AGENDA

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

November 29, 2016 – Tuesday **4:30 p.m.**

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Call to Order/Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes from November 1, 2016
4. Public Comment
   Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes
5. **Transportation Authority Board Meeting Agenda for December 1, 2016**
   a. Re-Programming $27,854,836 in New Measure A Funds from the South San Francisco Caltrain Station Improvement Project to the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project **(TA Item 9a)**
   b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for October 2016 **(TA Item 4b)**
   c. Update on State and Federal Legislative Program **(TA Item 10c)**
   d. Program Report: San Mateo Bridges Replacement Project **(TA Item 10a)**
   e. Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report – 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2017 **(TA Item 10b)**
   f. Approval of Minutes of November 3, 2016 **(TA Item 4a)**
6. Report of the Chair (Barbara Arietta)
   a. Appointment of Nominating Committee for 2017 Officers
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 3, 2017 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 • Kate Bond • An Chen • Essam El-Dardiry • John Fox • Pamela Haynie • Rich Hedges • Karen Kuklin • Jeff Londer • Olma O'Neill • Shaunda Scruggs • Steve Stamos • Jeanette Ward • William Warhurst (Vice Chair) •

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 NOVEMBER 1, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: B. Arietta (Chair), K. Bond, A. Chen, E. El-Dardiry, J. Fox, P. Haynie, R. Hedges, K. Kuklin, J. Londer, O. O'Neill, S. Scruggs, S. Stamos, W. Warhurst

MEMBERS ABSENT: D. Bautista, J. Ward

STAFF PRESENT: J. Averill, C. Cubba, J. Hurley, L. Velasquez, N. Vigil

Chair Barbara Arietta called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. and Rich Hedges led the Pledge of Allegiance.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS
Kate Bond said she has lived in the county for 35 years, she is a gerontologist, and works with seniors in the community for whom transportation is always an issue.

Shaunda Scruggs arrived at 4:32 p.m.

An Chen said her family is in the hotel business in Palo Alto and the East Bay. She has been active in the Hillsborough schools and she is on the Stanford Hospital Facilities Board. With all her work, one thing they always talk about is traffic.

Essam El-Dardiry said he has lived in the county for six year and works for YouTube. He said he has a lot of family in the area that span a variety of ages and needs.

Pamela Haynie said she is a strategic planner, program director, manager of budgets, so she hopes that will bring an interesting light to the CAC.

Karen Kuklin said she has lived in the county for 20 years and is an architect.

Steve Stamos said he lives in San Mateo and works for the San Francisco County Transportation Authority and he is a fan of public transportation.

APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2016 MEETING MINUTES
Motion/Second: Hedges/Londer
Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta
Absent: Bautista, Fox, Ward

Draft

APPROVAL OF THE 2017 TA CAC MEETING CALENDAR
Motion/Second: Hedges/Londer
Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta
Absent: Bautista, Fox, Ward

PUBLIC COMMENT
None

ITEMS FOR REVIEW – NOVEMBER 3, 2016 TA BOARD MEETING
Acceptance of the Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review and Outlook for the Quarter Ended September 30, 2016 (TA Item 10a)
Motion/Second: Londer/Hedges
Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta
Absent: Bautista, Fox, Ward

Award of Contract to Mark Thomas & Company and AECOM Joint Venture to Provide On-Call General Engineering Consultant (GEC) Services for an Estimated Aggregate Not-to-Exceed Total of $52.2 Million for a Three-Year Base Term (TA Item 10b)
Nita Vigil, Acting Director, Contracts and Procurement, said staff solicited a competitive procurement, four firms responded, none are Small Business Enterprises (SBE), but all have SBEs as subcontractors. This was a qualifications-based procurement.

John Fox arrived at 4:39 p.m.

Jeff Londer asked if the TA has allocated $17.4 million a year to engineering services in the past. Ms. Vigil said there was a previous contract for the very same services. The $17.4 million is actually an option year amount. The base term is $52 million.

