



# AGENDA

## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Bacciocco Auditorium, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

**December 1, 2015 – Tuesday**

**4:30 p.m.**

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Call to Order/Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes from November 3, 2015
4. Public Comment  
Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes
5. **Transportation Authority Board Meeting Agenda for November 5, 2015**
  - a. Authorize Amendment of the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget by \$5 Million and Programming and Allocation of \$6.2 Million of Measure A Grade Separation Funding for the City of San Mateo for the Design of the 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue Grade Separation Project **(TA Item 10a)**
  - b. Program Report: Transit – Shuttles **(TA Item 11a)**
  - c. Joint TA and City/County Association of Governments San Mateo County Shuttle Program Call for Projects **(TA Item 11b)**
  - d. Update on State and Federal Legislative Program **(TA Item 11c)**
  - e. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for Fiscal Year Ending June 2015 (Unaudited) **(TA Item 4b)**
  - f. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for October 2015 **(TA Item 4c)**
  - g. Approval of Minutes of November 5, 2015 **(TA Item 4a)**
6. Report of the Chair (Barbara Arietta)
7. Report from Staff (Joe Hurley)
8. Member Comments/Requests  
Committee members may make brief statements regarding CAC-related areas of concern, ideas for improvement, or other items that will benefit or impact the TA or the CAC
9. Date, Time, and Place of Next Regular Meeting: Tuesday, January 5, 2016 at 4:30 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 1250 San Carlos Ave, San Carlos, CA 94070
10. Adjournment

*All items on this agenda are subject to action*

**CAC MEMBERS:** Barbara Arietta (Chair) • Diana Bautista • John Fox • Rich Hedges • Randall Hees • Jeff Londer • Daina Lujan • Olma O'Neil • Philip Rosenblatt • Shaunda Scruggs • Larry Shaine • Laurie Simonson (Vice Chair) • Jeanette Ward • William Warhurst • Paul Young •

## **INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC**

If you have questions on the agenda, please contact the Assistant District Secretary at 650-508-6223. Assisted listening devices are available upon request. Agendas are available on the Transportation Authority Website at [www.smcta.com](http://www.smcta.com).

### **Date and Time of Boards and Advisory Committee Meetings**

San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) Committees and Board: First Thursday of the month, 5 p.m. Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC): Tuesday proceeding first Thursday of the month, 4:30 p.m. Date, time and location of meetings may be changed as needed.

### **Location of Meeting**

The San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Office is located at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, which is one block west of the San Carlos Caltrain Station on El Camino Real, accessible by SamTrans bus Routes ECR, FLX, 260, 295, and 398.

Additional transit information can be obtained by calling 1-800-660-4287 (TTY 650-508-6448) or 511.

### **Public Comment**

If you wish to address the Citizens Advisory Committee, please fill out a speaker's card located on the agenda table. If you have anything that you wish distributed to the Citizens Advisory Committee and included for the official record, please hand it to the Assistant Authority Secretary, who will distribute the information to the Committee members and staff.

Members of the public may address the Citizens Advisory Committee on non-agendized items under the Public Comment item on the agenda. Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes and items raised that require a response will be deferred for staff reply.

### **Accessibility for Individuals with Disabilities**

Upon request, the TA will provide for written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings. Please send a written request, including your name, mailing address, phone number and brief description of the requested materials and a preferred alternative format or auxiliary aid or service at least two days before the meeting. Requests should be mailed to Nancy McKenna at San Mateo County Transportation Authority, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306; or email to [cacsecretary@smcta.com](mailto:cacsecretary@smcta.com); or by phone at 650-508-6279, or TDD 650-508-6448.

### **Availability of Public Records**

All public records relating to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306, at the same time that the public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body.

