

<i>Meeting:</i>		<i>Date:</i>
DRC Policy Committee		November 15, 2005
<i>Location:</i>		<i>Time:</i>
City of Union City 34009 Alvarado-Niles Road Union City, CA		Meeting Start: 2:00 PM Meeting Adjourn: 3:30 PM
<i>Minutes Prepared By:</i>	<i>Issue Date:</i>	<i>File Code:</i>
Michele DiFrancia		

Attendees (sign-in sheet attached)	
<p><u>Policy Committee Members</u> Board Member Tom Blalock, Capitol Corridor JPA 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 Mayor Bob Wasserman, Fremont Mayor Pro Tem Mickie Winkler, City of Menlo Park</p> <p><u>Program Management Team</u> Howard Goode, SMCTA Joe Hurley, SMCTA Joseph Metzler, JPB Paul Mosier, JPB Marie Pang, SMCTA Beth Thomas, SMCTA Peter Gertler, HNTB Ron Holmes, HNTB Michele DiFrancia, HNTB Richard Page, HNTB</p>	<p><u>Others</u> Dianne Stark, ACCMA Art Dao, ACTIA Rebecca Kohlstrand, ACTIA Nathan Landou, AC Transit Malcom Quint, BART Anthony Lee, Caltrans Richard Napier, C/CAG David Kutrosky, CCJPA Jim Pierson, City of Fremont Chip Taylor, City of Menlo Park Marc Roddin, MTC Li Zhang, MTC Peggy Claassen, City of Newark Dennis Jones, City of Newark Dominic Spaethling, PB 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 Kevin Connolly, VTA Steve Fisher, VTA Scott Haywood, VTA George Adas Dawn Argula Doug Avery Jim Bigelow Larry Calhoun Jim Calhoun Chris DeBenedeth Bill Marshak Susan Robinson Kenneth Ryan 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"> Comments were made on the importance of Transit Oriented Development.
5.	Public Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public comment on page 50 of the Tech Memo 3.0; there are 3-5 freight trains weekly at Marsh Road.
6.	Consent Calendar
6.A	Proposed Action: <i>Approve minutes of last meeting</i> Minutes approved
7.	Information Items
7A.	Schedule Status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> H. Goode reported that the Phase 1 Study is in the final stretch. The study should be finished by the end of the year.
7B.	Budget Status <ul style="list-style-type: none"> H. Goode reported that the Phase 1 Study is approximately 15% under budget.
7C.	Union City Intermodal EIR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> H. Goode reported that the Union City Intermodal Station Draft EIR is out for the 45-day public comment period, which will close December 8, 2006. The Union City City Council plans to certify the EIR in February 2006.
7D.	MTC Transit-Oriented Development Policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> H. Goode reported that staff is working to analyze and refine the estimate for the DRC project to determine whether it meets the MTC criteria. This analysis should be available in about a month. ABAG staff has been helpful.
7E.	STIP Funding Application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> H. Goode stated that a joint STIP application (with the CCJPA) for \$39 million to cover the funding gap in the \$306 million project cost estimate was submitted to the CTC. A copy of the application was included in the DRC Policy Committee package.
8.	Regular Agenda
8A.	Phase II Environmental Evaluation Assumptions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Rail Alternative ii. Bus Alternative iii. Grade Separations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A presentation of the DRC Phase 1 Technical Memorandum 3.0: Alternatives Analysis was given by the consultant team. B. Wasserman reported that the City of Fremont submitted a letter requesting that Alternative A be brought forward to Phase II for analysis in environmental document. T. Blaylock stated that the team needs to consider safety and cost impacts of train crossings along corridor in prioritizing grade separations.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M. Winkler expressed support of Blaylock’s comments, and noted that Willow Road and Marsh Road have the greatest vehicular volumes, but do not rank as high as many East Bay crossings. Comments were also made regarding the consideration of the costs/impacts of key West Bay grade crossings in the Phase II Study. • B. Wasserman questioned whether or not DRC service would impact ACE schedules, and the response was that DRC trains would not cause other train delays. • S. Lempert raised the issue of the new, increased cost estimate for Alternative B (PSR alternative); the response was that there are contingencies in the estimate to help cover these additional identified costs. • B. Kerr questioned the bus alternative not being comparable to DRC train service going to Santa Clara County. Also raised the issues of grade crossing/traffic impacts at Willow Road, Marsh Road, and University Avenue that will be further studied in the Phase II Study. It was noted that the \$306 million cost estimate does not include grade separations. Lastly, the issue of new train technologies was raised as a possible item to be studied in the next phase. • S. Hagerty seriously questioned the continuation of Dumbarton Express bus service along with DRC service; good feeder bus service was suggested as an alternative. Kerr, Winkler and Wasserman also discussed the issue, and the general consensus was that these issues --- continuation of Dumbarton Express and future feeder bus service -- need to be furthered studied. It was also suggested that a discussion with the Dumbarton Express consortium (BART, AC Transit, SamTrans) take place. • T. Blaylock raised the funding gap issue; the response was that up to \$39 million was included in the STIP application. • T. Blaylock raised the issue taking DRC trains into San Francisco being cost effective/duplicative service; the response was that this option was previous alternatives studies ended at Millbrae, but that there were minimal O&M cost impacts.
9.	Other Business
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All members voted in favor of both Alternative A and Alternative B being carried forward into the Phase II Study.
10.	Date/Time of Next Meeting
	<p>Next Meeting: To be determined – February 2006 Meeting was Adjourned at 3:30 PM</p>

Attachments: Sign-In Sheet