

**TRANSPAC**  
**Transportation Partnership and Cooperation**  
**Special Meeting Notice and Agenda**  
**THURSDAY, JULY 24, 2014**  
**9:00 A.M.**

At Pleasant Hill City Hall, 100 Gregory Lane, Pleasant Hill  
in the Community Room

**TRANSPAC reserves the right to take formal action on any item included on this agenda, whether or not a form of resolution, motion, or other indication that action will be taken is included on the agenda or attachments thereto.**

- 1. Convene Meeting/Pledge of Allegiance/Self-Introductions**
- 2. Public Comment:** At this time, the public is welcome to address TRANSPAC on any item not on this agenda. Please complete a speaker card and hand it to a member of the staff. Please begin by stating your name and address and indicate whether you are speaking for yourself or an organization. Please keep your comments brief. In fairness to others, please avoid repeating comments.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- 3. Approval of July 10, 2014 TRANSPAC Minutes**

**ACTION: Approve minutes and/or as revised/determined.**

**Attachment:** July 10, 2014 TRANSPAC Minutes

**END CONSENT AGENDA**

- 4. Review of Recruitment Posting for Position of TRANSPAC Executive Director.** Given that the TRANSPAC Executive Director had submitted a letter of retirement effective June 30, 2014, at the July 10, 2014 meeting the TRANSPAC Board had created an ad hoc subcommittee comprised of Directors Pierce and Durant to discuss a recruitment process. Directors Pierce and Durant met on July 15, 2014 and recommended a special meeting on this date to review a recruitment posting for the position of TRANSPAC Executive Director.

**ACTION: Review, revise as needed, approve, and authorize posting.**

- 5. Review of Recruitment Schedule and Process**

**ACTION: Approve process.**

- 6. For the Good of the Order**

- 7. Adjourn/Next Meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for September 11, 2014 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined**

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

**MEETING DATE:** July 10, 2014

**ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT:** Mark Ross, Martinez (Chair); Loella Haskew, Walnut Creek (Vice Chair); Julie Pierce, Clayton, CCTA Representative; David Durant, Pleasant Hill, CCTA Representative; and Ron Leone, Concord

**PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Keith Haydon, Clayton; John Mercurio, Concord; and Diana Vavrek, Pleasant Hill

**STAFF PRESENT:** John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Martin Engelmann, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA); Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill, Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; Charlie Mullen, Clayton; Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa; Tim Tucker, Martinez; and Barbara Neustadter, TRANSPAC Manager

**GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Peter Engel, Program Manager, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA); and Jesse Ma, CCTA Intern

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

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

The meeting was convened at 9:08 A.M. by Chair Mark Ross, and Barbara Neustadter led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### **2. Public Comment**

There were no comments from the public.

Director Pierce advised of a need to consider three urgency items on the agenda; the TRANSPAC Budget for 2014/2015, a recruitment procedure to select a TRANSPAC Manager in light of Ms. Neustadter's letter of retirement; and a procedure to address the day-to-day operations of TRANSPAC in the interim of selecting a replacement TRANSPAC Manager.

**On motion by Director Pierce, seconded by Director Durant to add the three urgency items to the meeting agenda carried by the following vote:**

**Ayes:** Durant, Haskew, Haydon, Leone, Mercurio, Pierce, Vavrek, Ross  
**Noes:** None  
**Abstain:** None  
**Absent:** Mitchoff, Pickett, Stewart

### **3. Consider TRANSPAC Budget, Recruitment Procedure, and Interim Day-to-Day Operations**

Director Pierce presented a recent recruitment announcement from the West Contra Costa Transportation Authority (WCCTAC) as an example of what could be done to recruit for a TRANSPAC Manager. She noted that in WCCTAC's case, it had hired a recruiting firm at a cost of \$20,000, although she did not expect that needed to be done for TRANSPAC. She explained that WCCTAC had not issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) but had done a posting and had advertised the position through email. She recommended a similar recruitment process although with the formation of an ad hoc subcommittee to accomplish that task. She suggested that the recruitment announcement be distributed in the next week with an end of August deadline for an application, with TRANSPAC to meet as a body to conduct interviews.

