



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

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
July 11, 2007
Minutes

Margaret Okuzumi called the meeting to order at 12:40 p.m. In attendance were members Michael Amman, Steve Belkin, Mary Buttarro, Raphael Durr, Tian Feng, Richard Hedges, Sherman Lewis, Asok Mukhopadhyay, Bryce Nesbitt, Bob Planthold, Peter Oswald, and Don Rothblatt.

Minutes

Mr. Lewis stated that the June 13th minutes did not adequately address his concerns with the central subway. He expressed that the central subway could be greatly improved by considering a higher level of crossing that would not adversely affect bus service the way the current proposal does. Mr. Bob Planthold moved approval of the minutes with the noted changes. Mr. Rich Hedges seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Staff Report

Ms. Therese Knudsen stated that this is the last meeting for everyone who is completing their 2-year term, and thanked them for their service.

She commented on Proposition 1B, and stated that in May the Commission deferred to their June meeting to make a decision on the priorities outlined in the Transit Proposal. She noted that the Commission accepted BART's match offer at a proportionally reduced amount of \$34 million - \$6 million less than the request. To make room for the additional \$34 million, funding for the Program Reserve and the Zero Emission Bus program was eliminated. The remaining \$13 million was deducted proportionally from the Lifeline program and the Small Operator Capital program.

Ms. Knudsen also reported that the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Highway Administration is doing their triennial review of MTC's planning process. She noted that this is an opportunity for the committee to present their comments on July 24th from 5-8pm at MTC.

Regional Rail Study

Ms. Ashley Nguyen stated that the study team has worked diligently over the past 24 months to develop the Regional Rail Plan with several overarching goals in mind: 1) develop the BART system as the core metro transit system; 2) develop the regional rail system as the long-distance commute/intercity system; 3) develop a new governance structure for the regional rail system to support operational issues and right-of-way acquisitions; 4) provide interconnectivity with each of the rail systems at major transfer points; 5) grade separate the rail and highway system along major

corridors; and 6) phase, or sequence, the construction of the rail corridors to proceed from shared to separate freight and passenger rail.

She summarized a number of planning activities that have occurred during the study effort, including: 1) the study partners hosted a series of regional workshops to solicit early input; 2) the steering committee met four times to discuss the study process; 3) two workshops with General Managers and Board members from ACE, Caltrain, BART, Capital Corridor, and SMART were held; 4) the Planning Committee reviewed the public outreach summary and received a presentation of the twelve study alternatives; and 5) the study partners held various stakeholder meetings with passenger and freight rail operators.

In closing, Ms. Nguyen stated that the Regional Rail Plan will have three distinct components for the Commission to take action on: 1) regional rail phasing strategy, 2) rail governance structure, and 3) high-speed rail Bay Area alignment/phasing strategy. The study team plans to release a draft summary in late July. A Steering Committee meeting will be held in late July to discuss the draft summary, and three regional workshops will be held in mid-August. Staff will return to the Planning Committee in September to review and refer the Regional Rail Plan to the Commission for adoption.

Committee comments include:

- How can you distinguish between Caltrain and BART as being metro transit systems? Response: BART has a much larger geographic coverage than Caltrain. The metro systems are essentially meant to increase BART's core capacity.
- Look at interconnectivity with BART, Caltrain
- Dumbarton Rail Project – the switch investments on the east side are relatively affordable and could easily separate passenger and freight transit at a low cost.
- How will this document turn into right-of-way preservation? Response: The first objective was to identify key corridors that will preserve the right-of-way and not be converted for other uses. The second objective was to identify governance structure that could potentially serve as the entity that would be negotiating with the private railroads to acquire the promising rail right-of-ways.
- How does it look for BART being a potential feeder to high-speed rail? Response: Staff is looking at the possibility of a BART extension to Livermore meeting up with high-speed rail or the ACE train.
- How are the outcomes of this study going to be funded? Response: It is currently a vision document that is unconstrained.
- Recommend a carbon tax on all jet fuel use in California to pay for high-speed rail – the funds from a carbon tax can go into a high-speed rail investment fund.

Transportation 2035: a) Draft Three E Principles & Goals; b) Scenario Performance Assessment

Mr. Raymond Kan stated that one thing that is different with this Plan is that staff is identifying the vision first then developing the financially constrained element. Staff is essentially developing three vision scenarios. The first scenario is comprised of freeway performance improvements, the second scenario is comprised of a completed HOV system which will be priced and complimented by express buses as well as local bus services. The third scenario is comprised of outcomes from the Regional Rail Plan and the Water Transit Authority's Ferry Plan.

He highlighted the proposed measures: 1) Congestion, 2) Vehicle Miles Traveled, 3) Emissions, and 4) Equity, which he requested feedback from the committee on what they think staff should use to measure equity.

He also stated that discussions were held with members of all three MTC advisory committees on June 25th and with members of the public and stakeholders at a forum on June 28th

Mr. Kan addressed the broader set of measures and performance targets for the upcoming visioning phase of the Plan. Additional proposals for measuring equity across different scenarios have been proposed. These measures include: 1) Proximity and Access, which reduces travel time and improves walking distance to transit; 2) Public Health, which reduces health risk exposure to particulate matter emissions, and 3) Affordability and Cost, which reduces consumer out-of-pocket costs, increases user benefits, and reduces total public and private costs.

