

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, NOVEMBER 19, 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 to be hosted by the City of Martinez

1. Review/Revise Accept/Minutes of the September 24, 2015 TAC Meeting

Attachment: TAC minutes from September 24, 2015 meeting.

- 2. 2015 Measure J Strategic Plan:** At its May 2015 meeting, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) initiated the update to the 2013 Strategic Plan. Authority staff will provide an update and seek concurrence on proposed fund programming changes to be done as part of the 2015 Strategic Plan. (*Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, CCTA*)

ACTION: Consider proposed fund programming changes as part of the 2015 Strategic Plan.

Attachment: Letter dated October 15, 2015 from Randell H. Iwasaki, CCTA Executive Director, regarding the 2015 Measure J Strategic Plan.

- 3. Update and Review of the Initial Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP).**
(*Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, CCTA*)

Attachment: If any, to be distributed at the meeting.

4. 2016 TRANSPAC and TAC Meeting Schedule.

5. Announcement from Lynn Overcashier, Program Manager, 511 Contra Costa.

- 6. The next meeting, to be hosted by **The City of Walnut Creek**, is scheduled for December 17, 2015 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined.**

TRANSPAC Technical Advisory Commission (TAC) Meeting Summary Minutes

MEETING DATE: September 24, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Corinne Dutra-Roberts, 511 Contra Costa; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; Anne Muzzini, County Connection; Lynn Overcashier, 511 Contra Costa

GUESTS/PRESENTERS: Eddie Barrios, Fehr & Peers; Tim Lee, WMH, Consultant; Susan Miller, Director, Projects, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA)

MINUTES PREPARED BY: Anita Tucci-Smith

The meeting, hosted by Eric Hu, City of Pleasant Hill, convened at 9:02 A.M.

PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Review/Revise/Accept Minutes of the June 25, 2015 TAC Meeting

The minutes were accepted, as submitted.

2. Update on the I-680/SR-4 Phase 3 Project. Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) staff will provide an update on the status of the I-680/SR-4 Phase 3 Project.

Susan Miller, CCTA Director of Projects, introduced Tim Lee, WMH, Project Manager, and Eddie Barrios, Fehr & Peers, for the presentation of the update on the I-680/SR-4 Phase 3 Interchange Project. She noted that there were five phases to the project, environmental clearance had been attained some time ago, and because freeway-to-freeway connectors were being added similar to the I-580 Flyover Connector, it was an expensive project. As a result, the intent was to start with Phase 3 of the five phases; the plan was currently at 65 percent design; and funding would be through Measures C and J, and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds.

Ms. Miller explained that there had been a number of challenges with the project. Given the congestion through the interchange in general and the corridor in particular, the AM/PM peak continued to worsen with increased traffic and the benefits of the Phase 3 project would allow some relief through the interchange area. One of the primary challenges with the project was the Grayson Creek Bridge in that with the details of design, it had been found that the existing structure was in extremely bad condition and did not meet 100-year flood requirements. As such, Caltrans and the Army Corps of Engineers would not allow it to be widened and the entire structure would now have to be fully replaced. Given that as the case, it would have to be wide enough to accommodate future phases of the project, at great cost, and the current funding was not sufficient to complete Phase 3.

Tim Lee, WMH, explained that the project limits were just east of Glacier Drive on SR-4 to just east of SR-242, a little over four miles. He referred to the handouts provided to the TAC and noted that the west end of the project in the eastbound direction, east of Glacier Drive, was a lane drop. The project would do all the widening in the median of the freeway although there was some outside widening. When done, the lane drop would continue on and would be a general purpose lane for through traffic and would effectively act as an auxiliary lane to help with weaving traffic movements. The old cloverleaf style of interchange would eventually be changed to a flyover. The third lane would allow for weaving movements to occur. The extra lane would be used for traffic to get on and off Pacheco Boulevard and I-680. Moving to the east of I-680, the entire freeway would be raised which would be a challenge. The north I-680 lane would merge to those three lanes. East of Grayson Creek, there would be a fourth lane, a carpool lane that would continue east and connect to an existing carpool lane at SR-242.

Mr. Lee noted that the general purpose lane, which was acting as an auxiliary lane, was then dropped at the Solano Way off-ramp and the HOV lane would continue through the SR-242 interchange and tie into the existing HOV lane at the Port Chicago off-ramp. Ultimately, there would be an extra lane that would act as an auxiliary lane to help with the weaving problems that caused congestion and provide an extra two miles of carpool lane on SR-4. In the westbound direction, the third lane would be added east of where SR-242 diverged and the third lane would carry through the entire project as a general purpose lane and tie into the three lanes at Glacier Drive. When going through the I-680 interchange, that third lane would again benefit the weaving traffic in the cloverleaf and at Pacheco Boulevard.

