

TRANSPAC
Transportation Partnership and Cooperation
Meeting Notice and Agenda
THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 2016

SPECIAL MEETING

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

Pleasant Hill City Hall – Community Room
100 Gregory Lane, Pleasant Hill

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

- 1. CONVENE MEETING / PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE / SELF-INTRODUCTIONS**
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT:** At this time, the public is welcome to address TRANSPAC on any item not on this agenda. Please complete a speaker card and hand it to a member of the staff. Please begin by stating your name and address and indicate whether you are speaking for yourself or an organization. Please keep your comments brief. In fairness to others, please avoid repeating comments.
- 3. CONSENT AGENDA**
 - a. Approve March 10, 2016 Minutes**

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

Attachment: March 10, 2016 Minutes

END CONSENT AGENDA

- 4. UPDATE ON THE TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURE PLAN (TEP).** Continued discussion of the TEP from the March 10, 2016 TRANSPAC meeting prior to submitting a recommendation to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority Board, which expects to make a decision on a Final TEP by March 29, 2016. (*Hisham Noeimi, CCTA and Leo Scott of Gray-Bowen-Scott*)

ACTION: To be determined. There will be handouts at the meeting.

- 5. ADJOURN / NEXT MEETING**
The next meeting is scheduled for April 14, 2016 at 9:00 A.M. in the Community Room at Pleasant Hill City Hall unless otherwise determined.

REMINDER: BRING YOUR FORM 700 TO THE MEETING

TRANSPAC Meeting Summary Minutes

- MEETING DATE:** March 10, 2016
- MEMBERS PRESENT:** Loella Haskew, Walnut Creek (Chair); David Durant, Pleasant Hill, CCTA Representative; Julie Pierce, Clayton, CCTA Representative; Karen Mitchoff, Contra Costa County; and Mark Ross, Martinez
- PLANNING COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Dave Bruzzone, Clayton; Carlyn Obringer, Concord; Bob Pickett, Walnut Creek; and Diana Vavrek, Pleasant Hill
- STAFF PRESENT:** John Cunningham, Contra Costa County; Deidre Heitman, BART; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; Jeremy Lochirco, Walnut Creek; Anne Muzzini, County Connection; Tim Tucker, Martinez
- GUESTS/PRESENTERS:** Dave Campbell, Bike East Bay; Bill Gray, Gray-Bowen-Scott; Jack Hall, ITS CV/AC Program Manager, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA); Randell Iwasaki, Executive Director, CCTA; Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, CCTA; Elaine Welch, Mobility Matters
- MINUTES PREPARED BY:** Anita Tucci-Smith

1. Convene Meeting/Pledge of Allegiance/Self Introductions

The meeting was convened at 9:00 A.M. by Chair Loella Haskew, who led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Public Comment

There were no comments from the public.

CONSENT AGENDA

3. Approve February 11, 2016 Minutes

On motion by Director Pierce, seconded by Director Durant to adopt the Consent Calendar, as submitted. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Bruzzone, Durant, Mitchoff, Obringer, Pickett, Pierce, Ross, Vavrek, Haskew
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Leone

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

- 4. Update on the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP).** Continued discussion of the TEP. The Technical Advisory Commission (TAC) will be holding a special meeting on Tuesday, March 8, 2016 to discuss the TEP and to make a recommendation to the Board given that the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Board expects to make a decision on a Final TEP by March 29, 2016. (*Hisham Noeimi, CCTA and Bill Gray of Gray-Bowen-Scott*)

Hisham Noeimi, Engineering Manager, CCTA, introduced Randy Iwasaki and Bill Gray, and provided an overview of the schedule to approve an official Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) by the March 29, 2016 CCTA Board meeting. After that, the RTPCs would have an opportunity to review it and provide comments in April, and by the end of May there should be a Final TEP to take to the cities for their approval and support. Between now and then there had been a number of special Authority TEP meetings, the last being on March 9. The next meeting had been scheduled for March 23 to attempt to resolve the remaining issues.

