

# **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, February 27, 2014**

**9:00 A.M. to 11:00 A.M.**

**COMMUNITY ROOM**

**CITY OF PLEASANT HILL CITY HALL**

**100 GREGORY LANE**

**PLEASANT HILL**

- 1. Peter Engel, CCTA and Rick Ramacier, CCCTA Presentation on the County Connection Mobility Management Plan**

**Electronic Attachment:** Contra Costa County Mobility Management Plan, Final Draft, October 17, 2013.

**ACTION:** As determined.

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

**Attachments:** 2009 Actions and Projects (**electronic**) for TAC review/use; Minutes of the October 24, 2013 and December 19, 2013 TAC meetings; and draft documents "Completed Transportation Improvements in Central County," and "Goals and Actions" from Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill.

**ACTION:** As determined.

- 3. Appointment(s) to Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee**

Please see attached letter from CCTA Executive Director Randy Iwasaki requesting appointment(s) to the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) or reaffirmation of current appointments.

**Attachment:** Appointments letter from CCTA Executive Director Iwasaki dated January 21, 2014, with list of current appointees and CBPAC Bylaws.

**ACTION:** Appointments/reappointments as determined.

- 4. Initial discussion/consideration of, and if yes, how to structure a Call for Programs for Line 20a money for the next fiscal year.**

**Please recall that the TAC previously had expressed interest in travel training and information and referral services in the first Line 20a allocation. The swift second allocation of these funds did not allow time to consider funding for those programs.**

**ACTION: As determined.**

- 5. Update on 511 Contra Costa and TRANSPAC Discussion Regarding Formation of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) as an Administrative Construct if there is any New Information.**

**ACTION: As determined.**

- 6. The next TAC meeting is scheduled for March 27, 2014 at 9:00 A.M. in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room unless otherwise determined.**

TAC 2 27 2014

# Contra Costa County Mobility Management Plan

## Final Draft

October 17, 2013



*County Connection*

# **Contra Costa County Mobility Management Plan**

October 17, 2013

Prepared for

**County Connection**

by

**Innovative Paradigms**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Chapter 1: <u>METHODOLOGY</u> .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Background.....	6
Methodolgy and Outreach.....	6
<b>Chapter 2: <u>MOBILITY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE OPTIONS</u> .....</b>	<b>8</b>
Consolidated Transportation Services Agency .....	9
Consolidated Transportation Services Agency Models .....	11
Legal Setting .....	13
Governing Structure .....	14
Sample Consolidated Transportation Services Agency Operating Budget .....	15
<b>Chapter 3: <u>FUNCTIONS</u> .....</b>	<b>19</b>
Travel Training .....	19
ADA Eligibility Process.....	20
Agency Partnerships .....	24
Coordinated Vehicle Maintenance .....	25
Volunteer Driver Programs.....	26
Central Information Program .....	28
Advocacy Role of Mobility Management .....	29
Technical Support .....	30
<b>Chapter 4: <u>IMPLEMENTATION STEPS</u> .....</b>	<b>32</b>
Phase I: Adoption of Plan.....	32
Phase II: Mobility Management Oversight Board .....	33
Phase III: Form CTSA .....	34
Phase VI: Functional Programs .....	35
Implementation Timeline .....	36
<b>Appendix 1: <u>Stakeholder Planning Group</u> .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Appendix 2: <u>Case Studies</u> .....</b>	<b>38</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

The Central Contra Costa Transit Authority (County Connection) has taken the lead in managing the planning process for the development of a mobility management plan for the entire County. This Plan resulting from that effort is meant to guide implementation of a broad array of services under the mobility management framework. The starting point for the planning process is the definition of the concept.

**Mobility Management is the utilization of a broad mix of service delivery and support strategies that are directed primarily at the travel needs of seniors, persons with disabilities, and low income individuals. These strategies often integrate with and support other public service solutions provided to the larger public transit and paratransit rider populations. Mobility Management is not one solution but a toolkit of solutions that are tailored to the service needs of the special population groups.**

This Plan recommends the formation of an organization to take the lead in implementing a broad range of mobility management strategies. Specifically, a Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) is recommended for Contra Costa County. A CTSA in the County would provide the vehicle through which the list of desired services could be deployed. The creation of a Mobility Management Oversight Committee is recommended to undertake the tasks needed to establish the CTSA. Options for funding the program are identified. A draft startup budget and a draft sample initial annual operating budget are included in the Plan. An initial budget of \$325,000 is proposed for each of the first two years of full operation following the formation phase.

The Plan acknowledges the contributions and relationships of the existing human service agencies in the County. It recommends careful attention to the roles of these organizations relative to the new CTSA and that funding considerations always be based upon a thorough analysis of the impacts of coordinating efforts between these existing organizations and the new agency.

The Plan suggests a number of service strategies responding to transportation needs identified in the planning process. These gaps were vetted through outreach efforts with community stakeholders that work with seniors, persons with disabilities, and persons with low-income. The specific strategies proposed for Contra Costa County are listed on the following page:

- Travel training: Create a program to teach bus riding skills on all county transit systems.
- Improved ADA Eligibility Process: Institute a refined countywide ADA eligibility process, possibly an in-person assessment approach, to improve the accuracy of the eligibility determinations.
- Agency Partnerships: Work with human service agencies so they can provide transportation to their clients who currently use the ADA paratransit service operated by the transit agencies.
- Centralized Maintenance: Evaluate the viability of a centralized maintenance program directed at serving the unique needs of the human service community who are operating a variety of vehicles in their programs.
- Volunteer Driver Program: Expand volunteer driver programs throughout the County as an inexpensive means of serving difficult medical and other trip needs for seniors and persons with disabilities.
- Central Information Program: Expand information availability by making meaningful resource information available through a central referral mechanism.
- Advocacy Role of Mobility Management: Determine the level of advocacy appropriate for a new CTSA in Contra Costa County and include the new agency in all transportation planning processes.
- Technical Assistance Program: Include technical support as one of the services of the newly created CTSA to assist the human service community and other agencies in planning, grant management, and other technical functions.
- Driver Training Program: Establish a professional and consistent driver training program for human service agencies; offer driver training services relating to special needs populations to existing paratransit providers.

## Chapter 1: METHODOLOGY

---

### **Background**

The Contra Costa Mobility Management Plan was commissioned by the County Connection. It was derived from a Countywide outreach process, involved agencies throughout the entire County, and offers strategies applicable to the entire County. The Plan's technical basis is derived from input from transportation experts representing many agencies and the experience of the consulting team.

The Plan is intended to guide long term development of mobility management projects that fill gaps in existing transportation services and are sustainable both on the basis of organizational structure and funding. Traditional transportation services, such as public transit, are increasingly challenged to meet the needs of a diverse population. Public transit or "mass transit" is designed to carry large amounts of riders. Public transit includes fixed-route bus and rail service for the general public and paratransit bus service for disabled individuals in the community as described in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Although public transit provides an appropriate means of transportation for a majority of riders, there is an increasing population that requires specialized transportation. The result is increased emphasis on specialized programs that enhance transportation services and provide alternatives to fill gaps that seniors, persons with disabilities, and persons with low-income face. These are broadly defined as mobility management strategies. Effective mobility management strategies are those that coordinate with existing transportation services including: public transit, community based, and human service transportation programs. These strategies fill gaps often lost through public transit and will vary based on the demographic group being served. Examples of mobility management strategies specific to Contra Costa County are detailed in Chapter 3.

The identification and pursuit of these service delivery strategies is not enough to meet the need. Only through institutional commitment and appropriate institutional structures can these unique delivery strategies be provided. A CTSA will provide the framework for that process in Contra Costa County.

### **Methodology and Outreach**

The process used to construct the Plan involved the following steps:

Establish overall project direction and objectives: This initial planning stage involved discussions with the agencies managing the planning process, in particular County



Connection and the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA). The result was the broadening of the objective of the project to include consideration of the full range of mobility management options and structures for the County as opposed to a “one-stop” information referral project.

Identify appropriate mobility management functions and service delivery structures through technical analysis and community input: The analytical portion of the planning process was strongly supported by extensive community input. Activities involved meetings with community agencies to identify needs and to present technical options. The results of this process became the list of strategies included in the Plan.

Formal advisory input: The planning process was supported by two levels of advisory input. The first was the formation of an ad hoc Stakeholders Advisory Committee. This group represented varying interests throughout the County and included a cross section of agency types and geographic perspectives. The direction provided by this group was invaluable to the direction of the Plan. Among the most important outcomes of the advisory committee was recognition that an institutional framework was necessary to deliver the creative service options that are needed. The Plan defines both the structure recommended and the functional programs that were identified by the community and Advisory Committee.

The second level of advisory input was in the form of three Summit meetings held throughout the County. These Summits were structured to solicit input and feedback on specific mobility management options. Input from the participants was extremely helpful in defining the elements of this Mobility Management Plan.

Throughout the outreach process, stakeholder input was elicited to identify the challenges that their target population face when traveling throughout Contra Costa County. These findings were used to design strategies to fill the gaps that are detailed in Chapter 3. Throughout the outreach process the overarching theme was the lack of coordination amongst human service agencies, transit operators, and private/public/non-profit agencies. Although there are many providers of transportation, there is no central focal point for coordination, implementation, and enhancement of transportation options for these special needs populations. The recommendations in this Plan provide a comprehensive approach to address the challenges identified through outreach to the community.

## Chapter 2: MOBILITY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE OPTIONS

---

Mobility management is one part of a complex matrix of transportation services in any urban area. The “public transportation system” is made up of a number of elements that interact and often overlap. The major components of a public transportation system are: fixed-route bus service for the general public, paratransit bus service for individuals with disabilities as described in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and mobility management/human service transportation serving the specialized transportation needs of the population. These three elements have traditionally operated independently of each other.

In a coordinated transportation system, the three elements work in a more integrated fashion to serve certain targeted populations, specifically individuals with disabilities, the elderly, and persons of low income. This can result in service and cost efficiencies that yield benefits for the individual riders, public agencies, and smaller human service transportation providers. Within a coordinated transportation system, public transit, community based and human service agencies work with one another to refer riders to the service that is most appropriate for their functional abilities. Presently there are agencies in Contra Costa County that refer riders, but throughout the planning process there has been an emphasis on expanding and enhancing these efforts in a coordinated fashion. The quantitative and qualitative impacts of integrating a coordinated transportation system are captured in this Plan.

Though “mobility management” has often been defined narrowly to focus on one-stop call centers, this Plan takes a broader view. The concept goes far beyond minimal trip planning efforts for individuals to much broader strategies capable of improving service delivery to much larger numbers of individuals. No one strategy can serve all of the needs of the special needs groups targeted and for this reason the Plan consists of a variety of programs each meeting some aspect of the overall demand. This Plan includes strategies that exceed available funding and sets forth a list with recommended priorities. It also suggests approaches to funding intended to create a viable and sustainable program.

### ***Consolidated Transportation Services Agency***

Elements embodied in the concept of mobility management have been a part of the transportation service delivery framework for many years. Only recently have these elements been referred to as mobility management. Federal coordination requirements are now placing renewed emphasis on strategies to increase coordination in California such as the formation of CTSAs.

When the State passed AB 120, the Social Services Transportation Improvement Act, it allowed county or regional transportation planning agencies to designate one or more organizations within their areas as Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies (CTSAs). The goal was to promote the coordination of social service transportation for the benefit of human service clients, including the elderly, disabled individuals, and persons of low income. AB 120 specified the following strategies of service coordination through the use of CTSAs:

- Cost savings through combined purchasing of necessary equipment.
- Adequate training of drivers to insure the safe operation of vehicles. Proper driver training to promote lower insurance costs and encourage use of the service.
- Centralized dispatching of vehicles to efficiently utilize rolling stock.
- Centralized maintenance of vehicles so that adequate and routine vehicle maintenance scheduling is possible.
- Centralized administration of various social service transportation programs to eliminate duplicative and costly administrative functions. Centralized administration of social service transportation services permitting social service agencies to respond to specific social needs.
- Identification and consolidation of all existing sources of funding for social service transportation. This can provide more effective and cost efficient use of scarce resource dollars. Consolidation of categorical program funds can foster eventual elimination of unnecessary and unwarranted program constraints.

The CTSA structure is unique to California. While other states are beginning to implement coordinated transportation projects, only California has the state legislated model of the CTSA. Thus, for three decades, initiatives to coordinate human service transportation programs in California have been largely guided by AB 120. There is a new focus on CTSAs as the appropriate entity to implement the programs embodied in the federal legislation that provides funding for mobility management projects. Other communities are seeking to create new CTSAs or designate existing organizations as CTSAs to combine the State and federal legislation into service delivery mechanisms

that have resources and focus to achieve real coordination. A significant dialogue is underway throughout California regarding the role of the CTSA and its ability to meet both the federal and State coordination requirements.

In January 2013, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) circulated a Draft Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan Update which recommends the designation of CTSAs to facilitate sub-regional mobility management and transportation coordination efforts.

### What is a CTSA Intended to Do?

While no two CTSAs are structured the same way or provide exactly the same services, there are common objectives to be found in all CTSA activities:

- Increase transportation options for seniors, the disabled, and persons of low income.
- Reduce the costs for public transportation.
- Identify and implement efficiencies in community transportation operations.

### What Can a CTSA Look Like and Accomplish?

CTSAs in California have taken on a variety of forms and within those various forms they provide a range of services. The most successful CTSAs have embraced the concept of human service coordination and mobilized efforts to creatively use resources to accomplish great things in their local communities. While all forms of CTSA have the potential to achieve the objectives of the concept, evidence provided through a review of available CTSA documentation and case studies indicates that certain structures may be more conducive to successful project implementation than others.

AB 120, the California legislation creating CTSAs along with the subsequent federal guidance on human service transportation coordination offers a general concept of a mobility management agency. Within that guidance is great latitude to mold the concept to the unique circumstances of a local community. The most successful CTSAs have built a creative array of programs serving a broad population of persons in need. The typical target populations include the disabled, elderly, and low-income individuals. Many studies including planning efforts in Contra Costa County have documented the substantial unmet needs of these groups and the need for additional specialized transportation capacity programs capable of targeting these potential riders. As the definition of need is broadened to include young children and possibly other groups, the volume of need becomes even more extensive.

