

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes of September 26, 2007

3. Election of Officers

Rick Ramacier, CCTA, nominated and voted by the Board to be Chair.

John Ristow, SCVTA, nominated and voted by the Board to be Vice-Chair.

4. State Transit Assistance (STA) Consolidated Policy (Theresa Romell)

Theresa Romell, MTC, presented options for adjusting the STA population based consolidation proposal to account for the augmentation that the program will receive due to the passage of SB 717 in October. SB 717 is estimated to increase the region's STA population-based revenues by \$90 million over a 10-year period.

Three options were presented to PTAC on November 19th:

- Option 1 – proposes to flow the entire SB717 to the original consolidated proposal.
- Option 2 – proposes to apply half of the SB717 increment to the Paratransit category and divide remaining half among the 3 remaining categories.
- Option 3 – proposes to apply half of the SB717 to the Paratransit category, and divide remaining half between the Lifeline category and the Northern counties small operator category. Regional coordination would not receive a piece of the increment.

MTC recommended Option 2, since it allows all categories to benefit from the revenue increase. MTC is not supportive of Option 3.

Marcella Rensi, SCVTA, provided the Board with an update of the Partnership Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) meeting. PTAC recommended Option 2 & 3 for the Board's consideration. Transit Operators presented Option 4, which proposes to split SB 717 increment 1/3 to Northern counties small operator category, 1/3 to the Regional Paratransit, and split remaining 1/3 between Lifeline and MTC Regional Coordination TransLink.

Dennis Fay, ACCMA, raised an issue regarding the current RTP policy of 'fix it first', noting the policy should be presented as a fifth option. Mr. Fay asked that this option be considered and forwarded on to the Commission as an option.

Bob McCleary, CCTA, agreed with the 'fix it first' policy. Mr. McCleary noted that he is prepared to support PTAC's option and made a motion to move forward with this option for a specified period of time.

There was general discussion among the members about the merits of the various options, including the issue of time limit for the policy and trade-off between capital and operating.

Chair Smith clarified that the motion on the floor is for option 4 for a period of 10 years.

Carter Mau commented BART's concurrence with the Dennis Fay option, the fix-it-first option. BART believes the fix-it-first option is a RTP policy that we should put given very strong consideration whenever there is any new discretionary funding.

Marcella inquired if the 10-yr period, applies solely to the distribution of 717 increment or the entire distribution of the STA. Chair Smith answered that it applies to the entire distribution.

Dennis Fay acknowledged that absent the piece of the motion that says that we're going to look at this as part of the RTP, he votes no.

Chair Smith puts the motion to a vote, in which all are in favor, with the exception of Dennis Fay and Carter Mau.

Chair Smith proposed that for the record it be said that there was general consensus from the Partnership to support Option 4 with a lengthy discussion about the importance of addressing the fix-it-first policy in the RTP. All agreed.

Newly appointed Chair Rick Ramacier took over facilitation of remainder of the meeting.

5. Transportation 2035 Status Report Update (Therese McMillan)

Therese McMillan, MTC, presented an update of Transportation 2035, including four policy questions that were presented to the Commission at a workshop on November 21, 2007, and the Commission's general feedback. These same questions will also be presented to MTC's advisory councils before the next Planning Committee Meeting on Dec 14th. The Board's feedback on these questions will be presented to the Commission.

The 4 main policy questions are:

- 1). Should we adopt performance targets?**
- 2). How do we get the price right?**
- 3). How do we encourage focused growth?**
- 4). How do we implement the Freeway Performance Initiative?**

Michael Scanlon (Samtrans/Caltrain) noted that he is in agreement with the Commission comments.

Larry Patterson, City of San Mateo, inquired about this unfamiliar process where the Board is asked to critique consensus reached by the Commission.

Steve Heminger commented that 'consensus' is too strong a word. MTC talked to the Commission about this subject and got their advice, and now MTC is asking the advice of the Board.

John Ristow recommended MTC exercise caution in establishing targets, goals or implementation policy so that the region is not locked into achieving unattainable targets.

Therese agreed with Mr. Ristow, and commented that MTC would like to implement policies where there is an option to reset targets based on new information and the progress or lack thereof.

Bob McCleary commented on setting unrealistic expectations, particularly when referencing housing affordability. MTC should be careful about using those expectations to direct transportation funds. MTC needs to face issues in a fully collaborative manner. He highlighted the work that the Sacramento region has undergone as a good example.

Sonali Bose, SFMTA, posed a procedural question; if we want to adopt performance targets, what would be the process for individual projects? Would each individual target have to meet all the targets, one target or a portfolio of targets? How would that work?

Steve answered, referencing a requirement in the law that MTC conduct a performance analysis as part of the plan. After numerical performance target goals are established, MTC will then establish the performance review process.

Suzanne Smith commented on the issue of data being used and how that data is gathered and maintained. There is an issue of which data is good data and which isn't and also who has the financial ability to gather the right kind of data.

Steve pointed out the one question that was not posed to the Commission, but should be posed to the Partnership Board. MTC presented a range of targets in this analysis as illustration. One question is whether we ought to adopt all of them, or only some of them. If there are to be goals and targets, they should be across the range. One thing that is helpful is if a subgroup of this partnership would be willing to step in and aid this process. We can put together a proposal that the Commission can consider early next year.

Chair Ramacier inquired if Steve suggested a formation of an adhoc committee. The group agreed to work through a group of transit planners and CMA planners that have been convened for the RTP. This group will report to the PTAC.

Dennis moved that the unofficial subcommittee of the PTAC with planners become official. Motion on the floor, second by Bob. If interested, Marcella should be contacted.

Steve added that Caltrans and ABAG should be attending these meetings.

Therese continued explaining another policy arena that was explored with the Commission; the idea of a High Occupancy Toll (HOT) network.

Policy questions: Should the Commission broker a consensus on a regional HOT network in the next few months so we can 1) free up STIP revenue 2) include HOT network revenue in

the Transportation 2035 Plan? Commission input: Yes – agreement on regional system as prerequisite to adding revenue and revenue is to provide regional transit options.

Dennis Fay noted concerns regarding revenue assumptions, including statutes in Santa Clara County that prevent revenues derived in each corridor to be used elsewhere and the lack of proven track record on revenue generations.

Jim Helmer, City of San Jose, suggested the Board take into consideration, on any regional HOT lane network, that there be an emphasis on regional bus service through the network.

John Ristow inquired as to whether or not we really need to have an agreement in place as a prerequisite to incorporate potential HOT lane revenues into the RTP. Agreed with Dennis to have dialogue about HOT lanes and pricing of roadways. Also suggested the private investment or involvement be part of the dialogue.

Steve Heminger commented on the challenge of these discussions not being an impossible task. Revenue assumption issues are concerns as well. The RTP is a good context to have this discussion. The fact that it might free up public revenue is another reason to have this discussion.

Bob McCleary noted that a regional network will not happen unless there is a focus on the corridors. Indicated there will be difficulty convincing board members to support HOT lanes on I-680.

Members suggested that partnerships and collaboration between counties will contribute to the success of the HOT lanes in the corridors, and that MTC may want to reshape the discussion regarding donors / donees.

Suzanne Smith said that her board would potentially support this network and would be cautiously open to the concept.

Other members showed support for the regional network.

On the policy questions related to focused growth, Carter Mau, BART, commented that if there are to developments close to BART and other transit, that money should be put aside making sure these transit operators are able to make sure they are reliable for the transit riders.

In the area of implementing the Freeway Performance Initiative, there was general support for the off-the-top investment at \$600 million.

6. Adjourn/Next Meeting

Adjourned at 12:00 noon.