



TO: WCCTAC Technical Advisory Committee

DATE: Mar. 15, 2011

FR: John Rudolph JR

RE: Summary Notes of Mar. 10, 2011 WCCTAC-TAC Meeting

1. Meeting Notes will be distributed to TAC for comment prior to inclusion in the Board packet.

2. I-80 Integrated Corridor Mobility Project: Cristina Ferraz, Caltrans, and John Hemiup, ACTC, provided a status report on the project. The TAC discussed outreach, permits, and MOU issues.

A. Status:

- #4 ARM 95% design complete, #5 ATM 70-80% design complete.
- Staff noted #7 Richmond Parkway Transit Center may lose STIP funding until a future cycle and the RM2 allocation may be limited to \$100K for a feasibility study, and suggested project team contact Wil Buller at AC Transit for clarification of RPTC status.

B. Outreach:

- ACTC is developing a public outreach strategy for the arterial improvements. The construction management firm is S&C Engineers.
- Staff emphasized that WCCTAC Board members are keenly interested in construction impacts on local roadways, and advised local staff to apprise their elected officials.
- Berkeley staff stated that a well-thought out traffic control plan is critical.
- Staff suggested that the project team consult with Cyrus Minoofar, ACTC, before he retires, on successful strategies for conducting outreach on the SMART Corridors Project.
- City staff said that usual notification of construction projects includes hand-delivering flyers to all residents and businesses on both sides of affected streets, suggested that project team provide a project web site to the agencies that can be linked to their home pages, and confirmed that a telephone hotline would be useful.

C. Permits:

- Project team reviewed permit approval status. San Pablo staff stated that the city will require a signed, stamped set of full plans and specs. Some cities have moratoriums on pavement trenching which may require that new conduit be pushed. Project team will consult with each city individually.

D. MOU:

- El Cerrito has submitted comments; other agencies are completing their reviews.
- Staff noted that they would seek formation of a policy committee consisting of the Caltrans District 4 Director or his designee, plus one elected official each from MTC, CCTA, and ACTC, plus two from Contra Costa cities, two from Alameda cities, and one from a transit property. The PC would meet on an as-needed basis to make policy decisions, including but not limited to conflict resolution.
- Staff notified the project team that they will ask that the three levels of project staff be collapsed into two, with a corridor steering committee mirroring the composition of the PC and the project TAC, and encourage integrated, coordinated meetings in deference to the agencies who would be represented by the same individuals.

- Project staff noted that the MOU had been developed through the models of San Mateo and Santa Clara where there is no PC.
- Members of the TAC as well as Berkeley staff expressed their support for staff's proposal, stating that support for the project would be difficult without a policy committee that involves elected officials.
- Staff suggested that the PC could develop in time into a JPA to address issues that affect the cities and transit operators on a corridor-wide basis, not just I-80. Such a PC would be appropriate for resolving conflicts where there is no right or wrong answer but when solutions need to be weighed against many factors.
- The PC might also address matters such as a regional contribution toward O&M. Using West County HOV savings to defray O&M costs is a temporary band-aid that does not address the idea that this is a regional project.
- A body of elected officials could also champion this project, and help to achieve a collaborative win for all elected officials in all cities on this corridor.
- Examples of such policy bodies are the WCCTAC JPA and the San Pablo Ave SMART Corridor PAC.

E. Other MOU Issues.

- Documents explaining this project tend to be highly technical and unclear as to how the actual operation of the system will occur.
- A useful tool may be a one-page chart arranged around a basic framework of peak/off-peak and incident/no-incident, listing the strategies (ARM, ATM, flush plans, etc.) that will be deployed in each cell for each unit of analysis (freeway, arterial, or transit).
- The integration of the SMART Corridor with this project remains an issue.
- El Cerrito staff noted that responsibility for maintaining incident management devices, such as trailblazers, will fall on the city because it owns the sidewalks, though the benefit of the IM devices is regional.
- Before-and-after studies should be deployed for all strategies, not just ramp metering.
- The level of staff involvement is a major concern, given varying levels of resources at the cities. Staff suggested that one option may be to pay Caltrans to operate the system on behalf of the cities. Ms. Ferraz cautioned that Caltrans is constrained in its staff resources.
- Project staff will confirm that construction may begin before the MOU is signed.
- Staff noted that the project has been a struggle for those involved, as is natural when people are working together to accomplish something that is bigger than any individual.
- Staff will send project team a letter to discuss openly the issues noted above.

2. Upcoming Safe Routes to Schools Call for Projects: Brad Beck, CCTA, introduced David Parisi of Parisi Associates, the Authority's consultant to develop the SR2S Master Plan. Prior to completion of the Plan, approximately \$2.4m will be distributed countywide through the FY11-12 first cycle of this CMAQ-funded effort. Each RTPC will be allocated \$500K to \$750K for projects and programs. The balance of projects vs. programs will be determined by the RTPCs. At the next TAC meeting, agencies will present their preliminary ideas on using this funding opportunity. Joanna Pallock will email TAC representatives to coordinate agencies' participation through appropriate contacts.

