

LAMORINDA PROGRAM MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (LPMC) MEETING AGENDA

Monday, July 10, 2023, 2:15 PM

City of Orinda
22 Orinda Way, Orinda, CA 94563
Sarge Littlehale Community Room

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order the Lamorinda Program Management Committee (LPMC)**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Adoption of the LPMC Agenda**
4. **Public Comment**
5. **Consent Calendar:**
 - a. March 6, 2023, Minutes
Recommendation: Approve
6. **New Business:** None.
7. **Old Business:** None.
8. **Adjourn LPMC Meeting to Monday, August 7, 2023, 1:30 p.m.**

I, Sivakumar Natarajan, City Engineer, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that this regular meeting agenda has been posted at least 72 hours in advance at the Orinda City Hall, 22 Orinda Way and the Orinda Library, 26 Orinda Way.

Location of Agendas and Agenda Packets: Agendas and packets are available for review by the public by following this link: <https://swatcommittee.org/lpmc-meetings/> and during regular business hours at the Orinda City Hall, 22 Orinda Way, Orinda, CA 94563. Agendas and packets shall be made available at least 72 hours in advance of regular meetings and 24 hours in advance of special meetings.

Any writings or documents pertaining to an open session item provided to a majority of the Lamorinda Program Management Committee less than 72 hours prior to the meeting, shall be made available for public inspection at this link: <https://swatcommittee.org/lpmc-meetings/> and at the Orinda City Hall, 22 Orinda Way, Orinda, CA 94563.

LAMORINDA PROGRAM MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (LPMC) MEETING AGENDA

Monday, March 6, 2023, 1:00 PM

City of Orinda
22 Orinda Way, Orinda, CA 94563
Sarge Littlehale Community Room

AGENDA

1. Call to Order the Lamorinda Program Management Committee (LPMC)

Chair Gee called the meeting to order at 1:03 PM.

2. Roll Call

LPMC members present: Chair Darlene Gee, Orinda; Vice-Chair Renata Sos, Moraga; Board member Teresa Gerring, Lafayette.

Staff present: Siva Natarajan, Orinda; Bret Swain, Moraga; Patrick Golier, Lafayette.

3. Adoption of the LPMC Agenda

Gerring moved, Sos second. Unanimously approved.

4. Public Comment

None.

5. Consent Calendar:

- a. January 30, 2023, Minutes
Recommendation: Approve

Sos moved, Gerring second. Unanimously approved.

6. New Business:

a. **Lamorinda Action Plan Update**

Recommendation: Review the Draft Lamorinda Action Plan and Recommend SWAT to Reaffirm the Draft Lamorinda Action Plan and make a recommendation to Contra Costa

Lamorinda Program Management Committee

Transportation Authority (CCTA) to incorporate the Lamorinda Action Plan into the Contra Costa's Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP).

Lamorinda Action Plan: <https://placeworks.sharefile.com/d-sc167953f5b5a4c199d494074c8487640>

Staff noted that CCTA staff and their consultant Placeworks are here to present the item to the board. CCTA Director of Planning, John Hoang, did the introduction by stating that CCTA, LPMC and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) staff have been working on this for over a year. A lot of effort has been put into this, public outreach and received comments. CCTA role is to facilitate the process and brought Placeworks on board to develop the plan. The document incorporates some of the standard items but is mostly developed by your cities, staff and LPMC board. He then introduced David Early, Placeworks, to present the item.

David Early introduced himself and introduced Placeworks staff Torina Wilson, project manager. He noted that they have been working with particularly the TAC and host of other staff on this for over a year. We've actually presented it to the LPMC Board several times already as well, and we are hopeful that today will mark your actual approval or acceptance of the documents, and your desire to move it on to the Swat Board, which will actually meet this afternoon at 3 o'clock and further to the CCTA Planning Committee and CCTA Board which will be meeting in April to discuss this document.

Early noted that this is not a finished document and any changes requested by the LPMC will either be made on the record today and send it to CCTA or if the board prefers the document to be brought back, that could also be arranged.

Early gave a PowerPoint presentation of the Lamorinda Action Plan update. He noted that the Action Plans from the 5 subregions will be rolled up into the Countywide Action Plan (CTP). The CTP is expected to be completed by early 2024.

Early stated that the public review Draft Action Plan in front of the LPMC board incorporates comments from the public outreach and TAC. He requested the LPMC Board review and vote to forward the Action Plan along to the SWAT committee. Upon approval by the SWAT committee the Action Plan will be forwarded to the CCTA Planning Commission and the CCTA Board for inclusion into the CTP. The CTP will go into additional details and expenditure planning and will go to adoption by CCTA. Once the CTP is formally adopted, the Action Plan will be brought back to the LPMC for formal adoption.

