



METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
TEL 510.817.5700  
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769  
FAX 510.817.5848  
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov

*Scott Haggerty, Chair*  
Alameda County

*Adrienne J. Tissier, Vice Chair*  
San Mateo County

*Tom Azumbrado*  
U.S. Department of Housing  
and Urban Development

*Tom Bates*  
Cities of Alameda County

*Dean J. Chu*  
Cities of Santa Clara County

*Dave Cortese*  
Association of Bay Area Governments

*Chris Daly*  
City and County of San Francisco

*Bill Dodd*  
Napa County and Cities

*Dorene M. Giacopini*  
U.S. Department of Transportation

*Federal D. Glover*  
Contra Costa County

*Anne W. Halsted*  
San Francisco Bay Conservation  
and Development Commission

*Steve Kinsey*  
Marin County and Cities

*Sue Lempert*  
Cities of San Mateo County

*Jake Mackenzie*  
Sonoma County and Cities

*Jon Rubin*  
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

*Bijan Sartipi*  
State Business, Transportation  
and Housing Agency

*James P. Sperring*  
Solano County and Cities

*Amy Rein Worth*  
Cities of Contra Costa County

*Ken Yeager*  
Santa Clara County

*Steve Heminger*  
Executive Director

*Ann Flemer*  
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

*Andrew B. Fremier*  
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

**Transit Sustainability Project  
Select Committee Meeting  
July 9, 2010  
Minutes**

**1. Call to Order**

Chairman Bill Dodd called the meeting to order at approximately 9:04 a.m.

**2. Transit Sustainability Project Update**

Carolyn Clevenger, MTC Programming and Allocations Section, presented an update on the Transit Sustainability Project.

Commissioner Ken Yeager asked what is intended to be learned from this project that we do not already know. Ms. Clevenger responded that the project will evaluate what the transit operators are each experiencing at a single-agency level and address the barriers to a sustainable transit system at a regional level. Many of the individual agencies have tried to deal with the issues on their own but if addressed collectively, the region may come up with better solutions. Steve Heminger further explained that the project is intended to serve as a gap analysis and focus on those areas that have not done a comprehensive analysis of their services. There is value in having MTC, as somewhat of a third party, review the key issues regionally by taking a technical, data-driven approach.

Commissioner Jim Sperring asked where institutional changes will come into play in a technical data-driven approach, who will make the recommendations, and will the Commission be challenged with real choices at the end of this process? Mr. Heminger responded that the technical data driven aspect of this project is a new approach that we hope will help shed light on policy options. At some point it is a matter of political will and if it makes sense to continue to have two dozen agencies, we can do that. If we can have fewer, we can do that. If we want to take a different approach at the institutional question and not talk about mergers or consolidations of agencies at all but look at functional consolidations like we've done with Clipper, where we have a single way of paying for transit, we can do that. There are many other things that these agencies do separately, such as procurements, that could easily be done together. I think we are in an environment from a fiscal point of view where these questions are no longer rhetorical. We have to confront them and we may need to make some real changes in order to achieve a sustainable transit system. This will challenge the Commission and the Commission has to decide how they want to address that challenge.

Commissioner Steve Kinsey commented that clearly there will be legislative interests that follow this process and asked if there are plans to educate the

State delegation or at some point bring them along so that they are aware of where we are in the process. Mr. Heminger responded that we will need to work with Commissioner Rubin and the Legislation Committee. He noted that many strategies can be accomplished without legislation. An immense sum of money is allocated to the transit systems. The Commission has the power of the purse and it is a power that has been used sparingly but perhaps we should use it more often on this subject than we do. Beyond that, there are still several agencies that were created by state statute and we, in those cases we may need legislation to pursue some of the changes that might make sense.

Commissioner Jon Rubin commented that along with the legislative outreach, is the public outreach. Obviously, there will be ramifications and we don't want to make any assumptions going in. From the outset if we have some thoughts about the direction this process will go in, it is very important that our public outreach and our external communications program be geared appropriately. The grammar and vocabulary that we adopt as we send that message out should keep pace with the evolution of the project.

Commissioner Spring motioned for approval of the project work plan; Commissioner Worth seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Carolyn Clevenger presented a recommendation for the Committee to forward five consultant contracts including: Redhill Group of Irvine, CA (\$75,000); Cambridge Systematics, Inc. of Oakland, CA (\$100,000); PB Americas, Inc. of San Francisco, CA (\$150,000); Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates, Inc. of San Francisco, CA (\$200,000); and Transportation, Management and Design, Inc. of Carlsbad, CA (\$200,000) to advance the technical analysis for the project to the Administration Committee for approval.

Commissioner Kinsey motioned for approval; Commissioner Spring seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **4. Public Comment / Other Business**

Matt Williams, former AC Transit Director, commented on an institutional factor related to sustainability. He noted that in the 1990s, BART was pursuing an initiative known as FastTrack, and wanted over \$1 billion in the 1994 RTP. MTC sponsored legislation for the half cent sales tax, and the tradeoff is that Muni and AC Transit would receive mostly local funds and BART would receive sales tax. That hasn't really worked because AC Transit and Muni have had to curtail service and raise fares. BART is now bonding against the sales tax revenues. They then come back and compete with AC Transit and Muni for 5307 funds, which is like getting two bites at the apple. BART has made a decision that they have \$35 million more a year in operating than they really need. BART is now considering cutting fares. What other agency has the option of cutting fares?

#### **5. Adjournment / Next Meeting**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:23 a.m. The next meeting of the Transit Sustainability Project Committee will be determined at a later date.