

Meeting:

**DRC Policy Committee**

Location:

**City of Union City  
34009 Alvarado-Niles Road  
Union City, CA**

Date:

**January 16, 2007**

Time:

Meeting Start: **2:00 PM**  
Meeting Adjourn: **3:45 PM**

Minutes Prepared By: Issue Date:

**Wenlin Yang**

<b>Attendees (sign-in sheet attached)</b>	
<p><b><u>Policy Committee Members</u></b></p> <p>Council Member Ana Apodaca, City of Newark Board Member Tom Blalock, BART Board Chairperson Dean Chu, VTA Mayor Mark Green, City of Union City (Chair) Commissioner Scott Haggerty, MTC Council Member Diane Howard, City of Redwood City Board Member Breene Kerr, VTA Commissioner Sue Lempert, MTC John McLemore, MTC Appointee Mayor Bob Wasserman, Fremont Council Member Heyward Robinson, City of Menlo Park</p> <p><b><u>Program Management Team</u></b></p> <p>Howard Goode, SMCTA Joseph Hurley, SMCTA Marie Pang, SMCTA Sylvia Cox, SMCTA Christine Dunn, SMCTA Steve Minden, PCJPB Wenlin Yang, PCJPB</p>	<p><b><u>Others</u></b></p> <p>Diane Stark, ACCMA Art Dao, ACTIA Dawn Argula, County of Alameda Ian McAvoy, SMCTA Nathan Landou, AC Transit Christine Monsen, ACTIA Chip Taylor, City of Menlo Park Marc Roddin, MTC Peggy Claassen, City of Newark Dennis Jones, City of Newark Farooq Azim, City of Union City Mark Evanoff, City of Union City Joan Malloy, City of Union City Kevin Connolly, VTA Scott Hayward, VTA Jim Bigelow Jim Calhoun Larry Calhoun Paul Lanferman Susan Lanferman Tim Pitsker Ted Pugh Susan Robinson</p>

**1. Call To Order**

**2. Roll Call**

- o Apodaca, T. Blalock, M. Green, S. Haggerty, D. Howard, B. Kerr, S. Lempert, J. McLemore, H. Robinson, B. Wasserman were present to form a quorum. D. Chu arrives after the roll call has been performed.

**3. Election of Vice Chair**

- o **M. Green** nominates Sue Lempert for the position of Vice Chair. The motion is approved.

**4. Chairperson's Comments**

- o **M. Green** states he has met with Supervisor (Solano County) James Spring, who has experience in negotiating with the UPRR. He believes that Supervisor Spring's input will be beneficial to the DRC's future negotiations with the UPRR.

**5. Public Comment**

- o All public comments were in relation to the Phasing Options. Public comments were held under Agenda Item 8a. Phasing Options.

**6. Consent Calendar**

**6a. Minutes of November 2006 Meeting**

- o The minutes of last meeting were approved.

**6b. Recommendation for Additions to the Citizens Advisory Panel**

- o **M. Green** states that there is a recommendation for the addition of two representatives for the Town of Atherton and two representatives for the County of Santa Clara to the Citizens Advisory Panel. The recommendation was approved.

**7. Consent Calendar**

**7a. Budget Status & Schedule Status**

- o **H. Goode** reports the schedule has slipped as stated in the staff report attached.

**7b. Update on Project Cost-Effectiveness**

- o **H. Goode** presents the cost effectiveness comparison between DRC and other major transportation projects. The comparison shows an update between the MTC Blueprint 2000 projections for cost per new rider (cost/new rider) against the current cost per new rider projection. These updated cost/new rider projections are then compared to the DRC's cost/new rider. The updated cost/new rider projections are all comparable in the thirty dollar range. The decrease in cost/new rider for DRC and BART to SJ are due to increases in ridership. The current ABAG projection model is responsible for increasing the ridership numbers by including more parameters in the model. The following table summarizes the comparison.