Mr. Noeimi clarified that the TEP had been developed in July/August 2015, and had been revised based on the polling from the last six to ten months, the comments from the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC), and the special CCTA Board meetings. There had also been input from BART, as referenced in the letter from BART dated February 16, 2016, along with discussions that had been held between the Public Managers Association (PMA) and EPAC members, facilitated by Don Tatzin.

Mr. Noeimi clarified that there had been some agreement around the proposal where 23 percent of the revenues would go for *Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements*, with 6 percent to go to the new *Community Development Investment (CDI) Grant Programs*, and 8 to 9 percent to *Major Streets and Complete Streets Project Grants*. That proposal seemed to get some agreement from the PMA. He explained that BART was a big issue. In the draft TEP there was \$300 million for BART, almost triple the amount that had been requested by the RTPCs. He described the meetings between CCTA's Executive Director, San Francisco, Alameda and other counties with respect to the share in the cost of new BART cars. He referred to BART's proposed bond measure to rehabilitate the existing system and explained that measure could not fund cars and BART did not have money to add more cars to the system. BART had polled very high and everything was being done to improve access to BART, and without additional cars, which would cost \$1.6 to \$1.8 million each, BART service could not be provided as needed. He clarified that the money was contingent upon cost sharing with other counties and with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

With respect to the Draft TEP, Mr. Noeimi pointed out the *Regional Choice* category, where \$30 million had been allocated for TRANSPAC offering an ability to augment some of the categories that had been cut. He highlighted some of the adjustments that had been made to the categories, and noted that the work last summer to develop the TEP had not gone to waste since the allocations distributed by category had been based in proportion to the RTPC requests.

Ray Kuzbari reported that the *Regional Choice* category was the focus of TRANSPAC TAC's special meeting on March 8. In its discussion, the TAC had realized that there was an opportunity to move \$1.8 million from the *Innovative Transportation Technology / Connected Communities Grant Program* to *Regional Choice*. He explained that in July 2015 when TRANSPAC had put forth a TEP proposal, the discussion had been to include \$20 million in innovate technology, which would now match TRANSAC's original proposal, and which would allow the *Regional Choice* category a total of \$32 million. The TAC's recommendation was to split the money into three categories by moving \$10 million to the *Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities* category; \$5 million to the *Non-Rail Transit Enhancements* category, which nearly matched what TRANSPAC had initially recommended; and the remaining \$17 million to the *Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements* category, which would represent 25.2 percent return-to-source. To put the number into perspective, the Measure J return-to-source for Central County was effectively 26.8 percent. He clarified the 26.8 percent by explaining that the basic return-to-source in Central County was actually 20 percent not 18 percent; adding that to the extra 2.09 percent for additional improvements, which he noted in Measure J was more like 3.7 percent; and adding to that Line Item 28a at 3 percent which had recently been allocated as a steady stream of funds, all added up to 26.8 percent.

Mr. Kuzbari explained that the TAC had also requested additional language in the TEP. He referred to Page 6 of 33 of the 3/9/2016 Draft where a list of eligible projects for funding was placed under the *Major Streets and Complete Streets Project Grants* category, and explained the list could include other projects eligible under that category. He characterized it as a preliminary list that had originally been recommended in the July 2015 proposal, which now included Kirker Pass Road Truck Lanes – Southbound. On Page 8 of 33, under the freeway improvement categories *Improve traffic flow and implement high capacity transit in the I-680 corridor* and *SR-24*; and *Improve traffic flow along the SR-242 and SR-4 corridors in Central and Eastern County*, the TAC proposed to list eligible projects that they were all aware of, which had been listed in the original July proposal.

On Page 13 of 33, under the *Innovative Transportation Technology / Connected Communities Grant Program* category, the TAC proposed to add language to incorporate commute alternative programs into the category as an eligible item for funding. The TAC recommended that the Board consider the allocation of *Regional Choice* as well as the changes in the Initial Draft of the TEP.

Director Pierce referred to the recommendation to incorporate commute alternative programs into the *Innovative Transportation Technology / Connected Communities Grant Program* and questioned whether that was where it should be placed.

