

<i>Meeting:</i>		<i>Date:</i>
<b>DRC Policy Committee</b>		<b>July 26, 2005</b>
<i>Location:</i>		<i>Time:</i>
<b>City of Union City 34009 Alvarado-Niles Rd. Union City, CA</b>		Meeting Start: <b>2:00PM</b> Meeting Adjourn: <b>3:45PM</b>
<i>Minutes Prepared By:</i>	<i>Issue Date:</i>	<i>File Code:</i>
<b>Camille Tsao</b>		

<b>Attendees (sign-in sheet attached)</b>	
<p><b><u>Policy Committee Members</u></b></p> <p>Board Member Tom Blalock, Capitol Corridor JPA                  Mayor Dean Chu, City of Sunnyvale                  Mayor Mark Green, City of Union City, (Vice-Chair)                  Supervisor Scott Haggerty, Alameda County                  Councilmember Jim Hartnett, City of Redwood City (Chair)                  Board Member Breene Kerr, Santa Clara Valley TA                  Councilmember Sue Lempert, City of San Mateo                  Board Member John McLemore, Santa Clara Valley TA                  Councilmember Alan Nagy, City of Newark                  Mayor Bob Wasserman, Fremont                  Mayor Pro Tem Mickie Winkler, City of Menlo Park</p> <p><b><u>Program Management Team</u></b></p> <p>Marisa Espinosa, SMCTA                  Howard Goode, SMCTA                  Joe Hurley, SMCTA                  Darrell Maxey, SMCTA                  Marie Pang, SMCTA                  Beth Thomas, SMCTA                  Peter Gertler, HNTB                  Ron Holmes, HNTB                  Camille Tsao, HNTB</p>	<p><b><u>Others</u></b></p> <p>Dennis Fay, ACCMA                  Dianne Stark, ACCMA                  Art Dao, ACTIA                  Rebecca Kohlstrand, ACTIA                  Christine Mosen, ACTIA                  Malcom Quint, BART                  Brian Stanke, BayRail Alliance                  Anthony Lee, Caltrans                  David Kutrosky, CCJPA                  Karl Schaarschmidt, Earthtech                  Jim Pierson, City of Fremont                  Marc Roddin, MTC                  Peggy Claassen, City of Newark                  Dennis Jones, City of Newark                  Marilou Ayupan, City of Union City                  Larry Cheeves, City of Union City                  Mintze Cheng, City of Union City                  Mark Leonard, City of Union City                  Joan Malloy, City of Union City                  Kat Mereigh, VTA                  Larry Calhoun                  Jim Calhoun                  Bill Marshak                  Kenneth Ryan</p>

1.	<b>Call to Order</b>
2.	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>
3.	<b>Roll Call</b>
4.	<b>Chairperson's Comments</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>S. Lempert</b> and <b>J. McLemore</b> received an email from a Union City resident stating concerns that ROW acquisition for the Union City Intermodal Station project may be held up by the MTC TOD Policy.</li> <li>• <b>M. Roddin</b> stated that the concerns in the email are premature such as delay of acquisition of ROW. Funding for construction affects the project, not ROW. 2007 numbers may add up to the MTC TOD threshold. The Planning Commission is to review the TOD policy at the end of 2006.</li> <li>• <b>J. McLemore</b> stated that MTC is doing everything possible to support Union City in its TOD efforts, and complimented Union City for its progress so far.</li> </ul>
5.	<b>Public Comment</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No public comment</li> </ul>
6.	<b>Consent Calendar</b>
6.A	<b>Proposed Action:</b> <i>Approve minutes of last meeting</i> Minutes <b>approved</b> , with one abstention
7.	<b>Information Items</b>
7A.	<p><b>Union City Intermodal Station Environmental Study</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>H. Goode</b> reported that Union City is nearing the end of the Environmental process. Staff has met with Union City to discuss comments related to DRC and anticipated responses.</li> <li>• <b>H. Goode</b> clarified that Union City requested that a separate environmental document be prepared for Segment G of the DRC project (which includes the Union City Intermodal project) to take advantage of the opportunity to implement that segment earlier.</li> <li>• <b>J. Malloy</b> added that the 45-day review period closed on June 9. Staff is responding to comments. The Administrative Draft should be ready in early September.</li> <li>• <b>H. Goode</b> noted a correction to the staff report: Construction of the Union City Intermodal project begins in summer 2007.</li> </ul>
7B.	<p><b>MTC Transit-Oriented Development Policy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>H. Goode</b> reported that MTC's TOD policy is to be adopted at tomorrow's MTC commission meeting. DRC based on existing plans/zoning is slightly below the TOD threshold of 2,200 housing units within ½ mile of stations. Additional housing units could come out of the Menlo Park station area plan and Menlo Park is expecting station area planning funds from MTC.</li> <li>• <b>M. Green</b> expressed displeasure with the pending vote at MTC and feels that both housing and jobs should be included in the TOD policy. He hopes the Policy</li> </ul>

