

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

AMENDED

TRANSPAC TAC MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 2015

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

**in the COMMUNITY ROOM at CITY OF PLEASANT HILL CITY HALL
100 GREGORY LANE
PLEASANT HILL**

1. Review/Revise Accept/Minutes of the November 20, 2014 TAC Meeting

ACTION: Accept November 20, 2014 TAC Minutes and/or as revised/determined.

Attachment: TAC Minutes from November 20, 2014 meeting

2. Consider the One-time Use of Measure J, Line 20a Funds for the Senior Mini Bus Program in the City of Walnut Creek

ACTION: The TRANSPAC TAC is asked to review and forward to the TRANSPAC Board a recommendation for the one-time use of monies from Measure J Line 20a funds for the Senior Mini Bus program in the City of Walnut Creek.

Attachments: Budget Summary Mini-Bus Grant from TRANSPAC – 2013; and 2014 Mini Bus Numbers Report.

3. Review and Comment on Preliminary Scope of Work for the I-680 High Capacity Transit Study: CCTA proposes to conduct a study of congestion relief options for the I-680 corridor, including improved transit options such as express bus, light rail, and BART. The study will also examine new transit technologies. The study will be performed by DKS Associates during the next six months, and will be funded by CCTA. The study will include building upon previous studies, such as the I-680 Investment Options Analysis conducted in 2003. CCTA seeks TRANSPAC TAC review of the proposed scope of work as soon as possible so that the study schedule can be accelerated.

ACTION: Review and comment on the Preliminary Scope of Work for the I-680 High Capacity Transit Study.

Attachment: Preliminary Draft of the I-680 High Capacity Transit Study.

- 4. Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance.** CCTA is seeking general information regarding the need for Safe Routes to School projects and programs in Contra Costa. The Authority's Technical Assistance program provides consultant resources to assist local staff in conducting assessments of existing student pick-up, drop-off, and pedestrian/bicycling issues. The attached memo provides information regarding the Authority's Technical Assistance program.

ACTION: As determined.

Attachment: Memo dated January 16, 2015 from Martin Engelmann, Deputy Executive Director, Planning, CCTA, regarding Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance.

5. Revised 2015 TRANSPAC Meeting Schedule

Attachment: Revised 2015 Meeting Schedule

6. Adjournment

The next TAC meeting is scheduled for February 26, 2015 at 9:00 A.M. in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room unless otherwise determined.

TRANSPAC Technical Advisory Commission (TAC) Meeting Summary Minutes

MEETING DATE: November 20, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; John McKenzie, Caltrans; Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa; Michael Tanner, BART; Tim Tucker, Martinez

GUESTS/PRESENTERS: Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill

MINUTES PREPARED BY: Anita Tucci-Smith

The meeting was convened at 9:02 A.M.

1. Review/Revise/Accept Minutes of the May 22, 2014 TAC Meeting

ACTION: Accepted. (Kuzbari/Overcashier/Unanimous)

2. Update Action Plan to Reflect Public Comments and the 2040 MTSO Values. As part of the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) process, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) collected comments that pertain to the Central County Action Plan. CCTA has also undertaken additional technical analysis in support of the Action Plans since the TRANSPAC TAC last met. CCTA's modeling consultant, Kittelson, has prepared travel forecasts for 2040 with all of the Action Plan actions included and has estimated the MTSO values for this model run.

The TAC was asked to: 1) review public comments received on the Central County Action Plan and 2014 Draft Countywide Transportation Plan; review Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) obtained from updated 2040 Traffic and Transportation Projections for the Central County Action Plan; and 3) discuss proposed revisions to the draft for incorporation into the "Proposal for Adoption" of the Central County Action Plan.

