



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

AGENDA ITEM 2

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
Tel.: 510.464.7700
TTY/TDD: 510.464.7769
Fax: 510.464.7848
e-mail: info@mtc.ca.gov
Web site: www.mtc.ca.gov

MTC Advisory Council
May 9, 2007
Minutes

Margaret Okuzumi called the meeting to order at 12:33 p.m. In attendance were members Mary Buttarro, Herbert Crowle, Raphael Durr, Tian Feng, Richard Hedges (via phone), Andy Katz, Sherman Lewis, Asok Mukhopadhyay, Bryce Nesbitt, Bob Planthold, and Don Rothblatt. Commissioner Giacopini also attended.

Minutes

Due to a lack of quorum, the minutes were not approved. Mr. Sherman Lewis noted a correction to be made to the minutes regarding the Central Subway. Mr. Lewis stated that he thought the Central Subway was not a good idea, and that there are better alternatives than that.

Staff Report

Ms. Therese Knudsen reminded the committee that the Advisory Council terms are ending in June. She noted that staff will be working with Commissioners, who make the selections for the committees, on the final action to be taken in July for the new terms.

2009 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Ms. Ashley Nguyen briefly updated the committee on what an RTP is and the process that is taken to develop an RTP. She also summarized the draft goals for the 2009 RTP, which are: 1) safety and maintenance, 2) reliability, 3) access to mobility, 4) livable communities, 5) clean air, and 6) efficient freight. She noted that the safety goal that was adopted in the Transportation 2030 Plan will remain focused on traffic safety and maintenance, but staff will introduce a new goal that will deal with security and emergency response planning. Another goal under consideration is climate change. Ms. Nguyen requested the committee's feedback on the goals.

Ms. Lisa Klein described MTC's approach to defining the RTP vision, as well as the process for evaluating projects/programs proposed for the RTP vision through two separate processes - scenario performance assessment and project performance assessment.

Committee comments include:

- Security Goal – What's a regional plan going to do if a disaster strikes? Staff: There is a number of parties/agencies involved in emergency response, and each agency is responsible for developing their own emergency response plan. MTC serves as the regional emergency operations center and coordinates/communicates the transportation needs to the public via the media. MTC also communicates to the Governor's office about needs for emergency funding from the federal government.
- Safety Goal – would like to see personal safety incorporated into this goal.
- Climate Change Goal – make this goal action oriented by adding wording such as “prevent,” “stop,” “reduce emissions,” etc.
- Climate change goal is a good place to reference Smart Growth.
- The region should comply with AB32 – it should be referenced in the RTP
- Strengthen the section on global warming, the objective should be to reduce green house gases.

- Reliable commute – there is no reference to cost-effectiveness or the economics of transportation in any of the MTC goals.
- Regarding safety - development around transit stations is key – they cannot be deserted
- How are vehicle miles traveled measured? Staff: VMT is not measured, but modeled. Staff currently uses their travel demand model to see how the existing conditions are today.

Ms. Okuzumi called for public comment. Mr. David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF, commented on the RTP goals. TRANSDEF comments had to do with linking the goals to the vision. He suggested staff include in the Climate Change section a measure of total annual per capita VMT, as well as the green house gas output from the RTP modeling. In addition, he stated that the minimum requirements for Smart Growth should be a 10-minute walk to 15-minute service. He suggested two other performance measures be added - one to show the number of workers commuting into the region identified by mode, and one to show the percent of all land developed or re-developed since the base year divided into sub-types of agricultural wetlands and other. He also commented on the Security measure and the three targets. He stated that the measure in congestion is directly in conflict with greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets, and VMT reduction targets; therefore, TRANSDEF and TALC suggested having one scenario that is dedicated to reducing congestion, and another scenario that is dedicated to reducing VMT and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Additional committee comments include:

- What would the region look like, in terms of smart growth and transit investment, if they were to plan projects and grow in a way where greenhouse gases could be reduced by the AB32 goals?
- Consider pricing as a program.
- Consider bike/pedestrian projects.
- Need to use land use as a specific scenario.
- How do we compare to other region's RTPs, e.g. percent change in VMT?
- When do we report on measures of progress – we report when we begin a new RTP process
- Where is bicycling and walking under the performance-based targets? (this is included under outcome-based targets).

Draft Funding Proposal for Proposition 1B Regional Transit Funding

Ms. Anne Richman stated that the Draft Funding Proposal was taken to the Programming and Allocations Committee for their review and discussion. She briefly summarized the funding categories, which are: \$153m to Lifeline, \$169m to the Urban Core Transit Improvement, \$41m to small operators (flexible funding), \$35m for small operator capital programs, \$10m for zero emission bus, and \$11m reserve. The Programming and Allocations Committee decided on holding over any discussion of the VTA elements. She stated that Lynette Sweet, Chairwoman of the BART Board, was in attendance and stated that BART Board passed a motion to dedicate the portion of the bond funds that come directly to BART (\$250m) to system renovation projects. Ms. Sweet also stated that she was prepared to revisit that with her Board to provide \$20m each for eBART and Warm Springs out of their bond funds if MTC would consider matching it out of the MTC funds. The Programming and Allocations Committee made a motion for the Executive Director of MTC to work with BART to identify possibilities for the \$40m for these two projects. The committee also recommended that the Director look at the match requirement for the small operator capital funding.

Mr. James Corless also noted that MCAC passed a motion that recommended closing the Lifeline gaps, fix existing bus service, and fix existing rail service. He encouraged committee comments.

Committee comments include:

- Concern with Lifeline – money should not come out of Lifeline or the urban core.
- Where will the money come from? Does the BART request necessarily need to be met?
- What is BART not going to rehabilitate with this \$40 million and will they come back to MTC for this same amount at a later date?
- To give sufficient time for the Advisory committee's to respond, staff needs to go back and try to extend the date for the Commission to vote on this item.
- Explore other options to Warm Springs

Ms. Okuzumi called for public comment. Mr. Jerry Cauthen spoke on the Urban Core Transit Improvement section of the Prop. 1B allocation, and noted that at least the first two of those are not adequate Smart Growth projects to qualify under the guidelines MTC has developed. He also commented on the Central Subway system and the alternatives available to Chinatown and the larger area of San Francisco.

In closing, the committee recommended that a letter from the Advisory Council Chairperson be prepared to address their comments and concerns to the full Commission on the proposed \$40m MTC match with BART. Ms. Okuzumi stated that she will prepare the letter.

Other Business/Public Comment

There was no other business. The next meeting of the Advisory Council is scheduled for June 13, 2007. The meeting was adjourned at 2:23 p.m.

J:\COMMITTEE\Advisory\2007\05-07\minutes.doc