

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION AIRSPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, August 1, 2002
9:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

Video Conference
From
Caltrans' Districts 4, 7 and 12

MINUTES

Nina Gruen, Chair, called the meeting of the California Transportation Commission's Airspace Advisory Committee to order at 9:30 a.m. on August 1, 2002.

Those in attendance were as follows:

Committee Members: N. Gruen – Chair (D-4), B. Hauf - Vice Chair (D-12), R. Payne (D-4), W. Mosher (D-7), M. Ross (D-7)

Commissioner: A. Lawrence (D-7)

Commission Staff: K. Jacobs (D-4)

Caltrans Staff: P. Schultze (D-4), B. Wilson (D-4), S. Ikeda (D-4), Robert MacPherson (D-4), Greg Lundblad (D-4), Vern Rhinehart (D-4), Marta Bayol (D-4), Doug Sibley (D-4), Shirley Parker (D-4), Robert Bachtold (D-4), Anne Marc-Aurele (D-4), Carol Hanson (D-4)

Those absent: John Glassmoyer, George Moss, Peter Inman, Wylie Greig, Jack Nagle

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Proceedings:

Item 1. Committee Business

Nina asked each person in attendance at each of the videoconference sights to introduce him or herself.

Nina Gruen mentioned the letter sent to the Department by Commission Chair McKenna regarding the Oakland Housing Authority transaction. Nina also read a letter that she sent to Mr. Brice Paris, HQ's Right of Way.

Item 2. Approval of April 2002 Minutes Approval of May 2002 Special Meeting Minutes

The minutes were presented for approval.

Dr. Mosher noted that his location on the April minutes should be San Fernando not San Francisco.

Roslyn Payne moved to approve the minutes with the correction. Committee member Walt Mosher seconded the motion, which carried 5-0 (John Glassmoyer, Peter Inman, Jack Nagle, George Moss, and Wylie Greig were absent).

Commissioner Lawrence noted that the January 16, 2003 AAC meeting schedule may conflict with the tentative CTC meeting schedule and asked Kathie Jacobs to look into the dates and possibly reschedule the AAC meeting for January.

ACTION: Kathie Jacobs, look at the tentative 2003 CTC Meeting Calendar and reschedule the AAC meeting for January 2003 if necessary. **DONE – New January meeting date is either January 9 or 23, 2003. Members decide which date is preferred.**

Item 3. United States Postal Service

Bob MacPherson, District 4 Right of Way, discussed the question of why the United States Postal Service (USPS) couldn't be moved to a new location and use the site that they currently use as a park and ride facility.

Walt Mosher said that it appeared that the statements within the last paragraph of Bob's letter were pulled out of the air without any supporting information. Walt went on to say that there is no basis for the Department to say that the relocation of the park and ride lot could encourage suburban commuters to board BART much closer to their point of origin, thereby reducing the number of commute vehicles on the highway and increasing BART fare revenue from the same passengers. Walt recommended that in the future the Department make it clear by providing documentation or background information when making such comments.

Nina stated that she finds it hard to believe that in Oakland that there are no other sites. She felt that it was a very unsatisfactory letter.

Roslyn believes that most people using the park and ride lot are from out of the area and its very cheap parking for them. What's being planned now may give the state more revenue than what they currently receive. She agreed that it'd be nice to dot all the I's and cross all the T's but there is no doubt in her mind that the right decision was made in conveying the property and that the State is ahead of the game in doing so.

Commissioner Lawrence asked if moving the park and ride lot seven blocks would still ensure the utilization of the lot that it has at the current location.

Nina answered, yes, but they will probably use the bus and not BART because no one is going to make the number of switches that'd be necessary. They'd need to drive into the park and ride lot, hop on a bus and then transfer to BART. Nina doesn't see anyone doing that. They'd drive to the lot and get on the bus that would take them into the City.

Roslyn suggested that everyone move on recognizing that there are going to be differing views.

Walt said that the issue goes back to the letter that Chair McKenna wrote, that if the Department had brought the item to the Committee in April when everyone was in Oakland that they could have looked at the sites.

Commissioner Lawrence said that he understands that it's a done deal but that he's still unsure of what the costs would be to look into other sites for the USPS. Was that ever looked into?

Bob MacPherson said that yes, they contacted several agencies and looked at other sites for the USPS. High Street and Fruitvale was looked into and neither site was usable due to column structures. The possibility of moving the truck training operation out of the area was considered but the Department deferred to the USPS when they said that the drivers should be in close proximity to the mail center. He also said that that doesn't mean that it's a dead issue and that it won't be pursued in the future.