Director Pierce stated that in Ms. Neustadter's retirement announcement, she had offered to work on an hourly as needed basis, and she recommended that Ms. Neustadter be used as a consultant pending the availability of a replacement TRANSPAC Manager.

Chair Ross recommended a special meeting next week, open or closed, to consider the position for an individual, an agency, or a consultancy, although Director Pierce did not support a closed session. She recommended the appointment of a subcommittee to determine what was desired and she did not object to another meeting to work out the details. She volunteered for the subcommittee and recommended that it be comprised of Directors Durant and Pierce. There was no objection to that recommendation.

Chair Ross supported a consultancy arrangement with more than one person, although he was not adverse to one person, and asked that the subcommittee consider his recommendation to word the position for a person or firm.

Director Pierce noted that WCCTAC had more staff than TRANSPAC, and WCCTAC's budget was \$1 million annually, although TRANSPAC's budget was not that high. WCCTAC also had several employees, a Deputy Executive Director, and other positions, and she agreed with the need to see if there was a firm that could handle the job to provide some backup. She was open to innovation, which could be done in the job posting, and reiterated the hope to get proposals back by the beginning of September to be able to secure a TRANSPAC Manager by November 2014.

With respect to the budget, Director Pierce wanted to extend the budget which had been approved to June 30, 2014 until it could be posted on the next meeting agenda for discussion.

On the discussion of how to recruit and whether to hold another meeting, which Chair Ross preferred, Director Durant stated that he and Director Pierce could meet by next week to craft a proposal. He noted after that time he would be out of town until July 31, and if the Board wanted to meet in the interim he would make sure his alternate would be available.

**On motion by Director Pierce, seconded by Director Haskew to extend the TRANSPAC budget though the September 11, 2014 meeting to allow sufficient time to deal with the full budget, carried by the following vote:**

**Ayes:** Durant, Haskew, Haydon, Leone, Mercurio, Pierce, Vavrek, Ross  
**Noes:** None  
**Abstain:** None  
**Absent:** Mitchoff, Pickett, Stewart

Directors Pierce and Durant agreed to meet as the subcommittee later this month to craft a recruitment proposal, with a follow-up meeting. As to who would be responsible for preparing the September agenda and addressing other TRANSPAC issues, Chair Ross suggested that could be addressed at the special meeting.

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **3. Approval of June 12, 2014 Special Meeting TRANSPAC Minutes**

**On motion by Director Leone, seconded by Director Haskew, to adopt the Consent Agenda, as shown, carried by the following vote:**

**Ayes:** Durant, Haskew, Haydon, Leone, Mercurio, Pierce, Vavrek, Ross  
**Noes:** None  
**Abstain:** None  
**Absent:** Mitchoff, Pickett, Stewart

### **END OF CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **4. Presentation by Peter Engel on the Financial Feasibility of Contra Costa County Ferry Service 2015-2024 prepared for CCTA by Economic & Planning Systems**

TRANSPAC Manager Barbara Neustadter introduced Peter Engel, CCTA Program Manager, to present the report on the Financial Feasibility of Contra Costa County Ferry Service 2015-2024, which had recently been released by the CCTA Board.

Peter Engel explained that CCTA had become involved in the ferry service question given some articles in the Contra Costa Times about communication issues between the City of Antioch and the Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) ferry service. He explained that the Water Transportation Authority (WTA) had recently become WETA given the primary goal of overseeing water emergency on the Bay. In an effort to improve communications, the CCTA Executive Director had asked him to take the lead in the report process through the CCTA.

Mr. Engel stated that four cities had been involved in the original operations plan; Antioch, Martinez, Hercules, and Richmond, and staff from the affected Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) had been involved along with staff from Senator DeSaulnier's office in that plan. While a white paper had been preferred, a report had been produced by a consultant who had been hired to validate the information and put it together into a report.

Mr. Engel identified the study objectives to create a collaborative effort engaging WETA, the cities, and other stakeholders and noted that the report had been prepared with a very small budget, which report would identify what was already out there to see what could be done and to offer some direction. No policy considerations had been identified since other things had to be done before making a final determination. Other study objectives included the evaluation of the financial feasibility of expanding WETA's ferry services to Contra Costa County; identify policy considerations; and guide future planning, investment priorities, and funding efforts.

