.73% = 48,683).  
Refinements to this allocation may be made subject to receipt of additional data.

County Allocation for FY2013: \$272,212

\*\*\* Subject to GMP compliance in West County only

## LSM WORKSHEET TO ALLOCATE TO SUBREGION

	Initial Allocation	Population as of January 2013	% of Total Population	Allocation Based on Population	Road Mileage from 2011 Report	% of Total Road Mileage	Allocation Based on Road Mileage	Total LSM 18% Allocation
	(A)			(B)			(C)	(D)=(A)+(B)+(C)
<b>CENTRAL:</b>	29.73%			30.81%				
Clayton		11,093	1.22%	\$ -	42.0	1.63%	\$ -	\$ -
Concord		123,812	13.59%	\$ -	338.2	13.16%	\$ -	\$ -
Martinez		36,578	4.02%	\$ -	110.1	4.28%	\$ -	\$ -
Pleasant Hill		33,633	3.69%	\$ -	116.3	4.53%	\$ -	\$ -
Walnut Creek		65,684	7.21%	\$ -	185.2	7.21%	\$ -	\$ -
<b>WEST:</b>	22.15%			19.33%				
El Cerrito		23,910	2.62%	\$ -	73.0	2.84%	\$ -	\$ -
Hercules		24,403	2.68%	\$ -	56.5	2.20%	\$ -	\$ -
Pinole		18,664	2.05%	\$ -	54.1	2.10%	\$ -	\$ -
Richmond		105,562	11.59%	\$ -	264.5	10.29%	\$ -	\$ -
San Pablo		29,266	3.21%	\$ -	48.9	1.90%	\$ -	\$ -
<b>SOUTHWEST:</b>	19.47%			23.02%				
Lafayette		24,312	2.67%	\$ -	93.2	3.63%	\$ -	\$ -
Moraga		16,238	1.78%	\$ -	53.0	2.06%	\$ -	\$ -
Orinda		17,925	1.97%	\$ -	159.6	6.21%	\$ -	\$ -
San Ramon		76,154	8.36%	\$ -	145.0	5.64%	\$ -	\$ -
Danville		42,720	4.69%	\$ -	140.9	5.48%	\$ -	\$ -
<b>EAST:</b>	28.65%			26.84%				
Antioch		105,117	11.54%	\$ -	229.0	8.91%	\$ -	\$ -
Brentwood		53,278	5.85%	\$ -	205.2	7.98%	\$ -	\$ -
Oakley		37,252	4.09%	\$ -	117.1	4.56%	\$ -	\$ -
Pittsburg		65,339	7.17%	\$ -	138.5	5.39%	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Total</b>	100.00%	910,940	100.00%	\$ -	2,570.2	100.00%	\$ -	\$ -
<b>County</b>		163,762	17.98%	\$ -	625.3	24.33%	\$ -	\$ -

1,074,702.0  
03,195.5  
0.00

State/County/City	Total Population		Percent Change
	1/1/2012	1/1/2013	
<b>Contra Costa</b>	1,066,602	1,074,702	0.8
Antioch	103,950	105,117	1.1
Brentwood	52,635	53,278	1.2
Clayton	11,008	11,093	0.8
Concord	123,345	123,812	0.4
Danville	42,498	42,720	0.5
El Cerrito	23,801	23,910	0.5
Hercules	24,299	24,403	0.4
Lafayette	24,186	24,312	0.5
Martinez	36,264	36,578	0.9
Moraga	16,168	16,238	0.4
Oakley	36,573	37,252	1.9
Orinda	17,839	17,925	0.5
Pinole	18,581	18,664	0.4
Pittsburg	64,779	65,339	0.9
Pleasant Hill	33,477	33,633	0.5
Richmond	105,004	105,562	0.5
San Pablo	29,137	29,266	0.4
San Ramon	74,753	76,154	1.9
Walnut Creek	65,306	65,684	0.6
Balance of County	162,999	163,762	0.5

		MAINTAINED MILES		
COUNTY	JURISDICTION	RURAL	URBAN	TOTAL
<u>CONTRA COSTA</u>				
Cities:	ANTIOCH	10.19	218.85	229.04
	BRENTWOOD	3.58	201.61	205.19
	CLAYTON		41.99	41.99
	CONCORD	5.72	332.48	338.20
	DANVILLE	1.05	139.81	140.86
	EL CERRITO		72.95	72.95
	HERCULES		56.47	56.47
	LAFAYETTE		93.18	93.18
	MARTINEZ		110.08	110.08
	MORAGA	1.63	51.36	52.99
	OAKLEY	3.50	113.57	117.07
	ORINDA	0.35	159.28	159.63
	PINOLE		54.08	54.08
	PITTSBURG	0.36	138.12	138.48
	PLEASANT HILL		116.34	116.34
	RICHMOND		264.49	264.49
	SAN PABLO		48.89	48.89
	SAN RAMON	2.31	142.70	145.01
	WALNUT CREEK		185.21	185.21
Other:	COUNTY	347.06	278.24	625.30
	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE		1.06	1.06
	STATE HIGHWAYS	4.10	108.18	112.28
	STATE PARK SERVICE	61.99	7.38	69.37
	U.S. ARMY		0.10	0.10
CONTRA COSTA TOTAL		441.84	2,936.42	3,378.26



DAILY VEHICLE MILES  
OF TRAVEL (DVMT) [1,000]

RURAL	URBAN	TOTAL
3.57	763.11	766.68
4.93	361.10	366.03
	95.61	95.61
2.00	1,632.22	1,634.22
0.37	464.09	464.46
	157.62	157.62
	120.50	120.50
	334.29	334.29
	399.93	399.93
0.57	168.81	169.38
1.23	152.12	153.35
0.12	277.79	277.91
	204.20	204.20
0.13	417.22	417.35
	437.94	437.94
	1,005.35	1,005.35
	240.76	240.76
1.95	548.73	550.68
	1,052.57	1,052.57
469.23	1,073.95	1,543.19
	0.68	0.68
162.90	12,179.59	12,342.49
5.58	17.29	22.87
	0.06	0.06
652.57	22,105.54	22,758.11

\$5,266  
\$50,499  
\$15,633  
\$15,397  
\$27,067  
\$26,977  
\$8,247  
\$7,131  
\$6,351  
\$32,918  
\$8,023  
\$14,816  
\$10,084  
\$6,235  
\$8,781  
\$19,911  
\$16,516  
\$14,545