Mr. Kuzbari explained that commute alternatives by their nature included Transportation Demand Management (TDM), and it was something that could not be considered without keeping in mind there were TDM measures that went along with commute alternative programs.

Director Pierce expressed concern that it would become TDM instead of Smart City Programs, would dilute the intent of the category, and would not be available for what was needed, particularly since there were other funds for TDM, which largely came from outside Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding.

Director Mitchoff asked if there needed to be TDM in the new measure and if other RTPCs had included TDM, to which Mr. Noeimi stated the proposal in the Draft TEP did not include any money for commute alternatives, although West County had left some money in *Regional Choice* for subregional needs as was currently done in Measure J.

Director Pierce questioned whether something should be left in the *Regional Choice* category since it had been used in the past; some had gone into Contra Costa Boulevard enhancements and some other regional projects, which had been helpful.

In response to Director Mitchoff as to whether there had been any thought of putting TDM in the measure, Mr. Kuzbari stated that under the new plan there was nothing being shown under commute alternatives, although that could be discussed. He stated if the wish was to delete the language, that could be done and there might be other ways to cover commute alternatives in the future.

Director Ross noted that there were Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) funds in commute alternatives. He suggested there should always be that opportunity since they did not know what was coming up in the future. He noted that in Martinez the City Council was discussing a pop-up ferry system and were working to see what could be done, working with the Water Emergency Transit Authority (WETA) and the CCTA to see if there was money available on an emergency basis.

Director Mitchoff supported consistency and expressed concern if TRANSPAC was the only RTPC putting something under commute alternatives.

Director Durant suggested moving the TDM language to the *Regional Choice* category to have the opportunity to program commute alternatives under regional choice, as things that could be considered for the use of the funds.

Director Pierce suggested the *Regional Choice* category was already a catchall, and she did not believe it needed to be spelled out. She preferred to leave it open to whatever would come up and then decide where the funds would be used.

Director Durant supported the inclusion of the TAC recommended language from Page 13 of 33 related to commute alternatives to the *Regional Choice* category, not changing the dollars but changing the language from one paragraph to another.

Director Mitchoff stated that many of the categories overlapped and in the new measure there was a specific line item for *Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities* that was over and above what the RTPCs were doing. She noted the CCTA Board had requested a clearer list to identify the overlaps. She could see taking some RTPC money in the *Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities* category and putting it into *Regional Choice*, and agreed that a small amount of funds should be kept in *Regional Choice*.

Director Durant agreed that there was a need to consolidate some categories, such as *Non-Rail Transit Enhancements* with *Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities*, or more clearly identify the actual funds available. He would not increase *Non-Rail Transit Enhancements* by \$5 million, as recommended by the TAC, but would leave the \$5 million in *Regional Choice*.

Eric Hu stated that the TAC had discussed that option, retaining funds in *Regional Choice*, and before they had gotten to the final recommendation, they had thought of leaving \$7 million as contingency in that category. The first priority was to fund *Non-Rail Transit Enhancements* and *Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities*, and to zero out the *Regional Choice* to the *Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements* category. The TAC had decided to do that given that return-to-source would go to the various agencies and allow for flexibility. *Regional Choice* would not be distributed by formula where the *Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements* category would.

In response to Director Durant as to specific projects or programs desired, Mr. Kuzbari reported the intent to restore the dollars to the levels that TRANSPAC had considered in July.

Director Mitchoff liked the idea of leaving the recommended \$17 million in *Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements* and the \$10 million to *Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities*, and moving the \$5 from *Non-Rail Transit Enhancements* back to *Regional Choice*. She suggested the lower number the better to save those monies for emergencies.

Ray Kuzbari emphasized that return-to-source was very important to the cities given that it could be used to fix potholes, pave roads, add bike lanes with pavement rehab projects, synchronize signals, and use it to leverage projects to be able to obtain federal, state, and regional funds. He stressed that those funds were critical and the TAC had indicated that all \$17 million should be used as return-to-source to help fund not only maintenance but serve the objective of adding more bike lanes, creating safer sidewalks, and safer access to transit, among other benefits.

