

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor

MINUTES OF JUNE 1, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: B. Arietta, J. Bigelow, P. Dixon (Chair), J. Fox, R. Hedges, R. Hees, C. King, A. Mader-Clark, D. Maez, D. Mensing, L. Shaine, J. Whittemore, P. Young, G. Zimmerman

MEMBERS ABSENT: A. Vargas

STAFF PRESENT: L. Bhuller, A. Chan, S. Cocke, M. Espinosa, J. Hurley, R. Lake, M. Lee, S. Murphy

Chair Pat Dixon called the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m. John Fox led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Doris Maez restated her comment in the sixth paragraph, page four of 10: “Caltrain’s continued operations are threatened.”

A motion (Bigelow/Maez) to approve the minutes of May 4, 2010 with this correction was passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

ITEMS FOR REVIEW – JUNE 3, 2010 TA BOARD AGENDA

There was no discussion on the following items:

1. Approval of Minutes of May 6, 2010 - TA Item 4a
2. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for April 2010 - TA Item 4b
3. SamTrans Liaison Report – May 12, 2010 – TA Item 8

Presentation: “SMCTA Local Shuttle Program – Part 1 of 2”

Executive Officer, Planning and Development Marian Lee said the presentation and handouts including information on shuttle operations and funding are being given to the CAC as an informational item to address any concerns before presentation to the TA Board at the July 1 meeting. Ms. Lee will address the policies that the CAC reviewed and Board approved, which anchored the staff in how to administer the program; and Senior Planner Stacy Cocke will review the process, applications, proposal and schedule.

Ms. Lee provided the following details:

- Three documents anchored staff’s actions: the 2004 voter-approved Expenditure Plan; the Strategic Plan-2009-2013, which was adopted and approved by the CAC and TA Board; and an Implementation Plan that outlines a call for projects once every two years. The first one would be issued this spring. It also identifies evaluation criteria used to review applications. A process was identified to administer the call for projects.

- Shuttle projects funded by the original Measure A will continue to receive estimated funding of \$1.45 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 and 2012. New applications will receive estimated funding of \$800,000 for FY2011 and 2012 for an estimated total for the call for shuttle projects of \$2.25 million.
- Any project initiator must obtain sponsorship from SamTrans in order to submit the application to the TA, which will be evaluated by staffs from the TA, the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), and C/CAG's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).
- Evaluation Criteria include: project need, policy consistency, and readiness scored at 20 points each; effectiveness scored at 30 points; and sustainability in terms of environmental impacts, economic development and transit oriented development scored at 10 points. An internal shuttle inventory report was completed to review any overlaying of existing SamTrans' fixed-route service

Ms. Cocke provided additional details as follows:

- Staff recommendation is to support all existing requested funding; support all requests, monitor projects with lowest cost effectiveness and notify projects with low match.
- There are 12 existing shuttle applications and 10 of the 12 are commuter shuttles with the exception of the Bayshore/Brisbane and Menlo Park shuttles.
- Eight applications were received for new shuttles for just under \$800,000 over the next two fiscal years, which is undersubscribed by \$800,000.
- Staff evaluated and recommended three new applications at this time; requested resubmission of five applications; will monitor projects that potentially duplicate SamTrans service and notify projects with a low match.

Chair Dixon asked what would constitute a request to resubmit an application. Ms. Cocke said staff wants to see additional information in terms of market need and the public outreach process.

- New shuttle applications included three existing shuttles not currently funded by the TA that staff is recommending to move forward with approval: Foster City Blue Line community shuttle, which connects to the Foster City Red Line community shuttle and SamTrans Route 251; the Redwood City Mid Point commuter shuttle from the Redwood City Caltrain Station to the Mid Point Technology Park; and the Foster City Red Line community shuttle, which runs from the Hillsdale Shopping Center to the Bridgepoint Shopping Center.
- Five shuttle applications requiring additional information include:
 1. South San Francisco Ferry
 2. East Palo Alto Shopper Shuttle
 3. East Palo Alto Youth Shuttle
 4. Menlo Park Senior Shuttle Shopper
 5. Millbrae on-demand

Jim Whitemore asked about existing funding. Ms. Cocke said both Foster City shuttles were funded last fiscal year: 50 percent by Foster City and 50 percent by C/CAG. There is a delay in C/CAG's call for projects and the TA call for projects came first, so Foster City is requesting 25 percent Measure A funding and will apply for 25 percent funding in the C/CAG call for projects.