Well refined CTSA's have addressed the broad variety of needs in creative ways. They have typically used limited funds in creative ways to achieve substantial results. For example, efforts in other counties have included joint funding of service provided by human service agencies for their own client populations. Some communities combine funding for transportation programs with other sources. Examples of non-transportation funding that are sometimes used to support transportation services include Regional Centers, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and Area Agency on Aging.

An effective CTSA is an organization that serves as a broad facilitator – or champion - of transportation coordination. The role typically means that the agency is well connected in the transportation and human service community and is a leader in creating solutions to travel needs. This is often accomplished through negotiating cooperative agreements between agencies to coordinate the use of funds, acquiring capital assets (e.g. vehicles, computer equipment, etc.), and buying fuel and electricity for vehicles (e.g. joint fuel purchase). Service delivery can range from: coordinating a volunteer driver program to managing a travel training program for fixed-route service and can include the facilitation of direct service delivery through contracts with social service agencies. An important consideration is that most functions that a CTSA can perform can be offered through any of a variety of structural models.

### ***Consolidated Transportation Service Agency Models***

AB 120 requires that CTSA's be designated by a transportation planning agency. In Contra Costa County, this entity is the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). According to statute, each CTSA designated must be an agency other than the planning agency. The range of options for CTSA designation as defined in law are:

- A public agency, including a city, county, transit operator, any state department or agency, public corporation, or public district, or a joint powers entity created pursuant to the California Government Code Section 15951.
- A common carrier of persons as defined in Section 211 of the Public Utilities Code, engaged in the transportation of persons, as defined in Section 208.
- A private entity operating under a franchise or license.
- A non-profit corporation organized pursuant to Division 2 (commencing with Section 9000) of Title 1, Corporations Code.

Within these broad legal definitions, a number of alternative CTSA structure models have emerged. These or possible variations are open for consideration for application in Contra Costa County. The following are the principal structural options for CTSA organizations in the County.

- Single Purpose Non-profit Agency: In California there are limited examples of non-profit agencies that have been designated as a CTSA that provide a wide range of transportation programs and services. Noteworthy examples of existing non-profit CTSA's are Outreach in Santa Clara County, Valley Transportation Services in San Bernardino County, and Paratransit, Inc. in Sacramento County.

Outreach and Escort of Santa Clara County served as the CTSA in the County for several years before its designation was rescinded by MTC. It was recently re-designated by MTC and is currently the only CTSA in the nine county Bay Area. Among the provisions associated with this re-designation was an agreement that Outreach would not submit a claim for TDA Article 4.5 funds. Access Services in Los Angeles was created largely to manage the ADA paratransit program in LA County but was also designated the CTSA. It was created through action by public agencies to address ADA and coordination issues.

- Multi-Purpose Non-profit Agency: There are examples in California where a multi-purpose non-profit agency has been designated the CTSA. This is typically a situation where a strong non-profit organization with an effective infrastructure wishes to champion transportation issues and adds those functions to a broader list of agency activities. Ride-On of San Luis Obispo is an example of this form of organization. Ride-On was originally the United Cerebral Palsy (UCP) affiliate in San Luis Obispo and still serves in that capacity in addition to its transportation responsibilities. There are many examples of non-profit organizations that have created major transportation programs under an umbrella that includes nutrition services, housing programs, food banks, and other common human service functions.
- County Government: In many rural California counties, transportation services are provided by the County. Often this includes providing public transit services. This is a common structure in smaller or rural counties. Several counties have been designated CTSA's. Often, though not always, transportation services are provided through the public works department. Counties such as Glenn and Colusa are examples of this form of CTSA.
- Public Transit Agency: In some California counties the local public transit agency has been designated the CTSA. This applies to both legislated transit districts and Joint Powers Authority (JPA) agencies. It is typically in smaller counties that the transit agency has been designated. Examples of transit agencies that are

CTSAs are El Dorado Transit, Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (Bishop), and the Mendocino Transit Authority. All of these are JPAs.

Of the models presented above the non-profit agency model has historically been the most notable in terms of implementing programs with long-term sustainability. Non-profit agencies such as Outreach and Escort, Ride-On, and Paratransit, Inc. have delivered successful coordinated transportation programs throughout California for many years. Each of these organizations continues to evolve to meet the needs of the communities they serve. Non-profit organizations have typically been the most successful CTSA model for a number of specific reasons. These include:

- **Specific Mission:** Non-profit CTSAs have been established with a human services perspective focused on special needs populations and programs dedicated to fulfilling these unique needs. This differs from public transit agencies whose primary mission is to serve large groups of travelers (“mass” transportation). Human service transportation often plays a very small part in an organization with a mass transit mission.
- **Entrepreneurial style:** Non-profit CTSAs have often been created by transportation professionals seeking to apply creative approaches to the hard to serve needs of special population groups.
- **Flexibility:** Non-profit CTSAs typically have more flexibility to create and operate new programs than governmental agencies.
- **Applicable laws:** Non-profit corporations are subject to different laws than public agencies such as labor laws. This fact can provide more latitude to structure services with unique operating characteristics than most public agencies.
- **Access to funds:** Non-profit corporations may be eligible for funds that are not available to other organizations. Such funds may contribute to fulfilling the mission of the agency. An example would include the priority given to non-profit corporations applying for FTA Section 5310 funds.

### ***Legal Setting***

The legal basis for establishing and managing CTSAs is contained in the California enacted Transportation Development Act (TDA). This broad set of California laws and regulations concerning transportation funding and management contains the various provisions governing CTSAs. The CTSA portion of the TDA is a relatively small part of a much larger law concerning funding for all modes of transportation and certain specific funding sources available to all counties for transportation purposes.



The two funding sources included in TDA are:

- Local Transportation Fund (LTF): derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected within the county and
- State Transit Assistance Fund (STA): derived from the statewide sale tax on gasoline and diesel fuel.

The portion of the TDA creating CTSA states that such agencies are eligible to claim up to 5% of the LTF for community transportation purposes.

The Act also specifies the process through which a CTSA may be designated. The designating agency may promulgate regulations specific to the CTSA as well as the duration of the designation. The length of CTSA designation varies throughout California. For a number of CTSA, the term of designation has evolved over time. For example, Paratransit, Inc. in Sacramento was designated the CTSA in 1981 for a one year period. This designation was reviewed and extended later in multi-year increments. In 1988, the designation was extended “without a time limitation” and has retained designation to this day.

The oversight of claimants for TDA funds including CTSA are subject to two audits. The first is an annual fiscal audit that must be submitted within 180 days of the close of each fiscal year and the second is a triennial performance audit. This periodic audit conducted according to specific guidelines, evaluates the performance of a TDA claimant and could serve as the basis for determining the future of a CTSA.

### ***Governing Structure***

An area of CTSA oversight that is not contained in the TDA law and regulations is the local governing structure of the designated agency. If a CTSA is a public agency, the governing board of that agency would traditionally oversee receipt and expenditure of public funds. Since a CTSA can be a County, a transit agency, or other government agency, it would be subject to the scrutiny of a board that is otherwise responsible for fiduciary oversight. A CTSA may also be a non-profit corporation. The governing structure may vary substantially among non-profit corporations. Many traditional charitable non-profit corporations have self-appointing boards. This typically means that interested members of the community may be appointed to the board by the sitting board members. Ride-On in San Luis Obispo is an example of this type of governing structure.



There is precedent in California for a non-profit corporation to have a board of directors whose make-up is governed by political agreement associated with its structure. Paratransit, Inc. began as a traditional non-profit corporation with a self-appointing board. Later in its evolution, local public agencies formed an agreement associated with Paratransit's designation as a CTSA that included specific appointing authority to local governmental jurisdictions. This revised structure provided the desired level of oversight and representation.

Valley Transportation Services (VTrans) in San Bernardino County was created in 2010 to serve as the CTSA for the San Bernardino urbanized area. The Bylaws of this newly created non-profit agency specified that its Board of Directors be appointed by San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG), Omnitrans (the public transit agency), and by San Bernardino County. This publicly appointed governing board structure reflected the importance of oversight in a case where large amounts of public funding are made available to a non-profit agency. VTrans, as the designated CTSA, is eligible to receive an allocation of local sales tax Measure I for transportation purposes.

An effective and functional Board of Directors for a new non-profit CTSA should be made up of approximately seven to nine members. Because of the management of large amounts of government funds, it is appropriate that public agencies appoint members to the new Board. A typical structure might include appointments by CCTA, Contra Costa County, each transit agency, and some human service agency representatives. Appointing agencies can usually appoint from their own membership or from the community. In some cases, governance structure formats are established to require representatives of the service population (e.g. disabled representatives or seniors). These decisions would be debated by the Oversight Board recommended as a key implementation step.

### ***Phased Implementation: Sample Consolidated Transportation Service Agency Operating Budget***

Various phases will be necessary to achieve full implementation of a CTSA in Contra Costa County. Each phase in the process will have its own budget. This will allow for clear delineation of the costs of each phase. The first phase is preparatory to establishing an operational CTSA. It consists of the formation of an Oversight Board to guide development of the CTSA concept, establish its legal framework, determine a governance structure, and make final budget and operating decisions. The Oversight Board phase of the project is proposed to be funded by two sources: 1) funds remaining on the Innovative Paradigms Mobility Management planning contract and, 2) reallocation of New Freedom funds that had been granted to the Contra Costa

Transportation Authority for phase 3 of initial planning process. In combination, these funding sources provide adequate funding for formation functions.

Once the functions to be performed by a new CTSA are determined, a budget for the early operation of the organization can be developed. The budget will depend on whether a new agency is created or the CTSA designation is added to an existing organization. This will determine whether the entire infrastructure of an organization is necessary or if staff and other support services are added onto an existing agency. Administrative overhead will be an important element to identify. The staff capacity of the CTSA will have an impact on the organization's ability to build programs and to manage the range of functions that a CTSA is capable of performing.

In the growth stage of a CTSA, considerable time and effort (staff resources) will be necessary to forge partnerships with other organizations, prepare grant applications, implement service functions, etc. For discussion purposes, two CTSA budgets for Contra Costa County are presented below. The first is a startup budget intended to capture the cost of organization formation, creation of basic organization infrastructure such as accounting and business management functions, and early staffing functions that eventually lead to dedicated management. The second budget is a pro forma first year operating budget. It presents a basic structural budget for the first year of operation. It does not present operating costs for the various programs that might be operated. The initial organization budget is to support the pursuit of operating programs with their necessary funding and interagency coordination.

It presents general cost estimates for overhead but does not include costs for individual program elements. Significant refinement would be necessary with actual implementation. However, the sample budget serves as a presentation of basic cost items to guide decision making relative to structure options. This draft budget is based on the premise that a new stand-alone agency would be created to operate the CTSA. The budget therefore includes the financing necessary to lease office space, equip and staff the office, and initiate selected startup service delivery projects.

## Contra Costa Mobility Management Plan

### CTSA Formation Budget

[Estimated formation expense; approximately 6 months]

COST CATEGORY	Cost Estimate	Notes
<b>Professional Services</b>		
Management Consulting	\$75,000	Temporary management
Legal Services	\$40,000	Legal: document prep, filing
Accounting Services	\$40,000	Tax filings; accounting setup
<b>Temporary Operating Expenses</b>		
Office space	\$0	Possibly donated by agency?
Misc. office expense	\$10,000	Materials; travel; Bd expense
Filing fees; etc	\$2,000	Incorporation, etc.
<b>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$167,000</b>	
<b>FUNDING SOURCES (existing)</b>		
Innovative Paradigms Contract	\$20,000	
New Freedom Grant (CCTA)	\$147,000	
<b>TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES</b>	<b>\$167,000</b>	

**CTSA Operating Budget: New Nonprofit Corporation**

<b>COST CATEGORY</b>	<b>Cost Estimate</b>	<b>Notes</b>
<b>Staff</b>		
Executive Director	\$140,000	Salary, taxes, benefits
Administrative Assistant	\$49,000	Salary, taxes, benefits
<b>Direct Expenses</b>		
Office Space	\$72,000	2000 sq ft @\$3 / sq ft
Utilities	\$5,400	\$450 / mo
Professional Services	\$35,000	legal; accounting
Phone	\$3,600	\$300 / mo
Supplies	\$3,600	\$300 / mo
Insurance	\$3,000	\$3,000/ yr
Travel	\$1,000	\$1,000 / yr
Misc Expense	\$12,000	
<b>Functional Programs</b>		
Travel Training		Cost to be determined
ADA Eligibility Process		Cost to be determined
Agency Partnerships		Cost to be determined
Coordinated Vehicle Maintenance		Cost to be determined
Volunteer Driver Programs		Cost to be determined
Central Information Program		Cost to be determined
Advocacy Role		Cost to be determined
Technical Support		Cost to be determined
<b>Reserve</b>		
<b>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$324,600</b>	
<b>FUNDING SOURCES (potential)</b>		
MTC Grant	\$205,000	
Other	\$120,000	
<b>TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES</b>	<b>\$325,000</b>	

## Chapter 3: FUNCTIONS

---

The actual functions or services provided by CTSA's and the methods through which they are delivered can vary widely. One major influence on the overall effectiveness of a CTSA is the amount of available funding that the organization has to manage or direct. Some funds do not have to actually flow through the agency. Other funds are directly managed by the agency and can be used to provide direct services or to “seed” projects through other agencies using various grant management strategies.

The service functions that were supported by the stakeholders and the public in Contra Costa County are defined below. Some of these have been under consideration by the community for several years. Others emerged as priorities through the planning process. A subsequent implementation step would be to set priorities among the listed strategies and prepare precise implementation plans and budgets.

### ***Travel Training***

#### Existing Travel Training Programs in Contra Costa County

Some travel training programs currently operate in Contra Costa County. These programs have limited scope both geographically and relative to the clientele that are included in the programs.

