ITEM:  4a

SUBJECT:

Approval of the North County Corridor Project Charter (Route Adoption)

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. By motion, consent to the NCC TEA Authority Manager’s approval of the attached NCC Project Charter (Route Adoption) between the NCC TEA and the Department of Transportation, District 10.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact associated with this item.

DISCUSSION:

At the December 10, 2008 NCC TEA meeting, the Directors were asked to approve a Project Charter with Caltrans. The Charter is being revised to reflect the changes in strategy directed by Caltrans and adopted by the Board. The Charter only covers the Route Adoption phase of the project, but the limits have now changed to SR 108 (McHenry Blvd.) to SR 108/120 east of Oakdale. Future project phases will be amended into the Charter as appropriate.

The purpose of the NCC Project Charter (Route Adoption) is to memorialize the working relationship and delivery agreement between the NCC TEA and the Department of Transportation.

The basic tenets of the Charter are:
The project will have a design year of 2050 to develop traffic forecasts
A Modified Project Report and Program-level Environmental Document (CEQA) will be prepared for the route adoption
Appropriate sections of the Modified Project Report will be extracted to serve as the programming document for a Phase 1 segment in the 2010 STIP

The Department of Transportation, District 10 has provided direction to the NCC Management Team to simplify the Route Adoption process “given the extensive study performed to date, the accelerated schedule necessary to meet funding deadlines, the mutual benefit of the project for Caltrans and the local agencies, and the risk that the NCC TEA is willing to accept”. The Modified Project Report and Program-level Environmental Document (CEQA) will be non-technical in nature. It will not address specific termini and issues relating to design criteria, including route designation, facility type or logical termini. The Department and the NCC TEA will cooperatively determine these issues.
CHARTER PURPOSE

This Project Charter documents the mutual understandings between the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the North County Corridor Transportation Expressway Authority, hereinafter referred to as "NCCTEA" on the essential elements of the Route Adoption phase of the North County Corridor Project in Stanislaus County.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The North County Corridor Project will provide approximately 17 miles of roadway on new alignment to provide interregional connectivity from SR 108 McHenry Avenue, north of Modesto, east and north easterly, to approximately 7.7 miles east of the SR 120/108 junction. The primary intent of the project is to provide a high capacity, east-west roadway to accommodate inter-regional traffic, goods movement, anticipated traffic growth in the area, to alleviate traffic on parallel roadways, and to accommodate multi-modal travel. It is anticipated that the ultimate facility type will be a four to six lane controlled access highway (expressway/freeway), Category 1 project, with interchanges, at-grade intersections, grade separated railroad crossings, irrigation district crossings, frontage roads and street realignments.

The preliminary study limits are defined as starting at the State Route (SR) 108/McHenry Avenue on the west and extending northeasterly to SR-120/108 and ending east of the Oakdale community. The north-south study area is roughly bounded on the south by the northern boundary of the City of Modesto, and on the north by the Stanislaus River.

The proposed roadway would be built in unincorporated Stanislaus County and is not anticipated to cross any current city boundaries, though portions of it may travel less than one mile south of Riverbank and through the City sphere of influence, less than one mile south of Oakdale, and less than one mile north of Modesto.

Two build alternatives and one 'No Build' alternative have been identified. Both build alternatives stay within unincorporated Stanislaus County, but cross into the designated sphere of influence for the City Modesto and Riverbank.

**Alternative A** proposes approximately 17 miles of new highway, including interchanges, grade separated railroad crossings and at-grade intersections meeting State standards unless otherwise approved.

**Alternative B** proposes approximately 17 miles of new highway, including interchanges, grade separated railroad crossings and at-grade intersections meeting State standards unless otherwise approved.
Intent of Project

Traffic through the Corridor is a combination of commuter, local commerce, and goods movement, with a large component of recreational traffic. This traffic currently conflicts with local traffic on the existing facilities, creating congestion and safety concerns, as well as, increased noise and air pollution. These conditions are expected to worsen significantly over time as development continues and traffic increases within the Corridor.

The intent of the project is to provide an east-west highway to provide inter-regional connectivity and accommodate planned growth in the area. The North County Corridor project has been identified as a necessary improvement to accommodate inter-regional east-west traffic and help improve north-south network connectivity in northern Stanislaus and southern San Joaquin counties.

