

<i>Meeting:</i>		<i>Date:</i>
<b>DRC Policy Advisory Committee</b>		<b>April 29, 2004</b>
<i>Location:</i>		<i>Time:</i>
<b>City of Union City 34009 Alvarado-Niles Rd., Union City</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>Peter Gertler/ Dominic Spaethling</b>		

**Attendees (sign-in sheet attached)**

<p><b><u>Policy Committee Members</u></b></p> <p>Board Member Tom Blalock, Capitol Corridor JPA                  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 Alan Nagy, City of Newark                  Duane Bay (Substitute for Mayor Donna Rutherford City of East Palo Alto)                  Laura Stuchinsky, Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group                  Mayor Pro Tem Mickie Winkler, City of Menlo Park</p> <p><b><u>Program Management Team</u></b></p> <p>Howard Goode, SMCTA                  Darrell Maxey, SMCTA                  Joe Hurley, SMCTA                  Peter Gertler, PB/SMCTA                  Dominic Spaethling, PB/SMCTA                  Tim Cobb, HNTB/SMCTA</p>	<p><b><u>Others</u></b></p> <p>Jim Reese, City of Newark                  Rebecca Kohlstrand, ACTIA                  Joan Malloy, Union City                  Jim Pierson, City of Fremont                  Art Dao, ACTIA                  Brian Schmitt, ACE                  Frank Sharpless, VTA                  Mark Evanoff, Union City                  Dennis Jones, City of Newark                  Alix Bockelman, MTC                  Jim Allison, CCJPA                  Peggy Claassen, Newark                  Gene Skoropowski, CCJPA                  Bill Marshak, Tri-city Voice                  Kent Steffens, Menlo Park                  Christine Monsen, ACTIA                  Dawn Argula, Alameda County</p>
--	---

Presenter/Discussion	Action/Actionee		
1.	<b>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS</b>		
2.	<b>ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR (Action)</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>H. Goode</b> suggested moving the Board Action to elect a Chair and Vice Chair (Agenda Item 3.B) as the next agenda item.</li> <li>• <b>Policy Committee</b> agreed</li> <li>• <b>M. Green</b> nominated Jim Hartnett to be Chair of the Policy Committee. Vote by the Committee was unanimous for Jim Hartnett as Chair of the Policy Committee.</li> <li>• <b>A. Nagy</b> nominated Mark Green to be Vice Chair of the Policy Committee. Vote by the Committee was unanimous for Mark Green as Vice Chair of the Policy Committee.</li> <li>• <b>B. Kerr</b> asked if there is going to be a project director. <b>H. Goode</b> answered that that has yet to be decided and will be one of the issues that the PAC will help to decide</li> </ul>		
2.	<b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b>		
	No Public Comment		
3.	<b>GOVERNANCE (Information and Action)</b>		
3.A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>H. Goode</b> Reviewed the organization of the DRC project team and the current structure of the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees.</li> <li>• <b>H Goode</b> introduced the mission statement for the DRC Policy Committee.</li> <li>• <b>J. Hartnett</b> commented that before they adopt a policy statement for the DRC project that they should understand the project better.</li> </ul>		
3.B	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 35%; padding: 5px;"> <u>Action</u>            The PC was requested to take the following actions:           <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elect a Chair</li> <li>2. Elect a Vice-Chair</li> <li>3. Approve Mission Statement and responsibilities</li> </ol> </td> <td style="padding: 5px;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agenda item was moved to Item 2.</li> <li>• <b>J. Hartnett</b> recommended and Policy Committee agreed that adoption of Mission Statement be postponed till next meeting and after Committee becomes more familiar with Project.</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </table>	<u>Action</u> The PC was requested to take the following actions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elect a Chair</li> <li>2. Elect a Vice-Chair</li> <li>3. Approve Mission Statement and responsibilities</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agenda item was moved to Item 2.</li> <li>• <b>J. Hartnett</b> recommended and Policy Committee agreed that adoption of Mission Statement be postponed till next meeting and after Committee becomes more familiar with Project.</li> </ul>
<u>Action</u> The PC was requested to take the following actions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elect a Chair</li> <li>2. Elect a Vice-Chair</li> <li>3. Approve Mission Statement and responsibilities</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agenda item was moved to Item 2.</li> <li>• <b>J. Hartnett</b> recommended and Policy Committee agreed that adoption of Mission Statement be postponed till next meeting and after Committee becomes more familiar with Project.</li> </ul>		
4.	<b>PROJECT OVERVIEW AND SUMMARY (Information)</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>P. Gertler</b> gave the project overview</li> <li>• <b>M. Green</b> asked for a prioritization of the three major East Bay projects in level of complexity and cost. <b>D. Maxey</b> replied that the Industrial Connection project is the least complicated, while the Shinn Connection would rank second due to the right of way required and the Niles Bridge is the most complicated due to the need for a new bridge.</li> <li>• <b>T. Blalock</b> commented that the ROW acquisition would be a contested issue for the Shinn project.</li> <li>• <b>B. Kerr</b> asked for a description of the service. <b>P. Gertler</b> answered that there would be 12 total trips, 6 in the morning from the Union City to San Jose and San Francisco (3 to each destination) and 6 in the afternoon, 3 from San Francisco and 3 from San Jose to Union City.</li> <li>• <b>B. Kerr</b> asked if there will be improvements on the East Bay that would immediately benefit the existing Capitol Corridor service. <b>P. Gertler and G. Skoropowski</b> answered that the service would benefit from the new connection at Union City and from the Shinn connection, which will reduce travel time and delay.</li> <li>• <b>S. Haggerty</b> expressed concern about existing parking shortfalls at the Fremont Centerville</li> </ul>		

