

# **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, JUNE 25, 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**

***Meeting will be hosted by the City of Pleasant Hill***

**1. Review/Revise Accept/Minutes of the Special June 4, 2015 TAC Meeting**

Attachment: Minutes of the Special TAC meeting on June 4, 2015.

- 2. 2017 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Call for Projects:** At its special meeting on June 4, 2015, the TAC had considered the RTP and the need to develop a 24-year financially-constrained project list for submittal to MTC no later than July 24, 2015. The TAC is expected to refine a project list at this meeting for submittal to the TRANSPAC Board for approval at its meeting on July 9, 2015. Information to be provided by CCTA Staff and/or TAC members at the meeting. (*Hisham Noeimi - CCTA Staff*)

Attachment: None

- 3. Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) Development.** At its special meeting on June 4, 2015, the TAC had also considered the TEP and the need to submit candidate projects and programs for consideration in the development of a draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) by July 24, 2015. The TAC is expected to refine a project list at this meeting for submittal to the TRANSPAC Board for approval at its meeting on July 9, 2015. The list will be compiled at the meeting. (*Hisham Noeimi - CCTA Staff*)

Attachment: None

- 4. 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP):** The CCTA has released the Call for Projects for the 2016 STIP on May 20, 2015. Applications are due on July 17, 2015. Between \$10 million and \$20 million is expected to be available for capital projects in FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21.

Project sponsors are requested to seek concurrence from their respective Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) as part of the application process. The City of Concord has proposed that CCTA submit a STIP application for SR4 Operational Improvements in the amount of \$5 million for design. (*Hisham Noeimi - CCTA Staff*)

Attachment: None

5. **Update on the Status of the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Technical Assistance Program.** On March 12, 2015, the TRANSPAC Board approved a list of school-related projects that had been recommended by the TRANSPAC TAC, and forwarded the list to the CCTA for funding. An update on the status of the Technical Assistance Program to local jurisdictions is being conducted by Fehr & Peers as part of the Contra Costa SR2S Program. (*Continued from the Special TAC Meeting on June 4, 2015*).

Attachment: Status Update Memo from Martin Engelmann, CCTA.

6. **Continuing Discussion of the Budget and the Maintenance of the Pacheco Transit Hub** (*Continued from the Special TAC Meeting on June 4, 2015*).

Attachment: Year to Date TRANSPAC Budget Totals

7. **The next meeting, to be hosted by The City of Martinez, is scheduled for July 23, 2015 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined.**

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

**MEETING DATE:** June 4, 2015

**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

**GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Brian Cory, Concord Resident; Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA); Michael Tanner, BART

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

The special meeting, hosted by John Cunningham, Contra Costa County, convened at 1:04 P.M.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Brian Cory, 2039 Bonifacio Street, Concord, stated that he had been involved for a short period of time with Bike Concord, was an advocate for bike/pedestrian projects to improve bike programs and facilities, and questioned whether the general public was aware of the bike/ped efforts of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA), and TRANSPAC. He found very few projects in the City of Concord, the largest city in Contra Costa County, which was a concern, particularly since it was his understanding that approximately 15 percent of \$2.2 billion was to have been made available for bike/ped projects. He suggested that many of the bike/ped projects did not fit the bike/ped community's needs, and Bike Concord wanted to make sure that the 15 percent proposed to be used for bike/ped improvements would move forward. He asked that the information be made available so that there was more of a civic understanding of the local bike/ped projects.

John Cunningham advised that Mr. Cory's comments would be passed along to the TRANSPAC Board. He described how the projects were listed by jurisdiction and explained that the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee would be the appropriate forum for Mr. Cory to express his concerns.

Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, CCTA, spoke to the effort underway to place a ballot measure in 2016 for Contra Costa County, and affirmed that Mr. Cory's interest in special programs for bike/ped would likely start at 15 percent of the revenue generated by that measure.

Mr. Cory was thanked for his participation.

### **1. Review/Revise/Accept Minutes of the April 23, 2015 TAC Meeting**

The minutes were accepted, as submitted.