Deborah Dagang, CH2MHill, reported that last winter the TAC had approved the revised Draft Action Plan which had been presented to the TRANSPAC Board and had been posted prior to the CTP for review and comment. She presented the comments on the CTP and an analysis of the MTSOs for the 2040 No Project and with the Action Plan, and opened a discussion with the TAC of the proposed changes prior to forwarding the "Proposal for Adoption" Central County Action Plan to the TRANSPAC Board for the final Action Plan. She advised that the public comment period had ended on November 3, 2014, and between November and December the TACs were to prepare the "Proposal for Adoption" of the Action Plans, to be forwarded to the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) for final adoption in December 2014 or January 2015. She noted that the full package and comments had been sent out to all TAC members and summarized the contents of the package which included summaries, a log of comments, copies of all written comments, and any email comments received on the CCTA website.

Ms. Dagang referred to the main comments which had been received in multiple forms including the Central County public workshop on September 27, 2014, which had been very well attended. She explained that each comment received had been noted without filtering; characterized those who had attended the workshop as offering strong support for multimodal; stated that other comments included those submitted to the CCTA by email, through the CCTA's "Transportation Priorities and Bright Ideas" paper survey, comments submitted online via the website, and letters from agencies and organizations including those from a few cities; and added that all letters had been included in the packet.

Of the issues raised for Central County, Ms. Dagang identified the requests to conduct a High Capacity Transit Study along the I-680 Corridor from Central Contra Costa to Tri-Valley; State Route 4 operational improvements, which she noted had already been included in the Draft Action Plan and was being added to the CTP; a specific listing of East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD) trail projects; and providing more parking and bike stations at every BART station. She added that the County had recommended the deletion and addition of a few specific projects.

Ms. Dagang referred to the table presenting the analysis of the Central Contra Costa County Arterial MTSO Values (Arterial Segment Analysis), which had not been included in the packet and which had been distributed separately. She reported that Kittelson had been working on the traffic analysis and traffic forecast including the Action Plans, and a significant output of that was analyzing the MTSOs for the future. She pointed out that the tables showed both projections 2011 and 2013; the 2013 projections for comparison purposes only. She reported that the biggest change was the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS), and that the 2013 projections had included much more of the SCS approach but had not yet been adopted and reviewed by each of the TACs. The 2011 projections were the focus of the Action Plans. She reiterated that the 2013 results had been presented for comparison purposes but had not been included in the Action Plans; the projections were different but not necessarily better or worse; and the 2040 with Actions showed an overall improvement from the 2040 No Project, although that was not the case with every place.

Ms. Dagang added that in looking at the data one location at southbound Contra Costa Boulevard, where the TAC had decided to make all the MTSOs a delay index of 15.0, had been projected to be slightly underneath with a projected delay index of 14.4.

Ray Kuzbari pointed out that the statement should have read a "projected speed of 14.4," and he requested that the statement be corrected.

When asked by Jeremy Lochirco, Ms. Dagang clarified that the forecasts were updated with each Action Plan every five years.

Ms. Dagang identified her suggestions for the proposed revisions to the Draft Action Plan and recommended the following:

- Add "Conduct High Capacity Transit Study jointly with Tri-Valley Transportation Council (TVTC)" as an action for the I-680 Corridor;
- Add trail projects as identified by EBRPD;
- Revise actions as requested by Contra Costa County;

- Action 2-F: add a specific reference to supporting the addition of bicycle parking at BART Stations.

For the item related to the I-680 Corridor, John Cunningham asked that it be added as an Action since it had been studied ten years ago and officials in Tri-Valley were confident that the recommendations in the original study stood and there was no need to redo it. Given that it was a corridor, he suggested consulting with TVTC.

Ms. Dagang clarified that the comments had come from the TVTC, from multiple sources, and from elected officials. It was not that the corridor had never been studied but that the study had been more than ten years ago, and things changed over time.

Martin Engelmann stated that a similar Action would be included in the Tri-Valley Action Plan, and Ms. Dagang explained that the purpose of identifying a joint study was to ensure that if TVTC did not proceed with the Action, TRANSPAC would not do it on its own.

Jeremy Lochirco noted that Caltrans was conducting a corridor study developing the Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP), which included a Complete Streets component that was to incorporate transit and other long-term improvements intended to be broader than the freeway.

Ms. Dagang suggested that if the Action was added, it should build on the I-680 Investment Option Study and the current CSMP through Caltrans, and could be done after that report.

