

**West Contra Costa Advisory Committee  
Meeting Minutes, 09 December 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); Joe Wallace (AC Transit); Absent: John Gioia (County); Courtland Boozé (Richmond)

**Staff Present:** Christina Atienza, Valerie Jenkins, Joanna Pallock, John Rudolph, Linda Young; Benjamin Reyes, Legal Counsel; Hisham Noeimi, 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 called the meeting to order at 8:02 a.m.
2. **Public Comment.** There was no public comment.
3. **Election: (a) WCCTAC Chair, (b) WCCTAC Vice-Chair**  
*Director Wallace* nominated *Vice-Chair Abelson* for the WCCTAC 2012-13 Chair position; seconded by *Director Hansen*; and passed unanimously. *Vice-Chair Abelson* nominated *Director Wilkins* for the WCCTAC Vice-Chair position; seconded by *Chair Swearingen*; and passed unanimously

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

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

4. **APPROVE: Minutes and Summary of Oct 28 Board Meeting, and RECEIVE Summary of Oct 13 TAC Meeting**
5. **APPROVE Monthly Program and Projects Status Report**
6. **APPROVE: Financial Report for Oct & Nov**
7. **APPROVE: Payment of Invoice Over \$10,000.**
8. **APPROVE: Proposed 2012 Board and TAC Meeting Schedule.**
9. **APPROVE: AC Transit & WestCAT's FY 11-12 Claims for Measure J Program 19b, Additional Bus Service Enhancements.**
10. **APPROVE: Contra Costa Transit Enhancement Strategic Plan and West Contra Costa/Albany Wayfinding Plan.**

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**11. CONSIDER Suspension of Participation in Traffic Monitoring Element of the San Pablo Avenue Smart Corridor Program.**

**ACTION:** *Director Wallace* moved that the Board authorize the Executive Director to initiate the legal process for suspension of west County's participation in the traffic monitoring element of the San Pablo Avenue Smart Corridor Program; seconded by *Director Calloway*; passed unanimously.

**DISCUSSION:** *Mr. John Rudolph* asked the Board to turn to page #11-1 in the agenda packet, and stated that the proposed action is a cost-cutting measure. Mr. Rudolph indicated that in the middle of page #11-1, five traffic management tools are listed (A) through (E). The proposed action will not affect (C), traffic signal coordination, which may still be conducted on an as-needed basis; and will not affect (D), transit signal priority, which is maintained through a separate agreement between AC Transit and Alameda County Transportation Commission; and will not affect (E), emergency signal preemption, which is maintained through separate agreements between the individual jurisdictions and Alameda County Transportation Commission.

*Mr. Rudolph* stated that the proposed action is about suspending west County's participation in (A), traffic surveillance through closed circuit television cameras, and (B), traffic detection and monitoring through microwave video detection systems (MVDS). *Mr. Rudolph* stated that west County's participation in (A) and (B) costs approximately \$90,000 per year, although through improvements in technology these costs have been coming down. The proposed action is expected to save about \$30,000 this year, and \$60,000 every year thereafter until the I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility Project becomes operational in late 2013 or early 2014, when the Smart Corridors components will be repurposed so that traffic engineers will once again have the ability to detect and monitor traffic through closed circuit television and microwave video detectors. The I-80 ICM will provide enhanced capability.

*Mr. Rudolph* explained how the TAC determined that the limited use of these components does not justify ongoing costs of approximately \$90,000 per year. The TAC's recommendation is to suspend participation, save \$30,000 this year, save \$60,000 next year and the year thereafter, continue to work with the ICM project team to develop the ICM project so that it meets both regional goals and local objectives, and then to see these Smart Corridor components repurposed in the ICM at a future date.

*Director Ritterman* thanked staff for identifying an area of savings. He stated that because of staff reductions there may be other agencies that are spending money for information they're not using, and asked what functions might be lost by west County's suspension.