2. **2017 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Call for Projects.** The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) has released the Call for Projects for the 2017 RTP on April 29, 2015. CCTA staff will begin working with the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) and Transit Operators to develop a 24-year financially-constrained project list for submittal to MTC. RTPCs input is requested by July 24, 2015.

Hisham Noeimi explained that the RTP, a long-term planning document for the Bay Area, was updated every four years. The important part of the financially constrained document was that the cost of all projects could not exceed the amount of funding estimated over the life of the RTP from existing sources, which meant that every county had a target that could not be exceeded. The 2017 RTP would cover the period from 2017 to 2040. Capacity increasing projects not listed individually in the RTP would not be eligible to compete for state and federal funding sources like the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). He emphasized that the projects that needed to be listed individually in the RTP would all be capacity increasing projects that affected the transportation system or air quality, and that routine projects such as pavement rehabilitation, bike/ped, gap closure projects, and intersection operation improvements (if the improvements were localized) did not need to be listed. He added that there will be general categories for local streets and roads, Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC), paratransit, and bike/ped projects.

Mr. Noeimi stated while the total of the RTP was not available at this time, it was expected to be the same as the last RTP. For TRANSPAC, the amount of funding available had been estimated to be \$628 million in escalated dollars. He described the three lists provided which included a *Committed List of Projects*, a *Financially Constrained List of Projects*, and a *Vision List of Projects*.

Mr. Noeimi reported that the Committed List represented projects fully funded with a mix of federal/state and/or sources and expected to have environmental clearance by September 2015, or anticipated to be fully funded, with local funds even without environmental approval. Those projects could go on the Committed List and there was no limit on the number of projects. The advantage of being on the Committed List was that those projects would not require a performance evaluation. The Financially Constrained List represented the top priority of the subregion that needed to be in the RTP that were in need of funding. He explained that TRANSPAC's role was to make sure that the sum of the funding requested in escalated dollars did not exceed \$628 million. Anything that did not fit into the \$628 million would go on the Vision List, and while not included in the RTP, those projects would be evaluated by MTC and could qualify for new fund sources such as a new sales tax measure or bridge toll increases.

Mr. Noeimi stated that since the last RTP update, some projects had been completed, some had been abandoned, and some had cost increases. The RTPCs were being asked to fill in the blank spaces to update those projects. To the extent projects could be deleted from the Financially Constrained List, that would create the capacity to move projects from the Vision List. He advised that he would send the latest version of the lists after the meeting and urged the members to complete the information related to the projects whether completed, abandoned, with cost increases, or other modifications important to identify.

- Deidre Heitman reported that Item 12b on the Committed List; the BART crossover at Pleasant Hill Station, had been completed.
- Ray Kuzbari stated that Item 8 on the Committed List; Waterworld Parkway, had been dropped off, and the freeway projects attributed to Concord should be identified as CCTA projects.

In response to questions, Mr. Noeimi explained that once the Committed List had been updated, detailed information about each project would have to be provided so that MTC could model it; and projects on the Financially Constrained List would be those with clear scopes and costs. Costs for all projects should be provided in 2014 dollars and 2017. He suggested an escalation using 2.2 percent per year and offered an example of how to account for escalated expenditures.

On the discussion, Mr. Noeimi characterized the Vision List as backup projects. He suggested to the TAC to give more priority to capacity projects that may proceed between now and the next RTP update in 2021 to be included in the Financially Constrained List.

As to the cost of Phases 1 through 5 of the I-680/SR4 project which would exceed the available funding, Mr. Noeimi stated that would not likely be fully funded without a new tax measure. If the TAC felt that later phases of the I-680/SR4 project are not a high priority, they could be moved onto the Vision List.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that only Phase 3 of the I-680/SR4 project was realistic while the others were not, which Ms. Heitman stated should be reflected.

Mr. Noeimi emphasized that the list was required by July 24, 2015, and commented that MTC could decide to devote more money to the projects.

Mr. Kuzbari urged being serious about the list that should include realistic projects that could be funded through the STIP, those likely to be completed within the next five years. Other than that, he did not think the list reflected reality.