John McKenzie suggested that the TAC may consider also including the State Route 24 Transit Study to offer a regional picture.

In response to Mr. Kuzbari as to who would manage such a study, Mr. Engelmann stated that was unknown at this point although he acknowledged that stakeholders and members of the public sought some options on the I-680 Corridor which was getting more saturated by the day. He stated that West County was doing a similar study and the CCTA was contributing to that study to come up with a transit improvement in West County that would give them a project for a future Measure J expansion. The concerns expressed were that there was no marquee project and since there were so many members of the public asking for alternatives on the I-680 Corridor, the study would help them rethink a similar study that had been conducted in 2002 to identify what should be done.

Mr. Engelmann noted that the north area of TRANSPAC was very much in favor of BART, while Tri-Valley was very much opposed to BART in the I-680 Corridor, and 180 degrees against anything on the Iron Horse Trail. He commented that the forecast for the 2002 study had been high given that it had used a projection series that did not foresee the Great Recession. As a result, the forecast would be lower than 2002 and they would look at everything to see if there were any options. The previous study had come up with direct access ramps and auxiliary lanes. In conjunction with the CSMP, I-680 improvements such as express buses could be considered.

Mr. Engelmann noted that traveling to the West Oakland BART station would take less than an hour with one transfer although people did not want to go from Walnut Creek to Dublin given that they wanted to run on I-680.

Ms. Dagang stated that even in the last ten years there were all sorts of other high-capacity transit technologies that had not been envisioned ten years ago that could be studied.

Mr. Lochirco supported the inclusion of the I-680 Corridor study.

Ms. Dagang suggested a modification to include a statement under the action for the I-680 Corridor, "Building upon previous and ongoing corridor studies that assess high-capacity transit in this corridor."

Lynn Overcashier suggested that if looking for something beyond BART, there may be something else to consider.

With respect to the item to add trail projects as identified by the EBRPD, Ms. Dagang referenced the specific listing of trails from the EBRPD and suggested referencing only those in Central County in the Action Plan. On the discussion, she clarified that none of the trails were on Routes of Regional Significance (RORS) per se although there were some that connected to RORS.

Mr. Engelmann explained that all the trails on the EBRPD list would be included in the CTP.

Tim Tucker suggested including the trails that connected to RORS and other transit facilities.

Ms. Dagang stated she could identify the trails in a listing and send them out to the TAC. She also noted that there was a listing of actions. The County had sent a very specific listing with comments to add or delete although few were in the TRANSPAC area.

Ms. Overcashier referred to the County's letter with respect to expanded parking at BART as well as secured parking at BART stations, and asked if that could be considered a marquee project, and if that was something BART would anticipate.

In response, Michael Tanner advised that most cities had been approached by BART about expanded or additional access as well as improving intermodal stations in Pleasant Hill, and BART was also working with the city or developer on that piece.

Speaking to the last proposed revision to the Draft Action Plan with respect to Action 2-F, bicycle parking at BART Stations, Ms. Dagang suggested given the specific comments from multiple sources that reference should be made an Action at that level rather than making it a separate Action.

Mr. Lochirco referenced an access study in Walnut Creek and commented that if not done elsewhere in Central County the action should be to prepare an access study as opposed to looking at individual improvements. He liked the planning approach to improve accessibility which might help to secure funds. He explained that Walnut Creek was in the process of redeveloping its BART station, and he urged the development of an access plan prior to that redevelopment to be able to look for grant monies to place things on site or off-site as opposed to always building after the fact.

On the discussion of how to identify that as an Action, Ms. Dagang suggested “Support access to redevelopment plans at each BART station to improve multimodal access in the immediate proximity.”

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that TRANSPAC should be in a supportive role.

Mr. Lochirco wanted something more specific, sought the same for Safe Routes to School (SR2S), and stated it would be great to have a specific access plan around every school to be able to seek money for funding.

John Cunningham suggested it would be good to create a statement of joint planning.

Mr. Tanner supported a strong statement, and with respect to joint planning stated that those access plans that had been done had been done in coordination with each of the cities.

