

TRI-VALLEY – SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY REGIONAL RAIL AUTHORITY

Item 3

ACTION

Minutes of April 11, 2018 Meeting in Tracy

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Meeting was called to order by Board Chair Scott Haggerty at 2:04pm.

2. Roll Call of Members

Members Present

Supervisor Scott Haggerty (Chair), Alameda County
Supervisor Bob Elliott, San Joaquin County
Mayor John Marchand, City of Livermore
Mayor Jerry Thorne, City of Pleasanton
Vice Mayor Debby Moorhead, City of Manteca
Director Bernice King Tingle, Mountain House
Councilmember Karen Stepper, Town of Danville
Councilmember Paul Akinjo, City of Lathrop
Councilmember Susan Lofthus, City of Stockton
Board Member Leo Zuber (Ripon), ACE

Members Absent

Mayor Pro Tem Veronica Vargas (Vice Chair), City of Tracy
Vice Mayor Philip O'Loane, City of San Ramon
Board Member Steven Spedowski (Livermore), LAVTA
Mayor David Haubert, City of Dublin
Board Member John McPartland (District 5), BART

Board Chair Scott Haggerty noted that Director McPartland is still not feeling well and the Board sends him best wishes and hopes he gets better soon. Board Chair Scott Haggerty announced that BART Director Debra Allen is in the audience today.

3. Approve Minutes of March 14, 2018 Board of Directors Meeting **ACTION**

Board Chair Scott Haggerty asked for public comment on this agenda item.

Anthony Docto requested an amendment to the minutes on page 3 of 4, Agenda Item 6, last paragraph, second sentence to strike the word Tracy and replace with Alameda County.

The Board of Directors approved the minutes of March 14, 2018 Board of Directors meeting as amended.

Approved: Stepper/Zuber

Aye: Haggerty, Elliott, Marchand, Thorne, Moorhead, Tingle, Stepper, Akinjo, Lofthus, Zuber

No: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Vargas, O'Loane, Spedowski, McPartland

4. Strategic Discussion – Vehicles and Technology

[Susan Lofthus, Councilmember from City of Stockton, arrived during Strategic Discussion – Vehicles and Technology.]

Board Chair Scott Haggerty noted that today the Board of Directors will focus on a strategic discussion regarding the topic of vehicles and technology. Board Chair Scott Haggerty introduced the keynote guest speaker Mr. Thomas G. Matoff. Mr. Matoff is nationally recognized as one of the leading managers and planners on the rail transit industry and has more than four decades of experience in this field. Mr. Matoff has extensive experience in developing and operating coordinated multi-modal, multi-destination transit networks. Mr. Matoff has more than 20 years of experience spent working directly for transit authorities

around North America with significant responsibilities for new commuter rail and light rail system startups. Mr. Matoff's expertise and insights are needed to assist the Board of Directors to discuss vehicles and technology. Mr. Matoff provided the Board of Directors a PowerPoint presentation regarding Diesel Multiple Units (DMUs) and Electric Multiple Units (EMUs) – Definitions and Technologies. Mr. Matoff explained that "MU" stands for Multiple Unit. Every Multiple Unit car is powered, self-propelled, and is electrified by an overhead wire or a 3rd rail. A characteristic on a Multiple Unit are automatic couplers that make a physical and electrical connection that carries a control line through the train. The control line allows the whole train to be controlled through a single cab. All motors and brakes in all cars receive exactly the same control "instructions" from the active cab and the cars in the train behave identically. The propulsion type can be diesel or electric, but an important characteristics is whether it is being operated in a railroad environment or a rail transit environment and these environments are very different. The railroad environment means it is running on the tracks that are part of the railroad system (example: Union Pacific (UP) or ACE service over the Altamont Pass) and is regulated as part of the railroad network. The railroad network involves many things that a rail transit system does not. Rail Transit (example: BART or Sacramento Light Rail System) does not fall under the Federal Railroad Administration their safety regulation occurs at the state level through the California Public Utilities Commission and that has different implications. Mr. Matoff concluded by provided information on the railroad and rail transit regulations, issues, and CPUC clearance requirements. Mr. Matoff also spoke about emerging Multiple Unit technology that is in Research and Development (R&D), but they have higher capital cost, uncertain reliability, and life cycle costs. Mr. Matoff explained that these are not proven Multiple Unit vehicles and recommended that the Board of Directors get something that has been working at two other places first with proven results and revenue service before they get into an R&D mode.