Walt Mosher asked why they couldn't get the Army Base.

Bob responded that Oakland is not willing to use the site for that purpose. Walt commented that the City just didn't want to do it.

Nina asked what the terms for the lease are with the USPS.

Bob MacPherson said that it's a 10-year lease that they're approximately half way through with option to extend and an option to buy. Bob also said that he thinks that there may be a misconception because the Department fully recognized that the new lot was not the most convenient but it would work.

Commissioner Lawrence said that it was unfortunate that he wasn't able to participate in the teleconference but said that he would have liked to express his support that this type of transaction and information is brought forward in enough time to allow the members to fully consider the project.

Roslyn Payne said that she fully supports the decision made by the Department and the CTC and feels that they did absolutely the right thing.

Bob MacPherson thanked Roslyn for all her time and effort on the transaction.

Item 4. Los Angeles Unified School District

Vern Rhinehart, HQ Right of Way presented this item for informational purposes only. It will be some months before the item comes to the AAC for an action. He explained that the Department would review all the appraisals and costs and come to an agreement.

Bill Hauf asked what would happen in the interim.

Vern said that the terms would be such that there will be no interruption in the equipment shop. That there are three potential sites at this point, once the selected site is certified for occupancy they can move.

Kathie Jacobs asked what kind of time frame they are looking at to bring the item to the Committee for a recommendation.

Vern Rhinehart said that it's the Los Angeles Unified School District that appears to have the urgency and the timing will depend on them doing what they need to do before it comes back.

Commissioner Lawrence asked when the CTC could expect to hear something on this transaction. Vern replied that it's some months away and could be as much as two-years out.

Item 5. Caltrans' Land Management System (CLMS)

Greg Lundblad, HQ Right of Way, presented this information item regarding a new land management system based on a product out of Virginia Department of Transportation. The new system will utilize modern technology, consistent with California standards. It will be able to communicate with the Department's other systems being developed. Greg explained that there would be a one-time license fee of \$250,000 or 10% of what it cost Virginia to get theirs online. Greg estimated that the total cost to get the system up and going would be approximately \$5 million.

Nina Gruen said that she's less concerned with the purchase cost but what are the expected ongoing costs to operate and maintain the system? Will there be fewer people needed if the system gets up and going?

Greg said that it would be PY (personnel year) neutral, that there would be a savings on an ongoing basis. The new system would be more functional and would be able to track and review things that aren't currently available. The end users ability to produce reports and get data in the same day instead of weeks that it now takes will be greatly enhanced.

Nina said that she thinks that it will be a very important by product.

Bill Hauf asked what the best estimate would be when Dept. of Finance might allow the Dept. to move forward with this.

Commissioner Lawrence asked Kathie Jacobs where does the Dept. get its funds that would allow them to manage this system. Kathie said that this is not a financial item that would be brought before the Commission. The Department receives its funds for salaries out of the general funds and not through the STIP or any of the other programs that the Commission has oversight responsibility.

Greg said that they do have a contingency plan if they can't get approval for this system and that they are looking at other systems but none are as good as what they can get if they go with the Virginia product.

Greg said that the Department of Finance is requiring an integration study to analyze how this and the Department's other proposed systems would fit together. Greg explained that the integration study was set to go in July 2002, but the Department of General Services said that they needed to expand the advertising and new bids will be required. The financing for the system itself is still up in the air. The new system would allow for the loading of current system information and will not require completely new data entry.

Commissioner Lawrence would expect that the payback would be in efficiency. Greg said that it would probably take two years to get to a breakeven point.

Walt Mosher asked what the extra \$4.75 million was for if the cost to get the system is only \$250,000. Greg responded that Caltrans has different needs than Virginia DOT and that \$4.75 million is the estimated amount it would take to modify the system to fit Caltrans' needs.

Walt Mosher asked if the Department has a breakdown of all the costs. Greg said yes, he would put the numbers together and send them to Kathie. Kathie will review the item and forward it to Nina, and Nina will decide whether to have the item on the October agenda.

Peter Schultze reminded Commissioner Lawrence and the Committee members that this item was for informational purposes and that neither the Committee nor the Commission would be asked for a recommendation or to provide funding for the system.

Commissioner Lawrence said he understands that but the Commission and the Committee could possibly be of assistance in getting the approvals for the Department should it feel that it's a worthy cause. Commissioner Lawrence also said that if the Department was being asked to purchase the product from Virginia for 10% of its costs it should include the programming.

ACTION: Greg Lundblad, provide Kathie Jacobs with a breakout of the costs involved in the CLMS.