

**West Contra Costa Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes, 28 October 2011**

---

**Members Present:** Roy Swearingen, Chair (Pinole); Janet Abelson, Vice-Chair (El Cerrito); Tom Hansen (WestCAT); Genoveva Calloway (San Pablo); William Wilkins(Hercules), Joel Keller (BART), Jeff Ritterman (Richmond); Courtland Boozé (Richmond)\*; Joe Wallace (AC Transit)\*; Absent: John Gioia (County);

*\*Arrived after role call*

**Staff Present:** Christina Atienza, Valerie Jenkins, Joanna Pallock, John Rudolph, Linda Young; Benjamin Reyes, Legal Counsel; Peter Engel, CCTA

**Location:** San Pablo Council Chambers, 13831 San Pablo Avenue, San Pablo, CA 94806

---

1. **Call to Order and Self-Introductions – Chair Roy V. Swearingen**
2. **Public Comment-** The public is welcome to address the Board on any item that is not otherwise listed on the agenda. *Please fill out a speaker card and hand it to staff.*

**Changes to Agenda-** There was a request made by *Director Keller* to move Item 13 ahead of Item 14 due to time constraints. *Chair Swearingen* accepted this request.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**ACTION:** *Vice Chair Abelson* moved to adopt the consent calendar; seconded by *Director Ritterman*; and passed unanimously.

3. **APPROVE Minutes and RECEIVE Summary of July 22 Board Meeting, RECEIVE Summaries of July 7 and Sept. 8 TAC Meetings**
4. **RECEIVE Monthly Program and Projects Status Report**
5. **RECEIVE Financial Reports for July to Sept.**
6. **APPROVE Payment of Invoice Over \$10,000.**
7. **APPROVE East Bay Paratransit, Richmond Paratransit, and WestCAT's FY 11-12 Claims for Measure J Program 20b, Additional Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities.**
8. **APPROVE FY 11-12 Master Cooperative Agreement with CCTA No. 17W.12.**
9. **APPROVE Amendment No. 1 to FY 10-11 Master Cooperative Agreement with CCTA No. 17W.01.**

- 10. APPROVE WCCUSD's FY 11-12 Budget for Student Bus Pass Program Administration.**
- 11. APPROVE Recommended Project Evaluation and Selection Process for West County's Share of Measure J Transportation for Livable Communities Program Funds.**
- 12. Authorize Executive Director to enter into an Agreement with Meyers Nave for General Counsel and Legal Services.**

**DISCUSSION:** *Director Ritterman* addressed *Chair Swearingen* and asked why Item 12 did not include a proposal from Mr. Rodriquez's new firm. *Chair Swearingen* explained that Mr. Rodriquez's firm pulled out. *Chair Swearingen* introduced the new legal counsel from Myers/Nave, *Mr. Ben Reyes*.

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **14. CONSIDER Proposal to Initiate an I-80 Corridor Transit Opportunities Study.**

**ACTION:** *Director Ritterman* made a motion to a) form an initial policy working group consisting of WCCTAC and including Solano County as a non-voting member; b) direct staff to develop a draft study scope, schedule and budget; c) authorize staff to decide on which agencies to approach for funding contributions; d) direct staff to bring the item back to the Board for continued discussion on December 9. The motion was seconded by *Director Calloway*. *Vice-Chair Abelson* asked to clarify in the motion that the statement of purpose of the study should be focused on West County if Measure J funds are to be expended; accepted by *Director Ritterman* and *Calloway*. The motion was approved with no nays and one abstention from *Director Wallace*.

**DISCUSSION:** *Director Keller* introduced the item. He stated that the goal is to improve mobility along the I-80 corridor east into Solano County. The starting point is to focus on the potential station stops in West County but not defining the mode-type. The first step is to look and see if we want to extend transit and if so, what stops would be appropriate. Next would be looking for funds to do an EIR.