Mr. Engel explained that the report had studied direct service from Antioch, Martinez, Hercules, and Richmond to San Francisco individually and in combination with each other. Two of the services, Richmond and Hercules, were in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Resolution 3434 Transit Expansion Policy, and he stated in order to start any transit in the Bay Area it had to be in Resolution 3434. The study approach was to convene a working group to work with WETA and the representatives of the individual cities; to present an overview of WETA ferry service funding sources; to build a ten-year operational feasibility model from 2013 to 2025; to estimate ridership, operating cost assumptions, and farebox revenues; and to document expansion ferry service capital cost estimates for the four sites. He noted that the fares had been based on 2009 estimates and inflation had been used to build those numbers. He also noted that WETA was currently conducting another fare study since it had found that Oakland/Alameda service was leaving people on the dock and they felt that fares could be raised. The report had also looked at route service levels and the potential need for another boat. He added that operating costs had been based on WETA's experience with current operations in Alameda and Vallejo over the last few years. Policy considerations, such as how future funds could be allocated if different from the way they were now allocated, would be a WETA Board decision. He stated therefore that there were policy decisions that needed to occur.

Mr. Engel highlighted the available funding sources, identified ridership projections, and noted that Richmond projected better as far as service. He suggested in the future short trips might make more sense than long trips given that it might take two hours or more to get from Antioch to San Francisco. He identified operating costs for each route and interlining routes and explained that the metric used in the report was farebox recovery, which was the one metric that MTC used for RM2 for ferry service, rail, and bus service. He added that WETA used a 40 percent recovery after three years on peak hour service as a benchmark, and that Richmond service was projected to be over that at 44 percent, although he noted that as long as the percentage continued in the right direction there would not be an issue. He also noted that capital costs had not been inflated and the costs would change depending upon the construction estimate. In Hercules the estimate had been done at the original Hercules site near the Intermodal Transit Center although there was a new potential site which had since been acquired by the City of Hercules and some engineering work would be done to identify a potential optional site in Hercules.

John Mercurio asked about the running time from Martinez, reported by Mr. Engel that it had been estimated at 65 minutes, although once the river was involved there were a number of unknowns related to Maritime Law and it would be difficult to predict travel time for day-to-day operations which would affect the public's confidence and reliability of the service, which would happen in Martinez and more often in Antioch.

Tim Tucker noted that in the report WETA had indicated that its infrastructure could not support a hovercraft system, and Mr. Engel concurred and stated that was not WETA's chosen technology which was high speed catamaran service. He explained that hovercraft would have to pull up onto a platform in order to dock and the San Francisco Ferry Terminal would have to have platforms in order to accommodate hovercraft, which would have to be considered when changing to a technology like that. He reiterated that some Maritime Laws affecting the speed of boats in the river would affect times.

In response to Keith Haydon as to whether onboard Wi-Fi service had been included in the model, Mr. Engel stated that would likely be included and noted that ferry service was considered to be more of a premium public transit service.

Ron Leone stated that in the long-term future Concord would have a shipyard and a marina. As such, he asked if it was possible that Concord could be part of the system.

Mr. Engel did not know why Concord could not be part of the system, noting again that the four cities had been included in that they were part of the original operational plan of the former WTA. He stated that would be something that could potentially be studied. On the question of whether the four sites identified made sense or if a different model was needed, he noted that the largest cost by far would be fuel, which would only get worse.

Director Pierce commented that WETA was looking at commute and emergency operations, and while that was a wonderful thing to plan for in case of an emergency and for commute purposes, she stated the world did not revolve around San Francisco and there may be mid-day opportunities to use the ferries for recreation, tourism, or travel back and forth to the wine country or similar recreational or tourism to Marin, Vallejo, Napa, and similar destinations. She suggested that those uses might be financially viable, particularly with smaller vehicles.

Mr. Engel advised that the full Financial Feasibility report was on the CCTA's webpage at <http://ccta.net/resources/detail/45/1/53a87c424d21b.pdf>.

TRANSPAC thanked Mr. Engel for his presentation.

Mr. Engel took this opportunity to introduce Jesse Ma, a CCTA intern, part of MTC's College Intern Program.

