Minutes
Toll Bridge Advisory Committee
Meeting of September 13, 2002

Schedule Update

September 20	Project presentations from BART Access Plans, carsharing, Bicycle Access, eBART Antioch Extension, BART and Airport Connector, Alameda County CMA Projects, Golden Gate/Marin SMART link San Rafael to Larkspur
September 27	Project presentations from RIDES, Caltrans North Bay express bus infrastructure, MTC- Translink®
October 4	Transbay Terminal, Caltrain baby bullet, Dumbarton West service, CMA Association
October 18	First Evaluation of Projects

Given the large number of project presentations planned for September 20th, if the committee exceeds the time allowable, project presentations will be carried over to the following meeting. Ezra indicated that after the project presentations are concluded a draft plan would be developed and submitted to the committee. He said that objections and comments could be provided to him verbally or in writing for incorporation into any final funding plan.

Dennis Fay (Alameda County CMA) and Bob McCleary (Contra Costa CMA) both expressed concern about this model, in particular, the idea that the decisions would be made behind closed doors. Dennis suggested that there should be a follow up meeting to discuss any plan developed by the staff. He said that, to date, there has been no philosophical discussion of the criteria that would be used to determine what projects are included in the plan and that such a discussion needs to take place. Bob McCleary asked who would be preparing the plan.

Ezra replied that the first four meetings of the Advisory Committee discussed the evaluative criteria, and that the first draft of the plan would be a collaboration between legislative staff and MTC staff based on the presentations, comments provided, and a matching of the proposals to the evaluative criteria. It does not make sense to develop a first draft plan by committee. He said that the advisory committee was to provide input and advice on the plan but not necessarily to develop full consensus. Dennis took issue with this perspective and said that if the committee is trying to model itself on the decision-making approach used by the self-help counties to develop expenditure plans for their half-cent sales tax then we should absolutely strive for consensus. Bob McCleary expressed concern that discussions to date have been broad and qualitative and that project data is inconsistent.

Kathleen Kelly of AC Transit suggested that Ezra provide the committee with a draft plan that indicates why certain projects remained and others dropped off, and that we have a follow up meeting to review this draft plan. It was agreed that this meeting, first evaluation of projects, would be held on the third week of October.

MUNI Presentation

Muni staff Duncan Watry presented proposals for three projects: system integration, capacity expansion and safety/security. Muni made its case for nexus based on two points:

- Service operated directly in bridge corridors
- Feeder function to regional operators (such as BART, AC Transit, ferry service) serving transbay and bridge corridors.

The funding proposals for the projects are as follows:

Project	**Capital**	**Operating Cost per Year**	**New Riders per weekday**
System Integration	$156.0 m	$5.4 m	58,670
Capacity Expansion	$1,084.9 m	$95.2 m	167,584
Safety/Security	$120.4 m	$0.9 m	--
Total	**$1,361.3**	**$101.5 m**	**226,254**

In response to Ezra s comments, Muni staff indicated willingness to work with Ezra to revise their proposal to better target the nexus issue, focus more on serving the Bay Bridge corridor, and be more realistic in the amount of toll bridge funds requested. Stuart Cohen (Transportation and Land Use Coalition) commented that service expansion to Treasure Island is a great proposal with an obviously strong nexus. With regard to the capital expansion proposals, Stuart commented that he thought the Geary Street and Van Ness projects were the best. Mike Daley offered that the feeder services have the strongest nexus.

AC Transit Presentation

Kathleen Kelly presented AC Transit s enhanced bus project proposals. She emphasized that the project is scalable — that is, it can be implemented at various different levels and doesn t need the entire funding request to result in service improvements and mobility benefits.

Project	**Operating Cost per year**	**Funding Request**	**Capital Cost**	**Funding Request**	**Annual New Riders**	**Cost per New Rider**
Bus Rapid Transit and Enhanced Bus Corridors	$22 m	**$11 m**	$500 m	$250 m	8.7 m	$2.75 for enhanced bus, $12 for bus rapid transit
Bridge Service Improvements	$15.7 m	**$15.7 m**	$20 m	$20 m	2.33 m	$12-$25
BART Owl Network	$2 m	**$2 m**	$0	$0	0.153 m	$12
New Operating Facility	$1.2 m	**$0.60 m**	$86 m	$40 m	21 m	$0.20
Total	$40.9 m	**$29.3**	$606 m	310 m	33.5 m	NA

In response to questions, Kathleen noted that operating cost estimates for transbay and owl improvements assume no farebox return as a way to compensate for relative decrease in operating revenues over time. Operating cost estimates for local routes assume average AC Transit farebox

recovery rates. Kathleen noted that the local routes nexus is that they feed BART. These routes are the Board s highest priority per AC Transit s Strategic Vision. Dennis Fay suggested it might be appropriate to use toll revenues for a mix of local, transbay and owl improvements and that the remaining local routes would be a priority for local revenues. Stuart Cohen noted that bus rapid transit generates new riders *and* creates benefits in travel-time savings for existing riders; most projects under consideration do not do both.

Ezra suggested that to defend the legal nexus argument, AC and Muni need to show increased transbay transit ridership or relief on bridge approaches as a result of improvements to local and feeder bus services. Duncan stated that the fact that 44% of all westbound peak period Bay Bridge trips have destinations beyond downtown San Francisco shows a broader geographic nexus. Kathleen observed that a rich local transit network allows people to run errands during the day and this influences mode choice. Duncan noted that many of the proposed projects would increase the number of transit riders coming into San Francisco, and the burden will fall to Muni to move them around the city.

City of Vallejo

Pam Belchamber with the City of Vallejo spoke on behalf of the City s transit service, which provides express bus and high-speed ferry service, representing 80 percent of transit service in Solano County. Pam pointed out that the ferry service carries about 3,000 passengers per day and has reached capacity; meanwhile, Solano counties population is projected to grow more than 30 % over the next 20 years. Vallejo has new high capacity buses and ferries on the way but lacks operating funds. Pam did not submit a specific funding proposal to the committee since the amount requested would vary depending on whether voters approve Solano County s half-cent sales tax measure on the November ballot. Ezra requested that she submit a funding request for each scenario (i.e., with sales tax and without). Ezra requested that the City work with Caltrans to identify infrastructure improvements that would support express bus.