*Executive Director Christina Atienza* described this as an "I-80 corridor transit opportunities study" and that the policy question is whether to adopt the concept of a study. *Ms. Atienza* explained the issues facing the corridor in terms of congestion and the projection that congestion will increase. She emphasized how impacts from the congestion are detrimental to west county communities. This study would be different from other studies because it is not proposing a solution. Emphasis is on transportation to create thriving communities and thus is mode neutral. The goal of sustainable communities is also taken into consideration. The key policy question is what are the medium and long term transportation options in West County that will create thriving communities in the future.

*Director Keller* presented the solutions BART has proposed for the extension in East County. In 2001 the notion of an alternate technology that tied into BART was presented to the public. There were and still are arguments about paying for BART and getting "a second rate system."

East County obtained political consensus and now is in the process of building eBART with cross-platform connectors and TOD around the eBART sites. *Director Keller* walked the Board through the east County process, explaining how DMU's connect to the main trunk of the BART stations as well as the design of 10.1 miles of eBART and a further extension next phase study. He stated that in West County if and when an alignment is developed, then mode can be addressed. He stated he is not opposed to BRT, but needs political consensus on the study to extend transit.

*Ms. Aienza* emphasized first that the proposal is for a visionary concept. This document would focus on transportation infrastructure in the future to meet local desires. The focus is on West County, technology neutral, WCCTAC as the agency leading the study with local stakeholders, using Measure J Subregional funds and possibly funds from other local agencies, using a consultant and the primary deliverable as station concept plans with information on how to accomplish this. The recommended next steps are to form of a Board Working Group and maybe adding Solano County and possibly East County.

*Chair Swearingen* stated that the background on getting this study going is BART's current availability to focus on West County for planning projects. He said this is an opportunity to get the Board involved in a long range planning project. He added that possibly some parts of Alameda County could also be contacted.

*Director Ritterman* asked what the cost of eBART is per mile. *Director Keller* explained the full cost includes one time costs, but it is estimated at \$40 million per mile while the next phase of the next extension being \$20-25 million dollars per mile. BART is \$125 million per mile for the third rail original system. *Director Ritterman* asked how the study can be mode neutral if specific technologies embrace different station types and alignments. He added that he is interested in making sure light rail options are not precluded from consideration. *Director Ritterman* stated that BART has not embraced other alternatives that have not been approved by CPUC, but that question should be in the study.

*Director Wallace* mentioned his involvement in the original study of eBART and the expense of DMUs and asked how these costs will affect AC Transit and the total cost of operating and maintaining such a system could deplete existing transit. He stated that the service is not available now and could strap AC Transit in the future. He asked where is the money coming from and will it disable other transit systems? *Director Keller* stated he does not know where the money is coming from but eBART built funds over a ten year period from sales tax measures and Congress will hopefully get transit friendly. This study will help put West County in the position to get future funding. He stated all modes are critical and we should not play one mode off another.

*Director Boozé* asked about the visionary project nature of DMUs and what kind of technology the Oakland Airport Connector uses. *Director Keller* stated that is cable driven. *Director Boozé* stated that his constituents are concerned why the Oakland Connector drops into the parking lot and not directly into the airport. *Chair Swearingen* said that issue is not part of the item. *Director Keller* stated that the Port of Oakland is in charge of that decision. *Director Boozé* asked about the route to eBART and Highway 4 bypass. *Chair Swearingen* reminded the Board that this is an embryonic study and not the level of design achieved on eBART.

*Director Wallace* stated West County area needs to straighten out its current problems first before doing a visionary study. *Chair Swearingen* explained that growth and demand will occur and the Board can address the needs of West County in the study.

*Director Wilkins* stated that this study is about complementing agencies not competing agencies. WestCAT and AC can both benefit from the expansion of transit. He mentioned the Hercules ITC is an example of this type of visionary planning.