With respect to development of the Master Plan, Parisi Associates will survey public and private schools, public works departments and police personnel throughout the county and ascertain the boundaries, programs and issues of each school district and school. Nancy Baer, CCHS, suggested that

early in the process her colleague Shannon Ladner-Beasley provide a brief outline of what is happening now in West County, which has an existing SR2S program. San Pablo staff suggested that the plan could emphasize the safe crossing of streets, training parents to assist in safe crossings, and teaching children how to cross safely, plus simple improvements such as signage and raised crosswalks. Staff suggested contacting Jerry Parsons of the John Sweet Unified School District, and observed that a larger umbrella provided by the Master Plan will be forthcoming.

3. Proposed Guidelines for the Measure J Transportation for Livable Communities and Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Trail Facilities Programs: Brad Beck, CCTA, said that the Authority at its Mar. 16 meeting is expected to release the draft guidelines for both programs for review by the TCC on Mar. 17 and by WCCTAC at its April TAC and Board meetings. Jim Townsend, EBRPD, noted that one challenge of equitably distributing PBTF funds annually is that the funding is too small to address the specific needs of the district; a better system would be to accumulate funds over a cycle of several years and distribute them equitably over time. Project readiness is key. Mr. Townsend said rehabilitation of paved trails is usually a priority with this funding source because trail rehabilitation funding is difficult to obtain. The priority in West County would be to supplement capital projects already underway. The district would perform about \$500K of improvements in each RTPC through FY14-15.

Dave Campbell, EBBC, introduced his organization's new Executive Director, Renee Rivera, and asked if TLC or PBTF might be used for educational purposes. Mr. Beck said that Measure J is clear that the funding is for facilities (existing or planned). Mr. Beck said that NGOs would need to partner with agencies that can perform construction projects. Mr. Beck clarified that even the West County Additional funds are limited to construction or maintenance. Staff noted that the TAC had earlier agreed to tie its additional funding to the larger pot, though the WCCTAC Board had never acted on the TAC's proposal. The recommendation will be forwarded to the Board. Staff inquired about formalizing roles and responsibilities for members of the CBPAC, and suggested that because the CBPAC makes recommendations on funding, that formal appointments to CBPAC be made by the RTPC boards, as is done with TCC.

4. MTC 2013 Regional Transportation Plan and Call for Projects: Jack Hall, CCTA, reminded project sponsors to tier their project submittals and to be mindful of funding targets.

- Staff asked project sponsors to send an email with their lists for inclusion in the March Board packet by COB Mar. 16.
- BART staff asked if system-wide projects, which used to be submitted directly to MTC, are now to be submitted to CCTA, subdivided by region. Mr. Hall said he would provide population numbers for BART's use in submitting projects by subregion, and work with BART offline to answer this and other questions.
- John McKenzie said Caltrans would like to submit projects that emerged from the I-80 ICM CSMP effort, even though project costs are not attached yet, and that a set-aside of \$30m would allow flexibility in responding to future ICM issues. Mr. Hall noted line items for the ICM; Mr. McKenzie observed that the CSMP projects are not part of the original ICM. As the CSMP has been approved, the TAC was amenable to Mr. McKenzie's proposed strategy.
- Ms. Baer asked about the partnering process for NGOs. Mr. Hall clarified that the public agency sponsor would bring the project forward. Mr. Beck said that CCTA is compiling a list of NGOs and sending them notices of the RTP CFP process. Chad Smalley described the

Richmond process which includes city and NGO projects simultaneously. Staff noted the tight timeline, as MTC's deadline is Apr. 29, and Richmond's process is outside the proposed CCTA public outreach plan. Mr. Beck suggested the NGO projects are likely to be many and small, and would be subsumed under a catch-all line item such as "pedestrian and bicycle projects" or "interchange improvements," which are not specific but which would provide funding within the financially constrained list of projects.

5. Appointments to Technical Coordinating Committee: By consensus, the TAC recommended the following for appointment by the Board: Jerry Bradshaw (El Cerrito), Edric Kwan (Richmond), and Robert Reber (Hercules) as members, with Adèle Ho (San Pablo) as alternate, for the term April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2013. Responsibilities of TCC representatives include attending TCC meetings, reporting back to WCCTAC staff, and notifying Adèle when they anticipate being unavailable to attend a meeting.

6. MTC Program for Arterial System Synchronization: Staff announced that the PASS Call for Projects had been issued; deadline is Apr. 12. Staff suggested that the ICM project team avail themselves of this program for the crossing arterials on San Pablo Ave.

7. Richmond General Plan Update DEIR has been released; comments are due Mar. 31. Staff noted that the General Plan proposes changes in the circulation element may result in changes in the Action Plan, and suggested that the TAC, especially San Pablo and the county, take a careful look at the document and let WCCTAC staff know soon if they have comments.

8. Bike to Work Day is May 12, 2011.

9. Adjournment until April 14, 2011, at 9:00 a.m.

The next **regular WCCTAC-TAC meeting** will be: April 14, May 12 at 9:00 a.m.

The next **WCCTAC Board meetings** will be: March 25, April 22 at 8:00 a.m.