Mr. Lee stated that the bridges at Pacheco Boulevard and I-680 had been planned to be widened in the future although given a number of collisions, a 10-foot shoulder would now have to be provided to avoid blocking traffic. The outside widenings were being pulled in from a future phase and had not originally been anticipated in Phase 3. He reiterated that the Grayson Creek Bridge was a significant addition to the project and would be widened to its ultimate width and provide a much improved connector from I-680 to SR-4. He noted that a number of problems on SR-4 today was caused by weaving.

Mr. Lee referred to the handouts provided and identified what would happen in the future after the Phase 3 portion of the project had been built. In the future, the direct connected structures would be built and be widened to two lanes for more direct access but when they merged with SR-4, the connector from northbound I-680 would create another auxiliary lane. As a result, between I-680 and Solano Way there would be two auxiliary lanes to handle the additional traffic that would be pushed in from southbound I-680. One auxiliary lane would draw up at Solano Way and the other would draw up to the east at the SR-242 exit and then punch through to the Port Chicago off-ramp, at which point there would be two full lanes and a carpool lane. A separate project, SR-4 Operational Improvements would ensue.

Ray Kuzbari asked about the Solano Way area with the ultimate including the Phase 4 Interchange Connector, and verified with Mr. Lee that a general purpose lane and an HOV lane would connect to Port Chicago Highway.

Largely due to the Grayson Creek Bridge, Ms. Miller emphasized that the costs had increased significantly and additional items had arisen with Caltrans. She referred to the outside widening to provide shoulders at I-680, which had added additional cost, along with seismic retrofit of the five bridges involved, some enhanced lighting, high visibility pavement delineation, and rehabbed pavements (the last two requested by Caltrans), and the replacement of the Grayson Creek Bridge with a wider structure along with the relocation of three utilities (Contra Costa Water District, Kinder Morgan, and Phillips). The available funding was \$57.7 million. The original Phase 3 improvements had been estimated at \$58 million. Given the added costs, the current Phase 3 project was now estimated at \$96.6 million, with a predominant cost \$38.3 million for the Grayson Creek structure.

Ms. Miller stated they had been able to take advantage of other funding availability, although there was a risk of proceeding too early and requiring a redo of plan sets. As a result, the CCTA had authorized approval to proceed with right-of-way (ROW) acquisition and the relocation of utilities, was seeking funding on all avenues concurrently, and was attempting to figure out if there was a potential sub phase of the project, such as an eastbound carpool lane. She noted that there were some problems in the westbound direction given the situation with respect to the Grayson Creek structure. The funding was in place. If proceeding east of Grayson Creek, the CCTA could make a fairly good timeline on the project to start construction in early 2017. She explained that some of the timeline would be eaten up by permitting given permits required at Walnut Creek and at Grayson Creek, which would take some time. She sought input from the TAC as to how to move forward with a portion of the project.

Mr. Kuzbari verified with Mr. Lee that the current cost for the new bridge over Grayson Creek had been estimated at \$30 million given that the approaches would have to be rebuilt, with utility relocation, and a quarter mile of freeway reconstruction.

Mr. Lee added that it would be a complicated exercise to keep the freeway traffic moving while the new bridge was being built. Given those complications, it would also be expensive.

Ms. Miller described the effort with the State in recognition of the poor condition of the Grayson Creek Bridge structure and the suggestion that it was the State's responsibility to accommodate the cost of that structure. She stated that other avenues were also being explored to seek other partners.

As to a partial project, Mr. Kuzbari suggested it made sense to start the carpool lane east of Grayson Creek and to have the third lane that goes all the way through to be the HOV lane. He suggested the plan did that and made sense. In the future, he suggested there might be an HOV flyover from northbound I-680 to tie into the lane, which he suggested was where the connection was missing.

Ms. Miller suggested that sometime in the future those gap closures might be able to be addressed, and Mr. Kuzbari suggested that the CCTA should look into that at some point in the future.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested a phase east of Grayson Creek to the limit on the east side, and verified with Mr. Lee that the \$57.7 million currently available should be sufficient to accommodate that phase.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested the City of Concord would support partial improvements east of Grayson Creek as Phase 1 of Phase 3, with across the bridge to be the next phase.

Ms. Miller explained that a similar presentation would be made to the TRANSPAC Board to identify the \$40 million shortfall.

As to when the design would be completed, Mr. Lee stated there were at a crossroads given the need to further phase the project.

Ms. Miller suggested that the design could be completed in about a year although there were permitting and other issues that would have to be done concurrently.

Mr. Kuzbari expressed a desire that construction start shortly after the design had been completed. He did not want to stop progress if the bridge could not be commenced.

