

Record of Meeting
Partnership Board: August 1, 2005

1. Call to Order
2. Minutes of February 16, 2004 – Approved
3. Board Administration: Alix Bockelman provided a brief overview on the revision to the Bay Area Partnership Resolution item. A motion was opened to add the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) and the City of Benicia to the Partnership Board membership list. Daryl Halls of Solano Transportation Authority (STA) requested that the membership of the City of Benicia be tabled, until there is further discussion within Solano County. The motion to accept TJPA as a Partnership Board member and to table the City of Benicia's request was approved.

Paul Maxwell of Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) welcomed Maria Ayerdi (SFCTA, TJPA) to the Partnership Board and asked if she could provide the membership with a report TJPA's projects to get a better understanding of their agency and the project's process.

Maria Ayerdi happily agreed to provide the membership with more information on TJPA.

4. FTA Surplus Funds

Alix Bockelman provided background and a brief overview of the FTA Surplus Funds. She mentioned that the transit general managers met in July, and in regards to the FTA Surplus Funds, they recommended a hybrid of several of the options:

1. Increase Caltrain Caps from \$7.5 million to \$13 million, which is consistent with what BART and Muni receive per project category;
2. Direct 20% of the remaining surplus funds to address future capital needs; and
3. Distribute the remaining 80% by the incentive formula (half based on ridership and half based on the FTA revenue factors).

In addition, Ms. Bockelman stated MTC is recommending that \$1 million be set aside for enhancing the capital inventory in the Bay Area region. MTC staff would work with the transit operators to determine the best way to approach developing a better asset inventory.

She concluded by noting two additional issues that have recently emerged that could effect final decisions regarding distribution and use of these surplus funds.

1. The California Air Resource Board (CARB) transit fleet rule. CARB released a notice for a public hearing to discuss several options with respect to the urban fleet transit rule, one of which would require a statewide transition to alternative fuel buses; and
2. The issue of transit security.

Steve Heminger said that he had met with Jack Broadbent (Air District), Mark DeSaulnier (CARB/MTC), and Cindy Tuck (CARB) in which they discussed the three options being forwarded by CARB staff.

1. Stay the course with the current diesel bus rule (there will be no diesel buses that meet the emissions requirement to buy for the next couple of years);
2. Harmonize California and federal standards for that period of time, which could be viewed as weakening the California rule; or
3. Eliminate the diesel path all together.

Mary King (AC Transit) told the group that APTA is opposed to using federal formula funds for security. She reiterated her support for the hybrid recommendation from the General Managers, as a fair and comprehensive proposal.

Dennis Fay (ACCMA) stated that his preference is that the money be spent on Score 16 projects. If an operator does not have a Score 16 project, the money should be reserved for when they will have a Score 16 project.

Rick Ramacier (CCCTA) noted the Partnership Board should be careful in how to approach the CARB issue. While there may be surplus funds, compressed natural gas is not an affordable option for the region in the long-term and is inconsistent with the planned shift to zero emission vehicles. In regards to the issue of security, Mr. Ramacier agrees with Ms. King that he is not ready to support FTA Formula funds for security purposes when it is a national issue.

Leslie Rogers (FTA) noted that current FTA requirements state that each operator must spend at least 1% of the formula funds for security funds.

There was a desire by several Board members to better understand the financial ramifications of the CARB decision on the region.

Following the discussion, Tom Margro (BART) made a motion to go forward with the consensus as it is stated in the packet and was seconded by Mary King. There was a discussion about whether members felt comfortable enough to vote, given the two new issues that had emerged.

Dennis Fay made a substitute motion. The substitute motion was the general managers' proposal with the caveat that the transit operators must spend the flexible funds on Score 16 needs during the STIP period in order to receive any STIP funds for rehabilitation. An operator that does not have score 16 could bank the funds or otherwise reserve the capacity using a swap arrangement with MTC.

The original motion and substitute motion were not approved. Because the vote was close, MTC staff was asked to resubmit the item at the next Partnership Board meeting, and that the meeting take as soon as practical.

5. Local Streets and Roads Recommendation

Revision to Metropolitan Transportation System

Larry Patterson (City of San Mateo) provided a brief background and summary on the funding included for local streets and roads in Transportation 2030 and the use of the

Metropolitan Transportation System in identifying high priority road rehabilitation needs. He said that after much discussion and an evaluation of various alternatives, the Local Streets and Roads Subcommittee recommend using the Federal Functional Classification System (FFCS) to identify regional rehabilitation needs, based on several advantages: 1) the Federal Functional Classification System provides a coherent set of roads based on the definitions and designation of arterials and collectors; and 2) has a very well-defined process for including future roads as part of the network. The subcommittee, therefore, asked the board to consider the Federal Functional Classification System as the MTS system.

Dennis Fay suggested that the motion should have an amendment to clearly state that the FFCS is only to be used for establishing eligibility and needs, and that the long-range plan is still the appropriate place for establishing the funding cut-off for regional investments. The amended motion was made and approved.

Streets and Roads Allocation Formula

The second part of item five, the Streets and Roads Allocation formula was unanimously approved.

6. Third Cycle STP/CMAQ Funding Policy Discussion

Alix Bockelman provided a brief overview of the Third Cycle STP/CMAQ Funding Policy. In general, the framework is to honor the commitment established in the Second Cycle for the Third Cycle, with some minor adjustments in the areas of the Clean Air Program, the TLC/HIP Program, and the Lifeline Program.

Paul Maxwell voiced several concerns and comments:

1. That if there will be a windfall that the emphasis of the funding should be in meeting the local streets and roads and the transit shortfalls;
2. In regards to the Clean Air funding category, he would like to see the numbers of how effective the Free Transit program is before extending the program;
3. If the TLC/HIP program is to do station area planning studies CCTA feels that it should be the responsibility of the project sponsor; and
4. The planning program is a good opportunity to increase the planning funds because the requirements for CMA's are increasing and the planning funds have not increased.

Mary King commented that AC Transit needs an additional \$29 million - with \$9 million necessary for the repowering of 200 buses over the next couple of years and the rehabilitation of roughly \$20 million for two rapid bus corridors.

The item will be put on the agenda for the next Partnership Board meeting for further discussion.

7. Transportation 2030 Plan: "Calls to Action: Status Report" – the item was postponed.
8. Reauthorization Update

A list was distributed regarding the reauthorization Bill. Steve Heminger provided a brief overview.

9. ITS World Congress Preview

Neil Schuster from ITS America provided a brief presentation on the ITS World Congress and urged participation at the November 6-10th conference.

10. Next Meeting: The next meeting will be set at a later date. The group supported meeting within the next month or two to resolve issues that are carried over from this agenda.

J:\COMMITTEE\Partnership\BOARD\2005\Oct 3 2005\2_Aug05_minutes.doc