- County Connection has a travel ambassador program but staff time to manage it has been cut.
- Tri-Delta Transit operates a “Transit Orientation Class” four times per year to familiarize individuals with the fixed-route transit system. The agency also offers one-on-one travel training upon request. Coordination with high schools that offer travel training is also done by Tri-Delta.
- Contra Costa ARC and Futures Explored provide travel training for their consumers and receives a stipend from the Regional Center of the East Bay (RCEB) to provide this service.
- Independent Living Resources (ILR) of Solano and Contra Costa Counties has an informal travel training program for clients of their agency. ILR staff will provide training to clients on an as needed basis.

### Proposed Countywide Travel Training Program

There are several potential elements in a full scale travel training program. Each is defined below.

- **Travel Training or Mobility Training** – The most intensive level of travel training is based upon one-on-one instruction for difficult cases. Often the trainees are developmentally disabled and require extensive and repetitive instruction in order to achieve transit independence. The trainer will work with a client usually for several days to instruct them on how to use the transit system to get to their destination.
- **Bus Familiarization** – This type of training is less intensive and generally can be done in several hours. Typical bus familiarization training would be for a person or group to learn how to read transit schedules and/or take a single trip to a major destination such as a mall. This is also common for physically disabled individuals who need instruction on the use of the special equipment on standard transit buses such as wheelchair lifts, kneeling features, audio stop announcements both internal and external, farebox usage, etc. Bus familiarization is sometimes done in the field in active transit service. In other cases, this training is conducted at the transit facility using out-of-service transit coaches.
- **Transit Ambassador/Bus Buddy Program** – Transit ambassador or bus buddy programs can take several forms. The program usually matches a trainee with a trainer. Typically the trainee and trainer will have something in common - perhaps both are seniors going to a congregate meal site. Transit ambassador and Bus Buddy programs typically use volunteers to teach transit riding skills.

### **Financial Implications**

Moving riders from the ADA service to fixed-route transit can produce dramatic savings for transit agencies. For example, a rider traveling to and from a day-program Monday-Friday using a paratransit service costing \$31.00 per one-way trip that is trained to use fixed-route transit costing \$8.00 for the same trip can produce dramatic savings for the transit operator.

In addition to the financial implications, a rider that transitions from an ADA service to fixed-route transit has increased mobility and independence. This transition allows a rider to travel without the need to schedule a ride as required when using paratransit services. Travel training is an example of a mobility management strategy that

enhances existing public transit by moving riders from paratransit service to the less expensive option of fixed-route.

### ***ADA Eligibility Process***

#### Eligibility Assessment Options

The FTA does not prescribe a particular eligibility process and a number of models are in use across the US. Whatever process is selected by a local transit operator must simply meet the established FTA criteria outlined above. In addition to the paper application process currently in use by Contra Costa County transit operators, three other types of eligibility procedures are in use by transit operators in other communities. The three principal alternative approaches are: telephone interviews/assessments, web-based assessments, and in-person eligibility assessments. ADA eligibility experts debate the accuracy of the various assessment models. While telephone and web-based options are less expensive than an in-person process, the lack of personal contact and observation and the lack of functional testing make refined eligibility determinations, or conditional eligibility, difficult to assign. Yet some communities strongly endorse the telephone and web-based options.

#### Telephone Based Eligibility

Some agencies rely primarily on telephone interviews for eligibility determinations. These are usually conducted by high level professionals such as occupational therapists who conduct a comprehensive conversation on the phone with the applicant, and in a very few cases where a determination cannot be made, the applicant will be referred for an in-person assessment. Such assessments can be conducted at an applicant's home or other designated site. Eligibility outcomes are relatively similar to those of in-person assessments, though the ability to apply eligibility conditions is arguably more challenging.

#### Web-Based Eligibility

Web-based assessments have been pioneered by a Southern California firm. This model has been applied in nine paratransit programs, ranging from those in smaller communities such as Victor Valley and Butte County, CA (population in the 200,000 range) to larger systems such as Richmond, Virginia and North San Diego County (population in the 600,000 to 800,000 range). The web-based model is based on the premise that, since most applicants are found fully eligible, and since most systems that use in-person assessments have yet to apply their eligibility conditions, transit agencies that are fiscally constrained should not be spending significant sums on transporting

applicants to in-person assessments and burdening applicants with travel to an assessment location.

Under this model, applicants need to create an on-line account, complete the application and then mail or e-mail a healthcare form completed by a professional who is familiar with their abilities. This information is then reviewed by the professional on the evaluation team who has specific expertise in the disability that is the basis for the person's application. Team members include medical doctors, physical and occupational therapists, registered nurses, social workers etc. Eligibility outcomes are relatively similar to those from in-person assessments in terms of the breakdown of eligibility categories, but not in terms of level of detail. On average, about 56% of the 36,000 applications that have been reviewed so far have been determined fully eligible, 38% conditional (includes 11% temporary), and 6% ineligible. In a small number of cases, if determinations cannot be made remotely, the firm sets up in-person functional assessments locally. Appeals have remained below 1% of the total number of certifications.

Assessment costs range from \$45 to \$70 per application. While the relatively lower costs of these assessments have been appealing to a number of agencies, some of the shortcomings that have been cited by paratransit eligibility experts include:

- The model relies too heavily on applicants' ability to use technology (although these are often completed by caseworkers and other professionals, and exceptions are available for those who cannot use the web)
- There is limited ability to have a discussion with the applicant about the full range of mobility options afforded by in-person assessments.
- The inability to observe applicants ambulate in-person places a significant limit on the evaluator's ability to establish reliable and informative eligibility conditions.

An in-person assessment process results in the greatest accuracy. The ability to personally observe applicants, discuss their functional limitations, and perform structured functional evaluations results in a much greater level of accuracy. Though typically more expensive to perform than assessment models, many operators have determined that the refined ability to introduce conditions for ADA paratransit use make the additional expense of the assessment cost effective. Most of the major transit operators in the US have already introduced in-person assessments. Of the top 10 transit agencies, Boston was the last to introduce an in-person process in December, 2012. As interest in applying conditional eligibility as a cost control tool increases, more agencies are implementing in-person eligibility as the means to achieve that objective.



### In-Person Eligibility

An in-person ADA eligibility process typically consists of a number of steps in order to more precisely evaluate an applicant's ability to ride the bus, access bus stops, and to come to a definitive decision as to functional capability. The shift from a paper process to an in-person approach is based upon the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) focus on a functional model of eligibility versus a medical model. With a paper process, the emphasis is typically on the *function* of the applicant's disability.

Steps common to an in-person eligibility process include:

1. In-person interview of the applicant during which details of condition can be established by a trained interviewer.
2. Various transit skill functional tests that help the interviewer verify certain abilities relating specifically to transit riding.
3. Selected use of professional verification if the interviewer needs further information to establish details of conditions that are not readily apparent to the interviewer.

An in-person process usually takes between 30 and 90 minutes to complete depending upon the nature of the individual's disability and the resulting need for various functional tests. In order to render consistent and accurate determinations, the interview and any skills tests are conducted in a very uniform and "scientific" manner. Interviewers are typically trained to a high level of proficiency in evaluating information provided by the applicant and in interpreting information gathered during functional tests or from medical professionals. Thorough documentation of each assessment is then compiled. This becomes the basis for reviewing any case that is appealed by the applicant.

### **Financial Implications**

Financial implications for an ADA eligibility process vary amongst the models. There is typically a continuum of costs associated with the various processes with the in-person assessment being the most expensive. However, transit agencies that transition from a paper ADA eligibility application process to in-person assessment process typically realize an approximate 15% drop in applications. The drop in the application rate is one key method for controlling ADA paratransit costs. Another is the application of trip by trip eligibility using the conditional determinations made during an in-person process. With specific conditional information, operators are beginning to direct some ADA trips to fixed-route if the individual has been determined to be capable of taking that trip on

regular transit. While often starting incrementally, accurate mode assignment can also become a significant cost control tool.

As important as any cost control factor relating to the introduction of a refined eligibility process is the consistent application of determinations. At the present time, each operator in Contra Costa County makes its own eligibility determinations. Yet once made, the determinations apply to all operators in the Bay Area through the Regional Eligibility Database (RED) system. The application of determination criteria varies across operators. A countywide system would begin to standardize the application of eligibility criteria to result in more consistent eligibility determinations among County operators and perhaps lead to a more consistent regionwide process.

### ***Agency Partnerships***

One of the most effective tools available to CTSA's is partnering with community agencies to deliver trips more efficiently and at lower cost than those through traditional ADA paratransit service. An underlying concept in partnership agreements is shared cost contracting. This concept has proven effective in many communities and is now being replicated in others both within and outside California. This approach to service delivery builds on the resources of community agencies and offers partial support of their transportation through subsidized maintenance, insurance, or other technical contributions. Another form of community partnership involves the payment to an agency for the provision of its own transportation service through some combination of funding sources. The resulting service is far less expensive than traditional door-to-door service commonly provided today under ADA guidelines. Since virtually all clients of these agencies are ADA eligible, they could simply be added to the growing numbers of ADA riders. Instead, agency clients are carried on agency vehicles more efficiently and at lower cost. Higher quality service for the client also results from the dedication of the agency to its clients, the stability of routine pick-up and drop-off schedules, and the often shorter trip length due to the proximity of individuals to programs.

There are two advantages of this program to transit operators.

- By moving agency trips off ADA service, the 50% subscription cap in any given time period on ADA demand response service, which causes service denials under ADA, can be avoided.
- Reporting of CTSA agency trips can bring more federal funding into a region through formula programs. Some CTSA's report trips directly into the National Transit Database (NTD). Counting these trips increases the formula funding

available to a region through 5307. Agency trips typically qualify as part of the ADA trip total.

### **Financial Implications**

In locations where successful agency trip models have been deployed, cost savings for moving trips off ADA service are dramatic. Honolulu, Hawaii has such a model where trips performed by the local ADA service provider at a cost of \$38.63 for a one-way trip are now being completed by a human service agency for \$4.85 a one-way trip, with over 55,000 trips performed in the first year of operation. An annual savings of \$1,857,900 resulted.

A dramatic result of agency trip programs is the quality of service that riders experience. Using an agency trip model, the riders are generally transported by program staff. Staff members are generally familiar with the individual's disabilities and special needs, which general public ADA paratransit drivers are often not prepared to manage. Agency trips also typically exhibit shorter trip length, and routine pick-up and drop-off schedules. The combination of these factors results in service that is much higher in productivity than public paratransit services.

### ***Coordinated Vehicle Maintenance***

A major program function that can be performed by a CTSA is coordinated vehicle maintenance. In such a program, a central maintenance provider operates a garage servicing a broad range of vehicles. Participation in the maintenance program is voluntary but brings with it such benefits that make it appealing to community agencies from a business perspective. Typically, there are many advantages to the social service community in participating in a program designed to meet its unique maintenance needs. A primary benefit is the overall safety of the CTSA fleet. With services being provided according to rigorously structured maintenance standards, overall fleet safety is ensured. The central provider works with agency customers to ensure compliance with such requirements as CHP inspections and all OSHA regulations.

The beneficial features of a coordinated maintenance program are listed below:

#### Specialized Expertise

A centralized maintenance program that services paratransit-type vehicles (typically cutaway buses) develops specialized expertise that is not routinely available in commercial repair shops. This includes familiarity with wheelchair lifts, cutaway chassis, brake interlock systems, fareboxes, mobility securement systems, and other unique features.

### Central Record Keeping

A centralized maintenance program normally provides record keeping systems that help to ensure compliance with local laws and regulations as well as agency specific reporting on costs, maintenance intervals, life-cycle costs, vehicle replacement schedules, etc.

### Loaner Vehicles

A feature of a centralized maintenance program that is often cited as a “life saver” by participating agencies is the use of a loaner vehicle that is similar in size and configuration to the basic vehicles of the participants. This can be very beneficial to small agencies that do not have many or, in some cases, any backup vehicles.

### Specialized Schedules

A common feature of a centralized maintenance program is having business hours that best serve the client agencies. This can mean operating during evening hours or on weekends when commercial shops are often closed. Carefully crafted work schedules can greatly assist agencies by obtaining inspections and repairs when convenient to the customer.

### Fueling

Centralized fueling can also be a great benefit to agencies. It allows for careful monitoring of the fueling process and fuel usage. It also provides the opportunity for lower prices due to bulk purchasing and guaranteed availability in times of shortage.

### ***Volunteer Driver Programs***

Volunteer driver programs are an efficient method of providing transportation options in a community. These programs can take various forms, including: curb-to-curb, shared-ride transportation to common destinations, and highly specialized door-through-door service to riders with very specific needs. Whatever model is used, these programs are an important element in a community’s transportation framework. Volunteer driver programs models can vary significantly depending on the focus of the service. Volunteer programs typically involve some expense with the level of expense varying depending upon the service model employed. Two common approaches of volunteer driver programs include:

- **Shuttle Model:** In a volunteer shuttle operation, the driver is a volunteer but does not provide transportation with their personal vehicle. Instead, the volunteer typically drives an agency vehicle with the agency incurring expenses for all operating costs except the driver. The key cost saving element of this model is

the wages saved through the use of volunteers. Volunteer driver shuttles are often a curb-to-curb, shared-ride service that transport riders to common locations. Many shuttle programs require advance reservations, eligibility criteria (such as age), and a fee to ride.

Volunteer driver shuttles enhance transportation options for their passengers and assist with moving trips to the service that otherwise may be taken on ADA paratransit.

- **Door-through-Door Model:** This volunteer model typically involves a volunteer driving their own vehicle. The driver is not compensated for his time but may be reimbursed at a mileage rate to cover operating expenses such as use of personal gas. The door-through-door model is typically used to provide specialized transportation service for riders that need a high-level of assistance. In the door-through-door model, the driver may escort the passenger from the point of origin to the destination and wait for the passenger at the destination.

The service delivery approach for a door-through-door program varies but can include:

- Matching riders with volunteer drivers
  - Using this approach the agency recruits volunteers and matches the volunteer with a rider. Some programs schedule the rides with the driver and rider, and some “assign” a driver with a rider who coordinate trips without involving the agency.
- Rider finds their own driver
  - Using this model the rider finds their own driver and schedules trips with the driver as necessary.
- Mileage reimbursement
  - Some door-through-door volunteer driver programs offer mileage reimbursement for eligible trips. Reimbursement rates vary.

