

# **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 26, 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 January 22, 2015 TAC Meeting**

**ACTION: Accept January 22, 2015 TAC Minutes and/or as revised/determined.**

**Attachment:** TAC Minutes from January 22, 2015 meeting

- 2. Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance.** CCTA is asking each RTPC to prioritize a list of school-related projects to be funded from funding currently available from CCTA. Central County's allocation amount is \$31,200, however the list does not need to be financially constrained, as CCTA is hopeful that additional funds may become available in upcoming funding cycles.

**ACTION: As determined.**

**Attachments:** Safe Routes to School Technical Assistance requests from 511 Contra Costa Street Smarts (Clayton Valley Elementary School/MDUSD); Concord (Silverwood Elementary); Contra Costa County (Park Mead Elementary/Dorris-Eaton School); Pleasant Hill (Valley View Middle School/College Park High School); and Walnut Creek (Walnut Creek Intermediate/Walnut Heights/Las Lomas High School).

### **3. Adjournment**

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

**MEETING DATE:** January 22, 2015

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; Charlie Mullen, Clayton; Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa; Robert Sarmiento, Contra Costa County; Michael Tanner, BART; Tim Tucker, Martinez

**GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Brad Beck, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA); Leslie Young, Golden Rain Foundation

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

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

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

By consensus, the minutes of the November 20, 2014 TAC meeting were accepted, as submitted.

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

Jeremy Lochirco described the Senior Mini Bus Program in Walnut Creek as a successful program thanks, in part, to the Measure J monies that allowed the program to continue to operate. He reported that this year's request for \$43,000 was partly for staff expenses to manage the program although the majority share was volunteer based through many seniors who worked at the Senior Center. He requested a \$43,000 allocation of Line 20a funds to be able to continue to maintain service levels.

Tim Tucker commented that the City of Martinez was also working to buy its own bus/van and that Martinez seniors were soliciting sponsors, such as Shell Oil, which could be identified on the bus/van.

Mr. Lochirco reported that the City of Walnut Creek had also worked with other agencies, such as Rossmoor, to support the senior mini-bus service.

Leslie Young, Golden Rain Foundation, explained that the Rossmoor bus service coordinated with Walnut Creek's Senior Mini Bus Program to help seniors get to and from their medical appointments, among other assists, which was a valuable service to the seniors.

Ray Kuzbari made a motion that Walnut Creek's request for \$43,000 of Line 20a funds for the Senior Mini Bus Program be forwarded to the TRANSPAC Board for approval. Charlie Mullen seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Lynn Overcashier noted that the TAC had previously discussed the possibility of establishing criteria for a two-year allocation to allow more continuity, which she suggested be placed on a future agenda for discussion, as had previously been discussed by the TAC.

Mr. Lochirco agreed with the need for a more consistent methodology to the call for projects and for the allocation of resources.

Mr. Tucker asked if the CCTA had ever considered a two-year allocation cycle, to which Brad Beck explained that the CCTA produced a one-year budget and then a mid-year budget, every June adopting the next year's fiscal year budget.

- 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.

Brad Beck, Senior Transportation Planner, CCTA, commented that it had become clear from the first public workshop for the 2014 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP), that there was a lot of interest in doing something on I-680. In Walnut Creek, he stated there had been a lot of discussion, and one thing that had come up time and time again was doing something about I-680. The CCTA's on-line tool had also included a number of comments about BART down the I-680 corridor. Given all those comments, the CCTA Board determined to conduct an I-680 High Capacity Transit Study, which would be a follow-up to an earlier study and the I-680 Corridor Systems Management Plan. The new I-680 High Capacity Transit Study would evaluate new and innovative solutions for dealing with congestion and getting people from Walnut Creek to Dublin, and points in between.

Mr. Beck explained that the proposed study was meant to be a smaller study than the one of the same name being done in West County at a cost of \$1 to \$1.2 million, which would be a much more detailed study. The proposed new study was meant to be something that could be started in March 2015 and be completed within eighteen months. He described the scope of work as pretty common, looking at a number of potential options, going through a screening process to see whether those options should be considered in more detail, and then coming up with some recommendations, which could be incorporated into a potential new Expenditure Plan.

Mr. Lochirco saw the item as something that had gotten slipped into the Action Plan and he was surprised at the speed at which it had gone from concept to reality in terms of evaluating and reviewing a proposed scope. He asked if there had been a lot of consultation, noting that TRANSPAC was one segment of the corridor while SWAT was another, and he asked if the Authority had reached out to the community to make sure that something was not being proposed that would ring the alarms since there were some cities in the corridor that would not be as enthusiastic for high capacity transit as others.