Barbara Arietta asked which projects duplicate SamTrans service. Ms. Cocke said the Foster City Red Line shuttle has the same stops as Route 251.

Ms. Maez said she is surprised and somewhat appalled at the lack of proposals for the Coastsides, which is an underserved area. She asked if this could be addressed because there is remaining funding. Ms. Cocke said staff does not know why applications were not received. Call for projects' notices were sent to all mayors, city managers, the C/CAG Board, the C/CAG TAC, the C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee, public works directors, planning directors, the Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA), Peninsula Congestion Relief Alliance (Alliance), BART, and to existing JPB shuttles at the San Francisco International Airport and to all cities in the county under these titles.

Ms. Maez said it may be they didn't have the resources to apply.

Ms. Arietta said the Coastsides had a shuttle a few years ago that duplicated Route 14 but it was lost to swap for extended hours on Route 14 and some weekend service, which has since been cut back due to economic issues with SamTrans. She is concerned the Coastsides is desperate for transportation yet no applications were submitted.

Ms. Espinosa said there is service on the Coastsides currently funded under Lifeline, which is a program through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) primarily targeted to underserved populations including rural populations so some existing service for SamTrans is also supplemented with Lifeline funding. It may be that the city is looking to Lifeline as a potential other source.

Ms. Arietta asked what could be done to address the lack of applications from the Coastsides. Ms. Lee wasn't sure why applications were not received because call for project information was sent, which presented the opportunity to apply.

Ms. Maez asked what will happen to the undersubscribed funds of \$800,000. Ms. Lee said the funds will remain in the local shuttle program for availability in the next call for projects.

Jim Bigelow asked if there are any problems with cities guaranteeing their local match in their pre-budget cycle. Ms. Lee said the best word available is what is in the application and staff takes their word for what is written. She said applicants must submit quarterly reports and the monitoring process will also address any issues. She said the majority of the new applications have an average 55 percent match, which will need to be paid upfront.

Mr. Bigelow said full-sized buses run from BART to the South San Francisco Gateway employment area, drop off all passengers and ride empty back to BART. He said a question addressed with WETA is if those empty buses could pick up people coming off the ferry redistribute them with the same equipment. He asked if that question was asked on the South San Francisco ferry application. Ms. Cocke doesn't think this was part of the application.

Jim Whittemore asked if Foster City just voted to cut funding of \$82,000 for the Blue and Red Line shuttles. Ms. Lee said she will follow up to confirm the local commitment is still there.

Ms. Cocke said C/CAG's call for projects follows the TA's. She said C/CAG historically funded 50 percent but in order to try and cover bases in terms of funding, Foster City is proposing putting in applications to still bring that 50 percent they historically brought but then split the difference between the TA's and C/CAG's calls for projects.

Ms. Arietta asked about the deadline for submitting applications. Ms. Cocke said the application process opened on March 31 and closed on April 30; the next call will be in two years.

Charles King asked about Redwood City ferry service and if shuttle service will be available; and what information needs to be addressed in the South San Francisco Ferry application. He said shuttle service has been very popular in East Palo Alto. Ms. Lee said information on Redwood City ferry service will be addressed in tonight's WETA presentation.

Ms. Cocke said staff requested additional market research on the South San Francisco Ferry application because it is a new shuttle and there is no fixed-route service for the business parks in the area. Route information on the application looks similar to the existing Oyster Point Utah/Grand shuttle, which connects to BART and Caltrain, and adding another timed-connection wasn't feasible.

Ms. Espinosa said East Palo Alto shuttles are targeted towards the needs of the local community. For example, the proposal is to have the shuttles run very late shifts into the 1 a.m. to 2 a.m. time period because of late night shift workers and that is different from when SamTrans runs its buses. There is also a proposal for a youth shuttle, which would run direct from schools to youth-serving non-profit organizations. The demographic needs and times in East Palo Alto are very different from fixed-route services.