Anne Muzzini requested that the \$5 million remain in the *Non-Rail Transit Enhancements* category given that the transit request was much larger than the allocation and the funds were necessary to provide buses to serve everybody, not just seniors. She requested that the transit program be restored to its original request to support the public bus system.

Director Durant stressed the difficulty of making policy decisions of where to allocate funds, and if having a measure that would be able to pass, a set of clear priorities that spoke to the public had to be considered. He noted the idea was that each of the categories include so much overlap that it did not mean that the funding would not go to one particular use, it just meant that flexibility was being built in other categories. While \$57.9 million had originally been proposed for the *Non-Rail Transit Enhancements* category, \$50 million had been retained, and there were other categories that lost much more than \$7.9 million. In the past, funds had been reallocated from one item to another, and because the measure spanned such a long period of time, whatever was locked in now could be adjusted later on. He stated at some point the CCTA Board had to make a decision to avoid missing the ability to get a measure.

Randy Iwasaki stated from his perspective the CCTA had received requests for funding and had struggled given the inflexibility in the way Measure J had been structured. The proposed measure was an augmentation to the existing measure, and there was flexibility, particularly since it was unknown what would happen in the future. He stated there was a lot of trust amongst the CCTA Boardmembers to do the right thing at the end of the day. Without the ability to fund the needs in the future or leverage other monies, no one would be where they wanted to be. He emphasized the importance of being able to pass the measure, and added that folks wanted potholes fixed.

Bill Gray, Gray-Bowen-Scott, cautioned against including too many specifics. He explained that there had been a tremendous amount of input. There was clearly a lot of needs and a lot of advocates, and there were a lot of opportunities. The core issues were starting to revolve around policy issues and they were struggling to come up with recommendations. He stated that a draft TEP would be presented to the Board next week and it would be different from the one currently being considered by the TRANSPAC Board. Everybody wanted more money and more flexibility, and they didn't want strings. The intent was to come up with an innovative proposal and the CCTA Board would give direction on an official draft, which would not come out for another two weeks. He stated the process was that everybody would provide input and the Board would make a final decision. The biggest issues involved were policy questions, such as incentivizing infill, and he stated the business community did not want to do that. He urged some specificity with the *Regional Choice* category but not with the other categories. He sought direction of what had been underfunded or overfunded and explained that the next revision would attempt to address that. He emphasized the zero sum gain.

Director Durant commented that it was fashionable to have zero trust of government and at the end of the day everyone involved were citizens too and every policy making body was tasked with making hard choices. In this case, there was an attempt to solve real problems and help real people and it did not serve to get so far away from trusting each other. Looking toward policy discussions, he stated that the CCTA Board had always worked with cooperation and trust, and without that it would fail. He reminded those assembled that as a body, the CCTA Board had agreed to go without spending money for years to help East County in that it benefitted all communities to allow East County to have that resource.

Director Pierce emphasized the need to talk about policy issues such as the Urban Limit Line (ULL) and whether there should be a Community Development Investment (CDI) category at all for the entire measure.

PUBLIC COMMENTS OPENED

Elaine Welch, Mobility Matters, noted that TRANSPAC was the only RTPC doing what it was doing for seniors right now. With respect to overlap, she referred to the booklet *Way to Go, Contra Costa!*, a transportation resource guide for Contra Costa County that had been published without Measure J money and which was proving to be helpful to Contra Costa residents. She added that in 30 days, without any Measure J money, Mobility Matters would have a website that would help match a provider to each caller's service needs. She also referred to the mobility management portion of the *Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities* category that went above and beyond Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and which recognized the need for mobility.

Ms. Welch reminded everyone that Mobility Matters asked to be funded for another year, and with that funding could serve hundreds of people since mobility meant independence in that seniors and the disabled did not have to continue to drive to be mobile and remain in their homes.