No matter the service delivery approach door-through-door models provide a highly specialized means of transportation for an often vulnerable population. These programs fulfill a growing need in communities presently only being transported by fee-based service providers.

Contra Costa County has a robust volunteer driver network. The County has multiple examples of both shuttle and door-through-door programs. These programs are tailored to the niche that they serve and provide an efficient method of transporting riders. These agencies also work collaboratively with one another to ensure that riders are provided the service that best suits their functional abilities.

### **Financial Implications**

Contra Costa County volunteer driver programs enhance the transportation matrix by providing transportation options for residents, moving trips off ADA paratransit, and offering a highly specialized means of travel for riders that cannot use other transportation options. These programs, in effect, provide a resource to residents that would otherwise use ADA paratransit, providing both quantitative and qualitative benefits to the community.

### ***Central Information Program***

A central information program is often considered the heart of a mobility management program. While this Plan includes an information program as an important element, it is only one of many forming a complete mobility management program. There are two primary call center functions: providing simple information referral and more sophisticated trip planning services.

The simplest call center is a referral service. In this case a caller would be asked questions by the call taker and referred to the appropriate agency.

Examples of Call Centers in Contra Costa County:

- Contra Costa Crisis Center 211 connects callers with community services, such as food, shelter, counseling, employment assistance, and child care. Callers are asked a series of questions to determine which services they are eligible for and then referred to the appropriate agency.
- Contra Costa 511 is a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program that promotes alternatives to single occupant vehicles including carpooling, vanpooling, telecommuting, biking, public transit, and walking.
- Area Agency on Aging (AAA) Information and Assistance (I & A) provides seniors and their families with information on community services and programs that solve the problems faced by Contra Costa seniors.

The central information program for Contra Costa County is meant to enhance the existing call centers and be a resource for persons needing to find information on public,

private, and human service transportation in the County. This could include detailed transit route and schedule information, eligibility information, fares, as well as information on private and non-profit transportation providers. The central information program for Contra Costa County will serve as a point of contact for residents to call to receive both transportation referral services and trip planning assistance. The call center was brought up as a helpful mobility management element during discussions with stakeholder groups.

### ***Advocacy Role of Mobility Management***

A mobility management CTSA can play an important role in advocating for the needs of the population groups that it represents. Because the CTSA works closely with agencies and individuals in the human services sector, it is often in a strategic position to advocate for these special needs populations.

There are several alternative approaches or levels of advocacy that the mobility management program can take. The advocacy role for a mobility manager can vary widely depending on the existing conditions in the area that is being served. Possible levels of advocacy are listed below.

- Information Source: Mobility Manager serves as a source of “expert” information for other agencies in the community on issues relating to special needs population.
- Special Needs Representative: Mobility Manager represents special needs populations in transportation decision making venues.
- Active lobbying for special needs populations: Proactive advocacy for special needs groups including initiating proposals for funding and service improvements.

The new CTSA in Contra Costa County would have some level of advocacy involvement simply by the nature of its position in the transportation mix. Such a role is typically defined by the Board of Directors who represent diverse interests in the County. A balanced advocacy role contributes to the overall effectiveness of the agency in the institutional mix in the service area.



### ***Technical Support***

Mobility management agencies can provide a variety of support services that benefit local human service transportation providers. Whether due to lack of staff, technical experience, or funds, many organizations are not able to fully utilize the resources available to them. A CTSA has the ability to assist agencies by supplying technical assistance that can allow for increased funding, expansion of existing programs, implementation of new projects, and development of a more highly trained staff.

#### Grant Writing

CTSAs have the potential to significantly impact available transportation services within their geographic area by supporting local agencies in their efforts to secure grant funding. Completing grant applications can be confusing and overwhelming. While larger agencies often have staff dedicated to the preparation of grant applications, smaller public and non-profit human service agencies usually assign this responsibility to a program manager or other administrative team member. A human service agency may not have the time or the expertise to seek out grant opportunities and submit applications.

Many human service agencies are intimidated by Federal or State grant application requirements and, although some agencies have projects that could qualify for grant funds, choose not to apply. Though grant programs are changing as a result of the passage of MAP-21, the newly enacted federal transit funding program, grants still contain rigorous requirements for management and reporting. Programs such as 5310 are available to agencies and now can be used in part for operations. Yet such grants carry complex requirements that a CTSA can help agencies fulfill.

A CTSA can provide the expertise and the technical support necessary to complete grant applications for local agencies. CTSA staff time can be dedicated to staying current on specific grant requirements and application instructions. This type of time commitment is often difficult or impossible for human service agencies to achieve. CTSA staff can provide assistance through local grant writing workshops, mentoring local agencies, and physically preparing grant applications.

#### Grant Management

Grant management is a complex process that often prevents agencies from applying for funding. The data collection and reporting requirements can be daunting. Often agencies look at the amount of the grant award and determine that the staff time necessary to oversee the grant is not worthwhile.



A CTSA can assist human services agencies in its region by providing grant management services or by offering training in grant management. In either case, the CTSA staff takes on the role of expert advisor based on its in-depth understanding of the rules and regulations required by each grantor. It can then provide advice and assistance in matters such as:

- Compliance with grant reporting requirements,
- Development of recordkeeping systems,
- Data collection techniques,
- Understanding of sub-recipient agreements in FTA grants, and
- Compliance with DBE and Title VI requirements.

The CTSA can go so far as to prepare and issue reports on behalf of the grant recipient or sub-recipient, if necessary.

### Driver Training and Professional Development

California state law is very specific about the requirements for driver training programs, including the qualifications for instructors. For a variety of reasons, agencies may have difficulty operating their own training programs. The driver corps may be small, the need for training classes may be infrequent, or the agency may not have the resources to employ a certified driver instructor. A CTSA can help meet the demand for qualified instruction in a variety of ways:

- Employing a fully certified instructor to teach driver training classes, to which agencies can send new drivers,
- Coordinating between those agencies that have their own programs and those that do not in order to fill available training “slots”, and
- Making materials and speakers available so they can be used as part of ongoing required safety training.

## Chapter 4: IMPLEMENTATION STEPS

---

Successful implementation of the Mobility Management Plan for Contra Costa County will require a series of actions crafted to maintain the consensus that has emerged around the overall concepts contained in the Plan. Success will be evident in the level of community and agency support for the approach, the ability to obtain the necessary funds to achieve implementation, and the efficiency of the resulting structure. This Plan proposes the formation of a CTSA in the County. This has been well documented throughout the planning process. The basis for this recommendation is the long-running dialog in the County regarding mobility management activities with little actual implementation occurring. The planning process identified that a major impediment to action is the lack of a structural platform to serve as the vehicle through which action is accomplished. That vehicle has now been identified as a CTSA. Further, careful consideration has been given to alternative legal structures for a CTSA. The result of that dialog has been the agreement to pursue a non-profit corporation model. The principal basis for recommending this structural model is the level of success in other communities that have adopted this structure.

The steps or phases necessary to achieve successful implementation are defined here. They are presented in a level of detail consistent with the discussions throughout the planning process. It is clear that moving forward will require expertise in governance, finance, mobility management functional tools, and other very specific experience. Such resources have also been discussed throughout the planning process.

### ***Phase I: Adoption of the Plan***

The first step toward implementation of the Plan is its adoption by the Board of Directors of County Connection. As the sponsor of the planning process, County Connection is the first level of approval of the Plan and its recommendations. The County Connection Board should consider the implications of the Plan and adopt it both as the sponsoring agency and also as one of the key implementing agencies in the County. Concurrence of the other transit operators particularly WestCAT and Tri-Delta Transit should be sought to demonstrate the support of the transit community for the Plan. Their support will strengthen subsequent steps in the implementation process. It will also give the Transportation Authority what it needs to move the process forward. In adopting the Plan, County Connection should also officially forward the Plan on to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) as the countywide agency best suited to manage Phase II of the implementation process.

## ***Phase II: Formation of a Mobility Management Oversight Board***

An Oversight Board of critical agency representatives is the appropriate mechanism for Phase II of the process. This Board should be formed to guide discussion of the critical details of the CTSA formation process including makeup of the governing board, roles and responsibilities of the agency, identification and commitment of seed funds to create the organization, and other legal and procedural details. The Oversight Board is proposed to include: Executive staff from County Connection, Tri-Delta Transit, WestCAT, AC Transit, Contra Costa Transportation Authority, BART, and three executives representing human service agencies.

As a tool for use in guiding the efforts of the Mobility Management Oversight Board, it is recommended that a set of Guiding Principles be adopted to ensure that the interests and objectives of the affected agencies are represented and officially noted. Such a tool can help to keep the efforts of the participants focused and inclusive. A preliminary set of Guiding Principles is proposed below:

### Guiding Principles

- **Recognize Existing Agencies' Roles:** Many agencies in Contra Costa County currently provide services under the broad definition of mobility management. The role and interests of these agencies should be recognized and included in the formation of a CTSA and in the future allocation of resources to our through that organization.
- **Minimize administration:** The CTSA will require a management structure in order to accomplish its mission. In creating such a structure, care should be taken to minimize administration in order to maximize the allocation of scarce resources to functional programs.
- **Broadly Analyze Resource Allocation Decisions:** One of the roles of a new CTSA will be to pursue resources for the implementation or continuation of functional programs. In so doing, the CTSA should as a matter of policy prepare an analysis of the impacts of alternative resource allocation strategies that can be considered by all affected agencies in the CTSA service area.

Mobility Management Oversight Board Structure and Functions

- Oversight Board defines CTSA by-laws, board structure, and performance standards
- Oversight Board serves as advisory body after CTSA has been established
- Oversight Board consists of:
  - Executive staff representative of each of the following agencies:
    - County Connection
    - Tri-Delta Transit
    - WestCAT
    - AC Transit
    - BART
    - Contra Costa Transportation Authority
    - Three human service agencies

***Phase III: Form a CTSA as the Mobility Management Agency***

- Form a CTSA for Contra Costa County approximately twelve (12) months following formation of the Mobility Management Oversight Board.
- Establish a non-profit corporation to serve as the mobility management agency for the County.
- MTC designate the non-profit corporation as the CTSA for Contra Costa County
- Fund setup and initial operation of the CTSA through a combination of funding provided by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) and MTC for a minimum period of two years.
- Establish a governance structure for the non-profit corporation through appointment of Directors to the governing Board by public agencies in Contra Costa County.
- Allocate funds for an interim budget to cover agency formation expenses and initial management activities.
- Allocate a combination of funds totaling \$300,000 to \$400,000 per year for initial CTSA operation.

Funding

- CTSA pursues available grant opportunities.
- CTSA works with transit operators to allocate funds to mobility management programs which move riders from ADA service.

- CTSA works with MTC to identify discretionary funds.
- CTSA participates in new funding opportunities to include funding specifically for seniors, persons with disabilities, persons with low-income, and the CTSA.
- CTSA enters into a dialog with the transit operators, MTC, and the Transportation Authority regarding allocation of TDA Article 4.5 as defined in statute. Action on this issue would only follow the achievement of consensus regarding this funding source. The most logical allocation of TDA to a new CTSA would follow transfer of trips from the transit operators to services coordinated through the new CTSA.

### ***Phase IV: Functional Programs***

- Direct the CTSA to establish priorities among the identified functional programs for Contra Costa County.
- Develop grant applications through community partnerships for the implementation of functional programs.

***Implementation Timeline***

**CTSA Implementation Time Line**

(approximate)

Date or Time Period	Activity
Obtain Transit Operator Support	August - October, 2013
CCCTA Board Adoption	October, 2013
Form Oversight Board	September - October, 2013
CCTA Presentation	September - October, 2013
Oversight Board hires Manager	January, 2014
Oversight Board conducts performance review	January, 2015

## Contra Costa Mobility Management Plan

---

### Appendix 1

#### Contra Costa Mobility Management Plan Stakeholder Planning Group

Charlie Anderson	WestCAT	510-724-3331	<a href="mailto:charlie@westcat.org">charlie@westcat.org</a>
Christina Atienza	WCCTAC	510-215-3044	<a href="mailto:christinaa@ci.san-pablo.ca.us">christinaa@ci.san-pablo.ca.us</a>
Laramie Bowron	CCCTA	925-680-2048	<a href="mailto:bowron@cccta.org">bowron@cccta.org</a>
Heidi Branson	Tri-Delta Transit	925-754-6622	<a href="mailto:HBranson@eccta.org">HBranson@eccta.org</a>
Mary Bruns	LaMorinda Spirit Van	925-284-5546	<a href="mailto:mbruns@ci.lafayette.ca.us">mbruns@ci.lafayette.ca.us</a>
Sam Casas	City of Richmond	510-621-1258	<a href="mailto:Samuel_Casas@ci.richmond.ca.us">Samuel_Casas@ci.richmond.ca.us</a>
Laura Corona	Regional Center of the East Bay	510-618-7726	<a href="mailto:lc corona@rceb.org">lc corona@rceb.org</a>
Peter Engel	CCTA	925-256-4741	<a href="mailto:pengel@ccta.net">pengel@ccta.net</a>
Carol Ann McCrary	Contra Costa ARC	925-595-0115	<a href="mailto:cmccrary@arcofcc.org">cmccrary@arcofcc.org</a>
Teri Mountford	City of San Ramon Senior Center	925-973-3271	<a href="mailto:tmountford@sanramon.ca.gov">tmountford@sanramon.ca.gov</a>
Penny Musante	Futures Explored	925-284-3240	<a href="mailto:pennymusante@futures-explored.org">pennymusante@futures-explored.org</a>
Ann Muzzini	CCCTA		<a href="mailto:muzzini@cccta.org">muzzini@cccta.org</a>
Joanna Pallock	WCCTAC	510-215-3053	<a href="mailto:joannap@ci.san-pablo.ca.us">joannap@ci.san-pablo.ca.us</a>
Elaine Clark	Meals on Wheels	925-937-8311 x 122	<a href="mailto:eclark@mowsos.org">eclark@mowsos.org</a>
Kathy Taylor	Meals on Wheels	925-937-8311 x 119	<a href="mailto:ktaylor@mowsos.org">ktaylor@mowsos.org</a>
Debbie Toth	RSNC Mt. Diablo Center for Adult Day Health Care	925-682-6330 x 111	<a href="mailto:dtoth@rsnc-centers.org">dtoth@rsnc-centers.org</a>
John Rodriguez	Contra Costa Developmental Disabilities Council	925-313-6836	<a href="mailto:John.Rodriguez@hsd.cccounty.us">John.Rodriguez@hsd.cccounty.us</a>
Elaine Welch	Senior Help Line Services	925-284-6699	<a href="mailto:elaine@seniorhelpline.net">elaine@seniorhelpline.net</a>

## Appendix 2

### CTSA Case Studies

#### Overview

Case studies can be a useful tool in understanding how the experiences of other agencies or communities may offer guidance in a current decision process. Relative to the Contra Costa County Mobility Management Plan, a key underlying concept in implementing creative change in the County is consideration of the formation of a Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA). The guidelines within the Transportation Development Act (TDA) regarding formation of CTSA's are broad and offer the opportunity for a variety of approaches regarding their formation and operation.