*Director Calloway* asked how other agencies would contribute. *Ms Atienza* stated that contributions would be requested from BART, MTC, and possibly other agencies, but ultimately the Board decides who will participate. *Director Keller* stated he would ask BART for funds.

*Vice-Chair Abelson* said the focus should be west county not Solano County. She stated whatever goals we develop need to benefit our residents. Her other concern was that the rehabilitation the BART cars that remains unfunded. She also mentioned more people would put more stress on BART to transport more people. *Director Keller* stated BART is seven to eight billion dollars unfunded. *Vice-Chair Abelson* stated that this shortfall is her biggest concern.

*Chair Swearingen* noted these are all good questions that should be addressed by the study and stressed the importance of being proactive and not just reacting to proposals made by others.

*Director Ritterman* moved to adopt recommendations on slide #4 of the presentation; he added that Solano and Alameda County be non-voting members unless they put money in and it can be discussed later what role they will have. He stated that approaching other agencies is okay; all they can say is no. He asked to return to the discussion at the December 9 Board meeting. Seconded by *Director Calloway*.

*Director Wallace* asked if the motion today will cost money. *Ms. Atienza* said no.

*WestCAT General Manager Charlie Anderson* addressed the Board and stated there are many ways to meet the needs of West County. He stated a linear system is premature and should not be stated in the scope. He said this is more of a needs assessment. He mentioned the MTC Sustainability study that will impact the I-80 corridor. He asked the Board to refocus the study away from extensions and station alignments, and focus on the needs of the community.

*Director Keller* reminded the members that “no build” is always an option. *Chair Swearingen* stated that at least the needs will be able to be prioritized. *Chair Swearingen* stated that a plan will allow a list of priorities to be ready for development when funds are available.

*Director Boozé* asked for the budget to include a cost per mile. *Ms. Atienza* stated the budget is focused at high level and this request may be premature but a qualitative comparison and focus on the potential benefits is timely. *Director Boozé* stated that the eventual study needs to explain to taxpayers what they are going to get. He added that that taxpayers are being slammed and they need to know the costs associated with new service.

*Vice-Chair Abelson* asked for clarification on the motion. *Director Ritterman* stated that there is a regional perspective needed. The main focus is on serving our constituents. *Vice-Chair Abelson* stated all meetings are public so they can participate. The next step is developing a

statement of the purpose for this study. *Director Keller* stated Phase One of the study is West County focused. *Director Ritterman* said he is referring to the map but in the working group Solano or non-West County agencies can participate as non-voting members, unless they are willing to contribute funds towards the study. *Chair Swearingen* stated the scope is still vague and both adjacent counties should be involved.

*Director Ritterman* suggested that the working group be just West County. *Vice Chair Abelson* said that is not what she was seeking; she was focused on the purpose of the project and she wanted to make sure the study would focus on West County. *Director Ritterman* accepted this as a friendly amendment. *Director Calloway* said the key mission is the items listed in the slide and this is the first step. *Chair Swearingen* noted that the study would ensure that West County is in line and ready when funding starts flowing again. *Director Boozé* asked *Ms. Atienza* to get a resolution or letter to Barack Obama to show we are getting a shovel ready project ready.

*Director Wallace* mentioned that a project like BRT should also be looked at. The services should focus on West County and not address Solano County. He observed that rail is seen more favorably by the politicians in the county.

### **13. CONSIDER Richmond's Request for A Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) for STMP Funding for the Richmond Intermodal Station – East Side Improvements.**

**ACTION:** *Director Boozé* motioned to approve the LONP; seconded by *Director Ritterman* and passed with no nays and two abstentions from *Director Wallace* and *Vice-Chair Abelson*.