Mr. Londer asked if the TA uses it all every year. Joe Hurley, Director, TA Program, said the current GEC contract, which was entered into in 2007, expired last September. This is a GEC contract to use when the TA is asked to be the implementing agency on any component. This is a go-to source to do the work. It does not obligate the TA to spend this amount; it just gives the TA the contract authority capacity. This number is based on what staff estimates the needs to be for next five years. Under the recent contract the TA did not fully utilize the money because there was a slow start due to issues with matching funds for some projects. The US 101 Managed Lane (ML) Project has received support from the GECs under the recent contract and will from the new contract.

Mr. Londer asked what happens if there is one year that the TA does not use the full amount. Mr. Hurley said it carries over. This gives the TA the flexibility needed to adapt to a changing environment.

Ms. Scruggs said no SBEs or Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) submitted proposals. She asked what the definition is of an SBE or DBE, and what was the mechanism used to advertise the Request for Proposal (RFP). Ms. Vigil said the definition

Draft

is set by the State of California. She can send out the specific definition. There is a procurement website. Contract Officers reach out to the community to invite people to register on the website, and staff uses suggested vendors from previous procurement and conducts an extensive outreach.

Luis Velasquez, Senior Contract Officer, said typically what is considered an SBE is income driven. They have annual revenue of less than $12.5 million aggregate. The primary contractors are not SBEs, but all of them include SBE/DBE firms as part of their bench. This means small businesses can get work form this contract

Ms. Scruggs said some cities don't score very well on RFPs for projects. There should be direct solicitation to groups that don't tend to submit in order to receive a diverse number of applicants for the proposals. When cities don't do well, it is an indication that they don't have the capacity and perhaps the TA should do more to assist them. If they never score well they will never get money. Perhaps the best methods to reach out to organizations that might fit the definition may not be the method that is currently being used. Mr. Velasquez said staff is working to develop a more formalized SBE program.

Mr. Hedges said occasionally the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has classes for SBE and minority-owned businesses on how to participate in Calls for Projects (CFP). Maybe this could be put on the TA website or send out e-mails to companies when those occur. Ms. Vigil said the TA SBE coordinator sponsored SBE outreach and invitations were sent around the region.

Chair Arietta asked if the city assesses what it is that they don't do well when they consistently score low. Ms. Scruggs said perhaps it is not that the cities don't know what they're doing, but that they don't have the capacity and perhaps the TA should provide assistance targeting those that don't score well because if they continue to not do well they never get dollars.

Mr. Hurley said the CAC may be confusing the issues. One issue is cities during a CFP process that don't score well as opposed to going through a competitive RFP process. Staff understands the level of outreach necessary to engage the SBEs. The Contracts and Procurement staff has done outreach. There was a meeting in this building in an effort to let SBEs network and to engage into the bigger enterprises and to collaborate.

William Warhurst said by definition if an SBE were to get this contract they would no longer be a small business. Ms. Vigil said there is a cap on how much earnings a business can make to be considered an SBE. The primes supplement the SBEs and use them as sub-consultants.

Mr. Warhurst said this is a successful outreach because the size of the contract is too large by definition to have SBE. Ms. Vigil said it could be an SBE when they propose, but they won't be once they get the contract.

Mr. Velasquez said when staff issues the document, there are instructions and forms that the prime has to submit to document the outreach they have done and they identify

Draft

the companies they are going to submit and summarize which are DBEs and SBEs. Staff conducts a pre-proposal meeting, publicizes it on the website, does outreach, publishes a solicitation in the local newspaper, and encourages SBEs to team up.

Mr. Londer asked if these companies are the same that the TA used before. Mr. Hurley said prior to this there were three different firms available, but the rules changed so the TA can only have one, and this one is a joint venture between two of the three GECs that the TA currently uses.

