

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes of December 8, 2006

3. RTP Approach and Timeline

Asley Nguyen, MTC, reported on the approach and schedule of the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The new approach to the 2009 RTP is to fully define the RTP vision before delving into the financial detail, and beginning to form transportation policies and crafting specific project and program investments. The vision is goals and policy oriented.

MTC plans to release a draft RTP for public review in October 2008 and the final RTP to MTC Commission for adoption in early 2009.

Larry Patterson, City of San Mateo, asked about the land use strategy and how the different categories may or may not be getting certain amounts of funding and when the funding amounts associated with different categories will be announced.

Ms. Nguyen stated that the approach is to first define the vision and then later discuss financing and policy considerations.

Bob McCleary, Contra Costa Transportation Authority, expressed concern about the RTP approach and believes that the focus should be on the existing system first.

Maria Lombardo, San Francisco Transportation Authority, agrees with Mr. McCleary that the focus should be on the existing system and stated that MTC should allow more time for the CMA process.

Carolyn Gonot, VTA, stated that she was concerned about potential performance based measures, because VTA still has to accommodate growth. Ms. Gonot is concerned that performance based objectives will be set that VTA will not be able to meet and suggests that MTC look at the objectives that deal with accommodating growth and not just reducing congestion levels.

Daryl Halls, Solano Transportation Authority, believes that it is important to have a vision but cautioned MTC to be careful about expectations.

Henry Gardner, ABAG, stated that having a vision is important and does not support financial discussions before creating a vision.

Mr. Patterson expressed concern about the region's vision changing significantly every four years.

Ms. Nguyen stated that the RTP approach's schedule will go to the Partnership Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) on April 16th and that PTAC will be the forum for all discussion on RTP. The RTP information will also be taken to the various MTC Advisory Committees as

well as the Planning committee and MTC Commission. MTC staff will bring the RTP goals and scenario approach back to the Partnership Board for review in June 2007.

Will Travis, Air District, stated that there is an intergovernmental panel on climate change and reports they are issuing an AB 32 implementation plan and that MTC should respond to the issue.

4. Proposition 1B Transportation Bond

Alix Bockelman, MTC, stated that MTC is currently working on the next major element of Proposition 1B, the transit element. A proposal was released on March 7th to MTC's Programming and Allocations Committee (PAC) and significant public and stakeholder comments were provided.

Anne Richman, MTC, provided an overview of MTC's staff proposal for Proposition 1B Regional Transit Funding. The overall policy framework for the proposal contains three components: Base Policy, Proposition 42, and Proposition 1B capital revenues. Over the next decade, there is roughly \$419 million beyond current commitments that is the subject of the transit proposal. The current schedule is to seek MTC Commission approval in May.

Michael Burns, VTA, asked about the \$24 million for the BART to Warm Springs Project, and how Proposition 1B money applies to the project. Steve Heminger, MTC, stated that the \$24 million was the region's investment in the separation agreement between BART and Samtrans on the SFO extension. The \$24 million would go into a fund at BART and be used to defray the costs of the SFO extension. The fund will generate interest until the \$145 million that is owed to Warm Springs is accrued.

Mr. Burns supports the proposal, provided that the Caltrain ROW condition is dropped.

Dennis Fay, ACCMA, asks MTC not to misrepresent funding to BART to Warm Springs. Mr. Fay also stated that the use of Lifeline funding should be flexible and all operators should receive ZEB funding.

Bob McCleary, CCTA, stated that the entire proposal should be distributed by population, which is a similar formula to other regions in the state. Mr. McCleary also stated that the Urban Core conditions are unfair and should be removed.

Rick Fernandez, AC Transit, supported the Lifeline funding level and encourages direct subvention to operators, and not through the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) and Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) process. Mr. Fernandez supports more operating dollars for flexibility.

Tom Margro, BART, stated that the proposal needs additional detail on the Lifeline process and that the Urban Core should focus on fully funded projects and not spreading the funds across under funded projects.

Daryl Halls, STA, stated that Lifeline is evolving and should continue through the CMAs and that the overall discussion and process for the Proposition 1B Transit funding should have begun earlier.

Jose Luis Moscovich, SFCTA, agreed that the Lifeline Program should continue through the CMAs. Mr. Moscovich disagreed with Mr. McCleary by stating that funds should not be distributed by population. Mr. Moscovich added that the overall process should include more time for debate.

Rick Ramacier, CCCTA, appreciated the \$10 million addition to the Small Operators/Northern Counties portion of the proposal. Mr. Ramacier stated that operators should be able to use bond funds to provide local match for federal funds. He also agreed that Lifeline funds should go through the CMAs but would like to have further information on the Lifeline program.

Barbara Duffy, LAVTA, stated that a small operator match should not be required and that some funds should be set aside to deal with RTP priorities.

Henry Gardner, ABAG, was supportive of the proposal and stated that \$347 million is not enough funding to address all needs. However, the Urban Core projects are important in order to handle the housing allotments for various cities.

Carolyn Gonot, VTA, asked what type of projects would be funded through the Lifeline beyond projects in the CBTP.

Nina Reynolds, WTA, wanted the proposal to include money for WTA. Ms Reynolds also stated that the Oakland and Alameda ferries should be eligible for the small operators category.

Charlie Anderson, WCCTA, stated that Lifeline would be difficult to deliver with capital funds; operating funds are needed as well.

5. Other

No comments.

6. Adjourn for Next Meeting