

**San Mateo County Transportation Authority
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, California**

**Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)
Meeting Minutes**

September 5, 2023

**Members Present:
(In Person)** B. Arietta (Chair), I. Bucio (arrived at 4:33 pm), G. Carlini, K. Chin, N. Enriquez, J. Fox (Vice Chair) (left at 6:16 pm), K. Kuklin, S. Lang, J. Londer, G. Mattammal (arrived at 4:36 pm), A. Paul, M. Swire

**Members Present:
(Via Teleconference)** None

Members Absent: D. Bojack, P. Ohtaki

Staff Present: P. Skinner, P. Gilster, A. Linehan, S. van Hoften, B. Adams, J. Brook

1. Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Barbara Arietta called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Announcement of New and Continuing CAC Members

Chair Arietta welcomed new members Nheeda Enriquez, Allie Paul, and Giuliano Carline, G, and Allie, who briefly introduced themselves.

Ivan Bucio arrived at 4:33 pm.

3. Roll Call

Jean Brook, CAC Secretary, called the roll and confirmed that a quorum was present.

4. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

There were no comments.

Items 7 and 8 were taken out of order.

7. TA Board Item 5.a Approval of Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting of August 3, 2023

There were no comments.

Gus Mattammal arrived at 4:36 pm.

8. TA Board Item 10.a 101 Corridor Connect Program Update

Martin Reyes, Principal Transportation Planner, provided the initial part of the presentation.

Amy Linehan, Government and Community Affairs Officer, provided the community/stakeholder engagement and multimodal strategy section of the presentation.

Karen Kuklin asked how neighboring counties would connect to the multimodal strategy.

Mr. Reyes said they are focusing solely on San Mateo County for now, but would consider the impact of the strategy on San Francisco and Santa Clara Counties in their development of the plan.

Ken Chin asked how the project was funded and if the use of the funds is compliant with the Strategic Plan. Staff confirmed it is and that the program is funded through highway program oversight funds that were budgeted for this purpose.

Mr. Swire asked why the Program was prioritizing the north part of the County when Phase III of the Express Lane project was uncertain and could change the needs in the area adjacent to US 101. Staff said the projects included in 101 Corridor Connect would be prioritized by the local communities and it is inclusive of projects that benefit all modes of transportation. Also, staff said they do not have a preconceived notion of the project mix; rather, the TA is looking at ways to more holistically improve mobility and provide congestion relief along the corridor.

Sandra Lang asked why there would be a one-mile limit for the corridor. Mr. Reyes said beyond the one-mile radius would significantly expand the focus of the project beyond what is reasonable. Mr. Gilster said that C/CAG (City and County Association of Governments of San Mateo County) should be kicking off the update to the countywide Transportation Master Plan next year, which would include other County projects.

Giuliano Carlini asked how input from individual communities was used to put together a plan that makes sense regionally. Mr. Reyes said they would work with the consultant to translate community priorities into projects based on what they found in the project inventory.

Mr. Carlini asked why US 101 was chosen over other major arteries such as I-280. Mr. Skinner said US 101 is the most heavily traveled commute corridor in the County.

Ivan Bucio asked if data would be captured from people who work but do not live in the County. Ms. Linehan indicated a project survey was being developed to receive feedback from anyone that travels along the 101 Corridor, including commuters that do not live in San Mateo County.

Gus Mattammal asked about the purpose of the project inventory. Mr. Reyes said the inventory would inform which projects can be selected for delivery under 101 Corridor Connect while also helping to identify gaps or needs.

Vice Chair John Fox asked for confirmation that the project would look at the Grand Boulevard Initiative, and staff confirmed this would be appropriate.

Allie Paul asked if they would initiate action on projects from the area of the County where they collect feedback or would they wait to take action until feedback has been collected for the entire project area. Mr. Reyes confirmed that once feedback has been collected for North County, they would then work with local partners to initiate project delivery for that area.