Ms. Dagang stated she would add wording for each of the bullet items and send it to the TAC in track change mode for review and comment, to then be presented to the TRANSPAC Board for adoption.

Mr. Engelmann clarified that the TRANSPAC Board would be asked to approve the “Proposal for Adoption” of the Central County Action Plan and forward the “Proposal for Adoption” to the CCTA for incorporation into the Final CTP. Rather than submit the entire document to the TRANSPAC Board, it was agreed that just the pages with the track changes would be submitted.

Ms. Dagang presented the TAC changes to the proposed revisions to the Draft Action Plan, as follows:

- Add “Conduct High Capacity Transit Study jointly with Tri-Valley Transportation Council (TVTC)” as an action for the I-680 Corridor;
 - Building upon previous and ongoing corridor studies that assess high capacity transit in this corridor
- Add trail projects as identified by EBRPD;
 - Those that connect to Routes of Regional Significance or transit facilities
- Revise actions as requested by Contra Costa County;
- Action 2-F: add a specific reference to supporting the addition of bicycle parking at BART Stations.

ACTION: The TAC forwarded the revisions to the 2014 Draft Central County Action Plan “Proposal for Adoption” Central County Action Plan to the TRANSPAC Board.

3. Review Letter from the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors to the CCTA Chair Regarding the 2014 Countywide Transportation Plan Update

The letter from the County Board of Supervisors dated October 21, 2014 to CCTA Chair Kevin Romick regarding the 2014 CTP Update was presented and had been discussed as part of the discussion of the update to the Action Plan.

4. Consider Allocating \$161,648 in Measure J Line 19a and/or Line 14a Funds to the Monument Neighborhood Shuttle as Part of a Fund Swap with County Connection which has Agreed with MTC to exchange these Funds for STA Funds as the City of Concord is Not Eligible to Claim STA Funds to Make this Project Whole

Ray Kuzbari stated that the Monument Neighborhood Shuttle had originally been awarded \$311,703 in Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 3 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) funds two years ago although since that time changes in the rules on funding for Lifeline projects had resulted in the need to swap funds with County Connection to be able to fund the Monument Neighborhood Shuttle Program. He detailed the funds that would be swapped, as identified in the attachment, and explained that there would be a straightforward swap using \$161,648 of Measure J money that would otherwise be used by County Connection, similar to what had been done last year. He noted that Concord had been waiting for two years to launch the project, he had been working with Peter Engel at the CCTA, and he asked the TAC to forward the item to the TRANSPAC Board in December for approval, with submittal to the CCTA for final approval.

Noting the request to use Line 19a and/or Line 14a funds, Mr. Tucker stated that the fund balances in the line items needed to be identified.

Mr. Kuzbari stated he would work with Peter Engel on those details. He reiterated that the attachment had identified the history of the project which had received Line 19a money last year. Mr. Engel would look at the balances in the Line 14a and Line 19a accounts to determine which line item or a combination of both would be used.

ACTION: (Tucker/Cunningham/Unanimous) to recommend TRANSPAC allocation of \$161,648 in Measure J Line 19a and/or Line 14a funds to the Monument Neighborhood Shuttle as part of a fund swap with County Connection which has agreed with MTC to exchange these funds for STA funds, as the City of Concord is not eligible to claim STA funds to make this project whole.

5. Request TRANSPAC Authorization and Approval for the FY 2015/16 TRANSPAC / TRANSPLAN 511 Contra Costa Program Workplan with Funds from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Transportation Funds for Clean Air Act (TFCA), CCTA Measure J Line 17, and Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) (Employer Outreach).

Lynn Overcashier, Program Manager, 511 Contra Costa, presented the annual request for TRANSPAC's authorization for approval of the FY 2015/16 TRANSPAC / TRANSPLAN 511 Contra Costa Program Workplan with funds from the BAAQMD TFCA, CCTA Measure J Line 17, and MTC CMAQ.

Ms. Overcashier explained that the program elements were refined and changed each year to ensure the maximum cost effectiveness, as determined by the BAAQMD. She reported a change in call volume as well as email volume from employers because of SB 1339, the Commute Benefits Ordinance, and she was working closely with the BAAQMD and MTC to comply with the legislative requirements.