Mr. Beck commented that there had been opposition to widening the freeway.

Mr. Lochirco noted he was also under the assumption that there would be no ability to widen the freeway given right of way (ROW) issues, and Mr. Beck agreed that ROW issues would be very expensive.

Mr. Lochirco added that if contemplating BART expansion, there would have to be ROW acquisition for a BART line. He again asked about the outreach.

Mr. Beck stated that the I-680 High Capacity Transit Study was just meant to be a study. There had been a lot of support from elected officials, feedback from the public outreach process, and constituents' concerns for the growing congestion along I-680. He explained that while I-680 had not been on the most congested freeway list, it was now given the increase in the economy.

Mr. Lochirco asked if the study would be a feasibility study, to which Mr. Beck explained that much of the focus would be on alternatives, such as whether there was something less intrusive that could be considered in the way of new technologies. The intent was to attempt to find a different, cheaper technology that was quieter and that would not have an impact on the communities, which had been the problem with the proposals for transit in the corridor, such as light rail down the iron horse trail, and the opposition given the noise that light rail could create in the corridor.

Charlie Mullen asked if there would be an attempt to relieve localized traffic, although Mr. Beck explained that it was more to relieve traffic on I-680 and getting people out of cars and putting them into some other kind of system.

Mr. Beck suggested there were lots of alternatives that could be considered, and the study would focus on the commute since that was where the biggest problem was, too many people trying to use the facility. He explained that with too many cars on the road, there would be spillover onto adjoining facilities, especially on Contra Costa Boulevard, Main Street, and Danville Boulevard. If some alternatives were possible, there would be fewer diversions from the freeway onto local streets, although the technologies that might be used could create their own impacts, such as noise. The study would look at all those impacts. He explained that cost would be a big deal. He added that DKS Associates, which had prepared the earlier study, would do the new study under discussion.

Ray Kuzbari asked about the budget, to which Mr. Beck reported that the CCTA had budgeted \$250,000 to study a big range of alternatives, screen them to a more manageable number, look at the alternatives in more detail, and come up with more recommendations. He stated that the first task would be to review what they knew now and then get stakeholder input and look at alternative ways of doing things, including new ways to get information.

Lynn Overcashier asked if the CCTA would utilize council meetings, especially for those communities that might be most verbal.

In response, Mr. Beck stated that they would look at the task to find new ways of getting input. Proposed Task 3 would be to go through every alternative that was at all potentially feasible including operational improvements, and screen out those that were too expensive or involved too many environmental impacts. Task 4 would do the cost estimates and evaluate those estimates to see which ones might work. The final report would hopefully be a cohesive summary document that would have recommendations or identify the best alternatives.

Mr. Lochirco commented that the end game would have to develop a list of recommendations, although Mr. Beck noted that the study might not have recommendations but would offer advice to the decision makers as to what to do next.

Mr. Lochirco suggested there would have to be significant outreach to the public whether web based or through surveys to be completely transparent. He suggested that many residents might or might not realize what future projections would be and they might not understand that their 40-minute commute could be doubled or more. He wanted to make sure that the public was engaged and would be an active part of the process so that any recommendations could be identified and accepted.

Mr. Beck noted that if the study produced some feasible approach it could get incorporated into the next Expenditure Plan.

Mr. Lochirco suggested that ideally the short-range and long-range options would be clearly identified. He commented that there were other things that were long range that could turn into an East County situation of resources. He wanted to make sure that whatever came out of the study would include short- and long-range options.

Ms. Overcashier stated it would also be important to include an educational component to the public to advise the public of the modeling projections for delays in the future to identify the realistic possibilities for the future.

Mr. Lochirco referenced non-motorized transit such as the iron horse trail, a resource for bicyclists, and suggested that some of the advocacy groups might argue that there be the creation of more facilities for bicyclists. While it would be great to enhance transit, if the problem was transit on I-680 there were other options other than transit to alleviate that future congestion. He realized that the scope was limited to transit but he stated there would be those who would want other options to be considered.

Mr. Beck reported that Bike East Bay had made comments more than once that transit was an important part of the picture for future improvements and emphasis, and that bicycle and pedestrian access to transit was also important. His take was that they would not be opposed to the study but they would think that the CCTA and everyone else consider how they accessed transit.