In closing he stated that during July staff will consult with MTC Advisors about equity targets, host small work group sessions to further define equity targets, and then set the equity target. During the month of August staff will define scenario network definitions, and conduct a Scenario Performance Assessment. Throughout September staff will review the preliminary outcomes with stakeholders and Commission, and in October staff will present the outcomes at the joint MTC/ABAG Fall Forum.

He requested feedback from the committee on the overall performance measures in general and any priorities they might recommend for the equity measures.

Committee comments include:

- Will the Parking Study be complete in time to have input into this in terms of how better parking strategies can affect cost of land, movement of transit, cost of construction? Response: Staff will be including parking pricing and other pricing mechanisms as part of the scenario performance assessment.
- Would like to see a scenario matrix that could be presented graphically.
- Object to the goal of reducing commute time – you give the people a chance to get to work faster and they move further away in order to get better housing.
- Look at bus speeds as a measure of equity
- Access - important to have a statement about making sure there is adequate access in both the public and private domain.
- Map services versus population
- If you achieve equity will areas continue to be affordable?
- Would like to see a scenario dedicated to land use
- With pricing – need a qualitative perspective – e.g. benefits of HOT lanes – surveys have shown in San Diego that low-income residents will pay to drive in the HOT lane rather than being late for work or picking up children from childcare.
- The MTC model is not going to work for equity purposes because it was not designed with that in mind
- A working group on pricing was suggested by the Chair. Volunteers include Bob Planthold, Rich Hedges and Sherman Lewis.

Focusing Our Vision Update

Mr. Ken Kirkey presented an update on FOCUS. He commented on the Priority Development Areas (PDAs), and noted that in terms of the PDA process, they had a series of county level meetings in each of the nine counties, which were very well attended by local elected officials and senior staff from cities/counties across the region. He commented that applications were made available for entry-level designation for PDAs on April 29, 2007, with a deadline of June 29, 2007. He noted that the criterion for designation is that an area must be within an existing community, needs to be near existing or planned fixed transit, and an area must have either a plan in place with a significant housing component or there must be an initiative or a vision in a given community to create such a plan. Over fifty jurisdictions submitted applications for PDAs.

He stated that over the next several weeks, staff - with the assistance of a focus working group - will be reviewing the applications, grouping them into potential vs. planned PDAs, and work with staff to get a better understanding of what the jurisdictions are trying to accomplish in the areas.

Mr. Kirkey also stated that it is likely the Transportation for Livable Communities and the Housing Incentive Programs will be looked at in terms of how they can be applied to PDAs in the future. By linking land use and transportation through the RTP process, there might be a way to support PDAs in a meaningful way that can make a difference for the areas.

He commented on funding, and noted that there are some existing programs in some of the counties and subregions - there is some interest on the part of some of the CMAs of aligning those programs with regional agency programs with the FOCUS effort. He noted that Prop. 1C, \$850m that was designated for infill housing, will be spread widely and will not be linked closely to regional planning efforts.

In closing, he mentioned that staff will be convening some meetings for stakeholders related to the Economy, Environment, and Equity. These meetings are intended to lay out this program to the stakeholder groups in the region and get feedback in terms of how to make this successful, particularly in terms of incentives. The PDA designations will be reviewed by the JPC at their September meeting, presented at the ABAG/MTC Fall Forum on October 26, 2007, and then go before the ABAG Executive Board for formal adoption in November.

Committee comments include:

- What is the definition of housing plan? Response: It is defined broadly, in formally adopted jurisdictional plans.
- What is the relationship between PDAs and open space? Response: Limiting sprawl and taking the pressure off of developing open spaces
- What is being done to ensure that low-income people in the infill housing areas have an opportunity to stay after completion? Response: Where the regional agencies hope to make a difference is by adding incentives to funding opportunities - if a jurisdiction is applying for capital infrastructure monies, there would be an equity criterion that would have to be met, which may include an affordable housing set-aside or inclusionary housing guidelines.
- Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) - what is there to induce a town or county to seek to have some area conserved/preserved for open space? Will PCA's be more widely dispersed and more accessible? Response: PCAs are much better placed given the state

funding. The Coastal Conservancy concurrence with this process is significant. They have a considerable amount of money to spend in the region, and FOCUS PCAs will be one of the identifiers that they will use in the upcoming funding cycle in terms of identifying conservation priorities.

- Is there a process to nominate cities for PDAs/PCAs that did not nominate themselves?
Response: Not at this point. The local jurisdictions have to be on board – they have the local land use authority.
- Parking should be addressed in development - as more TOD-style developments are created, more gated parking garages are built, allowing people to drive straight into their garage, which doesn't enliven the area.
- VTA has developed a set of community design guidelines, which ABAG should consider adopting as a resource.

Other Business/Public Comment

There was no other business. The next meeting of the Advisory Council is scheduled for September 12, 2007. The meeting was adjourned at 2:28 p.m.