C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

BOARD MEETING NOTICE

Meeting No. 163

DATE: Thursday, January 13, 2005

TIME: 6:00 P.M. Board Meeting

NOTE: REVISED STARTING TIME

PLACE: San Mateo County Transit District Office
1250 San Carlos Avenue, Second Floor Auditorium
San Carlos, CA

PARKING: Available adjacent to and behind building.
Please note the underground parking garage is no longer open.

PUBLIC TRANSIT: SamTrans Bus: Lines 261, 295, 297, 390, 391, 397, PX, KX.
CalTrain: San Carlos Station

****

1.0 CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA
Note: Public comment is limited to two minutes per speaker.

3.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS/ PRESENTATIONS

4.0 CONSENT AGENDA

Consent Agenda items are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless members of the Board, staff or public request specific items to be removed for separate action.

4.1 Approval of Minutes of Regular C/CAG Meeting No. 162 of December 9, 2004. ACTION p. 1

NOTE: All items on the Consent Agenda are approved/accepted by a majority vote. A request must be made at the beginning of the meeting to move any item from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

555 COUNTY CENTER, 5TH FLOOR, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063 PHONE: 650.599.1420 FAX: 650.361.8227

5.0 REGULAR AGENDA

5.1 Review and approval of Resolution 05-01 to establish a C/CAG Board position on the retrofit of the Bay Bridge. ACTION p. 7

6.0 COMMITTEE REPORTS

6.1 Committee Reports (oral reports).

6.2 Chairpersons Report.

7.0 EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS REPORT

8.0 COMMUNICATIONS - Information Only

8.1 Letter from Honorable Deborah E.G. Wilder, Chair - C/CAG, to Honorable Gene Mullin, Assembly Member - CA Assembly, dated 12/3/04. Re: Legislation related to Storm Sewer Programs and Taxation. p. 47

8.2 Letter from Honorable Mark Church, Chair - San Mateo County Transportation Authority, and Michael J. Scanlon, Executive Director - San Mateo County Transportation Authority, to Richard Napier, Executive Director - C/CAG, dated 12/09/04. Re: Measure A Reauthorization Support. p. 49

8.3 Letter from Richard Napier, Executive Director - C/CAG, to California Department of Motor Vehicles - Office of the Director, dated 12/10/04. Re: Implementation of Chapter 2.65 - San Mateo County Environmental/ Transportation Pilot Program. p. 51

8.4 Letter from David F. Carbone, C/CAG ALUC Staff, to Doug Kimsey, Manager of Planning - Metropolitan Transportation Commission, dated 12/15/04. Re: Comments on the draft document entitled Protecting the Bay Area's Aviation Resources. p. 53

8.5 Letter from Honorable Deborah E.G. Wilder, Chair - C/CAG, to Honorable Tom Harmon, Assembly Member - CA Assembly, dated 12/20/04. Re: Re-introduction of ACA 10. p. 57

9.0 MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

10.0 ADJOURN

Next scheduled meeting: February 10, 2005 Regular Board Meeting

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG Board and Committee meetings will be posted at San Mateo County Transit District Office, 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA.

NOTE: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

If you have any questions about the C/CAG Board Agenda, please contact C/CAG Staff:

Executive Director: Richard Napier 650 599-1420 Administrative Assistant: Nancy Blair 650 599-1406

FUTURE MEETINGS

January 5, 2005	2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor Study TAC - Menlo Park City Hall - 2:00 P.M.
January 12, 2005	2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor Study PAC - Menlo Park City Hall - 4:00 P.M.
January 13, 2005	Legislative Committee - SamTrans Auditorium - 5:00 P.M.
January 13, 2005	C/CAG Board Meeting – SamTrans Auditorium - 6:00 P.M.
January 13, 2005	C/CAG Board Retreat - SamTrans Auditorium - 6:15 P.M.
January 18, 2005	NPDES Technical Advisory Committee - South San Francisco - 10:00 A.M.
January 20, 2005	CMP Technical Advisory Committee - SamTrans Auditorium - 1:15 P.M.
January 26, 2005	Administrators Advisory Committee - 555 County Center RC - 8:00 A.M.
January 27, 2005	Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee - San Mateo City Hall - Conf. Room C 7:30 P.M.
January 31, 2005	CMAQ Committee - San Mateo City Hall - Conference Room C - 3:00 P.M.

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

Meeting No. 162
December 9, 2004

1.0 CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Wilder called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll call was taken.

Bill Conwell - Atherton
Lee Panza - Brisbane/San Mateo County Transportation Authority
Rosalie O'Mahony - Burlingame
Joe Silva - Colma
Carol Klatt - Daly City
Deborah Wilder - Foster City
Lee Duboc - Menlo Park
Marc Hershman - Millbrae
Diane Howard - Redwood City (7:02)
Irene O'Connell - San Bruno (7:10)
Don Eaton - San Carlos
Sue Lempert - San Mateo
Rose Jacobs-Gibson - County of San Mateo
Karyl Matsumoto - South San Francisco

Absent:

Belmont
East Palo Alto
Half Moon Bay
Hillsborough
Pacifica
Portola Valley
Woodside

Others:

Richard Napier, Executive Director, C/CAG
Nancy Blair, Administrative Assistant, C/CAG
Miruni Soosaipillai, Legal Counsel
Walter Martone, C/CAG
Geoff Kline, C/CAG
Sandy Wong, C/CAG
Brian Lee, San Mateo County
Onnalee Trapp, CMAQ Committee, League of Women Voters of San Mateo County
Pat Dixon, SMCTA - CAC

ITEM 4.1

555 COUNTY CENTER, 5TH FLOOR, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063 PHONE: 650.599.1420 FAX: 650.361.8227

Adam Lodge, San Mateo County
Duane Bay, East Palo Alto
Ray Razavi, City of South San Francisco
Jerry Grace
Christine Maley-Grubl, Peninsula Congestion Relief Alliance

3.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS/ PRESENTATIONS

Board Member Matsumoto introduced the City of South San Francisco's new engineer, Ray Razavi.