Randy Hees asked about the three applications with 100 percent funding. He said the Broadway/Millbrae shuttle has a 100 percent match. Ms. Lee said the challenge staff has is in our policies in the Expenditure Plan and Strategic Plan with these assumed matches, and for the local shuttle one in the new Expenditure Plan, staff assumed a 50 percent match but there wasn't this hard-core requirement that the applicant had to have 50 percent or it was not getting funded; it's a soft push especially for this round because the TA is undersubscribed. That criterion didn't have the weight that it would under a competitive circumstance. If the TA had tons of projects and it couldn't fund all of them, clearly the projects that would have the larger match would rate better in this case, but because the TA has leftover funds, it didn't make a huge difference. Ms. Lee said it's currently a soft push and one of the things that can be considered is, as more call for projects are completed and the Strategic Plan is updated, staff can start to consider if they want to do some hard line criteria; right now the TA doesn't have it.

Rich Hedges said he uses the Foster City Blue line and both the Red and Blue lines are always packed.

Mr. Shaine said given the economic situation and budget shortfalls he strongly urged the folks involved with the South San Francisco ferry shuttle application to cooperate and coordinate with major players like Genentech in South San Francisco, which isn't far from the planned ferry terminal. He said Genentech has their own employer-sponsored shuttles from BART to their campuses and he thought one of the justifications for the ferry project was that employees traveling to that area would be taking the ferry and would need shuttle assistance. He said staff

should urge cooperation with employer-sponsored shuttles and allow the public to use them to and from the ferry, to get more utilization with limited dollars. He said this works well in Foster City industrial areas.

Presentation continued:

- Part 1 of the process involves CAC input on all existing and three new shuttle applications on June 1. The TA Board is to take action on the applications at the July 1 Board meeting. Staff will re-evaluate five applications for Part 2 of the process, return to the June 29 CAC meeting for additional input and ask for Board approval at the August/September TA Board meeting.

Mr. Bigelow said when one talks about employer shuttles or smaller shuttle buses, it might be good to paint a picture of the Alliance with C/CAG, Caltrain coordinators and SamTrans as the overall umbrella for coordination of the shuttle agencies getting together and working on something that would work very well. Ms. Lee said staff will do this.

Mr. Hees said he is pleased to see the first call for projects come forward with the new Measure A. He applauds Ms. Lee, Ms. Cocke and Ms. Espinosa for bringing the information to the CAC for input. He is concerned about the 50 percent match and the 100 percent match is a red flag. Ms. Cocke said staff understands this and is working that in as language because the TA already said it would fund them, especially the existing shuttles. Staff will be giving a heads up that as the TA moves to competitive calls for projects that will be a factor and included in the contract extension letter, which is the normal budget approval process for the existing shuttles.

A motion (Bigelow/Hees) to support Part 1 of the call for projects was approved. Mr. Zimmerman abstained.

Program Report: Transit: South San Francisco Ferry and Redwood City Ferry Projects – TA Item 12a

South San Francisco Ferry Service

Mr. Hurley introduced WETA Planner/Analyst Michael Gougherty who provided the following details:

- WETA staff approved two contract awards for construction of the South San Francisco Ferry project in May. Project completion is expected in 2011.
- The project will provide service between Jack London Square in Oakland to Oyster Point in estimated travel time of 35 minutes with projected ridership of 600 passengers a day by 2012
- Construction of the terminal will provide an important transportation infrastructure in the event of a disaster response needed in case of an emergency
- The project dates back to 2004 when Regional Measure 2 (RM2) and earmark funding were secured for the project. Certification of the environmental report was completed in 2006. Demolition and dredging are complete at a cost of \$1.1 million; construction of the terminal and pier was awarded to Power Engineering for \$8.6 million and includes improvements to the Bay Trail; and the gangway and float construction contract was awarded to Manson Construction for \$10.5 million.
- The pier is covered for weather protection. The float has the potential to accommodate two vessels at a time and is entirely Americans with Disabilities (ADA) compliant and features the gangway that connects the float to the pier

- Two WETA vessels will be used in the project, which are 85 percent cleaner than 2007 Environmental Protection Agency regulations; have a low wake and low wash hulls to protect Bay and marine life; and will have room for 34 bikes.
- Genentech, the Alliance, WETA, and SamTrans have been coordinating the best approach for providing shuttle service to the ferry terminal. Genentech has committed to run two lines that connect the ferry to their two campuses.
- WETA is working with the Alliance to close the gap in shuttle service between the ferry and Oyster Point because the challenge of integrating the existing Utah/Grand shuttle service to provide transfers to the ferry terminal is operationally impossible due to headways of existing Caltrain and BART shuttle service. WETA is proposing nine months of funding to get the schedule optimized to meet needs of potential commuters and coordinate service with Genentech, the Alliance and San Mateo County after the nine-month period expires.

