



AGENDA

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

April 5, 2016 – Tuesday

4:30 p.m.

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Call to Order/Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes from March 1, 2016
4. Public Comment
Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes
5. **Transportation Authority Board Meeting Agenda for April 7, 2016**
 - a. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for February 2016 **(TA Item 4b)**
 - b. Update on State and Federal Legislative Program **(TA Item 10c)**
 - c. Receive and File Measure A Program Status Report **(TA Item 4c)**
 - d. San Mateo County Shuttle Program Draft Funding Recommendations **(TA Item 10a)**
 - e. Program Report: Paratransit Program **(TA Item 10b)**
 - f. Approval of Minutes of March 3, 2016 **(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, May 3, 2016 at 4:30 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd 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 • Jeff Londer • Daina Lujan • Olma O'Neill • Philip Rosenblatt • Shaunda Scruggs • Larry Shaine • Laurie Simonson • Jeanette Ward • William Warhurst (Vice Chair) • 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. Communications to the CAC can be e-mailed to cacsecretary@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; 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
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor

Draft

MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: B. Arietta (Chair), D. Bautista, J. Fox, R. Hedges, P. Rosenblatt, L. Simonson, J. Ward, W. Warhurst, P. Young

MEMBERS ABSENT: J. Londer, D. Lujan, O. O'Neill, S. Scruggs, L. Shaine

STAFF PRESENT: J. Averill, S. Bhatnagar, A. Chan, J. Hurley, J. Slavitt

Chair Barbara Arietta called the meeting to order at 4:34 p.m. and Paul Young led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 2, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

Motion/Second: Rosenblatt/Bautista

Ayes: Bautista, Fox, Hedges, Rosenblatt, Ward, Warhurst, Young, Arietta

Absent: Londer, Lujan, O'Neill, Scruggs, Shaine, Simonson

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

ITEMS FOR REVIEW – MARCH 3, 2016 TA BOARD MEETING

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

Shweta Bhatnagar, Acting Manager, Government Affairs, gave the following update:

State

Assembly Bill (AB) 2030 (Mullin) increases the purchasing threshold for the San Mateo County Transit District (District) and by extension the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and the TA, for small purchases from \$2,500 to \$5,000, for supplies, equipment and materials from \$100,000 to \$150,000, and for public works contracts from \$10,000 to \$100,000 to expedite and streamline the procurement process. Bay Area Rapid Transit has also signed on to the bill and Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority has expressed interest in being amended into the bill. The TA has taken a support position on this bill.

AB 2126 (Mullin) increases the number of highway, bridge, or tunnel construction projects for which Caltrans is authorized to deliver using the Construction Manager/General Contractor method from six to 12. Caltrans has indicated they need this bill in order to accelerate project implementation of the proposed high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) or high-occupancy toll lane on Highway 101 in San Mateo County in the future.

Senate Bill 824 (Beall) makes several changes to the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) to make the program more flexible for funding recipients including

allowing agencies to bank, loan or pool funds, change projects if higher priority projects come into play, and implements a Letter of No Prejudice process from Caltrans allowing agencies to start projects using local dollars and be reimbursed when LCTOP funds become available.

A bill that the District is currently reviewing is AB 1640 (Stone). The passage of AB 1222 in 2013 exempted California public transit employees who were hired after January 1, 2013, and whose interests are protected under Section 13(c) of the Federal Transit Act, from Public Employees Retirement Act of 2013 (PEPRA) until December 30, 2014 when the exemption ended. Some transit agencies interpreted this legislation to permanently exempt these employees; other agencies interpreted the bill to only provide a one-year exemption for the employees hired in that time frame. This bill seeks to clarify that those public transit employees are permanently exempt from PEPRA.

Federal

On February 9 President Obama released his Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Federal budget, which included \$125 million for the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) through the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Core Capacity Program. The FTA also announced that the project will receive more than \$72 million in prior year Core Capacity funding allocations. The PCEP is the first project in California to be included in the Project Development phase of the Core Capacity Program. The Administration's request for \$125 million in funding for FY2017 will require Congressional approval.