The TAC thanked Ms. Miller and Mr. Lee for the presentation.

- 3. The 511 Contra Costa TDM Program is seeking approval and authorization from TRANSPAC to execute a Master Cooperative Agreement between the TRANSPAC/City of Pleasant Hill, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) for the FY 2016/17 TRANSPAC/TRANSPLAN 511 Contra Costa Program, with 2016/17 funding allocations from the BAAQMD Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) and CCTA Measure J (Line 17 and 21a).**

Lynn Overcashier, 511 Program Manager, noted that the workplan and approximate budget for 2016/2017 had to be approved in advance to have the preliminary workplan approved by the CCTA. She did not anticipate any significant changes. The budget would support the BAAQMD with SB 1339 requirements; Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) phasing out their employer outreach program at the same time the regulations had come in; and supporting employers with compliance requirements for pre-tax benefits or other options available to employers. The request was for authorization for both BAAQMD TFCA funds as well as Measure J Line 17, commute alternatives, and the Line 21a program which supported the Street Smarts program, and was significantly the same as it had been in the last year. She requested TAC approval to send the budget on to the TRANSPAC Board for approval. When asked, she reported that the activities and programs were ongoing; the only difference was the timing of the request as opposed to the activities themselves.

Anne Muzzini wanted to see how many of the student passes were being distributed given that County Connection had seen a bump in ridership and wanted to know if it was because of school passes.

Corinne Dutra-Roberts noted that the school program would close next week, with fewer applicants. She commented that parents applied prior to school for the first six weeks of school after which applications tapered off. Presumably future passes had been purchased; 1,300 had been acquired so far for both Tri Delta Transit and County Connection. More data would be available next week.

As to how many schools had Street Smarts programs in response to Mr. Lochirco, Ms. Overcashier reported that in the last three years all 119 schools in Central and East County had been accommodated. This year included a different type of middle school program. The only thing being suspended this semester was the high school outreach program due to a lack of staffing. All the rest of the programs were continuing with both temporary and part-time staff.

Ms. Dutra-Roberts advised that in November they would start booking the assemblies at all of the schools since that was offered to each school each year. She noted that some schools wanted the assemblies in the fall and some wanted them in the spring.

Mr. Lochirco commented that every school year the City of Walnut Creek received a flurry of emails from PTAs wanting city staff to give a presentation as to how they can make walking and cycling to school safer. He noted it was a slightly different target than with 511 Contra Costa programs since they were targeting parents who had specific questions and site specific issues. He asked if there had been any outreach to parent groups.

Ms. Overcashier advised that there had historically been contact with all Walnut Creek schools. The program had evolved over time and now some of the programs were so welcome that 511 Contra Costa had not gone back to the PTAs for their input or to brief them. Hopefully, more communication was being presented to the parents to identify the programs that were being provided.

Ms. Dutra-Roberts added that the principals loved the program because it started the discussion of parent driving behavior, and while going to the PTAs was not the current model both she and Ms. Overcashier expressed a desire to work with the PTAs to do that.

Eric Hu asked how many outreach sessions were possible, to which Ms. Overcashier advised that outreach was currently provided to 25 to 35 schools each semester and there were separate assemblies; K-3, 4th and 5th, middle, and an evening high school assembly. While those assemblies were provided on a first-come, first-served, it was a rare exception that every school making the request could not be accommodated. Even with the lack of staff and the set up and organization required, 511 Contra Costa had always been able to accommodate the schools within the same school year.

Ms. Dutra-Roberts added that in the fall 511 Contra Costa also promoted Back to School Day. Six schools had already been booked for an event; Oak Grove Middle had asked to tag on a special event for a helmet giveaway. In that case, the principal specifically asked for special accommodation since requests that fit into the grant allow some unique things to be done.

Ms. Overcashier explained that materials and a tool kit and other things are provided as well to encourage students, and 511 was investigating getting the leadership students involved, especially at the middle school level, which was an ideal age group to get the leadership kids to show that it's cool to ride a bike and walk to school. 511 was working to strengthen that element this coming year. She sought suggestions that could be integrated and incorporated into the 511 programs.

When asked by Mr. Lochirco, Ms. Overcashier emphasized casting as wide a net as possible working with the entire student body, and with multiple meetings with the principal and assistant principal. In the case of Walnut Creek, a parent survey had been conducted for all six Walnut Creek schools, and with that input an internal analysis had been conducted. She noted that students in elementary schools were within a mile and a half of the school, some as far as three, and it was an easier market. A lot of it was driver behavior for those accessing the school. Carpooling and all other modes were encouraged and everything was done, including infrastructure improvements, to separate students from cars.