Austin Mader-Clark asked if the shuttles connect to Caltrain and BART or only to work areas. Mr. Gougherty replied only to the work areas.

Mr. Fox asked if it would take three transfers to get to Oakland from an employer shuttle. Mr. Gougherty replied yes. Mr. Fox said a fourth transfer would be required in the East Bay from the ferry to Oakland.

Mr. Gougherty said the primary market for the ferry is identified as workers commuting from the East Bay to Oyster Point. WETA looked at providing service to BART, Caltrain and SamTrans stops to minimize transfers but those are largely cost ineffective at this time. The shuttle ride is about 7.5 miles right now; it's about a 28 minute run so, accounting for driver breaks, in order to meet the projected 40 minute headways, WETA would have to run a second shuttle in order to capture BART and Caltrain ridership

Mr. Whittemore asked how much higher the construction bids were than the original estimate. Mr. Gougherty said about 10 percent.

Mr. Whittemore asked what capacity would be projected out five years. Mr. Gougherty said the vessels have capacity for 149 or 199 people, depending on which of the four vessels is in service. He said WETA has the fleet to address changes in demand in order to gain operational efficiency.

Mr. Whittemore asked about how many trips will be made each day and the anticipated ridership on the proposed shuttle service. Mr. Gougherty said WETA is looking at eight to 10 total trips per day with somewhere between three and five arriving and three to five departing from the South San Francisco terminal. He said anticipated ridership on the shuttle service is projected about 80 passengers per day; the basis for this is that WETA is looking at approximately 200 shuttle riders per day, taking into account the assumption that approximately 120 will be served by Genentech shuttles. This would be a gap closure project to provide shuttle access to 80 people.

Mr. Whittemore asked how much of a rise in sea level would have to occur before the terminal and pier structure would be under water and, in the event of a tsunami, how much of a tidal surge could the structures take before they would be non-operational in an emergency.

Mr. Gougherty said these questions are part of the environmental review process. He said one criterion the terminal must meet is a 50-year expected rise in sea level. He could not speak to tsunami protection but said it is included in the environmental review process.

Mr. Zimmerman asked about capital and operating costs and anticipated funding sources for both the ferry project and shuttle service. Mr. Gougherty said the total expected capital investment for the project, which includes two vessels and all construction packages as well as environmental review, design and project management is just over \$50 million. He said the entire capital cost has been secured and WETA is receiving a capital contribution of \$15 million from Measure A, RM2 funding and federal earmarks.

Mr. Gougherty said he did not have sources of funding for operational costs but said it was undertaken in an endeavor in conjunction with the California Transit Association (CTA) to create a South San Francisco Ferry Terminal Business Plan, which projected capital and operating costs and figures are included in the Plan.

Mr. Zimmerman said major employers in the Oyster Point area would stand to benefit significantly from the project and asked about what level of contribution is expected from the employers for both capital and operational costs. Mr. Gougherty said there are no direct contributions and the majority of funding is coming from RM2 money.

Ms. Arietta said 30 percent of the funding is from Measure A and asked what percentage comes from RM2 and Federal earmarks. Mr. Gougherty said he didn't have the exact figures for operating costs and revenue sources but the information is available online at watertransit.org in the South San Francisco Ferry Terminal Business Plan.

Mr. Hurley said staff will provide members with the business plan.

Ms. Maez said she knows a person who rides a bike from Alameda to Oakland, rides BART to the Peninsula side of the Bay and bicycles to his final destination in 90 minutes. The rider's employer subsidizes the BART ticket, which is a relative cost to the taxpayers. She asked how that time and cost compare to a trip on the ferry. Mr. Gougherty said WETA staff is developing fare policy and will have a public hearing. The fares will be comparable to other transit service in the corridor but the ferry ride is considered a relatively higher level of service. Projections indicate a fare of \$5 to \$6 dollars. In terms of time savings, there are no bicycle restrictions on the ferry.

Mr. Gougherty said there is a five-month design phase followed by a nine-month construction phase, during which the service schedule will be finalized. He said WETA has been in contact with the MTC to advance efforts to integrate Clipper into the new fare collection system. The ferry service business plan spells out a very detailed public outreach plan.