Mr. Lochirco added that they would also want to make sure that they were accommodated, such as buses or BART trains allowing bicycles throughout the corridor.

Ms. Overcashier referenced the inclusion of bike racks on buses. She asked when the Countywide Bike Plan would be updated, and was advised by Mr. Beck that a technical update of the Plan was in process and would be submitted to the CCTA Board soon.

Ms. Overcashier suggested there may be a time to allow electric vehicles on trails during specific periods of time if there was some assisted means of getting where they needed to go.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that CCTA staff address the TAC's comments and return at the next TAC meeting with a revised draft before forwarding it to the TRANSPAC Board. He did not believe that the Preliminary Draft of the plan was ready to be submitted to the Board at this time.

Mr. Beck stated he could not ensure that would be done. He advised that he would have to discuss that request with Martin Engelmann since there was a desire to get the study started in March.

If the item was forwarded to the TRANSPAC Board, Mr. Lochirco urged that a memo from the TAC accompany the document to ensure that the TAC's comments were considered. He sought reassurance about certain components of the scope and he wanted assurance that the TAC's concerns were on the record.

Ms. Overcashier noted that if the CCTA was coming to the TAC for recommendations or suggestions, that was different from coming up with a study and not wanting the TAC's input.

Mr. Beck emphasized that the CCTA did want the TAC's input. He explained that the CCTA had already gotten comments from SWAT yesterday and there would be another scope. He did not know if there would be time to return given the need to get started so that there would be a factual base to incorporate into the Expenditure Plan. He stated he would definitely forward the TAC's comments to Mr. Engelmann.

The TAC sought assurance that would be done.

**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 assessment of existing study pick-up, drop-off, and pedestrian/bicycling issues.

Mr. Beck explained that as part of the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) project, \$120,000 had been set aside for technical assistance. The TAC was being asked for a list of the technical assistance studies priorities, and there was a certain amount designated for each of the four regions. He reported that TRANSPAC would get \$31,000 for the technical studies, starting with the priorities first until they ran out of money although he suggested there could be another source of money to allow the work to continue. He explained the funds were intended for focused studies, concept plans, traffic control plans around schools, and others. He asked for a short description of the project, the contact, responsible person, school contact person, what was intended to be achieved, and a schedule. He asked for priorities by the end of March to be able to conduct those studies. Fehr & Peers was the consultant contracted to do that work. There was also an ITS Safety Program where similar studies had been done, also free, and there were a number of on-call consultants including Fehr & Peers.

Mr. Kuzbari explained that Lynn Overcashier had done the same studies and he recommended that the CCTA coordinate with Ms. Overcashier for a project list. He suggested others could do the same if they wished.

Mr. Beck expressed his hope to have the little projects/plans done within a year; to get the list, and start scheduling the studies over the next year or so.

Ms. Overcashier stated that could be done. She reported that site visits had already been done and school sites in need of additional technical studies had already been identified. She was happy to coordinate with the TAC, develop a list, and discuss the possibilities at the next TAC meeting. She asked TAC members if they knew of other access issues in their areas, which should also be identified, discussed, and considered. She would be happy to see if that could be done through 21a funding or through the Street Smarts program.

Mr. Lochirco asked about the end game, potentially a list of improvements, although Mr. Beck explained that the assistance would be for the TAC, and how the projects were funded would be another issue. He stated there was another \$483,000, although that would get into the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) issue, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) had come up with a new approach. Since Congress had not dealt with the transportation funding issue, MTC had added another year to the OBAG grant as well as to some other operational programs. He wasn't sure how MTC wanted to deal with that and it would still have to be worked out with MTC.

Mr. Beck added that while not a lot of money, what was available could do some good things and perhaps some of the projects identified could be funded in that some of the things, such as a Traffic Control Plan, signage, or other operational plans may not cost that much to implement.

Ms. Overcashier reported that much of that work had already been done in that 511 Contra Costa had done 60 schools in two years.

Mr. Lochirco asked if there was anything that could be prepared for a walking audit that could help align the County to put the TAC in a better position to compete for regional or State SR2S funds. He suggested the region had been shortchanged and he wondered if something else could be done.

Mr. Beck suggested that data collection might be helpful in how things would be addressed later. The data collection could feed into a grant with that information incorporated into a grant. While the funds could not be used to prepare a grant, it could be used for information to make it look better.