Ms. Dutra-Roberts also emphasized that the principals were initially asked about the population and the culture, and since walking was not safe at some schools, the program was tweaked to focus on the most appropriate mode based on the principal's indication. The message and education was tailored to what the principal deemed appropriate. In the case where a student was killed walking to school in Byron, she advised that the program in that case had identified life skills; using a helmet, learning the ABC's of bike checks, and the like. Programs were customized based on the school, location, and culture. While driver behavior was the most often issue of concern, the message was to the students.

Ms. Dutra-Roberts took this opportunity to announce that International Walk to School Day had been set for October 7.

Mr. Kuzbari congratulated both Lynn and Corinne on the great job working with the Mt. Diablo Unified School District from physical improvements to programs and safety, and stated that the City of Concord appreciated what they were doing and commended them for offering optimal performance.

Ms. Overcashier urged members to contact 511 Contra Costa to offer any ideas to improve the programs.

On motion by Ray Kuzbari, seconded by Anne Muzzini, the TRANSPAC TAC recommended approval and authorization by the TRANSPAC Board to execute a Master Cooperative Agreement between TRANSPAC/City of Pleasant Hill, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) for the FY 2016/17 TRANSPAC/TRANSPLAN 511 Contra Costa Program, with 2016/17 funding allocations from the BAAQMD Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) and CCTA Measure J (Line 17 and 21a), carried by the following vote:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Ayes: | Cunningham, Dutra-Roberts, Hu, Kuzbari, Lochirco, Muzzini, Overcashier |
| Noes: | None |
| Abstain: | None |
| Absent: | Tucker |

- 4. Continued Discussion of the Budget and the Maintenance of the Pacheco Transit Hub.** The Pacheco Transit Hub has been open since August 2013. The facility is comprised of a park and ride lot and bus transit hub area. Charging stations were installed at the request of TRANSPAC. The City of Martinez agreed to be the Project Manager both in the bidding and construction phase and after construction.

TRANSPAC has made a commitment to fund 50 percent of the maintenance cost, up to \$10,000. The remaining funding was to come from TRANSPAC and the two transit agencies; WestCAT and Tri Delta Transit (25 percent up to \$5,000). Martinez has submitted an invoice to CCTA for maintenance and utility costs. The City of Martinez requests TRANSPAC allocate funds to pay its fair share of maintenance costs. The total cost for maintenance last fiscal year was \$11,813.39. TRANSPAC's share is \$5,906.60. With increased use of the charging stations it is anticipated electricity costs to increase significantly next year. *(Continued from the Special TAC Meeting on June 4, 2015).*

Ms. Overcashier referred to the statement in Tim Tucker's submittal memo which advised that electricity costs were expected to increase significantly next year, noted that the City of Martinez was charging for electric vehicle charging stations elsewhere in Martinez, and encouraged Martinez to charge for the electric vehicle stations located at the Pacheco Transit Hub.

When asked how many buses were using the site, Ms. Muzzini stated that County Connection was not servicing the Pacheco Transit Hub, and neither was WestCAT or Tri Delta Transit.

Mr. Lochirco asked if there had been any policy from 511 when going into a public agency or public structure that the agency or user as a condition of funding defer the cost so that the public was also not having to pay for private facilities.

Ms. Overcashier noted that when 511 Contra Costa installed elsewhere, it did not provide maintenance of any electric vehicle infrastructure. EV infrastructure has been installed primarily on public property available to the public. She commented that the Pacheco Transit Hub was a Caltrans parking lot.

Ms. Muzzini questioned whether the property was still owned by Caltrans, and Ms. Dutra-Roberts suggested that was why the City of Martinez could not impose a charging fee. She suggested that Caltrans policy would have to change in the future with respect to charging for electric charging stations.

Mr. Lochirco asked about sustainability and the ability for the charging stations to be made self-sufficient through the use of solar installations.

Ms. Overcashier referred to some new bus shelters that incorporated solar panels that supported interior lighting as well as real time information. She suggested the bus shelter at Pacheco could consider solar, although it would be meaningless if no buses were accessing the site.

Ms. Muzzini clarified that County Connection had received part of the funding for the site although it had become complicated to design and build because of Caltrans, so the CCTA had become involved and had entered an agreement where County Connection was responsible for the project, although somewhere in the mix the City of Martinez wanted to be the project manager because they were incorporating that property into Martinez. She stated the site was essentially a park-and-ride lot and would probably be for a long period of time.

Mr. Kuzbari noted that the property would have to be redesigned and potentially be relocated given future phases of the I-680/SR-4 Interchange project.

Mr. Lochirco questioned how much additional funding would be thrown into the site along with \$10,000 in annual maintenance costs for what was essentially a parking lot.

Mr. Cunningham asked for other examples of similar situations although none could be identified.

