TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
FOR THE
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)

January 16, 2003
MINUTES

The one hundred and thirty-sixth meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, Bacciocco Auditorium. Co-Chair Neil Cullen called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m.

Attending the meeting were: Neil Cullen, Meg Monroe, Corinne Goodrich, Ruben Niño, Parviz Mokhtari, Ray Davis, Howard Goode, Craig Ewing, Merrill Buck, Van Ocampo, Geoff Kline, Mo Sharma, Larry Patterson, Joe Hurley (Transportation Authority), Dennis Chuck (South San Francisco), Christine Maley-Grubl (Alliance), Brian Lee (San Mateo County Public Works), Richard Cook (SamTrans), Patricia Dixon (Transportation Authority CAC), Ben McKeever (Kimley-Horn), Jim Bigelow (Redwood City/San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce), Onnolee Trapp (CMAQ).

Absent from the meeting were: Jon Lynch, Mark Duino, John Lisenko, Marc Roddin, George Bagdon, April Chan, Kent Dewell.

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

Richard Cook reported that the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has issued new rules related to air quality standards for shuttle vehicles. It may be very difficult for C/CAG's programs to meet these requirements. The TAC may want to discuss this item at a future meeting.

2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMAQ meetings.

- Approval of contracts for the Local Service program.
- Contract with Seton Medical Center for the Employer Based Shuttle program.
- Contract with Fehr & Peers to monitor roadways for the 2003 CMP.
- Contract with Advocation for lobbying services.
  Report on potential housing program opportunities consistent with C/CAG Board direction.

3. Minutes from October 17, 2002 meeting.

Motion: To approve the minutes as presented. Unanimous.

4. Process and criteria for developing projects to include in the reauthorization of Measure A.

Joe Hurley from the Transportation Authority and Geoff Kline from C/CAG provided the report. The following are some of the points made in the presentation and feedback from TAC members:

- The Transportation Authority has hired a public education/outreach consult to assist in the process of getting information out to the public regarding the reauthorization of Measure A.
- Staff would like to finalize the process for developing the draft program of projects (expenditure plan) by the next TAC meeting.
- Input from all Public Works Directors to this process is very important. They will all be encouraged to attend the TAC meetings where this item will be discussed.
- The list of potential transportation projects developed through this process should also be used to solicit monies outside of Measure A.
- The list of projects will likely be updated every year.
- Joe and Geoff presented a draft calendar for creating the expenditure plan.
- In order to be included in the ballot measure to reauthorize Measure A, the list of projects must be fully developed by June 30, 2003.
- Projects of all sizes will be considered.
- The final list of projects must be signed of on by the appropriate boards (C/CAG and the Transportation Authority) by March 31, 2004 in order to complete the process in time for a November 2004 consideration by the voters.
- The Board of Supervisors and City Councils must approve the ballot measure by August 2004 in order to be placed on the ballot for November 2004.

Comments by the TAC included:

- Grade separation projects should be listed as a subset of the CalTrain program and should be the responsibility of the Joint Powers Board to manage instead of this burden falling to the cities.
- The category for bus services should be expanded to include the new C/CAG Local Transportation Services Program. This would provide another funding source for shuttles and other transportation that supplements and supports the SamTrans regional bus program.
- A question was raised as to whether the grade separation projects will be designed to accommodate four rails.
- The question was raised as to whether including a category for BART implies that BART will be extended past Millbrae.
- It was suggested that rail funding be identified for the corridor without designating the type of technology that will be employed (BART versus other technologies).
- By including a BART category, it implies that San Mateo County has agreed to be a BART County. This is a matter for the voters to decide as a separate item
- Is the money contemplated for BART, to be used for the extension of the line or for the operation of the current portion of the line that is in San Mateo County?
- Should high-speed rail be included?
- Should a category for intermodal improvements be included?
- Is the purpose of the expenditure program to be a way to divide up the pie or to do a real regional plan?

- The C/CAG Countywide Transportation Plan should be used as the official plan to guide what should or should not be included in the expenditure plan.
- The funding for BART should be for a study only. Until it is decided whether BART will be extended further, it is premature to include anything beyond a study in this expenditure plan.
- The Transportation Authority education and outreach study will attempt to poll and identify the needs expressed by the residents.
- There was general consensus that the proposed list is good enough to stimulate discussion on the process.
- Projects proposed for the list should only be nominated by the cities, the County, the Transportation Authority, SamTrans, the JPB, and CalTrans.
- Consideration should be given to creating a separate category for incentives.
- Transit Oriented Development is not consistent with any of the other categories; therefore it should be a separate category and not related to a specific transportation project.
- Incentives and Transit Oriented Development could be placed under the TSM category.
- Consider calling it Multimodal incentives instead of Transit Oriented Development.
- The focus should be on corridors and not the method of travel. There can be a sample of the types of project but not a specific and limited list of projects.
- The bicycle and pedestrian category should be for capital projects and not for studies. The local agencies should pay for the studies.
- It will be difficult to anticipate the specific project needs over the next 20 years. A lot can change over that period of time. It would be better to have the flexibility to adjust the projects as the needs become better defined.
- It will be harder to get voter approval if the Measure does not include a specific list of projects.
- The cost estimates for the candidate projects should be done in today's dollars.
- The money under the reauthorized Measure A program will not become available until 2008 and later.
- The Countywide Transportation Plan presumes that the Measure A funds will be married with state and federal dollars. Local funding would be considered separate and in addition to these funds.
- There needs to be clarification on the types of projects that can be submitted for consideration.
- It was recommended that the project ideas be solicited first and only the likely candidates go though a detailed cost estimating process.
- It was recommended that the solicitation of projects be kept informal as first until further direction is developed and some of the ideas are submitted. Consider doing this initial part as a brainstorming process to be followed by developing project specifics and cost estimates for the more likely candidates.
- Local streets projects are not being solicited at this time.
- Consider ignoring the categories and just collect the projects first. Let the project submissions be the method for developing the categories.

In summary the TAC agreed to the following:

- There should be additional discussion at a later date about the regions identified in the

proposal.

- The basic categories are okay for the initial process.
- The calendar is fine.
- The application form and the simplified cost estimate in today's dollars are okay.
- There should be some consideration given to the potential environmental hurdles that projects may face.

5. Recommendations for a scope of work for a ramp metering study.

It was recommended that the following additions be made to the scope.

- Include a time line chart that reflects the new starting date for the project.
- Include a budget that identifies the cost per task.

6. Recommendations for a scope of work for a Countywide Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Plan.

It was decided that a subcommittee would be formed to review and edit the proposed scope. Ray Davis and Larry Patterson volunteered to be on the subcommittee.

7. Sacramento budget implications.

Richard Napier reported:

- Projects that have begun construction appear to be safe from the budget cutbacks.
- The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is already over committed.
- The Governor has taken back all of the General Funds that were previously committed to transportation projects and has requested that the California Transportation Commission look for ways to fund these projects through the STIP.
- The Governor is attempting to forfeit paying the local subventions.

8. Items of interest/new business.

No items.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

NOTE: COPIES OF HANDOUTS FROM MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST BY CONTACTING WALTER MARTONE AT 599-1465.