He recommended that the LPMC review and approve the Draft Lamorinda Action Plan, making any recommendation for changes that are necessary and suggest the CCTA incorporate those changes to the Action Plan with the understanding that the final adoption of the Action Plan will be after the adoption of the CTP.

Chair Gee thanked Early for the presentation and for all the work that went into the Action Plan update, and asked if the committee members had any questions.

Lamorinda Program Management Committee

Vice Chair Sos thanked Early for the presentation and how does the update take into account COVID impacts and RHNA Housing allocation impacts.

Early stated that Housing Elements are supposed to be adopted by January 31st, 2023. He then noted that the Housing Element numbers are for an eight year period while the Action Plan is for 25 year period. So the amount of housing foreseen in the Housing Element is significantly less than the demand project by the Action Plan. The Action Plan looks at traffic impacts for a 25year period which are much higher.

Early answered the second question by stating that there is no clear information available regarding the change in pattern for trip making moving forward. He noted that trip making pattern changed during COVID but its different now and is more spread out throughout the day. He also noted that BART projects not getting back to pre-pandemic levels for another 15 years. The Action Plan and CTP foresees how the pattern changes in the coming years. There is less congestion now compared to early 2020. We will continue to gauge that and watch the impacts to address it in the next Action Plan updates.

Vice Chair asked if Safety is addressed or also part of the Action listed under the some of the other topics in the Action Plan.

Early answered yes and stated that there is a lot of overlap between the topics and Safety is covered under many of the topics.

Vice Chair Sos asked if the public outreach comments have been addressed?

Early stated Yes, they have all been addressed in one form or other.

Chair Gee asked how does the Action Plan look at the eventual transformation of the BART parking lots for other uses over the time horizon, whether housing or other things.

Early explained that the Action Plan is a programmatic document and does not go into that level of detail. The plans does talk about supporting mixed use development in a variety of areas in the three downtowns, and studying additional access to the BART stations, and includes allowances for additional housing by Transportation Assessment Zones (TAZ) based on modeling.

Member Gerring asked if the Action Plan will be brought back to the LPMC board after adoption by the CCTA board and if there will be opportunities for public, council members and staff to provide comments during this time?

Early confirmed that additional opportunity for providing comments exist but urged the committee to share any comments they currently have in order to be incorporated into the CTP.

Chair Gee opened the item for public comments.

Lamorinda Program Management Committee

Stella Wotherspoon, resident of Lafayette, presented a public comment. The comments were submitted in writing to staff prior to the meeting and were shared with the LPMC board prior to the start of the meeting.

Jenifer Paul, Resident of Lafayette, presented the following public comment.

- 1. Page 106 states that there will be no LOS standards for Downtown and transit priority area except for Pleasant Hill Rd the goal is to strive to maintain the current LOS. Ms. Paul stated that current LOS for Pleasant Hill Rd is "F" and can get worse. There is also no delay threshold for LOS F.*
- 2. I do not Agree with the elimination of the side street delay for Pleasant Hill Rd. In 2017 Action Plan the goal was to maintain a maximum wait time of 1 cycle of fewer on side street. Additionally, the footnote said the delay index on Pleasant Hill Rd must be increased, "In this case, the MTSO addressing maximum wait time for drivers on side streets takes precedence. The City of Lafayette preference per its General Plan is to accommodate local traffic over through traffic". Eliminating it goes against the General Plan. How can that elimination be kept in the Action Plan?*
- 3. The First goal of the 2017 Action Plan was to "Preserve and Enhance the semi-rural character of the City", which was removed since the October version of the draft Action plan. Also eliminated was "Minimize congestion and improve mobility on RRS within Lamorinda area". It is an important priority.*
- 4. Lastly Safety around schools was not listed in the Goals, while planning specific policies in the Policy & Goal pages. I see this as going hand in hand with increasing mobility in Lamorinda. There are more people working from home and could be walking their children to school. Would like to see a goal added, to create better infrastructure for walking and biking to school.*

Member Gerringer thanked both public comment participants and CCTA staff Chair for working to address the concerns of some of the pieces mentioned.

Member Gerringer asked if General Plans were looked at during the process of updating the Action Plan?

Early responded stating that they went to all the Cities and the County and went over land use projections for every TAZ. Staff have the ability to look at the information. The numbers were obtained from MTC and were previously vetted with staff. Staff were given an opportunity to review those and Placeworks is very confident that their land use projections are consistent with the General Plans of the individual Cities.

Member Gerringer asked if specific elements in the General Plan such as transportation circulation and goals in terms of delays were looked at.