Motion/Second: Hedges/Londer
Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta
Absent: Bautista, Ward

Receive and File the Semi-Annual Measure A Program Status Report (TA Item 4e)
Motion/Second: Londer/Hedges
Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta
Absent: Bautista, Ward

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for Fiscal Year Ending June 2016 (Unaudited) (TA Item 4c)
Mr. Londer said the agenda says Fiscal Year Ending June 30, but the title of the report says Period Ending June 30, and the action says the month of June 2016.

Carl Cubba, Director, Treasury, said the description "period end" is synonymous with "year end" or "month end." They are accounting periods for financial reporting services. The report is only for the month of June, which is the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. Warhurst said the agenda says Fiscal Year Ending June but the report is only for June. He asked to amend the agenda to say this is the report for the month of June rather than fiscal year ending June so it will reflect a month instead of a whole year. Mr. Cubba said it is the report for the month of June, but it reflects the final month of the fiscal year.

Motion to change the agenda to Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the Period Ending June 30, 2016.
Motion/Second: Hedges/Londer
Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta
Absent: Bautista, Ward

Draft

Motion to accept the Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the Period Ending June 2016.
Motion/Second: Hedges/Londer
Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta
Absent: Bautista, Ward

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for September 2016 (TA Item 4d)
Ms. Haynie asked if the Fiscal Year is July 1 through June 30. Mr. Cubba said yes.

Motion/Second: Londer/Haynie
Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta
Absent: Bautista, Ward

Update on State and Federal Legislative Program (TA Item 11b)
Mr. Hurley said staff tracks all of the legislation that is pertinent to transportation and if the TA takes a position on any of the specific legislation it is shown in the agenda packet.

Program Report: U.S. Route 101/State Route 92 Interchange (TA Item 11a)
Mr. Hurley presented:

- Preliminary Planning Study (PPS)
  - TA (funding and implementer) and the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) (sponsor) joint effort with input from the California State Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the city of San Mateo, the city of Foster City, and consultant
  - Assess traffic deficiencies, develop project purpose and need
  - Develop alternatives with stakeholders; evaluate costs, impacts and benefits
  - Recommend short- and long-term projects to move forward into the Caltrans Project Initiation Document (PID) phase
- Previous studies include
  - State Route (SR) 92 Project Study Report (PSR)/Project Development Support (PDS) (2001)
  - US 101/SR 92 Area Study (2013)
  - SR 92/SR 82 Project Report (PR) (2014)
  - US 101 High Occupancy Vehicle PSR/PDS
- Project purpose: Improve traffic flow and safety, and increase mobility through the US 101/ SR 92 Interchange area by minimizing traffic conflict locations and improving peak-period travel times within project limits along US 101 and SR 92
- Project need: Overall substantial delay and congestion at the US 101 and SR 92 Interchange
- Alternatives development
  - Evaluated seven short-term and 21 long-term alternatives
  - Brainstorming session with cities of San Mateo and Foster City, C/CAG and TA

Draft

    - Shortlisted nine basic alternatives
    - Presented to Caltrans
    - Revised alternatives based on Caltrans comments; cost estimates, impact evaluations, design exceptions and traffic operations benefits incorporated into final PPS June 2016
- Naming convention for alternatives
    - Short-term alternatives: A
        - Projects that can be implemented more quickly through streamlined Permit Engineering Evaluation Report (PEER) Caltrans process
        - Projects with relatively low total cost (less than $10 million)
    - Long-term alternatives: X, Y, Z
        - Projects that require full Caltrans oversight process (planning, environmental, design) and take longer to implement
        - Projects with relatively high total cost (more than $10 million)
        - Projects that provide more traffic and safety improvements
- Alternatives rated on various criteria
    - Safety
        - Low: No improvement to weave/merge areas; minimal mobility improvement could potentially lower rear-end type of accidents
        - High: Clear safety improvement by eliminating unsafe merges at weave conflict locations
    - Environmental
        - Low: Minimal impact that could likely be cleared with Categorical Exemption/Categorical Exclusion (CE/CE) approval
        - Medium: Not CE/CE, but avoids adverse impacts and may qualify for Initial Study/Environmental Assessment approval
        - High: Adverse impacts requiring Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement
    - Right of way
        - Low: May have only temporary construction easement requirements
        - Medium: May require partial right of way acquisitions or sliver takes
        - High: Full right of way acquisitions potentially requiring relocations
- Summary of alternatives along US 101
    - 1X ($52 million) improves weaving and operations, high safety benefit, needs further evaluation to determine impact to local traffic circulation, medium environmental impact, medium right of way impact
    - 1Y ($89 million) improves weaving and operations (northbound only), high safety benefit, needs further evaluation to determine impact to local traffic circulation, medium environmental impact, high right of way impact
    - 2X ($93 million) improves operations for ML users (westbound SR 92 to US 101) and operations for US 101, low safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, medium to high environmental impact, medium right of way impact