Dave Campbell, Director, Bike East Bay, asked for more funding for bike projects. He commented that years ago when 1.5 percent of Measure J was allocated for bike and pedestrian projects, that had allowed a five-inch wide white line bike lane. Things had since changed and bike lanes were no longer striped, they were built, and money was required to build bike lanes to separate a bikeway from the moving traffic with some degree of protection and safety. He referred to the cities of Pleasant Hill and Walnut Creek, which were working to rebuild streets to accommodate bike, ped, and cars. He added that while Local Streets and road monies could accommodate some things, it was the bike/ped money that was needed to rebuild bike lanes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS CLOSED

On the policy issues, Mr. Noeimi stated that at the March 9 CCTA Board meeting, items related to the ULL and the governing structure for the authority to create a Citizen Oversight Committee were to have been discussed. The Board did not have time to delve into those issues and would next meet on March 23 to address them. With respect to the ULL, the advocates wanted the exemption to be considered as a loophole, although he noted that the exemption had been used only once in the past. The Board needed to talk about how to address that issue and noted the options of tightening the language where exemptions could take place or eliminating the language altogether.

Bill Gray explained that the ULL had been a big discussion in 2004, and while it had been agreed that every city should have a ULL, the other two options were that the cities could adopt their own ULL policy or conform to the County's ULL policy, which was a pre-condition to receive return-to-source. Everybody had done that and it had been fairly successful. On the significant discussion of that issue, he reported that the consensus from the local jurisdictions was to leave well enough alone. He stated they, at the staff level, would be prepared to recommend changes to ensure the ULLs were being consistently applied; other than that, to leave it alone. He suggested asking staff to put something on the table for discussion. He added that the reality was that the measure needed voter approval and to get voter approval there needed to be a consensus-based plan. In order to get consensus, something had to be put on the table to see how it would play out. The issue would go to the May meeting.

Director Pierce agreed that there were a number of policy issues. Her understanding was for the need to discuss those policy issues at the CCTA Board meeting on March 16. She asked the TRANSPAC Board if there was any different direction. She also suggested that TRANSPAC meet again on March 24 to allow another opportunity to go over the reactions and the proposed language to get direction on what to take back if there was anything different. She was hopeful that by March 29 there would be something close to a final and it would allow TRANSPAC one last input. She stated the issues to be addressed were shown in the back of the Initial Draft TEP and included Complete Streets, Advance Mitigation Program, and Governing Structure, among others, which could be further discussed on March 24.

Mr. Gray urged everyone to make sure that TRANSPAC's CCTA Representatives were informed of the preferred direction of the issues. He noted that there would be two other versions before the release of the Final TEP in May, which would then be presented to the city councils and the Board of Supervisors. He added that without a unanimous acceptance of the proposal, it would not be going to the ballot.

Director Mitchoff requested that the special meeting on March 24 focus only on the Draft TEP. With respect to the question of infill development, she noted one of the concerns was that while infill development was supported, that had not occurred, and it cost more to develop infill than it did on the periphery, which was a concern with the ULL. There were, of course, different opinions from the various groups and geographic locations.

Director Pierce explained that the *Community Development Investment Grant Program* category was intended to offer more incentives for infill development.

Director Ross stated the incentive idea had not previously worked given that it was a paltry sum and no amount of incentives would overcome a group of neighbors who objected to infill development. He noted the incentives to support the proposal might tie some of the incentives to the approval of infill development.

Director Durant suggested the CDI proposal might be able to leverage the improvements associated with housing development or infill development to offset some of the transportation improvements to make it more viable.

Mr. Gray advised that there would be a proposal from the business community that would help inform the discussion.

Members of TRANSPAC were asked to offer their comments on the policy issues.

Carlyn Obringer commented that CCTA had conducted some of the community webinars in December to get input, and she suggested the most important thing would be to listen to the will of the people and put the bulk of the fund into *Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements*, which she suggested would be the biggest sell to the public. She felt that the CCTA representatives were on the right track.

