



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

**PLANNING COMMITTEE
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 14, 2007
MINUTES**

Bill Dodd, Chair
Napa County and Cities

Scott Haggerty, Vice Chair
Alameda County

Tom Ammiano
City and County of San Francisco

Tom Azumbrado
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

Tom Bates
Cities of Alameda County

Bob Blanchard
Sonoma County and Cities

Dean J. Chu
Cities of Santa Clara County

Dave Cortese
Association of Bay Area Governments

Dorene M. Giacopini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover
Contra Costa County

Anne W. Halsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sue Lempert
Cities of San Mateo County

Jon Rubin
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Bijan Sartipi
State Business, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

Adrienne J. Tissier
San Mateo County

Amy Worth
Cities of Contra Costa County

Ken Yeager
Santa Clara County

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Ann Flemer
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director,
Bay Area Toll Authority

Therese W. McMillan
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

ATTENDANCE

Commissioner Spering called the Planning Committee meeting to order at 9:31 a.m. Other members in attendance were Commissioners Azumbrado, Chu, Giacopini, Haggerty, Halsted, Lempert, Rubin, Yeager, and Bates.

MINUTES

The minutes of July 13, 2007 were approved unanimously.

**REGIONAL RAIL PLAN: a) Adoption of Regional Rail Plan, MTC
Resolution 3826; b) High-Speed Rail Alignment Options**

Item 3a): Ms. Ashley Nguyen introduced Mr. Brent Ogden, who works for DMJM Harris and served as the Regional Rail Plan's project manager. Mr. Ogden presented a powerpoint presentation on the Regional Rail Plan.

Ms. Ashley Nguyen highlighted a few key points. She noted that MTC Resolution 3434 is the Commission's Regional Transit Expansion Policy, and it represents MTC's investment commitments over the next 25 years. The Regional Rail Plan goes beyond that by identifying improvements and expansions for the Year 2050.

Ms. Nguyen stated that the Regional Rail Plan has been reviewed by MTC's Rail partners, various congestion management agencies, the private railroads and numerous stakeholders. In addition to the Regional Rail Steering Committee meetings that were held, there have been nine Regional Rail workshops during the month of August to solicit additional public comments on the Draft Plan. In general, many of the partner agencies and stakeholders have expressed overall support for the Plan.

She also noted that the Commission is not required to choose a particular high-speed rail alignment in adopting this Regional Rail Plan; therefore, Ms. Nguyen recommended that the Commission take a separate action on the high-speed rail issue as part of agenda item 2b.

Lastly, she commented on governance, and noted that the General Managers and Board members that staff met with agreed that the status quo is not acceptable. In the near-term, staff agreed that there are several regional activities that are underway that can be formalized by designating one or more entities to undertake each of them. In the long-term, staff recognized that new funding would need to be in place in order to expand regional rail services and within there is an opportunity to consolidate activities under a federation approach.

Ms. Nguyen recommended the Committee approve and refer MTC Resolution 3826, which adopts the Regional Rail Plan, to the Commission for final action.

Commissioner Lempert commented on governance and the issue of advocating for separate passenger and freight. She noted that this is something that staff should not wait for, pending any change in governance. It should be made a high-priority issue to be pursued immediately.

Commissioner Chu stated that he was surprised to see that in the 50-year visioning there was not a rail consideration between Walnut Creek and the Dublin area. Mr. Ogden stated that there were two alternatives tested. In view of the prohibitive high cost of this alternative, it appeared that an express bus solution in the I-680 that could make some of the connections to some of the more suburban land uses was more feasible.

Commissioner Haggerty requested that the Regional Rail Plan simply state a BART to Livermore extension, but not specify a location. Steve Heminger noted that there are a few places in the study that talks about “location to be determined”, so at the discretion of the Committee, it would be an appropriate amendment to make.

