

MEETING SUMMARY

SR 24 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting # 3

Tuesday, August 25, 2009
9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
CCTA Offices

Attendees

ACCMA: Bijan Yarjani
Caltrans: Erik Alm, Katie Benouar, Cristina Ferraz, John McKenzie
CCTA: Matt Kelly, Amin Abuamara
City of Orinda / Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT): Janice Carey
MTC: Joanna Fox, Mike Kerns, Albert Yee
MIG: Paul Rosenbloom, Diana Sherman
PBS&J: Tom Biggs, Kelly Klare

I. Welcome

Diana Sherman, MIG, Inc., provided brief introductions and welcoming remarks and explained that she was facilitating the meeting in Lou Hexter's absence.

II. CSMP Progress to Date

John McKenzie, Caltrans, provided an overview of the SR 24 CSMP progress to date. The only project delay noted was the Detection in Place step that was originally slated for completion in August, 2009 and will now be completed in December, 2009 (presentation previously provided).

III. Mitigation Strategies & Prioritized Mitigation Strategies Technical Presentation

Tom Biggs, PBS&J, provided an overview of the Mitigation Strategies and Prioritized Mitigation Strategies and answered TAC member questions during the presentation (presentation previously provided).

Questions and comments are listed below by topic area; questions and answers are also listed below by topic area. Sources of questions and answers are noted, when available, as well. Comments are also noted in this section.

Consultant Methodology and Notes

At the conclusion of his presentation, Mr. Biggs explained a number of assumptions made in the technical analysis, identified data sources and made other comments:

- Some proposed Mitigation Strategies may conflict with the established Lamorinda Gateway policies
- Unconstrained demand volumes for the Future Conditions analysis were used and based on Contra Costa and Alameda County travel demand models as well as the Caldecott Improvement Project model.
- The strategies presented are primarily focused on 2015
- The IDAS (ITS Deployment Analysis System) methodology was used to evaluate the reliability and safety benefits of proposed ITS mitigation strategies (i.e., Package A).

Questions

- **Caltrans:** Do the strategies identified for Package B require widening of SR 24?
Tom Biggs: We've reviewed a range of options and have not confirmed that at this time.
- **ACCMA:** What is the impact of installing ramp metering on local streets?
Tom Biggs: Our models were all set with end-of-ramp queue detectors and were also set so that if the queue got to the end of the ramp, the metering rate would increase as to prevent impacts to local streets.
- **ACCMA:** What parking enhancements are recommended?
Tom Biggs: We've recommended increased feeder service to provide options in Lamorinda and increased parking at BART stations further upstream which is consistent with existing policies.
- **Caltrans:** When is the BART ridership increase expected to occur?
Tom Biggs: In the 2015-2030 time periods.
- **Caltrans:** How would the mitigation strategies identified in Package A reduce delay?
Tom Biggs: The strategies identified in Package A are designed to increase reliability and safety, not reduce delay. This package ranks high among the others because of the low cost.
- **CCTA:** Could the HOV lane proposed in Package D be more strategically placed or shortened and still relieve the existing bottleneck?

Tom Biggs: *Our analysis showed that placement of this improvement in another location or decreasing the length of the HOV lane would surface an upstream embedded bottleneck or a downstream bottleneck.*

IV. Mitigation Strategies and Prioritization Discussion

The meeting continued with an overall discussion about the Mitigation Strategies and Prioritization. Questions are listed below:

- **CCTA:** Is there any chance to include Transit Enhancement and BART coordination in the Cost Benefit Analysis table?

Tom Biggs: *This type of analysis, while necessary, is not in our scope of work.*

- **CCTA:** The Lamorinda Action Plan uses a Delay Index and it would be useful to include this index in your analysis.

Tom Biggs: *We will find a way to integrate the Delay Index for purposes of direct comparisons and will include a discussion of the index in the Performance Measures text.*

V. Action Items and Next Steps

The meeting concluded with Erik Alm providing a description of the expected next steps.

FPI Analysis Comment Period: *Send comments to John McKenzie by September 16*

Finalize FPI Analysis	October
FPI Analysis Presentation to CCTA's TCC + ACTAC	October (November?)
Develop Scope for Supplemental SR-24 Corridor Study	TBD
Incorporate FPI Analysis into Draft CSMP	October/ November
SR-24 CSMP TAC meeting to review Draft CSMP	October/ November
Draft CSMP Comment Period	November
Caltrans Acceptance of CSMP	Dec. 2009-Jan. 2010

PBS&J will update draft materials and redistribute to the TAC, including updated information [already provided].