

# Report of the TA Community Advisory Committee

## Meeting of November 5, 2024

### Committee Actions

**Consent Calendar** - all approved unanimously, without comments

- **4a) Approval of Minutes of the CAC Meeting of October 8, 2024**
- **4b) Approval of 2025 TA CAC Meeting Calendar**
- **4c) TA Board Item 7.b Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the Period Ending September 30, 2024**
- **4d) TA Board Item 7.c Acceptance of Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review and Outlook**
- **4e) TA Board Item 7.d Accepting the Countywide Automated Vehicles Strategic Plan**
- **4f) TA Board Item 7.e Adopting the Amended Conflict of Interest Code**

### Other Items

- **3) Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**
  - No public comment
- **5) TA Board Item 7.a Approval of Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting of October 10, 2024**
  - No comments
- **6) TA Board Item 12.a 2024 Joint Cycle 7 Pedestrian and Bicycle Program and Cycle 2 Alternative Congestion Relief/Transportation Demand Management Calls for Projects Draft Recommendations**
  - Vice Chair Fox asked about the acronym ITS. Staff said that ITS = intelligent transportation systems (e.g., signal timing).
  - Nheeda Enriquez asked why smaller programs were undersubscribed. Staff said that in the bike/ped program, project costs are increasing and thus the <\$1M price limit may be pushing out some projects. For ACR/TDM programs, education with the cities could help identify eligible projects. The strategic plan program will help address additional, smaller TDM projects.
  - Mike Swire asked whether \$2M was a cap on large projects. Staff said that >\$2M (requests/) projects would need other funding sources. Some projects may require multiple funding requests. The strategic plan will increase this limit to \$3.5M. There is a 10% match requirement per the strategic plan.
  - Gus Mattammal asked how the Farallon View School in mid-Coast, which lacks sidewalks and will see more development and traffic, can attract funds. Staff said that funding for Safe Routes to Schools walking audits could help. The County Office of Education and County Public Works Department could help. The TA is providing walking audits through the Office of Education.

- Rich Hedges said that the 19th Avenue bike lane grant attracted \$2M in funding, but \$9M in funding is still required.
- Giuliano Carlini asked what are the minimum technical requirements for bike projects. He thinks that some of the projects - e.g., Class II bike lanes on busy roads - isn't enough. He thinks that the TA should have stricter rules on what they will/not support. Staff said that they use the FHWA Bikeway Selection Guide for guidance on appropriate solutions. If projects don't meet these guidelines explanations are required. Mr. Carlini would like to see projects meet NACTO all ages and abilities requirements. Staff said that this isn't always possible given project-specific conditions. Mr. Carlini would like to see teeth on bike standards, not just recommendations.
- Sandra Lang asked how "high" construction costs are defined and the impact on smaller grants. Staff said that none of the small capital projects were refused and that the Strategic Plan is considering raising the maximum grant requests to accommodate recent cost increases.
- Mr. Carlini asked why walk audits were necessary for Safe Routes to School projects. He didn't think that similar audits were necessary for car infrastructure and that the audits were process intensive. He asked whether they are legally mandated. Staff said the audits are not legally mandated but they provide the opportunity for input and help identify specific engineering solutions. Staff suggested that cities use complete streets assessments from UC Berkeley SafeTREC program. Mr. Carlini thought that staff was capable of identifying safety issues and to simplify processes to reduce costs.
- Vice Chair Fox said that we are undersubscribed in smaller projects and oversubscribed in larger projects. He is concerned that by funding all projects we aren't eliminating some lower quality projects and we aren't asking applicants to improve their requests. Staff said that the evaluation committee did not identify any projects that didn't merit funding.
- Mr. Swire agreed with Mr. Fox's interest in attracting better projects. He also suggested that we increase the funding match requirement higher than 10% as this would free up TA money for more projects and increase buy-in from cities to improve project quality.
- Mr. Carlini asked why ITS projects (e.g., signal timing), which help increase roadway efficiency/capacity, get money from alternative traffic buckets instead of local roads funding buckets. He said that efficiency doesn't help safety or alternate modes of travel. Staff said that the goal is congestion management and improving the efficiency of space, not increasing road capacity.
- Mr. Carlini asked whether bike/ped money would only be used for the bike/ped components of roadway projects. Staff said that other roadway improvements, which may be part of a larger project, cannot be funded with pedestrian and bicycle program funds.
- The Committee, via informal poll, agreed with staff's recommendation for Option 2 (funding additional projects) for both the bike/ped projects and ACR/TDM projects.

