

Meeting:

DRC Policy Committee

Location:

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

Date:

April 24, 2007

Time:

Meeting Start: **2:00 PM**
Meeting Adjourn: **4:15 PM**

Minutes Prepared By: Issue Date:

Wenlin Yang

Attendees (sign-in sheet attached)

<u>Policy Committee Members</u>	<u>Others</u>
<p>Council Member Ana Apodaca, City of Newark Council Member David Casas, VTA Mayor Mark Green, City of Union City (Chair) Council Member Diane Howard, City of Redwood City Mayor Yuriko Kishimoto, VTA Council Member Sue Lempert, City of San Mateo Council Member Heyward Robinson, City of Menlo Park Council Member Donna Rutherford, City Of East Palo Alto Mayor Bob Wasserman, Fremont</p>	<p>Nathan Landou, AC Transit Dennis Fay, ACCMA Christine Monsen, ACTIA Rebecca Kohlstrand, ACTIA Malcolm Quint, BART Arthur Lloyd, Caltrain Anthony Lee, Caltrans Mo Pazooki, Caltrans Nandini Shridhar, Caltrans Anne Richman, MTC Therese McMillan, MTC Kevin Connolly, VTA Scott Haywood, VTA Jim Pierson, City of Fremont Chip Taylor, City of Menlo Park Barbara Pierce, City of Redwood City Joan Malloy, City of Union City Richard Valle, City of Union City Simon Kim, HNTB Camille Tsao, HNTB Karl Schaarschmidt, Earthtech Jim Bigelow, representing RWC, SMC and MP Chambers of Commerce Larry Calhoun, Union City Larry Cheeves, Union City Yen Chen, Newark Len Conly, Friends of BRT Mike Dubinsky, Fremont Neighbors Group Mark Duncan Tim Pitsker Henry Riggs, Lorelei Homeowners Association Lennie Roberts, Committee for Green Foothills Onnolee Trapp, League of Women Voters Alex Starr Cathi Sweeny</p>
<u>Program Management Team</u>	
<p>Howard Goode, SMCTA Joseph Hurley, SMCTA Christine Dunn, SMCTA Steve Minden, PCJPB Wenlin Yang, PCJPB Marie Pang, SMCTA Sylvia Cox, SMCTA</p>	

1. Call To Order

2. Roll Call

- o A. Apodaca, D. Casas, M. Green, D. Howard, Y. Kishimoto, S. Lempert, H. Robinson, D. Rutherford, B. Wasserman were present to form a quorum.

3. Chairperson's Comments

- **M. Green** declined to make comments at this time to expedite the meeting.

4. Public Comment

- Public comments were to be in regards to items not on the agenda. (Public comments in regards to agenda items are under item 7.)
- Tim Pitsker, Resident of Fremont: Mr. Pitsker stated that he had been appointed to the citizen advisory panel by Mayor Wasserman. He stated that the project limits should be redefined to be between Newark and the Peninsula. He stated that the Alameda Creek freight bridge had a possibility of derailment and impacts to the water quality. He stated that it was illegal to build the Niles connection and the third track at Centerville with the funding because it would be a gift to UPRR. He stated that the funding does not allow for the acquisition of right of way from Hayward to Oakland. He stated that running additional freight should require contribution from the UPRR. He stated to leave Fremont out of the project and that the citizens were organizing to meet with Alameda County Supervisor and forming opposition to the freight bridge.
- Mike Dubinsky, Resident of Fremont: Mr. Dubinsky stated that the project is being handled in a divide and conquer approach. He asked where the money is coming from and that the explanation of funding needs to be simplified. He stated that Fremont was not being heard and that he supported Mayor Bob Wasserman's efforts. He stated that the community impacts must be looked at and that rail is not the best choice as a transit solution. He stated that Fremont deserved and needed attention and the community was not getting it.
- Eugene Chow, Resident of Fremont: Mr. Chow stated that he rides the Dumbarton Express and that it is efficient and successful as a point to point service. He stated that ridership has increased 25% in the past two years. He commended the Greyhound-like seating on AC Transit Line U from Fremont to Stanford University that allowed work to be performed on the bus. He stated that the frequency of the bus is higher than the train. He stated that the need for transbay buses that originate in Fremont is not being addressed. He stated that point to point buses are competitive with vehicles

5. Consent Calendar

Minutes of January Meeting

- The spelling of A. Apodaca's name was corrected on page six. The minutes of last meeting were approved with this correction.