4.0 CONSENT AGENDA

Board Member Conwell MOVED approval of Consent Items 4.1, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.10, and 4.11. Board Member O'Mahony SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 13-0.

4.1 Approval of Minutes of Regular C/CAG Meeting No. 161 of November 11, 2004.

4.3 Review and approval of Resolution 04-34 of the Board of Directors of the City/ County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) recognizing the Honorable Eugene Mullin for Co-Authoring AB 1546 - San Mateo County Environmental/ Transportation Pilot Program.

4.4 Review and approval of Resolution 04-29 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an agreement with Fehr and Peers Associates, Inc. to conduct monitoring for the 2005 C/CAG Congestion Management Plan (CMP) in an amount not to exceed $39,460.

4.6 Review and approval of Resolution 04-31 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an amendment to the agreement with Hexagon Transportation Consultants for on-call modeling services in the amount of $30,000.

4.7 Review and approval of Resolution 04-32 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute extensions to the Local Service Projects (shuttle programs) through March 31, 2005 for a total additional cost not to exceed $148,345 in order to allow for evaluation of the program.

4.10 Review and approval of Resolution 04-35 of the Board of Directors of the City/ County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) recognizing the Honorable Leland Yee for Co-Authoring AB 1546 - San Mateo County Environmental/ Transportation Pilot Program.

4.11 Review and approval of Resolution 04-36 of the Board of Directors of the City/ County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) recognizing the Honorable Byron Sher for Championing AB 1546 - San Mateo County Environmental/ Transportation Pilot Program in the Senate.

Items 4.2, 4.5, 4.8 and 4.9 were removed from the Consent Calendar.

4.2 Review and approval of the 2005 C/CAG Calendar.

The January C/CAG Board meeting was changed from January 20 to January 13.

Board Member Hershman MOVED modification to the C/CAG Board calendar to change the January Board meeting to January 13. Board Member Panza SECONDED.
MOTION CARRIED unanimously 13-0.

4.5 Review and approval of Resolution 04-30 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an amendment to the agreement with Hexagon Transportation Consultants to complete the biannual update of the C/CAG Travel Forecasting Model as required for the 2005 Congestion Management Program for an additive amount of $179,520 and a new total contract amount of $229,520.

C/CAG staff responded to questions about the large increase in the contract amount.

Board Member Panza MOVED in accordance with the staff recommendations. Board Member O'Mahony SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously 13-0.

4.8 Recommendation for C/CAG participation in the development of a cost-sharing plan to acquire Countywide aerial photographs to establish a current and consistent Countywide Geographic Information System (GIS).

C/CAG staff is working with potential funding partners to determine a funding strategy, in order to proportion the costs. Any financial commitment to participate will be brought back to the Board for approval.

Board Member Duboc MOVED in accordance with the staff recommendations. Board Member Conwell SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously 13-0.

4.9 Review and approval of Resolution 04-33 authorizing the adoption of the 2005-06 expenditure program for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) San Mateo County Program.

C/CAG staff clarified the support and responded to questions for the Menlo Park TSM program.

Board Member Duboc MOVED in accordance with the staff recommendations. Board Member O'Mahony SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously 13-0.

5.0 REGULAR AGENDA

5.1 Review and approval of the C/CAG Board State Legislative Priorities for the 2005 State Legislation Session. INFORMATION

C/CAG staff provided an overview of the Proposed C/CAG Legislative Priorities for 2005.

1. Working on legislation similar to ACA 10 to get funding for the NPDES program.
2. Protect against the diversion of local revenues ~~and to protect~~ *including* redevelopment funds.
3. Encourage the State to protect transportation funding and support efforts to develop a fair cost-sharing arrangement for the Bay Bridge cost overruns.
4. Guard the right of local jurisdictions to establish and enforce local land use policy
5. Protect against increased local costs resulting from State action without 100% State reimbursement for the added costs.
6. Support lowering the 2/3rd super majority vote for local special purpose taxes.

C/CAG staff was requested to do additional research on these and other possible priorities and bring back the information to the next Legislative Committee meeting. The final recommendation for a list of priorities will be brought back to the C/CAG Board after the Committee has completed its work.

5.2 Public hearing, review and approval of the AB 1546 - Environmental/ Transportation Pilot Program for FY 05-06 including establishment of a $4 increase in the vehicle registration fee for San Mateo County.

C/CAG staff provided an overview of the program, the fee and the action process recommended for the Board. Staff answered questions.

5.2.1 Public hearing to consider implementation of the AB 1546 - Environmental/ Transportation Pilot Program for FY 05-06. ACTION

Board Member O'Mahony MOVED to open the Public Hearing. Board Member Jacobs-Gibson SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously 14-0.

Chair Wilder opened the Public Hearing for Public comment.

Pat Dixon, SMCTA - CAC, stated she was for and against the Program. She shared her concerns that the $4 fee would be a hardship for the elderly and disabled.

Board Member Panza MOVED to close the Public Hearing. Board Member Hershman SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously 14-0.

5.2.2 Review and approval of a program and budget for FY 05-06 to support the management of traffic congestion and stormwater pollution with the proceeds of the fee authorized by AB 1546 (Chapter 931).

Board Member Panza asked that importance be placed on ITS versus investigating hydrogen-fuel based projects. Board Members O'Mahony and Howard agreed with Board Member Panza.

Board Member Lempert feels that C/CAG should make a concise public statement as to why C/CAG sponsored AB 1546 and how the funds will be used. Board Member Matsumoto agreed with Board Lempert.