What follows are illustrative case studies defining the approaches taken by other California communities to the formation and operation of CTSA's. Each goes into detail regarding such issues as:

- What approach led to the formation of the CSA? (Single agency application, competitive process, action by a major public agency, etc.)
- What is the governing structure of the CTSA?
- How is the CTSA funded?
- What are examples of the functional programs operated by or funded by the CTSA?

The CTSA's selected for case studies are:

- Paratransit, Inc., Sacramento: This was the first CTSA designated in California and has served as a model for the formation of others. It is a 501(c)3 non-profit corporation.
- Valley Transportation Services (VTrans), San Bernardino: This is among the newest CTSA's in California incorporated in 2010. It is a 501(c)3 non-profit corporation. In less than three years, VTrans has become a major service provider in urbanized San Bernardino County.
- Access Services, Los Angeles: The Los Angeles CTSA, Access Services, was formed in 1994. It also is a 501(c)3 non-profit corporation. It provides a range of services throughout LA County.
- CTSA of Stanislaus County: The CTSA in Stanislaus County was established in 2010. It is somewhat unique in the fact that the operator of the CTSA was chosen through a competitive process.



- Mendocino Transit Authority: This is a Joint Powers Authority transit agency in Mendocino County. This agency serves both as the transit operator and the CTSA. It greatly enhanced its emphasis on human service coordination with the hiring of a Mobility Management Coordinator in recent years.



## Paratransit, Inc. – Sacramento

### Organization Structure Summary

CTSA Designation: 1981

Organization Type: 501(c) 3 corporation

Board Structure: 9 member board of directors, established through an agreement among governmental jurisdictions

Paratransit, Inc. is a non-profit transportation agency originally incorporated in July, 1978. The agency's incorporation, built on the emerging concept of human service transportation coordination, was an early attempt to demonstrate the potential benefits of service coordination and the centralization of service delivery functions and administration under one organization.

Soon after its incorporation, Paratransit, Inc. served as a model for legislation being authored by the Assembly Transportation Committee to encourage coordination statewide. Assemblyman Walter Ingalls authored Assembly Bill (AB) 120, the Social Service Transportation Improvement Act. This landmark legislation included a provision calling for the designation of a Consolidated Transportation Service Agency (CTSA) in each California county. Paratransit, Inc. was the first such agency designated in California.

### Approach to Formation

Paratransit Inc. applied directly to SACOG (formerly SRAPC) for designation as the CTSA. No other agency at the time approached SACOG and no other agency was considered for designation as the CTSA.

Paratransit was designated the CTSA in the Sacramento area on July 16, 1981. At the same time it was authorized to claim up to the full 5% of TDA funds authorized under the law. The initial CTSA designation was for one year. Later designation periods varied between one and three years with the term typically becoming longer as the community became confident in the performance of the organization. In 1988, the CTSA designation was set without time limitation subject to rescission for performance issues.

Paratransit operates as a non-profit CTSA in a partnership with Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT). The two organizations are well respected in regional decision making in the Sacramento area serving together on the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Technical Coordinating Committee that oversees funding allocations. Paratransit has formal ties to RT on two levels. First, RT has the authority to appoint two members of the Paratransit Board of Directors (see Governance below). Further, Paratransit provides all complementary ADA paratransit service within the RT District under a collaborative agreement with RT. Paratransit's operation of the CTSA in parallel with the ADA service allows for maximum of service through unique agreements with many other community agencies.

### Governing Structure

Paratransit was initially incorporated with a self-selected and appointed Board of Directors. This model is common among human service organizations. The initial Board Members were mostly senior staff (Executive Directors in most cases) of other community organizations in the Sacramento area. These incorporating Directors had worked through the issues surrounding creation of a new single purpose transportation organization and thus supported the concept and direction. Within three years of its incorporation, Paratransit was receiving increasing amounts of local government funding. The major local jurisdictions then chose to institutionalize the governance of the agency through what became known as the Four Party Agreement. Parties to this agreement were the City of Sacramento, County of Sacramento, Sacramento Regional Transit District, and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). This agreement set forth terms concerning Board structure, financial commitments, asset transfers to Paratransit, oversight by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, etc. The Four Party Agreement served as the structural guide to the CTSA until it was replaced by a new Collaborative Agreement in December, 2012.

The critical provision of the CTSA designation concerned the agency's governing structure. The Four Party Agreement set forth the required Board of Directors makeup and appointing structure. A nine member Board was established to replace the original self-appointing Board. The Board today is made up as follows:

- Two members appointed by the City Council, representative of the general public (non users).
- Two members appointed by the County Board of Supervisors, representative of the general public (non users).
- Two members appointed by the Board of Directors of the Sacramento Regional Transit District.
- One member appointed by SACOG representing any city or county with which Paratransit contracts for service.
- Two members, one appointed by the City Council and one appointed by the County Board of Supervisors, representing the user community.

### CTSA Operating Details

Paratransit, Inc. operates a large array of programs under the mantle of the CTSA. Most are directly related to the objectives for a CTSA outlined in the original AB 120 legislation.

The most noteworthy of the Paratransit CTSA programs is its partner agreements with local community agencies. For many years, Paratransit has refined the concept of shared cost contracting, wherein the partnering organizations each contribute a portion of the cost of service for specific client populations. Working with 8 local agencies today, Paratransit contributes some of the funds it derives from TDA Article 4.5 and the local option sales tax (Measure A) to a funding mix with the agencies. This results in the agencies transporting their own clients at a far lower cost and higher service quality than through the standard ADA paratransit service (which Paratransit, Inc. also operates under contract to Sac RT). This highly successful program has dramatically increased system capacity over what could be funded through the traditional ADA paratransit program. It serves as a cornerstone of Paratransit's CTSA functions.

In addition to partnership agreements with local human service organizations, Paratransit has operated a maintenance program for its own vehicles and for those of other community agencies. Today this operation, dating back 30 years, provides services for over 50 organizations ranging from local non-profit human service agencies to Sacramento State University to private Medicaid transport operators.

For many years, the agency has operated a large travel training program aimed at training individuals, many developmentally disabled, to ride the fixed-route transit service. This program has recently expanded in other regions including Spokane, Washington, San Joaquin and Santa Clara Counties in California, and Honolulu, Hawaii. Over the years this program has trained thousands of individuals to ride the bus, thus saving an enormous expenditure on ADA paratransit service.



## Valley Transportation Services (VTrans) – San Bernardino

### Organization Structure Summary

CTSA Designation: 2010

Organization Type: 501(c) 3 corporation

Board Structure: 7 member board of directors, specified in Corporate Bylaws

Valley Transportation Services (VTrans) is among the newest CTSA's in California. It was designated as the CTSA by the San Bernardino Transportation Commission (SANBAG) in September, 2010.

### Approach to Formation

The concept of a CTSA had been included in the San Bernardino County local sales tax measure as a recipient of a portion of the tax receipts. Yet at the time of passage of the tax (Measure I) no CTSA existed in the County. To accomplish formation of a CTSA, SANBAG commissioned a study of alternative approaches to a CTSA with the intent that the study would result in a formal recommendation of the appropriate structure of the CTSA for the San Bernardino urbanized area. The study considered all structural options and concluded with the recommendation that a new 501(c)3 corporation be created to be designated as the CTSA. VTrans incorporation was completed in October, 2010.

The provision of the local sales tax measure calls for the allocation of 2% of the tax proceeds to the CTSA. Funding began to accrue in 2009 and was made available to VTrans immediately upon formation. The 2% funding level in the tax measure provides approximately \$2 million per year for VTrans operations. These local funds have been used very successfully to date as local match to leverage federal funds (see CTSA Operating Details below).

### Governing Structure

The VTrans Bylaws specify its governing structure. The structure is dictated in part by the large amount of public funding received by the agency and also by the intent to involve the major governmental organizations in its governance. The Board of Directors of VTrans consists of the following:

- Three appointed by San Bernardino Associated Governments (must be representative of the San Bernardino Valley)
- Two appointed by San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors (must be representative of the San Bernardino Valley area)
- Two appointed by Omnitrans – must be representative of designated population

Both SANBAG and San Bernardino County have chosen to appoint members from the community. In certain cases, these have been former elected officials from the area. Omnitrans has chosen to appoint two members of its own Board of Directors. The Omnitrans Board is made up entirely of elected officials of the represented jurisdictions. Thus its appointees are elected officials. Also included in the Bylaws is the right of SANBAG to appoint an ex-officio member. It has chosen to appoint a senior transportation executive to this post. The original corporate Bylaws did not provide for staggered terms for Board Members. This has since been corrected. Board terms are three years with a limit of two consecutive terms.

### CTSA Operating Details

VTrans was interested in beginning operation very quickly following formation. In order to do so, the agency retained a very experienced CTSA executive on a contract basis to serve as its initial Executive Director. That individual was vested with full authority to manage the startup of the agency including money management, hiring authority, etc. Early startup steps included the selection of office space, full office setup, establishment of the accounting system, development of operating policies, and negotiation of initial operating agreements. The final step in the contract called for the Executive Director to guide the selection process for a permanent Chief Executive Officer. That permanent CEO took over in January, 2011.

Among the initial operational steps undertaken by the new agency were the application for federal funds to create a new travel training program and the formation of partner agreements with human service agencies to serve as transportation providers for agency clients. These newly created services took passenger trips off of the ADA paratransit system and onto a service with agency vehicles and drivers. Initial response was overwhelmingly positive regarding both service quality and cost savings.

VTrans has gone on to establish a volunteer driver program, partner on a grant applications, and expand agency trip participation by bringing in additional operating agencies. VTrans is presently in the final stages of creating a maintenance program for human service agencies in the San Bernardino area by opening its own facility staffed with agency employees.





## Access Services (ASI) – Los Angeles

### Organization Structure Summary

CTSA Designation: 1994

Organization Type: 501(c)3 corporation

Board Structure: 9 member board of directors

### Approach to Formation

In 1990, the Los Angeles County Transportation Commission (LACTC) adopted an Action Plan and established a CTSA to begin coordination of Social Services transportation. The adopted plan called for the CTSA to implement and operate an information and referral service for social services transportation as well as provide technical assistance and training to local service providers. In 1991, in response to the mandates of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the mission of the CTSA was expanded to include the implementation of a regional ADA paratransit system for the Los Angeles County region.

In 1994, shortly after its formation, the successor to the LACTC, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) determined that the mission of the CTSA could best be fulfilled if the CTSA were a stand-alone independent agency. From this action, Access Services was established and designated as the CTSA for Los Angeles County per California Government Code Article 7, Section 6680.

### Agency Structure and Functions

Access Services Incorporated (ASI) was established in 1994 and was designated as the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) for Los Angeles County by LACMTA (Metro). ASI is a public non-profit corporation and as the CTSA, administers the Los Angeles County Coordinated Paratransit Plan on behalf of the County's 43 public bus and rail operators. ASI facilitates the provision of complementary ADA paratransit services under the name "Access Paratransit."

In its role as Access Paratransit, ASI enters into and administers federally funded regional contracts with independent private transit providers. The agency also leases vehicles to the regional providers at \$1 per month to help facilitate the provision of service under the contracts. In total, the Access Paratransit system provides more than 2.3 million rides per year to more than 74,000 qualified disabled riders in a service area of over 1,950 square miles. Access Services receives its funding from Proposition C sales tax, Federal 5310 grants, and fare box revenue.

As the designated CTSA in Los Angeles County, ASI is in charge of the development and implementation of regional coordination of social service transportation to seniors, persons with disabilities, youth, and the low-income populations.

ASI operates as the ADA provider offering complementary service to the fixed-route operations of LACMTA and local municipal operators. Its governing structure is separate from that of LACMTA but provides for the transit agency to appoint one of its Board members.

### Governing Structure

ASI is governed by a nine-member board of directors with one appointment by each of the following.

1. Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
2. City Selection Committee's Corridor Transportation Representatives
3. Mayor of the City of Los Angeles
4. Los Angeles County municipal fixed-route operators
5. Los Angeles County local fixed-route operators
6. Los Angeles County Commission on Disabilities
7. Coalition of Los Angeles County Independent Living Centers
8. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
9. Alternating appointment by the municipal and local fixed-route operators

### CTSA Operating Details

Access Services performs a variety of functions as the CTSA. In 2009, ASI will sponsor over a dozen workshops in conjunction with Caltrans, CalACT, the

National Transit Institute, and other organizations. These professional development opportunities are available to public and non-profit agencies providing specialized transportation in Los Angeles County and their employees/affiliates (private sector applicants). Most of these programs are low or no cost and are subsidized by Access Services CTSA program.

In addition to training and education, ASI provides brokerage services, technical assistance, joint procurement, and travel training under the auspices of the CTSA.

For FY 2009-2010, the CTSA portion of the ASI Budget is projected to be \$223,103, which represents 0.24% of the agency's total operating costs of \$92,350,473.