1. Along the route, the cities of Modesto, Riverbank, and Oakdale are anticipating growth which will quickly encroach on available highway/expressway Corridors.

2. The existing and planned development in this area limits the possibility to increase capacity along the existing route.
PROJECT BACKGROUND

The North County Corridor has been identified as a priority corridor by the Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG), the Cities of Oakdale, Riverbank, Modesto; and the County of Stanislaus. The four city and county entities have formulated a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) known as the North County Corridor Transportation Expressway Authority (NCCTEA) to develop and implement the construction of this project (Executed April 1, 2008). The NCCTEA is committed to development of a multi-modal transportation corridor with interregional significance.

Two studies have been completed to document the feasibility, scope, and funding needs for the project. The North County Corridor Feasibility Study was completed in January 2008. This study describes and analyzes existing conditions and anticipated constraints, potential alignments, environmental issues, future 2030 traffic forecasts, and conceptual construction cost estimates along the corridor. The North County Corridor, Preliminary Design Report (PDR) was completed in April 2008. This report further defined the conceptual alternatives along the two major alignments of the feasibility study, performed an intensive outreach program to the member agencies, Caltrans and the CTC, identified project development funding possibilities for the next phase of the project, and the PDR served as the programming document for the Project Approval and Environment Document (PA&ED) phase of the project in the 2008 STIP.

In a letter (see attached) from Caltrans Director Will Kempton, dated February 19, 2008, to the NCCTEA Board, he stated,

“The Department previously committed $91 million of Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) funds to the Oakdale Bypass project in 2004. Since that time, traffic patterns in Stanislaus County have changed and the region has indicated that all alternative projects may better serve the county’s needs. Under the authority of the resolution approving the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Augmentation last June, the California Transportation Commission redirected $22,169,000 of ITIP funds from the Oakdale Bypass project with the proviso that the funding would be restored when a viable replacement project was identified by the region. The Department understands the proposed North County Corridor project is being developed as a replacement for the Oakdale Bypass project. As we discussed, this project is in the early stages of development, and it would be premature to fund it in the 2008 STIP cycle. The Department however, remains committed to working with the region on a corridor solution, and intends to commit ITIP funds in the 2010 STIP cycle for up to $91 million in capital money for an ITIP-eligible North County Corridor project segment.”

Given the extensive study performed to date, the accelerated schedule necessary to meet funding deadlines, the mutual benefit of the project for Caltrans and the local agencies, and the risk that the NCCTEA is willing to accept, a modified approach to the traditional Project Report for the Route Adoption process is acceptable to all parties. This approach will build upon the Feasibility Study and PDR and supplement these studies with traffic forecasting and operations analysis sufficient to complete the Route Adoption, thereby allowing the project to meet the overall goal of obtaining CTC approval of ITIP funds in the 2010 STIP cycle.

The project has investigated several options for route designation for the completed facility. These included a route designation for the full length of the facility from SR 99 at Hammet Road to
approximately 7.7 miles east of the SR 120/108 junction, or utilize portions of existing State Routes and have the remaining constructed facility as a local roadway. In a meeting with the California Department of Transportation Director and the NCCTEA Manager on February 18, 2009, it was agreed that the Route Adoption limits should be from SR 108 (McHenry Avenue) to SR 120/108 east of Oakdale. This strategy was approved by the NCCTEA Board on March 11, 2009.

The selection of the specific route and any required relinquishment decisions are not part of this Charter and will be negotiated separately. Legislation to designate SR 108 as an inter-regional route from SR 99 to SR 120 will be required.

Traffic Forecasts The traffic analysis prepared to date for this project evaluated future (2030) operations on the North County Corridor and its effects on the parallel roadways by analyzing their operations both with and without the corridor. These forecasts will need to be updated for a 20-year design life. The StanCOG 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) travel demand model was the primary tool used in the traffic evaluation to date. The project is anticipated to carry between 14,000 and 76,000 ADT at full build out, depending on location. These results will change within the Route Adoption limits and when the forecasts are updated for a 20-year design life. The project is being designed to operate at LOS D or better conditions. Traffic shifts caused by the project are not anticipated to degrade the LOS at any roadways.

