

**Summary Minutes
TRANSPAC
February 21, 2008
Meeting rescheduled from February 14, 2008**

ATTENDANCE:

Elected Officials: Julie Pierce, Clayton, TRANSPAC Chair, CCTA Representative; David Durant, TRANSPAC Vice-Chair, Pleasant Hill; Bill Shinn, Concord; Cindy Silva, Walnut Creek, Susan Bonilla, Contra Costa County, Mark Ross, Martinez; Dave Hudson, CCTA Chair. **Absent (excused):** Charlie Abrams, Walnut Creek.

Planning Commissioners: Bob Armstrong, Clayton; Donnie Snyder, Contra Costa County; Diana Vavrek, Pleasant Hill; Bill Brumley, Concord; Vacant Seat: Martinez. **Absent (excused):** Donnie Snyder, Contra Costa County, Jon Malkovich, Walnut Creek.

Staff: Alex Pascual, Concord; Hisham Noeimi, CCTA; Ray Kuzbari, Concord; John Greitzer, Contra Costa County, Matt Kelly, CCTA; Tim Tucker, Martinez; Eric Hu, Pleasant Hill; John Hall, Walnut Creek; Deidre Heitman, BART; Lynn Osborn, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager; Barbara Neustadter, Connie Peterson, TRANSPAC staff.

Meeting convened with a quorum by Chair Pierce at 9:10 a.m.

1. **Convene meeting: Pledge of Allegiance/Self-Introductions - completed**
2. **Public Comment - None**

CONSENT AGENDA:

3. **Approval of the December 13, 2007 minutes (attachment)**
4. **Authorization to Submit Grant Applications and if approved, Authorization to Execute Grant contracts for 2008/09 TFCA/Measure C/MTC CMAQ TRANSPAC/TRANSPLAN Programs**
5. **Appointment of a new TRANSPAC representative and alternate to CCTA's Technical Advisory Committee (TCC).** At its January 24, 2008 meeting, the TAC recommended Ray Kuzbari, City of Concord to replace the retired Richard Pearson, City of Martinez and John Greitzer, Contra Costa County to replace Barbara Neustadter as the primary alternate for TCC. TRANSPAC's remaining representatives on the TCC are John Hall, City of Walnut Creek and Eric Hu, City of Pleasant Hill. Barbara Neustadter has been serving as the alternate. Staff recommends that TRANSPAC take an action now to appoint Ray Kuzbari and to reappoint all three members and the alternate for the next TCC term.
6. **On December 19, 2007, CCTA approved the submission of a Caltrans Planning grant to link carpool passengers with drivers via cell phone and GPS technology.** 511 Contra Costa and County Connection are partners in the grant application and are expected to provide technical support to this effort if funded. Martin Engelmann has requested a letter of support.

END CONSENT AGENDA

ACTION: Approved Consent Agenda. **Shinn/Silva/Unanimous**

7. **Presentation on the BART 25 Year Capital Program by Gregg Marrama, BART Manager of Capital Development**

Barbara Neustadter informed TRANSPAC that Mr. Marrama of BART was unable to reschedule his presentation for this meeting date. The presentation will be rescheduled for April or May.

8. City of Concord Ygnacio Valley Slide Repair Project Request for Fund Reprogramming Measure J Strategic Plan Amendment

To meet changing needs, the City of Concord is requesting the reprogramming of a portion of the \$9 million in Measure J funds set aside for the Waterworld Parkway project. The City's request is detailed in its letter in the packet. In essence, the City would like to reprogram \$3.5 million for the Ygnacio Valley Road Permanent Restoration (Phase 2), \$500,000 for the Ygnacio Valley Slide repair at Galindo Creek and \$2 million for the Clayton Road/Treat Boulevard/Denkinger Road Intersection Capacity Improvements project. The remaining \$3 million will be used for preliminary work on the Waterworld Parkway project.

The Waterworld Parkway project has also been proposed for future STIP funding which could be available in 2014 at the earliest. The City expects to be able to fully fund the project with a combination of Measure J, STIP, traffic mitigation and Redevelopment Agency funds and possibly developer contributions.

TRANSPAC's approval is required for the City to request a Measure J Strategic Plan amendment. The TRANSPAC TAC reviewed this request at its January 24, 2008 meeting and recommends its approval to TRANSPAC.