	<p>station and asked if new parking solutions were planned for the Station. <b>P. Gertler</b> answered that an additional 80 parking places is planned along the ROW.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A. Nagy</b> asked what year the cost estimates are in. <b>P. Gertler</b> answered that they are in 2004 dollars.</li> <li>• <b>B. Kerr</b> asked where electrification fits into the proposed DRC system. <b>H. Goode</b> answered that at this time the DRC service is planning on using diesel locomotives, however if electrification did become a reality on the Caltrain system there are several options for the DRC corridor, including: DRC diesel trains could operate on an electrified corridor; Dual mode locomotives (diesel and electric powered locomotives) could be used; and Electrifying the DRC corridor could be investigated. <b>G. Skoropowski</b> added that dual mode locomotives have been in revenue service since the 1940s and are currently in use in the New York Metro area.</li> <li>• <b>S. Haggerty</b> asked if the current capital funding plan include the upcoming Measure A funds from San Mateo County. <b>H. Goode</b> answered that it did not, and would not be able to fill the \$9.8 million gap currently forecast.</li> <li>• <b>T Blalock</b> asked how people would get to the Raycon (currently Tyco campus) center. <b>P. Gertler</b> there is plan for employer provided shuttles from the Willow Rd. Station.</li> <li>• <b>M. Winkler</b> asked about the location of the Willow Rd. Station in Menlo Park and if it could be moved to the other side of the tracks (from the Hamilton Avenue side to the Bay Front Expressway side. <b>P. Gertler</b> answered that the current location is the most optimal location given the site constraints and that the team has and will continue to work with the City to identify the optimal location. <b>B. Kerr</b> commented that given the congestion in that area, the shuttles could have difficulty getting to their destinations in a timely manner.</li> <li>• <b>J. Hartnett</b> asked how the project got to where it is today. <b>H. Goode</b> answered that ACTIA, SVMA, SMCTA and VTA all contributed \$200,000 each (\$800,000 total) to get the project study report to where it is today.</li> <li>• <b>M. Green</b> asked how the DRC's fare box recovery compared to other transit systems. <b>G. Skoropowski</b> answered that on the Capitol Corridor that they started at a 29% cost recovery 5 years ago and that today it is approximately 40% and that they have set a goal of 50% for the near future.</li> <li>• <b>M. Winkler</b> asked when and how will service be expanded? How constrained are the RM-2 funds? <b>P. Gertler</b> answered that for the purposes of the PSR expanded operations were not considered, however, the opportunity for additional service is not precluded and will be considered in future studies. <b>H. Goode</b> answered that the RM-2 funding is limited in that it was granted for the project described in the PSR.</li> <li>• <b>A. Nagy</b> asked if we had legal resources at our disposal. <b>H. Goode</b> answered that they did have SMCTA legal staff at their disposal.</li> </ul>
5.	<b>REGIONAL MEASURE 2 UPDATE (Information)</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A. Bockelman, MTC</b> gave an update on the RM-2 funding situation. MTC believes that they will have approximately \$125 million a year to allocate to the approved RM-2 projects. There are some issues regarding the use of toll funds for transit operating subsidies.</li> <li>• <b>M. Green</b> commented that given the flexibility of the funds for the DRC project, the availability of the RM-2 funds for operating subsidy should not be an issue.</li> </ul>
6.	<b>INITIAL PROJECT REPORT, RM 2 SUBMITTAL (Information and Action)</b>
6.A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>H. Goode and P. Gertler</b> presented the Initial Project Report (IPR) that will be submitted to MTC for funding in FY 2004-2005 and the proposed action for the PAC.</li> <li>• <b>M. Green</b> asked when their respective boards need to approve this funding plan. <b>H. Goode</b> suggested that this should be approved by June, so that the funding can be secured for further environmental and Right of Way work.</li> <li>• <b>J. Hartnett</b> asked if their staffs had been able to review the IPR before its submission. <b>H.</b></li> </ul>

	<p><b>Goode</b> replied that the IPR had been sent to the agencies on Wednesday, April 28, 2004 for review by staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>B. Kerr</b> asked what the DRC staff is requesting from the Policy Committee. <b>H. Goode</b> answered that they are looking for their approval to submit the IPR to MTC for their review.</li> </ul>	
6.B	<p><u>Action</u> The PC was requested to approve the RM 2 application</p>	<p><b>S. Haggerty</b> made a motion and <b>M. Green</b> seconded to approve the staff recommendation to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approve IPR RM2 application submittal to MTC and</li> <li>2. Refer the specific funding allocation approval to each of the respective funding agencies (ACTIA, ACCMA, CCJPA, SMCTA and VTA).</li> </ol> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p>
7.	<b>NEXT STEPS and FUTURE MEETINGS (Information)</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>H. Goode</b> presented the various sub-committees for the Technical Advisory Committee and future meeting plan for the PC.</li> <li>• <b>M. Winkler</b> asked if the environmental studies will involve both sides of the Bay and can other interested parties get involved? <b>H. Goode</b> answered that the environmental and all subcommittees are open to all interested parties.</li> <li>• <b>J. Hartnett</b> asked if the environmental sub-committee will meet before the next policy committee meeting and if yes, could they have a report on the progress? <b>H. Goode</b> replied that there will be an environmental sub-committee meeting and they will respond to the questions</li> <li>• <b>M. Green</b> suggested that staff review the future meeting schedule and take into consideration current conflicts with the dates identified and that future meeting dates will have to be scheduled at the next meeting.</li> <li>• <b>Policy Committee</b> agreed to the proposed meeting plan and agreed that staff would review the proposed dates and consider known conflicts</li> <li>• <b>L. Stuchinsky</b> moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 3:45 PM.</li> </ul>	
8.	<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	
	<p><b>L. Stuchinsky</b> moved and <b>R. Nagy</b> seconded to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 3:45 PM.</p>	

Attachments: Sign-In Sheet