

# ***UpState RailConnect Committee***

***Dedicated to Completion of the Alternative Rail Route Feasibility Study***

## **Meeting Announcement**

**June 26, 2013**

**10:00 AM**

**Eureka Public Marina  
Wharfinger Building  
1 Marina Way, Eureka, CA 95501**

## **AGENDA**

- 1. Introductions**
- 2. Public Comment**
- 3. Review of Agenda**
- 4. Approval of minutes from May 15, 2013 meeting (action anticipated)**
- 5. Discussion on Feasibility Study funding progress (action anticipated)**
  - a. Public**
  - b. Private**
    - 1. Land Bridge Alliance update**
- 6. Discussion on potential and scheduled presentations and events**
- 7. Discussion on Draft Scope of Work (action anticipated)**
- 8. Technical Advisory Committee Discussion (action anticipated)**
- 9. Private funding process discussion (action anticipated)**
- 10. Reports**
  - a. Staff**
  - b. Humboldt/Eureka representatives**
  - c. Trinity representatives**
  - d. Tehama Representatives**
  - e. UpState California Economic Development Council representatives**
  - f. Northern California Tribal Chairmen's Association representatives**
- 11. Task Assignments/Items for Next Agenda**
- 12. Next Meeting/Adjourn**

For information regarding this meeting, please contact the *Upstate RailConnect Committee* at [landbridgealliance@gmail.com](mailto:landbridgealliance@gmail.com)

# ***UpState RailConnect Committee***

***Dedicated to Completion of the Alternative Rail Route Feasibility Study***

## **Additional Events**

**After the UpState RailConnect Committee meeting, members of the Committee and their representatives are invited to participate in two events.**

- 1. UpState RailConnect Committee members are invited to attend a Luncheon at the historic Samoa Cookhouse, Samoa Road, Samoa, CA where the Humboldt Bay Harbor Working Group will hold their monthly Harbor Presentation Series. Noon-1:30. Samoa Cookhouse, Samoa Road, Samoa California (less than 10 min drive from the Wharfinger Building)**
- 2. The Land Bridge Alliance is hosting a narrated harbor tour for UpState RailConnect Committee members and their representatives on the historic 1910 passenger vessel *Madaket*. Non-committee members can attend on a first-come, first-served basis as space on the vessel is limited. To make reservations, please contact [landbridgealliance@gmail.com](mailto:landbridgealliance@gmail.com) and leave your name and contact information. 2:15 PM. Foot of C-Street in Eureka (bring a jacket, flat shoes and a camera for most enjoyment)**



Humboldt Bay Harbor Working Group

# INVITES YOU TO JOIN US FOR A NO-HOST LUNCH!

Come learn about our harbor and how together we can bring new life and prosperity to our county.

We can create an economically and environmentally vibrant green port. Be part of this grand enterprise!

## June's Guest Speaker Robert A. Martin

Tehama County Coordinator: Rail Development



## "Effects of Rail on the Economy" Luncheon

Wednesday, June 26<sup>th</sup>

at

Samoa Cookhouse

Across the Samoa Bridge Off Cookhouse Road

(707) 442-1659



### Lunch Menu & Cost:

Pot-roast	\$12.95
Soup/Salad	\$ 8.95

*(Tax and tips not included)*



See you at the



### SCHEDULE

12:00 p.m.	Sign in
12:30 p.m.	Introductions/Lunch
12:45 p.m.	Presentation
1:15 p.m.	Comments/questions
1:30 p.m.	Close

Important: RSVP by Monday, June 23rd to Susana Munzell:  
[S.munzell@Yahoo.com](mailto:S.munzell@Yahoo.com) or call 497-6137

# ***UpState RailConnect Committee***

***Dedicated to Completion of the Alternative Rail Route Feasibility Study***

**June 15, 2013**  
**Minutes (Subject to Approval)**

**727 Oak Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, Room 203 (Red Bank Room), Red Bluff, CA**

## **1. Introductions**

**Committee Members Present:** City of Eureka Councilmember Lance Madsen and Councilmember Marian Brady; Tehama County Supervisor Steve Chamblin and CAO Bill Goodwin; Trinity County Supervisor John Fenley; Upstate California Economic Development Council General Manager Alison O'Sullivan; Northern California Tribal Chairmen's Association representative Nick Angeloff; Humboldt County Representative David Tyson.