On February 23 the U.S. Department of Transportation announced that \$500 million dollars will be available for transportation agencies through the TIGER grant program. The TA will be submitting a grant application for the Willow Road/Highway 101 Interchange Project, similar to what was submitted in the last grant cycle. Applications are due on April 29.

Rich Hedges said the Cap and Trade money discriminated against Los Angeles because of the way it was distributed at a limit of \$15 million on housing. This generated 40 percent of the revenue for housing from Cap and Trade to northern California. He asked if this bill fixes that issue. Ms. Bhatnagar said this bill does not make any changes to the Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities Program.

Chair Arietta asked what the reason was for AB 2030. Ms. Bhatnagar said the Contracts and Procurement Department gets a lot projects over \$10,000 but under \$100,000, and they require an extensive process to get three bids and put the contracts out. The hope is to increase the threshold to \$100,000 in order to bundle projects together or not go through such a rigorous process to get a contract out.

Authorize Programming and Allocation of \$4,946,000 in New Measure A Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Category Funds for 10 Projects and Amending the FY2016 Budget By \$1,592,555 to Fund These Projects

John Fox asked if the amendment is because the TA is borrowing from a future year. Joel Slavit, Manager, Programming and Monitoring, said the amendment is to ensure

there is sufficient budget authority to cover the full \$4.946 million in additional allocations that are being made.

Mr. Fox asked if money is being borrowed from future years to fund these projects. Mr. Slavitt said no.

Mr. Slavitt presented:

- Program Overview and Process
 - Purpose of the program is to fund specific projects to encourage and improve walking and bicycling conditions
 - Funding considerations made through a Call for Projects (CFP)
 - Project review committees assembled to evaluate applications
 - Projects reviewed based on a set of evaluation criteria
 - Funding recommendations anchored to the evaluation criteria
- Evaluation Criteria
 - Project Readiness and Need: 35 percent
 - Effectiveness: 35 percent
 - Policy Consistency: 10 percent
 - Funding Leverage: 10 percent
 - Sustainability: 10 percent
- Project Proposals
 - 20 applications submitted from 13 sponsors
 - Over \$9.3 million requested, \$4.9 million available
 - At the last meeting, staff informed the Board the amount of available revenue increased from \$4.9 to \$5.7 million. There was an error in this calculation that was corrected as part of ongoing work to comprehensively true-up the difference in collected revenue and budgeted and allocated funding since the inception of the New Measure A Program. The confirmed amount of funding available is \$4.946 million.
 - \$4.9 million of Measure A Pedestrian-Bicycle Program funds will leverage over \$6.2 million in other secured sources
 - Nine requests can be funded and one partially funded within available funding
 - Funded and recommended Measure A award
 1. San Mateo Drive Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvement Project - \$200,000
 2. Kennedy Safe Routes to School Project - \$500,000
 3. Highway 101 Undercrossing Project - \$500,000
 4. Middle Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossing - \$490,000
 5. Highway 101/Holly Street Pedestrian and Bicycle Overcrossing - \$1 million
 6. Enhanced Pedestrian and Bicycle Visibility Project - \$337,500
 7. Complete the Gap Trail - \$300,000
 8. Alameda de las Pulgas Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements - \$275,000
 9. Belmont Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Project - \$882,036

- Partially funded and recommended Measure A award
 1. Sunshine Gardens Safety and Connectivity Improvements Project - \$461,464, leaving \$42,536 of needed funding on the contingency list
- Contingency list generated
 - Should projects recommended for funding not be able to meet program requirements
 - Should additional funds become available from completed projects with remaining balances
- If funding becomes available for contingency list projects, staff will request a separate programming and allocation action be taken by the Board