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)**  
**SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (TA)**  
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070  
4th Floor Dining Room

Draft

**MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 3, 2015**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** B. Arietta (Chair), D. Bautista, J. Fox, R. Hedges, R. Hees, J. Londer, D. Lujan, O. O'Neill, P. Rosenblatt, S. Scruggs, L. Shaine, L. Simonson, J. Ward, W. Warhurst, P. Young

**STAFF PRESENT:** J. Averill, S. Bhatnagar, R. Bolon, A. Chan, J. Hurley, L. Larano, J. Slavitt

Chair Barbara Arietta called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m. and Larry Shaine led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 29, 2015 MEETING MINUTES**

Motion/Second: Bautista/Hedges

Ayes: Bautista, Hedges, Hees, Londer, O'Neill, Rosenblatt, Scruggs, Shaine, Simonson, Ward, Warhurst, Young, Arietta

Absent: Fox

Abstain: Lujan

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

John Fox arrived 4:36 p.m.

**ITEMS FOR REVIEW – NOVEMBER 5, 2015 TA BOARD MEETING**

**Authorize Acceptance of the Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review and Outlook for the Quarter Ended September 30, 2015 (TA Item 10a)**

Monique Spyke, Public Financial Management Group (PFM), said the economic environment for the quarter was fairly volatile. Treasury yields moved up and down in response to various economic indicators and global economic uncertainty. The Federal Open Market Committee was expected to raise the Federal funds target rate, so yields rose in anticipation of that move. The rate was not raised, so yields fell at the end of the quarter. The rates are now expected to be raised by the end of the year. PFM tried to avoid making purchases throughout the quarter because of the volatility throughout the market. Before the news that the rate would not be raised, PFM made one purchase in September to extend the average maturity of the portfolio. As rates rise there will be more opportunity to get better income through the portfolio, so PFM is paying close attention to what the Federal Reserve is doing.

Motion/Second: Hees/Shaine

Ayes: Bautista, Fox, Hedges, Hees, Londer, Lujan, O'Neill, Rosenblatt, Shaine, Simonson, Ward, Warhurst, Young, Arietta

Abstain: Scruggs

**Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for September 2015  
(TA Item 4c)**

No discussion.

Motion/Second: Lujan/Hees

Ayes: Bautista, Fox, Hedges, Hees, Londer, Lujan, O'Neill, Rosenblatt, Shaine, Simonson,  
Ward, Warhurst, Young, Arietta

Abstain: Scruggs

**Receive and File the Semi-Annual Measure A Program Status Report (TA Item 4d)**

No discussion.

Motion/Second: Bautista/Lujan

Ayes: Bautista, Hedges, Hees, Fox, Londer, Lujan, O'Neill, Rosenblatt, Scruggs, Shaine,  
Simonson, Ward, Warhurst, Young, Arietta

**2015 Highway Program Call for Projects (CFP) (October 1, 2015 Meeting Follow-Up)  
(TA Item 11a)**

April Chan, Chief Officer, Planning, Grants and the TA, said the Board approved the staff recommendation to fund the program of projects, but had asked for clarification on the Manor Drive over cross (O/C) project and the Holly Street Interchange (I/C) project.

Ms. Chan said the Manor Drive O/C project did not score well in project readiness, effectiveness, or funding. The city of Pacifica asked for \$20 million in funding, but the TA evaluated the funding need over the next two years, which is primarily for the planning phase. The project has not started the planning process, so it did not score as well as other projects that were further along in the project development phase. The benefit this project would derive was a local benefit versus a regional benefit, so it did not score as well against projects in tiers 1 or 2 in that category. The city did not recommend any funding leverage. A question came up that if a project specifically listed as a Key Congested Area (KCA) is guaranteed funding. Even if a project is specifically listed as a KCA, it is not guaranteed to receive funding. It is one element that is considered, but funding is not guaranteed because of the amount of available funding and the number of projects requesting funding. Another area of concern was about geographic equity. Staff does not look at geographic equity for every individual cycle of funding. It is considered over the life of the program. Staff looked at how much funding the Coastside has received over the last two cycles. They received \$23 million or 26 percent for the first cycle. This is the only project submitted for this cycle, and staff decided it was not out of equity. Each region is getting some transportation improvement. Staff focused on the merit of the project.