**DISCUSSION:** City of Richmond Redevelopment Association staff *Alan Wolken* presented the request for a letter of no prejudice (LONP) for the Richmond Intermodal Station Eastside improvements including a grade level elevator on Nevin Ave., lighting enhancements and pedestrian improvements between BART and 19<sup>th</sup> Street. *Mr. Wolken* stated that a LONP is for a future commitment of \$527,000 allowing the agency to advance the project prior to the actual allocation of STMP funds. It would also help secure existing grant funds. This process is fairly common and was also done for the Richmond Parking Garage.

*Chair Swearingen* asked what the benefit is of a LONP from WCCTAC. *Mr. Wolken* stated this helps show the other sources of funding that there are a variety of funding sources.

*Vice-Chair Abelson* stated that STMP funds are not as originally expected; she asked if the signing of the LONP makes a commitment. *Ms. Atienza* stated that this letter would commit WCCTAC to eventually reimbursing Richmond for up to \$527,000 but it would not make this project a priority because it does not preclude the Board from making other projects a higher priority and funding this project at a later date. *Vice-Chair Abelson* asked why the elevator is urgent and stated that she is stuck if the elevator is out of service. *Mr. Wolken* said the second phase of the units on the eastside and ADA requirements require an elevator. The plans have been in place for a number of years. *Vice-Chair Abelson* asked if the project could be rethought to allow for an elevator option.

*Director Wallace* asked about the housing units being affordable. *Mr. Wolken* said that 50% are affordable based on Contra Costa cost of living standards.

*Director Boozé* made the motion to approve the LONP; seconded by *Director Ritterman*. The motion was approved with no nays and two abstentions from *Vice-Chair Abelson* and *Director Wallace*.

## **15. APPROVE West Contra Costa Transit Enhancement Strategic Plan and West Contra Costa/Albany Transit Wayfinding Plan.**

**ACTION:** *Director Boozé* motioned to bring back the study after addressing the outreach and questions raised by the Board; seconded by *Director Wallace* and passed with five ayes and two nays from *Vice-Chair Abelson* and *Director Calloway*.

**DISCUSSION:** *Ms. Atienza* introduced *Mr. Bob Grandy* from Fehr and Peers who was the Project Manager on this project and complimented the efforts by the consultant team.

*Mr. Grandy* presented a powerpoint presentation highlighting the contents of report and afterwards asked the Board for their comments and questions.

*Director Wallace* asked which staff members from AC Transit participated in the study. *Mr. Grandy* stated that there were several members from AC Transit and referred to the list at the front of the report. *Director Wallace* commented that he was not kept in the loop.

*Vice-Chair Abelson* asked what level of community interest was shown. *Mr. Grandy* stated that it depended on the forum but the team brought information to cities through local council meetings as well as hosting three Open Houses with 10-30 people per Open House. He added that most of the input was generated through the website. *Vice-Chair Abelson* asked what the top concerns expressed at the meetings were. *Mr. Grandy* said they included barriers to transit services, a desire for shuttles specifically especially from employers. Safety and heavy traffic were mentioned as well as security-issues were mentioned. The lack of bicycle parking and the need for better lighting were also raised.

*Director Boozé* asked *Mr. Grandy* where in Richmond the meetings were held. *Mr. Grandy* stated they were held at City Hall at 440 Macdonald. *Director Boozé* asked how many meeting were held. *Mr. Grandy* stated one community workshop. *Director Boozé* asked how many people attended the workshop. *Mr. Grandy* stated 25-30 people and many from the Richmond Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

*Director Boozé* stated that he is very upset because his constituents were not notified and stated that the African American community was not addressed. He noted that the effort to close certain streets like Macdonald, Cutting and 23<sup>rd</sup> Avenue is not okay. He stated he will not support this plan because it is unfair and needs more cultures involved.

*Ms. Atienza* stated that no specific streets are being proposed for closure and she addressed concerns and explained the limits of the study process and how the tool box works and allows each local agency to decide which efforts they want to pursue. She stated that the approval of this report does not supersede any plans agencies have in place but is a tool for applying for future grants.