DISCUSSION: Alex Pascual of the City of Concord gave a brief presentation about the City's request to reprogram Measure J funds for three higher-priority projects. The top priority project was to make permanent repairs to the slide area on Ygnacio Valley Road (shown on handouts). Emergency repairs to the area will be made this year as a severe storm this winter could increase the risk of slide. The FHWA requires that a good faith effort be made to try to fix problems or it may not fund. The second project will repair another slide area on Ygnacio Valley Road near Alberta Way, and the third project involves a traffic congestion area.

Ray Kuzbari identified this area as the intersection of Treat Boulevard and Clayton Road (a critical Route of Regional Significance), which is one of most heavily traveled in the city. This intersection is running at over-capacity conditions because of geometric conditions on Treat that limit the number of lanes needed to upgrade the signal. It is estimated that the project will cost \$2 million and involves acquiring rights of way on Treat, widening for one more lane, and upgrading the signal.

Neustadter commented that this request would be the first of a number of Strategic Plan amendments given that Measure J was developed in 2003-04 and needs/priorities have changed. The TAC has recommended approval of the City of Concord's request.

Pierce noted that the south side of Lime Ridge also looks like a very similar situation and added that she would like to see proactive efforts to avoid another slide.

John Hall said that this area is located in Walnut Creek open space. Remediation has been done in the past and the situation is being monitored.

Pascual said the same conditions here were suspected, and discussions have been scheduled with Walnut Creek, noting that there would be a cost benefit to combine projects.

ACTION: Approved the City of Concord's request for a Strategic Plan amendment request for the reprogramming of Waterworld Parkway Measure J funds. **Shinn/Ross/Unanimous**

9. Twenty-five (25) Year Program for Contra Costa's "County Share" Funds for the 2009 Regional Transportation Program (RTP) presented by Hisham Noeimi, Senior Engineer, CCTA.

In recent years, as part of the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) has assumed that a significant and increasing share of Contra Costa's Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds are subject to MTC's programming discretion even though the state statute requires that the funds be spent in the county.

As noted in the attached CCTA staff report, this approach conflicts with CCTA's policy to program all of its county share funds within the biennial five year STIP for Contra Costa projects. MTC, as part of the development of the 2009 RTP, has suggested that the bulk of the flexible funds be subject to MTC's discretion with no county funding targets. The Executive Directors of some Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies (CMA) have recommended the development of a long term (25 year) capital program intended to demonstrate full utilization of each county's formula funds.

The CCTA staff report details possible ramifications of the MTC proposed approach. The CCTA proposes to use the project list in the just adopted Congestion Management Plan and the 2005 RTP project list updated with current information. That list is composed of Proposition 1B Corridor Mobility and Improvement Account funds (CMAQ), Measure J capital projects, MTC Resolution 3434 transit guideway projects and projects submitted for the 2008 STIP. The CCTA is requesting the assistance of the RTPCs in establishing priorities as well as reviewing project descriptions, cost information and possible non-STIP funding sources. The criteria for the evaluation of projects for this list are on page 5-3. Packet information also includes the list developed for the STP programming required by the Adoption of the Measure J Strategic Plan and the TRANSPAC Measure J Bond List. Please note that early delivery of Measure J projects is a covenant with Contra Costa voters and that MTC must act to recognize this significant financial contribution to transportation projects in Contra Costa.

The TRANSPAC TAC and Manager have spent a considerable amount of time developing the attached 25 year financially constrained list that meets revenue projections. Please note that the TAC assumed TRANSPAC approval of the Waterworld Parkway reprogramming under item 8 and the chart reflects the reduction of Measure J funds for that project and the addition of the Clayton Road/Treat Boulevard/Denkinger Road project at \$2 million. The Clayton Road project is considered fully funded and will be submitted to MTC by CCTA as a "Committed" project for the 2009 RTP. Due to the nature of the two Ygnacio Valley Road Slide Repair projects, it is not necessary to include the projects on the 25 Year List.