Ms. Chan said the U.S. 101/Holly Street Interchange has a separate pedestrian and bicycle overcrossing. TA staff included in the CFP materials that separate pedestrian overcrossing structures are ineligible for highway program funds. Staff looked at how the voters originally approved the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP). Separate funding has been provided for highway projects and pedestrian and bicycle projects.

In the pedestrian and bicycle category, a number of overcrossing projects eligible to receive funding were listed. Based on the amount of funding available in each category, the TA could not fund everything. The CFP specifically instructed applicants to focus on highway projects. Legal counsel provided an opinion that this is the voters' intent. These findings were presented to the subcommittee and they are not recommending any changes to the action from last month.

Randy Hees asked if there are any cases where bike projects are funded as part of the highway structure. Ms. Chan said if the bike project is completely integrated into the roadway structure, it would be funded. The Willow Interchange bike lanes were included in the roadway structure and were funded. The Holly Street project does have bike and pedestrian components in the roadway structure that makes it safer, but it also has a separate overcrossing project.

Philip Rosenblatt asked if geographic equity looks at the Coastsides as one geographic location. Ms. Chan said geographic equity looks at four locations: northern, central, southern, and the Coastsides.

Mr. Rosenblatt said last cycle 26 percent of funds were allocated to the Coastsides. He asked what projects were funded. Joe Hurley, Director, TA Program, said there were projects on Highway 92 from the eastern limits of Half Moon Bay to Pilarcitos Creek Bridge, mainline improvement projects on Route 1, and in the incorporated area around Montara and Princeton there were improvements to access along and across Highway 1 south of Devil's Slide to Half Moon Bay.

Mr. Fox asked if there is an impact or economic penalty at Holly Street by constructing the two elements of the project at different times. He said there may have to be changes to lane configurations and that might impact traffic. Ms. Chan said this was raised at Board meeting. There would probably be cost savings to do the two projects together. The city is not looking to do construction until end of 2016, and there are a number of funding cycles from other funding programs that could be timed to do the two components together, but there's no guarantee they will get all the funding.

Mr. Hurley said there is economy of scale if the projects go out as one single contract. The schedule affords the city opportunity to find other funding and include both projects under one contract.

Rich Hedges asked if the Manor Drive project is fully funded. Ms. Chan said there are two components. The Milagra onramp component is fully funded and costs about \$1 million.

Mr. Hedges said he is concerned about safety in that area and the project should be taken care of as soon as possible.

Laurie Simonson asked if the Holly Street overcrossing will include an additional sidewalk and bike lanes and if they are being funded as a part of the highway project. Mr. Hurley said yes because it is all being done within the existing structure. This project is a modification of the interchange, not a reconstruction. They are utilizing the space

to widen the sidewalk on one side and put in a new sidewalk on the other side, add a delineated bike lane in both directions, square off the loop ramps to force cars to slow down, and improve weaves for bicyclists.

Ms. Simonson asked what the pitch is for the separate pedestrian and bicycle overcrossing as a separate project since the highway project will have improved bike elements. Ms. Chan said the city would have to answer that, but there is enough concern that they wanted a separate structure. The interchange will have safety improvements.

William Warhurst said the intersection is not safe and he is not sure if the proposed change is going to be enough. He said he is not sure if any design will make it safe without the separate structure.

Chair Arietta asked what the future of the Manor overcrossing is. Ms. Chan said the city can improve the scoring of the project. For cost effectiveness, the city could bring down the cost of the project or bring leveraged funding. This project did not bring in any funding.

Mr. Hurley said one of the deficiencies with the bridge has to do with seismic standards and the age of the bridge. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has resources available to replace bridges, so Pacifica could try to tap into that funding source.

