

**The Bay Area Partnership Board**

Record of Meeting: December 1, 2009

Page 1

**1. Call to Order / Introductions****2. Approval of Meeting Minutes of June 23, 2009****3. Election of Officers:**

John Ristow, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, was nominated and voted by the Board to be Chair. The Board deferred the vote for Vice Chair to the next Board meeting.

**4. Board Administration**

David Rzepinski, representing Marin County Transit District, was nominated by Dianne Steinhauser and voted by the Board as a new member. Hans Larsen, representing the City of San Jose, was nominated by the Local Streets and Roads Committee and voted by the Board as a member replacing the retired Jim Helmer.

**5. New Federal Transportation Funding Act Proposal**

Alix Bockelman, MTC, presented a recommendation for \$1.4 billion in federal funding for the six-year New Act period that will be taken to the Programming & Allocations Committee on December 9 and to the full Commission on December 16.

*Kate Miller, AC Transit*, commented that the Climate Initiative should fund required transit projects, such as retrofit and fuel cell demonstration projects. She also noted that State Transit Assistance should be prioritized for the Lifeline program should it return, given that federal STP is not flexible for many projects.

*Alix Bockelman* responded that if STA funds return they would likely go to the Lifeline program as well as the payback for SamTrans for right-of-way. With regards to the Climate Initiative, there have been discussion about using some increment of the FTA funds for retrofit devices should there be additional appropriations.

*Dennis Fay, Alameda County Congestion Management Agency*, asked for clarification on the difference between the \$100 million in Attachment A and the \$79 million in Attachment C for Local Streets and Roads. Alix explained that the difference is the PTAP program and the FAS program. The proposal calls for the \$79 million to go through the block grant to the CMAs and the FAS go directly to the counties. Ross McKeown, MTC, added that the FAS amount over six years is \$15 million and it is proposed that the entire six year amount be programmed in Cycle One. Mr. Fay further commented that using the name Safe Routes to Schools for a new program focused on GHG Emissions creates confusion and requested the use of a name that more closely addresses the focus. Lastly, he commented that there should be more funds dedicated to fix-it-first and local streets and roads.

*Dianne Steinhauser, Transportation Authority of Marin*, commented that small jurisdictions with small formula shares cannot meet both conditions of the policy and wanted to know which condition is more important; the \$250,000 Federal grant minimum size or the 25% formula share. Alix responded that the policies being written will offer some flexibility in meeting the dual objective of prioritizing PDAs and ensuring federal dollars are not spent on very small projects.

## **The Bay Area Partnership Board**

Record of Meeting: December 1, 2009

Page 2

*Hans Larsen, City of San Jose Public Works*, suggested more money go towards fix-it-first. Additionally, the City of San Jose has a strong interest in participating in the public education and outreach of the Climate Initiative.

*Maria Lombardo, San Francisco County Transportation Authority*, commented that it would be helpful to have a better understanding of MTC's vision for the Climate Initiative program and that she is supportive of the innovative grant approach but it may be helpful to have smaller seed money for planning of these innovative projects or studies and more of the money shifted to Cycle Two.

*Ben Tripousis, City of San Jose*, recommended the approval of the first two cycles using the revenues in hand and to consider delaying the commitment of anticipated revenues until we have a better idea of what is to come.

*Amit Ghosh, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency*, would like to see the prioritization of the anticipated revenues for SFgo in Cycle 1 and would like to see more funding for fix-it-first. Mr. Gosh further commented that the Board should consider meeting any day of the week except Mondays and Tuesdays.

*John Ristow, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority*, asked if the FAS formula amends the formula for the distribution to the county level for specific city projects. Alix responded that MTC is not proposing to change the streets and roads formula. Steve Heminger commented that the FAS program has not existed since the 1980s and we are tracking it simply because state law requires that we do so. He would welcome a collective effort to have this removed from state law.

Mr. Ristow further commented that he would like consideration to be made to make the block grants more flexible.

### **6. Transit Sustainability Project**

Because this item was recently presented at the PTCC meeting and many of the attendees of today's Partnership Board meeting were present, this item was opened for discussion without presentation. Alix Bockelman commented that a workshop was held in October with MTC Commissioners to discuss the importance of the Transit Sustainability Project. Staff is in the process of setting up a specific work scope for approval that will include a fact based financial analysis, a comprehensive assessment that acknowledges the role of land use and transportation pricing.

*Suzanne Smith, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority*, asked about staff leads, scope development, and transit operation participants. Alix responded that Ann Flemer is the lead and she is working with staff to put together the advisory structure first, which will likely have a steering committee, policy group, a technical group, and a citizens advisory group, with the intent to have the scope of work completed by the end of January.

*Mona Babauta, City of Santa Rosa*, asked if the Commission or the Operations Committee approve the scope of work. Steve Heminger responded that this has not yet been determined.

*Dennis Fay, Alameda County Congestion Management Agency*, asked how this effort dovetails with the need to reduce GHG Emissions. Steve Heminger responded that the requirements of SB 375 are one element that started the ball rolling for this project.

*Paul Maxwell, Contra Costa Transportation Authority*, commented that coming up with a scope of work, for a three year study that is acceptable to all participants is very important,

## **The Bay Area Partnership Board**

Record of Meeting: December 1, 2009

Page 3

but agreeing by January seems unlikely if the intent is to get input from the stakeholders. Steve Heminger responded that the objective is not to come up with a scope of work that is acceptable to everyone, rather to challenge a lot of accepted thinking on the subject.

### **7. Joint Policy Committee (JPC) Policies for the Bay Area's Implementation of SB 375**

Doug Kimsey, MTC, gave an overview of SB 375 and the policies adopted by the Joint Policy Committee (JPC) for implementing SB 375 in the Bay Area which included three main work elements (foundation, construction, and integration) occurring over the next three years leading to the adoption of the next RTP in Spring of 2013.

*Rick Ramacier, Central Contra Costa Transit Authority*, asked if the implementation level measure of unit for SB375 will likely be the MPO, to which Mr. Kimsey responded yes. Mr. Ramacier also asked if a small city within an MPO region is not in compliance but the rest of the region is, would the whole region be considered within compliance, to which Mr. Kimsey responded yes.

*Suzanne Smith, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority*, asked if consideration was being made to sub-allocate targets related to GHG Emissions, to which Mr. Heminger responded no.

*Dianne Steinhauer, Transportation Authority of Marin*, commented that it will be difficult to include a huge amount of housing in an alternative scenario in a county like Marin but the plan is to convert more trips out of single occupancy vehicles to carpools and school programs.

### **8. Public Comment / Other**

There were no public comments.

### **9. Adjourn/Next Meeting**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:18 p.m. The next meeting date, time and location will be determined at a later date.