Lamorinda Program Management Committee

Early responded that foregoing the side street MTSO/RTO was discussed with the TAC and Placeworks transportation engineers suggested that its better to use a single set of metrics that's used throughout the County and individual Cities and that the side streets delay were not adding much relative to the other measure in the Action Plan. So, a decision was made, which the TAC supported, was to go to a single standardized set of metrics that will be used on all five Action Plans. Yours was one that had the side street metrics and couple of other Action Plans looked at some other non-standard metrics and they collapsed them in the four metrics that I mentioned previously. Most critical one is the intersection LOS and there was as discussion about that at the CCTA staff level and it seemed that that was supported by everyone, primarily in order to make sure that the measurements were similar across the jurisdictions and RTPCs.

Member Gerringer mentioned about the Lafayette Council meeting where they decided not to change goals for Mt. Diablo but for Pleasant Hill Rd. there were lots of discussion about making it so that it is LOS F. There seems to be some lack of clarification around "is the language reflective of what the Council wanted to have in there?" and "Is it aspirational enough to leave us in a place where we are still working to find some ways to traffic not getting any worse?".

Early responded that Placeworks did draft some language that were sent to TAC and received some minor comments from staff asking Placeworks to change it. He thought that the language in front of the board was reflective of what was discussed at the Lafayette City Council. He recognized that the changes seem too loose, particularly because it is true that LOS F has no higher bound and can theoretically get to many cycles and it would still be considered LOS F. The language before the board was reflective of what LPMC TAC asked to be put in. We would be happy to work with staff or the board to agree on a language today or in the future. I understand that the intention is to make sure that the actual volume to capacity ratio doesn't get any worse than it is today. If the board would like to see that language modified, Placeworks can certainly do that.

Member Gerringer noted that as part of Lafayette Downton Specific Plan, Mt. Diablo Blvd did not include a restricted LOS goal because it could potentially not align with the goals to increase active transportation and mobility for bicyclists and pedestrians. Does having a specificity for Pleasant Hill Rd limit us as we are moving forward? If the LOS goals focus on prioritizing vehicle wait times are not getting worse, do we limit what we are trying to do in terms of pedestrian and bicycle tracking?

Early answered that people are in general comfortable with not having made any changes to the goals for Mt. Diablo Blvd. He also recommended considering saying that the volume to capacity ratio on Pleasant Hill Rd should not get worse than it is today. Such a statement as an aspirational goal would address the concern about the LOS F having no bounds.

Chair Gee asked if Mr. Early could address the public comment regarding the school.

Early said that it is true that there is not a specific goal or policy about safety but if the board directs them to include a goal and other policies, those can definitely be incorporated into the document before it goes to CCTA board.

Lamorinda Program Management Committee

Chair Gee asked if there was any previous conversations at any level about why it was not already there?

Early responded saying that the policy section of the Action Plan is relatively new and previously there were policies throughout the document but not under a specific section.

Wilson noted that there are goals and policies in the Action Plan read out the goal related to safety for all modes. She noted that there are three policies, two specifically call out safety and one that is tangentially related to safety for all modes.

Member Gerringer noted that the statement about semi-rural was taken out because it was subjective around how it relates to transportation.

Early confirmed that and noted that the decision was made in a prior LPMC board meeting.

Member Gerringer asked about the public comment about side street delay. Why was the statement about minimum congestion and improved mobility along the RRS within the Lamorinda area taken out?

Early responded that the Action Plan is moving us away from where managing congestion and lesser congestion is our only primary goal. Our professional belief is that there are going to be times when we cannot always minimize or lessen congestion, but we are trying to create a system that will maximize benefits to as many people with various mobility needs as possible. In some cases that means reducing congestion but in other cases it would mean improving mobility for other modes which will help with minimizing congestion. The Plan discusses lessening congestion at many locations but having a standalone goal was not something that could be maintained because it would conflict with many other goals.

Vice Chair Sos asked is it inevitable that there will be conflicts because the document will likely not align with each of the three jurisdiction's general plans? In the event of a conflict, is there a process or procedure to escalate that for resolution in a way that hopes to harmonize the general plan with the purpose and intent of the Action Plan?

Early noted that from a land use or regulatory perspective the individual General Plan of each City will prevail. There was some confusion with the Terraces project but the general plans are the guiding documents for land use. To the extent the City wants to change their General Plan from what Placeworks had used as a basis for projections in the action plan, then the City should notify Placeworks so that they can update the projections in the Action Plan.

Vice Chair Sos noted that she would encourage specifically considering adding schools to the goal about safety for all modes. Given the number of programs for schools and safety around schools, it is important to communicate that as a priority for us.

Early said he will keep track of the notes and read them back into the record when making the motion.

Lamorinda Program Management Committee

Vice Chair Sos noted that the comment about “current” must be clarified whether it is today or another time.

Early asked staff if it is okay to go back the previous goal. Mr. Golier said that it is a better goal than delay. He also suggested putting in the date to the LOS chart in Appendix D.