Please note that the TAC did not program any funds for the I-680 Northbound HOV project at this time but rather placed the project in the RTP "Vision" category. The TAC recommendation for this project reflects a number of issues: 1) The southbound rather the northbound I-680 HOV is considered to be TRANSPAC's highest priority project; 2) the southbound project should be funded before the northbound project; 4) the northbound project may become a candidate for HOT lanes funding by MTC in the future; 5) concern that the northbound project costs less and may replace the southbound project and 6) the northbound project should be placed on the list when funding for the southbound project is guaranteed.

At the January 24, 2008 TAC meeting, Caltrans staff advocated for fund programming for the northbound project. While the TAC understood this request, it determined to not take any programming action at this time. A few days later, CCTA staff raised the same issue and suggested that the northbound project could be included on the Financially Constrained list

shown to be funded with "Other/Local funds" in the event that a new fund source is available in the future. TRANSPAC staff polled the TAC via e-mail on this suggestion and its recommendation was to not program the program the northbound project in 2014-2033 and that unless there was a guarantee for the southbound project, northbound should be left as shown on the 25 Year list in the packet. TRANSPAC is requested to consider the TAC recommended list and to consider the requests of Caltrans and CCTA staff regarding the northbound I-680 HOV project.

DISCUSSION: Hisham Noeimi of the Transportation Authority provided a presentation on this topic. Over the past three months Authority staff has been working with RTPCs in developing the constrained list of projects to be included in MTC's Regional Transportation Plan. If a project is not on the constrained list, its sponsor cannot apply for state or federal funds. MTC proposes a process wherein it selects the projects in the financially constrained list. In the past, the RTPCs' priorities were considered. This is in conflict with the Transportation Authority's policy to program its own county share funds. Because Measure C and Measure J projects have shortfalls and are not fully funded, the Authority will not be able to meet its commitment to the voters.

Noeimi continued that in response to MTC's Call for Projects in December, the Authority agreed three-pronged approach that involves: 1) Working collaboratively with the RTPCs to develop a list of projects; 2) Working with the project sponsors to update MTC's project database, which includes all projects from RTPCs with scopes, costs and funding; and 3) making policy/program statements to MTC. The Authority adopted a resolution with three exhibits (handed out). TAC's recommendation is included in exhibit. TRANSPAC is asked to approve the TAC's recommendation today or it will have to go back to the Transportation Authority.

Pierce highlighted some areas characterized as calling for vigilance. MTC wants to take everyone's money and decide region-wide where it should go, without regard to county share. The CMAs in the Bay Area are assembling a program of projects showing county needs for the next 25 years to emphasize that the "share" is needed and should not be diverted to other programs. A month ago we looked at a resolution to send to MTC that supported continuation of Local Streets and Roads money, and most councils approved it. It was also on agenda of the Mayors' Conference. Local Streets and Roads money is needed for sidewalks, bike lanes and road repairs. MTC is moving to identify a new source for Local Streets and Road funding so that these funds can be used for MTC's programs. In her opinion, it would be appropriate for any new programs to find other sources of money. There was a proposal that HOT lane revenues from the areas that have the HOT lanes would complete the rest of the Bay Area's network. The message must be strong: we don't want MTC to appropriate our fair share because we want it to program our needs. She noted that no other areas of state are subject to intervention by another agency such as MTC.

Ross said that MTC likes to say where the money will go. MTC staff is very strong in its vision and the commissioners tend to go along with staff.

Durant asked how our MTC representatives have dealt with this.

Pierce said that Supervisor Federal Glover from the County and Councilmember Amy Worth from the Mayors' Conference were our representatives. Further discussion took place about comments made on the Local Streets and Road issue at the Mayors' Conference and about MTC's involvement.

Neustadter brought two issues to TRANSPAC's attention: 1) TAC assumed TRANSPAC's approval of Concord's request for reprogramming of funds in the 25-year list presented by the

TAC; and 2) the TAC did not propose any funding at this time for the northbound I-680 HOV Lane although there were two requests. TAC did not revise its recommendation because it believes that the southbound HOV lane and restripe projects are more important.

Durant commented that everyone here and at the Mayors' Conference who believes in what we want to do with Local Streets and Roads should hold our MTC representatives accountable. He strongly encouraged everyone to call and e-mail the representatives to express how we feel about this.