Draft

    - 3A ($3.3 million) low operations benefit, low to medium safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, low environmental impact, no right of way impact
    - 3X ($6.5 million) operational benefit (northbound only), low to medium safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, low environmental impact, low right of way impact
- Summary of alternatives along SR 92
    - 7A ($7 million) improves operations for ML users (westbound SR 92 to southbound US 101 only), low safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, low environmental impact, no right of way impact
    - 8A ($3.5 million) improves weaving and operations, high safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, low environmental impact, no right of way impact
    - 8X ($40 million) improves weaving and operations, high safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, high environmental impact, low right of way impact
    - 8Y ($58 million) low weaving improvement, low safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, high environmental impact, medium right of way impact
    - 8Z ($103 million) improves weaving and operations, high safety benefit, needs further evaluation to determine impact to local traffic circulation, high environmental impact, medium right of way impact
    - 8ZX ($154 million) improves weaving and operations, high safety benefit, needs further evaluation to determine impact to local traffic circulation, high environmental impact, high right of way impact
    - 9A ($500,000) low operations benefit, low safety benefit, needs further evaluation to determine impact to local traffic circulation, low environmental impact, no right of way impact
    - 9Y ($47 million) improves weaving and operations, high safety benefit, needs further evaluation to determine impact to local traffic circulation, high environmental impact, medium right of way impact
- Recommended alternatives and packages
    - Short term: Alternatives 3A, 7A, 8A, and 9A ($14 million)
    - Long term reduced package: 1X, 3X, 8X, 9Y ($146 million)
    - Long term alternate package: 1Y, 3X, 8Z, and 9Y ($246 million)
    - Long term primary package: 1X, 2X, 3X, 8ZX, and 9Y ($353 million)
- Next steps
    - Project sponsor(s) to determine which alternatives to advance using stakeholder input, regional goals and anticipated funding ranges
    - Sponsor to pursue Measure A or other source to fund effort
    - Engage Caltrans with pre-PID meeting to discuss project purpose and need and project development path
    - Prepare PEER, PID, and PR or PID as appropriate to program funding; gain project approval

Mr. Hedges said the cost seems low. The biggest problem with flyovers over the lagoon is there are several permitting agencies for work in that area.

Draft

Ms. Scruggs asked what will happen to the land beneath the two cloverleaves that are being eliminated. Mr. Hurley said it will probably be used for stormwater runoff.

Ms. Scruggs said changes to the SR 92/El Camino Real or to SR 92/US 101 interchanges might impact the housing along Ivy Street in San Mateo.

Mr. Warhurst asked if on the list of recommended alternatives there are any quantifications of how much traffic would be improved by any metric that is normally used for these packages. Mr. Hurley said that would be done as part of the PID. This study identifies the problem that contributes to the congestion and what it would take to mitigate if not eliminate the problem.

Mr. Stamos said two new stoplights are being installed on El Camino Real. He asked if staff is anticipating significant traffic impacts with those lights. Mr. Hurley said they will be coordinated with the existing signals to move traffic through the area smoothly.