***Consolidated  
Transportation Services  
Agency of the Stanislaus  
Region***

**Consolidated Transportation Services Agency of the Stanislaus Region**

Organization Structure Summary

CTSA Designation: 2010  
Organization Type: 501(c)3 corporation  
Organizational Approach: Contract with Paratransit, Inc. to serve as CTSA

Approach to Formation

A comprehensive Stanislaus County Transit Needs Assessment was prepared in 2009. This study identified a number of transportation service gaps in the County and recommended formation of a CTSA to address the variety of identified needs. The Stanislaus County Council of Governments (StanCOG) sponsored the study and directed implementation. StanCOG chose to create a CTSA and prepared a Request for Proposals (RFP) defining the responsibilities of the CTSA and openly solicited proposals for this service. This is a unique approach to the selection of an agency to serve as a CTSA.

Proposals were received by two agencies to serve as the Stanislaus County CTSA. One was submitted by Catholic Charities of Stanislaus County. This local non-profit agency operated a small volunteer driver program in the county in addition to other human service functions. The other proposal to serve as the CTSA was submitted by Paratransit, Inc. of Sacramento. This large non-profit corporation (see case study above) already served as the CTSA in Sacramento County and had more than 30 years of experience as a CTSA operating agency. StanCOG chose to designate Paratransit Inc. as the CTSA for Stanislaus County. StanCOG entered into a three year contract with Paratransit with two option years. A separate Resolution was also adopted designating Paratransit as the CTSA for Stanislaus County.

### Stanislaus Governing Structure

Paratransit Inc. is a Sacramento based corporation that does business throughout California and a number of other States. It has served as the CTSA in Sacramento County since 1981. Technically, the Stanislaus CTSA is governed by the Board of Directors of Paratransit, Inc.

To ensure local participation in governance, an advisory committee to StanCOG was established specifically to oversee the CTSA. This Mobility Advisory Committee (MAC) meets on a periodic basis to review operations and outcomes of the CTSA.

### CTSA Operating Details

The Stanislaus CTSA has no dedicated funding source. Instead, the CTSA claims TDA funds under Article 4.5 as provided for in the law. The amount of funding that is claimed each year is negotiated among the transit operators and through a review of program objectives with StanCOG. The expectation of the CTSA as it was formed was that it would use the local TDA allocation to leverage federal funds to operate agency programs. Within the first year of existence, the CTSA successfully sought Federal JARC and New Freedom funds to support operations. Because of the 80% federal share of these programs as mobility management projects, the CTSA was able to lever an initial \$100,000 TDA allocation into a \$400,000 budget in its first year. TDA allocations in subsequent years have increased along with additional successful grant applications.

The Needs Study that led to the formation of the CTSA established priority programs for implementation. These specifically included a volunteer driver program to provide door-through-door service beyond ADA requirements and a travel training program to operate for all 5 transit operators throughout the County. Both programs were created within the first year of operation. The CTSA presently has a full time staff of three. These employees of the CTSA perform travel training and manage an expanding volunteer program. In addition, the CTSA staff provides technical assistance to StanCOG and other County agencies regarding transportation issues and programs.



## Mendocino Transit Authority

### Organization Structure Summary

CTSA Designation: 1981

Organization Type: Joint Powers Authority: Transit Authority

Board Structure: 7 member board of directors as set forth in the JPA

The Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA) is a Joint Powers Agency created in 1975 to provide transportation services within Mendocino County. The agency was designated as the CTSA for Mendocino County in 1981 by the Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG).

The designation was accomplished through the use of a Minute Order by the COG and has been in effect since 1981. MTA has not had to re-apply in order to maintain its status as CTSA.

### Mendocino Transit Authority Governing Structure

The MTA Board has seven appointed members.

- 3 appointed by the County Board of Supervisors
- 1 appointed by the City of Ukiah
- 1 appointed by the City of Point Arena
- 1 appointed by the City of Willits
- 1 appointed by the City of Fort Bragg

Membership on the JPA does not require a board member to be an elected official. Currently, about half of the membership consists of elected officials.

### CTSA Operating Details

The Mendocino Transit Authority has substantially enhanced its efforts to provide a range of mobility management services in recent years. The hiring of a Mobility Management Coordinator was a major step in this development for the Authority.

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

### DESCRIPTION

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.

### ISSUE STATEMENT

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.

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.

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.

### 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.

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

**MEETING DATE:** December 19, 2013

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

**GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill

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

The meeting was convened at 9:00 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 advised that minutes of the November 21, 2013 TAC meeting and minutes of the November 14, 2013 TRANSPAC meeting had been provided to assist in the continued discussion of the Action Plan Update.

Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill, noted that the tenets and goals had been updated at the last TRANSPAC meeting. She distributed an updated list for the TAC's information and advised that tenets were on the first page and the Board had no changes, although there had been some changes to the goals in that some had been consolidated and reordered, and no numbers or perception of priority were to be associated with them.

Ms. Dagang thanked everyone for their input into the 2009 Action Plan Project List and distributed two versions; a black and white formal mode and a color track/change mode to more easily identify the changes that had been made. She characterized the document as a work in progress; urged members to take one more look at the forms she distributed and asked for updates, changes, or additions in that the project list would be appended to the Action Plan itself; and noted that most updated projects had included updated cost estimates which would be changed to identify the cost estimates in 2013 dollars. She noted that some projects had been repeated under roadway and bike/ped to ensure their inclusion. While some Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) did not go into that detail because it was not a requirement of the Action Plan, she asked TAC members if they did or did not want to include a higher level of detail.

Jeremy Lochirco had no strong feeling one way or the other but noted that project costs created red flags in several jurisdictions given the public document.

Mr. Lochirco suggested it could be an attribute to the plan to stress that a reauthorization of Measure C would be warranted, although he suggested there could be potential questions and unless the design and engineering had been done the numbers would be “pie in the sky.”

Ray Kuzbari recalled that the primary reason for adding to the 2009 update was to list the respective State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) request to identify projects and note that might come up again in the 2014 or 2016 STIP. From his perspective, if there was a list to show potential STIP requests it did not make sense to list project cost and potential funding, particularly since that information could be in the Comprehensive Transportation Project Listing (CTPL) which is on Routes of Regional Significance (RORS), which is the intent. He suggested that not everything in the CTPL should be included, although Ms. Dagang stated that if on a RORS it should be on the list and at a minimum the projects would be needed, and if including costs, the project cost would be necessary and should be identified with the project.

Lynn Overcashier suggested another benefit given the public document was for the public to see how many different funding sources it took to bring a project to reality and the effort required to find multiple funding sources to fund something was important to identify. As such, she appreciated those details and the nuances involved.

Mr. Lochirco suggested it important to note that the estimates were just initial or preliminary cost estimates.

Ms. Dagang reiterated that 2013 dollars must be identified and urged updates to cost estimates to 2013 dollars. She explained that the references were not intended to represent a true funding document.

Tim Tucker commented that the reference to 2007 dollars was consistent with the CCTA’s references, although Ms. Dagang explained that reference had been a leftover heading from the last Action Plan.

Deidre Heitman asked if the other RTPCs were doing the same, to which Ms. Dagang explained that they should be although the other RTPCs were not putting in the level of detail related to cost.

Ms. Dagang advised that she would develop a listing based on what she had received. She referred to a list of items or projects completed or under construction and asked if projects crossed off the list had been completed or eliminated. She explained that she would take all the projects deleted off the list and include a listing of projects that had been completed and asked TAC members to verify the accuracy of the resulting list.

Eric Hu stated he would send an email in that most of his projects were a “pipe dream” and no longer being pursued.

Ms. Dagang stated that would not be called out in the Action Plan. Since there was a section of the Action Plan for projects under construction or completed since the last Action Plan, she asked whether the Caldecott Tunnel Fourth Bore could be considered to be completed now, or by the end of 2014.

Ms. Neustadter advised that some operation work remained to be completed at the tunnel and should be incorporated on the list in that the tunnel was not actually completed; the same thing in East County. She noted, for instance, that the landscaping for the Fourth Bore was on the CCTA agenda. [Note from Barbara Neustadter: Caltrans Project Manager Cristina Ferraz advises that completion of the tunnel project is most likely 2018.]

Mr. Lochirco suggested at a minimum that the cost for the Caldecott Tunnel Fourth Bore could be updated.

John McKenzie referenced a Caldecott Tunnel website managed by the Caltrans Project Management Division which may provide information on the official completion date for the Fourth Bore.

In response to Ms. Dagang as to whether the Kirker Pass Road Northbound Truck Climbing Lanes project was separate from a planned project for Kirker Pass Road southbound truck lanes, John Cunningham stated that he would check with the County Public Works Department to verify whether one or two projects were involved. He noted that the northbound/southbound project had been listed in a number of county documents and had been bundled, although moving forward they might need to be unbundled and he would verify whether or not that was the case. He also affirmed that no funding had been identified for the southbound lanes. Ms. Neustadter suggested it would be nice to get the project identified and funded. [Note: For progress to date, thanks to Chris Lau.]

With respect to the East Bay Parks Scenic Trail, Ms. Dagang verified with Mr. McKenzie that the project was under construction and should be listed as a project under construction in that it was fully funded and was to open in 2015.

When asked about the Olympic Boulevard Trail Connector Project, Mr. Cunningham advised that he would have a cost estimate in the next few months and a "To be Determined" or *TBD* until that time would be appropriate.

Ms. Dagang concurred and stated that if cost estimates were not accurate a TBD could be included. With respect to the Olympic Boulevard Pedestrian Improvements, she asked if that was a Contra Costa County project or a Walnut Creek project, to which Mr. Lochirco advised that it was a joint jurisdiction project and should remain shown as a Walnut Creek/County project.

Mr. Dagang explained that she would update the list and send an updated list to the working document that she had previously distributed to come up with a list of projects completed and under construction for TAC review, to be done by email, and identify how the actions were tied to the goals and get that out as well. She suggested it would be valuable for the TAC to meet on January 23, 2014 in that at the subsequent TAC meeting on February 27, 2014, she would be presenting the full draft of the Action Plan for review.

Mr. Lochirco verified that the draft would be submitted by Ms. Dagang on January 23, 2014 and everything else would be done by email and the subsequent meeting on February 27, 2014, and that the TAC would have sufficient time for review and comment.

Mr. Kuzbari concurred and suggested it would be important for the document to show changes to the actions and goals on RORS, although Ms. Dagang noted that it would be difficult to show in the goals because the goals were different.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that anything having to do with freeways would be easy to change (if the name changed) and some of the actions would stay the same, and there might be new actions and he would like to see that listed as a strikeout, not just for the TAC but also for the electeds.

Ms. Dagang commented that some actions would apply to more than one goal as well. She referenced the limitations with the track change format and explained that since the goals had been reordered everything would look as if it had been changed.

By consensus, the TAC agreed to meet on January 23, 2014 to further the review of the Action Plan update.

- 2. 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.**

Ms. Neustadter opened the discussion of how to efficiently and effectively submit the Action Plan, when completed, to TRANSPAC and to each jurisdiction, whether it should be sent to each city manager/county administrator, put it on an agenda for information with no presentation or a short presentation. She asked what had worked best for other materials transmitted to councils for information when in depth or extensive comments were not expected.

Mr. Kuzbari asked what had previously been done and whether Martin Engelmann had expectations of circulating the draft to the city councils.

Ms. Neustadter explained that had not been done last time unless someone wanted to take it on their own. She verified that Mr. Engelmann wanted verification that the information had been transmitted to the councils/board, and she suggested that he might want to take it to each jurisdiction.

Mr. Kuzbari did not support submittal to the Concord City Council because it was not a programming document, a high level planning document, and it did not affect the money that much and could raise more questions than clarify them.

Ms. Neustadter asked if each jurisdiction's TRANSPAC representative supported by a staff person wanted to report to its council that the document had been completed to see if anyone wanted to ask about it.

Mr. Kuzbari supported that scenario.

Mr. Lochirco did not support submittal of the document to the City Manager because it would just get back to him and he did not want to submit it to the Walnut Creek City Council because it would produce wordsmithing, and he suggested submitting for information only and indicating that TRANSPAC representatives had already done the work. He was concerned with the opportunity to allow flexibility and he wanted to avoid confusion. He explained that his councilmembers reported out on the regional groups they served on and he suggested that was a good way to provide the information unless some specific action, mandate, or approval was required.

Mr. Cunningham asked if there had been a request from CCTA to have the Action Plan reviewed by all boards and councils. He did not support submittal to the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors on the casual interest to have it reviewed. If required to be submitted, he wanted a cover letter from the CCTA saying that it would have to be brought to the Board.

Mr. Lochirco recommended that Ms. Dagang or the CCTA identify the process in a one-page summary to allow a councilmember to give a committee update to the council and to the community.

Ms. Overcashier recommended using the PowerPoint that Mr. Engelmann had prepared, *What is an Action Plan?*, into a bulleted explanation with a URL at the authority site so that anyone who wanted could access it so that staff did not have to bring the information to the councils.

Mr. Lochirco agreed and suggested it would help reflect that there had been some participation and some buy-in and that jurisdictions and staff had participated in the preparation of the document.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that each jurisdiction forward the information the way it felt most comfortable. In his case, he had an internal unwritten policy of making information available to all councilmembers if it was available to one or more with the same information provided, and he would work with his city manager to handle it that way.

Ms. Neustadter explained that she would check with Mr. Engelmann, who had raised the issue, to clarify some of the complexities that had been discussed and to advise the jurisdictions that the work had been done. In response to Ms. Overcashier, she added that Mr. Engelmann wanted it known that the inclusion of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Subregional Transportation Mitigation Program (STMP) was absolutely abundantly clear.

Mr. Kuzbari noted that there is policy language in the GMP referencing the STMP as well, which helped.

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

Ms. Neustadter stated that Line 28a in Measure J read 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.*



Ms. Neustadter referred to the prior discussions about the use of Measure J Line 20a funds and a discussion of how the funds were to be used, divided, and allocated. There were different views on how to move forward and Mr. Kuzbari had crafted a protocol for the TAC to consider.