**Program Report: Grade Separations Program (TA Item 11b)**

Ms. Chan presented:

- Program Background
  - 15 percent of Measure A program
  - Estimate over \$200 million remains over the life of the program
  - Purpose of the program is to improve safety at railroad crossings and relieve local traffic congestion
  - Cities with candidate railroad crossings listed in the Expenditure Plan
    - South San Francisco
    - San Bruno
    - Millbrae
    - Burlingame
    - San Mateo
    - Redwood City
    - Menlo Park
    - Atherton
    - East Palo Alto
  - December 2009: Accepted new Measure A implementation plan, held off decision on project selection process for the Grade Separation program
  - September 2012: Authorized solicitation of letters of interest from cities interested in applying for Measure A funds
  - August 2013: Solicitation for candidate projects released, Board awards funding November 2013 and May 2014

- Key Guidelines
  - At least 80 percent of remaining funds for construction
  - Up to 20 percent for pre-construction with at least 10 percent for design
  - Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) concurrence letter required for consistency with blended system
  - Sponsors may be the lead with early phases of work, projects to be designed to Caltrain standards, JPB responsible for construction
- 2013 Funding Allocations – \$6.1 Million
  - San Mateo 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue Grade Separation environmental phase: \$3.7 million
  - Burlingame Broadway Avenue planning phase: \$1 million
  - Menlo Park Ravenswood Avenue planning phase: \$750,000
  - South San Francisco South Linden Avenue and San Bruno Scott Street planning phase: \$650,000

Liria Larano, Director Engineering and Construction, presented:

- Project Status Updates
  - 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue Grade Separation
    - Project lead: JPB
    - 35 percent design complete
    - Complete environmental clearance by December 2015
    - Right of way requirements identified
    - Ongoing coordination with city of San Mateo, electrification and high-speed rail
  - Broadway Grade Separation
    - Project lead: City of Burlingame
    - Evaluated six grade separation alternatives
    - Held two public outreach meetings
    - City Council briefing in next few months
    - Preferred alternative by mid-2016
    - Ongoing coordination with city of San Mateo, JPB, and high-speed rail
  - Ravenswood Avenue Grade Separation
    - Project lead: City of Menlo Park
    - Two alternatives to be reviewed
    - Consultant selection by December 2015
    - Perform technical studies in 2016
    - Hold public outreach meetings in 2016
    - City Council briefing in late 2016
    - Preferred alternative by late 2016
  - South Linden Avenue and Scott Street Grade Separation
    - Project lead: JPB
    - JPB and cities are coordinating on project scope
    - Perform technical studies in 2016
    - Conduct public outreach meetings in 2016 and 2017
    - City Council briefing in 2017
    - Preferred alternative by mid-2017

Ms. Chan presented:

- Next Steps
  - November 2015: TA CAC and Board informational item on 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue special circumstance funding request
  - December 2015: TA CAC and Board take action on 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue special circumstance funding request
  - Early 2016: Given limited funds, TA staff to consult with JPB on where to advance the next grade separation projects, considering safety and local traffic congestion relief factors
  - Mid 2016: TA staff to bring program recommendations to TA Board after JPB consultation

Jeff Londer said there is \$200 million and asked how much of that will be for construction. Ms. Chan said 80 percent is for construction, about \$160 million. The balance is to help with preconstruction and studies.

Mr. Londer asked how much the San Mateo grade separation construction will cost. Ms. Larano said \$180 million.

Ms. Chan said San Mateo is not asking for full funding, and staff is looking to use Measure A funding to leverage other funding. San Mateo is probably going to ask for \$70 to \$80 million for construction. Staff will consult with the JPB to find out where best to put the remaining funding.

Mr. Fox asked how short funding is for the grade separation projects. Ms. Chan said the San Bruno crossing was about \$155 million for three crossings, so they are about \$50 million per crossing.

Mr. Fox asked if cost escalation is coming. Ms. Larano said yes, but there are also design changes that can achieve cost savings.

Mr. Hedges said Burlingame and San Mateo are the most congested and the most dangerous. San Mateo brings more money than anyone else. It is important for all the development in the area to get the grade separations done.

Ms. Simonson said there are some grade separations that need addressing sooner than later. She asked which should be a priority. Ms. Chan said that is a conversation TA staff needs to have with JPB staff. There is a Public Utilities Commission (PUC) 190 rating, but that is only if a city decides to submit its project to be rated in that system. San Mateo asked for rating, and the project ranked very high. She said she would have to check if the other projects have submitted a request for ranking.