Board Chair Scott Haggerty stated that in order to further the discussion with technology when looking at EMU or DMU he would like to know their average capacity. Board Chair Scott Haggerty does know there is a difference in speed, acceleration, and is assuming there is a difference in braking. Board Chair Scott Haggerty discussed technology with Steve Heminger and he thinks we should utilize an EMU or other emerging technologies. Board Chair Scott Haggerty is leaning towards an EMU, because it is more efficient (acceleration/speed/more passenger capacity) to operate on a rail line. Mr. Matoff stated that the design is modular and can meet any requirement the agency has regarding seating capacity, but performance suffers if it is diesel. EMUs are an additional capital investment for superior performance and possibly lower operating costs in the long run. Board Chair Scott Haggerty informed that he heard from consultants that electrification on the Alameda County side would not be an issue, but the San Joaquin County side there would be an issue and asked if anyone could address this. AECOM Program Manager Diane Cowan informed Mr. Matoff that the Board is looking at part of the alignment within existing freight rail Right-of-Way (ROW) on the San Joaquin County side; whether, we would share track or be adjacent to remains to be decided. AECOM hopes to have coordination with the host railroad soon and has seen that some host railroads are concerned about electrification. We are being cautious and that is why choices are being brought forward with options to be more conservative. Mr. Matoff explained that if you acquire ROW from the railroad and make it public ownership you can adjacently run an EMU relatively close.

Board Member Bob Elliott wanted to know how much greater the electrified performance is. Mr. Matoff explained that it is mostly the acceleration AECOM Program Manager Diane Cowan informed that travel times were analyzed for EMU versus DMU and they found savings on the electrified service option. With any service (EMU, DMU, or other) a maintenance facility is needed and EMU would have added on cost for a specific infrastructure to deal with an electrified service. A per mile cost was also looked at for an electrified service to add the overhead electrical wires and overall the electrified service would cost more. Board Chair Scott Haggerty requested that AECOM provide a presentation at the next Board of Directors meeting on speed, acceleration, and capacity and stated that it is extremely informative.

AECOM Program Manager Diane Cowan will send the slide presentation out in advance of the next meeting for the Board to review and then briefly review and take questions at the next Board of Directors meeting.

Board Member Bernice King Tingle asked what the cost difference is for maintenance for an EMU versus a DMU. Mr. Matoff responded that typically an electric vehicle is having power generated somewhere else, so all the stuff associated with diesel propulsion and the conversion of diesel propulsion is either through a torque converter, transmission line or through the generation of power to run the electric motors, so you do not have to spend money on regular maintenance of that. It may be cheaper to maintain an electric vehicle versus a diesel vehicle, but you must maintain the overhead of an electric vehicle. You can have the electric company maintain and operate the overhead and have them sell you the power at the wire. AECOM Program Manager Diane Cowan informed that as the Board moves forward they can look at life cycle costs for each option, so it can be looked at from the capital side and renewal of the capital when the vehicle is at the end of its life cycle and also look at the operating side.

Board Member Paul Akinjo wanted to know how many miles of track belongs to the railroad. AECOM Program Manager Diane Cowan explained that from Greenville Road area up to the Alameda County line, where it meets the San Joaquin County line, is existing railroad right of way that is owned by Alameda. When they get to the San Joaquin line to the West Tracy station and before downtown Tracy the railroad is owned by Union Pacific, but is not used as often for freight. When they get to downtown Tracy and beyond they are in the Tracy sub and it has more freight activity.

Board Member John Marchand asked what the visual impacts will be with overhead wires with pantographs versus a third rail. Mr. Matoff explained that a third rail cannot be extended across a road crossing, so it cannot electrocute someone or something and typically is no longer used in main line rail applications. This is why the overhead wire is preferred. Board Chair Scott Haggerty informed that this is a policy decision.

Board Chair Scott Haggerty asked for public comment on this agenda item.