Ms. Overcashier noted that the only other element that was different was that almost all federal SR2S funds had been expended to support the Street Smarts Program, and more TFCA funds were being used to support East County programs. She was using the funding as wisely as possible since East County did not have the same type of employer base as Central County. It was her understanding from the CCTA that the budgets would be similar this year. She clarified that the budget was a close approximation, and the CCTA Board would be voting on it in March 2015. She asked the TAC to recommend the budget to the TRANSPAC Board for approval in December.

ACTION: (Lochirco/Kuzbari/Unanimous) to recommend TRANSPAC authorization and approval for the FY 2015/16 TRANSPAC / TRANSPLAN 511 Contra Costa Program Workplan with funds from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Transportation Funds for Clean Air Act (TFCA), CCTA Measure J Line 17, and Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) (Employer Outreach).

6. Request TRANSPAC Authorization and Approval of 511 Contra Costa Workplan and Budget for FY 2014/15 and 2015/16 Measure J 21a Safe Transportation for Children Funds

Ms. Overcashier reported that 67 percent of the funds in the 511 Contra Costa Workplan and Budget for FY 2014/15 and 2015/16 Measure J 21a Safe Transportation for Children Funds would go toward actual infrastructure. Since there were no more SR2S funds moving forward the program and infrastructure costs would come out of the funding. She requested that the TAC recommend approval of the Workplan and Budget to the TRANSPAC Board for approval in December.

ACTION: (Tucker/Kuzbari/Unanimous) to recommend TRANSPAC authorization and approval of 511 Contra Costa Workplan and Budget for FY 2014/15 and 2015/16 Measure J 21a Safe Transportation for Children Funds.

7. 2015 TRANSPAC Meeting Schedule

The 2015 TRANSPAC meeting schedule was presented.

Mr. Lochirco advised of a request for a reallocation of Line 20a Senior Transit Funds for Walnut Creek's Senior Mini Bus Program for the same amount of funding earlier provided to be able to continue to operate the senior bus program, a voluntary-based service, at the same level of service. He noted that the funds helped to pay for upkeep, maintenance, and operating costs.

Mr. Cunningham referenced the prior discussions of a policy for Line 20a disbursements and recommended renewed discussions to draft a policy to handle the requests for Line 20a funding. He urged a review of the entire budget, annual draw, and outstanding requests.

Ms. Overcashier volunteered to contact Peter Engel to get a balance of the line item. The TAC agreed.

Mr. Lochirco stated that there was time to address the need for the reallocation of funding and there was no need to meet on December 18, 2014, as scheduled, although there may be a need for a special meeting in January.

Mr. Tucker urged the designation of an Interim TRANSPAC Manager for TAC meetings.

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:17 A.M. The next meeting of the TAC is scheduled for February 26, 2015 at 9:00 A.M. in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room unless a need for a special meeting on January 22, 2015 is determined.

Budget Summary Mini-Bus grant from TRANSPAC - 2013

The proposed annual budget for the Mini Bus Program for 2013 was approximately \$43,000, including \$34,500 in staff expenses to manage the program and \$8,500 in capital expense for vehicle maintenance and replacement. The grant monies that we spent helped cover the expenses for this valued service and also kept our fares affordable to our participants.

For the year ending 2013 (see attachment) just over \$2600 in fares was brought in by our riders. Our grant of \$40,000 from TRANSPAC helped us reach full cost recovery. The Mini Bus program is an essential service to our seniors within Walnut Creek that desire to live life more independently. It is hoped that with continued TRANSPAC support, the program will continue to be financially viable for the upcoming year, and we will be able to sustain the current level of service and ridership levels without a fare increase. These grant funds are critical for the City to operate the program without adding an undue burden on those in need of our service.

