

## MEETING SUMMARY

---

### SR 4 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #2

Wednesday, March 11, 2009  
9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.  
Pleasant Hill City Hall Community Room

---

#### Attendees

Caltrans: Erik Alm, Hamid Fathollahi, Adrian Levy, John McKenzie, Cesar Pujol, Lee Taubeneck  
Contra Costa 511: Lynn Overcashier  
Contra Costa County: Steve Goetz  
CCTA: Amin Abuamara  
City of Hercules: Lisa Hammon  
MTC: Albert Yee, Joy Lee  
MIG: Lou Hexter, Paul Rosenbloom  
PBS&J: Tom Biggs, Kelly Klare  
TRANSPAC: Barbara Neustadter  
TRANSPLAN: John Cunningham  
WestCat: Robert Thompson

---

#### I. Welcome

Lou Hexter, MIG, Inc., and Erik Alm, Caltrans, provided brief introductions and welcoming remarks. Erik noted that an updated SR 4 CSMP Fact Sheet and letter of commitment will be distributed to the team shortly.

#### II. CSMP Progress to Date

John McKenzie, Caltrans, provided an overview of the SR 4 CSMP (presentation attached).

#### Overall CSMP questions

- **CCTA** Is 2010 the end date for all CSMPs or just for 4?

*Caltrans CSMPs have varying due dates, the technical work for SR 4 is fast tracked. With the core analysis completed early, Caltrans will have an opportunity to integrate the analysis into the document and allow for more stakeholder review time.*

- **CCTA** What does 'Detection in Place' Mean?

**Caltrans** *Filling the gaps in traffic data detection, there is a project along SR 4 to be completed by August with wireless detection technology (not wired "loop" detectors).*
- **TRANSPAC** What type of data does this detection provide?

**Caltrans** *The detection systems will capture speed, volume and occupancy data that will be added to the PeMS system (<https://pems.eecs.berkeley.edu/>).*
- **CCTA** Why does the CSMP corridor limit not extend to the San Joaquin County line?

**Caltrans** *CSMP limits are influenced by the primary travel corridor in which CMIA funds are being spent. Current CSMP limits are defined only to SR 160. The effect of existing SR 4 and the SR 4 Bypass are included in the demand modeling.*
- **CCTA** What about the SR 4 Bypass, why is it not included this in the CSMP study limits?

**Tom Biggs** *The Bypass is included in the existing and future year demand models being used.*

**Caltrans** *Consideration of alternative operational strategies for all of SR 4 Bypass will have to wait until CSMP update when better data will be available. CSMPs.*
- **CCTA** How is Brentwood being included in this process?

**Caltrans** *City of Brentwood representatives have been invited to participate in the CSMP process.*

**Transplan** *Transplan is keeping them in the loop and will provide an update on the process so far. Caltrans staff should schedule a presentation at a future Transplan meeting.*
- **City of Hercules** Why these corridor limits? It does not seem like Hercules needs to be here as the focus is on the east end of SR 4. Hercules is looking to relocate a ramp at 80/4 interchange but the CSMP existing condition report did not show problems on this portion of SR-4.

**Caltrans** *When SR-4 CSMP corridor was defined, the intent was to examine a broader extent of SR-4 than just the CMIA project area. If there are SR 4 strategies we should consider for SR-4 West, we'd like to include them in the analysis. That's why Hercules should participate, so we can learn about your project ideas. There also is a CSMP under development for I-80 West and this information could also be used in that effort.*

### III. Future Conditions Presentation

Tom Biggs, PBS&J, provided an overview of the Future Conditions Technical (FCT) Memorandum (presentation attached) 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.