William Warhurst said he does not know where the \$1 million limit came from, but if projects have a great enough need based on the degree of safety enhancement possible, \$1 million may not be enough. There should be some mechanism to allow for a larger amount. He said safety is not rated high enough. Connectivity and sustainability are not as important as safety because so many pedestrians and bicyclists are at risk and safety should be the driving factor. There are many needs throughout the county, but the TA can only respond to sponsors who put forward proposals. There are many unmet needs that are not being proposed in this CFP. There should be some way to get more cities and sponsors to put forward proposals. Mr. Slavitt said during the first CFP, there were two sponsors that got almost 50 percent of the funding. The Strategic Plan calls for geographic equity, and to try to meet that, the TA put a limit on how much any one sponsor could get, and that was the purpose for the \$1 million limit. Staff can look at that again before the next CFP. Safety is built into the Need criterion. Staff advertises extensively to sponsors, staff goes to the City/County Association of Governments Technical Advisory Committee, which is composed of the county public works directors, and staff holds a public workshop. The TA does not dictate down to the cities about which projects the TA will fund, it is up to the sponsors to come to the TA. He said he contacted every sponsor that is not recommended for funding to give them tips on how to make their projects more desirable. The CAC can help the TA get the word out to sponsors about the CFPs.

Joe Hurley, Director, TA Program, said it is important for the CAC to go to the community and sponsors to bring sponsorship opportunities to their attention.

Phil Rosenblatt said on the coast, most of the community is in unincorporated areas. Since there aren't any other cities on the coast besides Pacifica and Half Moon Bay, he asked to what extent the county can outreach to the local communities in unincorporated areas. Many sections along the coast in unincorporated areas are in drastic need of safety measures. He asked who to reach out to for projects in unincorporated areas. Mr. Slavitt said people can work with the county because the county is the sponsor that covers unincorporated areas.

Mr. Hurley said people can reach out to the Mid-coast Community Council as well.

Chair Arietta said anyone can go to the council and speak as the member of the public and advise city councils or townships.

Mr. Hurley said an effort called Connect the Coast is looking at improving all modes of transportation including transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and automobiles.

Mr. Hedges said he does not ride a bike because it is not safe. Recreation should be at the bottom of the criteria list because there are not enough safe bike paths on the Peninsula.

Mr. Fox said he was a bicycle commissioner for Menlo Park for 11 years and only thinking about safety is missing the value of connectivity, the fact that people are being encouraged to use commute alternatives, and other issues. The weighting that the TA uses is an attempt to balance everything.

Laurie Simonson arrived at 5:01 p.m.

Mr. Warhurst said there is not a safe path for him to bicycle to work. These projects are not about safety and he thinks safety is more important. Mr. Hurley said if there is not a safe way to get from point A to point B there is a connectivity deficiency.

Mr. Slavik said these projects have a safety component within them. The TA has only a limited amount of funds and the projected needs are huge.

Mr. Young said safety is a moving target based on congestion and the stresses caused by it. Even if there were safe paths he would still be worried about speeders and texters. He said there is a shortfall on the Holly Street project and asked what is being done to address it. Mr. Slavik said there are no guarantees, but staff tried to work with sponsors. It is a high-cost project and it is challenging for sponsors to get large dollar amounts from any one source. Staff put into place a rule for this CFP that sponsors with needs in excess of \$1 million and have a remaining gap to fill get an extra 12 months to seek other sources. This CFP was timed so it would end at the same time that other funding calls were going out, so there are other opportunities available for the project. There were no projects in San Mateo County that received a funding award from the Regional Active Transportation Program, but the highest scoring project in San Mateo County that did not get funding was the Holly Street project. He said there are some things that can be done to improve the ranking for that project and he has reached out to San Carlos city staff. The county active transportation coordinator could also help them with their application.

Ms. Simonson said the Burlingame project was originally on the recommended list and asked if consideration was given to taking 10 percent to 15 percent away from the top 10 projects in order to fully fund the 11th project. Mr. Slavik said staff did not consider that approach. Projects that scored the highest received the funding. Burlingame staff said they will proceed with the work and use their \$200,000 to pursue planning, environmental and design, and in two years put in another request to fund the project. At that point the project will score higher on project readiness.

Ms. Simonson said the money Burlingame is putting forth is only to study half of what the project originally would have been. She said historically projects of merit that were just

outside the funding cutoff were funded from future years or somehow money for those projects has come about. Mr. Slavitt said if additional funds come available or if any other projects cannot proceed for some reason, that funding could go toward Burlingame.