Diane Vavrek commented that the ULL appeared to work, and if that was the case she saw no reason to change it. With respect to development incentive, she looked forward to hear what the development community had to offer. Even if infill was as small as dividing one lot into two, there were concerns from the community. She looked forward to seeing another draft. She characterized the Draft TEP as a bit complicated, suggested the average voter would not take the time to consider everything involved, and commented that if there was some clarity the approval of the measure would still be a long shot. She added that to really incentivize development would be difficult to do.

Bob Pickett agreed that if the ULL worked it should be left as is. On the flexibility of commute alternatives, he suggested the need to make sure that there were future opportunities but recognized the concern with public trust and image.

Mr. Pickett stressed the need to be cautious to ensure legitimate flexibility in several categories to ensure future flexibility and management over the long term.

Dave Bruzzone preferred to the greatest extent possible to keep the options open for grant funding, and to pursue matched funds, where possible. He otherwise supported the priorities.

Chair Haskew commented that the City of Walnut Creek had resolved the ULL issue a long time ago and it was no longer an issue for the City of Walnut Creek.

Director Mitchoff commented that the ULL was a big issue for the County. As to incentivizing infill, she stated there would always be people who would be opposed to something. She stated that sometimes constituents did not know what they wanted but acknowledged there would be difficult decisions for policy makers and Planning Commissioners when it came to infill because infill was an issue everywhere.

Mr. Iwasaki stressed the intent to keep the rules and regulations as simple as possible to avoid the need for more people to monitor for compliance. He referred, for instance, to the request for performance-based audits which were more expensive as opposed to compliance audits, and reminded everyone to keep that in mind since there was no desire to require additional CCTA staff to monitor the measure.

Chair Haskew agreed with the trust issue and emphasized the need to be sensitive to the issues that shaped the public trust and a need to honor the system.

Director Ross stated that the performance audit and compliance audit was being performed by the public, as it was now under Measure J. He suggested the removal of three percent of vehicles from the road would make a difference, and there could be a breakthrough if the public saw what had been done in the past. He was concerned about people reading not only the measure, but the ballot itself. He referred to the upcoming election and emphasized the need to sell the proposal to the voters and show them that it would be helpful to them and their families.

Director Mitchoff stated that voters were looking for the word performance in things and she recommended the phrase “performance outcomes will be monitored through compliance checklists.”

Director Durant agreed with Director Ross, and noted that some of the detail around performance-based reviews was challenging and difficult given that most attempts were either not workable or asked too much. While he did not want to spend more money on review professionals, whatever was structured around CCTA meant that the cities and counties would have to have staff dedicated to that function. Given the ongoing belt tightening, the extra work might require the need to add more staff. He noted the question of how to measure prevention, how to come up with standards, and how to talk about what was achieved through prevention. He urged caution to be clear about what had been delivered versus what had been discussed, which was one way to measure performance.

On the discussion of the direction it would like to pursue, Chair Haskew supported moving the TDM, commute alternatives, to the *Regional Choice* category to address funding issues that might be needed in the future.

Chair Haskew commented that she would have reduced every category consistently so that no one category was cut more than another, and wanted to at least acknowledge the support of *Non-Rail Transit Enhancements*.

Director Durant recommended moving the \$5 million allocated to *Non-Rail Transit Enhancements* back to *Regional Choice*, and moving the language related to commute alternatives from *Innovative Transportation Technology / Connected Communities Grant Program* to *Regional Choice*.

By consensus, the Board made the following recommendation:

- Shift \$1.8 million from Category 17 *Innovative Transportation Technology / Connected Communities Grant Program* to allow a total of \$32 million under *Regional Choice*;
- Designate \$17 million to Category 1 *Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements*;
- Designate \$10 million to Category 12 *Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities*; and
- Retain \$5 million in Category 19 *Regional Choice*.