	<p>Committee will join and ask S. Lempert to persuade the commission to reconsider.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>M. Winkler</b> questioned whether the policy contradicts increasing ridership.</li> <li>• <b>S. Lempert</b> stated that it would help if East Bay representatives could come to the meeting tomorrow. MTC is still committed to transit, while the threshold has swung to housing only, many station areas along the DRC may be inappropriate for housing because of industrial uses and presence of toxic waste.</li> <li>• <b>J. McLemore</b> agreed with Lempert and Green. A shift of issues has forced a lot of compromises at the committee level. In the end, the policy should be a compromise of the two (housing and jobs). VTA submitted comments to MTC on the TOD policy.</li> </ul>
7C.	<p><b>Schedule Update</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request made for larger type in the future (DRC quarterly report)</li> <li>• <b>H. Goode</b> noted potential scope issues because of continuing dialogue with UPRR to determine the specific track configurations that are acceptable to the UPRR. Overall schedule includes the Union City portion of project.</li> </ul>
7D.	<p><b>Budget Status</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cumulative expenditure doesn't show up in this quarterly report. Quarterly updates will be provided in the future.</li> </ul>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Regular Agenda</b>
8A.	<p><b>Governance Recommendation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>H. Goode</b> reported that at the last Policy meeting, Art Dao presented principles developed by Alameda County agencies. Concerns from Policy Committee members, especially VTA, resulted in two action items: (1) Follow-up with concerns regarding how representatives would be selected; and (2) have the Executive Directors of the funding partners review the governance proposal. Since then, a series of meetings has taken place. These meetings resulted in a revised approach (thanks especially to the efforts of Dennis Fay, Art Dao, Jim Pearson, and Frank Sharpless). Instead of creating a new transit agency for DRC, the current policy body would continue to provide oversight, and a long-term arrangement would be held in abeyance until recommendations from Regional Rail Plan are developed. This is feasible with the schedule which shows construction beginning 2007. Caltrain/JPB asked to act as lead agency for the environmental study and during design/construction.</li> <li>• <b>C. Monsen</b> added that it was never the intention to abolish the policy body, but rather to establish a process for Alameda County to stay involved if JPB is to be the lead agency for operations. Alameda County supports what is proposed here today.</li> <li>• <b>M. Green</b> agreed with the preference not to create another agency. He asked if JPB has the staff to accommodate the extra workload. What will the roles be of the cities, ACCMA, and ACTIA? <b>H. Goode</b> confirmed that JPB has adequate staff. There will be an opportunity for the city of Union City and BART staff to have a role in the implementation of the Union City segment. The Policy Committee represents the funding agencies and will continue to have oversight of the DRC project. J. Hartnett could comment, being a board member of JPB. <b>J. Hartnett</b> agreed that policies concerning DRC would come from this body, and implemented by JPB staff.</li> <li>• <b>B. Kerr</b> asked if the Policy Committee would approve the EIR and design? <b>H.</b></li> </ul>