##### **5. Proposal by Ray Kuzbari to Establish a Cooperative Agreement to Distribute Central County Measure J Line 28a Funds**

Ray Kuzbari took this opportunity to thank Ms. Neustadter for all she had done for TRANSPAC and expressed his appreciation for all her work over many years. As a follow up to the previous TRANSPAC action related to Line 28a funds when TRANSPAC had approved the idea of disbursing Line 28a funds to the local cities and the County as a regular stream of funds annually, he explained that the question was how to do that and he had talked to CCTA staff who had been helpful and who had pointed him to what had been done with respect to the Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT) earlier this year.

Mr. Kuzbari explained that SWAT had entered into a Cooperative Agreement with all SWAT jurisdictions which had gone through the scrutiny, testing, and approval of local agencies as well as legal counsel from CCTA, and CCTA staff had recommended a similar path for TRANSPAC. He stated that the agreement provided a framework to utilize Line 28a funds as an annual stream of funds with the first collection of money to occur in January 2015 to encompass all the revenues collected through 2014, with collection each November for the previous fiscal year from November 2015 to November 2034; allocations to be based on a 50/50 split formula of road miles and population, with everything adjusted to account for the appropriation made to the City of Pleasant Hill last January. He referred to the last page of the proposed Cooperative Agreement where the projected allocations had been listed and stated that CCTA staff was comfortable with the plan under the current Measure J. It showed all the projected allocations to 2034 for all the agencies, and noted that Pleasant Hill would start collecting revenue in November 2020 if the economy remained as is.

Mr. Kuzbari requested the approval of Cooperative Agreement No. 28C.02 and expressed his hope that TRANSPAC would accept the framework of the agreement and forward it to the Central County City Managers and the County Administrator, and request that those jurisdictions review the agreement and provide comments to Hisham Noeimi, CCTA Engineering Manager, by July 21, 2014 to allow CCTA staff an opportunity to bring the Cooperative Agreement to the Administration & Projects Committee on September 4, 2014, and to the CCTA Board on September 17, 2014. He urged TRANSPAC Technical Advisory Commission (TAC) members to bring the Cooperative Agreement to their City Managers and the County Administrator.

Mr. Kuzbari verified that only staff remarks and comments would need to be returned by the deadline with staff to take the matter to the City Councils/Board of Supervisors in September. He clarified that Mr. Noeimi was working on a standard form to provide the required information to allow the allocation of the funds.

**On motion by Director Durant, seconded by Director Pierce to accept a proposal by Ray Kuzbari to establish a Cooperative Agreement to distribute Central County Measure J Line 28a Funds and to forward it to the Central County City Managers and the County Administrator, carried by the following vote:**

**Ayes:** Durant, Haskew, Haydon, Leone, Mercurio, Pierce, Vavrek, Ross  
**Noes:** None  
**Abstain:** None  
**Absent:** Mitchoff, Pickett, Stewart

TRANSPAC thanked Mr. Kuzbari for his work on the Line 28a funding proposal.

## **6. 511 Contra Costa Staff and TRANSPAC Reports**

### **A. 511 Contra Costa Report**

Lynn Overcashier reported that 511 Contra Costa was just launching the fall distribution of the SchoolPool brochures and information.

With the SchoolPool brochures and information, Ms. Overcashier explained that when parents registered their children for school they would be able to participate in the bus ticket program. She added that 511 Contra Costa was also closing out the last program for last year and working with jurisdictions to upgrade the electric vehicle charging stations from Level 1 to Level 2, and had just made an agreement with the City of Pleasant Hill to accommodate more people in the theater parking lot given the upgrade of the bollards.

Ms. Neustadter advised that Chair Ross had provided a report on the Bay Area Commuter Benefits Program, which had been included in the meeting packet, to identify new requirements for employers with 50 or more full-time employees in the Bay Area that were now required to offer commuter benefits to their employees.

Chair Ross stated that the September 30, 2014 deadline to offer the benefits had been pushed back. Pursuant to State law, employers would have four options to offer employees: pre-tax benefits; employer-provided subsidy; employer-provided transit; or an alternative commuter benefit.

When asked, Ms. Overcashier reported that 511 Contra Costa had received approximately 50 calls from employers and a lot of questions about Option 4 and there had been quite a bit of feedback from concerned employers. For the most part, 511 had been able to answer questions and give guidance.