*Ms. Atienza* stated that cities would lose the functionality of (A) and (B) – cities would not be able to look at the closed circuit television cameras and they would not be able to

download traffic counts from the microwave detectors. When staff surveyed the cities to assess their use of these components, staff found that due to staff reductions, cities are not able to use the components as often or as well as they'd like.

*Director Abelson* inquired whether the Smart Corridor program costs are related to maintenance. *Mr. Rudolph* said yes. *Director Abelson* said it was her understanding that the WCCTAC Board agreed to support the I-80 ICM under the condition that west County did not have to pay for maintenance of the ICM. *Director Abelson* asked whether, as these costs pertain to maintenance, WCCTAC would not have to pay these costs, because that was the condition upon which the Board agreed to support the ICM.

*Mr. Rudolph* explained that some devices are existing, and some will be added. Devices that currently exist are located either on the Caltrans right of way or on a local right of way. If a device is currently located on a local right of way, but the primary purpose of the device is to monitor traffic that's coming off the freeway, that device is effectively part of the ICM project. Staff continues to work with the ICM project team to make sure that Caltrans and Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) absorb the operations and maintenance costs for both the devices on the Caltrans right of way and the devices on the local rights of way if the devices are monitoring freeway traffic.

*Mr. Rudolph* noted that there may be some devices that the local jurisdictions want in order to monitor local traffic. These devices can be added, but there may be costs for the local agencies to operate and maintain.

*Director Abelson* said the emergency vehicle preemption saves lives, and asked about operating and maintaining EVP. *Mr. Rudolph* said that the protocols for operating and maintaining the emergency vehicle preemption are between the individual cities and ACTC. *Ms. Atienza* noted that typically cities maintain their own traffic signals, and maintenance of EVP is something the cities routinely do. The reason ACTC is involved pertains to its original role as project manager.

*Chair Swearingen* asked *Director Hansen* if WestCAT is participating in the same system as AC Transit. *Director Hansen* stated that he expects the functionality of transit signal priority for WestCAT buses on crossing arterials through WestCAT's participation in the I-80 ICM Project.

*Ms. Atienza* noted that WCCTAC is not a signatory to the original agreement for operations and maintenance responsibilities, payment, ownership, and other; that is between the cities and ACTC, Caltrans, and other regional agencies; the recommendation now is for staff to initiate the legal process that would help west County agencies get out of that agreement.

**12. Proposal to Initiate I-80 Corridor Transportation Investment Study.**

- 1. APPROVE initial tasks & preliminary budget for inclusion in Request for Qualifications;**
- 2. APPROVE use of up to \$140,000 in Measure J Subregional Transportation Needs  
(Program 28b) funds for the initial tasks;**
- 3. APPROVE release of Request for Qualifications;**
- 4. APPROVE mixed combination of Board directors and key staff to serve on consultant  
selection panel;**
- 5. APPOINT directors to serve on consultant selection panel; and**
- 6. APPOINT subcommittee to invite participation of, and seek support from,  
external  
agencies**

**ACTION:** *Director Hansen* moved to have the Board adopt the six items listed on the Slide 12-15 with amendments incorporated to include making a name change of the study, to include transportation equity, seniors and quality of life; seconded by *Director Ritterman*; and passed unanimously.

**DISCUSSION:** *Director Keller* presented the history of the development of an I-80 Corridor Transportation Investment Study. Staff from AC Transit, WestCAT, and WCCTAC met with *Director Keller*. He explained that his discussion today is building on the concept from the last Board presentation and incorporating the comments and feedback after that meeting. This is a good study made better with suggestions incorporated since the last presentation.

*Director Keller* also announced changes made the BART Board District and the changes to rebalance the District resulting in *Director Keller* being reassigned out of West County. The new district will have four BART Directors instead of five which will bring more representation to Contra Costa County. West County is split between Bob Franklin and Lynette Sweet. The BART stations will be represented by both directors. 60% of the West County population will be part of San Francisco and West County district under *Director Sweet*. She will be informed of the study by *Director Keller*.