	<p><b>Goode</b> responded that the Policy Committee will still have strategic oversight and will be involved with DRC at a more detailed level than the JPB (Board).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Governance Recommendation <b>approved</b> as proposed.</li> </ul>
8B.	<p><b>Phase I Environmental Evaluation Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>P. Gertler</b> presented a summary of the Travel Demand, Development of the Rail and Bus Alternatives, and Purpose and Need. He also presented the assumptions made about vehicle technology, at-grade crossings, and double-tracking across the Bay – issues that were raised at the last Policy Committee meeting. Some policy Committee members expressed concern about not including any grade separations or other improvements by 2010 for the start-up of DRC service.</li> <li>• <b>M. Green</b> pointed out that the project is funded at \$300 million. The Committee needs to keep this in mind as it considers adding costs to the project.</li> <li>• <b>S. Lempert</b> suggested that the Policy Committee approve the Purpose and Need. The Alternatives Development would be approved with attention paid to grade separation and technology issues. (1) Facts and data are needed regarding at-grade crossings to determine whether they should be separated. The EIR must do a good job of examining impacts. (2) The DRC team needs to coordinate with the 2020 Committee on the Peninsula and their detailed traffic impacts. (3) J. McLemore and S. Lempert should talk to MTC and see what other potential sources of funding might be available (beyond RM2). Additional toll revenues from bridges will probably not be available. The project needs to move forward, as other corridors are looking for money as well. DRC is unique in that it already has funding – we don't want to lose this advantage.</li> <li>• <b>J. McLemore</b> agreed with S. Lempert and M. Green. In the past additional monies have been found through MTC. If UPRR is demanding extra improvements, perhaps Willow Road and Fremont Blvd can be grade separated. Expressed concern that improvements in the 2030 scenario will be put on the “back burner.”</li> <li>• <b>B. Kerr</b> concurred with the report that hybrid vehicles should not be included due to the issues identified and that double-tracking is a difficult case to make given the results of the reverse commute travel demand analysis. However, DRC should assume a couple of high-priority grade separations in 2010. VTA is adding money to bridge tolls.</li> <li>• <b>B. Wasserman</b> stated that the EIR should address relative benefits and impacts of the DRC project and answer the question: Will DRC delay thousands of commuters (in cars) to accommodate hundreds of commuters (in trains)?</li> <li>• <b>H. Goode</b> commented that based on today's discussion, the Policy Committee clearly understands the dilemmas and tradeoffs involved with this project. We will assess impact of gate downtimes, and grade separations will only be triggered by severe traffic impacts. We will see where the impacts are and then consider including those severe ones in the project even if they increase capital costs beyond the \$300 million budget.</li> <li>• <b>A. Nagy</b> expressed concerns about elevating tracks near residences at the proposed Newark flyover (rail-over-rail grade separation in Rail Alternative 3).</li> <li>• <b>T. Blalock</b> requested an estimate of capital costs for the rail-over-rail grade separation to compare with the rail-over-road grade separation.</li> <li>• <b>M. Winkler</b> asked if there are opportunities for passing tracks, if not double-tracking? <b>H. Goode</b> responded that passing tracks are included in the project, just not across the Bay.</li> <li>• <b>M. Green</b> asked for confirmation on the request to develop a priority list of grade</li> </ul>

	<p>crossings. <b>S. Lempert</b> requested that the Committee’s concerns about grade separations be considered. <b>J. Hartnett</b> suggested striking the language “assume no grade separations in 2010” and replacing it with “there will be a determination whether there should be grade separation”. If there is no funding within the \$300 million budget for such grade separations, there will be a foundation for advocating for such funds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose and Need, and Alternatives Development <b>approved</b> with the identification of 2-3 critical grade crossings for grade separation consideration.</li> </ul>
<b>9.</b>	<b>Other Business</b>
	No other business.
<b>10.</b>	<b>Date/Time of Next Meeting</b>
	<p><b>Next Meeting:</b> November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2:00 PM, City of Union City Council Chambers                  Meeting was Adjourned by <b>J. Hartnett</b> at 3:45 PM</p>

Attachments: Sign-In Sheet