**Table 1. Cost Effectiveness Comparison**

Project	Document	Cost/New Rider
DRC	2000 Blueprint	\$48.94
	2004 PSR	\$41.49
	2006 EIR/S	\$30.74
SMART		
	2000 Blueprint	\$20.03
	2006 EIR	\$33.00
BART Warm Springs		
	2006 EIR/S	\$29.40
BART San Jose		
	2000 Blueprint	\$100.49
	2004 EIR/S	\$33.90

- o **H. Goode** presents a projection for demand on the Dumbarton Bridge(SR 84). Currently, the bridge is free flowing; however it is projected that in the year 2014, the bridge will be running at capacity during peak hours. In 2030, the projected patronage spillover from the shortfall of bridge capacity is in the same range of the ridership projected for the DRC.
- o **S. Haggerty** asks how the projection intervals are chosen for the ridership studies. **H. Goode** replies that the ABAG projections use the most recent horizon year, which is currently 2030. Every time a study is performed, the best available information is utilized. **S. Haggerty** states that the VTA's projections of ridership for BART to SJ are hard to believe. He addresses the Chairman and states that people are playing with the numbers and he is uncomfortable with the results. **B. Kerr** agrees with S. Haggerty. He asks how the construction costs have not increased while everything else has. **H. Goode** replies that the construction costs were updated although not all to the current(2006) dollar.

- **H. Goode** clarifies that the ridership is based on one way commute direction travel, 12 trains a day. The Dumbarton Express is currently running at 1200 one way trips or 600 round trips. **B. Kerr** states that he feels the projected ridership number is optimistic.
- **D. Chu** asks if the 2000 MTC Blueprint used 2020 as the projection year. **H. Goode** replies that is correct. **D. Chu** asks if it is a requirement for the most recent horizon year to be used. He states it is hard to evaluate a moving target. **H. Goode** replies that for federally funded projects, there is FTA requirement to use the latest cost and information. Dumbarton is currently not a federally funded project; the convention is to use the same benchmarks and methodology as the MTC evaluation.
- **S. Lempert** states that you have to take ridership with a grain of salt. It is known that there will tremendous growth on both sides of the bay which will mean more people and more jobs. She compares this project to other RM2 projects and points out that they are all in the \$30 dollar range and the biggest shift is in the BART to SJ. BART to SJ stands out as the hardest to believe projection. What's important from this comparison is that the cost/new rider for all the projects are all in the same ballpark.
- **J. McLemore** states that the most recent numbers for BART to SJ is 76-78,000 riders, which would decrease the cost per new rider. The project's increase in cost is due to improvements to the design. The increase in cost for the DRC project is for the same project scope without bells and whistles. When ridership goes up, it shifts the line of cost effectiveness and the cost/new rider goes down. **H. Goode** states that he could provide the numbers shown in the comparison table from the BART to SJ EIR/S. **J. McLemore** replies that he believes the numbers does appear to be correct but there are new projections since. **H. Goode** states that future year forecasts are based on many landuse assumptions such as TOD and job creations. One way to examine these various forecast objectively is to normalize the projections.
- **H. Robinson** asks for clarification on the projection dates used for the various projects. **H. Goode** answers that he has the horizon year for each cost/new rider projection for the DRC project. The most current forecast uses the year 2030. The horizon year used for the other projects are not known off hand. He can follow up and find the horizon years used for each project and normalize the patronage results to the same horizon year. **H. Robinson** asks if ridership is really increasing or does it just look like it is increasing because more time has passed. **H. Goode** replies that it is most likely both.
- **M. Green** states that this information was provided by H. Goode per the PAC request. The result has shown that all the projects are in the same boat.
- **S. Haggerty** asks for the ACE cost per new rider in 2030. **H. Goode** replies that ACE is not part of the MTC SF Bay Regional Plan.
- **S. Haggerty** states that he is frustrated by the methodology of ridership projections. He states that there is a problem with the process. From past projects, it is known that the actual ridership numbers did not live up to the projections. Instead of learning from past mistakes, the same process is utilized. It appears to him that the methodology is to work the numbers to get a desired result. **B. Kerr** agrees. **M. Green** states that staff should investigate and report a normalized ridership and cost effectiveness comparison in the next meeting.

