

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

MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 4, 2012

MEMBERS PRESENT: B. Arietta, J. Bigelow, R. Hedges, R. Hees, E. Lasensky, J. Londer, D. Maez, D. Mensing, B. Warhurst, J. Whittemore

MEMBERS ABSENT: J. Fox, L. Shaine, L. Simonson, A. Vargas, G. Zimmerman

STAFF PRESENT: J. Averill, A. Chan, M. Choy, C. Chung, A. Hughes, J. Hurley, N. McKenna

Chair Barbara Arietta called the meeting to order at 4:31 p.m. and Elizabeth Lasensky led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion (Whittemore/Bigelow) to approve the minutes passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

ITEMS FOR REVIEW – SEPTEMBER 6, 2012 TA BOARD MEETING

Feature Presentation: Bayshore Intermodal Station Access Study (TA Item 11a)

Manager, Caltrain Programming and Monitoring Melanie Choy said this is a presentation about the Bayshore Caltrain Station study which focuses on how to better integrate the land use plans and transportation services in and around the station. She said the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA), which did the study, acknowledged this was done prior to the progression of the High Speed Rail (HSR) plans and there is more work to be done to integrate the Bayshore Intermodal Station with the blended system plans. Ms. Choy introduced Chester Fung, Principal Transportation Planner from SFCTA.

Mr. Fung said the purpose of the presentation is to raise awareness of the study and investment opportunity.

- The proposed development and station opportunity area is on the San Mateo and San Francisco Counties border between Candlestick Point and the Cow Palace.
- The current station in Brisbane is not connected with the community, and this is an opportunity to transform the station and make it a transit hub.
- This study could support the Baylands planning process and this is an opportunity to exchange ideas about how to lay out the area for best use and success.
- Community input and feedback expressed the desire for faster, cheaper, better coordinated transit, and a local area for entertainment.

- There are two proposals for development: developer land use and community land use. Developer land use is put forth by the landowner and is focused on new housing and employment growth. Community land use is focused only on employment growth.
- Several alternatives have been identified and each have various trade-offs. One criterion to evaluate the alternatives was ridership catchment maximization which looks at how many residents and employees are within walking distance of the station.
- The study shows the various access modes planned to get to the station which include bicycle, bus, auto, light rail, and pedestrian routes. There was a strong emphasis on pedestrian needs.
- A recommendation for land use is to make the area dense and diverse especially with evening activity so the station will be safe and used after working hours. Considerations have been made regarding parking and shuttles.
- Cost estimates include \$50-\$60 million in station elements, and \$300-\$400 million for related projects including the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), the light rail train, the extension of Geneva Avenue, and bicycle and pedestrian paths.
- Funding will come from SFCTA and the private sector, and other funding options are being explored.
- The next steps include reviewing the environmental study, developing an interim BRT line, and reviewing the plan after the selection of the preferred land use option.

Daniel Mensing asked what the purpose of the employment was in the plan. Mr. Fung said there will be some retail and office space. Mr. Mensing asked if Schlage Lock is pulling out of the area. Mr. Fung said the area is being cleaned and will be available for land development.

Richard Hedges said light rail is a must for the area. He said San Mateo County should help extend it, and he believes this subject will end up on the ballot. He asked how the retail and office space will affect the State requirements for a housing element. Mr. Fung said he is not able to answer that question. Mr. Hedges said the Developer's Land Use Plan would be the best plan for the community.

Doris Maez asked what effects sea level rise will have on the area and if it was taken into consideration during the planning process because the area is all landfill. Mr. Fung said much of the infrastructure will have to be built on piles and foundations which will make it much more complicated and expensive.

Ms. Lasensky said the area will not have community ambiance after work hours if it is replete with commercial shops that close in early evening. Mr. Fung said the city of Brisbane will decide how to use the land and the SFCTA is focusing on the station and providing recommendations about how to make the station successful which includes after hours activities.

Jim Bigelow asked if the \$300-\$400 million includes modifying the Candlestick/US 101 interchange. Mr. Fung said it does not because that project is included in a different study. The cost estimate for that interchange is between \$175-\$200 million. The interchange reconfiguration would be to dedicate some right of way to bus use. Mr. Bigelow said this information should be disclosed in this presentation. He said the report should include information whether the soil contamination issue that used to exist in the area was resolved.

Chair Barbara Arietta asked if there was reclamation around the Schlage Lock area. Mr. Fung said it used to be a toxic waste site but the state, city, and private land owners have invested in cleanup.

William Warhurst asked what the timeline is. Mr. Fung said it is still very early in the planning process and no decisions have been made yet. The Environmental Impact Report will be released later this year.

Randy Hees asked Mr. Fung to provide more information about the Recology site. Mr. Fung said the Recology site might get bigger and the challenge is how to make the BRT connection to the station because it would have to go through the Recology area.