**Committee Members Absent:** County of Humboldt Supervisor Rex Bohn; County of Trinity Supervisor Debra Chapman and CAO Wendy Tyler; Upstate California Economic Development Council Board President Brynda Stranix; Eureka Councilmember Mike Newman

**Staff:** David Hull

**Public:** Jason Randacore; Bob Martin; Monte and Debbie Provolt; Judy Harrison; Kent Sawatzky; Bert Bundy; Richard Marks

## **2. Public Comment:** None

## **3. Review of Agenda**

No changes

## **4. Approval of minutes from March 21, 2013 meeting**

David Tyson moved for approval of the March 21, 2013 minutes; Alison O'Sullivan seconded the motion. Motion passed with members Fenley, Goodwin and Brady abstaining because they were not present at the March 21, 2013 meeting.

**5. Receipt of the Board of Commissioners of the Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation and Conservation District "UPSTATE RAILCONNECT COMMITTEE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING" entered into by Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation and Conservation District on April 25, 2013**

Chair Madsen asked staff for a report on this item. It was reported that the Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation and Conservation District recently approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that was not solicited by any member Agency or sitting member of the UpState RailConnect Committee, and did not evolve from discussions by or negotiations with the RailConnect Committee membership. The MOU does not express any support for the direction of the Upstate RailConnect Committee, only states that the "purpose of this MOU is for the Harbor District to become a member" of the RailConnect Committee. It was also noted that all of the UpState RailConnect Committee member organizations approved a Memorandum of Agreement, not a Memorandum of Understanding; begging the question as to whether they actually meant the MOA or something else. Richard Marks, a sitting Harbor Commissioner, was asked if he had a presentation. He stated he was only attending to observe.

Bill Goodwin noted that the Upstate RailConnect Committee had discussed additional members at their first meeting in November 2012 and that the focus was on cities and counties and not on special districts. He noted that special districts and others were envisioned to be technical advisors on an as-needed basis but not as standing Committee members. Mr. Goodwin continued that several special districts in Tehama County may also want to join which could make the Committee too big to function. David Tyson added that all interested agencies will be involved in working with the Upstate RailConnect Committee's consultant and that the Harbor District has a role there.

Mr. Marks stated that the Harbor District has not been involved or included in the RailConnect Committee process.

Mr. Tyson noted that the Harbor District has not been involved because they have chosen not to be involved. Mr. Tyson stated that he had offered on two occasions to present information to the Harbor District only to have the Harbor District decline. Mr. Tyson also noted that the Harbor District's "MOU" does not contain the same level of commitment as the other RailConnect Committee members made when they all approved the same MOA. Mr. Tyson stated that the goal of the RailConnect Committee has always been to have a very public process and is not as the Harbor District has characterized the process today.

Nick Angeloff noted the MOA that all members approved has specifics about support for the Alternative Rail Route Feasibility Study and suggested that from the NCTCA's perspective any new members should follow the same process, not create a new process with new language as the Harbor District has done with their MOU.

Chair Madsen noted that the Upstate RailConnect Committee set criteria in the MOA that the Harbor District has not met in their MOU. Chair Madsen continued that the Harbor District is already technically represented on the RailConnect Committee by the County of Humboldt.

Bill Goodwin stated that maybe the RailConnect Committee should start thinking about the possibility of the Harbor District being a technical advisor to the RailConnect Committee process.

David Tyson noted that the only reason the City of Eureka is on the RailConnect Committee is because Eureka took the original lead on the Alternative Rail Route Feasibility Study and that the Upstate RailConnect Committee, once formed, suggested that they stay as members.

Chair Madsen suggested that although the RailConnect Committee had discussed the possibility of technical advisors, the Committee should discuss what that means at the next meeting. Mr. Goodwin agreed.

Supervisor Chamblin noted that there are lots of presentations going on this week that may need to be followed up by technical advisors or a technical advisory committee.

The RailConnect Committee requested that an item regarding a discussion on technical advisory committee be on the next RailConnect Committee meeting agenda.