Mr. Kuzbari verified that there were six charging stations, although the use of all six stations was questionable. And, while bus service was to have used the site that had not occurred.

It was also noted that the TRANSPLAN Committee was to have supported the Pacheco Transit Hub although whether TRANSPLAN would continue to support the site as a parking lot only was questioned.

Mr. Kuzbari asked what budget line item had been designated for the maintenance of the site. In the discussion, it was noted that maintenance costs had never previously been charged. He suggested that Line 14 for additional transit enhancement or express, something about mass transportation or non-auto use, could potentially be used.

On comments that the total maintenance cost being requested for reimbursement was not significant, Mr. Cunningham suggested the maintenance costs would increase and there would need to be a discussion and a greater understanding of the decisions being made.

Mr. Lochirco noted that TRANSPAC had agreed years ago to help pay for maintenance costs but with the assumption it was a transit hub and not a parking lot. If additional costs were incurred and if the site was not meeting the initial objectives, he wanted another conversation since there needed to be accountability and conversation as to how the monies were being used.

Mr. Kuzbari noted that the TAC needed to hear from Mr. Tucker and suggested the item be continued for additional discussion. He requested that the comments be provided immediately to Mr. Tucker for feedback with a list of questions, and with a response prior to the next TRANSPAC meeting.

Mr. Lochirco had no problem approving the request with the assumption that additional requests would require a conversation.

The TAC recommended that Mr. Tucker work with Peter Engel, the CCTA Transit Program Manager, to identify potential funding sources to maintain the site given the park-and-ride use of the site rather than as a transit hub.

By consensus, the TAC forwarded a recommendation to the TRANSPAC Board for approval of the City of Martinez request for TRANSPAC's share of \$5,906.60 for the Pacheco Transit Hub, and sought a response from the City of Martinez to the comments, questions, and concerns by October 8, 2015.

5. Line 20a Grant Issues:

- a. **Distribution of DRAFT Program Documents.** At the September 10, 2015 meeting of the TRANSPAC Board, the Board authorized the TAC to distribute the *Draft Line 20a (Additional Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities) Call for Projects* to interested parties for review and comment, and considered and supported the input from the TAC to “cast a wide net” in getting feedback on the program. The Board also authorized disbursement of Line 20a grant funding to four existing Line 20a recipients.

The TAC thanked Mr. Cunningham for all his work.

Mr. Cunningham asked TAC members if there were any revisions to the draft program documents that had been presented and any specific mailing list that the TAC preferred.

Ms. Muzzini explained that County Connection was working with some of the service providers under the Mobility Management Plan and she had a list that could be used for distribution. She added that the CCTA could also be contacted for additional lists.

Mr. Cunningham stated he would get a package together and send it out.

b. Review and Approval of City of Walnut Creek Line 20a Grant Funding

Mr. Lochirco explained that the TRANSPAC TAC had previously recommended and the TRANSPAC Board had in February 2015 approved \$43,000 from Measure J Line 20a funds for the Senior Mini Bus Program in Walnut Creek, although that approval had never made it to the CCTA for implementation because there had been no TRANSPAC Manager to follow through on that action. He reported that Peter Engel had since expedited the request which was to be considered by the CCTA Board this month. As a result, the funds expected to be received were for last year’s program. He advised of a similar request to continue operation of the senior bus for Walnut Creek for next year and wanted to be able to project out the budget and estimated fund and grant monies as well and did not want to be excluded from the process.

Mr. Cunningham noted his expectation that Walnut Creek would receive those funds annually with the budget he had brought to the TAC in the spring.

Mr. Kuzbari emphasized the need for jurisdictions to follow through with the responsible party in the CCTA to ensure the necessary funding.

Mr. Lochirco noted the amount of work that former TRANSPAC Manager Barbara Neustadter had performed, noted the lack of that work, and commented that there would continue to be a lot more work.

Mr. Kuzbari agreed but commented that without a TRANSPAC Manager, each TAC member would have to perform extra work to get things running with the CCTA.

Ms. Muzzini verified with the TAC that approximately \$1 million remained in the Line 20a account.

Mr. Cunningham commented that when Peter Engel at the CCTA had discovered that some of the funding was late, he had distributed that funding as soon as possible.

6. Discussion: Regional Transportation Planning Committee Structure. At the TRANSPAC Board meeting on September 10, 2015, the Board requested that the TAC examine different committee structures and provide feedback to the Board. This request was a result of the dialogue regarding the transitional phase of the Committee after the departure of the TRANSPAC Manager and other organizational changes.

Mr. Cunningham presented his evaluation in table form of the various committee models in use in Contra Costa County to start the discussion directed by the TRANSPAC Board that the TAC examine different committee structures and provide feedback to the Committee given the transitional phase of the Committee after the departure of the TRANSPAC Manager and other organizational changes.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested that the TAC could be kept running smoothly with the status quo for the next couple of years, with everyone doing their part to see how it worked.