*Director Ritterman* asked how his leaving will affect the study. *Director Keller* noted that BART staff will remain involved but he can participate in a limited way if Ms. Sweet and Mr. Franklin are comfortable and the WCCTAC Board concurs with that request. *Director Ritterman* stated he would like to keep *Director Keller* involved because of his passion for the study. *Chair Swearingen* stated that he would like to see both Ms. Sweet and *Director Keller* be involved. *Chair Swearingen* noted that a transit study such as the one WCCTAC is proposing to undertake may be the kind of exciting multi-jurisdictional project that would engage Ms. Sweet's attention, and he looks forward to working with *Director Sweet*.

*Vice-Chair Abelson* remarked that it is not advantageous to El Cerrito to split its BART stations between two BART Board Members, especially as El Cerrito prepares to develop its stations. The redistricting effectively diminishes El Cerrito's representation on the BART Board. *Director Abelson* stated that *Mr. Franklin* attended most Board meetings for many years, even though west County was not in his district, and acknowledged *Mr. Franklin's* dedication to BART and the west County area. *Director Abelson* stated that *Director Keller* has been a valuable, engaged WCCTAC Board member, and noted that *Ms. Sweet* had not attended a WCCTAC Board meeting in memory. *Chair Swearingen* asked *Director Keller* if he might coordinate with *Director Sweet* on oversight of the transit study, and perhaps continue to give the study his attention and effort. *Director Keller* thanked the Board members for their kind words and said that he would speak to *Ms. Sweet* and *Mr. Franklin* and report back to the Board in January.

*Director Swearingen* thanked *Director Keller* for his efforts and asked him to oversee *Ms. Sweet* for awhile and provide continuity. *Director Keller* stated that he has some ideas on how to resolve these issues before the rest of the year. He noted that BART elected participation is important. He turned over the discussion on the study to *Ms. Atienza*.

*Ms. Atienza* presented the PowerPoint and noted the new name for the study and the broader focus on transportation as opposed to just transit. She refreshed the Board on the concept approved last month for a mode neutral opportunity study. She stated that this is not a major investment study only; it can include smaller investments as well. Last month the Board approved a work product for investigating the need for high capacity extensions and mode and technology neutral and retaining a consultant or team of consultants and fund the study mainly from Measure J Subregional funds as well other sources.

She also noted that the Board had general agreement made last month on the following:

- Cities want thriving communities and necessary infrastructure – jobs and housing;
- There are funding challenges due to lack of money;
- It is a good idea to have flushed out plans so when the money flows again, we are ready;
- The study offers a chance for positive change and collaboration as opposed to previous recently challenging projects like I-80 ICM and HOT lanes;
- WCCTAC's purpose is as a planning agency so this fits well with the agency;
- A study needs to consider existing plans; not done in a vacuum.

*Ms. Atienza* outlined areas that need to be fleshed out more including is it possible to do a technology neutral study? Other questions asked are do we need a study? And also with a shortage of funds to maintain, why consider expanding services when we can't maintain existing capital and operating. It was clear that the agencies not compete with each other but complement one another.

*Ms. Atienza* asked the key question is what if any initiatives should be pursued first, to mitigate the adverse impacts of congestion on the I-80 corridor and second, to support the goal of future sustainable housing and development. She proceeded to outline what the study could do and why it makes sense to do the study now, the approach and the funding sources.

*Director Keller* asked what is the cost of doing nothing and how much is lost in productivity. He mentioned the quality of life issues and the study would be a broad study but include individual information.

*Ms. Atienza* reviewed the final two slides and outlined the recommendations for the Board to adopt today. The tasks would include a meeting with key staff by consultants hired. The goal is to assure that any tasks done would be beneficial even if the rest of the study is not advanced. *Ms. Atienza* stated that \$140,000 from Measure J 28b is being requested and other items listed on Slide 12-15.

*Director Wallace* stated that AC Transit is in support of this study.

*Director Ritterman* stated that this presentation is a terrific response to the questions and concerns that were raised. The question of transportation equity was not mentioned. He asked that it be reflected and the consultants see it as a high priority. He is on board.