6. Information items

6a. Budget Status & Schedule Status

- **M. Green** stated that everyone was up to date with the budget and schedule and to go straight to the Citizen Advisor Panel.

6b. Summary report of the Scoping Meetings

H. Robinson commended the summary of the scoping report. He asked what will be done with this information. **H. Goode** stated that there is a more detailed report available. The issues raised in the scoping report will be addressed in the environmental document.

6c. Citizen Advisory Panel (CAP)

- **H. Goode** stated that the meetings will be in the evening, after normal working hours and will alternate location between the East and West sides of the Bay on a quarterly basis. He stated that he was still receiving appointees from the invited cities. The staff report identified appointees have been made by Fremont, Redwood City and Menlo Park. He provided an update that since then, Newark and Union City have identified its designated citizens.
- **B. Wasserman** why there is no meeting in Fremont. He stated that he wanted it on the record that Fremont is an integral part of the project and had to demand for meetings in the past, that the impacts to Fremont are the greatest, and that Fremont will fight the project if Fremont is not included.

- **M. Green** asked H. Goode to repeat the scoping meeting information. **H. Goode** stated that one scoping meeting was held in Newark and one in Menlo Park. An agency scoping meeting was held in Menlo Park. An informational meeting was hosted by the City of Fremont per the request from Fremont. **M. Green** stated that many cities did not get a scoping meeting.
- **D. Rutherford** asked how much time was available to submit the appointees. **H. Goode** replied approximately 6 weeks before the first CAP meeting is to be held.
- **H. Robinson** asked what is the role of the CAP. **H. Goode** replied that the representatives' focus will be to provide input on the Environmental Impact Report, and provide input to PAC.
- **D. Howard** asked if alternates will be allowed on the committee in case one appointee is unable to make a meeting. **H. Goode** replied that hasn't been discussed and it is the call of the PAC. **D. Howard** asked that there be two representatives from each city/agency and one alternate allowed so that each city/agency will be able to be fully represented at the meetings. All members of the PAC agreed to her request.
- **S. Lempert** stated that today's meeting was being attended by PAC members from the west bay communities, Fremont and Newark despite the meeting location being in Union City. She is concerned that only citizens from the east bay had a chance to attend and be heard. She stated that it is a good idea to alternate both the PAC and CAP meetings between the west and east bay to provide both community equal chance to participate.

