

*Meeting:*  
DRC Citizens Advisory Panel

*Date:*  
October 16, 2013

*Location:*  
San Mateo County Transit District  
1250 San Carlos Avenue  
San Carlos, CA

*Time:*  
Meeting Start: 7:05 P.M.  
Meeting Adjourn: 9:08 P.M.

*Minutes Prepared By:*  
Paula Hirsch

*Issue Date:*  
December 17, 2013

<b>Attendees (sign-in sheet attached)</b>	
<p><b><u>CAP Members</u></b>            Tim Pitsker, Fremont            Mike Dubinsky, Fremont            Thaddeus Norman, Menlo Park            Mark Gonzales, Newark            Eric Hentschke, Newark            Jim Bigelow, Redwood City            Nancy Radcliffe, Redwood City            Barry Ferrier, Union City            Raymond Gonzales, Union City</p>	<p><b><u>Project Staff</u></b>            Bill Hurrell, CDM Smith            Paula Hirsch, CDM Smith            Robert Del Rosario, AC Transit            Howard Der, AC Transit            Raj Murthy, ACTC            April Chan, PCJPB  <b><u>Members of the Public</u></b></p>

**Meeting Purpose: Review the information to be provided to the PAC on October 25, 2013.**

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Minutes from October 10, 2012**

Minutes were approved.

**4. Public Comments**

B. Ferrier requested that Ray Gonzalez be officially added as the Union City representative, noting that letters have been sent twice to SamTrans over the last 5-6 months.

**5. Informational Items:**

**A. Administrative Draft EIS/EIR**

A. Chan provided an update on the status of the DRC project. Since the CAP last met on October, 10<sup>th</sup> 2012, staff has completed the Administrative Draft EIS/EIR. While all elements of the environmental document are complete, the funding plan for the project is deficient. The cost of the various rail alternatives included in the Administrative Draft EIS/EIR range from \$700 million to \$800 million. The funding sources available to fund these various rail alternatives are less than \$350 million. FTA has indicated that if reasonable funding sources cannot be included in the Administrative Draft EIS/EIR to fully fund the rail alternatives, it is unlikely the conclusion of the environmental review process would result in a Record of Decision (ROD) by the FTA. We do not feel it is prudent to expend any additional resources to release the document at this time and continue with the environmental process. In light of

the substantial shortfall in the project budget, staff recommends the project be placed on hold indefinitely until such time the project partners can secure a funding plan that can advance the project further. Project staff received a letter from MTC dated 5/3/2013, inquiring on the status of this project. The letter indicates there is an unallocated amount of RM2 funds in the amount of \$34.7 million for the Dumbarton Rail project. MTC requested an implementation plan be sent to MTC on or before September 30, 2013 on how the project would proceed forward. Project staff will prepare a response to MTC after obtaining input and consensus through the DRC project committee meetings.

**B. Discussion**

M. Gonzales commented that without a completed EIS, the project is unlikely to get any additional funding as the funding tends to go to projects that are ready to implement.

N. Radcliffe asked Bill Hurrell to explain what parts of the EIS would have to be redone if the document was put on hold for an extended time period?

W. Hurrell responded that the delay would not make the document invalid, but that after a certain amount of time the technical studies would need to be undated, such as the traffic counts and biologic studies. This would occur after 2-3 years. The updates would take several months.

J. Bigelow commented that we spent close to 19 million dollars on this study of a project thought of 25 years ago. The value of the work we have done diminishes as time passes. Not being able to certify EIS starts this clock running. Alameda County perhaps in 2016 will have another try at Measure B1 and if they have robust funding for this project it could take it off the shelf. The game plan is to keep enhancing the ridership through expanded bus service and help the rail project. We need to keep the CAP and the PAC operating; there is the bus service and some other projects that require their involvement.

M. Gonzales commented that the ACTC is now considering putting the sales tax measure on the ballot in 2014.

B. Ferrier asked if there was any possibility the EIS can be broken up in to segment. We need that Segment G completed for connections at both ends.

W. Hurrell –replied that you have to disclose the entire project for an environmental document. Segment G could be handled as a separate project, which would require a separate environmental document.

M. Dubinsky should the CAP offer our thoughts as to whether as a panel we agree with the staff recommendation that the project be put on hold?

A. Chan replied that there is nothing staff can do about this. Without a valid funding plan we cannot move forward. If you want to recommend something as to how we can keep this on the radar, I'm fine with that. This item is informational and there is nothing more we can do right now.

J. Bigelow requested that the word "indefinitely" from the phrase "indefinitely on hold" be removed from the staff memo and note that there are other funding sources being worked on. Recommend that to the PAC.

T. Norman asked about the fate of the rail bridge.

A. Chan replied that we still need to preserve the bridge. The Coast Guard has not approached us for 2-3 years, if they do come back: we need to preserve bridge for a future transportation project. We may have to do additional work in providing documentation.