5. Request to Program Measure J Funds for the EasyMile Pilot Project. BART in partnership with the CCTA is requesting the programming of \$250,000 in Measure J funds from the BART Station, Access and Parking category for EasyMile testing and initial rollout at BART stations in Central County. EasyMile is an automated on-demand shuttle service that will improve access to BART stations. At its meeting on February 25, 2016, the TAC received a presentation on this item and unanimously recommended that the request be referred to the Board for approval subject to the identity of project distributions, and on the condition that the rollout be in Central County first. *(Hisham Noeimi, CCTA)*

On motion by Director Mitchoff, seconded by Director Pierce to program \$250,000 in Measure J Funds from the BART Station, Access and Parking category for the EasyMile Pilot Project, subject to the identity of project distributions and on the condition that the rollout be in Central County first. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Bruzzone, Durant, Mitchoff, Obringer, Pickett, Pierce, Ross, Vavrek, Haskew
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Leone

6. Discussion and/or Appointment of Citizen Representative to the Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC).

Ray Kuzbari reported that the TAC had reviewed the request which had come at the last moment since the term of the citizen representative to the Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) had expired and CCTA had requested that TRANSPAC consider an appointment or reappointment.

It was noted at the meeting that David Favello was the current CBPAC citizen representative and the TAC looked at the situation and recognized that Mr. Favello had been a representative for some years and the TAC had no problem reappointing him to that position unless there was another bicycle advocate who would like the opportunity to serve. By consensus, the TAC had recommended the reappointment of David Favello to CBPAC but wanted to send out a solicitation of interest in June 2017 to determine whether there were other interested bicycle advocates to represent Central County on CBPAC.

Jeremy Lochirco, TRANSPAC's representative to CBPAC, advised that Mr. Favello had attended the CBPAC meetings, although meetings were few and far between. He added that Mr. Favello had served as a main spokesman for East Bay Bike, was a resident, an avid biker, worked at a local bike shop in Walnut Creek, and had been instrumental with the original Countywide Bike and Ped Plan. The TAC had struggled since the appointment had already expired, Mr. Favello had expressed an interest in continuing to serve, and the TAC had suggested casting the net wider to see if there might be more interest in serving on CBPAC in the future.

On motion by Chair Haskew, seconded by Director Ross to reappoint David Favello as the Citizen Representative to the Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC). The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Bruzzone, Durant, Mitchoff, Obringer, Pickett, Pierce, Ross, Vavrek, Haskew
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Leone

7. Continued Discussion of the TRANSPAC Budget.

Director Pierce presented the draft Budget for 2015-2016 and advised that the formula used for Local Streets and Roads, which had been used in the past to calculate half of the jurisdictions' share, had been used to draft the proposed budget, as had the current administrative support costs for Anita Tucci-Smith, and a placeholder for a potential consultant contract, along with half on the percentage based on return-to-source. The jurisdiction share was reported on the last page of the budget document. There was little change from the previous budget with an \$8,000 increase spread over the jurisdictions. When approved, the budget would be submitted to the City of Pleasant Hill which would send out invoices for 2015-2016.

On motion by Director Durant, seconded by Director Ross to adopt the 2015-2016 Budget, as shown. The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Bruzzone, Durant, Mitchoff, Obringer, Pickett, Pierce, Ross, Vavrek, Haskew
Noes: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Leone

8. **TRANSPAC CCTA Representative Reports:** Reports on the February 2016 CCTA Administration and Projects Committee (Member Pierce), Planning Committee (Member Durant), and the CCTA Board meeting (Members Pierce and Durant).

The reports had already been presented under prior discussions.

9. **CCTA Executive Director's Report Regarding Authority Actions/Discussion Items**

CCTA Executive Director Randell H. Iwasaki's Report dated February 17, 2016 had been included in the Board packet.

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

The letter to RTPCs from Randell H. Iwasaki dated February 19, 2016 for the February 17, 2016 Board Meeting had been included in the Board packet.

11. **TAC Oral Reports by Jurisdiction**

There were no reports.

12. **Agency and Committee Reports**

The available reports had been included in the Board packet.

13. **For the Good of the Order**

There was nothing under the Good of the Order.

14. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 A.M. The next meeting of the Board is a special meeting scheduled for March 24, 2016 at 9:00 A.M. in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room, and then to the next regular meeting on April 14, 2016 at 9:00 A.M. in the City of Pleasant Hill Community Room, unless otherwise determined.