7. Phasing Options

- **H. Goode** stated that due to the funding shortage, they had been asked to identify projects with independent utility. Additional information had been requested on three phasing options. H. Goode recognized the hard work of HNTB and Cambridge Systematics to produce the extensive information in a short time frame.
- **S. Minden** presented the phasing options. Phasing Option 1 was the rail option from Newark to Redwood City, with a layover yard in Newark and two new stations. This option did not require negotiations with UPRR. Newark will be the end of the line station and required property acquisition for parking facility. He reported that the City of Newark approved the station design in theory. The Menlo Park station had formerly been located on the Tyco property, but that property had been sold to GM to be an auto dealership. The new proposed station location was across the street from the Tyco property and had been conceptually designed. There was a developer interested in transit oriented development (TOD) at this location. The City of Menlo Park had been supportive of the station location and design so far. The layover yard in Newark had originally been designed to be east of the station, which was operationally the best location, but that area was close to residential areas. At the City's request, the layover yard had been located west of the station in an industrial area.
- **S. Minden** presented Phasing Option 2, Segment G. Segment G had a passenger rail station next to the Union City BART station, which created an intermodal connection between the two. It also linked the Niles Subdivision to Oakland Subdivision at the Industrial connection and created a connection to the Centerville station via Shinn connection. This option had been defined by an approved CEQA document. It is proposed that the new station will be served by Capitol Corridor trains and did not require a layover yard. There would be no transbay crossing with this option.
- **S. Minden** presented Phasing Option 3, an Interim Bus Rapid Transport (BRT) over the dedicated right of way. The buses would run over the dedicated right of way in the peak hours and run in the reverse direction on the highway bridge. It was assumed that there would be a 30% farebox recovery. One option is a new BRT route called the "Loop" Alternative and continue the service of three existing bus routes: the Fremont-Stanford U-line, the Dumbarton Express (DBX), and the Hayward/Union City-Redwood Shores (MA) line. The BRT "Loop" created one new route which ran from Ardenwood Park-N-Ride to the Redwood City Caltrain station with a timed connection to Caltrain. The service plan for the three existing routes would stay the same. The other BRT route was called the "4-Route" Alternative. The routes will be replacing existing bus services with BRT service planning and modified origins and destinations. This alternative was a pulse system where all the buses converged at the Newark BRT station. Riders could transfer routes at Newark, typically having to wait only five minutes on the platform.

- **S. Minden** presented the capital and operating costs in 2006 dollars for the three phasing options. The total annualized costs for Option 1, 2 and 3, respectively, were \$27.1 million, \$10 million, and \$32.8 million.
- **B. Wasserman** asked where the connection to ACE was in Option 2. **S. Minden** replied that it was in Fremont and that there would be no change in the level of service. **B. Wasserman** asked why the fixed cost of Option 3 was so high. **S. Minden** replied that constructing the bridge to rail standard resulted in the high capital costs.
- **S. Lempert** asked if the BRT phasing option will eliminate buses crossing over the San Mateo Bridge. **N. Landou** of AC Transit replied that the M line will continue to serve the San Mateo Bridge and MA line will be re-routed through the Dumbarton Bridge which is already being planned. **S. Lempert** stated that she was interested in the impacts to the existing bus service.
- **Y. Kishimoto** asked why the speed on the dedicated busway was only 40 mph. **S. Minden** replied that the speed had been determined by discussions with bus engineers. The bridge is very narrow and is the limiting factor. **Y. Kishimoto** asked what the overall bus trip times were. **R. West** of Cambridge Systematics replied that the routes would only be a little faster than existing trips over the highway bridge because they have many more stops. **M. Green** asked if a guideway automated service would be used. **R. West** replied that it was not planned but can be considered. **M. Green** asked if there would be protection on both sides of the busway on the bridge. **S. Minden** replied that there are physical barriers proposed and that automated guiding service will be looked into if this option was to be pursued. **M. Green** asked where the \$70 million dollars to convert from busway to rail came from. **S. Minden** replied that it would be temporary detours, engineering, construction management, construction of new ties and rails, and the rail signal systems.
- **H. Robinson** asked if the rolling stock would be heavy rail. **S. Minden** replied that it would be and pointed out that the rolling stock cost had been reduced from \$60 million to \$20 million by using reconditioned trains. **H. Robinson** asked how the conversion of Caltrain rolling stock to EMU's will be incorporated. **S. Minden** replied the Caltrain was still in discussion with the FRA to get permission to run non-compliant vehicles. Caltrain planned to either run both the old style heavy rail and the EMU's separated by train controls or to convert the entire fleet to EMU's if there was enough money.
- **B. Wasserman** asked what the fixed costs were for Option 2. **S. Minden** replied that the costs were for the track work, a new elevated passenger rail station, the acquisition of ROW from UPRR for Shinn, engineering, and construction management. **B. Wasserman** stated that this would be tapping out the project on both ends. **S. Minden** stated that this would have no benefit to the West Bay.
- **D. Howard** asked what would happen when the busway was converted to rail. She stated that the temporary disruption in service would result in lost ridership. She asked that the fallout and impact of choosing this option be examined. **S. Minden** replied that \$70 million was a conservative out of pocket cost estimate. He agreed that the loss of ridership cannot be quantified and it should be considered. **D. Howard** asked if bus and rail can be run at the same time over the bridge. **S. Minden** stated that the bridge is only wide enough for one lane. The conversion could be accomplished in a couple of month's time. At the approaches, bus lanes are designed to be at one side of the ROW to minimize disruption.
- **S. Lempert** asked if the rail crosses the bridge, will there still be bus service across SR 84. **H. Goode** replied that this still needed to be determined. The concept is that DBX will continue to operate with the rail and serve destinations that the rail does not. At **S. Haggerty's** request, the environmental document will study the need to continue the DBX service during peak hours.
- **S. Lempert** stated that her concern was that buses routed over the San Mateo Bridge will not be replaced by the rail. The San Mateo Bridge is the only way some people get to work. Changing the bus schedule and routes may drive people back into their cars.
- **H. Goode** presented the ridership projects for 2012 and 2030, which were performed by Cambridge Systematics with the cooperation of the VTA. The projections for the total riders and the total new riders, which were the people getting off the road and onto public transit, were provided.