Jim Whittemore said he would prefer a cheaper station be built there with an opportunity to develop it later rather than spend the money on such an expensive station. He said if the TA is going to build regional transit hubs he would rather support building one in South San Francisco.

Update on Highway Call for Projects (TA Item 11b)

Project Manager Aidan Hughes said:

- The objectives were set out in the Short-range Highway Plan (SRHP) which included attempting to close out the Original Measure A, moving forward with New Measure A, funding projects based on merit, and initiating planning phases for projects to establish a pipeline for projects over the next 25 years.
- Staff is recommending \$46.81 million to be programmed and allocated from the Original Measure A which will almost close it out and most of this will be in construction, \$21.6 million for Key Congested Areas (KCA), and \$13.3 million for Supplemental Roadways for a total of \$81.71 million.
- Each of the applications comes with a sponsor either from individual cities or the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG).
- Staff from the TA, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the Alameda California Transportation Commission (ACTC) were on the evaluation panel and used the criteria from the SRHP.
- Evaluation weighting included effectiveness, readiness, need, policy consistency, sustainability, ease of implementation, the funding plans, stakeholder interest, and economies of scale.
- The program intent was to reduce congestion on commute corridors.
- Staff received 29 applications, 2 of which were withdrawn, 19 had multi-phase requests and 8 had planning-only requests. There was a range of project types requesting a total of \$103.3 million out of the \$104 million available.
- The draft recommendation list has 23 projects totaling \$81.71 million, most of which is from construction projects.
- Staff is recommending the Board program and allocate \$54.42 million, and program (but not allocate) \$27.29 million. Program only is for projects with conditions staff put into place. Once the conditions have been met, staff will recommend the Board allocate the funds.
- There is a leverage of 34 percent.

- The recommended list will be presented to the TA in October and will include a summary of comments staff receives from applicants and other interested parties. Subsequently, staff will develop a summary of lessons learned which will address whether there is a need for policy or other changes to the process.

Chair Arietta said San Mateo County Supervisor Don Horsley sent a letter to her asking the CAC to consider supporting full funding for the Mid-coast Highway 1 Congestion, Throughput, and Safety Improvements Project application. Mr. Hughes said this project requested funding for multiple phases over a period of time and there continues to lack of specificity about the project due to unforeseen changes in scope or cost so the evaluation panel decided to make a commitment to the early phases of the project but not to the later phases. The process allows applicants to come back at future Calls for Projects (CFPs) to request additional funding.

Mr. Whittemore asked why staff did not program the entire amount requested for the Mid-coast project but not allocate as was done with other projects. Mr. Hughes said there has not been preliminary planning on the project so staff didn't feel it was appropriate to program funds at this time. There will be another CFP in one year and if this project has advanced through the preliminary planning and has more specificity about future phases, the Board will have the opportunity to allocate or program additional funds. Mr. Whittemore said he agrees with Supervisor Horsley and believes the funding should be programmed.

Mr. Whittemore asked to see the supporting documentation that goes along with these projects. Director, Transportation Authority Program Joe Hurley said the CAC is not being asked to evaluate each of the projects but rather to validate that staff is following the established process to evaluate and prioritize the projects.

Mr. Warhurst said he thinks the CAC's role is to make sure the community is getting its money's worth to determine how the money is best spent and they should go over the project list. Mr. Hughes said the criteria was established by the Board of Directors and included scoring and weighting.

Mr. Mensing left at 6:05 p.m.

Mr. Hees asked how the concept of Complete Streets will affect the projects in the future as Federal and State policy changes. Mr. Hughes said staff will be proposing something to the Board to address Complete Streets.

Mr. Bigelow said it is good not to program all the funding available at once because it allows for a cushion, and other issues that come up can be addressed at future CFPs.

Ms. Maez asked how the highway interchanges that will be changed relate to the 13-mile High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane C/CAG recommended. Mr. Hughes said the TA does not make any policy recommendations about HOV lanes but does have an obligation to recognize KCAs as established by the voters. These projects are evaluated based on individual merit because the TA does not have the authority to make countywide decisions.

Jeff Londer said he thought the scores should be listed for each project. Mr. Hughes said scoring information has been made available to the applicants so they can see where they scored and the scores can be made available to the CAC.

Chair Arietta said she thinks the evaluations need to be looked at again because the Mid-coast project referred to by Supervisor Horsley is important.

Mr. Whittemore said he thinks it is the CAC's due diligence to look at the projects in more detail to check how they were evaluated.

Solicitation of Letters of Intent for Grade Separations (TA Item 11c)

Ms. Maez asked why the amounts from the staff report do not match the amounts in the Capital Report for the San Bruno Grade Separation. Executive Officer, Planning and Development April Chan said the \$29.2 million in the staff report is the amount that came from the New Measure A, but the total funding for the San Bruno Grade Separation contains funds from the Original Measure A.