Mr. Cunningham verified that comments were needed by June 18 to be included in the packet for the next meeting of the TAC on June 25. He clarified that Mr. Noeimi would do the accounting and return the lists to the TAC at that meeting, which would then be discussed for recommendation to the TRANSPAC Board for its meeting scheduled for July 9, 2015.

Mr. Kuzbari emphasized that the TAC needed help from the CCTA in determining how soon some of the projects would be constructed given that some were 20 years in the future, and suggested that a CCTA update of the freeway projects was required to be able to coordinate the priorities to identify the reserve capacity available on the reserved list.

Mr. Noeimi emphasized that information from the TACs was important to fill in the blanks on the projects so that decisions could be made.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that what would help update the list and potentially add new local projects would be to clean up the input for freeway projects and then give the list to the jurisdictions, which would take it from there.

Mr. Cunningham clarified with Mr. Noeimi that the TAC had the discretion to move out Phases 4 and 5 of the I-680/SR4 project to the Vision List. On the continued request for information from the CCTA related to the freeway projects, he emphasized that as the project sponsor, the CCTA would have the information on the details of the projects and the timing involved.

Mr. Noeimi sought cooperation and input when needed from the TAC and stated he would be happy to provide that information on behalf of TRANSPAC. On the discussion, he clarified that updates included not just cost but timeline as well. He stated he would provide the updated spreadsheet and urged TAC members to come prepared at the next meeting with a list of projects and costs to allow a discussion. He reiterated that projects could be added to the Vision List with no limitation although every project needed to be added to the MTC database and would require scope and cost. He also clarified, when asked, that the Financially Constrained List had a higher priority than the projects on the Vision List.

Jeremy Lochirco commented that the RTP project list was different from the Comprehensive Transportation Project Listing (CTPL) and suggested it would also be important to update the CTPL.

Mr. Noeimi stated he would send the updated spreadsheet by June 9, and would need input from the TAC by June 19 to allow a discussion at the TAC meeting on June 25. He reiterated the need for TAC members to fill in the gaps in the Excel sheets for the Committed, Financially Constrained, and Vision Lists.

Mr. Cunningham thanked Mr. Noeimi for the assistance.

Eric Hu commented that most of the projects on the Financially Constrained List were the freeway projects and others that would qualify for the STIP.

Mr. Noeimi stated that when going for environmental clearance and the scope changed, the limits would be changed, and the project would be jeopardized. He suggested that streetscape improvements could be added if members felt the description was not descriptive enough.

**3. Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) Development.** The CCTA is considering placing a new transportation sales tax measure on the ballot as early as November 2016. The RTPCs are requested to submit candidate projects and programs for consideration in the development of a draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) by July 24, 2015.

Mr. Noeimi stated that the CCTA was considering a new sales tax measure for the 2016 Ballot and initially the discussion had been for a half cent for 25 years, starting on April 1, 2017 through March 31, 2042. If passed, there would be a period of overlap with a one cent sales tax until the expiration of Measure J in 2034. The new sales tax is estimated to generate \$2.3 billion in constant dollars. TRANSPAC share would be \$686 million in constant dollars.

CCTA issued the Call for Projects and was seeking input from the four RTPCs on what to include in the Expenditure Plan. Input from the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) is also being sought. TAC input was requested by July 24 to have something for the CCTA Board to consider in September 2015, along with input from other advisory committees.

Mr. Noeimi offered polling results from March 2014 to identify the projects and programs that had resonated with Contra Costa Voters, and information about the existing Measure J and the status of funding. He explained that TRANSPAC had a huge funding shortfall on the mega projects such as I-680/SR4. He sought input from the TAC by July 24, 2015 and explained that the TEP was being aligned with the RTP so that the two processes could benefit from each other.

When asked, Mr. Noeimi clarified two more pollings were expected, with one before the Authority decided to place on the ballot around May 2016.

It was clarified that the TEP proposed projects needed to be discussed at the TAC meeting on June 25. Members would mail the project information to Anita Tucci-Smith ([tuccismith@sbcglobal.net](mailto:tuccismith@sbcglobal.net)) no later than noon on June 18 to be compiled in a list of projects for distribution.