5. Consent Calendar

5.a. Approval of Minutes of the CAC Meeting of August 1, 2023

TA Board Meeting Agenda for September 7, 2023

5.b. TA Board Item 5.b Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the Period Ending July 31, 2023

5.c. TA Board Item 5.c Acceptance of Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report for 4th Quarter Fiscal Year

5.d. TA Board Item 5.d Deprogramming and Deallocation of Three Pedestrian and Bicycle Program 2022 Cycle 6 Projects

5.e. TA Board Item 5.e Program and Allocate \$9,650,560 in Measure A Funds to the San Mateo County Transit District for the SamTrans Paratransit Program and Caltrain

Regarding Item 5.d, Vice Chair Fox asked staff to confirm that funds could not be moved between categories, and Mr. Skinner confirmed they cannot. He said the Pedestrian and Bicycle funds would revert back to that category and be made available in the next Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Call for Projects.

Regarding Item 5.a, Mr. Swire requested the following amendment to his comment under Item 13. Member Comments and Requests:

Mr. Swire concurred about the Grand Jury report. He noted that Smart Growth America focuses on sustainable neighborhoods and healthy communities; [according to Mr. Swire, they recently did a national survey which indicated that most people do not believe that highway widening reduces congestion.](#) He said he felt that America's perception of transportation is changing to favor transit, and Chair Arietta concurred. [He also surveyed Nextdoor members on the mid-Peninsula asking if the \\$581 million spent on highway widening in San Mateo County had reduced congestion and was worthwhile, reporting that 85 percent of survey respondents indicated that the money was not well spent and that the project had not improved congestion.](#)

The Committee voted to approve Item 5.a as amended:

Motion/Second: Chin/Fox

Ayes: Arietta, Bucio, Carlini, Chin, Enriquez, Fox, Kuklin, Mattammal, Paul, Swire

Abstain: Lang, Londer

Absent: Bojack, Ohtaki

Regarding Item 5.c, Ms. Lang asked if the City of San Mateo's alternative development workshop would evaluate the cost-effective solutions for the Peninsula Avenue/101 Interchange. Mr. Skinner clarified the City of San Mateo is the project lead. He said the cost of the project has increased dramatically particularly regarding acquiring the right of way required to construct the project. Ms. Lang agreed that the right-of-way provisions are important. Mr. Skinner said the right of way is difficult to fund and its acquisition is a large part of the project cost.

Mr. Mattammal asked if the County and Caltrans are disagreeing about who will fund the maintenance of the Gray Whale Cove project. Mr. Skinner said that was correct that neither party has agreed to maintain the project.

The Committee voted to approve Item 5.c:

Motion/Second: Mattammal/Bucio

Ayes: Arietta, Bucio, Carlini, Chin, Enriquez, Fox, Kuklin, Lang, Londer, Mattammal, Paul, Swire

Absent: Bojack, Ohtaki

The Committee voted to approve Items 5.b, 5.d, and 5.e:

Motion/Second: Lang/Kuklin

Ayes: Arietta, Bucio, Carlini, Chin, Enriquez, Fox, Kuklin, Lang, Londer, Mattammal, Paul, Swire

Absent: Bojack, Ohtaki

6. Brown Act and CAC Role Orientation

Brendan Adams, Legal Counsel, Hanson Bridgett LLC, provided the presentation on the Brown Act.

Ms. Kuklin asked about the annual committee to nominate a committee chair, if that would be in violation of the Brown Act. Mr. Adams said no, if it does not constitute a quorum of the body.

Mr. Carlini asked about posting on social media, such as Nextdoor or Facebook, and other members reached a consensus there, would that be a violation, and Mr. Adams said it was risky.

Ms. Enriquez asked about responding to public comments. Mr. Adams said it was okay as long as there was no discussion on items not on the agenda. Shayna van Hoften, Legal Counsel, said if a response is required, a committee member can briefly respond or defer the question to staff. She said there is new legislation regarding posting on the internet and social media. She said generally a one-way push of information is okay, but that replies could generate a discussion that may be in violation.

Mr. Swire suggested pushing out articles to the committee that is of general interest and not committee business.

Shayna van Hoften, Legal Counsel, Hanson Bridgett LLC, provided the presentation on the role of the CAC member. She noted that the rules of procedure would be updated based on member input.

