

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

**MEETING DATE:** December 12, 2013

**ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT:** David Durant, Pleasant Hill (Chair); Julie Pierce, Clayton, CCTA Representative; Loella Haskew, Walnut Creek; Ron Leone, Concord; and Karen Mitchoff, Contra Costa County

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

**STAFF PRESENT:** John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Corinne Dutra-Roberts, 511 Contra Costa; Martin Engelmann, CCTA Deputy Director for Planning; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa; Tim Tucker, Martinez; and Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager

**GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill; and Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, CCTA

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

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

The meeting was convened at 9:04 A.M. by Chair David Durant, the Pledge of Allegiance was observed, and self-introductions followed.

### **2. Public Comment**

There were no comments from the public.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

### **3. Approve November 14, 2013 Minutes**

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

### **END OF CONSENT AGENDA**

### **4. Funding Proposal for I-680 Southbound Carpool Lane Completion Project Presented by Hisham Noeimi, CCTA Engineering Manager.**

TRANSPAC Manager Barbara Neustadter introduced Hisham Noeimi to present the funding proposal.

Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, CCTA, presented the I-680 Southbound Carpool Lane Completion Project, an important project for Central County that would close the HOV gap by offering a continuous HOV lane from the Carquinez Bridge to the Alameda County Line, a distance of 19 miles. He reported that the project and environmental clearance phase would be done in the spring of 2014. Since the CCTA is working on the design of the project, he described the need to ensure full funding for the project, which had a \$62 million shortfall.

To cover that shortfall, Mr. Noeimi reported that the cost of the project could be cut by \$20 million by seeking value engineering and design exceptions from Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) would contribute \$27 million if the CCTA could contribute \$14.9 million, and the CCTA Board would be asked to pre-commit \$10 million in future State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding, which would reduce the shortfall to \$4.9 million. The proposal was to use Measure J savings from the Caldecott Tunnel Fourth Bore project, which could be \$4 million from TRANSPAC's share, with the remainder to come out of the I-680 Corridor Reserve established by TRANSPAC in the 2013 Measure J Strategic Plan. If that did not happen, MTC had agreed to provide \$5 million in additional money if it could be matched. The \$5 million would come out of the reserve.

Mr. Noeimi emphasized the intent to leverage other funding sources as much as possible with Measure J funds. The request was to amend the Strategic Plan to reprogram savings from the Caldecott Tunnel as well as to secure the balance from the I-680 Corridor Reserve.

When asked by Bob Pickett, Mr. Noeimi advised that the total cost of the project is currently \$104 million. He also clarified in response to Ray Kuzbari that I-680 Corridor Reserve funds were separate from the \$24 million projected in additional revenue that had been allocated to Phase III of the I-680/SR4 Interchange Project and would not affect that project.

**ACTION:** Accepted report and concurred with an amendment to the 2013 Measure J Strategic Plan to program up to \$9.9 million in Measure J funds from Central County's share of the Caldecott Fourth Bore savings and I-680 Corridor Reserve to the project. Pierce/Pickett/Unanimous

**5. Presentation by Michael Wright, City of Concord Reuse Project Director, on the Current Planning for Reuse of the Concord Naval Weapons Station (CNWS)**

The presentation by Michael Wright, City of Concord Reuse Project Director, was continued to the TRANSPAC meeting scheduled for February 13, 2014.

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

Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill, continued the discussion of the update to the TRANSPAC Action Plan, stated that the tenets and goals had not changed, and advised there had been good progress in the process.

Ms. Dagang read the nine specific goals and explained that in general the tenets varied because they were more specific as well as being specific to emergency management plans. She did not want to add to or change the words. The Goals were identified as follows:

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

In the discussion, elected officials and Planning Commissioners expressed concern with the numbered order of the goals and while Ms. Dagang explained that there was no intent to identify any priority with the list, elected officials and Planning Commissioners remained concerned that the listing could offer a perception to the public that it was a priority listing. As a result, the placement of each goal was discussed in detail, some wording was changed to better reflect the intent, clean fuel vehicles and new technologies to reduce emissions were encouraged, and the list was changed from a numbered list to a bullet point list, resulting in the following amended 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

Chair Durant suggested the formulation worked.