Design year forecasting assumes that the ultimate construction of the entire corridor will be complete by 2030. With 20 years of design life added to this, the Design Year will be 2050. This assumption of a 2030 completion year is based on current funding scenarios. The funds are anticipated to come from Public Facility Fees (PFF), ITIP and the STIP. It is highly reasonable to assume that these funds will be available over the next 20-year period for a completion by 2030.

The traffic extrapolation methodology from the current 2030 StanCOG RTP model to the year 2050 land use projections was approved by the NCC Technical Advisory Committee and PDT.

Environmental A Preliminary Environmental Assessment Report (PEAR) was prepared for the proposed project during the PDR development.

It is critical to complete a state route adoption by the California Transportation Commission and designate the facility as an interregional system in order to receive the Interregional funding from Caltrans in the 2010 STIP. Therefore, a “step-wise environmental approach” will be used for this project that would enable timely completion of necessary environmental approvals required for route adoption and interregional designation. The approach consists of a program-level CEQA environmental document for the Route Adoption followed by a corridor wide program CEQA EIR/NEPA Tier I EIS.
Delivery Strategy

CTC Route Adoption:

- Prepare a Route Adoption Report and a Program-level Environmental Document (CEQA) necessary for State Route Adoption.

- Appropriate sections of the Route Adoption Report will be extracted to serve as the approval document (PSR) for programming of a Phase 1 Segment in the 2010 STIP.

DELIVERY SUCCESS CRITERIA

The project phase objective is an approved program-level Environmental (CEQA) Document, Approved Route Adoption Report, and a PSR to serve as the programming document for a Phase 1 segment meeting the following criteria:

Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Scoping of Alternatives - Route Adoption</td>
<td>Nov 2008 - Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Preparation</td>
<td>Jan 2009 - Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAD for Mainline Geometrics Only</td>
<td>May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine the limits of Phase 1 Project</td>
<td>May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve Draft Route Adoption Report &amp; Draft Env. Doc</td>
<td>June 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulate Draft Env. Doc.</td>
<td>July 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify a General Corridor for Route Adoption</td>
<td>Aug 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve final Route Adoption Report &amp; Env. Doc.</td>
<td>Sept 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Determination</td>
<td>Oct 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Adoption by CTC</td>
<td>Nov 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit project (PSR – Segment 1) for 2010 STIP programming</td>
<td>Nov 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Future project implementation milestones for the PA & ED will be amended into this Charter once Route Adoption process is substantially completed.

Quality:

Quality Control procedures will be strictly adhered to and properly documented throughout the entire course of the work. Specific activities may include:

- Verification that all preliminary design is accomplished in accordance with appropriate design criteria and required processes.

- Periodic audits of the Project Team for conformance with contract requirements, design criteria, and other project quality standards.
Customer Satisfaction:
The objective of this phase is to complete an approved Route Adoption Report and environmental document for Route Adoption and a Project Study Report (PSR) for programming of Phase 1 segment in 2010 STIP.

PROJECT SUCCESS RESPONSIBILITY

The project will establish a Project Development Strategic Team (PDST) comprised of agency management representatives, consultant management, Caltrans representatives at the Office Chief level, and a Caltrans project manager. This team will have the primary role of strategic guidance of the project, policy resolution, conflict resolution and inter-jurisdictional communication. PDT will include Caltrans personnel at the Senior and functional unit level. There will also be periodic Caltrans Executive Management briefings. Technical focus team meetings will be held as directed by the PDT. These will be comprised of agency representatives, consultant members and appropriate functional unit representatives in Caltrans in the following areas:

- Environmental
- Public Involvement
- Traffic
- Design

Decisions on issues of a technical nature will be delegated to the focus teams. The focus teams will keep the PDT informed and elevate issues where conflicts or policy issues arise. Please refer to the Conflict Resolution portion of this Charter.

1. All PDST and PDT members shall agree upon and use generally accepted principles of project management and task management, in order to deliver the project on time, on budget, and in a quality form.

2. Each PDST and PDT member has the responsibility for the products and processes associated with the project delivery plan.

