

1. Call to Order / Introductions

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes of November 10, 2008

3. Update on the Draft Transportation 2035 Plan (Ashley Nguyen):

There were no comments or questions on the status material that was provided as a handout.

4. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009: Regional Programming Proposal (Steve Heminger / Alix Bockelman)

Steve Heminger, Executive Director, MTC, and Alix Bockelman, MTC, presented materials on a Regional Programming Proposal in anticipation of the enactment of the federal economic recovery package. Highlights of the presentation included:

- Review of the economic Recovery Program: Transportation Investment Principles, which were unanimously adopted by the Commission in December 2008 to guide MTC's advocacy in Washington. The principles clarified projects that could be put out to bid promptly and quickly create jobs, such as rehabilitation work on transit and road systems as well as projects with more significance for economic growth.
- Review of a Side-by-Side Comparison of House long-term and Senate bills, which identify a lot of commonality, but result in a large swing in funding that may come to the region based on suballocation.
- MTC proposal to direct \$270 million to \$510 million on system preservation projects; \$190 million to support longer-term infrastructure projects that support a new economy; reinforce commitments to regional initiatives and priorities; and ensure regional success in project delivery.

Kate Miller, AC Transit, asked how the take-down for expansion projects would affect the urbanized areas and if they would be taken off the top of the list or if they would come from San Francisco and Oakland. Alix Bockelman responded that the Oakland Airport Connector would be eligible for any urbanized area that BART serves, so this would be broader than San Francisco and Oakland and would include Antioch and Concord. The Transbay Terminal would be eligible for any urbanized area that Caltrain operates in.

Michael Burns, Santa Clara Valley Transp. Authority, asked if the expansion proposals are being treated as fixed dollar amounts and if the transit rehabilitation is being treated as the percentage that remains. Mr. Heminger responded that was correct.

Larry Patterson, City of San Mateo, requested a change that would provide a fixed 80% to local streets and roads and that additional Safety or Smart highway project programming be added if the funds start to approach the level recommended in the Senate Bill. Steve Heminger explained that local streets and roads rehabilitation has a shortfall of about \$10 billion plus but is a scalable project. The Oakland Airport Connector is not scalable and the board will need to determine whether or not to do it. If some of the capital projects requiring

The Bay Area Partnership Board

Record of Meeting: February 6, 2008

Page 2

a number of different agreements between funding agencies do not get the agreements, the funding would shift back to rehabilitation.

Ian McAvoy, San Mateo County Transit District, asked why there are more formula funds in the National program in comparison to that of the Bay Area given there are more potentially eligible elements of programs that could be realized in the Bay Area. Mr. Heminger explained that the intent was to capture the federal discretionary pieces that might come into play for the Bay Area projects.

Ben Tripousis, City of San Jose, asked for confirmation that the recommendation for the Transbay Terminal project is \$75 million from the regional discretionary funds and \$50 million for High Speed Rail program assuming that is still in the Bill, to which Mr. Heminger responded that his understanding is correct.

Rich Napier, San Mateo Congestion Management, asked how projects were selected for the proposal and requested a minimum of 80% for local streets and roads rehabilitation. Mr. Heminger explained that MTC relied on the policy priorities that the Commission has established, and the long range plan that was developed over the past two years. Mr. Heminger further explained that 80% is a target and not a rule.

Daryl Halls, Solano Transportation Authority agreed that the transit perspective is consistent with the RTP and is supportive of the local streets and roads rehabilitation but feels that more should be dedicated to rehabilitation and that staff should look more closely at safety corridors. Mr. Halls would like to dialogue further, at a future Partnership Board meeting, to discuss authorization and focusing on PDA's before moving forward. Mr. Heminger suggested that the intent was to put off acting now but wanted it noted now that we would be matching transportation investments with the land-use strategy.

Celia Kupersmith, Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District, asked what is the best way to look at getting funding for the Golden Gate Bridge given it is not a local road nor a transit system and where the bridge fits into the ARRA plan. Mr. Heminger responded that the Golden Gate Bridge is an anomaly because it is not owned by the state but is sort of a local road; however, not in the local road formula. Staff would like to follow-up to determine if the Golden Gate Bridge might be included in some of the federal discretionary opportunities.

John Ristow, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, agreed that transit rehabilitation should be moved up to 80%. Mr. Ristow went on to comment that consideration should be made to set aside the references to PDA funding policies in the ARRA memo. Mr. Heminger explained that the memo has been signed and sent out and the issue is before the committee but that portion of the memo is simply saying that MTC will work on that piece at a later date.

Nina Rannells, Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA), expressed a concern about the ability to have input on the programming of any transit formula funds used to meet the needs of ferry services, in particular, Alameda-Oakland ferry services. Ms. Bockelman

responded that there were a few operators that are not a part of the formula distribution because they are not federal grantees, which was the case for Alameda-Oakland. While WETA is a federal grantee, they have not yet taken over the Alameda-Oakland ferry service; however, we can have additional discussions about this but MTC was trying to rely on existing formulas for purposes of moving forward with the ARRA memo.

Dianne Steinhauser, Transportation Authority of Marin, requested that when staff goes before the Commission that they talk very clearly about the benefits regionally from the Smart highways project.

Larry Patterson, City of San Mateo, suggested that, for the STP portion, we reduce funding for the Freeway Performance Initiatives (FPI) and as more funds approach the Senate funding level of funding, the 80% for rehabilitation could be achieved.

5. Public Comment / Other

Bob Planthold expressed a concern that the communication mechanism for stimulus funding and project selection has major ADA deficiencies.

6. Adjourn/Next Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:47 p.m. The next meeting date, time and location will be determined at a later time.