*Director Hansen* stated the study will be a great asset and something positive. WestCat is 100% behind it.

*Director Wilkins* is seeking a well defined scope of work. Numerous studies completed and don't recreate the wheel. He is supportive.

*Vice-Chair Abelson* would not like to make it easier for people to drive on the freeway. This needs to make West County a better place to live. Climate issues are not addressed. Also issues around seniors and transportation needs should be addressed. The goal should emphasize living closer instead of Solano County.

*Director Calloway* gave her support for the study and asked for more information to sell her peers on it. She too wants to see more transit equity attention in the study. The quality of life is most important and the title focuses on the freeway; not just I-80. Trips within the communities and not all freeway trips are her concern.

*Director Keller* stated all the comments are very helpful and noted that Title VI concerns and transit equity need to be added. He mentioned that this should not just be an I-80 study but the housing prices affect decisions to purchase in Solano County even with more infill efforts. The study is broad enough to incorporate all of those elements. Maybe dropping the I-80 name should be changed and emphasize "west county" but resources from other sources would be attracted if the title is broad.

*Director Wallace* stated that he agrees with *Vice-Chair Abelson* and *Director Calloway* about the name of the study. He stated that education on transit is key to getting people off the freeway.

*Vice-Chair Abelson* noted the West County focus and any efforts should make the emphasis on bringing housing closer to the workplace.

*Director Hansen* asked to make a motion. *Chair Swearingen* stated that he would like to give his comments.

*Ms. Atienza* stated that she has heard the comments and that Task 1 of the study would help define the boundaries of the study. She noted that if the study looks exclusively at West County, then solutions may be too narrow and not address problems created outside West County.

*Chair Swearingen* thanked staff for putting this together. All the comments will be incorporated into the definition of the study. Everyone will have their chance to give their input. *Chair Swearingen* has already spoken to his local congressional representative to ask for their involvement and support for Solano County.

*Director Hansen* motioned to adopted slide 12-15 with the amendments made by the Chair. *Director Ritterman* seconded. *Vice-Chair Abelson* asked for a specific list of the amendments. The members listed them as making a name change of the study, to include transportation equity, seniors and quality of life.

### **STANDING ITEMS**

#### **13. Correspondence/Other Information**

- a. **Incoming**
  - Nov. 17, from CCTA, on Items Approved by the Authority on Nov 16 and Other Items of Interest
- b. **Outgoing**
  - Nov. 14, to Richmond Community Redevelopment Agency, Letter of No Prejudice Approval Authority for Richmond Intermodal Station, East Side Improvements Project
  - Nov. 17, to Richmond Planning Department, Comments on Via Verdi Repair Project – San Pablo Creek Culvert Replacement – Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration
- c. **Workshops/Conferences/Events**
  - none

**14. Board and Staff Comments**

- a. Board Member Comments, Conference/Meeting Reports (AB 1234 Requirement), and Announcements  
*Director Wallace* noted that he gained area in west County through the recent AC Transit redistricting.  
With a round of applause, *Director Hanson* thanked *Chair Swearingen* for his service to the Board.  
*Chair Swearingen* reminded members to complete their Form 700.
  
- b. Report of CCTA Representatives (*Directors Abelson & Calloway; Director Ritterman, alternate*)  
*Director Calloway* announced that CCTA has hired a lobbyist for State and Federal issues and she will bring back more information later. *Director Abelson* noted that CCTA's *Executive Director Randell Iwasaki* is a potentially valuable resource. *Director Ritterman* asked if a presentation on the CCTA's legislative program could be made to the Board at a later time.
  
- c. Executive Director's Report  
*Ms. Atienza* stated that staff will look into a Board retreat for 2012. She also commented on the recent CyberTran tour attended by Directors Abelson and Callaway and WCCTAC staff. *Director Ritterman* added that Assembly Member Nancy Skinner also toured the facility.

**15. Other Business - none**

**16. Adjourned** until January 27, 2011.