Mr. Noeimi verified that TEP projects needed to be on any of the three lists, especially capacity increasing projects so that MTC could evaluate them. Because the RTP would not be adopted until 2017, it would be known prior to that time if the measure passed. He added it was also okay if the projects were on the Vision List, although if the measure passed, the projects would then be moved onto the Financially Constrained List. He suggested that by deciding the programs first they could figure out how much money would remain for specific projects.

Mr. Hu commented that if the measure passed, between 2017 and 2034 the two measures would overlap and hypothetically there would be double funding overlap for programs over those years.

Mr. Kuzbari recommended a discussion of the programs at the June 25 meeting and volunteered to craft a proposal and suggested it should be coordinated with the project list as well.

Mr. Lochirco expressed concern with the process, the fact that the TAC would have to develop 30 years of high profile projects in a week, particularly since there had been no opportunity for a dialogue with constituents or elected officials to identify high level projects to be able to make a decision. He asked where the other studies fell into the mix. He emphasized that the existing Measure J Expenditure Plan had involved a lot of input which had produced very broad pots of money.

Mr. Noeimi clarified that the same was expected in this case.

Mr. Lochirco asked if the allocation percentage needed to be changed for all of those pots or if the wording needed to be changed to identify what was included in addition to the big marquee projects. Since all the projects that had been discussed could not all be funded, he wanted to make sure that the communications were clear but he remained concerned with such a short timeframe to identify future projects.

Mr. Noeimi concurred and sought a flexible description of projects so that over the next 25 years the money could be used for major street improvements, for example, and the type of improvements desired without specifically identifying the projects since they would likely change. Members could identify the amount to be dedicated to a specific project given the priority, and projects did not have to be fully funded with Measure J, although funds were needed as seed money to be able to seek other sources.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that Complete Streets projects could be discussed at the June 25 TAC meeting potentially for the TEP without worry about the RTP because it was on the Committed List, and capacity increasing projects could be on the TEP or one of the three lists.

Rather than get into specifics, Mr. Lochirco proposed a dedicated line item for improvements to Routes of Regional Significance, allowing the ability to tap into those various areas of improvements. He recommended the use of the existing Measure J Expansion Plan to determine whether or not the funding was currently deficient, although he stated there had been a change in ideology since Measure J had passed which should also be considered. He sought a template to work from.

Mr. Noeimi emphasized the need for broad descriptions, such as “examples include,” and noted that the polling would identify the type of descriptions that could be used.

For the new measure, Mr. Kuzbari suggested the more information provided the more it would help TRANSPAC make financial decisions between projects and programs.

As to when the outreach would be scheduled, Mr. Noeimi stated it was being done in different ways. There would be an on-line tool at the end of July through September seeking input online from the public; there would be workshops which would probably happen between January and April 2016, which would be done with the cities, the elected and the Board of Supervisors; and nothing would be final until May 2016. Between now and then, the RTPCs would receive updates and RTPCs would offer their proposals and identify what EPAC was recommending and what the Board decided to do. He clarified that the RTP deadline had been set. Before placement on the ballot, a support resolution from each city would have to be secured between May and June 2016.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested using Measure J as a template and noted that could be discussed at the June 25 meeting.

On the discussion of the details that should be listed, Mr. Noeimi explained that in the RTP Call for Projects there was an attachment from MTC of what needed to be listed separately.

- 4. 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).** The CCTA has released the Call for Projects for the 2016 STIP on May 20, 2015. Applications are due on July 17, 2015. Between \$10 million and \$20 million is expected to be available for capital projects in FY 2019-20 and FY 2020-21. Project sponsors are requested to seek concurrence from their respective RTPCs as part of the application process.



Mr. Noeimi reported that the Call for Projects for the 2016 STIP had been released and applications were due by July 17, 2015, which would require sponsors to get concurrence from the RTPC which would allow the RTPC to show support for some projects or deny others. The STIP can be used to fund only capital projects with completed Project Study Report (PSR) or equivalent, meaning scope and cost. Funds would become available in FY 2020 and 2021. Projects must be at least \$1 million or more to apply. He commented that the chances for funding were higher now than in future cycles.