Year 2030 Daily Boardings

Operator	No Project	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3 Loop	Option 3 4-Route
Dumbarton Rail	-	7,300	-	-	-
DBX	1,600	1,200	1,600	11,900	13,100
Capitols	8,700	9,200	9,100	9,300	9,300

- The 2030 daily boardings showed that the BRT 4 Route Alternative was superior to the BRT Loop Alternative.
- H. Goode pointed out that under Option 1, the rail would steal some, but not all of the DBX riders.
- **H. Robinson** asked for clarification on the bus routes. He asked that DBX represented the Dumbarton Express alone, but that the BRT included all routes. **H. Goode** agreed.
- **H. Goode** stated that the DBX ridership grows until congestion on the highway bridge in 2014. Competition from the BART Extension to San Jose takes away riders in later years and contributes to the decline in ridership.
- **H. Goode** stated that the target of the DRC project is transbay crossings and provide a graph of the daily transbay crossings for DBX alone, Option 1 and Option 3. Generally, Option 1 and Option 3 were comparable, but Option 3 had higher total ridership numbers.
- **H. Goode** presented the transit cost-effectiveness comparison which showed that the annualized cost per new rider was four times higher for Option 3 than for Option 1. The annualized costs for Option 2 were the highest of the options. However Option 2 has the utility of intermodal connections that cannot really be quantified.

Cost Effectiveness Comparison

	Annualized Cost per Rider	Annualized Cost per New Transit Rider
Option 1: Segments A-C	\$14.94	\$33.74
Option 2: Segment G	\$110.01	\$192.98
Option 3: BRT 4 Route	\$9.98	\$135.77

- **D. Howard** stated that the projections were based on the assumptions that BART to San Jose and DRC would go through. She asked what would happen if one of the projects did not go through. **H. Goode** stated that the “No Project” alternative is the resultant.
- **H. Robinson** stated that the rail option is for peak operation only and the BRT is all day service. He asked how that was accounted for. **R. West** replied that the midday bus/reverse commute ridership is nominal and that the peak is 90% of the ridership. **H. Goode** stated that the graph showed that the bus was more effective at low density and that the rail was more effective at high density and the objective was to find where they crossed. The federal government uses cost per new rider for cost effectiveness comparison, but this approach doesn’t work well with Segment G.
- **H. Robinson** asked why the BRT projections showed 13,000 riders, but only 1,000 new transit riders. **R. West** replied that he did not have an answer for that yet but it is under investigation. **H. Robinson** stated that it was a very high cost per new rider. **H. Goode** stated that cost per new rider numbers were provided per S. Haggerty’s request.
- **D. Casas** asked if VTA provided the latest numbers for their projects. **H. Goode** replied yes. **D. Casas** asked to identify the capacity and the sensitivity of the model. For example, the BRT shows 13,100 daily riders. He asked if this is the BRT with all the buses full. Is there room for more capacity? In addition, a 10% reduction to ridership on BART to SJ would be significantly different than a 10% reduction on other projects. This reflects the model’s sensitivity. These parameters needed to be examined.
- **B. Wasserman** asked if travel time is part of the model. **H. Goode** replied that it is a factor.
- **H. Goode** stated that the 2030 transbay market for BRT is a little better than Rail, but they are comparable in ridership and construction costs. Option 2 had value as a BART station, for

