

| | | |
|--|--------------------|--|
| <i>Meeting:</i> | | <i>Date:</i> |
| DRC Policy Advisory Committee | | July 20, 2004 |
| <i>Location:</i> | | <i>Time:</i> |
| City of Union City 34009 Alvarado-Niles Rd., Union City | | Meeting Start: 2:00PM Meeting Adjourn: 3:55PM |
| <i>Minutes Prepared By:</i> | <i>Issue Date:</i> | <i>File Code:</i> |
| Peter Gertler/ Dominic Spaethling | 8/6/04 | |

Attendees (sign-in sheet attached)

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><u>Policy Committee Members</u></p> <p>Board Member Tom Blalock, Capitol Corridor JPA Mayor Mark Green, City of Union City, (Vice-Chair) Councilmember Jim Hartnett, City of Redwood City (Chair) Board Member Breene Kerr, Santa Clara Valley TA John McLemore, Santa Clara Valley TA Councilmember Alan Nagy, City of Newark Donna Rutherford, City of East Palo Alto Mayor Pro Tem Mickie Winkler, City of Menlo Park</p> <p><u>Program Management Team</u></p> <p>Howard Goode, SMCTA Peter Gertler, PB/SMCTA Joe Hurley, SMCTA Darrell Maxey, SMCTA Marie Pang, SMCTA Dominic Spaethling, PB/SMCTA</p> | <p><u>Others</u></p> <p>Dawn Argula, Alameda County Marilou Ayupan, Union City Joanne Benjamin, VTA Alix Bockelman, MTC Larry Cheeves, Union City Art Dao, ACTIA Dennis Jones, City of Newark David Kutsoky, CCJPA Anthony Lee, Caltrans Mark Leonard, Union City Joan Malloy, Union City Bill Marshak, Tri-city Voice Jim Pierson, City of Fremont Kenneth Ryan, Sierra Club Frank Sharpless, VTA Kent Steffens, Menlo Park</p> |
|--|--|

| Presenter/Discussion | Action/Actionee | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| 1. | Minutes (Action) | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A. Nagy moved to approve the minutes M. Green seconded. Minutes approved unanimously | | |
| 2. | Public Comment | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No public comment | | |
| 3. | Old Business: Policy Committee Mission Statement (Action) | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J. Harnett asked that this agenda item be addressed at a later session. | | |
| 4. | Project Implementation (Information and Action) | | |
| 4A | <p>Process Overview (Information)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H. Goode gave an overview of the of the DRC project • J. McLemore asked if the RM-2 funds can be used to speed the development of the Union City Intermodal project. H. Goode replied that staff has met with MTC staff and it looks like it can be done. J. McLemore commented that the early funding and completion of the UCI project would be an “early win” for MTC and RM-2. • B. Kerr asked if there would be a breakdown of the expenditures for the DRC project. H. Goode responded that item 4c on the agenda would have a more detailed schedule. • M Green. asked why the current RM-2 funding plan has moved the completion date from 2010 to 2012. P. Gertler responded that the project schedule is a result of the funding commitments of the agencies. B. Kerr commented that we should not push out the project completion date because of the perceived funding availability. It is the Policy committee’s responsibility to push the Policy Committee’s respective boards to progress the DRC funding plans. • T. Blalock commented that in spite of the extended timeline, there will be improved Capitol Corridor service as a result of the completion of the Union City Intermodal project. | | |
| 4.B | <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="256 1062 592 1896"> <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) document for the full DRC Project 2. Support funding through RM 2 funding, the incremental costs of modifying the on-going Union City Intermodal (UCI) Project EIR to include DRC specific related improvements located within the UCI project limits. </td> <td data-bbox="592 1062 1542 1896"> <p>Decision One: Environmental Documentation (Action)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H. Goode gave an overview of the process • P. Gertler noted that the recommended actions were consistent with the TAC’s findings. • M. Winkler asked if legal council had reviewed the recommended action. P. Gertler replied that it had not, but this recommendation was vetted by several environmental experts and managers at SMCTA and other agencies. • M. Green asked how much would the environmental process cost. P. Gertler responded that it would cost approximately \$5.7 million over the next two years. M. Green added that he supported option 3 (the full EIR/EIS for the DRC) as he wanted to make sure this project was “bullet proof.” • T. Blalock commented that segment D (Union City) with the additional funding could finish their environmental process and move onto the Right of Way acquisition stage. This would help expedite the process. • B. Kerr moved to adopt staff recommendation, J. McLemore seconded. The motion passed unanimously. </td> </tr> </table> | <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) document for the full DRC Project 2. Support funding through RM 2 funding, the incremental costs of modifying the on-going Union City Intermodal (UCI) Project EIR to include DRC specific related improvements located within the UCI project limits. | <p>Decision One: Environmental Documentation (Action)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H. Goode gave an overview of the process • P. Gertler noted that the recommended actions were consistent with the TAC’s findings. • M. Winkler asked if legal council had reviewed the recommended action. P. Gertler replied that it had not, but this recommendation was vetted by several environmental experts and managers at SMCTA and other agencies. • M. Green asked how much would the environmental process cost. P. Gertler responded that it would cost approximately \$5.7 million over the next two years. M. Green added that he supported option 3 (the full EIR/EIS for the DRC) as he wanted to make sure this project was “bullet proof.” • T. Blalock commented that segment D (Union City) with the additional funding could finish their environmental process and move onto the Right of Way acquisition stage. This would help expedite the process. • B. Kerr moved to adopt staff recommendation, J. McLemore seconded. The motion passed unanimously. |
| <p>Action:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) document for the full DRC Project 2. Support funding through RM 2 funding, the incremental costs of modifying the on-going Union City Intermodal (UCI) Project EIR to include DRC specific related improvements located within the UCI project limits. | <p>Decision One: Environmental Documentation (Action)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H. Goode gave an overview of the process • P. Gertler noted that the recommended actions were consistent with the TAC’s findings. • M. Winkler asked if legal council had reviewed the recommended action. P. Gertler replied that it had not, but this recommendation was vetted by several environmental experts and managers at SMCTA and other agencies. • M. Green asked how much would the environmental process cost. P. Gertler responded that it would cost approximately \$5.7 million over the next two years. M. Green added that he supported option 3 (the full EIR/EIS for the DRC) as he wanted to make sure this project was “bullet proof.” • T. Blalock commented that segment D (Union City) with the additional funding could finish their environmental process and move onto the Right of Way acquisition stage. This would help expedite the process. • B. Kerr moved to adopt staff recommendation, J. McLemore seconded. The motion passed unanimously. | | |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 4C | <p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>To approve the attached Initial Project Report (IPR) for Regional Measure (RM) 2 capital funds for submission to the MTC, and the proposed funding plan.</p> | <p>Decision Two: Funding Plan and Regional Measure Two Application (Action)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J. McLemore commented that MTC anticipates \$85 million in toll receipts for the RM-2 program in 2004. The MTC is looking to distribute the first \$40 million of RM-2 funding to eligible projects in August of 2004. • M. Green commented that there had been some shifting of funds from the version that was presented to the Policy Committee in April and asked for an explanation of that shift. P. Gertler replied there were some misallocations, but the current version is correct. • B. Kerr commented that the preliminary costs are based on a 10% level of engineering and are therefore subject to change. He also asked if any grade separations were included in this cost estimate. P. Gertler acknowledged that the cost estimates were preliminary and that currently there were no grade separations in the cost estimate. • B. Kerr commented that the motion should be amended to state that the project should be complete by 2010, not 2012. • J. Hartnett replied that as noble as the goal is, the 2012 schedule is based on a realistic funding scenario. • J. McLemore commented that by lengthening the schedule, the Policy Committee run the risk jeopardizing the project due to regional economic variability. • M. Green stated that the Policy Committee didn't want to have counties coming up short on the funding of projects. Consequently the Policy Committee need to keep pressure on the staff and the funding agencies to keep the DRC project a priority. • B. Kerr asked what would be the impact of moving the start date of service from 2012 to 2010. Would it mean moving a \$9-10 million commitment on the VTA's part up to 2007? • M. Winkler asked if the EIR/EIS would cover grade separations. P. Gertler replied that as part of the scoping process, grade separations could be included. • M. Winkler asked if the project should be held to its forecasted \$300 million price tag. H. Goode replied that the project is already limited to that budget by the identified available funding. • M. Green asked Alix Bockelman what would happen if the project went over its estimated \$300 million cost. A. Bockelman replied that if a project goes over its estimated cost, then the project might be determined to be "undeliverable" by the MTC. The MTC board can then review the project to determine if it is eligible for additional funding. • B. Kerr motioned that the staff recommendation be adopted with the schedule revised to reflect a 2010 initiation of service date instead of 2012. J. McLemore seconded. The motion passed unanimously. |
|----|---|---|

| | | |
|------------|---|---|
| <p>4.D</p> | <p><u>Action:</u></p> <p>1.The Policy Committee continue to provide oversight through the project definition and delivery stages.</p> <p>2.That the Policy Committee designate cooperating agencies to take the lead on project implementation tasks, specifically:</p> <p>2a. The San Mateo County Transportation Authority for the preparation of the Environmental Document for the complete project.</p> <p>2b.The City of Union City for the preparation of the Environmental Document for Segment D.</p> <p>2c. A Task Force composed of staff representatives from the funding agencies (SMCTA, VTA, ACTIA, ACMA and Capital Corridor JPA) initiate discussions with the Union Pacific Railroad for rail rights of way anticipated to be needed for the project.</p> <p>Further, that each lead agency prepare an anticipated schedule for their task and the points in that schedule where Technical and Policy Committee review and approval</p> | <p>Decision Three: Institutional Approach (Action)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J. McLemore asked if this recommended action would extend beyond 2010. H. Goode replied that the funding for the Board runs out in 2010. The institution responsible for the construction and operation of the service will be on board well before 2010. J. McLemore suggested that it would most likely be Caltrain. H. Goode replied that there are several institutional models around the state that could work. It would be premature to assume that there is only one model for this service. • B. Kerr asked if Staff had a recommendation as far as the inclusion of the SVMG on the board. H. Goode replied that the SVMG would probably not have a long term interest in serving on the board. J. McLemore added that at this point the SVMG would be part of the TAC, but not part of the Policy Board. • M. Green offered that the first priority for the project will be getting it constructed. The ACE (Altamont Commuter Express) model is working well and deserves consideration. • J. Hartnett suggested that while the Policy Board does have some time, it would be advantageous to come to a decision regarding the institutional structure before the environmental process is completed. • M. Winkler asked if this (the Policy Committee) would be the body that would determine if a new JPA were needed to build and operate this service. H. Goode replied that it would. • J. McLemore remarked that Caltrain is expanding to Monterey County under contract with the County. The Policy Committee might develop a similar institutional/contractual relationship. • T. Blalock remarked that a staff report on different institutional structures would be useful. H. Goode replied that staff will develop a report for the Policy Committee. • K. Ryan informed the board that MTC will be conducting a study that will examine the coordination of the Bay Area’s regional rail system. Most of the parties interested in regional rail in the Bay Area are represented in this Policy Committee and they should play an active role in this impending study. • M. Green motioned to approve the staff recommendation J. McLemore seconded. The motion passed unanimously. |
|------------|---|---|

| | | |
|-----------|---|--|
| | <p>would take place. The proposed schedule and approval process should be presented to the next meeting of the Policy Committee.</p> <p>3. That the Policy Committee, prior to the completion of the Environmental Document(s) for any and all project segments, determine the entity which will design, construct, operate and own the facilities and equipment needed to implement the project.</p> | |
| 5. | Double Tracking (Information) | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B. Kerr asked if the current plans call for the double tracking of the rail line. H. Goode replied that the current bridge is build for double track but that the ROW from Newark, heading west across the Marsh/Newark Slough area and the track in San Mateo are not double track. • B. Kerr asked if the current engineering plans call for the complete rebuilding the whole bridge as double track. H. Goode answered that most of the wood pilings would need to be replaced, but that some of the concrete pilings might still be usable for double track. • J. McLemore commented that he hoped that in the environmental process that we would examine the possibility of double tracking the entire corridor. He believes that it would be far less costly both financially and environmentally to put the double track into the system today then to wait for some future date. • B. Kerr asked staff to consider a double track system as part of the environmental analysis (EIR/EIS). • T. Blalock asked if the Newark Slough bridge is single track. H. Goode answered yes it is. • J. Hartnett requested staff to investigate what double tracking the system would mean for the project. | |
| 6. | Future Meetings | |
| | <p>The next meeting will be held on October 21st at 1:30 PM at City of Union City Council Chambers.</p> | |
| 7. | Other (No comments) | |
| | <p>T. Blalock commented on agenda item three: the Policy Committee mission statement. He asked to whom is the Policy Committee supposed to give policy oversight and direction? The DRC project staff, the TAC or SMCTA?</p> | |
| 8. | Adjournment | |
| | <p>Meeting was Adjourned by J. Hartnett at 3:55 PM</p> | |

Attachments: Sign-In Sheet

SIGN UP SHEET

SUBJECT: DUMBARTON POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
 DATE: July 20, 2004
 TIME: 2:00 PM
 LOCATION: Union City Council Chambers
 ATTENDEES:

| NAME/ORGANIZATION | PHONE NUMBER | E-MAIL ADDRESS |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Peter Gertler, PB | 415-243-4704 | gertler@pbuworld.com |
| ALAN L NAGY | 510-792-2906 | alan.nagy@strio.com |
| BRENDAN KERN / VTA | (650) 302-9376 | BRENDAN@BKP.COM |
| Jim Hartwitt Rwc | 650 568-2822 | Hartwitt@stts |
| MARK BLOCH | 510-481-3883 | mark1953@att.com |
| Tom Blalock/Cap.Corridor | 510-490-7565 | |
| Mickie Wintler Mp | 650-473-9722 | Mickie650@aol.com |
| JOAN McLEMORE | 408-615-2250 | JLMcLemore@aol.com |
| DARRELL MARE/SMTA | 650-508-7922 | maxjcl@samtrans.com |
| JOSEPH M. HURLEY | (650) 508-7942 | hurleyj@samtrans.com |
| Kent Steffens Menlo Park | 650-330-6781 | Ksteffens@menlopark.org |
| LARRY CHEEVES | 510-675-5344 | LCHEEVES@UNION-CITY.CA.US |
| KENTON RYAN | 510-481-8230 | kyryan@samtrans.com |
| Marie Pang | 650-508-6338 | pangm@samtrans.com |
| Alix Bockelman | 510.464.7850 | abockelman@mtc.ca.gov |
| Jeanne Benjamin | 408-321-5929 | jeanne.benjamin@vta.org |
| David Kutrosky | 510/464-6993 | dkutros@bart.gov |
| FRANK SHARPLESS | 408-321-5516 | FRANK.SHARPLESS@VTA.ORG |
| JIM PIERSON | 510-494-4722 | jpierson@ci.fremont.ca.us |
| ARTHUR DAO DANA ARSILA/HAGBERG | 510 893 3347 510-272-6691 | adao@acta2002.com Continue → |

| <u>Name/organization</u> | <u>phone</u> | <u>email</u> |
|---|----------------|------------------------------|
| Marilyn Ayupan / Union City Public Works | (510) 675-5310 | MAYUPAN@ci.union-city.ca.us |
| Dennis Jones / Newark | (510) 790-7204 | dennis.jones@Newark.org |
| MARK LEONARD / Union City | 510-675-5323 | mleonard@ci.union-city.ca.us |
| Donna Rutherford | 650 327 7926 | 5032451@AOL.com |