ACTION: Agreed with staff recommendations for the Central County 25 year capital plan for "county share funds" project list developed by the TRANSPAC TAC and affirmed the recommended programming for the northbound I-680 HOV project. **Shinn/Armstrong/Unanimous**

10. Request for a Measure J Strategic Plan Amendment for the I-680 Southbound HOV Restriping Project

The purpose of the project is to extend the southbound I-680 HOV lane from north of Livorna Road to north of Rudgear Road. The project will extend the southbound HOV lane north of Livorna for approximately one mile and smooth the current difficult transition from 6 lanes down to 5 lanes then 4 lanes and then 3 lanes before the road expands to 3 lanes plus the HOV lane. TRANSPAC's request letter is in the packet.

CCTA staff has advised that RTP and TIP actions can be handled and that the restriping project can be implemented as part of a Caltrans pavement rehabilitation project planned for the Spring 2009. To move the restriping project forward, Caltrans requires design and construction support funds to advance the Restriping project in conjunction with its planned pavement rehabilitation project.

The TRANSPAC TAC reviewed this option at its January 24, 2008 meeting and recommends that TRANSPAC proceed with a request for a Strategic Plan amendment for this project.

ACTION: Approved the TAC recommendation to request a Strategic Plan Amendment for the I-680 Southbound HOV Restriping project. **Durant/Ross/Unanimous**

11. Trips in the CCTA's Draft Growth Management Program Implementation Guide and Trip Thresholds the 2008 TRANSPAC Action Plan. The item includes discussion of two issues:

- A) CCTA has circulated a public review draft of the Draft Growth Management Program Implementation Guide. The attachment includes excerpts from the Appendices of the full document, relevant resolutions adopted over the years by CCTA and the circulation memo and abbreviated PowerPoint version of the changes to the Guide.

As noted, the Draft Implementation Guide includes previous resolutions adopted by CCTA. The Guide and resolutions have various references resulting in different definitions of the type of trips to be used for various analyses.

For example, for the GPA review, TRANSPAC's standard is 100 peak hour trips for GPA's and project traffic analyses. The established standard for notifications of projects generating more than 100 peak hour trips should be 100 peak hour vehicle trips. What kinds of trips are included? While there seems to be consensus on the time of day of the trips (peak), it is not clear if the requirement is for all trips, new trips of some kind or for vehicle trips. The TRANSPAC TAC suggests that CCTA review all of the relevant documents and establish a

standard definition for “trips”. The TAC suggests that current trip definition for traffic analyses is really “net new peak hour vehicle trips” and recommends that TRANSPAC forward that recommendation to the CCTA.

B) While RTPCs may set lower thresholds than required by CCTA policy, the Planning Committee has suggested that the threshold for both the evaluation of the impact of new development and General Plan Amendments (GPAs) be set at 500 peak hour vehicle trips.

In its 2000 Action Plan, TRANSPAC set 100 peak hour vehicle trips as the evaluation threshold for both assessment of development impacts and the GPA evaluation. The TAC considered the Planning Committee suggestion and is recommending to TRANSPAC that the threshold for major development impact evaluation and GPAs be increased from 100 to 500 peak hour vehicle trips in the 2008 Action Plan even though the TAC would really prefer that these thresholds be set at 1,000 net new vehicle trips.

Please also note that the TRANSPAC TAC as part of its updating of the Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (RTMP) will also be recommending that the interregional trip threshold for the application of RTMP requirements be raised from 50 trips to 100 trips. TRANSPAC will have an opportunity to review that subject in detail when the RTMP revisions are presented for review, possibly in March or April.

DISCUSSION: Neustadter noted an issue that came to light during review of the Implementation Guide and past CCTA resolutions, where different terminology has been used to define “trips”. The TAC recommends that TRANSPAC approve the request that CCTA go back through both Measure C and Measure J GMP documentation and select a definition to be used consistently throughout for the term “trips”. The TAC recommends defining trips as “net new peak hour vehicle trips” and to forward this recommendation to CCTA.

Hall clarified that “net new peak hour vehicle trips” is the term customarily used. The language should be cleaned up to avoid confusion. Typically the air quality analysis in an EIR looks at all trips. Here, the definition that goes with the threshold of whether or not we need to follow Authority procedures to do the traffic impact studies, not necessarily an air quality issue but could lead to air quality analysis in the EIR.