Ms. Simonson asked if there has been any thought about borrowing future funding to fund the 11th project. Mr. Slavitt said in the first cycle, not all the funding that had been collected to date was put up, and in the last CFP, revenues came in higher and staff was able to fund one additional project from the cutoff line, but staff is not anticipating the budget to increase by \$1 million to fund this project.

Ms. Simonson said it was recommended for \$711,000, not \$1 million. Most of the communities will take whatever they get, so even if the TA gives them 85 percent of what they ask for, they'll take it and find the remaining funding.

Mr. Hedges said this is a worthwhile project and he would make a recommendation to the Board to look for other funding, but it is not a good idea to try to take away funding from 10 other projects.

April Chan, Chief Officer, Planning, Grants, and the TA, said if staff had the correct revenue estimate, this project would not have been on the recommended funding list. There is only \$4.9 million and projects are funded in priority order. She is apologetic to Burlingame and has thought of ways to assist. Staff will work with all sponsors that did not get on the list on the merits of their projects. There are a number of other funding programs coming up and staff will assist sponsors to apply for other sources. Tapping into future funding would mean there will be less money in the next cycle. Burlingame will position itself for the next TA CFP or other funding programs. She said Burlingame could ask the Board to advance future funding, which they did for the first cycle. In the last cycle, future funding was not advanced. Funding was provided from excess funding from the remainder of the revenues at the end of the fiscal year. It was a very small amount, less than \$100,000.

Motion/Second: Rosenblatt/Hedges

Ayes: Bautista, Fox, Hedges, Rosenblatt, Simonson, Ward, Warhurst, Young, Arietta

Absent: Londer, Lujan, O'Neill, Scruggs, Shaine

Program Report: Highway Program – US 101/Woodside Road Interchange (TA Item 11a)

Mr. Hurley said the environmental document for this project will be released in April. The TA has allocated \$11.56 million to this project for environmental, design, and supplemental design and right of way activities.

Paul Krupka, Consultant Project Manager, Redwood City, said he is preparing the environmental document for public release on April 11 and the public meeting on April 28. The project approval and environmental document phase will be completed around November. He will be bringing the project back once it has been approved and certified to request allocation of the programmed design money from the TA.

Scott Kelsey, Senior Transportation Manager, AECOM, presented:

- Roles/Responsibilities
 - Redwood City
 - Project sponsor
 - Project implementer
 - Funding partner
 - Caltrans
 - Environmental lead agency
 - Owner/operator of the State highway system
 - TA
 - Funding partner
- Project Area/Existing Conditions
 - Existing interchange configuration
 - Developed area (hospitals, commercial, residential, industrial, and public facilities)
 - Major utilities (high-voltage transmission lines, pump stations)
 - Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR)
 - Under construction (One Marina, correctional center)
 - Future public improvements (trolley corridor)
- Project Description
 - Purpose is to alleviate peak-period congestion, improve traffic operations, improve bicyclist and pedestrian access
 - 19 alternatives/variations researched (nine alternatives and 10 variations)
- Community outreach included two public meetings, two city council study sessions, three council subcommittee meetings, and 15 stakeholder meetings
- Basis for Reducing Alternatives
 - Did not result in improved performance of the interchange
 - Lack of community support
 - Significant right of way impact
 - Unable to secure Caltrans approval for non-standard design features
- Viable Alternatives
 - Alternative 3
 - Conventional type of interchange
 - Partial clover leaf configuration from northbound Highway 101
 - Diamond configuration from southbound Highway 101
 - Extensive bicycle and pedestrian access
 - Class 1 bike path along UPRR spur line
 - Class 1 bike path from Veterans Boulevard over Woodside Road
 - Woodside Road has three lanes in each direction, plus double left turn lanes to get onto Highway 101 South
 - Alternative 8b
 - Diverging diamond interchange
 - On Woodside Road, traffic on either side of Highway 101 crosses over to the opposite side of the road for that segment, which eliminates the need for left-turn pockets and storage
 - Extensive bicycle and pedestrian access
 - Class 1 bike path along UPRR spur line

