MINUTES

1. Welcome, Roll Call of Members and Introductions

LAVTA’s Executive Director Michael Tree called the meeting to order at 1:30pm. Supervisor Zapien attended the meeting by telephone. He was unable to participate in discussions, due to the Brown Act.

Members Present
Supervisor Scott Haggerty (Chair), Alameda County
Supervisor Moses Zapien (Vice Chair), San Joaquin County
Councilmember Don Biddle, City of Dublin (alternate for David Haubert)
Mayor John Marchand, City of Livermore
Mayor Jerry Thorne, City of Pleasanton
Councilmember Veronica Vargas, City of Tracy
Board Member Vince Hernandez (Manteca), ACE
Board Member John McPartland, BART
Board Member Steven Spedowfski (Livermore), LAVTA

Members Absent
Mayor David Haubert, City of Dublin

After the welcome, roll call and introductions, Agenda Item 5 was moved up on the agenda for the convenience of the group in managing the balance of the meeting.
5. **Advisory Group Organizational Framework**

The Altamont Regional Rail Working Group attendees voted and appointed Supervisor Scott Haggerty as Chair.

Approved: Marchand/Spedowfski  
Aye: Marchand, Spedowfski, Biddle, Haggerty, Thorne, Vargas, Hernandez, McPartland  
No: None  
Abstain: None  
Absent: Haubert

The Working Group also voted and appointed Supervisor Moses Zapien as Vice Chair.

Approved: Marchand/Vargas  
Aye: Marchand, Spedowfski, Biddle, Haggerty, Thorne, Vargas, Hernandez, McPartland  
No: None  
Abstain: None  
Absent: Haubert

After a brief discussion, the Tri-Valley Regional Rail Advisory Group name was changed to “Altamont Regional Rail Working Group”.

Supervisor Haggerty stated how happy he was to have his colleagues at the table to discuss how to expedite the BART to Livermore extension and ultimately connect to ACE at the Altamont. Supervisor Haggerty recognized the staff of Congressman Denham, Assemblywoman Baker, Senator Glazer, and Congressman Swalwell.

2. **Public Comment**

Robert Allen
Mr. Allen provided the Working Group with a petition that was circulated years ago in the City of Livermore. 8,400 voters signed the petition. At the time the City of Livermore was proposing a more expensive version of BART to Livermore that would have a station at Junction School. Residents wanted BART operate on the freeway. The City Council realized that keeping BART on the freeway was what the people desired and took action to keep BART on the freeway.

Dale Kaye
Dale Kaye of Innovation Tri-Valley addressed the Working Group to congratulate them, because an interregional collaboration is imperative to getting anything big and extraordinary accomplished and executed. Innovation Tri-Valley Leadership Group is a stake holder in the bay area council’s megaregion report and it is clear from working on that report how imperative it is to have this interregional collaboration. Dale Kaye offered support from the business community, if needed.

3. **Background and History of Regional Rail Planning Efforts to Present Day**

Michael Tree introduced Daniel Iacofano of MIG who has been hired as a facilitator to work with the group in setting their goals and objectives over the next several meetings. Daniel presented to the Working Group a PowerPoint presentation regarding the background and history of regional rail planning efforts to present day. The presentation covered rail history and plans in the region and mega-region, the BART to ACE Project,
ACE Forward, Isabel Neighborhood Plan, and additional initiatives. The initial goals of the Working Group were identified in the presentation as providing input into regional rail projects, and working towards a more efficient, cost effective and timely BART to ACE connection.

Councilmember Vargas wanted to know why BART is only going to Isabel and when do we insert the next few miles to study the connection to ACE at Greenville? BART Director McPartland responded by saying that Measure BB only allowed for funds to go towards BART to Isabel, which is the first phase of getting to ACE. From this point forward we need to identify additional funding sources to complete the first phase and beyond. Director McPartland explained that what’s great about this Working Group is we can start the funding dialog today. Supervisor Haggerty added that when the electrification was done at Caltrans, as part of that there was $600 million set aside for East Bay Rail and a lot of time people forget that. Additionally, Supervisor Haggerty mentioned, there is Cap N’ Trade that we should have at least a $200 million call on, as well as $200 million in RM3. Supervisor Haggerty finished his comment by stating that the project is delayed and each year of that delay is costing taxpayers $30 million.

