



TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

Maria Ayerdi • Executive Director

**TRANSBAY JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, July 17, 2007  
Yerba Buena Center for the Arts  
701 Mission Street  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room  
San Francisco, CA

Meeting #004

5:30 p.m.

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Jim Lazarus, Chair  
Karen Knowles-Pearce, Vice Chair  
Andrew Baglino  
Adrian Brandt  
Richard Brooks  
Tracy Cramer  
Alfonso Felder  
Peter Hartman  
Adrienne Heim  
Michael Kiesling  
Shawn Leonard  
Jane Morrison  
Jul Lynn Parsons  
Norm Rolfe  
Dave Snyder

Executive Director  
Maria Ayerdi

201 Mission St. #1960  
San Francisco, California 94105  
415-597-4620  
415-597-4615 fax

### **1. Welcome & Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Jim Lazarus, Chair, at 5:35 pm. A quorum was formed by 11 of the 15 voting members as follows: Jim Lazarus, Andrew Baglino, Richard Brooks, Tracy Cramer, Adrienne Heim, Michael Kiesling, Shawn Leonard, Jane Morrison, Jul Lynn Parsons, Norm Rolfe, and Dave Snyder. Non-voting member Bob Beck was also present.

### **2. Approval of June 12, 2007 Meeting Minutes**

Andrew Baglino made a motion to approve the Draft Meeting Minutes for the June 12, 2007 meeting and the motion was seconded by Richard Brooks. A vote was called by voice and the motion was unanimously moved and carried.

### **3. California High Speed Rail Authority – Overview & EIS/EIR Presentation**

Dan Leavitt, Deputy Director of the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA), showed a 10 minute video which provided an overview of the High Speed Rail (HSR) program and what it hopes to accomplish. Mr. Leavitt provided copies of the video to the meeting attendees and the video is also available on the High Speed Rail website at <http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov>.

Information presented included:

- A 30% increase in California's population is anticipated within the next 30 years.
- A high speed rail train (HSRT) could reach speeds of up to 220 miles per hour between San Diego and San Francisco.
- A trip between San Diego and Los Angeles would take 1 hour and 20 minutes, and a trip between Los Angeles and San Francisco would take 2 ½ hours.
- HSR is good for the environment and would be part of the solution to address global warming, reduce reliance on oil, and enhance quality of life.
- Overhead electric lines will be utilized.
- 450,000 new jobs will be created.
- CHSRA will not have any operating subsidies.
- Grade separations are important to enable trains to run at high speeds and will make the system safe by eliminating crossings.
- The environmental review has been successfully completed.
- HSR is attractive to business, investors and workers.
- The Sierra Club has endorsed HSR.
- Actions are being taken at this time to secure Right of Ways (ROW).

Mr. Leavitt also gave a PowerPoint presentation which focused on the decision making process regarding the route that HSR might take between Southern California and the Bay Area. His presentation included the following points:

- The statewide EIR/EIS was completed in 2005 by the High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA) and Federal Railroad Administration (FRA).
- It would cost 2 – 3 times less to provide HSR than to construct equivalent highway capacity.

- A draft program level EIR evaluating alignment between Southern California and the Bay Area is available for Public comment until September 28, 2007.
- The EIR/EIS studied alternate routes for HSR including the Altamont Pass and Pacheco Pass and outlined the advantages and disadvantages for both.
- A network of 21 alternatives were developed and evaluated in the EIR/EIS document.
- Ridership analysis was done by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).
- HSR would produce 1/10<sup>th</sup> the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions per passenger mile of airplanes and automobiles and would cover all of California's current goals for the reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.
- The EIR/EIS is complete and is available to the public in libraries and on the HSR website.
- A series of public hearings will begin in late August. Comments will be collected, reviewed and recommendations will be given to the HSR Board at either the October or November 2007 Board Meeting. A final document is expected by the end of the year.
- The San Francisco Public Hearing will be at City Hall on August 23, 2007 from 4:00 pm to 6:00pm. Comments can be transmitted to the HSRA by writing, E-mail, or on the HSR website. Only oral comments made in public meetings will be documented.
- Public comment is important in identifying the route and which cities are to be served by HSR.
- It has been a good year as \$14.5M was appropriated last year. Eight consultant teams were brought on board and are currently doing work.
- This year a budget of \$103M was requested and the Governor recommended only \$1M. \$60M was recommended by the legislative budget committee, but we will not know if this will be available until the budget is signed.
- HSR is considered front page news and is now viewed as a more vital issue than it has been in the past.
- A bond measure for \$9.95 Billion is still scheduled to be placed on the November 2008 ballot.