- **7) TA Board Item 12.b Strategic Plan 2025-2029 Public Review Draft Release**
  - Ms. Lang asked whether external collaborations would be included in draft - e.g., Grand Boulevard Initiative. Staff said that the TA will aid other agencies. The new definition of county-wide significance will include El Camino Real.
  - Mr. Hedges asked what % of Measure A goes toward grade separation. Staff said the grade separation bucket receives 15% or \$15M/year based on a conservative estimate of Measure A generating \$100M per year. Mr. Hedges said that Caltrain wants to do 12 grade separation projects, but TA doesn't believe that is possible - there is a disconnect in terms of feasibility given funding. Mr. Hedges said to prioritize projects that include arterials and high safety concerns.
  - Mr. Hedges said the Dumbarton was deprioritized when Scott Haggerty moved \$90M of Regional Measure 2 (RM2) funding to BART to Silicon Valley, which went into a deep financial hole. He asked why are we still looking at Dumbarton? Staff said the focus is on what can be accomplished on this side of the Bay.
  - Mr. Swire said that there is a lot of good detail in the plan but would like to see a higher level. E.g., what metrics are we trying to hit in our KPIs - this drives the overall strategy. He said that some CAC members have asked about VMT, mode share, pollution, and other metrics in the past and have been told by staff that the metrics need to be in the strategic plan. Staff said that the metrics would be identified after the strategic plan, early next year.
  - Peter Ohtaki said that it seems like there isn't sufficient funding for Dumbarton (rail) or grade separation. Staff confirmed that there is no rail project being considered. For grade separations, staff will need to come back to the Board to determine next steps to fund these expensive projects. This will be a separate discussion. Mr. Ohtaki asked whether we need an ally like MTC to help with funding. The Dumbarton corridor might compete with funding with another transbay tube. Staff said that the TA helps fund the projects, but it is up to the project sponsors to decide which projects to pursue.
  - Mr. Ohtaki didn't see a strategy around EVs in the strategic plan. E.g., for shuttles. Staff said that electric conversion of shuttles also requires upgrades and is encouraged in the shuttle program evaluation criteria. The TA is incorporating EVs into mobility hubs through ACR/TDM funding. EVs are a GHG-reduction opportunity.
  - Mr. Hedges said that we will have challenges to getting sufficient electricity for mass EV conversion.
  - Mr. Carlini said that the plan is rather tactical, not strategic. The TA has spent most of its money on highway expansions and it would be great to move away from this in the strategic plan and look at other congestion mitigation strategies. Making this clear would discourage others from proposing highway expansion projects. He said the strategic plan should reflect where we want to go.

- Mr. Carlini said that Measures A&W are different and a single program might be preferable and aligned. Staff said that the time trajectories are different and Samtrans has ownership of W, making alignment/unification difficult.
  - Vice Chair Fox said that the promotional video could help explain to the public what the TA does. The public either doesn't understand or objects to what the TA does. For the Dumbarton corridor, we need to keep options open when recommending temporary solutions. The Dumbarton corridor is a big opportunity, but requires regional cooperation.
  - Mr. Carlini said that the quick two week public review means that it is very important for the public to learn about this opportunity. Marketing is key. Staff said that it will notify the public through social media and other channels. Stakeholder outreach groups will be key to getting comments.
  - Ms. Lang said that there is little public education about Measure W and we could do a better job on outreach.
- **8) TA Board Item 3 Legislative Update**
    - No discussion as legislatures are in recess.
- **9) Report of the Chair**
    - The Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) is considering a toll increase and other toll policy changes for the Bay Area's seven state-owned bridges. If approved by BATA later this year, the changes would take effect beginning Jan 1, 2026. Two of these bridges, the San Mateo-Hayward Bridge and the Dumbarton Bridge service high numbers of San Mateo County commuters. In order to avoid a large increase in a single year, the proposed toll increases would be phased in over five years. The Bay Area Toll Authority is inviting the public to come and speak about these proposed changes.
    - PUBLIC HEARING: There will be a public hearing on Wednesday, November 20, 2024 at 9:35 am to hear testimony about the proposal from Bay Area residents, businesses and other interested parties. Members of the public will be able to participate via Zoom or in person at the Bay Area Metro Center, 375 Beale St, San Francisco, CA, 94105. Public Comment will be accepted from November 4, 2024 through December 3, 2024 at 5 pm. Oral testimony will be received until the close of the public hearing on November 20, 2024.
- **10) Report from Staff**
    - No comments.
- **11) Member Comments / Requests**
    - Mr. Hedges said that state bridge tolls go to \$8 on 1/1/25. He said that we aren't necessarily seeing the (economic) pain that the public is going through.
    - Mr. Swire recommended that CAC members try the Transit app. He said he will circulate an article in the Chronicle on whether the 101 widening and Express Lane project had reduced congestion.

- Ms. Kuklin thanked staff for the Strategic Plan and attention from constituents.
  - Mr. Fox said that we need to think about how the strategic plan will guide us for the next four years, but should be flexible for changing conditions/technology.
  - Mr. Mattammal thanked the CAC for serving the community.
  - Mr. Ohtaki said that the strategic plan is an opportunity to think big and long-term instead of thinking incrementally. It should also be a marketing document that educates voters for the next time a vote comes around.
- **12) Date/Time of Next Regular Meeting: Tuesday, December 3, 2024, 4:30 pm**
  - **13) Adjourn**