Redwood City Ferry Service

Environmental review began in 2004, which was supported by Proposition 1B funds. The review was stopped when funds were frozen by the State. WETA received \$44 million from the State several months ago and restarted the environmental review; secured services to provide conceptual design and engineering for the environmental review process; and expects a draft by summer 2011.

Ms. Arietta asked if there has ever been any input from employers who benefit from TA projects. She said it might be time to think outside the box and, perhaps, ask for a contribution from those who benefit from projects. Mr. Hurley said the TA does not have contractual agreements with employers. The Alliance has developed relationships between the employer and the shuttle system.

Mr. Bigelow said he was in a meeting with 16 chief executive officers of biotech companies in South San Francisco. Their commitment is a \$220 pre-tax amount per month an employee can shelter from taxes, and the companies are committed above and beyond their shuttle support to get riders.

Mr. Bigelow said he has seen water at high tide overflowing walkways and coming near parking lot areas near the Oyster Point Yacht Club and urged good planning because people walk on the land to access the ferry.

Mr. Whittemore said the land at Oyster Point is sinking and it is prime liquefaction territory. He asked if the Redwood City ferry stops at Oyster Point. Mr. Gougherty said no. The project is in early stages of development and a 2003 ridership study indicates service from the East Bay to Redwood City, service to San Francisco and then a run from San Francisco to Oakland. WETA is updating ridership levels and would appreciate input and ideas from anyone involved with the project.

Mr. Whittemore said it would be important to know the number of employees who live in the Redwood City area that work at Genentech and it would be a benefit to get those people off Highway 101. He asked if the land near the Redwood City ferry project could be developed into an area similar to Foster City. Mr. Gougherty said the ferry terminal would be built at the very end of the land area.

Mr. Zimmerman commended Mr. Gougherty for the excellent presentation. He said there should be more aggressive and assertive efforts in securing not just employer subsidies but also in assuming some of the capital and operating costs because employers don't have the luxury to rely upon public agencies anymore. Mr. Gougherty said WETA would definitely be working in partnership with South San Francisco on this issue.

Mr. Fox said, philosophically, Caltrain services many people and it is not asked to subsidize except indirectly through a tax base or some other means. He said Hewlett Packard employers don't pay a subsidy to Caltrain. He said this project should be an example of a new service, a new modality and an investment that benefits employers, and employees.

Mr. King commended WETA on its plans for emergency response during a disaster.
Mr. Gougherty said WETA has a very strong mandate for an emergency response infrastructure.

Update on State and Federal Legislative Program – TA Item 12b

Government Affairs Manager Seamus Murphy reported:

Federal

The Public Transit Preservation Act bill was introduced at the Federal level last week by Senator Christopher Dodd for emergency operating services for local agencies, which is something staff has been insisting be included in any kind of surface transportation reauthorization bill. The bill authorized \$2 billion in appropriations to fund three specific purposes:

1. Restore transit service that has been reduced in 2009 or 2010.
2. Rescind fare increases applied in 2009 or 2010.
3. Prevent any further reductions or fare increases through September 2011.

Mr. Murphy said \$2 billion doesn't go far nationwide but it will bring approximately \$85.5 million to the region with \$84.9 of that to the urbanized area formula, which is where District agencies receive the bulk of their funds. The funding will not solve any current operating deficits for next fiscal year but every bit helps to cover shortfalls. The MTC has a formula and discretion in distribution of funds.

State

The governor released his May Revise last month and did not propose to alter funding levels negotiated by the transit community with the Legislature earlier this year. This means this year's \$400 million appropriation statewide to the State Transit Assistance Program now and a long-term commitment of at least \$350 million a year for that program.

Mr. Bigelow asked if the governor's \$464 million High Speed Rail (HSR) funding survived the May Revise. Mr. Murphy said the governor proposed to increase funding from the HSR funds that the State received from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act in an approximate amount of \$100 million for inter-city passenger rail Track One Recovery Act funds. A good part of that funding goes to the Capitol Corridor for improvements.