Mr. Hu noted that was one of the options. He thanked Mr. Cunningham for compiling the information for the discussion.

Ms. Overcashier suggested that one other advantage of keeping things status quo was that it would mean return to source funds would remain with the jurisdiction because an Executive Director would not need to be supported.

The effect of the legal costs on the budget given the ongoing Joint Powers Authority (JPA) process was raised and discussed.

Ms. Dutra-Roberts also suggested operating as is for now to see what would need to be done.

Mr. Lochirco wanted it clarified that it needed to be very clearly stated that there would be implications to existing city staff in each jurisdiction since that would directly affect the staff workload. He stated that the electeds needed to know that if their staff was working on something that had previously been handled by someone else, they would be authorizing a change in paradigm. He assumed even continuing at status quo there would need to be a chair or vice chair or something so that it was not a constant revolving door of who was leading the meeting.

Mr. Kuzbari noted at the TAC level it was just the person running the meeting. At the TRANSPAC level, Ms. Neustadter had introduced every single item and told the members what was going on. Currently, he suggested that was not needed in that if there was an item, each person would speak to it.

Mr. Kuzbari suggested the effort level was not that much and did not want to go near saying that it would take too much of their time and did not want to be reimbursed for cost, because he didn't think they were there.

Mr. Lochirco reiterated that the potential for extra work for staff should be clearly articulated and while the process had previously been seamless, it was slightly different now. He suggested that needed to be reported.

Mr. Cunningham noted the assumption that volunteering and jumping into the items would be a short-term solution. He suggested continuing the status quo for a year to figure out how it was working, and beyond that he agreed the electeds needed to know there was a bit more staff level involvement, even if just a marginal increase.

Ms. Overcashier explained that for Line 20a, for instance, staff had kept a running spreadsheet as opposed to Ms. Neustadter, and stated the responsibility was more evident for a TAC member to follow through given the lack of a safety net. She suggested a letter to TRANSPAC jurisdictions could advise of that change.

Mr. Lochirco agreed with a letter to advise and continued to seek recognition of the potential to increase staff time dedicated to TRANSPAC.

Mr. Kuzbari stated that the process had worked for over a year and everyone had done their part harmoniously. He recommended keeping the operation status quo through 2016.

On the discussion, the TAC agreed to retain the status quo for a year which would give the TRANSPAC Board a sense of what to budget.

On another matter, Mr. Hu stated with respect to the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), that one of the items under discussion was the preparation of guidelines for OneBayAreaGrant II (OBAG II), and given the history of OBAG I, South County representatives had volunteered to be on the subcommittee. He stated the TRANSPAC TAC would be asked if anyone wanted to represent Central County. He noted that Brad Beck would be coordinating the committee and he described some of the agencies that were now represented.

Anne Muzzini volunteered to represent Central County.

Mr. Kuzbari stated that ultimately the guidelines would be reviewed by other agencies. He also asked about the timeline for Call for Projects, reported by Mr. Lochirco that would occur in the next six months, noting the discussion of doing a 2020 timeline going out to 2020 or expanding the Call for Projects to include 2022, which would increase the amount of funding to be available. He noted that this cycle was the last since the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) grant, the next could be a six-year funding cycle, and what he estimated could be between \$22 to \$27 million based on the current sales tax for the next cycle to 2022, although there was still a conversation as to whether they would coordinate through 2020.

On another matter, the TAC requested a letter to Randy Carlton to request the FY 2015/16 Purchase Orders for 511 Contra Costa projects given the need for funds immediately to cover activities and expenditures incurred since July 1, 2015.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 A.M. The next meeting of the TAC, to be hosted by the City of Martinez, is scheduled for October 22, 2015 at 9:00 A.M. in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room unless otherwise determined.



CONTRA COSTA
transportation
authority

COMMISSIONERS

Julie Pierce, Chair

Dave Hudson,
Vice Chair

Janet Abelson

Newell Arnerich

Tom Butt

David Durant

Federal Glover

Karen Mitchoff

Kevin Romick

Don Tatzin

Robert Taylor

Randell H. Iwasaki,
Executive Director

October 15, 2015

Re: 2015 Measure J *Strategic Plan*

Dear Regional Transportation Planning Committee (RTPC) Managers:

At its May 2015 meeting, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority initiated the update to the 2013 Measure J *Strategic Plan*. Every two years, the Authority reviews its assumptions on future Measure J revenues, debt service costs, and projected Measure J expenditures in order to respond to fluctuations in economic conditions and project schedules.