Mr. Kuzbari sought some type of coordination between the RTPCs and the CCTA and asked if there would be information available at the June 25 meeting.

Mr. Noeimi asked the TAC to let him know by June 25 if they plan to apply. He indicated that CCTA is considering applying for design money for the SR 242/Clayton Road project or Highway 4 operational improvements, or construction money for the I-680 Northbound Carpool Lane Extension to SR 242.

Ms. Heitman reported that BART was at the 35 percent design stage for a station modernization at Concord BART, which would expand the station and bring the elevator inside the area and other improvements, amount yet to be determined. She added that BART had some Prop1B funds to dedicate to the project.

As to whether there were local projects that could be considered, Mr. Lochirco stated that Walnut Creek had nothing and would defer to the next cycle, and Mr. Hu commented that Pleasant Hill had applied for STIP funding the last two or three cycles but had always come in below the cutoff.

It was reported that Laramie Bowron, Eric Hu, and Michael Tanner had all volunteered for the STIP Subcommittee.

- 5. Update on the Status of the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Technical Assistance Program.** The CCTA had asked each RTPC to prioritize a list of school-related projects. At its meeting on February 26, 2015, the TAC considered the requests that had been submitted and recommended that each jurisdiction be allocated \$7,800 of TRANSPAC'S total identified \$31,200.

The TRANSPAC Board on March 12, 2015 approved the TAC's recommendation and forwarded the list to the CCTA for funding. An update on the status of the Technical Assistance Program to local jurisdictions is being conducted by Fehr & Peers as part of the Contra Costa SR2S Program.

- 6. Continued Discussion of Budget and Pacheco Transit Hub Maintenance**

Both Items 5 and 6 were continued to the next meeting on June 25, 2015.

- 7. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 P.M. The next meeting of the TAC is scheduled for June 25, 2015 at 9:00 A.M. in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room unless otherwise determined.



## MEMORANDUM

---

**Date** May 19, 2015

**To** SR2S Oversight Committee and Task Force

**From** Martin Engelmann, Deputy Executive Director, Planning *ME*

**RE** Countywide SR2S Technical Assistance Program: Status Update

---

Over the past two years, the Authority has been working to assess Safe Routes to School (SR2S) needs in Contra Costa. Work products from this effort include a SR2S Resource Guide (available on the CCTA website) and a Safe Routes to School Needs Assessment Report.

The final element of the SR2S effort is direct technical support to local jurisdictions in Contra Costa to help them identify barriers to walking and bicycling and to plan for specific SR2S improvements at individual school sites. The total budget for the technical assistance is \$120,000, which was allocated to the RTPCs based on school enrollment.

In January 2015, the Authority requested that each RTPC submit a prioritized list of SR2S technical assistance needs. In total, the RTPCs submitted 17 requests from 14 jurisdictions. These requests fit within the available budget. All 17 projects are currently underway, with site visits and data collection occurring throughout April and May. Table 1 lists the projects and describes the scope of work for each.

If you have any questions, please contact me at [mre@ccta.net](mailto:mre@ccta.net) or 925-256-4729, or the SR2S Project Manager at Fehr & Peers, Julie Morgan, at [J.Morgan@fehrandpeers.com](mailto:J.Morgan@fehrandpeers.com) or (925) 930-7100.