Early said that they will work with staff, as a second item, to change that RTO to state to keep no worse than existing volume to capacity ratio as documented in Appendix D.

Vice Chair asked Mr. Early to summarize the notes until now.

Early stated the following: I suggest a motion that the board accept the document and forward it to the CCTA board for inclusion into the CTP with two amendments:

- 1. To mention schools in the such as statement of Goal 4.*
- 2. Change the exception to the lack of a LOS standard along Pleasant Hill Rd. to refer specifically to the existing volume to capacity ratio as document in Appendix D or elsewhere in the Action Plan. This will be finalized in discussion with staff.*

Member Gerringer asked if the proposed changes answer the concerns raised during public comment. It was noted by a public member that the question still remains regarding the General Plan circulation element.

Early stated that it is true that Lafayette has statements in their general plan to prioritize side street traffic and that level of detail has not been transferred into the Action Plan. Goal is to make them more uniform throughout the County. LPMC can still provide direction to say otherwise. The language in the Action Plan does not preclude Cities from prioritizing improvements such as prioritizing side street movements.

Member Gerringer asked if Placeworks, staff and CCTA look at the transportation circulation elements of our plans?

Early responded that all three Cities and that of the County’s general plans were considered.

Member Gerringer asked if staff is comfortable with where we are with the circulation element and the local area plan?

Golier responded yes.

Vice Chair Sos asked is it worth saying how the Action Plan relates to the respective general plans of each jurisdiction. It will be helpful to the reader to understand that there is a process if there is a conflict.

Early stated that a language might already exist but if it does not exist one could be added as the third item to the Action Plan.

Swain suggested adding a clause that says General Shall prevail in the event a conflict exists.

Lamorinda Program Management Committee

Vice Chair Sos asked if there are any specific references to general plan provisions for any of the three jurisdictions in the Action plan.

Early noted it is perfectly reasonable to ask Placeworks to add language to the Action Plan to say that local jurisdictions have the authority to make their own land use decisions separate from what the CCTA region might do. Contra Costa County has a very advance system of inter-regional planning which does to a degree limit by beholding under Measure J Growth Management Program, to work together, work with all the agencies in the County through CCTA. You do have to make sure coordinating and planning together and it is also the case that under state law local control is paramount particularly when it comes to land use decisions. Placeworks will find the right language to include as item 3 to the effect that General Plans generally will prevail particularly when it comes to local decision making about land use and transportation issues.

Vice Chair Sos asked are there places in the Action Plan that refers to or cite a particular provision from Lafayette, Orinda or Moraga general plans?

Early answered there is nothing in the Action Plan currently because it is not actually in the domain to what we are doing here.

Public (Stella Wotherspoon) stated that the 2017 Action Plan included a footnote that City of Lafayette preference per its general plan is to accommodate local traffic over through traffic. That footnote has been removed. Adding an item 3 would address that.

Vice Chair Sos noted that as a matter of policy it is not a good idea to refer to a particular City's general plan in this document but making a statement on what the hierarchy will be very helpful.

Chair Gee brought the item back to the committee for discussion and asked if the committee has anything else to bring up as a possible change, amendment, or addition to the Action Plan.

Vice Chair Sos said no additional comments but thanked everybody who were involved in the Action Plan update, for all the hard work and achieving the level of consistency that applies to the entire area and the individual jurisdictions.

Member Gerringe agreed.

Chair Gee agreed to that and noted that the planning process if Contra Costa is quite unique.

Chair Gee asked is there is a motion, in addition to the three items that have already been articulated, to accept and forward the Lamorinda Action Plan?

Motion made by Gerringe and seconded by Sos. The Motion passed Unanimously.

7. Old Business: None.

8. Adjourn LPMC Meeting to Monday, April 3, 2023, 1:30 p.m.

Lamorinda Program Management Committee

Chair Gee adjourned the meeting at 2:17 PM.

I, Sivakumar Natarajan, City Engineer, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that this regular meeting agenda has been posted at least 72 hours in advance at the Orinda City Hall, 22 Orinda Way and the Orinda Library, 26 Orinda Way.

Location of Agendas and Agenda Packets: Agendas and packets are available for review by the public by following this link: <https://swatcommittee.org/lpmc-meetings/> and during regular business hours at the Orinda City Hall, 22 Orinda Way, Orinda, CA 94563. Agendas and packets shall be made available at least 72 hours in advance of regular meetings and 24 hours in advance of special meetings.

Any writings or documents pertaining to an open session item provided to a majority of the Lamorinda Program Management Committee less than 72 hours prior to the meeting, shall be made available for public inspection at this link: <https://swatcommittee.org/lpmc-meetings/> and at the Orinda City Hall, 22 Orinda Way, Orinda, CA 94563.