**Question and answer period included:**

**Question:**

Andrew Baglino noted that the ballot measure had been scheduled for past elections and asked why it had not been placed on the ballot.

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

The measure in 2004 did not move because of energy and it did not move in 2006 because of fiscal reasons. The Governor has proposed deferring the bond measure beyond November 2008, but, because it was scheduled for the ballot by the legislature, 2/3 of the legislators have to agree to defer it. That is unlikely given current public awareness and support of HSR. It will take "champions" to keep HSR going, and they now have some including Assembly Member Fiona Ma and Senator Dean Flores of the Central Valley.

**Question:**

Andrew Baglino asked that, assuming the calculations presented regarding CO<sub>2</sub> are correct, how can the Governor not approve it?

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

The Governor has stated that he supports lowering CO<sub>2</sub> omissions, and he now says that he supports HSR. He has made some appointments to the Board, and we see this as a good sign that he will get behind HSR.

**Question:**

Jane Morrison asked what we can do to convince the Governor to support HSR.

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

The Governor takes notice of public correspondence to him. Dan commended Jane for her work regarding organizing public support for HSR and encouraged her to continue her work of gathering comments to be sent to the Governor.

**Comment by Jane:**

She has already sent in 508 names and 50 post cards.

**Comment by Dan:**

They are hearing from the public and he expects the Budget in the next couple of weeks. He feels that unless you have a personal contact to speak to, you should continue to write. The Sierra Club has stepped up and supports HSR. Both the environmental and business communities like it. He also encouraged anyone who was hearing the Governor speak in public to ask him about HSR as he takes note of the public's interest in the subject.

**Comment from Jim Lazarus:**

The Governor attended a Community Meeting in San Francisco where there were about 400 people who showed a good reaction and that they were behind HSR.

**Comment from Dan:**

The Governor wants a money commitment from the private sector, but this should come later and not yet. The State needs to step up. Representative Costa is working hard on the Federal side to get matching funds.

**Question:**

Andrew Baglino asked how much we are impacted because the United States does not have any high speed train manufactures.

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

Most of the cost of the HSR will be the infrastructure system which the United States and California are very good at. And, there will be an opportunity for a partnership with a foreign train company. HSR will take advantage of the current "over the counter" technology which has been proven by 40 years experience in Japan and 25 years experience in Europe. The "train" portion vs. infrastructure portion is very small – about 10% – 20%.

**Comment by Michael Kiesling:**

The United States do not have manufacturers in the street car industry either and many street cars are gotten from Siemens. There are examples of where a foreign company can come and build their product in California.

**Question:**

Greg Riessen, a member of the public, asked if the HSRA would exist after the system is built.

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

The State will be the owner and HSRA will continue as an oversight agency only. The operation of the system will be contracted out to a private company through competitive bid.

**Question:**

Dave Snyder asked if there is a certain amount of money designated for the Transit Center.

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

There isn't a specific amount designated for the Transit Center. Phase 1 is planned to extend from the Bay Area to Anaheim. The "Bay Area" is mentioned but not necessarily to the Transbay Transit Center. Initial improvements are to be made in urban areas, and, if the Peninsula alignment is selected, there will be several billion dollars for improvements along that corridor some of which might be available to the Transbay program.

**Question:**

Dave Snyder asked about the Pacheco vs. Altamont Pass alternatives.

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

Care must be taken when discussing this as there is trade-off's with both alternatives. There is a 10 minute faster travel time with the Altamont alignment; however, each serves different markets and cities. They are trying to lay out the differences objectively and will wait for public and legislative comment.

**Question:**

Dave Snyder asked about local service.

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

In the instance where there is also local service, 4 tracks will be needed.

**Question:**

Andrew Baglino asked about the peninsula corridor.

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

In the Peninsula, there would be 4 tracks with full grade separation and electrification. The grade separation is an important safety feature.

**Question:**

Jane Morrison asked how fast HSR would travel from San Jose to San Francisco.

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

The train could run between 100 – 125 miles per hour between San Jose and San Francisco.

**Question:**

Jane Morrison asked if the route would be the same as Caltrain.

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

Yes, but with full separated grade.

**Question:**

Greg Riessen, a member of the public, asked if the grade is fully separated, why the train can't run at full speed.