#### **B. TRANSPAC REPORT.** Update on JPA Actions

TRANSPAC Manager Neustadter reported that at this time all jurisdictions had acted on the efforts to establish a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) for TRANSPAC, with the exception of the City of Martinez which would act on July 16, 2014, which would complete all of the actions unless there was a reason that a change had to be made when the process would have to start all over again.

Director Durant noted that things seemed to be on track and TRANSPAC needed to move forward with the item and the jurisdictions that had signed on were prepared to move forward, and there had been a discussion that non-substantive changes would not have to return. Even if the City of Martinez did not move on the item, he suggested it was best to move forward.

Director Pierce stated that the liability remained whether the City of Martinez signed on or not.

Director Durant explained that things were moving along although more slowly than hoped. He referred to a letter from CalPERS that had instructed that existing employees not be included in the system and explained that they had started the appeal process, which would allow sufficient time to get done the things that needed to get done. He reiterated that the process was on track and come September they were trying to put together a meeting with the consultant and CalPERS to take the next step and begin the formation of the documentation.

Director Pierce added that it appeared from the consultants that CalPERS was being cooperative and was not demanding that anyone be dumped immediately, and as long as they continued to show progress CalPERS was liable to be somewhat patient and understood TRANSPAC was working through it and it was not in CalPERS interest to have things go awry.



While it would take some time, Director Pierce emphasized the need to be patient and work through the process in a methodical way.

- 7. TRANSPAC CCTA Representative Reports:** Reports on the most recent CCTA Administration & Projects Committee (Member Pierce), Planning Committee (Member Durant), and the CCTA Board meeting (Members Pierce and Durant).

Director Pierce reported that the APC had met last week and had some local projects going forward including the I-680/SR 4 Interchange in the process of executing a Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans for right-of-way acquisition; the Clayton Road/Treat Boulevard/Denkinger Road Intersection Capacity Improvements in the City of Concord was commencing; the Hercules Rail Station where the CCTA was taking over the management of the entire project for the city and where the city was responsible for all the funding; extended a contract with the Lobbying and Consultation Services Group in Washington, DC; I-680 Auxiliary Lanes toward the SWAT area were open and making a tremendous difference; Highway 4 was progressing and gradually getting open further and further; the Annual Investment Policy for the CCTA had been approved, and the annual review for the Executive Director had been conducted.

Director Durant reported that the Planning Committee had met on July 2, had approved a resolution for the Walnut Creek Bike/Ped project; checklists for a number of jurisdictions; the release of the Draft 2014 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP); approved a fairly large amendment to the Gray Bowen/Zell and Associates contract for the purpose of survey research in anticipation of a potential new transportation measure to move to the Authority for discussion; and an increase in the budget for DKS Associates for additional consulting work in connection with Routes of Regional Significance.

- 8. CCTA Executive Director's Report from Randell H. Iwasaki Regarding Authority Actions/Discussion Items**

Mr. Iwasaki's report dated June 18, 2014 had been included in the packet.

Martin Engelmann, CCTA Deputy Director Planning, provided an update on the 2014 CTP public outreach process and schedule, with the release of the Draft 2014 CTP at the CCTA Meeting in July for a 60-day review and comment period through September 30, 2014, and with the CTP to be adopted in December 2014. The CCTA had approved a public education and outreach plan and budget with Gray Bowen to include the development of an on-line engagement tool which would allow anyone to look at the projects and identify the kinds of projects they would like to have in the future. Four community workshops would be scheduled with one telephone town hall (an opportunity for thousands of people to get on line and hear a presentation and respond to questions), some printed material, direct mail, and some printed survey material for the communities of concern that did not have Internet access, stakeholder tool kits where a package of materials could be provided, and potentially a year end progress report to discuss accomplishments.

With respect to vetting the plan, Mr. Engelmann reported that a presentation of the draft CTP would be available to any city council. Each RTPC had already scheduled their presentations and TRANSPAC had been scheduled for September 11, 2014 and he would like to go over the CTP at that meeting.

Mr. Engelmann noted that the community workshops would cater to the general public, talk about the transportation system, the projects planned for each subarea, what was funded and was not funded, and the kinds of projects the public would like to identify. He stated that the workshops would be in open house style in the evening, to start at 7:00 P.M., with a presentation and a focus outreach to discuss specific projects in the subarea. The CCTA would provide staff and refreshments. He asked for a date to schedule a Central County workshop, to be hosted by the CCTA.