intercity rail and for TOD. The recommendation of the PDT was to retain all three options, to identify and enhance the Bus Alternative to incorporate the BRT service with the cooperation of AC Transit, and to request the MTC application now that the question of which phasing options would be carried forward had been addressed.

- **Y. Kishimoto** asked what the schedule of the train service was in Option 1. **H. Goode** replied six trains in the peak hours with 30 minute headways. Service would begin in 2012. **Y. Kishimoto** asked if the DBX service could be bolstered with RM2 subsidy money. **H. Goode** replied that the RM2 funding comprised of \$135 million for capital costs and \$5.5 million for operating costs. He directs the question to T. McMillan of MTC if RM2 operating funding could be used for bus service before the rail service was implemented. **T. McMillan** stated that the language of the application of funding could be changed and would require a public hearing. If the bus was for long term or permanent, a hearing would be necessary to modify the language. If the bus was for the interim, there may be some flexibility.
- **S. Lempert** stated that RM2 funding is unique in dealing with operations funding. She stated that operations cannot recover from farebox alone. The transit agency had to cover operating money.
- **B. Wasserman** asked what funds were available. **H. Goode** replied \$260 million. **B. Wasserman** stated that the recommendation is three times the amount available. **H. Goode** replied that it wasn't that bad, but more than what was available. **B. Wasserman** asked how the funding will be made up. **H. Goode** replied that they are looking for federal money. **B. Wasserman** stated that there is enough money to do Option 1. He stated that they should do what they can with the available funds.
- **Y. Kishimoto** asked if the costs reflect the total cost, including the feeder shuttles to stations. **H. Goode** replied that the rail cost did not assume additional feeder shuttles, only local bus service.

Public Comment

- Dick Senn, Resident of Menlo Park: Mr. Senn represented a Homeowners Association that will be impacted by the project. Mr. Senn stated that he doesn't understand why it takes six weeks for the CAP to meet. He asked what the plan for the EIR is. **H. Goode** replied that the EIR will complete in another eighteen months and that the CAP will be able to address the committee.
- Marshall Loring, Resident of San Mateo: Mr. Loring stated that he rode public transit from San Mateo to the meeting today. He stated that the connections weren't very good. He encouraged the committee to go forward with the project. He stated that he represented the senior citizen community and was a member of the Alameda Advisory Committee. He stated that the DRC was a valuable link in the regional transit system.
- Henry Riggs, Resident of Menlo Park: Mr. Riggs stated that there were numerous assumptions and conclusions that he did not agree with. He stated that he had attended the scoping meeting in Menlo Park and that he disagreed with Mr. Robinson's statement that the attendants were generally for the project. He stated that most of the scoping meeting attendants supported light rail. He stated that there was a serious need for public transit. The tracks go past his backyard, but there are too many advantages locally and regionally not do something. Problems included the proximity of the tracks to neighborhood homes, the noise, the commute service through street crossings which will be interrupted by the project, the lack of options for transfer from Caltrain, and the economics.
- Vaughn Wolffe, Resident of Pleasanton: Mr. Wolffe stated that he is on the advisory committee for Alameda County. He stated that with \$300 million, ACE could run 8 trains a day. He asked what would happen if you increased service. He asked that the committee look at the long term and consider the ability to increase service. The opinions of the riders are as important as the Not In My Backyard constituents.
- Jim Bigelow, representing the Chambers of Commerce of the City of Redwood City, San Mateo County and City of Menlo Park stated that the project needed to be moved forward, the RM2 funding needed to be accessed, and that VTA needed to contribute their financial support. He stated that he had empathy for the residents, but that the employees were suffering too. He