**TABLE 1: SR2S TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECTS**

Planning Area	Jurisdiction	School Name	Scope of Work	Site Visit and Data Collection
WCCTAC	El Cerrito	Korematsu Middle School	Preparation of traffic control plan and walk and roll to school map.	May 20
WCCTAC	San Pablo	Downer Elementary School	SR2S concept plan and a walk and roll to school map.	May 19
WCCTAC	Contra Costa County	John Swett High School, Willow High School, and Carquinez Middle School	Field observations and counts to determine pedestrian circulation patterns during bell times. Recommendations for enhanced crosswalk treatments at four locations.	May 11 and 28
TRANSPLAN	Pittsburg	Marina Vista Elementary School	Safe routes to school concept plan.	April 23
TRANSPLAN	Pittsburg	Pittsburg High School	Field observations and traffic counts to look at auto/pedestrian conflicts. Recommendations for operational improvements to enhance pedestrian safety.	April 23 and May 5
TRANSPLAN	Antioch	Marsh Elementary School	SR2S concept plan and cost estimate.	April 17
TRANSPLAN	Oakley	Orchard Park School	SR2S concept plan and cost estimate.	May 5
TRANSPLAN	Oakley	O'Hara Park School	SR2S concept plan and cost estimate.	May 5
TRANSPLAN	Oakley	Vintage Parkway School	SR2S concept plan and cost estimate.	May 5



TRANSPLAN	Brentwood	Heritage High School and Adams Middle School	Field observations and counts; recommendations for operational improvements.	April 30 and May 14
TRANSPAC	Concord	Silverwood Elementary School	Field observations of pedestrian activity and volumes, assessment of missing sidewalk facilities along Claycord Avenue, and recommendations for safety improvements.	May 18
TRANSPAC	County (Saranap)	Park Mead Elementary School/Dorris-Eaton School	Field observations of pedestrian and bicycle activity and recommendations for safety improvements.	May 12
TRANSPAC	Pleasant Hill	Valley View Middle School, College Park High School	Field observations of vehicle circulation, drop-off/pick-up activity, and pedestrian and bicycle activity along Viking Drive. Prepare Traffic Control Plan.	April 30 and May 7
TRANSPAC	Walnut Creek	Walnut Creek Intermediate School, Walnut Heights Elementary School, and Las Lomas High School	Data collection of vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle counts and vehicle speed surveys along Walnut Boulevard.	May 7
SWAT	Moraga	Campolindo High School	Field observations and traffic counts; signal warrant assessment; conceptual design plans.	May 14
SWAT	Danville	San Ramon Valley High School	Field observations of pedestrian crossing; prepare scaled concept plan.	April 29
SWAT	Lafayette	Stanley Middle School	Field observations of school bus stop on Reliez Valley Road; prepare scaled concept plan.	April 21 and 30

FUND #: 85 Name: TRANSPAC Percent of Year Remaining: 17%

Revenue Description		Actual Current Month Apr 2015	Year to Period Actual Jul14-Apr15	<*> Annual Encumbrance	Annual Actual+Encum.	Budget Total Year	Remaining Budget	Rem%
3510	INTEREST REV	102.98	154.53	0.00	154.53	0.00	-154.53	-999
4570	CONTRIB FROM OTHER AGENI	0.00	190443.00	0.00	190443.00	190440.00	-3.00	
Total Revenue ----->		102.98	190597.53	0.00	190597.53	190440.00	-157.53	
Expense Description		Actual Current Month Apr 2015	Year to Period Actual Jul14-Apr15	<*> Annual Encumbrance	Annual Actual+Encum.	Budget Total Year	Remaining Budget	Rem%
7085	0100 TRANSPAC SALS-PERMANENT	-32501.26	38604.07	0.00	38604.07	56572.00	17967.93	32
7085	1198 TRANSPAC CONSULTANT/OTHR	44191.66	70039.37	22114.41	92153.78	127112.00	34958.22	28
7085	2500 TRANSPAC PHOTO/PRINTING	0.00	41.60	0.00	41.60	200.00	158.40	79
7085	2604 TRANSPAC AUTO MILEAGE	0.00	176.96	0.00	176.96	1200.00	1023.04	85
7085	4200 TRANSPAC SUPLS/OPERATING	0.00	107.75	0.00	107.75	2500.00	2392.25	96
7085	6800 TRANSPAC ADMIN OVERHEAD	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2856.00	2856.00	100
Total Expense ----->		11690.40	108969.75	22114.41	131084.16	190440.00	59355.84	31
FUND TOTAL		-11587.42	81627.78	-22114.41	59513.37	0.00	-59513.37	-999