Mr. Stamos asked what the timeline is for the next steps on the improvements to the SR 92/US 101 Interchange. Mr. Hurley said staff is targeting to issue a CFP in the fall next year.

Adoption of Conflict of Interest Code (TA Item 4f)
Motion/Second: Hedges/Haynie
Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta
Absent: Bautista, Ward

Approval of 2017 Board of Directors Meeting Calendar (TA Item 4b)
Motion/Second: Londer/Haynie
Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta
Absent: Bautista, Ward

Approval of Minutes of October 6, 2016 (TA Item 4a)
No discussion.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR – BARBARA ARIETTA
See attachment for Chair Arietta's complete report.

REPORT FROM STAFF – JOE HURLEY
Mr. Hurley said a scoping meeting for the US 101 ML Project was held October 27. This provided a forum for good, engaged discussions with the public. The public shared concerns about social equity, enforcement, time of implementation and funding. The intent of the scoping meeting was to solicit input from the community in terms of what things need to be considered in the environmental process. Comments will be welcome through November 18. The environmental document being prepared will explore the alternatives and assess the environmental impacts associate with those alternatives. This will take 28 months. Technical studies will be prepared, the results are

Draft

put together, and a draft document will be circulated to public, which includes a public comment period. The draft won't go out until next summer at the soonest.

Mr. Warhurst said he could not find any reference to the scoping meeting on the TA website. Mr. Hurley said it was on the home page under current issues.

Mr. Warhurst said it was not there the day before the meeting. The most current news on the TA website was from June. It is sometimes hard to know what all the feasible alternatives are. Mr. Hurley said it was shared at the meeting and should now be on the website. He will send out a link to that information.

MEMBER COMMENTS/REQUESTS

Mr. Stamos asked if staff will be coordinating with San Francisco and Santa Clara counties on creating a contiguous managed lane. Mr. Hurley said staff has been meeting extensively with San Francisco. This environmental document looks at the project through Interstate 380, but the TA is also in discussions with San Francisco about Interstate 380 north to Interstate 280 and off to King Street.

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

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, November 29, 2016 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070

Adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Averill, Joshua

From: Barbara Arietta <barietta@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 12:07 PM
To: Averill, Joshua
Subject: **** CHAIR'S REPORT TO CAC - 11/1/2016****

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2040

The public comment period for the San Mateo County Public Transportation Plan ended on October 31, 2016. The City/County Association of County Governments (CCAG) recently held three public workshops looking for public input on updating the current San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan, which is a comprehensive document that aims to create consistent planning goals through 2040.

Its the second rendition of the 2010 Plan that was issued in 2001 and provides keen insight into how mobility patterns of those who live or work in San Mateo County have changed. I have reported below some highlights of information from the draft document.

By 2040, total travel in San Mateo County is due to increase by 22 percent from 2015 levels. Transit is expected to grow by 67% and biking is projected to grow by 64%. However, the automobile is predicted to continue to reign supreme, according to the draft document.

An estimated 70 percent of those who commute to work in the County drive alone, and by 2040, there will be an estimated 116,000 car trips from those commuting solo or via a rideshare.

Outside of heading to work only 47 percent of people drive when traveling around San Mateo County.

The average San Mateo County household has 2.7 cars and there are more registered vehicles than licensed drivers. Street and highways remain in high demand.

In 2013, the county's estimated 2,100 miles of roads accommodated 18.7 million vehicle miles traveled everyday.

In 2015, almost a dozen high traffic road segments received an "F" grade during peak travel times...many are along Highway 101 and connector freeways that lead to Interstate 280 and the East Bay.

By 2040, the county's population is expected to increase by 150,000 residents and another 70,000 jobs will be added.

Expanding highways to account for cars is neither economically nor geographically feasible throughout most of the county. Therefore promoting mass transit and using technology to promote mobility is key, according to the draft.

By 2040 an estimated 448,000 people will travel into and out of San Mateo County every day, which will be a 24% increase.

Respectully submitted,

BARBARA ARIETTA
Chair, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, CAC