

MEETING SUMMARY

SR 4 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #1

Tuesday, February 3, 2009

9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.

Contra Costa Transportation Authority Offices, Conference Room

Attendees

Caltrans: Erik Alm, Becky Frank, John McKenzie, Cesar Pujol, Carolyn Trunnell

City of Antioch: Ken Warren

City of Martinez: Tim Tucker

City of San Pablo / WCCTAC: Christina Atienza

Contra Costa County: Steve Goetz

CCCTA: Cindy Dahlgreen

CCTA: Martin Engelmann, Jack Hall, Matt Kelly

MTC: Danielle Stanislaus, Albert Yee, Mike Kerns

MIG: Lou Hexter, Paul Rosenbloom

PBS&J: Tom Biggs, Kelly Klare, Shadde Rosenblum, Jin Wang

TRANSPAC: Barbara Neustadter

TRANSPLAN: John Cunningham

I. Welcome

Martin Engelmann, CCTA, called the meeting to order and thanked everyone for attending and participating in the CSMP process. Lou Hexter, MIG, Inc., and Erik Alm, Caltrans, provided brief introductions and welcoming remarks.

II. CSMP Workplan Review

John McKenzie, Caltrans, provided an overview of the SR 4 workplan

III. Operations Analysis

Tom Biggs, PBS&J, provided an overview of the Existing Conditions Memorandum and answered TAC member questions during the presentation. Questions and answers are listed below by topic area. Sources of questions and answers are noted, when available, as well. Comments are also noted in this section.

Approach

- **Cindy Dahlgren** Is the CSMP a multi-modal strategy?
Caltrans *It is intended to be and Caltrans is seeking greater stakeholder input to generate ideas and strategies for improving congestion in the corridor through all modes. The consultant is considering both short and long-term improvement strategies.*
- **Cindy Dahlgren** The Caltrans “Mobility Pyramid” should include transit strategies.
Caltrans *The mobility pyramid does not specify any particular mode among the system management strategies listed. They could be applied to any mode that utilizes the transportation network.*
- What is the relationship between the CSMP and local transit authority action plans and regional transportation plans?
Caltrans *The CSMP offers an opportunity to gauge local support for a variety of projects that may be included in future action plans and regional transportation plans. The CSMP draws heavily on existing plans and these will be acknowledged in the final product.*

Existing Conditions Data

- Why is I-680 not listed on the map? There is a strong relationship between I-680 and SR 4.
Caltrans *Because there are no CMIA funded projects on the I-680 corridor, no CSMP is currently in progress for the corridor. Caltrans would like to eventually conduct a CSMP for every major urban freeway corridor, although we do not yet have the capacity to do so.*
- **John Cunningham** Can the existing conditions analysis include specific location info for accident data?
PBS&J *The Existing Conditions Memorandum does provide additional detail on accident locations.*

Comments

- **Cindy Dahlgren** North Concord/Martinez station starting to be better utilized. Need to get more current information from BART.
PBS&J *Will investigate.*

- **Barbara Neustadter** Fatalities are up in corridor near I-680 interchange.
- **Tim Tucker** Construction activity could be affecting safety numbers
- **Barbara Neustadter** Still concerned about metering in corridor, but TRANSPAC is now willing to consider it. Is encouraged by WCCTAC's experience.
- Consider including the I-680/SR 4 interchange improvements in traffic analysis model.
- Consider that the bottleneck at SR 242 usually goes past I-680 and encouraging local diversion where drivers exit at Morello and get back on at Pacheco.
- Please include ramp metering in the analysis.
- Clarify future conditions assumptions with CCTA before running model.
- Clarify what projects will be included in the model. (Measure J projects, I-680/ interchange projects, etc.).
- Place bypass on corridor map and note that congestion location data was collected before the bypass opened. Since the opening of the bypass, traffic patterns have shifted significantly.
- Note that construction activities in the corridor have an impact on congestion and that there are increased accident rates near construction sites.
- Overall, please place a greater emphasis on transit in the CSMP.

Other factors to consider

- Solano County transit options could increase and improve when the Pacheco project is completed.
- Are HOT lanes going to be considered, should these be identified as a current option?
- **Christine Atienza** How are new ideas coming from CSMP handled in RTP? What about committed projects?

Caltrans CSMP investment recommendations will be better positioned for future funding by being identified as part of the corridor's accepted management strategy. They will be input into planning process through traditional means (RTP, Countywide Plans, etc.)

MTC Some discretionary FPI \$\$\$ will be available from current RTP process (T2035), which could be influenced by CSMP investment choices.

PBS&J Committed (but not yet constructed) projects will be part of 2015 analysis.

Review Process

- The timeline does not allow for a sufficient review window for local RTPC groups. How should these groups be included the CSMP process?

CCTA Inform RTPC members of the CSMP process and invite them to attend future TAC meetings.

Caltrans We understand the concern expressed over the accelerated timeframe of this FPI analysis, combined with some confusion over the FPI analysis completion (May 2009) with the CSMP completion (Jun 2010). We will clarify and discuss with the TAC how we can use the time between the two deadlines in future meetings.

Additional Stakeholders to Include

- BART
- 511 Contra Costa

IV. Action Items and Next Steps

- Caltrans to confirm additional identified stakeholders to participate in TAC
- PBS&J to incorporate the following elements into technical analysis:
- Updated North Concord/Martinez BART station ridership data and fare differential notation between Concord/Martinez BART station and Pittsburg/Bay Point station.

- Including the I-680/SR 4 interchange improvements in traffic analysis model.
- Local diversion caused by SR 242 bottleneck.
- Ramp metering impacts.
- Improved Solano County transit options following completion of improvements at Pacheco.
- PBS&J to place bypass on corridor map and note that congestion location was collected before opening of bypass.
- PBS&J to clarify what projects are included in traffic analysis model, will make sure list is current and reviewed before next meeting.
- PBS&J to clarify future conditions assumptions with CCTA before running traffic analysis model.
- TAC members will provide comments on presentation results and related materials to Caltrans by February 17th.
- Future TAC meetings will take place in March, April and May, 2009.