Ms. Chan said the original Grade Separation Study was paused to allow for better coordination with the HSR project regarding grade separations. Recently, the State appropriated funding for the Caltrain Early Investment Program. Staff is proposing to solicit letters of interest to learn which cities are interested in grade separating at-grade rail crossings within their jurisdictions.

Mr. Whittemore asked how this affects the request from the city of San Mateo for funding for their grade separation project. Mr. Hedges said San Mateo has private money to help fund for the project and the grade separation is critical to San Mateo because the city is ready to build housing and office space but cannot do anything until the grade separation is planned.

Mr. Hees said there have never been a lot of requests to build grade crossings and if there is a surplus of funding for grade crossings but not much interest the TA might not have to go through a formal process.

Ms. Lasensky asked if all of the grade separations are going to be above grade. Ms. Chan said no assumptions will be made. The purpose of the letters is to get more information to help the TA establish how to go forward with the CFP. Ms. Chan said the benefits include determining where TA can leverage funding, which projects are already in the planning process, have already gone through an environmental study, and possibly have a preliminary engineering design.

Mr. Bigelow said the JPB staff is working on the environmental document for HSR and determining the effects of trains in the corridor using at-grade crossings. Finding out which cities would be interested in applying for funds for grade separations can help the TA identify which projects would be most valuable and prioritize them accordingly.

A motion (Whittemore/Hees) to support the solicitation of letters was passed.

Ms. Lasensky left at 6:56 p.m.

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

No discussion.

Authorize Acceptance of Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review and Outlook for Quarter Ended June 30, 2012 (TA Item 10a)

A motion (Hedges/Bigelow) to support the acceptance of the Quarterly Investment Report was passed.

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for July 2012 (TA Item 4b)

A motion (Warhurst/Bigelow) to support the acceptance of the statement was passed.

Measure A Program Status Report (TA Item 4c)

No discussion.

Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report – 4th Quarter (TA Item 11e)

Mr. Hees asked if a plant monitoring item was added to the report. Mr. Hurley said yes because the plant establishment project can't be closed even after planting was done. This is in reference to project sites where plants are cared for and monitored to make sure they will live.

Mr. Whittemore said there is a lot of money left in monitoring and plant establishment and asked if the money should be freed up. Mr. Hurley said staff will look to see what the required balance is for the project.

Mr. Whittemore asked if the money should be released that is saved for station platform projects that are on hold. Mr. Hurley said it will have to be revisited.

Chair Arietta asked what the status was on the Calera Parkway Project. Mr. Hurley said it was determined the preferred alternative should be identified in the environmental document so the Pacifica representative solicited input from the Pacifica City Council which stated their preferred alternative was the landscape median.

Mr. Whittemore said the Caltrain Electrification section of the report states there was a budget of \$2,490,555 for contingency, \$0 was expended to date, but the estimate to complete is \$14,809,629, and asked what that contingency was for. He said \$7 million was spent in administrative overhead already but only \$265,000 is estimated for completion and asked if administrative expenses are usually front loaded onto a project. He said administration expenses seem high on the San Mateo Bridges Project. He also said the San Bruno Grade Separation Project is behind schedule by 248 days as of the end of June and asked if a new schedule was released and how far behind the project is.

Mr. Hurley said he would get back to the committee with answers to all of these questions.

SamTrans Liaison Report – June 13, 2012 (TA Item 7)

No discussion

Approval of Minutes of August 2, 2012 (TA Item 4a)

No discussion

REPORT OF THE CHAIR – BARBARA ARIETTA

Chair Arietta reported:

- The Communications-based Overlay Signal System is compatible with HSR as required by the Federal Railroad Administration.
- The Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments approved a study to consider a vehicle miles traveled tax which would be tracked with a Global Positioning System-like device in vehicles.
- SamTrans is making route changes and information is posted on its website.
- The supports and bridges for the San Bruno Grade Separation Project are now up and visible.

REPORT FROM STAFF – JOE HURLEY

Mr. Hurley said C/CAG Executive Director Rich Napier is retiring and he will be missed.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Mr. Whittemore said he commends the people who worked on the Caltrain operator change to Transit America Services, Inc because it was a major project, there were no negative external impacts, and customer service remained excellent. He said Stanford and Palo Alto announced they will be spending their \$10.4 million grant but the plans do not include any allocation to the Bay Trail completion through East Palo Alto. Mr. Whittemore said he supports Santa Clara Supervisor Liz Kniss' proposal to complete the trail over the new Palo Alto proposal.

Mr. Whittemore said some Santa Cruz buses run on natural gas.

Date and Time of Next Meeting

Tuesday, October 2, 2012 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070.

The meeting adjourned at 7:21 p.m.