

<i>Meeting:</i>		<i>Date:</i>
DRC Policy Committee		June 20, 2006
<i>Location:</i>		<i>Time:</i>
City of Union City 34009 Alvarado-Niles Road Union City, CA		Meeting Start: 2:00 PM Meeting Adjourn: 3:15 PM
<i>Minutes Prepared By:</i>	<i>Issue Date:</i>	<i>File Code:</i>
Michele DiFrancia	6/29/06	

Attendees (sign-in sheet attached)	
<p><u>Policy Committee Members</u> Councilmember Ana Apodaca, City of Newark Board Member Tom Blalock, Capitol Corridor JPA Mayor Dean Chu, City of Sunnyvale Mayor Mark Green, City of Union City (Vice Chair) Councilmember Jim Hartnett, City of Redwood City (Chair) Councilmember Sue Lempert, City of San Mateo Board Member John McLemore, MTC Mayor Bob Wasserman, Fremont Mayor Pro Tem Mickie Winkler, City of Menlo Park</p> <p><u>Program Management Team</u> Howard Goode, SMCTA Steve Minden, SMCTA/JPB Marie Pang, SMCTA/JPB Sylvia Cox, SMCTA/JPB Christine Dunn, SMCTA Joseph Hurley, SMCTA Ezekiel Robles, SMCTA Michele DiFrancia, HNTB Simon Kim, HNTB</p>	<p><u>Others</u> Art Dao, ACTIA Nathan Landou, AC Transit Karla Goodbody, Assem. Alberto Torrico's Office Malcom Quint, BART Anthony Lee, Caltrans Jim Allison, CCJPA Karl Schaarschmidt, EarthTech Chip Taylor, City of Menlo Park Marc Roddin, MTC Dominic Spaethling, PB Mintze Cheng, City of Union City Mark Leonard, City of Union City Joan Malloy, City of Union City Kevin Connolly, VTA Scott Haywood, VTA Jim Lawson, VTA Jim Bigelow Larry Calhoun Jim Calhoun Brett Chamberlain Mark Evanhoff Barry Ferrier Zakhary Mallett Hugh McNamara Tim Pitsker Kenneth Ryan Dick Senn Cathi Sweeney Steve Van Pelt</p>

1.	Call to Order
2.	Welcome and Introductions
3.	Roll Call
4.	Chairperson's Comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair Hartnett will be resigning.
5.	Public Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steve Van Pelt - commented on whether the DRC crosses the Hayward fault, and requested that the EIR/S be made accessible from the MTC website. Dick Senn – from the Menlo Park Suburban Park Homeowners Association; inquired why the TAC is being turned into the Project Development Team with closed meetings. Requested that documents be made publicly available. Brett Chamberlain – Fremont resident; stated opposition to the Shinn Connection and locating of the layover yard in Fremont, and expressed support of the sound wall barrier as mentioned in letter by Jim Pierson, City of Fremont. Zakhery Mallett – Improve existing connections with BART, ACE and CCJPA; explore options to make better connections/extensions with ACE service.
6.	Consent Calendar
6A	Proposed Action: <i>Approve minutes of last meeting</i> Minutes approved
6B	<p>Project Development Team</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Project Development Team is proposed to be formed in support of the upcoming environmental impact work and to replace the TAC. <p>Proposed Action: <i>Approve creation of a Project Development Team</i> Action approved</p>
7.	Information Items
7A	<p>Phase I Final Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> H. Goode reported that the Phase I Final Report has been delivered, which includes a refinement of the project definition that will be carried forward into Phase II. Copies of the Final Report, containing CDs inside with both the report and appendices, were distributed to the Policy Committee. B. Wasserman noted the letter from the City of Fremont, stating opposition to locating the layover yard in the Shinn area.
7B	<p>Union City Intermodal EIR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> H. Goode reported that the Final EIR for the Union City Intermodal Project was certified by the Union City Council in February 2006. The document clears Segment G of the Dumbarton Rail Project except for the layover facility.
7C	<p>Quarterly Status Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> H. Goode reported that the Dumbarton Rail Project Quarterly Status Report, included in Policy Committee package, was sent to the MTC as part of the RM2 requirements. T. Blalock asked about the total project amount being escalated. H. Goode responded that it is escalated to current dollars.