Michael Maciel asked if there would be a backup generator system in the event of a power failure and his greatest concern is the remote area of the Altamont. Michael Maciel heard that if you have the UP on an existing line they would frown on electrifying, but if you run rail adjacent in the ROW it would be more feasible to have it electrified. Michael Maciel would like to know how many miles from Greenville to North Lathrop. Mr. Matoff responded that electrical failures can happen and typically and electrification of this kind has duplicate feeds to the overhead sub stations, so if you have a failure on one the other is still operating. If there was a real concern about a power failure you could have backup generators, but Mr. Matoff does not think it would be worth the additional expense. It was stated that it is about 30 miles from Greenville to North Lathrop, but google can give a more accurate distance.

This was informational only.

5. Comments on California High Speed Rail Authority 2018 Business Plan

Executive Director Michael Tree provided the Board of Directors the comments on California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) 2018 Business Plan. The CHSRA is required to release a Business Plan every two years and we currently are in a sixty day public review period for the 2018 draft update. The High Speed Rail Central Valley segment is expected to be in revenue service ready by 2027 and could provide a significant boost to north-south travel in the Central Valley. Executive Director Michael Tree noted that this could provide an early connection from high speed rail to the Bay Area in particular to the East Bay. Staff reviewed the Business Plan and offers some recommendations for a comment letter to include the Board adopted Project Concept and reference to project purpose and need as outlined in Assembly Bill 758, the 2018 State Rail Plan and the Bay Area Economic Council Megaregional Report. The comment also included a few key points that Executive Director Michael Tree provided the Board of Directors.

The Board of Directors reviewed and approved the submittal of comments on the California High Speed Rail Authority *CHSRA) 2018 Business Plan (DRAFT).

Approved: Zuber/Lofthus

Aye: Haggerty, Elliott, Marchand, Thorne, Moorhead, Tingle, Stepper, Akinjo, Lofthus, Zuber

No: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Vargas, O'Loane, Spedowski, McPartland

6. Comments on San Joaquin COG Regional Transportation Plan

Executive Director Michael Tree provided the Board of Directors the comments on San Joaquin Council of Governments (COG) 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (DRAFT). The draft 2018 Regional Transportation Plan ("Plan") is out in draft for comment through April 26, 2018. When the Board of Directors engaged with the San Joaquin COG our request for the Regional Transportation Plan was to include our Authority in Chapter Four (Financing the Transportation System) and Chapter Eight (A Framework for Moving Forward: Challenged and Opportunities). Executive Director Michael Tree provided the Board of Directors key points for inclusion in a comment letter to be created and signed by the Executive Director. Executive Director Michael Tree further noted that while the Authority has some features of a Joint Powers Authority in that its members are appointed by member agencies, the new Authority is in fact a special separate purpose public entity formed pursuant to AB 758 and should be referred to simply as an Authority created by the State of California. Board Member Scott Haggerty thanked Andrew Chesley and the San Joaquin COG for being supportive and supporting the Rail Authority.

The Board of Directors reviewed and approved staff to submit comments to the San Joaquin Council of Governments 2018 Regional Transportation Plan (DRAFT).

Approved: Akinjo/Zuber

Aye: Haggerty, Elliott, Marchand, Thorne, Moorhead, Tingle, Stepper, Akinjo, Lofthus, Zuber

No: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Vargas, O'Loane, Spedowski, McPartland

7. Adoption of Conflict of Interest Code

Legal Counsel Michael Conneran provided the Board of Directors the adoption of Conflict of Interest Code. The code was prepared by legal counsel and submitted to the staff of the Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) for their comments and they approved the code. There was then a required 45 day comment period, so the affected staff members are able to make comment and there were no comments received. The code is now ready to be sent to the FPPC for final approval.

The Board of Directors adopted the attached Conflict of Interest Code, including Appendix of Designated Employees. Resolution R04-2018.

Approved: Tingle/Thorne

Aye: Haggerty, Elliott, Marchand, Thorne, Moorhead, Tingle, Stepper, Akinjo, Lofthus, Zuber

No: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Vargas, O'Loane, Spedowski, McPartland

8. Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Michael Tree provided the Board of Directors the Executive Director's Report. Executive Director Michael Tree informed the Board of Directors of a Community Informational Meeting on the new Rail Authority and ACE to BART connectivity that will be held on Saturday, April 21, 2018 from 11am to 2pm at the Tracy Transit Center. Executive Director Michael Tree received requests from Board Members for BART to Isabel updates, so he provided BART Board Meeting Dates that are upcoming. Executive Director Michael Tree also provided what funding is available for the BART to Livermore project from BART's

website. Executive Director Michael Tree informed that the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will meet on April 25, 2018 and will look at ridership modeling that AECOM is currently working with for the feasibility report, also looking at the results of station outreach, and beginning to look at project alternatives. Executive Director Michael Tree reported that the Feasibility Report is on time. Our goal was in June or July to have alternatives to review and to work through the selection of the locally preferred alternative.