Neustadter noted that Part B looks at the threshold issue. The TAC would like the threshold set at 1,000 trips but the recommendation is to raise it from 100 to 500 for both development impact and general plan amendments. TAC also recommends the RTMP interregional trip threshold be raised from 50 to 100 net new peak hour vehicle interregional trips.

Hall noted the significant change made in Measure J concerning how we deal with local traffic impacts on streets. There is no longer the requirement to report impacts on basic routes on the Compliance Checklist. We recognize that congestion is here and we need to densify in areas that provide appropriate opportunities for travel other than in a vehicle, so net new peak hour vehicle trips will be fewer at transit stations than in other areas. If the intent is to concentrate development, it creates the situation of bringing more traffic to an area that is already congested. The question is are we trying to encourage development where we think it would be most efficient or are we trying to push it elsewhere. The thought is to change threshold to not have to report on every little project that is added to areas that are TOD or priority development areas in the cities.

Pierce said if the goal is to exempt areas for denser development, it needs to be defined; basic greenfield or other infill in TOD or priority development areas will end up with the same exemption.

Hall mentioned one additional important point, that procedures require us to use the countywide transportation model, which is inaccurate for 100 peak hour trips. He noted that 100 peak hour trips could be generated by a fast food restaurant, but would we use the countywide model to evaluate that?

Greitzer added even for smaller projects, if the threshold is raised from 100 to 500, the small projects are still going to have CEQA review on development projects that includes transportation impacts and communicated to neighboring jurisdictions and regions. The Measure C and Measure J analysis that we have to do for that is very involved technically, is costly, and is probably “overkill” for small projects.

Pierce said that she understands staff’s wish to not trigger the use of the countywide model if it isn’t necessary, but wants to continue to provide noticing as required under Measure C.

Neustadter briefly explained the noticing process in response to a question from Susan Bonilla and said that the information is distributed to concerned parties usually in less than 48 hours. Noticing could remain at 100 trips regardless of analysis thresholds.

Hall stated that he has carefully considered this issue and believes that it mainly concerns the reporting processes required to be in compliance with Measure J. He did not foresee any “landmines”. The goal should be to streamline the process and make it more economical for the developer and less burdensome for staff. It does remove the ability for someone to use this to challenge a project.

Durant asked if changing the number could impact a jurisdiction in any way. The answer given was that it would eliminate a jurisdiction’s ability to use Measure J to comment or stop a development.

ACTION: Pierce/Durant/Unanimous

- A) Adopted the TRANSPAC TAC Recommendations on Trip Definitions to “net new peak hour vehicle trips” and “net new peak hour interregional vehicle trips” as the evaluation threshold for both assessment of development impacts and the GPA evaluation.
- B) For the TRANSPAC 2008 Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (RTMP), agreed to set the evaluation trip threshold at 1000 net new peak hour vehicle trips; and the interregional trip threshold for the application of RTMP requirements set at 100 trips. For project and GPA notices, the number remains at 100 net new peak hour vehicle trips.

12. TRANSPAC and CCTA Representatives are requested to report on the most recent CCTA Administration and Projects Committee (Member Pierce), Planning Committee (Member Abrams), and CCTA meetings (Members Pierce and Abrams).

Member Pierce reported that at the Administration and Projects Committee the Strategic Plan resolution was discussed. The APC chair pulled the resolution off the agenda to be carried over because West County had a problem with the language about the guarantee. The Transportation Authority intends to focus project capacity over next five STIPS.

Neustadter reported that at the CCTA Board meeting one of the topics was the 511 TDM deficit that is still under review. The issue involves an error in the Authority’s allocation and a four-year

payback program has been proposed to minimize adverse impact on the RTPC programs.

ACTION: Reports accepted

13. Reports from Staff and Committees – Reports accepted

- a) 511 Contra Costa Monthly report by Lynn Osborn, 511 Contra Costa Program Manager

Osborn reported that 511 Contra Costa had completed a survey of Contra Costa County employees and are working on survey analysis. The County survey began as a contest with San Mateo County to determine which one could improve the vehicle to employee ratio over two years. Steve Goetz requested 511 Contra Costa's help with the distribution and analysis of surveys, which are currently being evaluated. In the Employer Outreach Program, another project in progress is the employer outreach required by MTC. Currently two employers have requested parking management analysis by 511 Contra Costa. In addition, we are working collaboratively with MTC's new and improved rideshare rewards program to promote ridesharing. 511 Contra Costa staff, CCTA, and RTPC managers are working with the Air District to convince them of the validity of follow up survey analysis for ongoing programs that do not change annually and that have years of data so as not to require annual surveys.