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

Ms. Neustadter advised that the Biennial Compliance Checklist would be released to the jurisdictions in 2014, reported that Lynn Overcashier had produced comments and recommendations which had been included in the packet, and asked whether there was concurrence in the TAC's action to include those amendments and refer them to the CCTA.

Martin Engelmann, Deputy Director, Planning, CCTA, explained that the CCTA was completing the 2012 and 2013 reporting periods, which would end December 31, 2013; the Checklist would go out in January; and the checklist would have to be submitted by June 15, 2014 to allow jurisdictions to receive their 18 percent for streets and roads, and 2.09% additional Measure J funds to local jurisdictions for Local Street Maintenance (LSM) and improvements. A Growth Management Task Force, comprised of engineering and planning staff from each subarea, had been scheduled to meet on December 18, 2013 at 9:00 A.M. He explained that Ms. Overcashier had been invited to discuss her proposed revisions to the TDM Ordinance at that meeting, and anything new would roll over for adoption in the 2014/2015 Checklist cycle. He described the current cycle as easy, noted that the City of Hercules had now finished its Growth Management Element, all cities had adopted the Growth Management Elements, and a streamlined checklist review cycle was expected for 2014/2015.

Ray Kuzbari verified that the upcoming Compliance Checklist would have to comply with the current TDM Ordinance.

Chair Durant expressed his support for the changes recommended by Ms. Overcashier.

Ms. Overcashier advised with respect to her recommendations that the prior TDM Ordinance had been approved by the jurisdictions in 1997, and part of her recommended changes was to update the ordinance to be more germane. She stated that the term TSM [Transportation Systems Management] was a term used both for demand management as well as systems management, and currently TDM [Transportation Demand Management] or ITS [Intelligent Transportation Systems] were being used. In this case, all jurisdictions had ordinances and most, if not all, were codified and while the CCTA allowed for resolutions years ago, most had ordinances. She stated there was actually something to ordain in that due to SB 1339, most employers would have to comply with Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) requirements for pre-tax commuter benefits. She described the language in the current TDM Ordinance as vague, not specific to any current legislation, and she supported more emphasis on emission reductions. She added that a baseline had been identified for all jurisdictions in 2005 offering actual data on what 511 Contra Costa had been doing on behalf of jurisdictions for compliance purposes.

Mr. Engelmann referred to Ms. Overcashier's November 7, 2013 memo and stated the only change would be an update of the ordinance, requiring jurisdictions to update their ordinance for Fiscal Year 2012/2013, although the 2012/2013 cycle was over. He suggested developing the updated ordinance, circulating to local jurisdictions which would take well into 2014, and then releasing that update to the jurisdictions and advising each jurisdiction to update its TDM ordinance/resolution in accordance with the updated model, requiring jurisdictions to have updated ordinances by Fiscal Year 2014/2015.

Ms. Overcashier clarified that the information had been sent to the CCTA last summer with the expectation that all of the jurisdictions would have had an opportunity to address the issue and update their ordinances prior to this time.

Mr. Engelmann explained that the ordinance had to be updated because much had been changed including the law and the goals.

Chair Durant found the changes to be language changes to the questions themselves with nothing to do with the underlying document. He asked whether a TSM or TDM reference really mattered.

Mr. Engelmann suggested the term should be TSM.

Director Pierce commented that the term TSM had been used in the original ordinance.

If that was the case, Chair Durant recommended that the language be left as currently stated and if there was no objection to Mr. Engelmann's outline, he wanted to move forward if there was a way to incorporate the spirit of the changes that had been recommended by Ms. Overcashier.