Mr. Engelmann advised that SWAT had scheduled its public workshop on September 10, 2014; TRANSPAN had scheduled its public workshop on August 6, 2014; WCCTAC had not yet scheduled its public workshop; and he requested that TRANSPAC designate a time for a public workshop in Central County. He clarified that it would be nice to have an elected official from the city where the workshop would be held, and while it would not be a TRANSPAC meeting, members were all welcome to attend.

Director Pierce noted that several cities were hosting September 11 memorial events and she suggested another date for the draft CTP presentation to TRANSPAC.

After discussion, TRANSPAC designated Wednesday, August 27, 2014 at 7:00 P.M. for the CTP Public Workshop, with CCTA staff to work with Ms. Neustadter to designate a location for the workshop.

**9. Items Approved by the Authority for Circulation to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and Related Items of Interest**

Mr. Iwasaki's report dated June 24, 2014 had been included in the packet.

**10. TAC Oral Reports by Jurisdiction:** Reports from Concord, Clayton, Martinez, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek, and Contra Costa County, if available.

Eric Hu identified construction in Pleasant Hill for projects on Contra Costa Boulevard; Buskirk Avenue; Geary Road; and the Golf Club Road Bridge, which was currently being demolished in a two-year construction process. He added that all stores and shops would remain open.

**11. Agency and Committee Reports:**

Director Pierce referenced a recent SWAT meeting and reported that SWAT wanted TRANSPAC to consider, in a reauthorization or something going forward, Routes of Regional Significance (RORS) for trails and BART, and to potentially consider another category other than RORS.

Ms. Neustadter noted that the issue had been discussed more than once and the problem was TRANSPAC's perspective of naming BART as a RORS where the question would become whether TRANSPAC had to establish multimodal transportation service objectives (MTSOs) for BART and there would be no control or money, and it was in a whole different arena than a group of RORS for Pleasant Hill Road and other roads in Contra Costa County. She suggested the dilemma was that while they were key components for a system, how it would be handled within the CCTA's construct was problematic and TRANSPAC had always declined to identify BART as a RORS.

Director Durant expressed concern for the potential financial ramifications to the rest of the RTPCs. He did not necessarily support more transportation funds from Central County for BART and did not want to lock into it, particularly since Central County had already paid for BART. Director Pierce concurred.

Mr. Engelmann stated that West County and East County also did not want to make those designations, although West County had designated the Iron Horse Trail as a RORS, and SWAT had identified BART as a RORS. He noted that the whole idea of RORS was to focus on routes with all of the congestion and all of the traffic. He stated that the Action Plans from Tri-Valley and Lamorinda wanted to designate the routes which was a dilemma for the CCTA as well, and the issues of establishing MTSOs for something where an RTPC would have no control was also problematic. He quoted the following from the Planning Committee staff report dated July 2, 2014: "From the Authority's perspective, a countywide policy that can be applied equally to all RTPCs is needed. Therefore, staff recommends the following approach, which was reviewed and approved by SWAT at its July 7 meeting: Allow RTPCs the option to include BART and/or regional trails in their Action Plans as regional routes, but do not formally adopt them into the CTP; Any MTSOs, actions, review policies, etc. adopted by an RTPC as a result of having designated non-roadway facilities as a RORS would be: a) limited to consideration within the RTPC; and b) de-coupled from the Authority's GMP compliance requirements. SWAT further discussed developing a new nomenclature for these routes. Staff suggests the following: For BART in the Lamorinda Action Plan – "Regional Transit Route;" for the IHT in the Tri-Valley – "Non-motorized Regional Route."

**12. For the Good of the Order:**

Ms. Neustadter expressed her pleasure and appreciation in working with TRANSPAC and the jurisdictions over 20 years and commented that everyone had come together to achieve something, which had been spurred on by the voters of Contra Costa County.

Chair Ross presented Ms. Neustadter with a gift and expressed his appreciation with her efforts and for the diplomacy with which she had done the job.

Director Pierce asked Ms. Neustadter to attend the September meeting.

**13. Adjourn/Next Meeting.**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:40 A.M. The next meeting is scheduled for September 11, 2014 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined.