

<i>Meeting:</i>		<i>Date:</i>
DRC Policy Advisory Committee		March 1, 2005
<i>Location:</i>		<i>Time:</i>
City of Union City 34009 Alvarado-Niles Rd. Union City, CA		Meeting Start: 2:00PM Meeting Adjourn: 4:00PM
<i>Minutes Prepared By:</i>	<i>Issue Date:</i>	<i>File Code:</i>
Camille Tsao	3/29/05	

Attendees (sign-in sheet attached)	
<p><u>Policy Committee Members</u></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 John McLemore, Santa Clara Valley TA Mayor Donna Rutherford, City of East Palo Alto Mayor Bob Wasserman, City of Fremont Mayor Pro Tem Mickie Winkler, City of Menlo Park</p> <p><u>Program Management Team</u></p> <p>Howard Goode, SMCTA Joe Hurley, SMCTA Darrell Maxey, SMCTA Marie Pang, SMCTA Peter Gertler, HNTB Camille Tsao, HNTB</p>	<p><u>Others</u></p> <p>Dianne Stark, ACCMA Art Dao, ACTIA Rebecca Kohlstrand, ACTIA Project Controls Christine Monsen, ACTIA Dawn Argula, Alameda County Nashua Kalil, BART Jim Allison, Capitol Corridor JPA Karl Schaarschmidt, Earthtech Alix Bockelman, MTC Marc Roddin, MTC Peggy Claassen, City of Newark Dennis Jones, City of Newark Jim Bigelow, Redwood City/Menlo Park, San Mateo County Chamber Boris Dramov, ROMA Design Group Bonnie Fisher, ROMA Design Group Marilou Ayupan, Union City Mintze Cheng, Union City Mark Evanoff, Union City Joan Malloy, Union City George Adas, resident Union City/ Palo Alto Vet Kenneth Ryan, unaffiliated</p>

Item No.	Discussion (Presenter)
1.	Call to Order
2.	Introduction of New Members New members to the DRC Policy Committee are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mayor Bob Wasserman, City of Fremont • Mayor Dean Chu, City of Sunnyvale • Councilmember Sue Lempert, City of San Mateo
3.	Roll Call <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David Casas and Alan Nagy, absent
4.	Chairperson's Comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure A sales tax measure in San Mateo County passed by 75% • Caltrain Baby Bullet service has helped to increase Caltrain ridership by 15% • VTA programmed \$44 million to the DRC project despite funding shortfalls
5.	Public Comment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jim Calhoun requested that the EIR include a look at the half-mile segment between Chilco and Willow Road in Menlo Park. The proposed Willow Road station is in the Belle Haven neighborhood, which is in a flood plain. If the Bayfront Expressway is built one foot higher, it could prevent future flooding in the area. • Howard Goode stated that members of the public will have an opportunity to bring up scooping issues at the beginning of the environmental study during the scooping process.
6.	Consent Calendar A. Minutes of Last Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes approved as submitted.
7.	Regular Agenda A. Status of Union City Intermodal DEIS/R Info (Joan Malloy / Boris Dramov) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joan Malloy of Union City introduced Boris Dramov of ROMA Design Group, who gave a presentation on the design concept of the Union City Intermodal station. • In designing the Union City station, the goals of the project team are to maintain flexibility for future growth and find the most cost-effective means for building the station. • B. Dramov clarified that the DRC/Capitol Corridor tracks would be elevated right from the beginning. A full pedestrian concourse would be at grade. • John McLemore complimented the work on the concept plan to-date and the inclusion of transit-oriented development (TOD) • Mark Green stated that a key component to TOD at Union City is housing – over 1000 residential units are planned within a half-mile of the station. About 500 (rental) units are planned just south of the existing parking lot, 600 units are planned for the PG&E site. There will probably be 1200-1300 residential units when the station area is developed. It will be beneficial to have similar residential development/TOD at all DRC stations.