- b) Staff requests an appointment of a TRANSPAC elected official to replace Member Abrams on the Regional Measure 2 I-680 HOV Express Bus Access Study Policy Advisory Committee

ACTION: Cindy Silva was as the TRANSPAC Representative to the Policy Advisory Committee for the I-680 HOV Express Bus Access Study.

14. Correspondence/Copies/Newsclips/Information - Accepted

15. Election of TRANSPAC Chair and Vice Chair for the 2008 term

ACTIONS:

- 15. A. Elected David Durant as TRANSPAC Chair for the 2008 term. Silva/Shinn /Unanimous**

- 15. B. Elected Mark Ross as TRANSPAC Vice Chair for the 2008 term. Durant/Bonilla /Unanimous**

15. C. Acknowledgment of Chair Pierce's year of service as Chair

David Durant presented Chair Pierce with a commemorative gavel plaque in recognition of her year of service as Chair and thanked her for an extraordinary year. On behalf of all TRANSPAC members, Member Pierce was presented with a "Construction Sandbox" representing all her work on projects in Central County. Chair Pierce expressed her appreciation.

- 16. Appointment/reappointment of a TRANSPAC representative to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority for the 2008-10 term commencing February 1, 2008.** Member Pierce holds this appointment for the 2006-2008 term. NOTE: Pursuant to the TRANSPAC Joint Agreement, Section VI (e) (3) which is consistent with the CCTA Administrative Code, only elected officials may vote on this item.

ACTION: Reappointed Julie Pierce as TRANSPAC CCTA Representative for the 2008-10 term commencing February 1, 2008. **Shinn/Silva/Unanimous**

17. **Appointment of TRANSPAC CCTA alternate(s) for the CCTA representative appointed under item 16.** NOTE: Pursuant to the TRANSPAC Joint Agreement, Section VI, (e) (3) which is consistent with the CCTA Administrative Code, only elected officials may vote on this item.

Pursuant to CCTA policy, TRANSPAC's two representatives are first alternates for each other.

A second and third are named alternate for each TRANSPAC CCTA Representative and will attend CCTA Board meetings or other necessary functions in the event that the TRANSPAC CCTA representative is unable to do so.

ACTIONS: Shinn/Durant/Unanimous

- 1) Appointed Councilmember Cindy Silva as the designated second alternate for the CCTA Representative appointed for the 2008-10 term commencing March 1, 2008.
- 2) Reappointed Mark Ross as the third alternate to be used by both TRANSPAC CCTA representatives if both second alternates are not available.

18. **Appointment of a TRANSPAC CCTA Representative to replace Member Abrams for the completion of the 2007-09 term commencing March 1, 2008.** NOTE: Pursuant to the TRANSPAC Joint Agreement, Section VI (e) (3) which is consistent with the CCTA Administrative Code, only elected officials may vote on this item.

Bonilla made a motion to appoint Shinn, who declined due to scheduling conflicts.

ACTION: With his agreement, nominated and appointed David Durant as TRANSPAC's CCTA Representative for the completion of Member Abrams' 2007-09 term from March 1, 2008 until January 31, 2009. **Ross/Bonilla/ Unanimous**

19. **TRANSPAC appointment of an Alternate for the CCTA Representative appointed under item 18 if necessary.** NOTE: Pursuant to the TRANSPAC Joint Agreement, Section VI (e) (3) which is consistent with the CCTA Administrative Code, only elected officials may vote on this item

ACTION: Per action in item 17.

- 1) Member Silva the second alternate for the CCTA Representative appointed for the 2008-10 term commencing March 1, 2008.
- 2) Member Ross remains the appointed third alternate to be used by both TRANSPAC CCTA representatives if both second alternates are not available. In February 2007, Ross was appointed as the third alternate for Member Abrams current term (2007-09).

20. **For the Good of the Order**

21. **Adjournment at 11:36 a.m. The next TRANSPAC meeting is scheduled for March 13, 2008 at 9 a.m. in the Community Room, City Hall, City of Pleasant Hill.**