3. Task Managers are responsible for the delivery of their outputs in a timely, thorough, and quality manner. If inputs are delayed, the Task Manager for that element (receiving the inputs) shall contact the provider of the inputs and take active steps to obtain, in a timely manner, the information that is required. If the inputs are not forthcoming, the Task Manager will inform the Project Manager, and undertake a course of action to correct the situation. This may cause a schedule amendment, and appropriate documentation.

4. It is each PDST and PDT members goal to work toward qualifying a new route as a replacement project for the Oakdale SR 120 by-pass project by the December 2009 California Transportation Commission meeting as outlined in the letter from Caltrans Director, Will Kempton.

CONSTRAINTS, RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

It is expressly understood by all project team members that the primary objective of the first phase of this project (CEQA Environmental and accompanying Route Adoption Report) is to enable this project to be eligible for the Interregional funding in the 2010 STIP. It is understood that there are
several constraints that need to be overcome jointly in order to make this schedule. It is understood that the following constraints need to be overcome jointly in order to meet the schedule:

1. **Modified Project Study Report:** The NCCTEA desires to update the existing PDR to make it suitable for the Project Report to accompany the CEQA for Route Adoption. It is understood by the team members that the PR accompanying CEQA will be an update to address the specifics needed for the Route Adoption approval. As such, it will not meet the standards of a stand alone PR that is typically part of PA&ED. However, subsequent to the Route Adoption and prior to the completion of the PA&ED, the Modified Project Study Report will be updated to meet the Caltrans PR requirements for PA&ED.

2. **CTC Route Adoption Process:** It is understood that the Caltrans and NCCTEA will work together to identify the most efficient process for the CTC approval of the Route Adoption at its December 2009 meeting. The Caltrans team will provide NCCTEA with the dates of required submittals to the district and the headquarters for processing the Route Adoption by December 2009. This schedule will be finalized by December 2008. This schedule will consider risks that include need for additional CTC public hearing.

3. **To meet the schedule requirements, concurrent submittals of traffic and environmental drafts to NCCTEA and Caltrans will be necessary.**

The key constraints and assumptions for this project are as follows:

1. It is recognized by all PDST, PDT, and Focus Team members that conditions can change that will affect the original schedule. PDST, PDT, and Focus Team members will work together to minimize the impacts of such changes.

2. **All comments will be addressed during the review, comment, and resolution process.**

3. **Caltrans will complete the review and submit written comments and/or concurrence of all documents within a 15 working day review period.**

4. **The NCCTEA’s Project Manager, its Consultant’s Project Manager and the Caltrans Project Manager will facilitate expedited decision making (where they have the authority), and may designate alternates from time to time on specific tasks.**

5. **Documented decisions will hold as final unless conditions have changed. Decisions shall be documented, including those identifying any changed assumptions, issues and conditions leading to the change(s).**

6. **It is assumed that the Resource Agencies will review the project documents in the time allowed and all team members will work expeditiously to pursue the review and approval from Resource Agencies.**

7. **All project mapping, engineering reports, technical studies, and Geometric Approval Drawings will be developed in English units.**

8. **The Project will be coordinated with other current/future construction projects in the vicinity. The NCCTEA and Caltrans will ensure that the Agency(s) responsible for such projects will expeditiously provide all pertinent information needed for successful coordination.**
9. Environmental Impact Report for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance will be required.

10. A Risk Management Plan will be maintained.

11. Public outreach will continue.

The key risks for this project are as follows:

1. Adherence to project milestones to obtain funding.

2. Logical project termini definition and political influences on first phase project.

4. The local community concerns will be properly investigated and incorporated into the project design.

5. Route Adoption legislation to designate the NCC route as inter-regional.

PHASE DELIVERABLES & BASELINE SCHEDULE

KEY DELIVERABLES FOR ROUTE ADOPTION & PROGRAMMING OF PHASE 1 SEGMENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Item</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Approval Agency</th>
<th>Delivery Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Final Environmental Technical Studies</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>5/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Draft Route Adoption Report</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>6/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Approved Final Route Adoption Report</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>9/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Notice of Determination</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>10/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Route Adoption by CTC and ITIP Nomination of Phase 1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>11/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JE = Jacobs Engineering  F & P = Fehr and Peers

NOTE: Future project implementation steps will be amended into this Charter once they are more clearly defined.
DELIVERABLE MANAGEMENT