### 7c. Results of Scoping Meetings

- **S. Minden** presents a summary of the two public scoping meetings and one informational meeting. He states that the scoping report is still being compiled. The major comments that resulted from the scoping meetings fell into three categories. The first category was alternatives not considered, such as light rail, personal rapid transit, bus rapid transit, and re-routing ACE. The second category consisted recommendations to modify existing alternatives, such as changing the Menlo Park station location, extend Dumbarton Express to Sunnyvale and using electrified trains instead of diesel trains. The last category consisted of environmental impacts, such as noise, vibration, safety, and the impacts to the natural environment. These examples are representative of comments received via all means of submittal.
- **B. Wasserman** asks how it was decided where the scoping meetings would be held. **S. Minden** replies that it was planned to have one on each side of the Bay. Newark was chosen for the East Bay because it is the county sponsor. Menlo Park was chosen for the West Bay because it was the only city that would have a station as a result of this project. The

informational meeting in Fremont was for the consideration of Fremont residents. **B.**

**Wasserman** states that Fremont had to ask for the meeting. Fremont is the most impacted by the project, yet it was not considered for the location of the scoping meeting.

- **H. Robinson** states that he attended the Menlo Park scoping meeting. Residents from Menlo Park, Redwood City, and Atherton comprised the majority of the audience. Although there were a lot of concerns he believes that most of the audience supported the project, but wanted to be ensured that the proper mitigation measures would be taken.

#### 7d. Status of UPRR discussions

- **H. Goode** reports that the UPRR has additional requests, such as a third track through Fremont Centerville and a grade separation at Newark Junction. He recommends taking a step back from the negotiations since UPRR has not made any concessions from their original position.
- **M. Green** states that Supervisor Spering has experience negotiating with the UPRR on behalf of the Capitol Corridor and he has come up with some strategies for UPRR negotiations. Union City staff will be taking a proactive role in the UPRR negotiation with the help from Supervisor Spering and Capitol Corridor staff. Union City staff will present the DRC project in the upcoming Capitol Corridor board meeting, and also try to set up a meeting with the UPRR in Roseville.
- **T. Blalock** asks much of the Oakland Subdivision is needed. **H. Goode** replies about a third of the total length.

### 8. Action Items

#### 8a. Phasing Options

**S. Minden** presents four options to be carried forward into the environmental analysis.

- **Option 1** is the rail project from Menlo Park to Newark on the ROW that is already owned by Samtrans. The advantages include that there are no issues with the UPRR and it achieves bay crossing with Newark being the east end terminus. It is likely that there is enough funding to complete this phase however the West Bay will be receive most impacts. The disadvantages are that an interim layover yard is needed in Newark, it does not connect with ACE and Capitol Corridor, and there is an associated decrease in ridership.
- **Option 2** is Segment G only. The advantages are that Union City gets its Intermodal station and TOD; BART, Capitol Corridor, and ACE will have connectivity, and it could be built with existing funds. The disadvantages are that it doesn't cross the Bay and that ROW and trackage rights with UPRR would need to be negotiated.
- **Option 3** is the rail project from Segment A through E and a modified G. This rail phase would run from Menlo Park through Centerville and then onto the Niles Subdivision. It would succeed in providing a commuter rail service to Union City and allow for intermodal transfer. The negotiations with UPRR should be limited since ACE and Capitol Corridor already have a trackage agreement in place on the Niles Subdivision and Centerville line.
- **Option 4** is a phasing option to operate a bus rapid transit (BRT) as an interim service until funding is available and/or ridership demand justifies the full rail project. The DRC right-of-way would be built to rail standard, but used as a dedicated bus lane for the BRT. This option is the least defined. It would minimize many of the impacts to the West Bay. There is a potential for federal funding where BRT is considered to be a favored transit system. A disadvantage is that it does not provide a continuous service onto the Caltrain system, resulting in the need to transfer to Caltrain or other shuttle/bus systems. The need for transfers will result in a decrease in ridership. The trip times are unknown. Establishing this service and switching to rail at a later time still requires the impacts of the entire rail project be evaluated and addressed now.
- **B. Kerr** asks if the ROW in Option 4 will be dedicated in Menlo Park all the way to the Redwood City station. **S. Minden** replies that it is being looked into. **B. Kerr** states that the VTA started the 522 rapid service line between Palo Alto and San Jose successful and with very little capital cost. It shows that there is a lot of interest in buses. **J. McLemore** states that the BRT concept has been extremely successful. AC Transit is implementing one along the San Pablo Avenue. He asks if the ROW stops short of the Redwood City station. **S. Minden** replies that it does, but the buses could run on city streets. **J. McLemore** states that he is not in favor of replacing rail with buses, but as an interim, it is a great idea.