Board Member Jacobs-Gibson MOVED approval of the recommended draft plan and budget and that C/CAG Staff return at a future meeting with a more detailed plan and budget. Board Member Panza SECONDED.

C/CAG Special Voting Procedures in accordance with Section 2 of the C/CAG Joint Powers Agreement was performed. Results: 14 agencies approving with 0 agencies opposing. This represents 67% of the agencies representing 82% of the population.

MOTION CARRIED in accordance with the C/CAG Special Voting Procedures that requires a majority of the agencies representing a majority of the population for approval.

MOTION CARRIED in accordance with California Government Code, Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 2.65, Section 65089.11 (a) that requires approval by Board Members representing two-thirds of the population of San Mateo County.

5.2.3 Review and approval of Resolution 04-37 for the establishment of a $4 increase in the vehicle registration fee for San Mateo County for FY 05-06.

Board Member Panza MOVED approval of Resolution 04-37 for FY 05-06 only. Board Member Conwell SECONDED.

C/CAG Special Voting Procedures in accordance with Section 2 of the C/CAG Joint Powers Agreement was performed. Results: 14 agencies approving with 0 agencies opposing. This represents 67% of the agencies representing 82% of the population.

MOTION CARRIED in accordance with the C/CAG Special Voting Procedures that requires a majority of the agencies representing a majority of the population for approval.

MOTION CARRIED in accordance with California Government Code, Title 7, Division 1, Chapter 2.65, Section 65089.11 (a) that requires approval by Board Members representing two-thirds of the population of San Mateo County.

5.2.4 Review and approval of Resolution 04-38 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an agreement with the State of California Department of Motor Vehicles or its designee, to develop procedures and processes for the collection of vehicle registration fees as authorized by AB 1546 (Chapter 931).

Board Member Panza MOVED approval of Resolution -04-38. Board Member O'Mahony SECONDED. A roll call vote was taken. **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously 14-0.

5.3 Review and approval of programming of Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Incentive Program obligation to the City of South San Francisco.

Board Member O'Mahony MOVED in accordance with the staff recommendations. Board Member Jacobs-Gibson SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously 14-0.

5.4 Review and approval of a call for projects for the Third Cycle of the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program.

The Congestion Management Plan (CMP) Technical Advisory committee Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Congestion Management and Air Quality Committee (CMAQ) reviewed this item on 11/18/04 and 11/29/04. Both TAC and CMAQ recommend approval in accordance with the staff recommendation.

CMAQ recommended the addition of a $250 per bedroom incentive for a project that includes a minimum of 10 per cent low to moderate income housing.

C/CAG Staff suggests no substantial policy changes, and only minor modifications to some of the language in the policy.

Board Member Panza suggested that the following modification be made to section 6 of the policy:

"~~If it is not visibly clear that a project is under construction, then~~ ~~as~~ *As* a minimum the project must have ~~pulled~~ *received* building permits, demonstrate that less visible construction has started (such as

fencing, grading, utilities, infrastructure etc.) and that both the developer and the City/ County are clearly obligated for completion of the project in a timely manner."

Board Member O'Connell MOVED approval of the Third Cycle Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program in accordance with the staff recommendations with modifications. The modifications include implementation of the $250 incentive for low to moderate income housing recommended by CMAQ and to modify section 6 of the policy as suggested by Board Member Panza. Board Member Panza SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously 14-0.

6.0 COMMITTEE REPORTS

6.1 Committee Reports (oral reports).

None.

6.2 Chairpersons Report.

C/CAG Staff will meet individually with new members assigned to the C/CAG Board for orientation. The annual C/CAG retreat will take place on January 13 at 6:30 p.m. at the SamTrans building in the 4th Floor Dining room.

7.0 EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS REPORT

Richard Napier is working closely with the City of San Carlos to provide the Board with C/CAG's Financial Management reports.

Richard Napier reminded the Board that the TOD applications are due on December 10 at 5:00 p.m.

8.0 COMMUNICATIONS - Information Only

8.1 Letter from Richard Napier, C/CAG - Executive Director, to Peter Kutras Jr., Santa Clara County – Executive, Kevin Duggan, City of Mountain View - City Manager, Frank Benest, City of Palo Alto - City Manager, dated 11/16/04. Re: CEQA Notifications.

9.0 MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

10.0 ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 13, 2005

TO: C/CAG Board of Directors

From: Richard Napier, Executive Director - C/CAG

Subject: Review and approval of Resolution 05-01 to establish a C/CAG Board position on the retrofit of the Bay Bridge

(For further information or response to question's, contact Richard Napier at 650 599-1420)

Recommendation:

Review and approval of Resolution 05-01 to establish a C/CAG Board position on the retrofit of the Bay Bridge. Provide C/CAG staff direction.

Fiscal Impact:

No direct impact to the C/CAG Budget. However, any solution to fund the Bridge will likely have an impact on future capacity of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and future County shares. It could also practically limit future Regional Measure Bridge Toll Programs.

Source of Revenue:

State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Bridge Tolls.

Background/ Discussion:

There is currently a cost overrun of $3.2 billion on the Bridge Seismic Retrofit program. The new program cost estimate of $8.3 billion represents a 63% increase from the $5.1 billion statutory budget enacted by Assembly Bill 1171 in 2001. The Governor and State Legislature were unable to agree upon a long-term funding package to cover the latest cost overrun during the 2003-04 Regular Session. Furthermore, at least 50% of the cost overrun is unrelated to the design element for the east span. However, the Administration feels there is an opportunity to reduce the cost by considering a simpler design for the Bay Bridge. In December the Administration and Caltrans recommended that the SAS construction be halted and that a Skyway design be incorporated. The design choice for the Bay Bridge and how to pay for it will be a hot item in the 2005-06 Regular Session of the Legislature.

