

1. Call to Order and Introductions

2. Minutes of December – Approved

Minutes of December 5, 2005 – Approved. Jim Gleich mentioned that the wording in Item 5, Lifeline Program, in the October minutes is unclear and clarified that lifeline program funds could be used for existing service.

3. Federal Transit Administration Funding – Follow-up

Kate Miller (MTC) distributed a revised version of this item at the meeting. She reported that at the last Partnership Board meeting in October the Partnership agreed to a funding distribution for FTA funds that included a set-aside for California Air Resources Board (CARB) and security project costs.

Since the last meeting CARB modified the diesel fleet rule allowing bus operators to procure buses between 2007 and 2009 with a retrofit of either an older vehicle or service vehicle in the region with a NOX reducing device. Based on the change, staff included costs associated with procuring NOx devices, as necessary. Samtrans also submitted a request for a fleet replacement project, but agreed to defer the bus replacement until the next programming cycle.

The security funding was distributed based on the Department of Homeland Security's eligibility requirements as well as regional discussion on the highest priority needs for Bay Area operators.

Rick Ramacier of County Connection asked that there be consideration of broadening the eligibility definition for security needs if future FTA funds are directed to this project category.

Ian McAvoy of Caltrain/Samtrans voiced concern that the surplus funds were the result of buses not being replaced in a timely manner. Kate responded that there were several factors contributing to the surplus including recent decreases in service levels as well as the annual cap on larger projects per the FTA programming policy. Ian also noted that the CARB requirements could produce a large spike in the program when buses begin to be replaced again. Kate agreed that the region needed to improve the transit capital inventory to assess how these future needs will impact the program.

There was a suggestion that the region seek federal earmarks to cover the costs associated with security and CARB to reduce the burden on FTA formula funds.

Dorothy Dugger (BART) clarified that the funding need identified by MTC is not the total security need of each transit agency, but rather is the need that is eligible for this specific DHS funding source.

The item was unanimously adopted.

4. Environmental Justice Principles –

Frank Galow, the Minority Citizens Advisory Committee Chair summarized the four Environmental Principles provided as an informational item and comments were welcomed.

Frank introduced another MCAC member, Jerry Rico from Napa. Jerry explained that the Committee participated in the inequity analysis for the Transportation 2030 Plan and during that process looked at the quantitative and qualitative measures that were done, made suggestions, and saw improvement over the process. He stated that their purpose in bringing the environmental justice principles forward to the Partnership is to have a full understanding and appreciation of some of the problems that may exist and to improve the evaluation and collection of the data. He understands that there is still work after the principles are implemented, but believes this is an appropriate starting point.

Therese McMillan further provided background on the principles. They were developed in order to establish and respond to what the Committee believed were gaps in how environmental justice had been addressed in the last RTP. MTC is required to do an environmental social justice analysis – the equity analysis for RTP. There is some substantial work in terms of implementation of the principles. Any long-range plan has a large amount of assumptions financial and otherwise that are going to be evaluated and addressed. The principles are a framework against which planning or funding proposals could be considered and evaluated.

There was significant discussion about the principles among the Partnership members. Many members were concerned about word choice in various principles, and how these words may imply that there is a problem prematurely with regional transportation investment decisions. Various suggestions were offered to modify the language. Some members thought that making suggested phrasing changes was counterproductive. Other members felt that more context/background was necessary for the Commission to be able to better appreciate the principles and their purpose. There was also a lengthy discussion about how the principles would be implemented and the potential consequences with respect to MTC's funding decisions. In this regard, members mentioned that there are many considerations that the Commission must consider such as safety and congestion relief.

In general, the members supported the hard work of the MCAC and the core of the principles.

Jose Luis Moscovich (SFCTA) stated that the Partnership should advise the commission about context and a roadmap for implementing them. Jose Luis made a motion that the Partnership prepare a unified set of comments, which was seconded.

Celia Kupersmith (GGBHTD) prepared a motion that read "The Partnership strongly supports the work of MCAC and supports the four proposed principles as important components within the Commission's complex investment decision-making processes which must balance multiple important facts when making planning and programming decisions. The Partnership looks forward to actively participating in the process of operationalizing these principles."

A consensus was reached and the motion was passed with one abstention.

5. Regional Rail Plan: Public Workshop Comments

Doug Kimsey presented comments from the Regional Rail Plan Public Workshops. The study focuses on a 30-year timeframe and contains two elements: 1) regional rail strategies; and 2) how to integrate regional rails strategies with high-speed rail. The study will look at four modes of rail. California High Speed Rail is a partner with MTC on the project and is embarking on an EIR/EIS to evaluate High Speed Rail alignments from the Central Valley into the Bay Area. By law the plan is supposed to evaluate a number of ways to improve operations and expand capacity and coordinate land use with propose investments. MTC is to adopt this plan and the adoption date is set for July 1, 2007. RM2 specifies that the study oversight will be provided by a steering committee. The day-to-day management is being shared by four agencies: 1) MTC; 2) California High Speed Rail; 3) Caltrain; and 4) BART. MTC Resolution 3434 will be baseline transit system for the study as well as alignments and projects identified from outside of the region. The plan is developed in three phases: outreach, alternatives analysis, and plan development, and is currently in Phase One, outreach.

6. Other Business

Mike Scanlon mentioned that at the next Partnership Board meeting a new Chair and Vice Chair would be elected.