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

The speed constraints have to do with acceleration distances and alignment. The route needs to be straighter to maintain trains running at the higher speed. On existing alignments in urban environments, speeds are lower. The maximum speeds and time savings will be achieved in the more open stretches of the Central Valley.

**Question:**

A member of the public asked if they had figured out what kinds of trains they will use.

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

There are several possibilities and a competitive bid will be solicited.

**Question:**

Adrienne Heim asked if they will be standard gauge.

**Answer by Dan Leavitt:**

Yes.

#### **4. Status of Temporary Terminal – Progress Update**

Bob Beck gave a PowerPoint presentation to provide an update on the progress of the Temporary Terminal and to get the word out about upcoming meetings that will be held in the next few months.

The following information was provided:

- The maximum legislated operation for the Temporary Terminal is 5 years and it will be built for that life of the facility.
- The Temporary Terminal will be bordered by Howard, Folsom, Beale and Main streets.
- A slide was used to illustrate the phases to be used in constructing the Temporary Terminal and what the Temporary Terminal will look like.
- The contract for the Temporary Terminal was awarded to Carter & Burgess Inc. on 4/25/07.
- The Temporary Terminal will be used for approximately 4 ½ years and then operations will move into the newly completed Transbay Transit Center.
- The design charrette with bus operators was discussed. By analyzing the alternatives, improvements were made to pedestrian movement and the travel flow when buses crossed one another. A design option with a

single central passenger island was selected providing greater pedestrian safety, facilitating bus flow by reducing bus crossings, and including extra waiting spaces for buses waiting to load passengers.

- On 6/27/07 there was a bus simulation held at Alameda Point Station. The simulation was a great help to identify “pinch points,” review the management of bus and pedestrian flows, and confirm that the Temporary Terminal configuration would work.
- The schedule of the “next steps” was provided including public outreach for public meetings that are anticipated to be held mid 9/07.

Question and answer period included:

**Question:**

Richard Brooks asked if part of the plan is to get more staff for traffic flow.

**Answer by Bob Beck:**

They are looking at how traffic both inside and outside of the Temporary Terminal will be regulated. They are in the preliminary stages.

**Question:**

Jamie Whitaker, a member of the public, asked where the buses will enter and exit the Temporary Terminal.

**Answer by Bob Beck:**

They will enter on Beale and exit on Folsom.

**Comment by Jim Lazarus:**

The neighbors and how the traffic affects them is an important issue.

**Comment by Bob Beck:**

Currently, Main and Beale streets are one way. We are reviewing how the MUNI buses will circulate externally.

**Comment by Tony Bruzzone:**

On Folsom, buses will go to Essex to get onto the bridge.

**Question:**

Tracy Cramer asked where the closest neighbors are regarding noise.

**Answer by Bob Beck:**

Most of the neighboring area is either used by Caltrain or are office buildings. The closest housing would be the Infinity Towers and the Temporary Terminal will probably be built before the Infinity Towers are complete and occupied.

## 5. General Comments / Questions

**Comment by Dave Snyder:**

He said that the injunction against implementation of the City’s Bike Plan should not hold up planning so the TJPA should go ahead and work with them regarding potential future bike lanes on Folsom.

**Question:**

Richard Brooks asked if there will be a public display of the design and development submittals.

**Response by Bob Beck:**

On August 6, 2007, the three firms will make their first public presentation of their proposals. This meeting will be held in the Board of Supervisors chambers in City Hall at 6:00 PM. This meeting will be broadcast live on Chanel 26 and webcast. The three firms will also provide models that we plan to have displayed in the North Light Court of City Hall on August 7<sup>th</sup>. We anticipate that the TJPA Board will select a team to negotiate with at the September 20<sup>th</sup> Board Meeting.

**Question:**

Tracy Cramer asked about the status of the Redevelopment RFP's.

**Response by Bob Beck:**

I will look into this issue and provide an update.

**6. Public Comment**

No Public Comment.

**7. Next Meeting**

The next meeting is scheduled on Tuesday, August 14, 2007.

**8. Adjourn**

A motion to adjourn was made, seconded and passed. The meeting was adjourned by Chair Lazarus at 7:00 pm.

The Ethics Commission of the City and County of San Francisco has asked us to remind individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Admin. Code Sections 16.520 - 16.534] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 1390 Market Street, Suite 801, San Francisco, CA 94102, telephone (415) 554-9510, fax (415) 554-8757 and web site: [sfgov.org/ethics](http://sfgov.org/ethics).