T. Pitsker asked what cost of tearing down the bridge is.

A. Chan replied in the \$80 to \$100 million range.

B. Ferrier stated that we don't have a chair and a vice chair at the PAC.

A. Chan replied that we are going to ask the new Union City mayor to chair the meeting on an interim basis until new officers are elected.

### **C. DBROC Update**

Howard Der of AC transit provided an overview of how the Dumbarton Express service is performing. In July of 2012 Dumbarton Express service was increased. The DB route is a service that runs all day, during commute hours it runs every 30 minutes. There are 23 trips each in direction each day. The DB1 route service was increased to every 20 minutes and extended to 8:35 P.M. in the evening, with 23 eastbound and 22 westbound trips daily. Average daily ridership has increased from 975 to nearly 1,300 per day now. Monthly ridership is around 24,000 per month up from 20,000. Overall ridership has increased 20% since these improvements were implemented. Most of the fleet received a paint job with DB Express branding and new side mirrors. The website [www.dumbartonexpress.com](http://www.dumbartonexpress.com) is running, and we ran a billboard campaign near the toll plaza in both directions. The most critical need for Dumbarton Express bus service is fleet replacement. Half the fleet needs to be replaced now. We do not have additional bus capacity to increase the service beyond what is out there now.

T. Pitsker asked about sufficient number of buses.

H. Der replied that if something happens we are in a world of hurt. The contractor had to lease an additional four vehicles. Some trips have to operate with standing room.

B. Ferrier commented that there is not enough parking at the Ardenwood Park and Ride.

T. Pitsker stated that he is an advocate of the buses, and asked if there are any plans to expand parking get more riders.

H. Der replied that we're funded 100% by RM2 operations funding through a generous transfer from the DRC project. There is no money currently available for capital improvements such as parking.

## **6. Action Items**

### **A. Review of PAC Agenda of October 25, 2013**

A. Chan reviewed the proposed agenda and requested that the action item "Review of Proposed Short Term Project List for Submittal to MTC" be made an informational item as no formal PAC action is required by MTC.

### **B. Discussion**

T. Pitsker stated his agreement and asked if anyone disagreed. There was no objection.

**C. Review of Proposed Short Term Project List for Submittal to MTC**

A. Chan summarized the list of proposed short term projects and the process used to prepare the list. The list was prepared in response to a letter from MTC requesting that the DRC funding partners provide recommendations as to what projects should be considered for use of the \$34.7 million of RM2 funds that are unallocated. The projects were developed by SamTrans in coordination with ACTC. Meetings were held with the East Bay and West Bay cities in the DRC to review the projects and add projects to the list. This review resulted in three high priority projects: 1) Replacement buses for the DB Express, 2) A study of options for expanding the DB Express Service, and 3) Transit Priority Signal treatments at the intersections on the DB Express routes. No priorities were assigned to the rest of the projects.

**D. Discussion**

E. Hentschke asked if the bus acquisitions would be operational costs rather than capital costs.

J. Bigelow responded that bus purchases would be capital funds.

H. Der indicated that when the buses are leased it is an operational expense.

R. Murthy said that he presented the list of projects to the ACTC programs and projects committee. They support these three priority projects, but they are also asking if it can be done from surplus operational funds rather than capital RM2 funds. Art Dao has asked MTC to look into it.

J. Bigelow stated that we recognize that the rail project is not immediate. We supported going to the MTC to get the \$5.5 million a year in RM2 operating funds focused on the Dumbarton corridor. They blessed the idea of using the money for bus operating funds. The rail EIS is going on hold. There is \$34.7 million left out of the RM2 capital money. We have established that buses are the way to build rail ridership. It's time to use this money for a purpose to increase ridership for the rail. We would be wise to take this money and invest.

M. Dubinsky added that as a committee, it is our job to identify the top picks to bring to the PAC. This is quite a bit of info to evaluate before this meeting. I support the projects that lend themselves to improve travel east to west such as East Palo Alto bike improvements and preferential treatment for the buses.

J. Bigelow stated that he would like to make a motion that the committee recommend to the PAC support for the three top priority projects as well as the Newark Transit Center, the Centerville Station Improvements, and the Menlo Park Transportation Center project. All of these projects support the short term enhancement of the Dumbarton Express bus service and also would support the longer term rail project. They would use up the \$34.7 million.

M. Dubinsky seconded the motion.

T. Pitsker called for a vote. There was unanimous approval (10-0).

**7. Member Comments and Requests**

There were no comments or requests

**8. Future Meetings**

A. Chan said that we should plan on meeting every 6 months to continue to monitor the DB Express service performance and to address other issues as needed?

Adjourn 9:08 P.M.

**Attachments:** Sign-in sheet