Ms. Larano said the JPB has a grade crossing assessment program where staff went through each of the 40 grade crossings to assess traffic issues and the local environment. Broadway was ranked the number one priority and 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue was in the top 11. The main driver was traffic. Staff has an internal process to prioritize grade crossings.



**Request from the City of San Mateo for \$5 Million in New Measure A Grade Separation Funds for the Design of the 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue Grade Separation Project (TA Item 11c)**

Ms. Chan said this Board previously approved \$3.7 million to this project to complete the environmental phase.

Ms. Larano presented:

- San Mateo Funding Request
  - Project: 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue grade separation
  - Phase: Final design, right of way acquisition and utility relocation
  - Cost estimate: \$11.2 million for the current phase of work
    - Measure A request: \$5 million
    - City of San Mateo match: \$5 million
    - Prior allocation cost savings: \$1.2 million
- Project Scope
  - Construct grade separation at 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue along with elevated rail between Hillsdale Boulevard and Highway 92
  - Relocate Hillsdale Station and provide station access and parking
  - Construct east/west connections at 28<sup>th</sup> and 31<sup>st</sup> avenues
- Project Cost Estimate – \$180 million
  - Grade separation at 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue, elevated rail: \$134 million
  - Relocated elevated Hillsdale Station: \$33.8 million
  - East/west connections: \$12.2 million
- Project Schedule
  - Environmental: July 2014 – December 2015
  - Design and right of way: December 2015 – July 2016
  - Bid and award: August 2016 – January 2017
  - Construction: February 2017 – December 2019
- Coordination with Electrification
  - Electrification construction to start mid-2016
  - San Mateo needs to secure construction funds by mid-2016 to begin construction by early 2017
  - Construction of grade separation needs to start by early 2017 to be completed before the installation of the Electrification Overhead Contact System

Ms. Chan presented:

- Project Funding Plan
  - Environmental: \$3.7 in Measure A; \$1 million from San Mateo
  - Design: \$3 million from Measure A; \$3 million from San Mateo
  - Right of way: \$2 million from Measure A; \$2 million from San Mateo
  - Construction: \$65.3 million from Measure A; \$6 million from San Mateo; \$10 million from State Section 190; \$84 million from Proposition 1A
- Special Circumstances Consideration
  - Urgency
    - Significant cost savings
    - Safety improvement
    - Potential loss of funds

- Impact to Measure A program
  - Current grade separation program balance: \$13.7 million
  - Annual receipts – approximately \$11 million
- Next Steps
  - November 2015: TA informational item; San Mateo City Council action to commit matching funds
  - December 2015: TA action

Mr. Hees said there is not enough funds and asked if the TA should bond to get enough funds or spend highway money now and put the account into a negative balance by borrowing from other TA accounts. Ms. Chan said the TA can potentially borrow from other programs. Staff would need to look at the financial impacts when the Board allocates construction funding whether to borrow from other programs or do bonding.

Mr. Shaine asked if the project could save money by keeping the track at level and lowering the road. Rafael Bolon, Project Manager, said the road is already at the lowest it can go, so that idea is not feasible on this project.

Shaunda Scruggs said there would be cost savings by preparing for electrification now. She asked if the other stations would have added costs by having to reconfigure for electrification later. Ms. Chan said the other projects are not at the stage that can be done now and have electrification ready.

Ms. Simonson said when this item comes back she would like to know what the PUC 190 prioritization is for this project. She asked staff to quantify the cost savings. Ms. Larano said staff estimated it to be between \$10 and \$12 million in today's dollars.

Ms. Simonson asked what the potential loss of funds is for this project to be funded now. Ms. Chan said there is not one at this time.

Mr. Londer asked how realistic it is that California High-speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) will provide the \$84 million. Brad Underwood, Public Works Director, City of San Mateo, said the city has been working with CHSRA and they are very positive about what the city is trying to do. CHSRA is suggesting other cities look at this project as a model for funding for other cities to use because CHSRA is getting requests to do other grade separation projects. This specific location benefits CHSRA because there may be passing tracks.