- asked people to think regionally. He stated that he grew up living across the street from Southern Pacific freight and he survived and was able to sleep at night.
- o Richard Valle, Union City Council Member: Mr. Valle stated that he lived next to BART and heavy rail and he had become accustomed to the noise. He stated that the existing infrastructure for transit was good and more is needed. He stated that Union City unanimously supported the project. The project offered transportation across the Bay and to San Jose, the opportunity for TODS, and the regional benefit of the movement of goods via freight. The project would decrease conflicts between freight and commuter trains and offered environmental benefits. The commuter would enjoy a more comfortable ride to work. He asked for workable phasing for the projects.
- o Barbara Pierce, Mayor of Redwood City: B. Pierce stated that the MTC funding needed to be accessed. There is never enough money, but you must go forward. She stated that she grew up one block from commuter rail in New Jersey and never noticed it. She stated that there is the possibility to upgrade equipment in the future.
- o Steve Schmidt, Resident of Menlo Park: Mr. Schmidt stated that he sat on the City Council for Menlo Park for two terms. He stated that while campaigning, people liked to talk about congestion reduction projects and alternatives to driving. But once elected, they hate the project they used to love to talk about. He stated that they had been talking about DRC for over ten years. It was time to create some wind behind these sails and move forward on the project. He stated that he lives close to University Ave and it is jammed with traffic going to Stanford. He stated that there is also congestion in East Palo Alto. He asked that people think and act regionally and support the whole project.
- o Len Conly, Friends of BRT Co-chair: Mr. Conly stated that he supported BRT. It was the quickest way to get transit running and offered flexibility. The cost of conversion to rail should not be included in the cost effectiveness comparisons because it is not a fair depiction of BRT. He stated that high speed rail had not been discussed and that the Dumbarton corridor is one of the possible routes. He stated BRT minimizes the levels of carbon dioxide released, reducing the contribution to global warming.
- o Arthur Lloyd, Board Member of Caltrain and SamTrans: Mr. Lloyd endorsed everything stated by Mr. Conly, Mr. Wolffe, and Mr. Bigelow. On the record, the Rail PAC supported the full rail project. Light rail crosses would cause more downed gate time than twelve trains a day. He stated that in forty years of commuting, he had been late eight times. That's once every five years. He challenged people to try to beat that driving on the 101.

- o **M. Green** stated that the overall goal was rail between Union City and Redwood City. However, he was fully aware that the funding was not there at this time. He stated that they need to move forward with a transbay span. He reluctantly agreed to the BRT study, but believed it to be a throwaway cost. He stated that Segments A-C and G are needed. He asked for a recommendation on how much money each part should receive from the RM2 funding.
- o **B. Wasserman** stated that they should move forward with the critical transbay crossing and study the others. Having three options was diffusing the limited funding. There are issues to be resolved, but that will take a long time. He recommends moving forward with A-C and then assess the next step.
- o **M. Green** asked that there be an idea on the funding split for the next meeting.
- o **H. Robinson** asked if there was a decision to be made today. He wanted the opportunity for H. Goode to attend a City Council meeting in Menlo Park and receive comments from the public. He stated that he was not comfortable with the model numbers and wanted to meet with H. Goode and understand the assumptions. He believed that there may be benefits to Option 1 and 3 that were not being considered and/or easily quantified. Option 1 had the benefit of no transfers with the tie in to Caltrain. Option 3 had the benefit of flexibility and was quicker to implement.
- o **S. Lempert** stated that the recommendation was to approve the three phasing options with more information on the BRT. She stated the history of the project. The original project started as a bridge between Newark and Menlo Park to fulfill the need for a southern Bay crossing. Senator Diane Feinstein wanted it to be an auto bridge, but Alameda County didn't want more cars on 880 and San Mateo County didn't want more cars on 101. The committee recommendation was the

DRC, a cost effective project that linked the homes in the east Bay with the jobs in the West Bay. It was cheap compared to the option to build a new highway bridge. The project needed to be sensitive to the neighborhoods and she suggested soundwalls and grade separations. She also stated that phasing is a common way to get projects done and cites Bart to Warm Springs as a phase to a bigger project. She stated that people may have been overwhelmed with data and lost their perspectives. She advocated to move forward on the project in some effective manner as the most important goal for the PAC.

