

## MEETING SUMMARY

---

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

Tuesday, July 27, 2010  
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
CCTA, 2999 Oak Road, Walnut Creek

---

#### Attendees

BART: Deidre Heitman  
Caltrans: Erik Alm, John McKenzie, Cesar Pujol  
Contra Costa County: Jamar Stamps  
CCTA: Matt Kelly  
City of Martinez: Tim Tucker  
City of Concord: Ray Kuzbari  
City of Pittsburg: Paul Reinders  
MIG: Lou Hexter, Paul Rosenbloom  
TRANSPAC: Barbara Neustadter  
TRANSPLAN: John Cunningham  
WCCTAC: John Rudolph

---

#### I. Welcome

Lou Hexter, MIG, Inc., called the meeting to order and explained that the purpose of the session was to conduct a final review of the draft SR-4 CSMP, highlight key findings in the document and solicit stakeholder feedback. Matt Kelly, CCTA, welcomed the group to the new CCTA offices and noted that the CSMP meeting was the office's inaugural meeting.

#### II. CSMP Presentation

Erik Alm, Caltrans, provided an overview of the SR 4 CSMP (presentation attached). He also explained that additional CMIA projects have been identified with some of the cost savings from the original CMIA project estimates; SR-84 will now require a CSMP as a result.

#### Comments and Discussion

- **TRANSPAC** The CSMP will inform the development of the forthcoming SR-4 Corridor Management Plan (CMP). This planning study will be overseen by CCTA and was initiated to reconcile the outcomes of previous planning processes conducted by TRANSPAC, TRANSPLAN, and WCCTAC.

**Caltrans** Caltrans is looking forward to participating in this process and sharing data as needed.

- **City of Pittsburg** The CSMP does not discuss the potential to develop additional capacity on the arterial road network.  
**Caltrans** Caltrans recognizes that this first generation CSMP focused on freeway efficiency and did not identify parallel arterials improvements. Perhaps a more thorough review of the arterial road network and ramp metering can be included in the upcoming CMP. This issue is also acknowledged in the CSMP text.
  
- **City of Concord** Please make the following changes and ensure that they are reflected throughout the document:
  - Page S-19, Package B, third improvement. Change Westbound to (west)
  - Page S-20: Package E, 1<sup>st</sup> improvement should say # 10, Improvement #10 should say #11.
  - Package D, Remove (9)
  
- **BART** Is the reconfiguration of the Bailey Road Interchange ramp included in the CSMP?  
**Caltrans** No, however lack of inclusion in CSMP does not negate potential projects being advanced through the traditional planning process. This is a project that could be considered in the forthcoming CMP.

**City of Pittsburg** When TCC considered SR-24 CSMP, it requested some language changes in the CSMP Introduction that was accepted by the full Board. Will this agreed upon SR 24 language be included in the SR-4 CSMP?

**Caltrans** Only if the TAC members want that language changed. TAC members should weigh in (through their comments to CSMP document) as to whether or not to include this same CSMP Introduction language should be used.

**CCTA** CCTA will distribute this language for review.

## **Section 5: Recommended Strategies and Improvements**

- **Caltrans** On topic of Express Lanes, MTC recently briefed their Legislative Committee on the status of Regional HOT Lane enabling legislation (July 2). As a result of many factors, AB 744 as currently amended is no longer considered feasible by MTC, and unlikely to advance for signature. MTC proposes an alternative for Express Lane development in the Bay Area where

first emphasis in Regional HOT Lane development will be on the “core” or “backbone” HOV network; SR 4 is not considered part of this core network.

- **City of Concord** Page S-22, 4<sup>th</sup> line from bottom. Please add “**User Benefits**” to existing language about express lanes.

### III. Final Comments and Next Steps

- **Caltrans** Draft CSMP materials are available online and Caltrans is accepting comments through August 13<sup>th</sup>. Comments should be directed to Matt Kelly at CCTA. TAC members should take note of issues of particular interest or concern documented in *Section 1-7: Stakeholder Issues and Concerns* (i.e., Ramp Metering, Concord Naval Weapons Station, Sustainable Communities Strategy).
- **TRANSPAC** Thanks to Caltrans for the opportunity to build on the analysis and data developed for the CSMP in the upcoming CMP. The CMP will provide an opportunity to reconcile the action plans of three RTPCs. MTC and PBS&J did excellent work presenting the CSMP to the RTPC boards.
- **WCCTAC** The WCCTAC Board has asked about lack of transit in CSMP. When discussing CMP, the board expressed interest in ROW/ Arterials/ Planned projects and PDA (Priority Development Areas) as well as developing short, medium and long term strategies. Rodeo study is too much to include.
- **TRANSPLAN** Thanks for being responsive early on; there were no surprises as this document was completed.
- **City of Concord** The recommended improvement packages make a lot of sense. Please advise of any changes in the draft.