

## MEETING SUMMARY

---

### I-580 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #3

Tuesday, November 17, 2009  
2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
Dublin City Hall

---

#### Attendees

ACCMA: Bijan Yarjani  
Caltrans: Erik Alm, Katie Benouar, Julie Campero, Cesar Pujol  
City of Dublin: Nicole Gonzales  
City of Livermore: Cedric Novenario  
City of Pleasanton: Josh Pack  
MTC: Danielle Stanislaus  
MIG: Lou Hexter, Paul Rosenbloom

#### I. Welcome

Lou Hexter, MIG, Inc., called the meeting to order and thanked everyone for attending and participating in the CSMP process. Lou reviewed the meeting objectives and agenda for the meeting.

#### II. CSMP Review

Erik Alm, Caltrans, provided an overview and status update of the I-580 CSMP workplan (presentation attached). The Draft CSMP is currently in the external agency review phase and TAC members are welcome to submit comments to Caltrans by December 11.

Erik noted that the expected completion date for the CSMP has been pushed back, District 4 staff are planning to deliver a complete CSMP to the CTC for approval by March, 2010.

- **ACCMA** Can Caltrans clarify what CSMP “acceptance” means? Partner agency boards have different processes for accepting reports. Given that no two CSMPs are alike, there may need to be a tailored approach for getting the acceptance of each CSMP document.

### III. CSMP Document Review

Julie Campero, Caltrans, provided an overview of the Draft I-580 CSMP Document and reviewed the available materials. Julie noted that the identified strategies build on a variety of local transportation planning efforts referenced in the plan, and input provided at previous TAC meetings. CSMP recommendations are made for short-term (to be in place by 2015) and long-term (to be in place by 2035).

Following Ms. Campero's initial overview, TAC members were asked to provide comments and questions to Caltrans. These comments and questions are sorted by category below:

#### Information Update

- **ACCMA** The cost of the BART extension to the ACE/Livermore Station has increased from \$750 million to \$3.5 billion.
- **ACCMA** Project 1b on page 19 of the summary, I-580 Westbound on-ramp at I-205, is not going to happen. The status of this project needs to be clarified or removed.
- **Pleasanton** The WB aux lane between Fallon/ El Charro and Tassajara/ Santa Rita (Freeway Capacity Improvement 12, page 20) is under construction and should be completed by mid-December.

#### Requests for Clarification

- **ACCMA** Terms such as-Productivity and Flow Rate should be more explicitly defined and or replaced with a more commonly used terms such as Capacity.
- **ACCMA** The Key Findings and Conclusions section in the Summary document could be strengthened with the addition of more specific references to the technical analysis the conclusions are based on.
- **ACCMA** The Key Findings and Conclusions section in the Summary document could be strengthened by a stronger distinction between Management Issues and Operational Issues. Some of the issues identified, including Goods Movement, are corridor specific.
- **Pleasanton** The document identifies percent change in transit and traffic demand. Please add whole numbers to compliment these numbers.
- **Pleasanton** Signal Optimization is identified on page 18 as a Corridor Management Strategy. This is a very broad strategy and one that the City of Pleasanton has been working on for some time.

**ACCMA** *The document could add greater specificity to this strategy, such as: Maintain ongoing Interregional Signal Optimization efforts, including regular agency communication, and signal timing coordination.*

**Caltrans** *Signal Optimization has been discussed at prior TAC meetings as a necessary strategy. Greater coordination has been discussed. Caltrans can add greater specificity in the document to describe potential coordination. We have had success doing this on San Pablo Ave.*

**Livermore** *The City of Livermore would welcome ongoing signal coordination with Caltrans.*

- **Pleasanton** *The Surface Street Management and Operations finding on Page 14 should be clarified to articulate that surface street improvements are not intended to support traffic diversion from I-580, but to support local traffic demand, and requires interagency coordination.*
- **Pleasanton** *Is there a sketch of Freeway Capacity Improvement Concept 9 described on Page 20 of the summary?*

**Caltrans** *Yes, Caltrans will send those sketches to TAC members.*

## **Requests for Additional Information**

- **Pleasanton** *The current draft would benefit from a more thorough description of the existing arterial system in Pleasanton, such as Sunol Blvd and Stanley, and how the system is currently impacted by existing deficiencies on I-580.*
- **Pleasanton** *There are local circulation improvement concepts identified in the Pleasanton General Plan including Jack London, Stoneridge and Dublin Boulevard. Discussion of these projects should be acknowledged in the CSMP. Additionally, local jurisdictions have completed MOUs and are phasing these projects, we are willing to share this information with Caltrans.*

**Caltrans** *The model used for analysis in the CSMP had some limitations on the amount of the arterials network that could be included. In the future we'd like to see more types of the arterials network included in the simulation model.*

**ACCMA** *Caltrans should develop some model disclaimer text to identify the limits of the model used for the technical analysis. This disclaimer will*

*help answer other questions about why some arterials are not included in the analysis.*

- **Pleasanton** An Executive Summary would be a very useful addition moving forward. This could be used for presenting the CSMP to elected officials and relevant boards. The summary could identify major topic areas including:
  - Corridor Improvements
  - Improvements to local circulation

**Caltrans** *Caltrans will explore adapting and updating the existing Fact Sheet to serve as an Executive Summary.*

#### **Other Issues and Concerns**

- **Pleasanton** The language around improvements to the arterials should be softened. Local residents are very sensitive to the potential for increased traffic on arterials.

**Livermore** *Increasing arterial traffic is not going to be popular with local residents. The CSMP text should make clear that improvements will not redirect regional and interregional traffic to arterials and are intended to minimize the local circulation impacts on I-580.*

- **ACCMA** Caltrans, ACCMA and MTC need to develop a working schedule for the presentation of the CSMP to ACCMA and MTC boards for approval. Materials may need to be ready by the third week of January to keep the schedule of submitting a signed CSMP to the CTC in March.

#### **IV. Action Items and Next Steps**

- Caltrans will send schematics of identified improvements to TAC members.
- TAC Agencies will provide additional comments as needed in writing to Caltrans by December 11.
- Caltrans will coordinate with MTC and ACCMA to develop a timeline for delivery of a final CSMP for acceptance.