Mr. Warhurst said it seems like the choice to grade separate 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue is dependent on what happens elsewhere. Mr. Bolon said independent of what happens at 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue or elsewhere in the area, grade separation is still the answer at 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Mr. Fox left at 6:07 p.m.

### **Measure A Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Call for Projects (TA Item 11d)**

Joel Slavit, Manager, Programming and Monitoring, presented:

- TA Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Overview
  - 3 percent of Measure A Program

- Purpose of program is to fund specific projects that improve conditions to encourage walking and bicycling
- 2004 Transportation Expenditure Plan includes a list of bikeways and overcrossings, but other projects can be considered
- Eligibility Requirements
  - Eligible projects
    - Paths, trails and bridges over roads and highways
    - Pedestrian/bicycle component of a larger multi-modal project
  - Sponsors and application/funding caps
    - Eligible sponsors: cities and the county of San Mateo
    - Limit of three applications per sponsor
    - Maximum funding award of \$1 million per sponsor
- Process: Funding and Evaluation
  - Approximately \$4.9 million available
  - Projects reviewed based on a set of evaluation criteria
  - Funding recommendations anchored to the evaluation criteria
  - Project Review Committee assembled to evaluate applications
  - Committee consists of staff from the TA, SamTrans, City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG), County Public Health and a C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee member
- Process: Timely Use of Funds
  - Allowable expenditure period varies from:
    - Two years for pre-construction activity
    - Three years for construction activity
    - Total of five years allowed if both pre-construction and construction are part of Measure A allocated work scope
- Evaluation Criteria
  - Project readiness and need: 35 percent
    - Readiness:
      - Clear and complete proposal
      - Right of way certification complete
      - Permits, agreements and/or environmental clearance obtained
      - Results from a public planning process
      - Demonstrates stakeholder support
      - Has solid funding plan
    - Need:
      - Meets commuter and/or recreational purposes
      - Identified pedestrian and/or bicycle need
      - Safety improvement/enhancement
  - Effectiveness: 35 percent
    - Accommodates multiple transportation modes
    - Provides connectivity to pedestrian and bicycle system
    - Closes gap in countywide pedestrian and bicycle network
    - Enhances connectivity to schools, transit stations and other activity centers
    - Value: Benefit relative to the amount of funding requested

- Serves a low-income/transit-dependent population in the immediate vicinity
- Policy consistency: 10 percent
  - 2004 Expenditure Plan
  - Countywide Transportation Plan
  - Countywide Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan
  - City Pedestrian and/or Bicycle Plan
  - City General Plan, Specific Plan, other local plans
  - Grand Boulevard Initiative Guiding Principles
  - Metropolitan Transportation Commission Regional Priority Development Area
  - Americans with Disabilities Act
- Sustainability: 10 percent
  - Reduces emissions and improves air quality
  - Innovative low environmental impact/green development
  - Improves links for pedestrian and/or bicycle access between transit-oriented development, transit and other high-use activity centers
  - Supports livable, walkable and healthy communities
  - Integral transportation component that can support existing components and help spur new economic development in the immediate vicinity
- Funding leverage: 10 percent
  - Local match contribution
- Summary of Proposed Revisions
  - New 10 percent minimum match requirement
  - Projects with an unfunded phase/minimum operable segment over \$1 million
    - Consider allocating Measure A funds conditioned on sponsor securing remaining funds within one year
    - Contingency list to be created in case sponsors are not successful in securing remaining funds within one year
- Next Steps: Schedule
  - November 2015:
    - Informational item to TA CAC, TA Board, and C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee
    - 2015 CFP released covering period from March 2016 through March 2016
    - 2015 CFP sponsor workshop
  - Mid-December 2015: applications due
  - February 2016: Informational item to TA CAC and TA Board on draft program of projects
  - March 2016: TA Board approves proposed program of projects

Ms. Scruggs said six weeks' notice is a short period of time to put a project together. Mr. Slavitt said most sponsors have plans prepared and in process and it is just a matter of filling out the application.