*Director Boozé* said he was unaware of this plan and 25 people out of a population of 110,000 is not representative of the community. He also noted that computers are not available to all and more information is needed.

*Director Wallace* asked what Albany has to do with the study area. *Ms. Atienza* explained that it focused on the wayfinding portion of the study since the Ohlone Greenway is connected to the study area.

*Vice-Chair Abelson* made a motion to approve acceptance of the report. *Director Booze* made an amendment to the motion to bring the study back at the December Board meeting after he talks to members of his staff. *Vice Chair Abelson* asked to accept the report now and review with staffs later and put part of this to rest now. *Director Boozé* asked for 20 days. *Chair Swearingen* said he does not have a problem with extending the time to the next meeting to talk to their staffs and proposed taking a vote on the main amendment.

The amended motion was seconded by *Director Wallace*. *Director Calloway* stated that this plan is paid for and completed so the conversation next month should be to adopt the plan. *Ms. Atienza* explained that there is no money to expand the scope. There were two nays by *Vice-Chair Abelson* and *Director Calloway* and five ayes to bring the item back to the December 9 Board meeting.

## **STANDING ITEMS**

### **2. Correspondence/Other Information**

#### **a. Incoming**

- Aug. 10, from Hercules, on Certification of Environmental Impact Report for the Intermodal Transit Center
- Sept. 22, from CCTA, on Items Approved by the Authority on Sept. 21 and Other Items of Interest
- Oct. 5, from Richmond, on Request for Letter of No Prejudice for STMP Funding for the Richmond Intermodal Station – East Side Improvements (*see item 13*)
- Oct. 10, from BART, Letter of Support for Richmond’s Request for Letter of No Prejudice for STMP Funding for the Richmond Intermodal Station – East Side Improvements (*see item 13*)
- Oct. 20, from CCTA, on Items Approved by the Authority on Oct. 19

#### **b. Outgoing**

- July 22, to CCTA, Comments on Draft Bylaws for Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- July 27, to CCTA, Letter of Support for West County Applications for 2012 STIP Funding
- July 28, to TransForm, Letter of Support for Hercules’ Safe Routes to Transit Grant Application for John Muir Parkway Extension and Transit Route Improvements
- Aug. 20, to East Bay Regional Park District, Comments on Draft EIR for Pinole Shores to Bay Front Park Bay Trail Gap Closure

- Aug. 22, to CCTA, Comments on MTC's Proposed Bay Area Express Lane Network Application to CTC
- Aug. 22, to CCTA, Request to Amend Measure J Expenditure Plan Provisions for West County Additional Bus Service Enhancements (Program 19b) and West County Additional Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities (Program 20b)
- Aug. 29, to Chabot Space & Science Center – Challenger Learning Center, re: Request for Support for Transportation Needs

c. **Workshops/Conferences/Events**

- none

**3. Board and Staff Comments**

- Director Wallace stated that AC Transit has held redistricting meetings
- Ms. Atienza noted the report 17-C.1 on the comments to Caltrans on the I-80 ICM and hopefully will be ready to have responses in December; part of that is the discontinuation of Smart Corridors participation for now.

**4. Other Business - none**

**5. Adjourn.** Next meeting is Friday, December 9, 2011 at 8:00 a.m.

- 
- In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, if you need special assistance to participate in the WCCTAC Board meeting, or if you need a copy of the agenda and/or agenda packet materials in an alternative format, please contact Valerie Jenkins at 510.215.3217 prior to the meeting.
  - If you have special transportation requirements and would like to attend the meeting, please call the phone number above at least 48 hours in advance to make arrangements.
  - Handouts provided at the meeting are available upon request and may also be viewed at WCCTAC's offices.
  - Please refrain from wearing scented products to the meeting, as there may be attendees susceptible to environmental illnesses. Please also put cellular phones on silent mode during the meeting.
  - A meeting sign-in sheet will be circulated at the meeting. Sign-in is optional.