Design Issues:

The two alternatives being considered are the Self Anchored Suspension (SAS) and the Skyway. Attached is an overview and comparison of the two Bay Bridge Alternatives. Clearly this is a

complex issue with a great deal of uncertainty.

BATA and Caltrans Positions:

MTC/ BATA Position:

1- The potential Skyway savings of $350-450 M is not significant enough and has the potential to be less due to the potential for design and permit delays that will increase the Skyway cost.
2- The SAS design will provide a completed bridge sooner than the Skyway since the Skyway requires design and the permitting process may create delays.

Administration/ Caltrans Position:

1- The Skyway savings of $350-450 M is significant and is likely to be higher due to the low construction risk on the Skyway design.
2- Experience has shown it is highly likely that Caltrans will get multiple bidders for the Skyway design that should help reduce the cost.
3- Caltrans feels there is minimal schedule risk on construction so it is realistic to still complete the Skyway by 2013 even though design and permitting needs to be done.

Proposed C/CAG Board Bay Bridge Position:

This issue will be quite fluid in the Legislature. Therefore, it is important that the C/CAG Board take a position on key principals to guide our legislative representatives in dealing with this issue. There are three key principals (1-3) for the C/CAG Board's consideration.

1- Seismic Safety - Addressing the seismic safety issues of the Bay Bridge is paramount and must be addressed as quickly as possible. Caltrans should pursue a design and construction process to minimize the time to implement the seismic solution.
2- Cost Sharing - It is recognized that the Bay Area toll payers will have to pay for some of the cost. However, it is unfair for the Bay Area to pay the whole cost. Furthermore, at least 50% of the cost overrun is unrelated to the design element for the east span. Our legislative representatives are urged to pursue a cost sharing arrangement that is equitable for the Bay Area and the State.
3- No diversion from Regional Measure 2 - Funds should not be diverted from Regional Measure 2 to pay for the Bay Bridge. This would result in the voters being misled about the projects that would be funded by Regional Measure 2. Not following through with the projects identified in RM 2 could negatively impact the ability to get future measures passed.
4- Design (Optional) - Given the complexity of the design issue and the level of uncertainty, staff does not have a recommendation. However, the Board may wish to take a position on the design alternative.

Attachments:

Bay Bridge Alternative Comparison/ Risk Assessment
Resolution 05-01
Caltrans 12/08/04 Bay Bridge Report Executive Summary
Caltrans Bay Bridge Alternatives Matrix
FHWA Peer Review dated December 2004
BATA Plan of Action
Bay Bridge East Span Model Resolution
Report on Bay Bridge Briefing from BT&H and Caltrans on 12/10/04

Alternatives:

1- Review and approval of Resolution 05-01 to establish a C/CAG Board position on the retrofit of the Bay Bridge. Provide C/CAG staff direction.

2- No action. Establish no formal C/CAG Board position on the Bay Bridge retrofit.

BAY BRIDGE ALTERNATIVE COMPARISON

Alternative	**SAS**	**Skyway**
Design	100%	5%
Environmental	100%	Uncertain (Some Impact)
Permits	100%	Uncertain (Some Impact)
Construction:		
Non-SAS Tower	In-Process	TBD
SAS Tower	TBD	N/A
Multiple Bidders Likely:		
Non-SAS Tower	High	High
SAS Tower (Only received 1)	Low	N/A
Schedule	2012-2013	2011-2013
Schedule Risk:		
Permits	None	Medium
Construction	Medium	Low
Potential Construction Cost Increase:		
Non-SAS Tower	Low-Medium	Low-Medium
SAS Tower	High	Not Applicable
Projected Capital Cost:		
Bechtel	$1.9-2.1 B	$1.3-1.7 B
Caltrans	$1.8-2.1 B	$1.3-1.6 B

The potential capital cost savings is $350-450M (Less the Design/ Permitting costs) for the Skyway over the SAS.

The following points are clear:

1- There is no complete consensus among the experts.
2- There are many intangibles and risks that can significantly impact the estimates of either design.
3- Either design creates a significant funding problem for the State and will impact the STIP and Bridge Tolls to varying degrees.
4- The Skyway would be simpler to construct with a greater likelihood of meeting the projected cost. However, it is not clear whether the total cost would necessarily be less.

BAY BRIDGE ALTERNATIVE RISK ASSESSMENT

	SAS	Skyway
Design Problems	**None (Completed)**	Low (at 5% Design)
Environmental Problems	**None (Completed)**	Low (Similar to SAS)
Permitting Problems	**None (Completed)**	Low (Similar to SAS)
Material Cost Growth Due to Delay	**Low (Ready for Bid)**	Low-Medium
Probability of Good Bid (Note 1)	Low	**High**
Construction Environmental Impact (Note 2)	Medium	**Low**
Construction Problems	High	**Low-Medium**
Design/ Construction Experience	Low	**High**
Probability of Meeting Schedule	Medium	Medium
Probability of Meeting Cost	Medium	Medium
Seismic Safety	High	High
Legislation Required	Yes (Additional Funds)	Yes (Design alternative/ funding)

Advantages of respective alternative are shown in **Bold.**

Note 1- Good bid due to multiple bidders.
2- Additional supporting structures in Bay required during construction of SAS.

SUMMARY: The operative question is which approach has the lowest overall risk given all the factors. Clearly there are pros and cons to both alternatives. The Administration is counting on the Skyway construction advantages to significantly outway the additional design, permitting, and delay costs to result in a lower overall cost. BATA feels that the SAS construction risks are reasonable such that the advantage of having completed design, environmental, and permitting and ready to go to Bid would result in a similar cost to the Skyway.