Ms. Scruggs said the review committee is made up of elected officials and asked to include residents in the review process. Mr. Slavitt said it is composed of staff with expertise in these areas of planning and engineering.

Daina Lujan said the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee member is a resident.

Mr. Hees asked how much the Holly Street bike and pedestrian project costs. Mr. Hurley said the design has not begun, but it is currently estimated to be between \$3 and \$5 million.

**Update on State and Federal Legislative Program (TA Item 11e)**

Shweta Bhatnagar, Government Affairs Officer, provided the following update:

State

The governor signed Senate Bill 705 that will allow San Mateo County to exceed the 2 percent local sales tax cap in order to pursue a half-cent local sales tax measure to address transportation. The county has until 2026 to put a measure on the ballot, and it requires two-thirds approval.

Federal

The president signed into law the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2015, which extends Federal transportation funding through November 20 to prevent a Highway Trust Fund shutdown. It includes language for positive train control deadline extension giving railways until December 31, 2018 to complete implementation. The provision also allows for two years of leniency for operators that meet certain benchmarks. Railways have 90 days after the bill is signed to submit a revised implementation plan.

The Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery award recipients were announced. The South San Francisco Caltrain Station Improvements Project and C/CAG's request for funds for the U.S. Highway 101/Willow Road Project submitted applications, but neither project received funding.

**Approval of Minutes of October 1, 2015 (TA Item 4a)**

No discussion.

Mr. Warhurst left at 6:29 p.m.

**Approval of 2016 Board of Directors Meeting Calendar (TA Item 4b)**

No discussion.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR – BARBARA ARIETTA**

See attachment for Chair Arietta's complete report.

**REPORT FROM STAFF – JOE HURLEY**

Mr. Hurley said the Board funded two projects for the environmental phase on the U.S. Highway 101 corridor: the express lane or high-occupancy vehicle lane from Whipple Avenue to Interstate 380 and Interstate 380 to the San Francisco county line. Staff has met with Caltrans, C/CAG and the project sponsor to develop an integrated team tasked with the implementation of the environmental document for both projects and defining the roles and responsibilities of the players. Staff is constantly pursuing opportunities to accelerate the process. The business communities want a remedy to the congestion as soon as possible. There is pending legislation that could put in place a means of expediting the project delivery.

Olma O'Neill left at 6:34 p.m.

**MEMBER COMMENTS/REQUESTS**

Mr. Rosenblatt asked for larger font in the staff report attachments.

Ms. Lujan said the South San Francisco planning commission has approved high-density housing near the train station that will be redeveloped with TA funding. There will be two affordable housing units.

**DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday, December 1, 2015 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070

Adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

**Averill, Joshua**

---

**From:** Barbara Arietta <barietta@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 04, 2015 4:19 PM  
**To:** Averill, Joshua  
**Subject:** \*CAC Chair's Report - November 3, 2015\*

## **STREAMLINED REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY CONSIDERED**

**In a recent report from the San Mateo Daily Journal it has been revealed that officials with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments voted last week to explore a merger that would create one streamlined regional planning agency,**

**The MTC Board, a 21 member commission that oversees transportation planning and finance in the nine-county Bay Area, voted unanimously to explore a possible merger with ABAG, a smaller agency that focuses on regional land use planning for Bay Area local governments.**

**MTC Chairman Dave Cortese, president of the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors, said in a statement recently that a merger would create a "one stop shop" providing technical assistance and grants to local governments, use taxpayer dollars more efficiently and bolster staff resources for policy development and analysis.**

**The two agencies are vastly different in size and scale, with the MTC's budget of \$945 million dwarfing ABAG's budget of \$27 million.**

**The MTC oversees programs including Clipper and Fastrack, the 511.org traffic information service and the Bay Area Toll Authority, while ABAG, which gets some of its funding from the MTC manages the Bay Trail program.**

**An MTC spokesperson said that the MTC will select a consultant to evaluate a merger, with a report expected back by June 2016.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**BARBARA ARIETTA  
Chair, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, CAC**