Item No.	Discussion (Presenter)
	<p>B. Scope, Schedule, Budget of DRC Environmental Phase 1 (Peter Gertler)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter Gertler explained that Phase 1 of the Environmental work would consist of preparing the project definition and conducting the alternatives analysis. Phase 1 will take 30 weeks. Evaluation of the alternatives will result in one rail and one bus alternative for further study. • Phase 2 will consist of the technical analyses required for preliminary engineering (30% design). • Outreach activities will include outreach to UPRR, local jurisdictions, counties, and funding agencies. • Sue Lempert asked about the criteria for the bus and rail alternatives. • The rail alternatives will run on the same corridor and have the same stations. The alternatives analysis will include different rail alignment options (number of tracks in specific locations). The bus alternative will include different operational options. • Tom Blalock stated that the Union City environmental study clears CEQA/NEPA for the Union City Intermodal station, Capitol Corridor, and Shinn to Industrial connection (CEQA). • The DRC Environmental analysis will likely be at a higher level with Federal (NEPA) and California (CEQA) clearance. RM2 funding for the project requires federal clearance. • Tom Blalock asked about the Policy Committee's role. • The Policy Committee will be informed about the analyses through regular meetings. The committee will have the opportunity to review three (3) key deliverables. • Mark Green asked how TOD would be accounted for in Phase 1. • Planned TOD at proposed stations will be reflected by ridership projections. Phase 2 will include preliminary engineering and station area concept plans. • Mickie Winkler stated that the City of Fremont expressed concerned about local noise / traffic impacts from the project. San Mateo County communities have similar concerns and would like them addressed in the study. • Mickie Winkler asked why it is assumed that the DRC will use diesel locomotives? • It was assumed that the DRC would use the conventional technology currently being used by other rail operators (Caltrain, Capitol Corridor, ACE). It was concluded that it would be too expensive to use a different technology than the existing Caltrain corridor. • Breene Kerr stated that electrification of Caltrain continues to be an issue and it will be impossible to increase rail traffic through communities without electrifying. • Jim Hartnett, Bob Wasserman, and Breene Kerr would like staff to consider including dual mode locomotives into the alternatives analysis. • Scott Haggerty expressed concern over possible additional costs to conduct additional studies. The Committee agreed that the approved amount is not to be exceeded without prior approval from the Committee.
	<p>C. Project Funding Agreements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding agreements approved as submitted.

Item No.	Discussion (Presenter)
	<p>D, Recommendation for Dumbarton Rail Operating Entity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Howard Goode introduced Art Dao of ACTIA, who described and summarized the discussions among Alameda County agencies regarding the DRC operating entity. • Mark Green asked when the operator agreement would need to be in place for Union City ROW acquisition? • Howard Goode said, perhaps within 6 months, to facilitate early implementation of the Union City phase. • Mark Green stated that Alameda County is known for not cooperating or coordinating its efforts. The principles are a good start and will hopefully be followed by staff action and meetings with San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. • Jim Hartnett recommended that the Executive Directors of each funding agency review the principles and check the feasibility of implementation. They should complete their review within two Policy Committee meetings. • John McLemore agreed that no decision should be made today. Would like clarification of how the cities in each county will be represented, by an association? Clarify whether it is cities with stations. What about participation by VTA and SamTrans? • Breene Kerr requested clarification of who is on the Board of Directors. • Mickie Winkler suggested that the Board would succeed the current Policy Committee. Use a milestone rather than transition in six months. • John McLemore stated that the Policy Committee shouldn't be dissolved in six months, perhaps 18-24 months. • Breene Kerr proposed that each member of the Policy Committee reevaluate his/her availability and commitment for the next year. Moves that Policy Committee remain intact and after one year minimum be replaced by the Board of Directors in the organization chart shown in the proposal. • Tom Blalock agrees with (seconds) this approach. Capitol Corridor JPA did something similar. • Dean Chu asked for clarification of the Board of Director representatives (i.e. rather than naming the specific cities, require three representatives from ACTIA, VTA, SMCTA). • Mark Green stated that Alameda County included in the proposal how Alameda County should be represented. The other counties/funding agencies should decide how they would like to be represented on the Board. • Ten approve, One opposed.
8.	<p>Correspondence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No correspondence
9.	<p>Requests of Committee Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting location: Request by Tom Blalock to prevent scheduling multiple events at Union City so that there is adequate parking.
10.	<p>Date/Time of Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting date: First Tuesday of the month conflicts with ACCMA meeting. John McLemore suggests Policy Committee meet before May 25th (MTC meeting). Dean Chu prefers May 17th.

Attachments: Sign-In Sheet