RESOLUTION 05-01

* * * * * * * * * * * *

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/ COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY TO ESTABLISH A C/CAG BOARD POSITION ON THE RETROFIT OF THE BAY BRIDGE

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

WHEREAS, the Loma Prieta earthquake struck 15 years ago, killing 63 persons, collapsing and closing highways throughout the Bay Area and forcing the closure of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge for one month to make repairs to its damaged eastern span; and

WHEREAS, the Northridge earthquake struck Southern California 11 years ago, killing 51 persons and causing major highway damage; and

WHEREAS, thousands of California highway bridges have been retrofitted or replaced costing the State of California billions of dollars; and

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Bay Area has experienced nine major earthquakes in excess of 6.5 or greater over the past 170 years, averaging a major earthquake every 19 years; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Geological Survey has estimated a 62 percent probability of an magnitude 6.7 or larger earthquake within the next 30 years on the San Andreas and Hayward faults, both of which are adjacent to the east span; and

WHEREAS, such an earthquake could cause collapse of major sections of the existing east span cantilever truss structure, which is used by 180,000 persons every day; and

WHEREAS, loss of the Bay Bridge would have a significant economic impact to the Bay Area and the State.

RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors of the City/ County Association of Governments of San Mateo County adopts the following position on the Bay Bridge Retrofit Project.

1- Seismic Safety - Addressing the seismic safety issues of the Bay Bridge is paramount and must be addressed as quickly as possible. Caltrans should pursue a design and construction process to minimize the time to implement the seismic solution.

2- Cost Sharing - It is recognized that the Bay Area toll payers will have to pay for some of the cost. However, it is unfair for the Bay Area to pay the whole cost. Furthermore, at least 50% of the cost overrun is unrelated to the design element of the East Span. Our legislative representatives are urged to pursue a cost sharing arrangement that is equitable for the Bay Area and the State.

3- No Diversion for Regional Measure 2 - Funds should not be diverted from Regional Measure 2 to pay for the Bay Bridge. This would result in the voters

being misled about the projects that would be funded by Regional Measure 2. Not following through with the projects identified in RM 2 could negatively impact the ability to get future measures passed.

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors of the City/ County Association of Governments of San Mateo County urges the California Legislature and Governor of California to promptly commence negotiations to achieve a fair and equitable cost-sharing agreement for the latest cost overruns for the toll bridge seismic retrofit program.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED, THIS 13TH DAY OF JANUARY 2005.

_____

Deborah E.G. Wilder, Chair

Caltrans 12/08/04 Bay Bridge Report Executive Summary

California Department of Transportation
Toll Bridge Seismic Retrofit Program Report

Findings and Recommendation For Completion of the Main Span of the San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project

December 8, 2004

Alternatives Being Evaluated



Alternative 1- Self-Anchored Suspension



Alternative 2 – Modified SAS Concrete Tower



Alternative 3 – Two-span Asymmetrical Cable-stayed with Concrete Tower and Deck



Alternative 4 – Two-span Symmetrical Cable-stayed with Concrete Towers and Deck



Alternative 5 – Two-tower Three-span Cable-stayed

Alternative 6 – Extend the Skyway Bridge to Yerba Buena Island

Executive Summary

On October 17, 1989, the Loma Prieta Earthquake (magnitude 7.1) struck the San Francisco Bay Area, resulting in major infrastructure damage and loss of life. The epicenter of the earthquake was approximately 60 miles south of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB). SFOBB, which carries 275,000 vehicles per day, sustained major damage and was closed for one month. This major earthquake highlighted the seismic vulnerabilities of all the State-owned toll bridges, especially the SFOBB with its unique site geology and close proximity to two major faults, both of which are substantially closer to the SFOBB than the Loma Prieta epicenter. Given the high cost of retrofitting the eastern span of that structure, the Department and regional officials elected to replace the existing bridge with a "signature" span.

The decision to replace the 2.2 mile-long east span of the SFOBB and the subsequent selection of the replacement bridge design was the result of many years of regional consensus building. Virtually all of the major elements of the replacement bridge have already been designed, and several sections have been constructed or are currently under construction. The 0.4-mile long self-anchored suspension (SAS) portion of the replacement, referred to as the "main span", is the section that is now in question. T.Y. Lin International – Moffat & Nichols, a joint venture, was the consultant team that designed the entire east span of the SFOBB, including the SAS main span.

On May 26, 2004, after 16 months of contract advertisement, a single bid of $1.4 billion was received for the self-anchored suspension bridge (SAS) contract, which was nearly double the budget adopted by the Legislature in AB1171. Major factors contributing to the high bid include availability and cost of domestic steel, industry-wide steel price increases, and bonding and insurance market changes after 9/11. After the bid expired on September 30, 2004, due to the lack of a funding solution to provide the additional budget, the California Business, Transportation and Housing Agency (BTH) and the California Department of Transportation (Department) initiated an evaluation of six alternatives for proceeding with the construction of the SFOBB main span:

1. Repackage and re-advertise the SAS as a de-federalized contract.
2. Modify the SAS design to change the towers and deck from steel to concrete.
3. Redesign as a two-span asymmetrical cable-stayed bridge with concrete tower and deck.
4. Redesign as a two-span symmetrical cable-stayed bridge with concrete tower and deck.
5. Redesign as a two-tower, three-span cable-stayed bridge.
6. Extend the Skyway Bridge to Yerba Buena Island.

To facilitate a comprehensive analysis in anticipation of a funding solution during the 2005-2006 Legislative session, the evaluation included technical peer reviews, industry consultations, and environmental resource agency and stakeholder input. The following is a list of major activities included in this effort to assess scope, cost, and schedule for each alternative:

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Peer Review Team (PRT).
- Independent Review Team (IRT).
- Executive Industry Consultation Program (contractors and fabricators, surety firms, and bridge design firms).