Vice Chair John Fox left at 6:16 pm

9. TA Board Item 10.b 101/92 Mobility Hub and Smart Corridor Concept Plan Progress Update

Mr. Reyes provided the presentation on the 101/92 Mobility Hub and Smart Corridor Concept Plan.

Ms. Linehan provided an update on engagement activity for the second part of the presentation.

Ken Chin asked if they had considered adding public restrooms. Mr. Reyes said they had talked about having restrooms specifically for bus operators. Mr. Chin, as the Vice President of the San Mateo-Foster City School District Board, asked if staff had reached out to the school district since the Hub is adjacent to Fiesta Gardens School. Mr. Reyes said they had a meeting with the

school Parent Teachers Association. Mr. Chin urged them to reach out to the school district specifically and not just the school.

Mr. Swire endorsed the need for a protected bike lane given current safety and comfort concerns. He also recommended the project extend one additional block to Bridgepointe Shopping Center, especially given the expected traffic once Chick-fil-A arrives.

Mr. Swire questioned whether the new express buses would succeed given previous challenges and the existence of Caltrain serving similar routes. Mr. Reyes mentioned that Caltrain serves a different demographic than SamTrans. Mr. Swire questioned whether the express bus user might be different than the average SamTrans user if fares are higher.

Mr. Skinner said Caltrain has a challenge attracting riders due to the ability of commuters to work from home.

Mr. Carlini said he was concerned with bike path routes not being 100 percent safe, such as the route to Bridgepointe Shopping Center. He noted that USB charging outlets on benches could potentially be hacked.

Mr. Mattammal asked if the existing conditions report was a public document. Mr. Reyes said it will be made public closer to the final concept plans being release.

10. TA Board Item 11 State and Federal Legislative Update

Amy Linehan, Government Affairs Officer, provided a summary of federal and state legislation.

On the federal side, she said the Senate had reconvened and the House would reconvene in October. She said that Congress has not passed any of their appropriation bills yet, and that a continuing resolution (CR) was likely.

On the state side, she said the Legislature reconvened from their summer recess on August 14 and fiscal committees completed their business by September 1. She said that all business by the floor of each house must conclude by September 14 in order for anything to be considered for signature by the Governor by October 14.

She noted recent personnel changes and provided some background on the transportation trailer bill.

Mr. Carlini asked if there is no omnibus bill, will the TA provide any direction. Ms. Linehan said there could be a CR. Mr. Skinner said that the federal shutdowns do not affect the TA.

11. TA Board Item 15.a Approval of Policy for Settlement of General Liability Claims

Ms. van Hoften presented the staff report.

Ms. Kuklin asked if the policy change was likely to invite claims. Ms. van Hoften said that it was unlikely since each TA agreement had a strong indemnity clause.

Motion/Second: Kuklin/Bucio

Ayes: Arietta, Bucio, Carlini, Chin, Enriquez, Kuklin, Lang, Londer, Mattammal, Paul, Swire

Absent: Bojack, Fox, Ohtaki

12. Report of the Chair

Chair Arietta reported on the new battery-electric multiple-unit Caltrain train set, which would use battery power on non-electrified sections of track between San Jose and Gilroy.

13. Report From Staff

Mr. Skinner said the report was in the packet. He asked committee members were welcome to volunteer to write the monthly CAC meeting summary. Ms. van Hoften suggested that guidelines may be added to the updated rules and procedures. Mr. Swire volunteered to write the summary.

14. Member Comments/Requests

Nheeda Enriquez suggested have an AI (Artificial Intelligence) summary of the meeting.

Mr. Chin welcomed the new CAC members and announced his retirement from the Committee. He thanked staff and members.

Mr. Kuklin thanked Mr. Chin for his participation. Mr. Londer thanked Mr. Chin and welcomed the new members.

15. Date/Time of Next Regular Meeting

Chair Arietta announced that the next meeting would be held on Tuesday, October 3, 2023, at 4:30 pm in person at the SamTrans Auditorium and via Zoom teleconference.

16. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 7:18 pm.

An audio/video recording of this meeting is available online at <https://www.smcta.com/about-us/board-directors/video-board-directors-cac-and-smcel-jpa>. Questions may be referred to the CAC Secretary's office by phone at 650.508.6223 or by email to cacsecretary@smcta.com.