## **6. Discussion on Potential Funding Sources**

**a. Public Sources:** David Hull described the list and progress made on exploring public sources of feasibility study funding as follows:

- **MAP-21 Grants** – David Hull reported that he continues to explore MAP-21 as a potential source of funding for the Alternative Rail Route Feasibility Study.
- **CalTrans Transportation Planning Grants** – David Hull reported that he submitted a 2013/14 CalTrans Community Based Transportation Planning grant application prior to the April 2, 2013 deadline. Per UpState RailConnect Committee's request, the City of Eureka voted to be the grant Applicant with the Upstate California Economic Development Council as Sub-Applicant thereby representing the entire potential rail corridor. Notification of award is to be this "summer" with funding to be available in February 2014.
- **RBO Grants** – Alison O'Sullivan reported on the potential of an RBO grant and agreed to pass along a link to the program to staff.

**b. Private Sources:**

- **Land Bridge Alliance Update:** **David Tyson**, Chair of the Land Bridge Alliance (LBA), handed out a LBA brochure and reiterated the purpose of LBA in education and outreach. In addition he reported that LBA has continued to do some fundraising and reported on LBA activities since the last UpState RailConnect Committee meeting. David Tyson noted that he has been doing a lot of presentations in Humboldt County. He introduced the LBA's Sacramento Valley

representative Bob Martin and noted that thanks to Mr. Martin and Supervisor Chamblin, Mr. Tyson and Chair Madsen are spending three days in Tehama County making presentations and meeting prospective shippers. Mr. Tyson noted that it is uplifting to make presentations and meet people in Tehama County because there is a real can-do attitude shown by the public and the businesses. Mr. Tyson noted the hugely productive LBA exhibit at the Redwood Region Logging Conference and suggested that Mr. Martin was looking into similar events in Tehama County. Mr. Tyson reiterated that the purpose of LBA is to plow the ground so that elected officials can be comfortable having a public dialogue and that the private sector has now taken notice and are willing to hear about the proposed study.

**Bill Goodwin** noted that Jason Randacore of the Governor's Office of Business Development was at this meeting and that it was important to get the State to provide some seed dollars to get the federal agencies interested. Mr. Goodwin complimented the UpState RailConnect Committee and Land Bridge Alliance process and noted how quickly it has grown.

**Chair Madsen** agreed that LBA is now acting as intended and this week, thanks to Bob Martin, LBA is growing with Mr. Martin getting three new LBA members in Tehama County.

## **7. Discussion on the Draft Scope of Work**

No additional changes to the Scope of Work were made. The draft Scope of Work continues to stand as follows:

- Identification of a proposed route and alternatives
- Identification of land ownerships
- Assessment of economic benefit of a connection to the national rail system
  - Assessment of market potential
  - Assessment of community and socioeconomic benefits along the proposed route
  - Assessment of impact to ports
- A conceptual development plan that will include:
  - Ownership/governance of the rail line
  - Prelim engineering
  - Highway/port connectors/potential stops/spurs along the route
  - Outline of national security issues
  - Additional uses of the corridor (fiber optic, trail, water, passenger, etc)
  - Estimated permitting needs
  - Estimated environmental issues and mitigations
  - Estimated development costs and timelines

Richard Marks noted that the Harbor District recently hired a consultant to do a study of the route and actually flew the route. Since the UpState RailConnect Committee has not started the feasibility study and thus not defined a "route" Mr. Marks was asked as to what "route" they were analyzing and flew over. Mr. Marks was not sure but thought it was the lines on the Upstate RailConnect Committee conceptual graphic. It was noted that the Harbor District's consultants are economic consultants and not engineers. It was also noted that Upstate RailConnect Committee staff had offered on two occasions to work with the Harbor District's consultant to help coordinate their study with the RailConnect Committee study, but were never asked.

## 8. Discussion on Potential and Scheduled Presentations and Events

David Tyson noted that Bob Martin and Supervisor Chamblin have done a great job of scheduling meetings this week in Tehama County. Bill Goodwin noted that it is good to have Mr. Martin as a private sector representative on LBA to be able to approach other private sector businesses and thanked Mr. Martin for being a part of the effort.

Supervisor Fenley noted that after research, he believes that the places in Trinity County to focus efforts with presentations are in Weaverville and Hayfork. Supervisor Fenley also noted that he is helping to coordinate with a group called the Forest Cooperative and with USDA.

