



## Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

**DATE & TIME:** Thursday, March 14, 2013, 9:00 – 10:30 a.m.

**LOCATION:** City of San Pablo, Council Chambers  
13831 San Pablo Avenue (at Church Lane)

---

**1. Self-Introductions:** A quorum had been reached at the start of the meeting.

**2. Public Comment:** None

**3. Minutes and Sign In Sheet from February 14, 2013**

Action: Approved (Motion made and seconded by Ortiz/Thompson, unanimous approval)

### *INFORMATION*

**4. Update WCCTAC Board Roster**

Action: None

### *DISCUSSION*

**5. TDM 2014 Program Outline**

Action: Approved to forward to the Board (Motion made and seconded by Landau/Reilly, unanimously approved)

Discussion: Linda Young presented the FY13-14 TDM Program. She reviewed the upcoming legislation of SB 1339 which requires all employers over 50 employees to comply with a set of TDM strategies. It is a four year demo project between MTC and the Air District. She also shared details on the Real time Rideshare demo effort as well as the May Bike to Work Day. And last but not least, Linda announced her retirement from WCCTAC in 2013.

Nathan Landau asked about the College Class Pass for the community college. Linda explained the conflict between parking fees, police funds and transit passes. Bill Pinkham asked if the arrival of LBNL is part of the TDM plan and Ms. Young noted that WCCTAC is actively involved with the move.

## **6. One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Call for Projects**

Action: None

Discussion: Matt Kelly presented the OBAG Call for Projects. Nathan Landau asked for a definition of “station” in terms of proximity to a station. The definition is on page 34 under the scoring criteria. Deidre Heitman noted that the sense was that a station would be an intermodal station, not a bus stop.

Adele Ho asked if the Local Streets and Roads projects still need to submit applications. The answer was yes, but they will not be scored. Chad Smalley asked why geography is an issue and how did the discussion transpire. Adele noted that geographic equity is not required but that the cap (lowered from \$10 million to \$6 million) ensures that there will be at least four projects – ostensibly one for each RTPC. Matt noted that MTC prefers larger projects.

Jerry asked if it was necessary to have a council resolution if an application was approved. Hisham Noeimi said that the planning schedule would make the resolution necessary by July 30, 2013. Hisham also noted that applications are for construction phase, not PE and design, but that the match can come from the PE and design phase. Also, all consultants involved must comply with federalized contract rules. CCTA needs to answer the issue of having a PE federalized before the E-76.

## **7. Safe Routes to School Cycle 2**

Action: None

Discussion: Julie Morgan (Fehr & Peers) spoke on behalf of Brad Beck who was out sick. SR2S applications are due June 4 2013 to CCTA. Jerry noted that means getting applications to the WCCTAC Board for the May 24<sup>th</sup> meeting, which means that the TAC must arrive at their recommendation at their April or May meeting. Since the program allocates a fixed amount to each RTPC, there are no competitive scoring criteria set by the CCTA; there will only be a narrative style application for the projects. It is left to each RTPC to arrive at the recommended projects or programs.

Corrie Reilly and Shannon Lander Beasley presented the County Health Department’s SRTS program in West County and discussed how the efforts to date have yielded benefits as well as ways to enhance the existing efforts.

Hisham mentioned the overpass to Riverside school as a possible project. Yvetteh Ortiz mentioned her desire to add more elementary schools in El Cerrito to the existing SRTS education program.

Jerry noted that this Cycle 2 covers the next three years of SRTS funding.

## **8. Development of 2014 Action Plan:**

Action: None

Discussion: Julie Morgan (Fehr & Peers) noted that the Action Plan could have a more user friendly format. Jerry asked if the idea is to dig in deeper or just do a slight remodel. It's up to the RTPC, but her scope of work was to simply update the current Action Plan. Jerry Bradshaw indicated that it may be worth considering simplifying the format and even the content of the Plan – the Action Plans of other RTPCs were typically more streamline than WCCTAC's. For instance, there are many Routes of Regional Significance (RRS) designated, and the TAC could consider trimming that number down. It was pointed out that Multi-modal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) on RRS are tools used by neighboring cities to determine impacts of major development projects. Nathan Landau pointed out that routes that fall entirely within a single jurisdiction may not be useful as a RRS with MTSOs. That could be a way to trim the number of RRS.

The monitoring results of the existing MTSOs were not yet available. Without know that data, it would be difficult to know how effective the MTSOs have been since 2009 and whether their metrics were meaningful. It was anticipated that the monitoring data would be available by the April TAC meeting.

#### **9. I-80 Corridor Mobility Project**

Action: None

Discussion: John Hemiup gave an update on the latest I-80 ICM efforts. Signs that were deployed early have been covered for the time being. Public relation contracts have not been signed; they are undergoing an internal Caltrans process. An in-house website is being created without a PR firm. Adele stated that the public needs more information and Yvetteh confirmed the need for public outreach efforts.

#### **10. TAC & Staff Member Comments and Announcements**

Action: None

Discussion: none

#### **11. Other Business**

None