Mr. Bigelow asked about \$464 million in the May Revise that was to finish up the project level for all eight route segments. Mr. Murphy said staff has not heard this was threatened.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what affects, if any, HB 4213 – The American Workers, State, and Business Relief Act of 2010 would have on TA functions or operations. Mr. Murphy said it wouldn't have any affect on any operating revenue. The only proposal at the Federal level that would affect the operating budget of any transit agency is the Dodd Bill.

Authorize Adoption of the Fiscal Year 2011 Budget in the Amount of \$38,259,999 – TA Item 3a

A motion (Hees/Shaine) to support adoption of the FY2011 budget was approved.

Finance

Authorize an Amendment to the Fiscal Year 2010 Budget in the Amount of \$51.4 Million from \$68.61 Million to \$120.01 Million and Allocation of Measure A Funds to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board for the San Bruno Grade Separation Project – TA Item 11a

A motion (Hees/Hedges) to support the budget amendment for the San Bruno Grade crossing was approved.

Authorize the Adoption of Appropriations Limit for Fiscal Year 2011 in the Amount of \$506,713,853 – TA Item 4c

Manger of Budgets Ladi Bhuller said there is a constitutional amendment known as the Gann Initiative, which places limits on the growth of expenditures for publicly funded programs. Each year staff calculates the maximum amount of tax proceeds the TA can appropriate each fiscal year.

To calculate the FY2011 limit, the FY2010's limit of \$514,000 is adjusted for inflation, which was a decrease of 2.54 percent and a population change, which is an increase of 1.17 percent. Staff will be asking the Board to adopt a resolution to approve the TA's FY2011 appropriation limit of approximately \$507 million.

A motion (Hees/Arietta) to support the staff recommendation was approved.

Program: Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report – 3rd Quarter Fiscal Year 2010 – TA Item 12c

Mr. Hurley said he will reply to any member questions/comments.

Mr. King said his job is taking him to Marin County and he must resign his seat. He said members bring their own passions to the CAC and wished all continued success in their work.

Chair Dixon said Mr. King will be missed and wished him well in his new endeavor.

Mr. Shaine asked if approved shuttle funding will need to be approved each year or every other year. Mr. Hurley said budget capacity will cover the shuttle program for a two-year period with renewal every other year.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR – PAT DIXON

Attended the groundbreaking for the Belmont pedestrian overcrossing. TA Chair Rosanne Foust introduced her and said the entire Board was with her in pushing for this project.

REPORT FROM STAFF – JOE HURLEY

- The groundbreaking ceremony for the Belmont pedestrian/bike overcrossing was a very positive ceremony and the CAC was recognized through Chair Dixon.
- There will be an informational meeting on June 22 for the Calera Parkway Project, which is an outcome of the scoping meeting that occurred in March in Pacifica. The intent of the meeting is to provide more specifics in terms of the other concepts explored to address the congestion problem in Pacifica. The meeting is scheduled for 6 p.m. in the Pacifica City Council chambers.
- A ribbon-cutting ceremony will be scheduled for the 3rd to Millbrae Auxiliary Lane Project mid-July. The date is to be determined.
- Mr. Hurley will miss the July meeting due to travel.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Paul Young was involved in the BART fiasco last week and was stuck in the Glen Park Station for 40 minutes.

Mr. Hees said the FRA waiver for Caltrain for use of lightweight rail equipment is a very significant milestone for electrification and HSR and allows Caltrain to go out for design on new equipment.

Mr. King was happy to see headway on water transit.

Austin Mader-Clark is excited about ferry service but very concerned about the lack of shuttle connections to BART and Caltrain, which is a disservice to riders of public transportation.

Ms. Arietta agreed the intermodal connections need to improve. She is concerned that the city of Pacifica missed out on the application process for shuttle service.

Mr. Bigelow said there is a workshop on HSR at the Burgess Recreation Center in Menlo Park this evening.

Mr. Shaine said the new SamTrans buses are sleek and hopefully will attract riders.

Ms. Maez expressed her happiness that funding is going to be secured for the San Bruno Grade Separation Project.

Mr. Whittemore thanked Mr. Hurley and Assistant District Secretary Rosemary Lake for his CAC orientation and the opportunity to serve on the CAC.

Chair Dixon encouraged all to vote.

Mr. Hurley thanked Mr. King for his service to the CAC and wished him all the best in his move to Marin County.

NEXT MEETING

The next regular meeting of the TA CAC will be held on Tuesday, June 29, 2010 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070.

Adjournment – 6:33 p.m.