Mr. Kuzbari advised of the objective to create something simple with no ground rules but simple guidelines for record keeping purposes. He presented a breakdown between now and 2034 for the use of allocated funds from Line 28a of Measure J and noted that the only jurisdiction that had taken advantage of that program was the City of Pleasant Hill, which had recently received \$750,000 for one of its projects on Contra Costa Boulevard. His proposal estimated revenues distributed by population and road miles, which the CCTA had used to allocate Line 23 funds for local streets, roads, maintenance, and improvement funds. His proposal had summed up the distributed amounts from population and road miles, added those numbers, and subtracted any of the allocated funds that had been used. He explained that he and Ms. Neustadter had discussed how to refer to the last column of his chart formulating his proposal and had decided that the best way to phrase it was to say it was a reference point (for record keeping) for each jurisdiction to consider when making a request for the use of Line 28a funding.

The remainder of his protocol for the utilization of Line 28a funds was that:

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 percent of the available fund balance accumulated to date in Program 28a 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 request per fiscal year; and
5. Requests for programming funds will be reviewed by TRANSPAC TAC and recommendations will be forwarded to TRANSPAC for consideration.

Mr. Tucker suggested there should be another column in the chart presented with respect to getting the money in increments over the life of the project, with a balance to be shown each year. He suggested it would be nice to divide the money and have each jurisdiction be allowed to count on the money noting that two agencies could commandeer the available funds for some time. He suggested that each jurisdiction be specifically identified in which year it could receive the funds.

Ms. Neustadter understood but clarified that the agenda included the definition of Line 28a funds which she reiterated, and explained that the Pleasant Hill situation fell under that definition in that it could have lost the entire project. She suggested that other ways to allocate the funds over the term of the measure could be considered at the discretion of the TAC and TRANSPAC within the confines of the definition and the dollars available.

Mr. Kuzbari added that the line item was dollar sensitive and not time sensitive and he wanted to see it used for emergency purposes when there was a concern for the loss of a federal grant, for instance. To attempt to plan out budgeting for a project was not the purpose of the line item.

Mr. Cunningham suggested that protocol 4 related to one request only per jurisdiction per fiscal year be changed, from one request per year to one request for every other year or some other period given that an annual request was too regular.

Ms. Overcashier commented that if rotating between jurisdictions, every four or five years would be more appropriate.

Mr. Hu supported a process to retain the funds for an emergency, and having gone through the process, talking to all the funding sources, using all other available funding sources, and doing the best possible to plan for the project, something unexpected had happened in that the bids had all come in over the Engineer's Estimate. For Pleasant Hill, Line 28a funds had provided the ultimate safety net and he would like to keep those funds as a safety net above all other safety nets. At the same time, he was hesitant to use the funds in a way where it would be counted on, and should a similar situation occur again, it would be the only fallback and should be used in that capacity given that there was no additional safety net beyond Line 28a funding.

Mr. McKenzie suggested that the amount allotted Pleasant Hill exceeded the amount banked and if it was an emergency contingency over the 20 years of the plan, he did not want to stipulate the percentage of money to be spent or the individual year to be distributed given that would be something the local jurisdiction would have to address.

Mr. Kuzbari clarified the funds available versus the funds requested by Pleasant Hill and noted that the City's request had not exceeded 50 percent of those funds.

Mr. Tucker agreed with the recommendation that funding be rotated between jurisdictions once every three to five years.

Mr. Hu suggested that protocol 4 be more general and be considered on a case-by-case basis. He did not support a routine annual allocation.

Ms. Neustadter referred to the Pleasant Hill case and the urgency in that case and asked if there was a need to rethink how the text had been written to focus on the fact that the TRANSPAC TAC would make a recommendation that, in fact, an emergency existed and then they could get to the point of how much was available to address that emergency consistent with the chart.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that the language in protocol 1 should be strengthened or that protocol 4 be strengthened, although he noted that the first protocol covered the risk of losing grant funds and he could strengthen that language but did not want to get stuck in the future on a definition issue.

Mr. Lochirco took a different approach and did not necessarily want to restrict the use of the funds for emergency purposes because if Walnut Creek did not have an emergency it would never have access to the funds. He wanted to know how to communicate with the City of Clayton, for instance, which had no representative on the TAC, and he asked how an emergency would be defined and if it meant that there could be only one emergency every three to five years. If used for emergencies, there could potentially be one or more emergency per year or there could be 20 years without an emergency. He suggested the use of the funds for roadway maintenance, for instance, to ensure some geographic equity, and he sought the ability to use the extra fund of monies for projects and noted that a need for matching funds should be emphasized. He was not sold on the emergency aspect although he liked the intent but stated that the money was there for jurisdictions to use and there should be ability for each jurisdiction to use the funds.

Ms. Neustadter suggested that should be considered in a reauthorization of Measure J.

Ms. Overcashier recommended every three years for allocation but in any given year if any jurisdiction had an emergency need versus use as matching funds then the emergency need should take precedent. She clarified that if there was still money remaining she did not want to arbitrarily include Pleasant Hill, for instance, requesting more money, and if there was another jurisdiction that had a use for the funds that jurisdiction should be able have a priority request.

Mr. Tucker suggested another way was to maintain a minimum balance to accommodate a request for emergencies and the rest could theoretically be available for matching funds.

Mr. Lochirco suggested splitting the funds with 50 percent to offer some flexibility without being too emergency focused with the other 50 percent to be emergency focused.

Mr. Kuzbari supported that approach but questioned the language to use and suggested that the use of the term “emergency” could be eliminated.

Ms. Neustadter agreed with the need for a better description. In the case of Pleasant Hill, the Contra Costa Boulevard project would have been lost without Line 28a funds and there would not only be a lost project but there would have been the loss of a grant. She noted the need to more carefully consider the language in order to frame the policy so that it encompassed the discussion without getting into terms of definitions, protocols, and requirements, to make sure that Line 28a would work. She referred to the first use of the funds when Pleasant Hill had contacted the staff of different TRANSPAC jurisdictions to advise of the request which had been reviewed by the TAC and which had been submitted to TRANSPAC for concurrence.

Mr. Hu agreed with Mr. Lochirco that one of the major goals of Measure J was a source of local funds to leverage against federal dollars and what separated that line item from all the others was that when a situation arose there should be some exploration of not just Line 28a but other Measure J line items before tapping Line 28a given that it was the most generally worded compared to others. He supported some wording with that distinction in recognition that an emergency could be created if there was no local match.

The TAC supported the use of Line 28a funds to leverage other dollars.

Ms. Neustadter verified that no one had an issue with the leverage issue which was an issue with the reauthorization of Measure J.

Mr. Lochirco referenced Safe Routes to Transit and Safe Routes to School funding and noted there were not a lot of projects submitted, although there were regional dollars requiring a 10 percent match, which in some cases would be difficult to do, and it might be something that should be allowed to jurisdictions if able to leverage against a larger pot of funds.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that leveraging the application was not a bad idea if the money was available and then coming to the TAC and TRANSPAC when all the funding had been secured, keeping in mind the need to maintain a positive 50 percent cash flow, to be broken down by emergency and other funding.

Mr. Tucker recommended that the item be considered for further discussion to allow development of a policy over the next six months. He requested that the spreadsheet be modified and emailed to TAC members.

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

Mr. Kuzbari explained that he had submitted the information, the latest breakdown from Mr. Engelmann for Program 23 in the Expenditure Fund, and the distribution between all the cities and the county given that it might be of interest to the TAC.

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

Ms. Neustadter advised that a number of TRANSPAC electeds had been in initial discussions with the CCTA as to whether or not it would be in a position to consider housing the 511 Contra Costa operation and at the same time continue to consider the formation of a JPA. As such, TRANSPAC had approved the services of Best Best & Krieger for legal representation in the potential formation of a JPA and she had been directed to talk to Mala Subramanian who was also the CCTA's attorney. She explained that she and Ms. Overcashier had gone through a number of files and that TRANSPAC over the years had established protocols and policies that fit neatly into the creation of a JPA, and those documents had been submitted to the attorney working on the creation of a JPA document. At this point there was no idea of how much the process would cost, when it would become effective, and whether a JPA would be a smart move for TRANSPAC to make.

Ms. Neustadter clarified that local jurisdictions supported the operation of TRANSPAC, and 511 Contra Costa supported itself with grant funds and there is at this point in time no draw on local jurisdictions for the 511 operation. She added that even with an option with the CCTA, the dollars would be the same. She would be happy to clarify any of that information for any of the jurisdictions.

Mr. Hu asked how that could affect the agreements currently in place with the City of Pleasant Hill, 511 Contra Costa, and Caltrans regarding the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) program, to which Ms. Neustadter noted that the City of Pleasant Hill is TRANSPAC's fiscal agent as well as 511 Contra Costa's and it would have to be determined if that would remain the same or if it would have to be picked up and moved.

Ms. Dutra-Roberts explained that she had consulted with the CCTA's Compliance Checklist representative and while there would have to be a letter identifying the move, there was no perceived problem doing that.

In response to Mr. Kuzbari as to whether the formation of a JPA would restore California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS) vesting in full to 511 Contra Costa employees, Ms. Neustadter explained that was yet unknown although that was one of the goals. She commented that the State of California was trying to find places where the rules had not been followed and the same thing had occurred elsewhere and all over the state.

Ms. Overcashier added that right now everything was in jeopardy.

Ms. Neustadter offered Best Holiday Wishes to all.

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:38 A.M. The next meeting of the TAC has been scheduled for a special meeting on January 23, 2014.

## Completed Transportation Improvements in Central County

Since adoption of the 2009 Action Plan, the following major improvements to the transportation system in Central County have been completed:

- **Opening of the Fourth Bore of the Caldecott Tunnel.** The fourth bore of the Caldecott Tunnel opened in November 2013. The fourth bore features 2 lanes in the westbound direction, shoulders, emergency access between the two westbound tunnels and advanced traveler information. The uncertainty of off-peak congestion is reduced by providing four lanes in each direction.
- **Modification of the Original Martinez-Benicia Bridge.** The original bridge was being modified to carry four lanes of southbound traffic and a bike-pedestrian facility.
- **I-680 SB HOV Lane Restriping.** The southbound HOV lane was extended in 2012 to the north from Livorna Road to Rudgear Road. This project allowed carpoolers to bypass congested mixed-flow lanes on I-680 in the southbound direction.
- **DVC Transit Center.** The Diablo Valley College (DVC) Transit Center was opened in September 2010. The project created a boarding area for passengers, larger bus shelters, improved lighting, and an area for buses to turn around that is separate from other vehicle traffic.
- **Iron Horse Trail Crossing at Treat Boulevard.** A bicycle/pedestrian bridge along the Iron Horse Trail was constructed in 2010 to cross Treat Boulevard, in the vicinity of Jones Road. The bridge provides a grade separation between traffic on Treat Boulevard and bicycle/pedestrian traffic on Iron Horse Trail.

The following improvements are in the planning or design stages:

- **Completion of High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes on Interstate 680.** A “gap” in the I-680 HOV system remains through Pleasant Hill and Walnut Creek. Closing the southbound gap is a major priority for which funding has been procured. Closing the northbound gap is more costly, and funding for this project is not available.
- **I-680/SR-4 Interchange.** This interchange is scheduled for a major upgrade designed to eliminate tight-weaving sections, expand the size of the loops, and

improve capacity and efficiency. In addition, the “missing” third lane in each direction on SR-4 through Central County will be completed.

- **Fourth Bore of the Caldecott Tunnel.** Further work on the 4<sup>th</sup> Bore of the Caldecott Tunnel includes landscaping the approaches on both sides of the tunnel.
- **Other Freeway Capacity and Operational Improvements in Central County and Adjacent Regions.** Planned capacity improvements to SR-4 in Central County and continued improvements to SR-4 in East County will encourage traffic to stay on the freeway rather than use the arterials to enter and leave Central County.
- **Collaboration with Solano County.** TRANSPAC, via its representatives on the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, will continue to collaborate with the Solano Transportation Authority on a variety of transportation issues of mutual interest.

## **Goals and Actions**

TRANSPAC has outlined the six region-wide goals and actions that build on the tenets, focus the Action Plan's direction, and guide future decisions.



<b>GOAL 1</b>	Maintain existing transportation system and infrastructure
<b>ACTIONS</b>	1-A: Seek funding for the ongoing maintenance and operation of the existing transportation system and infrastructure. Includes all modes.
	1-B: Support development of pavement management systems and implementation of pavement rehabilitation improvements.
	1-C: ???.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.

<b>GOAL 2</b>	Support the enhancement and expansions of an efficient transit system
<b>ACTIONS</b>	2-A: Support the development of real-time information and better connectivity for regional transit and local and feeder bus service.
	2-B: Promote coordination of transfer times among Express bus, feeder bus, BART, and park-and-ride lots.
	2-C: Support the expansion of BART service and BART station and parking facilities.
	2-D: Support the construction and maintenance of accessible bus stops, park-and-ride lots, and transit hubs.
	2-E: Support improvements that increase the efficiency of local transit on Regional Routes.
	2-F: Support increased access to BART stations for buses and other alternative modes.
	2-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.
	2-H: Support expansion and use of park-and-ride facilities using Express and local buses.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.

<b>GOAL 3</b>	Encourage land use decisions that address the increase in overall traffic demand
<b>ACTIONS</b>	3-A: Continue to support implementation of the Measure J Growth Management. Program.
	3-B: Continue to support higher-density development around transit hubs and downtowns.
	3-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>
	3-D: Include the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists in the design, construction, and maintenance of development projects.
	3-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 4</b>	Support the use, enhancement, and expansion of low emission technologies
<b>ACTIONS</b>	4-A: Support innovative approaches for the deployment of low emission technologies.
	4-B: Support the construction of infrastructure needed for the expansion of low emission technologies, such as vehicle charging stations.
	4-C: ???.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.

<b>GOAL 5</b>	Manage arterial traffic flow
<b>ACTIONS</b>	5-A: Seek funding for traffic and transit improvements along Regional Routes and other major streets.
	5-B: Continue to implement the Central Contra Costa Traffic Management Program.
	5-C: Where feasible and appropriate, address the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists along and connecting to Regional Routes.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.