The outcome of the *Strategic Plan* is a firm commitment of Measure J funds by year to specific projects for the next 5-7 years. In addition, project sponsors will know the amount of Measure J funds programmed for their projects beyond the 5-7 year time horizon, but not the exact year for funding. With every update, an additional 2 years are added to the previous *Strategic Plan* time horizon providing the project sponsors more specificity on the funding years for their projects.

Programming Capacity

The approved revenue forecast for the 2015 *Strategic Plan* shows a slight increase in revenues over the life of Measure J (\$4 million for projects). Given the large size of the Authority's current construction program, the Authority instructed staff to augment the programmed construction reserve by a total of \$4 million for unforeseen cost increases, as follows: \$1.94M (*east*), \$1.18M (*central*), \$0.52M (*southwest*), and \$0.36M (*west*). Therefore, at this time, no additional programming capacity beyond the \$4 million is projected in the 2015 *Strategic Plan*.

Cashflow Capacity

It is estimated that \$27 million in cashflow capacity will be available in the last two years of the 2015 *Strategic Plan* time horizon (FY2019-20 and FY2020-21). Table 1 shows the break-down of this capacity by sub-region, while adhering to each sub-region's proportional share of Capital Project Categories in Measure J Expenditure Plan which takes into consideration previously programmed Measure J funds in each subregion.

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

Table 1
Cashflow Capacity in FY2019-20 and FY2020-21

| Sub-region | Millions of YOE dollars |
|------------------|-------------------------|
| Central County | \$10 |
| East County | \$8 |
| Southwest County | \$5 |
| West County | \$4 |

Attachments 1 through 4 highlight projects with funding currently programmed outside the current time horizon for the 2013 Measure J Strategic Plan (FY2019-20 through FY2033-34). Measure J funds programmed for those projects may be advanced in the 2015 *Strategic Plan* subject to the limitation of cashflow capacity by sub-region.

Since there isn't enough cashflow capacity within the *Strategic Plan* time horizon for all programmed Measure J projects, priority should be assigned to on-going projects with cost increases and projects that are ready to proceed.

Below is a summary of funding issues on ongoing Measure J projects.

- a) Requests to Increase Measure J Programmed Funds:** *Since there is no additional programming capacity in the 2015 Strategic Plan, increasing Measure J programmed funds on these projects will require reducing funding on other projects within the same sub-region(s).*

State Route 4/Balfour Road Interchange: Construction is expected to start in 2016 but there is currently a funding shortfall of \$17 million. ECCRFFA and Measure J funds are needed to bridge this funding gap.

To keep the project on schedule, staff proposes to program \$6 million from "East County Corridor Reserve" to the project. ECCRFFA will be requested to fund the remaining \$11 million.

State Route 4 Integrated Corridor Mobility (ICM): The Authority has received \$200,000 grant to develop the scope for the SR4 ICM project. In addition, the Authority will be competing for another \$6 million in federal grants for the project. A local match of \$4 million is needed.

In order to provide the match for the grant, staff proposes programming \$4 million from Central and East County shares (\$2 million each) in the 2015 *Strategic Plan*. In East County,

it is proposed to program funds from the “Subregional Needs” category for this project. In Central County, it is more challenging since the “Subregional Needs” category is fully programmed and the project is eligible under one other category (Interchange Improvements on I-680 and SR242) in the expenditure plan. One option would be to reprogram \$2 million from the SR242/Clayton Road, as the project is not likely to be constructed prior to FY2020-21 given its funding shortfall.

- b) Requests to Advance the Programming Year for Measure J funds:** *Advancing programmed Measure J funds will not require reducing funding on other projects but will impact Measure J cashflow capacity.*

Caldecott Tunnel: Changes introduced by the State Fire Marshall, other design changes and differing site conditions are the basis for “claims” submitted by the contractor. Caltrans and the contractor are continuing to resolve the final cost of the tunnel contract. It is possible that additional project reserves will have to be expended. Measure J commitments at this time are approximately \$129.8 million which includes \$5.4 million commitment to backfill RM2 funds reprogrammed by MTC to the I-680 Carpool Lane Completion project in anticipation of construction savings. Currently \$125 million is programmed in the 2013 *Strategic Plan*, potentially requiring another \$4.8 million to be reserved for the project until the final cost is resolved.

In order to ensure sufficient funding is available to address the final cost of the project, staff proposes maintaining the existing and additional construction reserves in Southwest and Central counties for the project. This will require advancing the programming year for the reserves to FY2019-20 or earlier, thereby reducing the cashflow capacity for Central and Southwest counties by \$3 million and \$1.8 million, respectively. A strategic plan amendment will be completed in the future to reprogram the funds from the reserves to the Caldecott tunnel if needed.