Commissioner Worth commented on the potential impacts of increasing freight and passenger rail traffic to Contra Costa County, and asked staff if they addressed the community impacts on expanding the system? She also asked if express bus is one of the areas staff is looking at as a way of expanding or linking into the rail network? Mr. Ogden stated that they do show bus links in all of the locations where it looked like you needed to tie into the network. He also commented on the potential impacts to W. Contra Costa County.

Commissioner Bates asked how the lines were chosen. Mr. Ogden stated that they were chosen through a process of looking at the existing transportation corridors, consulting with the rail operators and various stakeholders, and through visioning workshops with the public. Mr. Ogden noted that the modeling effort helped to estimate the ridership potential in various corridors. Commissioner Bates also asked why isn't all new rail infrastructure constructed in a way to provide for future upgrading to high-speed rail? Mr. Ogden stated that electrification where feasible; the intent was to make improvements that are high-speed rail ready, such as the case of the Caltrain electrification in the Peninsula. Commissioner Bates suggested staff to maximize the opportunity.

Commissioner Spring called for public comment:

- Mayor Mark Green, Union City, advocated Regional Measure 2 dollars being allocated for the Dumbarton Rail project. He also expressed his support for right-of-way acquisitions, especially from Fremont to Oakland. He also suggested more prioritization to the communities that are actually doing something about transit-oriented development. In conclusion, he noted that having high-speed rail coming through the Altamont Pass makes the most sense.
- Mr. Howard Goode, Caltrain, stated that the recommendations are consistent with what has been going on as part of Caltrain on the peninsula. He also commented on railroad negotiations, and endorsed the recommendation that is in the plan. He also recommended

that some portion of the remaining funds for the project be used to get the ball rolling on right-of-way negotiations with the railroad.

- Mr. David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF, does not support the plan, and stated that the worst projects rise to the top and consume the most money. He urged the committee to ask the legislature for more time and money to complete the plan.
- Mr. Michael Cunningham, Bay Area Council, expressed his interest in planning for and investing in the infrastructure and organizational needs for the mega-region, which this study represents an important first step in that direction. He encouraged the committee to move towards a strong federation model that can plan towards a transition of perhaps 8-10 years towards an authority that will have the ability to fund, develop, implement, and operate this system over the next 50 years.
- Mr. David Kutrosky, staff for the Capital Corridor Joint Powers Authority, stated that this plan aligns with the vision plan that the Capital Corridor adopted in April 2005. He noted that the Capital Corridor supports, in concept, two high-speed rail alignments coming into and out of the Bay Area, which will maximize the revenue yield for the High-Speed Rail Authority as well as meeting all of the interregional travel demands.
- Ms. Marianne Payne, planning manager with BART, expressed her support for the plan, and looks forward to continuing to work with the Project Management Team and other agencies to see the vision evolve into an implementation plan.
- Ms. Margaret Okuzumi, Bay Rail Alliance, stated that this process has been poorly managed, and the consultants did not complete the modeling that was to be part of the study. She also noted that there has not been adequate time for the public to review this report. She requested the committee ask the legislature for more money and time to do it right.
- Mr. Gerald Cauthen stated that the plan needs to be extended for a couple of months so that all the questions can be answered. He also stated that leveraging statewide funds with local investments would apply better to the Altamont.
- Mr. Andy Katz, Sierra Club, stated that this is not a plan but a first step in a study. The alternatives analysis is not transparent, the modeling is incomplete, you can't see stations or choices, and the public process was lacking.
- Mr. Gregg Baxter, staff with the Altamont Commuter Express, noted that ACE was involved in the planning process and ACE agreed with the principles and concept that are contained in the plan and supports its adoption.
- Mr. Steve Lowe, W. Oakland Commerce Assoc., stated that they would like to be viewed as more of a stakeholder in the discussion of how the high-speed rail and the regional rail plan is going to impact W. Oakland.
- Mr. Jim Bigelow, Redwood City/San Mateo County Chamber, stated that the Regional Rail Plan is a concept plan – it merely opens the discussion for more detail to work on aspects of the plan, and that the Commission should move it along.