- **D. Casas** stated that he advocated the staging to Berryessa on BART to San Jose project. He stated that BRT is reasonable as a interim phasing. He asked for two items, capacity utilization of BRT and sensitivity on ridership forecast changes to be provided for him.
- **M. Green** asked if everyone wanted to continue to consider BRT. Everyone agreed.
- **Y. Kishimoto** asked if the VTA Board would release the \$1.75 million funding now that it had been decided to keep the BRT as a phasing option. MTC funding was dependent on the three agencies, ACTIA, SMCTA, and VTA approving their allocations and VTA was the only one left to approve their full allocation.
- **K. Connolly** replied in B. Kerr's absence. He stated that B. Kerr will need the PAC's input for the June Board meeting. **D. Casas** stated that the conditioned allocation can also be modified by the full VTA Board. **M. Green** stated that hopefully VTA will come forward to commit to full funding and allow MTC to act on the pending RM2 funding request.
- **Y. Kishimoto** asked if they could run rail on the tracks in 2012, but use a RM2 funding to run an expanded DB Express for backup until then.
- **B. Wasserman** states that the problem is that they are going to proceed with three options when there is only enough funding constructing one option.
- **D. Casas** stated that B. Kerr would be coming off the VTA Board in January and Los Alto and Palo Alto were coming on. He asked to keep the project on track and stop delaying.
- **H. Robinson** stated that he strongly objected to take Option 3 off the table. The data did not adequately make this decision clear. He was not trying to delay or derail the project, but he does not have the information to make the best decision in how to spend the taxpayers' money.
- **S. Lempert** stated that she believed that B. Kerr put the restriction on the funding out of frustration to make something happen. She supported BRT because she thought it was important to Santa Clara County but it doesn't seem like it is anymore.
- **B. Wasserman** stated that they should only study Option 1 and Option3.
- **D. Howard** makes a motion to keep all three phasing options to be carried into the environmental document, that the enhanced Bus Alternative incorporate data from the BRT, that D. Casas receive capacity evaluation and sensitivity analysis on ridership forecast, that H. Robinson receive his meetings with staff on the detail review of ridership modeling and results, and that a RM2 funding split between Segment A-C and Segment G be proposed in the next meeting per M. Green's request. D. Rutherford seconds the motion.
- **M. Green** asks for a vote on the motion. The motion passes 8:1. The vote is as follows:

Committee Member	Vote
A. Apodaca	Yes
D. Casas	Yes
M. Green	Yes
D. Howard	Yes
Y. Kishimoto	Yes
S. Lempert	Yes
H. Robinson	Yes
D. Rutherford	Yes
B. Wasserman	No

8. Correspondence

- The correspondence was received too late to be part of the agenda package and copies were passed out as a supplement before the meeting. Some correspondences were submitted during the meeting. These correspondences will be incorporated as an attachment to this meeting minute.

9. Requests from Members

- As previously stated, **H. Goode** will provide D. Casas ridership model sensitivity and capacity information, he will attend a Menlo Park City Council meeting to present an overview and status of the project and arrange for H. Robinson to meet with the modelers to understand the assumptions. He will also provide a RM2 funding split recommendation between Segments A-C and Segment G per request from M. Green in the next meeting.

10. Time and Date for Next Meeting

- The next meeting will be on June 19, 2007 on the West side of the Bay.

11. Adjourn

Attachments: Sign-In Sheet, DRC PAC Presentations, Correspondences Received