Maximum Review Times for Design Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Readiness Check. Caltrans reviews and approves the documents or returns them with notification on why they are unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 days</td>
<td>Agency makes appropriate changes and submits a written response to Caltrans comments, using the Comments and Response table. Comments are resolved and the Agency makes a resubmittal of documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>Caltrans verifies all comments are addressed and changes have been made and obtains approval of documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 days</td>
<td>Total Review Time Note: If comments are not addressed or the submittal is incomplete, the documents are returned within 20 days and the last two steps are repeated until the documents are approved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND COMMUNICATION PLAN

The Conflict Resolution and Communication Plan for the NCCTEA is intended to provide open and timely communication and provide the framework for resolving conflicts between the local agency sponsor (Stanislaus County) and Caltrans. The Plan will define the need and purpose of each group, (the Project Development Team and NCC Project Delivery Strategic Team) and will establish the process and timing for the distribution of meeting agenda, minutes and action items. This will be made available on a file-share website as well as distributed by email.

It is the intent of Caltrans and the local agency sponsor to settle conflicts at the PDT level. It is only when an impasse is reached at the PDT level that the particular topic under question will elevate to the PDST and follow the conflict resolution process.

Caltrans and NCCTEA share the following principles in the resolution of conflicts:
1. The efficient delivery of effective, appropriate projects is the primary goal of both parties.
2. The parties will focus on their common goals rather than maintain their differences.
3. Win/win solutions to disputes should be sought.
4. Differences of opinions are acceptable.
5. Timely, open, and honest communication is the key to avoiding and resolving conflicts.
6. Technical concerns should be separated from interpersonal issues.
7. Standard policies and procedures, as well as Caltrans interpretation of the California Environmental Quality Act are established. Reasonable interpretation must be made in developing a purpose and need statement, considering a full range of alternatives, developing and evaluating technical data, and other steps in the project development process.
8. Decisions should be made and conflicts resolved at the lowest possible level.
Decision Process

The "Conflict Resolution Matrix" will be followed to identify the process by which unresolved concerns may be elevated to a higher decision authority. It is the intent of both parties to resolve conflicts quickly.

Conflict Resolution Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Decision Timeframe</th>
<th>NCCTEA</th>
<th>Caltrans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-5 days</td>
<td>PDST</td>
<td>PDST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-15 days</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>District Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first level of review and resolution takes place within the Project Development Team, especially those questions that do not affect the scope, cost, or schedule. The team will review the question, options for resolution, pros and cons to each option, and the advocate's reasons in support of the option. If the team and Project Managers do not have the authority or cannot agree, then the conflict will be presented to the PDST.

If the issue is not resolved the second level of review and resolution takes place at the Caltrans District Director and the NCCTEA Chair. An Issue Memo should be written by the Caltrans Project Manager and the NCCTEA’s Project Manager to detail the question, options for resolution, pros and cons to each option, and the advocate's reasons in support of the option. The memo should specifically present completed staff work performed to resolve the question.

Some conflicts may fall within the purview of Caltrans Design, Legal, or Headquarters. In those instances, the questions, options for solutions, and pros and cons may be raised to each subsequent management level by the District Director. These issues will be brought to forward at Caltrans Executive Management briefings. At NCCTEA’s direction, the NCCTEA’s Consultant will assist the District Director in presenting the issue(s) to Caltrans Headquarters team.

Caltrans expressly reserves the right to exercise its authority to direct the implementation of appropriate responses to questions affecting:

- The safety of the traveling public.
- Future Caltrans liability of the operation and maintenance of the completed facility.
- Future operations and maintenance costs of constructed project facilities.
- Future statutory obligations pertaining to the new or existing facility.

In those rare instances where Caltrans exercises this authority, the NCCTEA will be informed 15 days before Caltrans issues a determination in a letter signed by the District Director.

It is anticipated that most concerns will be resolved at the levels identified in the matrix above. If an impasse is reached, the NCCTEA may submit a written request for further review by Caltrans to the District Director. The request must fully describe the position of the regional agency on the problem. The District Director will forward the NCCTEA’s request to the appropriate Caltrans Headquarters Management for consideration. In addition, the District Director (with assistance provided the Caltrans Project Manager) will provide a report to NCCTEA describing the steps taken to attempt to resolve the problem. This report should provide a problem overview and detailed discussion of the
items in dispute, with references to sections in policy manuals and memos that support the District’s position, and a District recommendation on the problem.

RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Risk Management Plan for the NCCTEA is intended to establish a comprehensive plan that clearly defines roles and responsibilities for risk management and addresses the process by which it will identify and quantify project risks, implement and track risk response activities, and monitor and control risks throughout the duration of the project. This plan will quantify the effect of identified risks in financial terms, develop and maintain documents to track identified risks and related mitigation steps. This plan is independent from the Charter but is incorporated by reference.

RESPONSIBILITIES

NCCTEA:

• Ensures that its staff, consultants, and contractors comply with applicable state and federal laws, regulations, policies, and procedures, and with the Cooperative Agreement.

• Provides adequate resources to ensure that projects can be developed to meet Caltrans standards and submittal requirements.

• Ensures the adequacy of its products through a quality control and quality assurance procedure.

• Designates a person to be the Project Manager.

NCCTEA’s Project Manager:

• Fulfills the Agency’s responsibilities for successfully completing the Project Report.

• Coordinates with the Caltrans Project Manager to assemble a Project Development Strategic Team (PDST) and Project Development Team (PDT) in accordance with Chapter 8, Section 4, of Caltrans’ Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM).

• Schedules a PDST kick-off meeting to provide an overview of the project and schedule.

Caltrans Project Manager:

• Assists and advises the NCCTEA’s Project Manager and serves as the project ombudsman within Caltrans.

• Ensures that Caltrans’ interests are represented and addressed adequately in the alternatives studied by the PDT.

• Ensures that submittals are given to the appropriate support unit for review and responds to
the NCCTEA and consultants with the support units’ comments in a timely manner. Makes decisions on behalf of Caltrans at the PDT meetings and actively facilitates the Caltrans team to make the PDST meetings more effective.

PDT:

Ensures that information is disseminated and discussed for impacts to others. Discusses and makes recommendations on policy issues to the PDST.

PDST:

Ensures that issues from the PDT are discussed and resolved if possible and makes recommendations on policy issues to the NCCTEA Chair and Caltrans District Director.

KEY TEAM MEMBERS

Matt Machado  Manager, NCCTEA  
Laurie Barton  Project Manager, NCCTEA  
Kris Balaji  Jacobs Engineering (Consultant Project Manager)  
Theron Roschen  Jacobs Engineering (Consultant Deputy Project Manager)  
Eddie Barrios  Fehr & Peers (Traffic Consultant)  
Mike Davis  Jacobs Engineering (Environmental Manager)  
Judith Buethe  Judith Buethe Communications (Public Outreach)  
Maggie Townsley  Jones & Stokes (Environmental Consultant)  
Christina Hibbard  Caltrans Project Manager  
Dennis Agar  Caltrans Deputy District Director, Program Project Management  
Chrisine Cox  Caltrans Office Chief, Environmental  
Silvia Dayak  Caltrans Project Analyst  
Anton Kismetian  Caltrans Design Oversight  
Gail Miller  Caltrans Senior Environmental Planner  
Terry Ogle  Caltrans Office Chief, Design  
Pat Robledo  Caltrans Senior TE, Travel Forecasting  
David Sangha  Caltrans Senior Design Oversight  
Scott Smith  Caltrans Environmental Coordinator  
John Thomas  Caltrans Environmental Coordinator  
Nguyen Vu  Caltrans Traffic Operations Chief

Caltrans Executive Management Briefings

Kim Anderson, Chief, Central Region, Project Development  
Carrie Bowen, Division Chief, Central Region Environmental  
Tony Tavares, District 10 Acting Director  
Dennis Agar, Deputy District Director, Program Project Management  
Christina Hibbard, Project Manager  
Silvia Dayak, Project Analyst  
Dinah Bortner (as needed), Deputy District Director, Maintenance & Operations  
Ken Baxter (as needed), Deputy District Director, Planning
APPROVALS:

CHRISTINA HIBBARD  
Project Manager  
Program Project Management  
Caltrans - District 10

MATT MACHADO  
Director  
North County Corridor Transportation Expressway Authority (NCCTEA)

TONY TAVARES  
Acting District Director  
Program Project Management  
Caltrans - District 10