9. Directors' Discussion: Comments, Questions and Agenda Requests

Board Member John Marchand stated that the informational meeting may be a good opportunity to engage the public's support for a funding mechanism (sales tax/property tax) on the San Joaquin County side, since Alameda County has a tax for funding purposes.

Board Member Bob Elliott asked if the \$533 million is the amount BART has now for funding. Board Chair Scott Haggerty responded that that is what the region (not BART) has assembled towards the project. Board Member Leo Zuber stated that this doesn't answer the question asked at the last meeting. In the legislation it says funds that BART has for a Livermore extension and if that does not happen will come to the Rail Authority. Someone asked at the last meeting how much is that. Board Chair Scott Haggerty informed that it is the \$533 million.

Board Member John Marchand attended a UOP Bay Area Council symposium two weeks ago. Public agencies are trying to move people from job centers in the Silicon Valley and San Francisco and connect them to housing centers in the Tri-Valley and San Joaquin Valley. We are trying to get workers to their companies and the companies are making hundreds of billions of dollars while we are trying to gather public dollars. One of the things that came out of the San Joaquin Regional Rail Meeting was the Board's suggestion to pursue opportunities for private funding. There is a company that has offered \$500 million dollars for a potential rail connection. The Board authorized their Executive Director to determine what the interest is for private funding for some of these projects. Board Member John Marchand informed that the San Joaquin Regional Rail suggested that we determine what that level is for private funding. Board Member Susan Lofthus would like to determine what the level of interest is to bring these businesses here, so their employees do not have to commute six hours a day. Board Member Leo Zuber informed that one of the questions asked at the symposium was what kind of people are the ones commuting from here to there and it is not the Silicon Valley people. The people commuting from the Central Valley are the teachers, firefighters, construction workers, policemen, and janitors that cannot afford to live in the Silicon Valley. Those type of jobs exist in the Central Valley, so Board Member Leo Zuber explained that we need to be careful about what we say we are trying to do versus what the facts of the matter say.

10. Public Comments

Robert S. Allen provided the Board Members a BART to Livermore letter that urged BART to do certain things regarding the BART DEIR. Robert Allen noted that 8400 Livermore voters had signed a successful initiative petition in 2011 to amend Livermore's General Plan and requesting BART along I-580 to Isabel and ultimately to Greenville. A BART Yard and shop should be at Greenville, he noted, together with a joint BART-ACE-DMU transfer station. Robert Allen would like ACE unchanged and have a DMU from Greenville over the Altamont.

Michael Maciel appreciated the information provided regarding funding. A number that was repeatedly referred to locally was \$800 million. Michael Maciel informed that a source of that was Board Vice Chair Veronica Vargas and a different source said that was a questionable amount. Michael Maciel appreciates the clarification on funding available coming from Alameda County (that region). If the BART decision is made to extend to Isabel then the \$533 goes away and this project is at square one. Michael Maciel hopes that there is some consideration being given to plan B should that happen. Michael Maciel asked where we go from there to make this connection occur, because it is vitally important. Michael Maciel has stated in the past that it will get to a point that San Joaquin County will have to identify funding sources and it will not be a simple task for them to identify those funding sources. Then Alameda County will be challenged with not only finding funding sources for this connection,

but the \$533 million only represents apparently one-third. All of this is vitally important, all of these connections, all of the extensions and is hugely expensive. You will never hear Michael Maciel say it is a bad idea to connect BART to ACE, connect the megaregion to BART, increase ACE capacity, or increase the area ACE serves. Michael Maciel believes those are all good ideas, but it is very challenging to find the funding. Michael Maciel requested that BART build to Isabel or better yet go to Greenville, but he knows what that will cost and the time it will take. If that happens both sides will have to start working on how we are going to make these connections happen.

11. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 3:43pm