Ms. Overcashier referred to her November 7, 2013 memo and her recommendation that the current language "Adopt a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Ordinance or Resolution. Jurisdictions must adopt an ordinance or resolution that promotes carpools, vanpools, and park and ride lots, and is substantially consistent with the Authority's Model TSM Ordinance or Resolution," as shown on Page 10-3 of the October 2, 2013 Planning Committee Staff Report, be changed to read: *Adopt a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance or Resolution. Jurisdictions must adopt an ordinance or resolution that promotes alternative transportation modes to the single-occupant vehicle, and is substantially consistent with the Authority's Model TDM Ordinance or Resolution.* The concern was that the language had been taken straight out of Measure C and not Measure J, and the language harkened back to Measure C's promotion of vanpools and carpools.

Mr. Engelmann suggested the terms TDM and TSM were the same although TDM was probably more modern. He verified the request for the proposed change to the actual checklist to match what Ms. Overcashier had proposed instead of what had been proposed in the Planning Committee Staff Report, adding to the list a change from vanpool, carpool, park and ride to alternatives to a single-occupant vehicle, and suggested that request be forwarded to the CCTA for discussion at its next Board meeting.

The TAC had also discussed Ms. Overcashier's other recommended changes to the Compliance Checklist itself on Page 10-8 of the October 2, 2013 staff report where No. 7 "Transportation Systems Management Program" had been listed with the question "Has the jurisdiction adopted a transportation systems management ordinance or resolution that incorporates required policies consistent with the updated model ordinance prepared by the Authority for use by local agencies or qualified for adoption of alternative mitigation measures because it has a small employment base?" Ms. Overcashier had recommended replacement with *Transportation Demand Management Program. Has the jurisdiction adopted a Transportation Demand Management Ordinance or Resolution that incorporates required policies consistent with the updated model ordinance/resolution prepared by the Authority for use by local agencies?*

Chair Durant suggested that the recommended language be redlined and submitted to the CCTA for discussion.

Mr. Engelmann noted that jurisdictions in Lamorinda did not have large employers and did not want a TDM ordinance or resolution, just alternative mitigation measures which were softer than an ordinance, which was why a qualified alternative mitigation measure had been included for those jurisdictions that had a small employer base.

Ms. Overcashier stated, however, that TDM was not just employer based, which was her point.

Chair Durant suggested that issue be discussed more at the Authority meeting on Wednesday, December 18.

Mr. Engelmann advised that he would meet with Ms. Overcashier to discuss the matter.

Ms. Neustadter referred the membership to the information in the packet highlighting the TAC's previous comments on the Compliance Checklist at the TAC meetings held on October 24 and November 21, 2013.

At this point in the meeting, Ms. Dagang presented the resulting nine goals from the prior discussion of the Action Plan Update and stated that she would email the list to everyone in time for the Authority meeting on December 18, 2013.

The Board agreed with the modified list from Ms. Dagang with the use of bullets instead of numbers.

Referring back to the Compliance Checklist, Ms. Neustadter highlighted the TAC's comments from the October 24 and November 21 meetings and explained that the only change from the old checklist was the dates. The other issue was from Ray Kuzbari who had expressed difficulty with the mechanics of the program itself with respect to entering information electronically.

Mr. Kuzbari stated it was rather difficult to enter the information, save it, and update it again. Each time there was an update, he had to go back and enter the whole thing again and some of the windows were not expandable so that he could not expand on the text and print the entire text.

In response, Mr. Engelmann stated that the Checklist had been fixed.

Ms. Neustadter also noted minor comments from the City of Walnut Creek making sure that the language reflected the Checklist format, which she reported had since been fixed, and that the Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP) would have to be highlighted when included in the new Action Plan so that there was no question that the STMP had been adequately reflected in the document.

There were no other comments.

By consensus, the TRANSPAC Board concurred.