Commissioner Spring noted that he would like to see stronger land use language in the plan, and more emphasis placed on preserving rights-of-way in general plans.

Commissioner Lempert moved staff's recommendation with these amendments (1) identify a BART to Livermore extension but not specify specific locations; (2) add stronger language about preserving right-of-way in general plans, and (3) move forward immediately with the governance

strategies, particularly with regards to designating an entity to negotiate rail rights-of-way on behalf of all regional entities, and allocate remaining RM-2 study funds to support this effort. Commissioner Yeager seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Item 3b): Mr. Doug Kimsey reported on the High-Speed Rail Alignment, and recommended the committee take the following two steps: 1) review and consider the high-speed rail evaluation information provided in the Regional Rail Plan, but defer taking action on the HSR concept and proposed alignment options until the October 12th committee meeting, which will allow additional public discussion and additional comparative analysis; and, 2) authorize the Executive Director to send a letter to the California High-Speed Rail Authority requesting that it extend the comment period for the Bay Area to Central Valley HSR DEIR/DEIS by 30 days, changing the close of comment date to October 28, 2007.

Commissioner Haggerty commented on the alignments and stated that he would like to see high-speed rail cross over to Highway 5, maybe even staying up to Highway 99, and then come over the Altamont and terminate at Greenville – in the meantime, bring BART to Greenville. Mr. Steve Heminger stated that it is clear that the Pacheco Pass is to deliver high-speed statewide service, but it is less clear exactly how to make good on the notion to have some high-speed, regionally based service in the Altamont. He suggested the Commission consider seeking additional bond funds dedicated specifically to that purpose in the Altamont Corridor.

Commissioner Spring called for public comment. Mayor Mark Green, Union City, suggested the committee members look at the High Speed Rail Authority's Draft Environmental document, which includes costs, environmental damage, and ridership times to Sacramento. Mr. Steve Lowe agreed with Commissioner Haggerty's Altamont comment. Mr. Gerald Cauthen commented on costs, and noted that there is a gap in funding that has not been discussed. Ms. Margaret Okuzumi expressed her support on staff's recommendation to extend the comment period, but also noted that the lack of modeling transparency and how the alignments were narrowed down is very troubling.

Mr. Steve Heminger asked the committee to authorize staff to send a letter to the California High-Speed Rail Authority asking them for a 30-day delay in the high-speed rail environmental process. Commissioner Spring requested that high-speed rail materials be sent to the Planning Committee for review well in advance of the next meeting. Commissioner Lempert moved approval, Commissioner Chu seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

TRANSPORTATION 2035 SCENARIO PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT: Performance Targets/Sensitivity Analysis

Ms. Lisa Klein recommended modifications to the performance targets for Environmental and Equity. The recommended Environmental target would replace the previously approved target for particulate matter emissions (10 percent reduction compared to today) with the following targets: 1) reduce emissions of finer particulate matter (PM2.5) by 10 percent under today's levels by year 2035, and 2) reduce emissions of coarser particulate matter (PM10) by 45 percent under today's levels by year 2035. The recommended Equity target is to decrease by 10 percent (from today) the share of household income consumed by housing and transportation costs for low-income households.

Commissioner Sperring asked what happens if we don't hit these targets. Mr. Heminger stated that staff is trying to see how close we can get, and if proposals don't reach them, with a combination of infrastructure as well as pricing and land use changes, then the commission needs to make a decision on whether those targets are ones to continue to strive for, or whether staff gets rid of the targets all together. He noted that this is a learning process, and that targets are being adopted in Sacramento that are binding in nature.

Commissioner Azumbrado stated that he thinks targets on the amount of time someone has to spend on transportation and the availability of transportation would be better targets than percentage of income.

Commissioner Worth moved approval of the modifications to the targets, Commissioner Lempert seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS/PUBLIC COMMENT

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 11.39 a.m. The Committee's next meeting is scheduled for Friday, October 12, 2007 at 9:30 a.m. in the Lawrence D. Dahms Auditorium, Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland, CA.