- Stakeholder Outreach Program (State and Federal resource and regulatory agencies, and public interest groups).

The PRT provided an extensive risk assessment of all alternatives. The IRT provided preliminary design information focused on the cable-stayed alternatives. Industry provided feedback on the ability to design, bid, and construct the various bridge types based on their experience in bonding, financing, and building large public works projects. Resource agencies and public interest groups provided suggestions on the environmental impacts and permit issues essential to minimizing the time for the redesign alternatives. The Bechtel Infrastructure Corporation (Bechtel) August 2004 Cost Review Report, which was originally performed to assist in the evaluation of the single SAS bid, also provided valuable project cost, schedule, and risk information.

Major areas of evaluation included seismic performance, foundation design, environmental issues, interface with structures adjacent to the main span, materials availability, construction risks, cost savings, project delivery alternatives, and completion schedules. A summary of the pros and cons of each alternative follows:

Alternative 1

Repackage and Re-advertise the SAS as a de-federalized contract. (Elimination of the original contract's federal status which in turn removes the requirements of "Buy America".)

The self-anchored suspension (SAS) alternative is unique and only a small number of bridges of this type have been constructed worldwide. The expertise in both construction and design of SAS bridges is limited. Relatively new technology and innovation comes with substantial construction risk and a potential for cost escalation and delay. The SAS has a significant advantage in having regional consensus, being completely designed, and having the necessary environmental approvals and permits to allow construction to begin. De-federalization will result in significant costs savings by allowing the use of foreign steel, as demonstrated by the $400 million cost differential in the previous bid. This will also encourage more bidders by creating a more competitive bidding environment.

Alternative 2

Modify the SAS design to change the towers and deck from steel to concrete.

The SAS with a concrete tower possesses some of the same risks as Alternative 1 with respect to design and constructability, plus it has its own unique risks. The concrete tower provides advantages in material cost, but also adds weight to the tower foundation, which may require foundation modification. This alternative does not have a completed design and will likely require minor modifications to existing environmental permits. The potential for cost savings with this alternative is limited.

Alternatives 3 through 5

Redesign as a two-span asymmetrical cable-stayed bridge with concrete tower and deck / Redesign as a two-span symmetrical cable-stayed bridge with concrete tower and deck / Redesign as a two tower three-span cable-stayed bridge.

Three cable-stayed alternatives, with different span lengths, tower heights, and foundation locations were considered. While the industry is familiar with cable-stayed design and construction, complex site conditions exist. The interface of a cable-stayed structure, which differs from the original SAS design, and adjacent structures will likely present challenges in developing constructible details that satisfy the stringent seismic criteria. The foundation construction work will be complex and the design will likely have significant geotechnical requirements to address. The cable-stayed alternatives have only conceptual designs (five percent) and will require revising existing environmental permits, which could require significant effort to resolve. While potential for cost savings exists when comparing a cable-stayed bridge to the SAS alternative, this savings could easily be lost due to delays in obtaining regional consensus and the necessary environmental permits. In addition, the costs to modify existing contracts and completed work may likely absorb any remaining savings achieved with the cable-stayed alternatives.

Alternative 6

Extend the Skyway Bridge to Yerba Buena Island.

This alternative essentially continues with a structure similar in type and appearance to the skyway structure, currently under construction. The continuation of the skyway will not provide a signature span (a cable supported structure), which differs from the other alternatives. This alternative diverges from public expectations for a signature bridge and narrows the U.S. Coast Guard navigational channel. Community acceptance, along with revisiting environmental approval and review of the permits required, will add risk, and may require significant time and effort to resolve. Little design effort has been expended on this alternative, however, the design and construction of this type of bridge is more common than any of the other alternatives. The potential for reduction in cost and construction risks add to the attractiveness of this alternative. Like Alternatives 3-5, potential savings could be lost due to delays in obtaining regional consensus, environmental review, and regulatory permits.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the input from the teams involved, along with external and internal experts, the Department recommends two options.

1. Proceed with Alternative 1, which re-advertises the SAS contract, in conjunction with modifications and enhancements described below. The Department believes this alternative has a high likelihood of meeting the key objective of achieving seismic safety, but the potential for cost increases is also high. The substantial uncertainty associated with the other alternatives (lack of available design details and the potential to re-open political debate) makes it considerably less likely that the objective would be met.

   Modifications and enhancements, some of which may require legislation and policy changes, could make the contract more biddable and buildable, hence likely to result in more

competition and less cost than those received in May 2004. These include: (1) waiver of domestic steel requirements on major items if de-federalization of the entire contract is not possible, (2) authorize the Department to develop an alternative insurance and bonding strategy more appropriate for this project, (3) extension of the seismic retrofit law which authorizes 15-day action on state permits, (4) increase stipend amount paid to contractors to develop a bid to encourage competition, (5) authorize Department to negotiate with sole bidder if there is only one bid, and (6) solicit and hire steel bridge construction management expertise to complement and assist the Department's construction management activities. The Department would also aggressively pursue post bid project enhancements through the Cost Reduction Incentive Proposal (CRIP) provision in the contract specifications in order to identify and implement potential cost savings measures.

2. As cost is a critical factor, Alternative 6 needs to be considered. While there are risks associated with this alternative, the potential for savings is higher than Alternative 1. The primary risk associated with Alternative 6 is the time it may take to reach public consensus and to obtain final environmental approvals and permits for this alternative. If this process takes too long, it is possible that not only any potential cost savings could be lost, but also an increase of the risk of a major seismic event damaging the existing east span bridge.

It is important to note that no alternative under consideration stands out as an obvious choice in this decision process. The Department received substantial input to assist in making a decision, but the recommendations from involved sources varied significantly. The Department therefore recommends that the two options cited above be considered for implementation.