- **S. Lempert** states that the purpose of this project is to enhance regional connectivity between ACE, Capitol Corridor, Caltrain, SamTrans, and BART. She asks which of these options satisfies this purpose. **S. Minden** replies that they are trying to get as close to the purpose as possible with the available funds.
- **S. Lempert** states that people who object to rail will also object to having buses on local roads. People will have serious issues with where the buses will go. Project 2020 is dealing with the automobile congestion to the Dumbarton bridge approaches. People can't get out of their driveways because of the congestion. Adding buses to the congested approaches won't be supported. Planning on having buses get off the dedicated ROW and onto local streets and roads could be opening a lot of debate and criticism from the community.
- **B. Kerr** states that Segment G has many benefits. He supports a hybrid solution between Option 2 (Segment G only) and BRT. Segment G will enhance the performance of the Capitol Corridor. He asks that the questions presented today be followed up.
- **H. Robinson** states that the options should be addressed in the EIR/S. He also states that S. Lempert's comments are well taken. He believes that buses will decrease the number of cars on the local streets and not cause more congestion. He asks if the buses will be bi-directional or will they only run one-way in the peak hours. **S. Minden** replies that it is more appropriate to have the rail bridge accommodate one way peak hour travel due to its width. He suggests one alternative for bi-directional travel, using the DRC right of way for travel in the direction of congestion and highway bridge on SR84 in the reverse commute direction to form a loop.
- **T. Blalock** agrees with S. Lempert's comments. He states that there is a study that supports her argument. He suggests a matrix table of the issues and solutions to the different phasing options should be prepared to aid the decision making process.
- **B. Wasserman** asks if all the options will be carried forward. **S. Minden** answers that the Board is being asked to eliminate some of the options if it is possible. **B. Wasserman** states that funds are already limited and the unknown costs of these additional studies seems counterintuitive and are reducing the available funds. He states that Option 2 should be eliminated and that he is in favor of Options 1, 3, and 4.
- At M. Green's prompt, J. Malloy (Union City staff) passes out a handout to the Board and audience that argues the disadvantages of Option 3. This handout was not a part of the Agenda packet provided for this meeting.
- **M. Green** asks for a consensus to study Options 1, 2, and 4 further, eliminating Option 3.
- **B. Kerr** agrees, but asks how option 2 gets anyone over the Bay.
- **M. Green** invites Public Comment on the phasing options.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Public Comment**

- Jim Bigelow, representing the Chambers of Commerce of the City of Redwood City, San Mateo County and the City of Menlo Park, states that relying on his experience, the public will not be happy if the comments they submitted during the scoping process are not responded to. Option 4 would succeed at responding to their comments. He states that several million dollars will be spent on Phase 2 to get some answers. At Willow Road and Marsh Road, the fire and police departments cannot respond to emergencies due to congestion. If the population increase by 40% by 2020, the congestion will be worse. Employees can't get to and from the workplace. He argues that a rail and bus option should be pursued to provide relief to commuters.
- Tim Pitsker, a resident of Fremont, states that he believes that Option 3 should be evaluated further. He states that if Segment G is built and negotiations with the UPRR are not successful, than there are no backup alternatives.