I-680 Southbound Carpool Lane Completion: In December 2013, the Authority and TRANSPAC approved reprogramming up to \$4.9 million for the I-680 SB Carpool Lane Completion project from the I-680 Corridor Reserve. The final amount to be reprogrammed was to be determined after settling all claims on the Caldecott tunnel. Assuming there will be no savings on the Caldecott Tunnel, \$4.9 million will need to be programmed in the 2015 *Strategic Plan* to the I-680 Carpool Lane Completion project.

In order to keep the I-680 Carpool Lane Completion project on schedule, staff proposes advancing the programming year for the \$4.9 million to FY2019-20 or earlier.

I-680/State Route 4: The I-680/SR-4 (phase 3) project, which will widen State Route 4 in the vicinity of I-680, has currently a funding shortfall of \$38 million. The shortfall is due to the need to replace (in lieu of widening as originally envisioned) a deteriorating state-owned bridge (Grayson Creek Bridge) within the project limits. Staff is actively working with Caltrans to add SHOPP funds to the project, and continuing to advance utility relocations and right-of-way work while considering possible phasing.

To reduce the funding shortfall, staff recommends moving all remaining Measure J funds programmed to the project from future years to FY2019-20 or earlier.

BART Del Norte Station: BART has requested moving an additional \$2.5 million programmed to the project from future years to FY2019-20 or earlier.

Richmond Parkway: The City of Richmond has requested moving all remaining Measure J funds programmed to the project of \$0.5 million from future years to FY2015-16.

- c) **Projects with Surplus Funding.** At this time, it is anticipated that only one project to have surplus Measure J funding that can be reprogrammed to other projects in the same subregion. Surplus funds will help offset the demand on cashflow capacity in earlier years.*

Alhambra Creek Bridge and Ferry Street Improvements (Martinez): Project is currently under construction and is expected to have at least \$3.3 million in Measure J funds that can be programmed to other projects in the same category.

Table 2 summarizes the remaining cashflow capacity by sub-region based on staff recommendations above.

Table 2
Demands on Cashflow Capacity by Subregion
(millions of YOE dollars)

| Sub-region | Subregion Share | Caldecott | I-680 Carpool | SR 4 ICM | SR4 Balfour | SR 4/ I-680 | Others | Remain- der |
|----------------|-----------------|-----------|------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Central County | 10.0 | -3.0 | -4.9 | -2.0 | - | -3.4 | +3.3 (Alhambra) | 0 |
| East County | 8.0 | - | - | -2.0 | -6.0 | - | | 0 |
| Southwest Co. | 5.0 | -1.8 | - | - | - | - | | 3.2 |
| West County | 4.0 | - | - | - | - | - | -3.0 (BART & RP) | 1.0 |

Request for RTPCs Input

The Authority is requesting RTPCs input and concurrence on proposed programming of Measure J funds through FY2020-21. Input is requested by November 30, 2015.

Should you have any questions, please contact Hisham Noeimi at 925.256.4731 or by email at hnoeimi@ccta.net.

Sincerely,



Randell H. Iwasaki
Executive Director

(YOE Dollars x 1000)

[illegible]

(VOE Dollars x 10000)

[illegible]

(YOE Dollars x 1000)

[illegible]

(YOE Dollars x 1000)

[illegible]

TRANSPAC Transportation Partnership and Cooperation

2016 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 14 | July 14 |
| February 11 | August 11 (Proposed vacation) |
| March 10 | September 8 |
| April 14 | October 13 |
| May 12 | November 10 |
| June 9 | December 8 |

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 28 | July 28 |
| February 25 | August 25 (Proposed vacation) |
| March 24 | September 22 |
| April 28 | October 27 |
| May 26 | November 17 (Alternate date – location TBD) |
| June 23 | December 15 (Alternate date – location TBD) |

TRANSPAC Backup Meetings

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

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

TAC Backup Meetings

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

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

Loella Haskew, TRANSPAC Chair

CC: TRANSPAC and TAC

Dear Chair Haskew:

November 4, 2015

I want to thank you, the TRANSPAC members and TAC for allowing me the opportunity to work with many wonderful and talented colleagues over the last twenty-three years. We have developed the TDM program over the years to include not only employer-based trip reduction, but outstanding Street Smarts programs, electric vehicle infrastructure, bicycle infrastructure, transit and college programs and community promotions. It has been a very rewarding career.

With that said, I want to formally inform you that I plan to retire as of December 16, 2015. I want to assure you that I am leaving the department in VERY capable hands with Corinne Dutra-Roberts. She has the expertise and institutional memory to build upon the successes of 511 Contra Costa, so it should be a very smooth transition.

Thank you all for the great work done at the TRANSPAC committee level. The community is lucky to have such dedicated people working on their behalf.

All the best,



Lynn Overcashier