## **5. 2015 TRANSPAC Meeting Schedule**

The 2015 TRANSPAC meeting schedule was presented.

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:48 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 otherwise determined.

	A	B
1	<b>TRANSPAC SR2S TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WISH LIST</b>	
2	For discussion and prioritization at February 26 TAC mtg.	
3	<b>CITY</b>	Concord
4		
5	<b>CITY STAFF CONTACT INFO (name, phone/email)</b>	Lynn Overcashier
6		
7	<b>NAME OF SCHOOL</b>	Clayton Valley Elementary School/MDUSD
8		
9	<b>SCHOOL CONTACT INFO (IF NEEDED)</b>	N/A
10		
11	<b>CROSS STREETS OR LOCATION OF PROJECT</b>	4255 Clayton Rd., near Treat Blvd.
12		
13	<b>BRIEF DESCRIPTION (2 PARAGRAPHS) OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTED AND DESIRED OUTCOME</b>	The 511 Contra Costa Street Smarts program worked with City staff, school district and the school to install drop off/bicycle/pedestrian access improvements in 2014. It would be helpful to have a walking audit/traffic study to determine how the improvements are functioning and if any additional improvements should be considered.
14		
15	<b>DESIRED SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETION OF TECH. ASST. AND EXPLANATION OF SCHEDULE CONSTRAINTS (IF ANY)</b>	spring 2015
16		
17	<b>ESTIMATED COST OF TECH. ASST.</b>	~\$3,000-\$5,000



	A	B
1	<b>TRANSPAC SR2S TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WISH LIST</b>	
2	For discussion and prioritization at February 26 TAC mtg.	
3	<b>CITY</b>	<b>Concord</b>
4		
5	<b>CITY STAFF CONTACT INFO (name, phone/email)</b>	<b>Ray Kuzbari (925) 671-3129 ray.kuzbari@cityofconcord.org</b>
6		
7	<b>NAME OF SCHOOL</b>	<b>Silverwood Elementary</b>
8		<b>1649 Claycord Ave , Concord, CA 94521</b>
9	<b>SCHOOL CONTACT INFO (IF NEEDED)</b>	<b>(925) 687-1150</b>
10		
11	<b>CROSS STREETS OR LOCATION OF PROJECT</b>	<b>Claycord Avenue between Thiessen Court and west of Cherokee Drive</b>
12		
13	<b>BRIEF DESCRIPTION (2 PARAGRAPHS) OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTED AND DESIRED OUTCOME</b>	<b>Conduct a walking audit along the route to Silverwood Elementary School on the west side of Claycord Avenue where a sidewalk is missing. Conduct field observations of school children as they walk to the school from Clayton Road, collect pedestrian volumes and provide recommendations to improve children/pedestrian safety in this area.</b>
14		
15	<b>DESIRED SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETION OF TECH. ASST. AND EXPLANATION OF SCHEDULE CONSTRAINTS (IF ANY)</b>	<b>School Year 2014-15 or 2015-16 would be fine</b>
16		
17	<b>ESTIMATED COST OF TECH. ASST.</b>	<b>This may be determined by consultant, but an estimate might be helpful. \$3,500 to \$5,000</b>

	A	B
1	<b>TRANSPAC SR2S TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WISH LIST</b>	
2	For discussion and prioritization at February 26 TAC mtg.	
3	<b>CITY</b>	<b>Contra Costa County (Seranap)</b>
4		
5	<b>CITY STAFF CONTACT INFO (name, phone/email)</b>	<b>John Cunningham</b>
6		
7	<b>NAME OF SCHOOL</b>	<b>Park Mead Elementary/Dorris -Eaton school</b>
8		
9	<b>SCHOOL CONTACT INFO (IF NEEDED)</b>	<b>N/A</b>
10		
11	<b>CROSS STREETS OR LOCATION OF PROJECT</b>	<b>Olympic Blvd., Boulevard Way/ Newell Ave./I-680 offramp</b>
12		
13	<b>BRIEF DESCRIPTION (2 PARAGRAPHS) OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTED AND DESIRED OUTCOME</b>	<b>A site assessment is needed to provide for a permanent walking/bicycle path from Bonita Court to Olympic Blvd., at the base of the southbound offramp of I-680. There is much need for a safe access to get from this neighborhood to the schools, as there are no sidewalks along Boulevard Way. There is much neighborhood support and the County is interested in proceeding with improvements and has some funds for capital improvements.</b>
14		
15	<b>DESIRED SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETION OF TECH. ASST. AND EXPLANATION OF SCHEDULE CONSTRAINTS (IF ANY)</b>	<b>spring/summer 2015</b>
16		
17	<b>ESTIMATED COST OF TECH. ASST.</b>	<b>unknown</b>