Walnut Creek Seniors Club
Transportation Program
Collections Report 2014

December	# volunteers	# punches	# fare rides	total # rides	punch card sales	\$ fares collected	total \$ collected	total mileage	notes
1	1	5	2	8	\$0.00	\$2.00	\$2.00	79	b
2	2	7	3	12	\$0.00	\$3.00	\$3.00	56	
3	4	2	0	6	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	42	
4	2	4	5	11	\$0.00	\$5.00	\$5.00	71	
5	3	2	12	17	\$0.00	\$12.00	\$12.00	105	
totals	12	20	22	54	\$0.00	\$22.00	\$22.00	353	
8	1	2	4	7	\$0.00	\$4.00	\$4.00	40	
9	4	6	4	14	\$20.00	\$4.00	\$24.00	69	Holiday
10				0			\$0.00		
11				0			\$0.00		
12				0			\$0.00		
totals	5	8	8	21	\$20.00	\$8.00	\$28.00	109	
15				0			\$0.00		
16				0			\$0.00		
17				0			\$0.00		
18				0			\$0.00		
19				0			\$0.00		
totals	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0	
22				0			\$0.00		
23				0			\$0.00		
24				0			\$0.00		Holiday
25				0			\$0.00		Holiday
26				0			\$0.00		
totals	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0	
29				0			\$0.00		
30				0			\$0.00		
31				0			\$0.00		Holiday
				0			\$0.00		
				0			\$0.00		
totals	0	0	0	0	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	0	
month end totals									
	17	28	30	75	\$20.00	\$30.00	\$50.00	462	



MEMORANDUM

Date January 16, 2015

To RTPC Managers

From Martin R. Engelmann, Deputy Executive Director, Planning

RE **Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance**

Over the past two years, the Authority has sponsored a comprehensive effort to understand current Safe Routes to School (SR2S) activities around Contra Costa and to evaluate the needs for future programs and capital improvements. Work products from this effort include a SR2S Resource Guide (available on the CCTA website) and a Safe Routes to School Needs Assessment Report (currently being finalized in response to comments from each RTPC).

The last phase of the SR2S effort is to provide direct technical support to local jurisdictions and public school districts in Contra Costa to help them identify barriers to walking and bicycling and/or to plan for specific SR2S improvements at individual school sites. Examples of the types of services that can be provided through this technical assistance program include:

- Conducting and documenting a walking and bicycling audit
- Developing concept plans for specific capital improvements (which may be identified through a walk/bike audit)
- Preparing a walk/bike route map
- Collecting data around a school (such as traffic volumes, speeds, pedestrian/bicycle volumes or routes, parent surveys regarding school travel, etc.) to better understand current travel and to plan for improvements
- Preparing a traffic control plan for a school area

The table below provides more detail on what could be covered in each of these activities, and includes approximate costs.

At this time, we are seeking only the general information requested below. A more detailed scope of work would be developed prior to commencement of services. Please note that grant-writing assistance is not an allowable use of these technical assistance funds, although the products of the services listed above are often important elements of successful grant applications.

Request for Prioritized List of Technical Assistance Needs

The current budget for this effort is relatively meager —\$120,000. The Authority will allocate these funds to the RTPCs based on school enrollment. We ask that each RTPC submit a prioritized list of SR2S technical assistance needs. Resources will be allocated to each project on the list in turn until that RTPC's allocation has been exhausted. The percentage of school enrollment and the allocation for each subarea is as follows: West – 19% or \$22,800, Central – 26 % or \$31,200, East – 31% or \$37,200, and SWAT – 24% or \$28,800. The prioritized list, however, does not need to be financially constrained as we are hopeful that additional funds may become available in upcoming funding cycles.

For each SR2S technical assistance project included on the list, please provide the following information:

1. Name and contact information of the requesting agency and the responsible individual.
2. Name of school to be addressed and contact information for school administrator.
3. Brief (no more than two paragraphs) description of the technical assistance being requested, why that assistance is needed, and what the desired outcome would be.
4. Desired schedule for the completion of the technical assistance project, and explanation of schedule constraints (if any).

Please submit the prioritized list from your RTPC by March 31, 2015 to Julie Morgan at j.morgan@fehrandpeers.com with a copy to Brad Beck at CCTA bbeck@ccta.net .