Caltrans Bay Bridge Alternatives Matrix

RISKS RELATED TO SFOBB MAIN SPAN ALTERNATIVES FOR THE EAST SPAN SEISMIC SAFETY PROJECT

SAFETY RISKS	Alternative 1: SAS	Alternatives 3-5: Cable-Stayed	Alternative 6: Skyway
Seismic Safety	• Has been designed and modeled to meet seismic safety. • Independently checked. • Independently peer reviewed.	• Can be designed and modeled to meet seismic standards. • Seismic safety verification dependant on 60% design. • Requires additional independent checks and peer review.	• Can be designed and modeled to meet seismic standards. • Seismic safety verification dependant on 60% design. • Requires additional independent checks and peer review.
Design	• Design more complex. • Design complete.	• Design complex. • Design conceptual (5 percent).	• Design conventional. • Design conceptual (5 percent).
Environmental (Permits)	• All permits in place.	• BCDC permit would involve public hearings. • USCG amendment to bridge permit likely required (concerns about impacts to navigational channel). • USFWS amendment to Biological Opinion likely required (concerns about bird impacts although none shown currently to listed species). • PRT viewed risks as manageable.	• BCDC permit would involve public hearings. • USCG amendment to bridge permit likely required (concerns about impacts to navigational channel). • USFWS amendment to Biological Opinion likely required (concerns about bird impacts although none shown currently to listed species). • PRT viewed risks as manageable.
Impact on Adjacent Structures	• Adjacent structures designed for SAS.	• Impact to: W2, T1, E2, Skyway, and Yerba Buena Island viaduct.	• Impact to: W2, T1, E2, Skyway, and Yerba Buena Island viaduct.
Potential Award Date	• Fall 2005	• Spring 2008	• Fall 2007
Schedule (open to traffic)[1] IRT TY Lin Bechtel Department	• 2011 • 2011 • 2012 • 2012 - 2013	• 2010 • 2013 • 2013 • 2012 - 2014	• 2012 • 2012 • --- • 2011 - 2013
Design Phase[1]	• Design is complete.	• 18-24 months to procure designer and complete design. • Difficult interface with adjacent structures.	• 12-18 months to procure designer and complete design. • Less difficult interface with adjacent structures.
Construction Phase[1]	• Construction will be very difficult. • Potential for delay is very high.	• Construction will be difficult. • Potential for delay is high.	• Construction will be less difficult. • Some potential for delay.

[1] These schedules are conservative, based on normal procurement practices. The Department will make every effort to accelerate this process.

RISKS RELATED TO SFOBB MAIN SPAN ALTERNATIVES FOR THE EAST SPAN SEISMIC SAFETY PROJECT

COST RISKS	Alternative 1: SAS	Alternatives 3-5: Cable-Stayed	Alternative 6: Skyway
State Legislation	• Fiscal package required. • Extension of CEQA exemption required. • Extension of seismic retrofit procurement provisions required.	• Fiscal package required. • Extension of CEQA exemption required. • Extension of seismic retrofit procurement provisions required. • Legislation required to allow redesign.	• Fiscal package required. • Extension of CEQA exemption required. • Extension of seismic retrofit procurement provisions required. • Legislation required to allow redesign.
Constructibility	• Designed. • Reviewed. • Very unconventional construction.	• Very preliminary design. • More review needed (IRT has conducted initial review). • Unconventional construction.	• Very preliminary design. • More review needed (Substantial Bay Area experience with this bridge type). • Conventional construction.
Pool of Bidders[1]	• Up to two.	• Four to six.	• At least one.
Capital Cost IRT TY Lin/MN Bechtel Department	• • $1.2-1.4B • $1.9-2.1B • $1.8-2.1B	• $0.75-0.9B • $1.0-1.5B • $1.7-1.8B • $1.5-1.7B	• Up to $1.1B • $0.8-1.0B • $1.3-1.7B • $1.3-1.6B[1]
Project Management/Capital Outlay Support	• Significant construction complexities create potential for higher support costs.	• Will require redesign costs. • Construction complexities may lead to higher support costs.	• Will require redesign costs. • Lower support costs anticipated due to conventional construction.

AESTHETIC RISKS	Alternative 1: SAS	Alternatives 3-5: Cable-Stayed	Alternative 6: Skyway
Local Expectations and Acceptance	• High acceptance in 1998.	• Previously rejected by region in 1998. • Limited opposition expected today.	• Previously rejected by region in 1998. • Some opposition expected today.
Aesthetics (Look of Bridge)	• Has had public consensus.	• Similar appearance to SAS.	• Not a cable-supported structure.

IRT estimate includes:

- Capital cost of the main span, and main span foundations E2/T1 and W2 (modifications).
- No cost for impacts to adjacent contracts.
- Design costs ($25 million).
- Escalation to mid-point of construction.
- Contingencies of $100M are included in the cable-stayed estimate.

Bechtel estimate includes:

- Capital cost of the main span, and main span foundations E2/T1 and W2.
- Cost of impacts to adjacent contracts including termination, redesign, or modification to on going contracts.
- Design costs.
- Escalation – 5% per annum was used for specific portions of the work.
- Contingency was developed based on a probable risk analysis.

TYLin/MN estimate include:

- Capital cost of the main span, and main span foundations E2/T1 and W2.
- Cost of impacts to adjacent contracts including termination, redesign, or modification to on going contracts.
- Design costs ($30 to $50 million).
- Escalation – no indication that the estimate was escalated to mid-point of construction.
- Contingency – a specific contingency was not provided other than the estimated cost range shown.

Department estimate includes:

- Capital cost of the main span, and main span foundations E2/T1 and W2.
- Cost of impacts to adjacent contracts including termination, redesign, or modification to on going contracts.
- Design costs ($65 million).
- Escalation – estimates are escalated to the mid-point of construction.
- Contingency – 10% to 15% on re-advertise, 20% to 30% on redesign.