<b>GOAL 6</b>	Support the implementation of Complete Streets, including the implementation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities
<b>ACTIONS</b>	6-A: Support the inclusion of Complete Streets in General Plan updates ???
	6-B: Support the improvement of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on and connecting to Routes of Regional Significance.
	6-C: Seek funding to provide bicycle parking infrastructure at employment sites and activity centers throughout Central County.
	6-D: Support development of pedestrian and bicycle plans and safe routes to transit improvements.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.

<b>GOAL 7</b>	Increase participation in the 511 Contra Costa Program
<b>ACTIONS</b>	7-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.
	7-B: Develop TDM programs at K-12 schools and colleges to encourage carpooling, transit ridership, walking, and bicycling.
	7-C: Promote alternative work opportunities including employer pre-tax benefit programs, compressed work-week schedules, flex schedules, and telework.
	7-D: Encourage commuters to make local trips or trips linked to transit by walking, bicycling, or carpooling instead of driving alone.
	7-E: Promote park-and-ride lot use to potential carpoolers, vanpoolers, and transit riders, including shuttle services, where applicable.
	7-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.
	7-G: Explore innovative new technologies to improve mobility and reduce SOV trips.
	7-H: Seek funding to provide bicycle parking infrastructure at employment sites and activity centers throughout Central County.
	7-I: Encourage “green” commuting, including ZEV and NEV vehicles, clean fuel infrastructure, and car sharing.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	511 Contra Costa, TRANSPAC, and TRANSPAC jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing.

<b>GOAL 8</b>	Work to improve freeway flow
<b>ACTIONS</b>	8-A: Continue to monitor and evaluate operational improvements at freeway interchanges on I-680, SR-242, SR-24, and SR-4.
	8-B: Support development of operational improvements on mainline SR-4.
	8-C: Continue to support the completion of the fourth bore of the Caldecott Tunnel (SR-24).
	8-D: Support the study and implementation of potential regional freeway management strategies.
	8-E: Consider a multi-agency approach to freeway ramp metering.
<b>RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES</b>	TRANSPAC and its jurisdictions
<b>TIMELINE</b>	These actions are ongoing. The fourth bore of the Caldecott Tunnel was open to the public in 2013, with project completion estimated to be 2018.

<b>GOAL 9</b>	Support Use of HOV and Express Lanes
<b>ACTIONS</b>	9-A: Support the completion of a continuous HOV system on I-680.
	9-B: Support the connection of the SR-4 HOV system to I-680.
	9-C: Support consistent occupancy requirements for toll-free HOV lanes on the Benicia-Martinez Bridge and I-680.
	9-D: Support the implementation of Express Lanes on I-680, consistent with MTC's project.
	9-E: Support additional incentives for HOV users.
	9-F: 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 9-A in the southbound direction is intended to be completed by 2014. Other actions are ongoing.
-----------------	---





CONTRA COSTA  
transportation  
authority

---

COMMISSIONERS

January 21, 2014

Janet Abelson, Chair

Kevin Romick,  
Vice Chair

Newell Arnerich

Tom Butt

David Durant

Federal Glover

Dave Hudson

Mike Metcalf

Karen Mitchoff

Julie Pierce

Robert Taylor

James H. Iwasaki,  
Executive Director

Hon. David Durant  
Chair of TRANSPAC  
100 Gregory Lane  
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523-3323

Subject: Appointment to Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Dear Chair Durant:

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority first established the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Advisory Committee (CBPAC) to help oversee the preparation of its first Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP), which was adopted in December 2003. Since that time the CBPAC has helped review and recommend applications for funding bicycle and pedestrian projects, review complete streets checklist required by MTC, and oversaw the development of the 2009 update to the CBPP. The Authority expects the CBPAC to continue its role in implementing the Authority's bicycle and pedestrian policies and advising it on funding decisions, including making recommendations on funding through the Measure J Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities program, and on issues affecting walking and bicycling in Contra Costa and the region.

The advisory committee is composed of representatives from the following agencies and organizations:

- One citizen and one staff person plus one alternate appointed by each of the four Regional Transportation Planning Committees
- One staff person plus one alternate appointed by the County of Contra Costa
- One representative plus one alternate appointed by the East Bay Regional Park District
- One citizen representative plus one alternate appointed by the East Bay Bicycle Coalition
- Two citizen representatives appointed by the Authority, one familiar bicycling and walking issues affecting youths and one familiar with bicycling and walking issues affecting seniors and people with disabilities

2999 Oak Road  
Ste. 100  
Walnut Creek  
CA 94597  
PHONE:  
925.256.4700  
FAX: 925.256.4701  
www.ccta.net

Hon. David Durant

TRANSPAC

January 21, 2014

Page 2

---

We are now writing to ask that your organization reaffirm its current appointments to the advisory committee or appoint a new member or members.

The attached CBPAC by-laws outline the role of the committee and the responsibilities of its members. Members are appointed for two year terms. There is no limit on the number of consecutive terms that a member may serve.

CBPAC meetings are generally scheduled for 11:00 a.m. on the fourth Monday of every other month beginning in January. Meetings, however, may be added or cancelled depending on need. Because the committee is made up of both citizens and public agency staff, members will need to have a certain amount of flexibility in meeting times. While the committee has recently met most frequently at lunch, it has also met in the late afternoon and early evening.

If you have any further questions, please call Brad Beck, Senior Transportation Planner, at (925) 256-4726.

Sincerely,



Randell H. Iwasaki  
Executive Director

Attachment: CBPAC Bylaws Adopted, 10/19/2011

cc: Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC

File: 01.07.03

CBPAC Members 2013

First	Last	Agency/Jurisdiction	Title	Street	City	State	ZipCode	Email
John	Fazel			51 Moraga Way Number 1	Orinda	CA	94563	runmntns@prodigy.net
David	Favello			2677 Oak Rd #202	Walnut Creek	CA	94597	davevelo@mac.com
Corinne	Dutra-Roberts	511 Contra Costa	Sr. Transportation Analyst	2300 Contra Costa Blvd., #360	Pleasant Hill	CA	94523	corinne@511contracosta.org
Bruce	Ohlson	City of Pittsburg	Planning Commissioner	3829 Los Altos Pl	Pittsburg	CA	94565	bruceolehlson@hotmail.com
Joanna	Pallock	WCCTAC	Project Manager	13831 San Pablo Avenue	San Pablo	Ca	94806	joannap@ci.san-pablo.ca.us
James	Townsend	East Bay Regional Park District	Regional Trails Program Manager	2950 Peralta Oaks Court	Oakland	CA	94605-038	jtownsend@ebparks.org
Jeremy	Lochirco	City of Walnut Creek	Senior Planner	1666 N. Main Street	Walnut Creek	CA	94596-803	lochirco@walnut-creek.org
Bill	Pinkham	East Bay Bicycle Coalition	Board of Directors	P.O. Box 1736	Oakland	CA	94604	bpinkham3@gmail.com
John	Cunningham	Contra Costa County - CD	Senior Transportation Planner	30 Muir Road	Martinez	CA	94553	John.Cunningham@dcd.cccounty.us
Rich	Ravin			1631 Saint Lawrence Way	Pleasant Hill	CA.	94523	rravin25@yahoo.com
Leah	Greenblat	City of Lafayette	Transportation Planner	3675 Mt. Diablo Blvd., Ste. 210	Lafayette	CA	94549	lgreenblat@ci.lafayette.ca.us
Paul	Reinders	City of Pittsburg	Senior Civil Engineer	65 Civic Ave	Pittsburg	CA	94565	preinders@ci.pittsburg.ca.us
Andy	Dillard	Town of Danville	RTPC Mgr./Transportation Engineer Associate	510 La Gonda Way	Danville	CA	94523-174	ADillard@danville.ca.gov
Jerry	Fahy	Contra Costa County		255 Glacier Drive	Martinez	CA	94553	jfahy@pw.cccounty.us



# BY-LAWS

## Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee

---

*Adopted October 19, 2011*

These by-laws outline the purpose, membership, responsibilities, and operating procedures of the Contra Costa Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (herein “CBPAC”) of the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (the “Authority”).

### **1. Name and Authorization**

The name of this organization shall be the Contra Costa Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC).

### **2. Purpose**

- 2.1. The purpose of the CBPAC is to advise the Authority on bicycle and pedestrian issues and to help the Authority carry out its responsibilities as a sales tax and congestion management agency.
- 2.2. The CBPAC shall have the responsibility to:
  - 2.2.1. Oversee updates to the CBPP and other Authority policy documents and help implement the policies established therein
  - 2.2.2. Review and provide recommendations on applications for funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs
  - 2.2.3. Review and comment on “complete streets” checklists required of proposed projects
  - 2.2.4. Address other bicycle or pedestrian issues facing the Authority, Contra Costa and the region

### **3. Membership**

- 3.1. The CBPAC shall be comprised of 13 members, plus alternates as noted, appointed from the following agencies:
  - 3.1.1. One citizen and one staff person plus one alternate appointed by each of the four Regional Transportation Planning Committees
  - 3.1.2. One staff person plus one alternate appointed by the County of Contra Costa
  - 3.1.3. One representative plus one alternate appointed by the East Bay Regional Park District
  - 3.1.4. One citizen representative plus one alternate appointed by the East Bay Bicycle Coalition
  - 3.1.5. Two citizens appointed by the Authority, one of which familiar with issues of youth walking and bicycling and one of which familiar with issues of seniors and disabled non-motorized transportation
- 3.2. Citizen members shall be residents of Contra Costa.
- 3.3. Members shall represent the general countywide interest and not solely the interest of their appointing authorities or any specific organization.
- 3.4. At the discretion of the respective appointing body, CBPAC members are subject to recall at anytime.
- 3.5. Members shall be appointed for two year terms. There shall be no limit on the number of consecutive terms which a member may serve.
- 3.6. If a member fails to attend three consecutive meetings, whether regularly scheduled or special, the position to which that member was appointed shall be considered vacant. Attendance by an alternate for that position shall be considered attendance by the member.

- 3.7. A vacancy in a position shall be filled for the remainder of the term by the alternate assigned to that position, if any, or until the appointing agency appoints another person to fill that position.

#### **4. Officers**

- 4.1. The Officers of the CBPAC shall be a Chair and a Vice-Chair. Their duties shall be as follows:
  - 4.1.1. Chair: Presides over CBPAC meetings; reviews the meeting agenda; appoints subcommittees and subcommittee chairs; and reports the CBPAC's actions and decisions to the Authority as appropriate.
  - 4.1.2. Vice-Chair: Presides over the CBPAC meetings in the absence of the Chair; conducts the other duties of the Chair in his/her absence.
- 4.2. Election of Officers shall be made as follows:
  - 4.2.1. Chair: The Chair's term of office shall be for one calendar year. The Chair shall be elected each year at the last meeting of the calendar year by a majority of the CBPAC members present and voting, and shall serve until replaced by a newly-elected chair. If the term of appointment of the Chair expires before the year is out, and that member does not seek or accept reappointment, the Vice-Chair will serve as Chair until the following January.
  - 4.2.2. Vice-Chair: This officer shall be elected by a majority of the CBPAC members present and voting at the last meeting of the calendar year. The term of office shall be for one year. If the term of appointment of the Vice-Chair expires before the year is out and that member does not seek or accept reappointment, the Committee will hold an election for a Vice-Chair to serve out the remainder of the term.
- 4.3. In the event of a vacancy in the office of the Chair, the Vice-chair shall be elevated to the office of Chair for the remainder of the calendar year term, and the CBPAC shall nominate and elect a new Vice-chair.

## **5. Voting**

- 5.1. Decision-making by the CBPAC shall be by consensus. The CBPAC shall use formal voting only where consensus among members, and alternates attending in place of a member, cannot be reached.
- 5.2. Each member shall have one vote. Alternates are eligible to vote when seated in place of their regular committee member.
- 5.3. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the then-appointed CBPAC members. Vacant positions shall not be considered in calculating whether a quorum has been achieved. Alternates attending instead of regularly-appointed members shall be considered as members in determining whether a quorum has been achieved.
- 5.4. Actions taken by the CBPAC must be approved by a majority of those members or alternates eligible to vote at a meeting at which a quorum has been achieved.

## **6. Meetings**

- 6.1. All CBPAC meetings shall be posted public meetings conducted in compliance with the Brown Act.
- 6.2. The regular meetings of the CBPAC are generally scheduled for the fourth Monday of every other month beginning in January of every year at 11:00 a.m. in the Authority offices at 2999 Oak Road, Suite 100, Walnut Creek, California 94597. Additional or alternative meetings may be scheduled to address issues requiring more immediate consideration.
- 6.3. The rules contained within the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised) shall govern the CBPAC in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with these bylaws, the Authority's Administrative Code, the Authority's Office Procedures Guide, and any special rules of order the CBPAC may adopt.

## **7. Subcommittees**

- 7.1. The Chair may establish subcommittees and ad hoc committees as necessary.

- 7.2. Each subcommittee shall consist of at least three (3) CBPAC members. Members shall be reappointed annually.

## **8. Amendment of By-Laws**

Amendment of these bylaws may be initiated either by the CBPAC or the Authority directly. Amendment by the CBPAC requires a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the CBPAC members present and voting at any regular meeting of the CBPAC, and subsequent approval by the full Authority Board. Amendment by the Authority would be made consistent with the Authority's adopted procedures.

## **9. Communications and Reporting**

- 9.1. The primary channel of communication for the CBPAC shall be through written and oral reports from the CBPAC to the Technical Coordinating Committee, and through that committee to the Planning Committee and Authority board.
- 9.2. Reports from the CBPAC should reflect the consensus of the CBPAC. If consensus has not been achieved, the Chair shall convey to the Authority that the CBPAC position reflects a majority vote, and the Chair shall acknowledge and convey minority opinions.
- 9.3. CBPAC members are encouraged to report back to their appointing Councils or boards on at least an annual basis and more frequently if warranted.

## **10. Conflict of Interest**

- 10.1. There shall be no monetary gain by members of the CBPAC as a result of their membership and actions on the CBPAC.
- 10.2. CBPAC members shall recuse themselves from discussion and voting on issues in which they might have a personal financial interest or benefit.