\*\*\*\*\*

- **M. Green** asks if the Committee agrees with Options 1, 2, and no on Option 3 and 4. **B. Wasserman** states that Option 4 should not be eliminated. **H. Robinson** states that Option 4 is a very good idea and he is on the record to support it. **B. Kerr** asks J. McLemore if Option 2 will help Capitol Corridor. **J. McLemore** replies that should take some congestion off and would benefit Santa Clara County. He also states that Segment G provides a direct connection between Capitol Corridor and BART to San Jose and will decrease the running times using the

Oakland Subdivision. **B. Kerr** states that there is a need for VTA to receive benefits from this project as a funding contributor.

- o **M. Green** asks for a vote on the motion to support Options 1, 2, and 4. The motion passes 10:1. The vote is as follows:

<b>Committee Member</b>	<b>Vote</b>
A. Anacoda	Yes
T. Blalock	Yes
D. Chu	Yes
M. Green	Yes
S. Haggerty	Yes
D. Howard	Yes
B. Kerr	Yes
S. Lempert	Yes
J. McLemore	Yes
H. Robinson	Yes
B. Wasserman	No

**8b. Funding and Implementation Strategy**

**H. Goode** presents a timeline for the proposed steps for implementation. The detailed definition of the phasing options through further preliminary engineering and planning work will be provided in summer 2007; the options will then be carried into the EIS/R evaluations in early 2008. MTC RM2 application will be amended to reflect the phasing options and the conditional use of design funding on Segment G, with the approval funding allocation expected in March 2007.

- o **B. Kerr** states that he wants answers back within a couple of months. **M. Green** asks H. Goode when accurate, but expedited answers would be available. **H. Goode** replies that the PAC meets every other month. The March meeting is too soon, so answers will be available for the May meeting. **B. Kerr** states that there has been no progression since November and the VTA want answer now. As BART to SJ project progresses, securing funding for the DRC project will be more difficult. He wants more information on Option 4.
- o **M. Green** states that an executive director for this project is needed.
- o **D. Chu** states that VTA is re-evaluating its capital expenditure to determine what projects will be put on a standby list.
- o **S. Lempert** recommends that the answers in regards to potential problems, advantages, service plan and routes, etc. to be presented in March. The full definition can be presented at the May meeting. **H. Goode** replies that route, service plan, impacts, ridership, etc. will be provided incrementally in the next two meetings with the best information available.
- o **J. McLemore** states that the MTC has the discretion to distribute 350 million dollars anticipated from the Infrastructure Bond to projects and that this tri-county project would be a better use of the funds over other projects. He states that delays are a continuing problem. If the BART extension is lined up faster than DRC, funding will be distributed to VTA first.
- o **M. Green** states that a progress report will be presented by H. Goode in March and the full report is due in May. **H. Goode** states that he will be presenting a refined BRT option in March, including frequency and routes. In May, the cost and patronage will be reported.
- o **M. Green** states that the distribution of funds from the Infrastructure Bond has not been determined yet and he hopes that no one is expecting to make a decision on DRC in March which may result in giving up hundreds of millions to other projects later when the bond funding is allocated.
- o **H. Goode** states that the pending funding application to MTC is being held in conveyance. Once a strategy for the phasing option is set, they can go forward in March to secure the design money with the caveat that no design money will be spent on Segment G until negotiations with the

UPRR are settled. SMCTA will be the lead to try to obtain funds from the infrastructure bond. Union City will be the lead on negotiations with the UPRR.

- o **M. Green** states that there are no disagreements.

**9. Correspondence**

- o There was no correspondence.

**10. Requests from Members**

- o As previously stated, **H. Goode** will provide an update on the BRT option in March and a full report in May.
- o **M. Green** states that he would like to explore forming a subcommittee to evaluate creating a joint power authority (JPA) governing the Dumbarton project. He asks that if Mr. McLemore who has experience in JPA with would like to join himself and vice chairperson Lempart in the research of creating such an organization. **J. McLemore** replies he will think about it.

**11. Time and Date for Next Meeting**

- o The next meeting will be on March 20, 2007 in Union City. The following May meeting will be held in the West Bay.

**12. Adjourn**

Attachments: Sign-In Sheet, DRC PAC Presentations