- Woodside Road has three lanes in each direction, a large facility for bicycles, and a separate area for pedestrians
- Environmental Summary
 - Trees and landscaping
 - Construction staging
 - Minimal impacts to parks and recreation
 - New Veterans Boulevard flyover ramp
 - No noise walls
 - No jurisdictional wetland impacts
 - Minimal impact to waters of the State (0.2 acres)
 - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Notice of Intent, and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan required by construction contractor
 - Biological construction requirements
- Right of Way Needs
 - Full takes: two parcels
 - Partial takes: 17 parcels
 - Permanent easements: three parcels
 - Temporary construction easements: 19 parcels
 - Section 83: seven parcels
- Project Benefits
 - Improved overall capacity, operation and safety of the interchange by realigning and widening ramps
 - Signalized intersections within the interchange will realize an improved level of service
 - Local and regional traffic is improved
 - Improved access to and from the Port of Redwood City
 - Provides accommodations for both pedestrians and bicyclists traveling through the interchange
- Project Cost Estimate - \$139 million
 - Environmental Phase: \$4 million
 - Design Phase: \$10 million
 - Right of Way and Utility: \$36 million
 - Construction: \$89 million
- Schedule
 - Project
 - 2006: Project study report
 - 2011: Alternatives analysis
 - 2014-2016: Environmental Project Approval
 - 2017-2020: Design and right of way
 - 2020-2023: Construction
 - Environmental
 - 2014: Alternatives investigation
 - 2014-2015: Technical studies
 - 2015: Preferred alternatives
 - 2015-2016: Draft environmental document
 - 2016: Public circulation and final environmental document approval

Mr. Fox said when bike and pedestrian facilities are separated with physical barriers, one issue is how it is swept and kept clean. There needs to be some provision for this. The width may accommodate a miniature sweeper, but then the question is who owns that responsibility.

Mr. Hedges said this is one of the most impacted intersections on the Peninsula. He asked which options would move the most traffic and how much more could be moved. Coming off Highway 101 going south gets backed up. Mr. Kelsey said the Traffic Operations Analysis Report shows no backups with either option. For both alternatives there will be ramp metering because Caltrans requires it. The traffic projection for 2040 shows that with Alternative 8b there may be backup getting onto Woodside Road because it does not have as much room for storage as Alternative 3.

Diana Bautista asked who paid for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Mr. Hurley said it was a combination of TA and Redwood City funding.

Mr. Kelsey said it is not an EIR, it is an Initial Study Environmental Assessment.

Chair Arietta asked if there is any leaning between the two alternatives. Mr. Kelsey said both would work. Alternative 3 is looking better for the one issue about backups in 2040. Caltrans wants an HOV bypass for the onramps. That option is not available for both onramps in Alternative 8b, so they are eliminated because of the distance and amount of room available. With Alternative 3, there is another Class 1 bicycle facility flyover structure from Veterans Boulevard over Woodside Road. With alternative 8b, there is no room for that flyover. Alternative 3 is looking a little better, but these are two viable alternatives that Caltrans would consider.

Ms. Simonson asked how cars cross over to the opposite lanes in Alternative 8b. Mr. Kelsey said there is a signalized intersection.

Ms. Simonson asked how wide the vehicle travel lanes and the Class 1 bikeway are. She is concerned about bike safety. Mr. Kelsey said the vehicle lanes are 12 feet and he thinks the Class 1 bike lanes are 10 feet. There is a barrier separating bikes from cars.

Mr. Fox said the right turn at red lights has to be looked at in terms of visibility, but any mechanism to slow down the car traffic is hated by the motorist.

Mr. Warhurst said in southern California bicycles are signalized separately from cars in high-conflict areas.

Mr. Kelsey said Alternative 8b doesn't have many phasable opportunities because of the configuration of the lanes, so most of the interchange has to be all done at once. Alternative 3 can be phased. Flyovers can go in first, the northbound east side can be done in a phase, and southbound improvements can be made at a separate time. This includes \$3 million in throwaway costs.

Chair Arietta asked if there is funding in place. Mr. Krupka said not much funding is committed and the project is in a big search for funding. Some city funds are committed.