7D	<p>Transportation Infrastructure Bonds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H. Goode reported that there have been project cost increases partially due to inflation alone. The new costs will be made public after the current evaluation of them is completed. There will be a need for additional funding. The funding partners are limited in funding capabilities. The Transportation Infrastructure Bond on the November 2006 ballot offers four categories of potential funding for the Dumbarton Rail Project. • S. Lempert noted that the MTC was successful in getting categories, not projects, on the bond measure. The MTC has provided a good description of the process of getting the categories into the bond measure, as described in the staff report included in the Policy Committee package. • J. McLemore stated that spillover funds due to higher gas prices and Prop 42 funds might be available for the Dumbarton Rail Project. Perhaps staff could take the lead in soliciting the other two counties, in addition to the three partner counties, to contribute project funding (\$2M each from spillover funds). • M. Green stated that the partner counties, including Alameda, San Mateo, Santa Clara, as well as Contra Costa County, need to get organized to be prepared to request funding after the bond measure passes. There needs to be a unified strategy for additional funding for the Dumbarton Rail Project, especially before the next Policy Committee meeting and election. • J. Hartnett expressed that these are good ideas and that there should be sufficient time for staff to work with each of the counties.
8.	<p>Regular Agenda</p>
8A	<p>Project Schedule Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S. Minden presented the Implementation Schedule (also in Policy Committee package). S. Minden is working closely with M. Pang, looking at other environmental documents and processes. S. Minden presented the following schedule highlights: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The EIR/S process should take 2.5 years, with a Record of Decision (ROD) expected by 2009, which is longer than originally anticipated. ○ The consultant team for the EIR/S and scoping process should be selected by the end of summer. ○ In parallel with the environmental process, design (35%) will also occur for Segments A – F. Final design for Segment G is also proposed. ○ By 2009, there will be complete design for bid for Segment G and 35% design and solid cost estimates for Segments A – F. ○ 2009: design/build for Segments A – F, and bid and award for Segment G. ○ 2010-2011: Segment G under construction; Segments A – F will be in detailed design and construction. ○ 2012: Pre-revenue testing for Segment G in first six months; rest of service by late 2012. • M. Winkler asked whether there will be scoping meetings in various communities, to which S. Minden replied that they anticipate intensive public efforts in scoping and reviewing the draft documents. • M. Green asked whether it is possible to compact the schedule to get the consultants on board sooner. S. Minden replied that they are doing their best by using an informal selection process amongst the three JPB GECs. • T. Blalock asked whether a ROD is necessary for the Dumbarton Rail Project. S. Minden responded that the agency made the decision to go for both NEPA and CEQA certification, even though there is no federal funding, due to the permits

	<p>required by federal agencies such as the Corps of Engineers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S. Lempert stated that project readiness is crucial especially if the team is going to pursue additional funding (spillover funds, Infrastructure Bond funds). The process needs to be expedited; timing is of the essence. • J. Hartnett inquired about the replacement of the TAC with the Project Development Team. H. Goode responded that there were members of the public who attended TAC meetings, but as the project moves into the next stage, there will be more formal public meetings through the environmental/scoping process. The technical work of staff, consultants and Project Development Team will be presented regularly to the public through a newly proposed community body. • B. Wasserman stated that this was a good idea. • J. Hartnett similarly stated that these would be good parallel processes. • T. Blalock asked whether ACE would be included in the Project Development Team. H. Goode responded that they were involved in the TAC earlier on, and that they would be added to the recommended list of the Project Development Team. • J. Hartnett stated that ACE should be encouraged to participate. • H. Goode stated that staff would develop a proposal for the community input group and have it ready in time for the next meeting of the Policy Committee. <p>Proposed Action: <i>Approve the Implementation Schedule</i> Action approved</p>
8B	<p>Application for Design Funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H. Goode reported that there are three elements to the design funding request: 1) prepare 35% design for Segments A through F (\$9.8M); 2) proceed with full design for Segment G (\$6.9M); and, 3) final design for the Union City Intermodal Project / BART east side access (\$2.5M). The application to MTC for RM2 funding covers the three elements. The utilization of RM2 funds for the Union City / BART piece will be off set by an increase of an equivalent amount of Alameda CMA funding for the Dumbarton Rail Project. The aggregate amount is \$19M. Each of the three counties would contribute \$2M, and MTC would cover the remainder. • J. McLemore asked when this request/transaction would occur. H. Goode responded that it is on the MTC agenda for September 2006. • M. Green reported that the Alameda CMA did approve the request, and it is an agenda item for their meeting this week. <p>Proposed Action: <i>Approve the Application for Design Funding</i> Action approved</p>
9.	<p>Other Business</p>
9A	<p>Freight Use of Dumbarton Rail (Request of Committee Member Winkler)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M. Winkler reported that the Dumbarton Rail Project should be viewed as a project that benefits both commuter rail as well as freight rail operations, and as such, the role of freight should be more closely analyzed, such as the need for grade separations and the sharing of costs with freight railroads. • H. Goode reported that he reviewed the agreement between the freight railroad and public agency, which provides for Union Pacific (UP) use of the Dumbarton rail bridge with payment of costs. If the bridge is damaged, then the agreement calls for the two parties to negotiate the sharing of reconstruction costs. The UP has not indicated any interest in using the bridge. Staff will send a formal letter to the UP, asking whether they have interest in operating freight on the Dumbarton

	<p>Bridge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M. Winkler asked whether this is consistent with RM2. • J. Hartnett stated that the agreement needs to be respected, and that voters did not vote for freight operations on the bridge. • T. Blalock asked whether freight operations were factored into the original JPB agreement when they purchased the SP line. H. Goode responded “yes”, and that the UP currently has 24 slots that they pay for to operate at night.
10.	Date/Time of Next Meeting
	<p>Next Meeting: October 3, 2006 Special recognition was given to J. Hartnett for his role and commitment as Chair of the Policy Committee. Meeting was Adjourned at 3:15 PM</p>

Attachment: Sign-In Sheet