Sample Menu of Services for SR2S Technical Assistance Program

Walking and Bicycling Audit

- Kick-off Meeting: Attend a kick off meeting (conference call or in-person) with school staff/stakeholders to discuss known issues in advance of audit. School or school district would identify staff/stakeholders and arrange meeting and audit date.
- Conduct Audit: Lead a walking and bicycling audit during either the morning drop-off or afternoon pick-up period. Lead stakeholders on an assessment of the school area to observe drop-off/pick-up operations and walking and bicycling activity, note infrastructure deficiencies, and assess opportunities for safety and operational improvements. Following the audit convene inside the school to discuss potential improvements.
- Prepare Summary Report: Outline key issues and recommended infrastructure and programmatic improvements. Recommendations can be categorized as Short, Mid or Long-term, and the responsible agency identified. The Draft Report can be submitted electronically to the school/district and COE for review and comment.
- Final Meeting: Attend a final meeting with the school stakeholders/city staff to discuss recommendations and receive comments.
- Final Report: Incorporate comments received into Final Summary Report and improvement graphic. Submit electronic copy to school/district and COE.
- Typical cost: Approximately \$5,000

School Walk/Bike Route Map

- Conduct Field Review: Inventory existing traffic controls, crossing guard locations, sidewalks, crosswalks, bicycle facilities, pedestrian and bicycle access points.
- Develop Draft Route Map: Develop map in GIS showing preferred walking and bicycling routes (within 1-mile radius or school boundary area), crossing guard locations, traffic controls, and school access points.
- Meeting to Review Draft Map: Conduct meeting with stakeholders (to be identified by school representatives) to review and solicit comments on draft map.
- Prepare Final Map: Incorporate comments into final map and provide electronic copy for printing/distribution by the school and/or posting on school website.
- Typical cost: Approximately \$5,000 per school

Safe Routes Concept Plan

- Preparation of detailed engineering concept plan for SR2S-related infrastructure improvements. Includes background map, scaled concept drawing, planning-level cost estimate, and project description. These can be valuable to include in grant applications.
- Typical cost: \$2,000 to \$3,000 per plan, depending upon scope of work

Data Collection

- Collection of data to better understand current travel characteristics around schools and support the determination of appropriate SR2S measures or strategies. This could include: counts of vehicle traffic, bicycles and pedestrians; traffic speed surveys using radar; parent surveys to determine typical mode of access to school; and other methods.
- Typical cost: Depends upon scope of work

School Area Traffic Control Plan

- Development of school area traffic control plan, consistent with Chapter 7 of the California Manual on Traffic Control Devices. Includes plan preparation and illustration of existing and proposed school area signage and pavement markings.
- Typical cost: \$3,000 to \$5,000 per plan, depending upon scope of work

TRANSPAC Transportation Partnership and Cooperation

REVISED

2015 MEETING SCHEDULE

Unless otherwise notified, all meetings are held at 9:00 a.m. at Pleasant Hill City Hall,
Community Room, 100 Gregory Lane, Pleasant Hill

TRANSPAC Meetings

Second Thursday of every month or as notified. Other meetings as scheduled.

January 8 (As needed)	July 9
February 12	August 13 (Proposed vacation)
March 12	September 10
April 9	October 8
May 14	November 12
June 11	December 10

TAC Meetings

Fourth Thursday of every month or as notified. NOTE: The November and December TAC meetings are scheduled for alternate dates. Meeting location to be determined.

January 22 (As needed)	July 23
February 26	August 27 (Proposed vacation)
March 26	September 24
April 23	October 22
May 28	November 19 (Alternate date – location TBD)
June 25	December 17 (Alternate date – location TBD)

TRANSPAC Backup Meetings

Held only as needed on the third Thursday of the month.

January 15	July 16
February 19	August 20 (Proposed vacation)
March 19	September 17
April 16	October 15
May 21	November 19
June 18	December 17

TAC Backup Meetings

Held only as needed on the first Thursday of the month.

January 1	July 2
February 5	August 6 (Proposed vacation)
March 5	September 3
April 2	October 1
May 7	November 5
June 4	December 3