	A	B
1	<b><u>TRANSPAC SR2S TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WISH LIST</u></b>	
2	For discussion and prioritization at February 26 TAC mtg.	
3	<b>CITY</b>	<b>Pleasant Hill</b>
4		
5	<b>CITY STAFF CONTACT INFO (name, phone/email)</b>	<b>Eric Hu, (925) 671-5203, ehu@pleasanthillca.org</b>
6		
7	<b>NAME OF SCHOOL</b>	<b>Valley View Middle School (181 Viking Drive, Pleasant Hill, CA 94523)</b>
8		<b>College Park High School (201 Viking Drive, Pleasant Hill, CA 94523)</b>
9	<b>SCHOOL CONTACT INFO (IF NEEDED)</b>	<b>Valley View Middle School (925) 686-6136, College Park High School (925) 682-7670</b>
10		
11	<b>CROSS STREETS OR LOCATION OF PROJECT</b>	<b>Viking Drive (between Ruth Drive and Stubbs Road)</b>
12		
13	<b>BRIEF DESCRIPTION (2 PARAGRAPHS) OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTED AND DESIRED OUTCOME</b>	<b>Conduct walking/bicycling audit along the south side of Viking Drive near Valley View Middle School and College Park High School. Collect traffic counts as needed (both vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian counts) and develop a traffic control plan for the two schools. The two schools are adjacent to each other, with Diablo Valley College campus across the street. Viking Drive is a 2-lane residential roadway and does not have the capacity to accommodate the traffic volume from the three schools during the morning and afternoon peak periods. Study area should also include the YMCA/City Corporation Yard parking area off of Civic Drive (back of the school property), where some students are being dropped off or picked up.</b>
14		
15	<b>DESIRED SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETION OF TECH. ASST. AND EXPLANATION OF SCHEDULE CONSTRAINTS (IF ANY)</b>	<b>2014/2015 or 2015/2016 school year.</b>
16		
17	<b>ESTIMATED COST OF TECH. ASST.</b>	<b>\$5,000 to \$10,000, or as defined by the consultant.</b>

	A	B
1	<b>TRANSPAC SR2S TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WISH LIST</b>	
2		For discussion and prioritization at February 26 TAC mtg.
3	<b>CITY</b>	Walnut Creek
4		
5	<b>CITY STAFF CONTACT INFO (name, phone/email)</b>	Rafat Raie, City Traffic Engineer, (925) 943-5843/raie@walnut-creek.org
6		
7	<b>NAME OF SCHOOL</b>	Walnut Creek Intermediate, Walnut Heights, Las Lomas High School
8		
9	<b>SCHOOL CONTACT INFO (IF NEEDED)</b>	
10		
11	<b>CROSS STREETS OR LOCATION OF PROJECT</b>	Walnut Boulevard Between Sierra and Homestead
12		
13	<b>BRIEF DESCRIPTION (2 PARAGRAPHS) OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTED AND DESIRED OUTCOME</b>	Technical assistance to evaluate the feasibility of converting Walnut Boulevard to a one-way street. The analysis could be divided to three separate steps:
14		1. Collect vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle traffic counts including turning movement counts on Walnut Boulevard, Walker Avenue, Homestead Avenue and Sierra Drive. The data will be used to evaluate the conversion of part or the whole section to one-way with the goal of using the existing street wide for a multi-modal ped and bicycle facility.
15		2. Develop one-way Scenarios and develop initial sketch of how the existing pavement width may serve vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic
16		3. conduct and present initial findings to internal and external stakeholders, develop recommendations and document findings.
17	<b>DESIRED SCHEDULE FOR COMPLETION OF TECH. ASST. AND EXPLANATION OF SCHEDULE CONSTRAINTS (IF ANY)</b>	Step 1- Must be completed before the end of this School year (May 2015) Step 2- Must be done before Sept. 2015 Step 3- Preferred to be done before the end of the year (Dec 2015).
18		
19	<b>ESTIMATED COST OF TECH. ASST.</b>	Step One estimate is \$5,000. Step Two estimate \$10,000. Step Three 10,000. The total of this request is \$25,000