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for January 2016 (TA Item 4b)

Motion/Second: Hedges/Bautista

Ayes: Bautista, Fox, Hedges, Rosenblatt, Simonson, Ward, Warhurst, Young, Arietta

Absent: Londer, Lujan, O'Neill, Scruggs, Shaine

Approval of Minutes of February 4, 2016 (TA Item 5a)

No discussion.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR – BARBARA ARIETTA

See attachment for Chair Arietta's complete report.

REPORT FROM STAFF – JOE HURLEY

Mr. Hurley reported:

- The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a five-year program, but the current fiscal situation may require the deprogramming of funding impacting the first two years of the STIP. The Willow Interchange Project and the State Route 92/El Camino Real Reconstruction Project, which are set to go to construction this summer may be affected by this decision. He will send a link to the CAC of a video explaining the fund swap that has contributed to this problem.
- There is a potential raid on aviation fuel tax. The Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) interpretation of the rules for aviation fuel is that funds collected from aviation fuel must be used for operation and capital costs associated with aviation-related items, which means the half-cent sales tax from aviation fuel sales would be restricted. It is difficult to quantify this because of the way the Board of Equalization collects the tax, but it is in the millions on an annual basis. The Self-help County Coalition is trying to get an exemption because voters approved the sales tax to be used for a specific purpose, and the belief is the tax cannot now be used for a different purpose.
- A meeting was held concerning the Highway 101 managed lane project trying to get together the right alternatives to move forward with. There are a range of alternatives that are being pared down. This includes a lane conversion and a lane addition option. When there is clarity and direction the issue will come back to this group.
- A meeting was held on February 19 concerning State Route 92 and what is being done for that corridor. The finding from that issue will be shared with this group this summer.

Mr. Fox left at 6:08 p.m.

MEMBER COMMENTS/REQUESTS

Mr. Hedges said he is looking forward to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) office eventually housing the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the Association of Bay Area Governments, and MTC.

Ms. Bautista left at 6:11 p.m. The quorum was lost.

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, April 5, 2016 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium,
2nd Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070

Adjourned at 6:11 p.m.

Averill, Joshua

From: Barbara Arietta <barietta@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2016 2:48 PM
To: Averill, Joshua
Subject: ***CAC Chair's Report - March 1, 2016***

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION VOTES TO LOWER GASOLINE TAX

On Tuesday, February 23, 2016, the State Board of Equalization voted to lower the excise tax rate for gasoline by 2.2 cents for the Fiscal Year that ends June 20,2017. The board decided that Californians paid too much at the pump last year and decided to give them a break at the pumps this year. The board calculates each year how much of a gas tax Californians should pay under a formula that was implemented in 2010 to help with the state's budget deficit.

The board is supposed to lower and raise the gas tax rate annually in order to ensure that the state is bringing in the same amount of revenue over a three year period as it would have with the old sales tax.

According to State Board of Equalization Vice Chair, George Runner, " Californians overpaid gas tax last year because of a bizarre formula known as the 'gas tax swap', passed by lawmakers in 2010.

The state already reduced the gas tax last year as a preemptive measure when gas prices began to plummet, but the 6 cent decrease wasn't enough.

However, California Department of Transportation Director, Malcolm Dougherty, said the latest gas tax reduction, coupled with the one from last year, would reduce the amount of money going to transportation in this state next year by \$328 million.

Although Caltrans will continue to prioritize safety projects, this new tax reduction emphasizes the need for the comprehensive transportation funding package that Governor Brown continues to call for, Dougherty reported.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (MTC) IS MOVING TO SAN FRANCISCO

MTC's Bay Area Headquarters Authority is redeveloping a former World War II Tank Assembly Plant-turned US Postal Service facility to serve as the headquarters of MTC, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Bay Area Quality Management District.

Slated to leave Oakland and open their new building sometime in 2016, MTC's new building will include ample public space and public amenities, including:

- *Auditorium/board room
- *Cafe
- *Bicycle parking
- *And more

The building's new location will be in San Francisco's Rincon Hill neighborhood. The new address is 375 Beale Street.

Respectfully submitted,

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