Nick Angeloff reported that he will be providing the Rolling Hills tribe with a packet of feasibility study information at the conclusion of this meeting.

Alison O'Sullivan stated that she will work to set up some targeted presentations in Butte and Glenn Counties.

Chair Madsen reinforced David Tyson's previous statements regarding ongoing efforts and presentations in Humboldt County.

## 9. Reports:

- a. **Staff:** Nothing more to report
- b. **Humboldt/Eureka:** Eureka Councilmember Brady noted that she was filling in for Councilmember Newman and relayed a story from a Humboldt county flower grower that detailed large cost savings to their company if and active rail were connected to Humboldt county. Councilmember Brady also suggested that the UpState RailConnect Committee might work to get some information on what would ship in and out of Humboldt County.
- c. **Trinity:** Nothing more to report
- d. **Tehama:** Nothing more to report
- e. **Upstate California Economic Development Council:** Nothing more to report
- f. **Northern California Tribal Chairmen's Association:** Nothing more to report

- g. **Jason Randacore** stated that the Governor's Office of Business Development has been monitoring the Alternative Rail Route Feasibility Study effort pretty much since the beginning and has been focusing on getting Humboldt Bay's harbor up to speed with the rest of California's deep water ports.

10. **Task Assignments/Items for the Next Agenda:** The Committee agreed the following items should be discussed at the next meeting:

- a. Discussion on the inclusion of technical advisory committees
- b. Discussion on private side funding and how to deal with proprietary interests and how the private sector can utilize the UpState RailConnect Committee process.

11. **Next Meeting:** It was decided that the next meeting will be held in Humboldt County. The Committee suggested that it would be good for Committee members to be able to see Humboldt Bay's harbor area. It was agreed that the next meeting would be Wednesday, June 26, 2013.

12. **Meeting adjourned:** 11:17 AM

Approved:

---

Lance Madsen, Chair

# ***UpState RailConnect Committee***

***Dedicated to Completion of the Alternative Rail Route Feasibility Study***

## **Agenda Detail**

**Date:** June 26, 2013

**Agenda Item:**

### **9. Private Funding Process Discussion**

---

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends the UpState RailConnect Committee Board review and discuss the issue and provide direction.

**Background:**

At the UpState RailConnect Committee meeting of May 15, 2013, Committee members expressed a desire to discuss in more detail what the mechanism(s) might be to accept and direct handle potential private funding of all or part of the Alternative Rail Route Feasibility Study. This agenda detail provides information to start this discussion.

At the January meeting of the UpState RailConnect Committee, the flow chart (attached) was presented as an overall outline of how private donations might be handled. This flow chart provides an overview but does not provide specific details of the use of private funds. The general narrative that has been applied to the use of private funding has been described as having three general alternatives, namely:

1. Private funders do all or part of the feasibility study on their own with no involvement from the UpState RailConnect Committee
2. Private funders essentially “donate” their money to the Land Bridge Alliance to be used in the public UpState RailConnect Committee process with no strings
3. A hybrid of the above two options.

While the first two options are straightforward, the “hybrid” is where questions have been raised and where the Upstate RailConnect Committee needs to provide direction.

As has also been discussed at previous meetings, The Land Bridge Alliance has been active in soliciting private donations with some success and has generated even more significant funding leads. Before these leads are pursued much further, it is important for the UpState RailConnect Committee to have a discussion and agree on how private funds can be applied to the Alternative Rail Route Feasibility Study.

In order to start this discussion, a few scenarios are presented below:

#### **Scenario 1**

A private investor desires to fund all or part of the Alternative Rail Route Study. The private investor wants to keep their information proprietary and has little or no interaction with the UpState RailConnect Committee.

1. What is the UpState RailConnect Committee’s reaction and role in this scenario?

#### **Scenario 2**

A private investor wants to donate funds to Land Bridge Alliance to pay for the Alternative Rail Route Feasibility Study or certain components with no strings attached. The information generated is public and the consultant selection and study oversight is intended to be provided by the multi-agency UpState RailConnect Committee.

1. What is UpState RailConnect Committees reaction and role in this scenario?
  
2. If Land Bridge Alliance accepts the funds, what is the instrument that binds the land Bridge Alliance to the UpState RailConnect Committee to guarantee the Committee’s role in the study?