- **Caltrans** How did you incorporate the future design of the SR 4/ 680 interchange into your model.  
*Tom Biggs* The model we are using includes projects with committed funding that will be constructed by 2015. Today's presentation does not include planned projects that are unfunded.
- **Contra Costa County** Why does 3,100 VHD differ from the values reported in the Existing Conditions Report?  
*Tom Biggs* There are some data discrepancies that need to be resolved.
- **City of Hercules** Did the Future Conditions report identify any bottleneck at the I-80/ Hwy 4 interchange?  
*Tom Biggs* No, but this analysis will not show future year bottlenecks from I-80 that could potentially impact SR 4.
- **City of Hercules** Are the Future Conditions population and employment numbers from ABAG?  
*Tom Biggs* Yes, these are the same numbers used by CCTA for future conditions modeling.
- **Contra Costa County** What does cost of delay per year mean?  
*Tom Biggs* Cost of delay refers to the value of time that drivers spend in delay. The figure used is approximately \$15.47 per vehicle per hour, and equates to approximately \$13.45 per person per hour, which is a lower value than is used elsewhere in the Bay Area. (These numbers were taken from MTC's 2007 Freeway Performance Initiative Traffic Analysis Report).
- **Caltrans** Why is there a different growth of VHT from 2007 to 2030 when you compare Eastbound and Westbound.  
*Tom Biggs* These are indicative measurements. They are primarily a measure of traffic delay, not traffic quantity.

**MTC** *The PM delay is actually before the corridor boundaries, so there still is delay, but it is not reflected in the corridor data.*

- **TRANSPLAN** Previous data (ECT memo) showed transit accounting for 10% of travel; why has it changed? [Study team couldn't find where transit % has changed from 10% figure, but are checking all data from previous material for consistency]

**Tom Biggs** *We're still trying to plug some data holes, we only have transit data for freeways. Moving forward, text in the CSMP addressing public transportation will be expanded to address arterials. Available transit and Bike/Ped data is limited. The two different analyses, Existing and Future conditions have different measurements as they rely on different methodologies: Existing Conditions uses PEMS and travel time runs; Future Conditions uses the FREQ12 model.*

- **City of Hercules** No extreme congestion on SR-4 at SR 4/I-80 interchange in 2030?

**Tom Biggs** *No.*

## Comments

TAC members expressed a general need to clarify the Future Conditions Performance Analysis table and add a greater degree of specificity. Suggestions included better identifying where delay occurs in the corridor.

**Contra Costa County** Mode split forecasts should include eBART share in corridor

**TRANSPAC** reminded group that an SR-4 Management Plan initiative is being conceived by RTPCs. Has potential to build upon and expand on SR-4 CSMP results.

TAC members suggested that PBS&J and Caltrans clearly identify the improvement projects that are included in the travel forecast model and those that are not. A number of local projects were noted that are moving forward with some degree of funding that are not included the model. Identified projects include:

- Phase 3 of the I-680/SR 4 interchange
- eBART (included in travel demand model, however)
- Hercules Transit Center
- Pacheco Transit Center

TAC members suggested that other planned projects that have not received funding should also be analyzed in the CSMP.

#### **IV. Mitigation Strategies Brainstorming**

Using an aerial map with the five congestion locations noted, Lou Hexter facilitated a discussion about potential mitigation strategies that would improve capacity and efficiency in the corridor. Strategies identified during the brainstorming session are listed below:

##### **Overall Corridor Strategies**

- Ramp metering
- Incident Management
- Express bus service
- HOV Lanes
- Not interested in freeway expansion as a strategy

##### **Location 1**

- I-680/SR 4 interchange, phase 3
- Expanded Pacheco Park and Ride/ Transit Center with east/west/north service
- Seamless HOV/ Express bus connection to 680/242

##### **Location 2**

- Extend frontage road access (in conjunction w/ Concord Naval Weapons reuse)
- W. Leland Road: extend to Port Chicago Hwy
- Evora Road
- eBART parking
- Expanded carpool parking at BART stations
- Pittsburg/Bay Point TOD @ Bailey Road
- Improved pedestrian access to Pittsburg/BP BART for pedestrians along Bailey Road.
- BART: address fare differential at N. Concord/Martinez station

##### **Location 3**

- Ferry service between Antioch/ SF, Martinez/ SF.
- Direct connection between 680 and 4
- Extended and consistent HOV hours between 680 and 4

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

- Caltrans will distribute the Draft Future Conditions Technical memo to TAC members.
- PBS&J will refine the Future Conditions Performance Analysis table.
- TAC members will provide any additional comments on mitigation strategies and the Future Conditions Memo to Caltrans within a week of report being available for TAC review. Draft memos are forthcoming.
- Caltrans to develop options for TAC members to do CSMP presentations to community group.
- The next TAC meeting will be in May to review the analysis of potential mitigation strategies and to perform a prioritization of them.