BART Director McPartland said that BART first phase will not go to downtown Livermore and that it is very controversial. The preferred alignment that BART has on record is to go downtown and the reason this has not changed is the Engineers that are working on the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to Isabel would be the only staff he has available and it would take a year to change that dialog. Also, the reason we are considering every viable alternative is due to law.

Mayor Marchand added that if an alternative is not politically or financially feasible then the alternative does not need to be considered. BART going downtown was $4 billion dollars and 82% of the public was against it. That was Livermore’s contention as to why BART didn’t need to study the alignment downtown. It was both economically and politically infeasible.

Supervisor Haggerty requested that an upcoming agenda topic is to see how much environmental work/over analyzing has been done, how much has been spent thus far, and how much would you normally spend with this type of work. How much time should normally be spent on the EIR process? Compare the EIR work of different projects.

Councilman Steven Spedowfksi commented that when we are researching how much has been spent on studies, it would be helpful to know what we spent so far getting BART to Isabel versus BART to Greenville connecting to ACE. All members agree that cost savings should be something looked at. Councilmember Vargas added that usually it is a cost savings if we add the extra few miles of rail (BART/ACE) today versus at a later date.

In regard to the length of the schedule for the project, Director McPartland commented that the dates on the schedule have been continually bumped and he is concerned about the delays. Supervisor Haggerty commented that things in the schedule can be done concurrently, which can speed up construction.

Mayor Marchand commented that the City of Livermore is working on the Neighborhood Plan for the BART station at Isabel. There has been a lot of community engagement that
takes time. He heard that since the City was three months behind on the schedule it was going to push the schedule out several years and the City can’t understand why it would add years. That’s something we would like greater definition on.

Supervisor Haggerty wants another agenda item to be the “understanding of the schedule” and how to minimize it. Supervisor Haggerty also added that a presentation from the City of Livermore regarding the Station Planning would be a benefit.

Director McPartland’s primary concern is looking at Greenville. The idea of trying to save money by virtue of continuing the EIR beyond Phase I to Phase II has positives associated with it. However, Director McPartland’s caution and concern is that it might delay the construction and finalization of the project. If it is going to delay the Isabel project if even a little bit Director McPartland will accept that, but will scrutinize it.

Councilmember Vargas asked about cost and time savings associated with looking at environmental work of Phase I and Phase II concurrently. Staff commented that they would bring back information.

Supervisor Haggerty would like the following to become future agenda items: BayFair Connector, I-580 Corridor Goods Movement Enhancements, High Speed Rail, and LAVTA System Redesign.

4. Regional Rail Advisory Group Vision and Goals

Goals:
- Want a connection to ACE
- Deliver BART to ACE project that is streamlined and more cost effective
- Create an Authority to facilitate

Mayor Marchand brought up creating a JPA to drive this process more efficiently and accelerate it to completion. Supervisor Haggerty said that as we move towards a JPA it’s important to understand and work with the political climate. LAVTA Board Member Spedowsfki would like to have short-term goals to kick-start the process and show that we are action oriented. Director McPartland said that every member of the Working Group represents a vested interest and gives us the ability to collectively work together in a single direction for a single goal. Director McPartland thinks that a JPA is premature and thinks it should be a next step once the vision for the group is clear. Supervisor Haggerty added that he doesn’t disagree in theory, but thus far hasn’t seen any action to streamline and create a more cost effective BART to ACE project.

Councilmember Vargas would like BART to be at Greenville and that this needs to be a seamless transition. Director Hernandez commented that there is a lot of fact finding that needs to occur. He understands the emotion on the topic due to the years that have been spent on the project without apparent progression. Director Hernandez continued by stating that when you run an EIR you have the expectation that the EIR will lead you to shovels in the ground. What agencies are causing the consternation? As a group we need to set an agenda of the issues that need to be addressed and the financing issues of the project.
Mayor Jerry Thorne expressed frustration on the duration of EIRs for this project. He wants to better understand what has been looked at through the years and what were the results. Why are we looking at BART to downtown Livermore still? Makes no sense. We need to find a path to get this finished. To connect with ACE. It’s ridiculous.

Scott asked that Working Group be visionary and bold, and directed staff to prioritize the goals for the next meetings and see what can be accomplished.

6. Summary and Next Steps

LAVTA staff to prioritize goals and near future action items for the next meeting. Meetings will be held bi-monthly. Supervisor Haggerty suggested that one meeting will be held on the other side of the Altamont, and that maybe Tracy can be the host.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned 3:10pm.