[1] Based on Industry outreach program

[2] These costs could increase by $200M if there is a substantial delay in obtaining permits.

FHWA Peer Review dated December 2004

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

SAN FRANCISCO–OAKLAND BAY BRIDGE PROJECT

PEER REVIEW

DECEMBER 2004

Executive Summary

After the 1989 Loma Prieta and 1994 Northridge earthquakes, the State of California enacted the State Toll Bridge Seismic Retrofit Program in 1997 to improve the safety and reliability of critical transportation infrastructure assets in California. One of the critical elements to successfully finishing the program is completion of the San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB) project. This project consists of 16 separate contracts, including the proposed self-anchored suspension (SAS) bridge contract.

Caltrans advertised the SAS contract in February 2003 and opened bids in May 2004. The single bid received (in the amount of $1.4 billion using foreign steel) exceeded the $740 million of funding available for the SAS portion of the SFOBB. The California Legislature was unable to develop a funding package to address the additional cost and the contractor's bid was allowed to expire.

In September 2004, the California Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing asked the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for assistance in moving the SFOBB project forward. FHWA assembled the Peer Review Team (PRT), which convened November 1–5, 2004. The team examined project alternatives identified by Caltrans and assessed the risk that each might not achieve its key objectives. It is important to note that the PRT did not perform any independent analysis of technical issues (seismic performance), environmental documentation, cost estimation, or constructability, but relied exclusively on data presented by Caltrans, the Independent Review Team (IRT), the project design team (T.Y. Lin International/Moffatt & Nichol), and Bechtel. In the risk assessment, the PRT considered the quality and reliability of the data presented on the basis of the design development of the different alternatives, which range from a 100 percent design completion for the current SAS design to less than 5 percent design completion for some of the other alternatives.

Each of the six project alternatives we evaluated provides a solution to the SFOBB problem, but can be affected by uncertainty and associated impacts. These impacts typically affect project cost and schedule, either directly or indirectly. We identified, quantified, and prioritized technical, cost, and schedule; environmental; management; and public acceptance and expectation risks.

The alternatives and their overall impacts follow:

- *Rebid the current SAS design (Alternative 1).* A small number of SAS bridges have been constructed worldwide. The design is a technological innovation that employs materials of limited availability and requires complex methods of construction. These factors impact construction risk and as a result cost of construction. At the same time, the completeness of its design and environmental approvals mitigate the ability of third parties to delay the project.

- *SAS with concrete tower (Alternate 2).* This alternative poses the same risks as Alternative 1 with the additional complication that some minor modifications to the environmental permits may be required.

- *Cable-stayed (Alternatives 3, 4, and 5).* The construction industry is familiar with this type of bridge, reducing construction risks. A significant pool of suppliers exists for the necessary materials, further reducing risk. If bid as a single large contract, bonding and insurance costs will be significant. All of the cable-stayed alternatives may require revisiting existing permits, which could involve significant effort to resolve concerns.

- *Skyway bridge design (Alternative 6).* The most significant risks associated with this alternative are community acceptance and revisiting most of the permits. Construction cost would be significantly lower than for the other alternatives because it involves relatively standard bridge construction processes. Because of the construction methods employed, the opportunity to break the work into smaller contracts may arise, thereby reducing the cost of bonding.

Figure ES-1 shows the associated risk scores for each alternative by risk type.

Figure ES-1. Summary of Risk Scores by Alternative



The selection of a preferred alternative is a matter of trading risk for expected cost and schedule benefits. In essence, the State of California's tolerance for risk should be the deciding factor in selection. The results of this analysis provide the State's leadership with the information necessary to make that decision.

During the course of the study, we identified several potential actions that Caltrans might consider to enhance the probability of successful project completion. They generally apply across all alternatives, and we enumerate them in Chapter 4.

BATA Plan of Action
Toll Bridge Seismic Retrofit Program
September 22, 2004

In August 2004, Caltrans disclosed the latest cost overrun for the Toll Bridge Seismic Retrofit Program (SRP) totaling $3.2 billion. The new program cost estimate of $8.3 billion represents a 63% increase from the $5.1 billion statutory budget enacted by Assembly Bill 1171 in 2001. In the waning two weeks of the 2003-04 Regular Session, the Governor and State Legislature were unable to agree on a long-term funding package to cover the latest cost overrun. In the meantime, the single bid received to construct the self-anchored suspension (SAS) element of the new east span for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge is scheduled to expire on September 30, 2004.

In the interests of public safety, the region's economy, and Bay Area toll payers, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in its role as the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) will actively pursue the following steps in seeking a solution to the SRP funding shortfall.

1. Seismic Safety

The fundamental purpose of the SRP is to protect public safety by strengthening or replacing seismically deficient bridge structures. Although re-bidding or re-designing the SAS element of the new east span has the potential to lower costs, an independent report has confirmed that such strategies are just as likely to raise costs and – more importantly – would delay completion of the new east span by 1-4 years. As the fastest path to seismic safety, BATA supports award of the pending SAS bid. Since an extension of the bid deadline is necessary to provide time to adopt a new legislative funding agreement, Caltrans should secure such an extension from the bidder.

2. State Responsibility

The Bay Area toll bridges subject to the SRP are owned and operated by the State of California; they are an integral part of the state and interstate highway systems; and state law vests in Caltrans "full and sole responsibility for completion of all seismic retrofit projects on the bay area bridges." Furthermore, at least 50% of the latest cost overrun is unrelated to the SAS design element selected by BATA for the new east span. Accordingly, the Commission will support the efforts of our Bay Area state legislative delegation to obtain an equitable share of federal and state funds to cover SRP cost overruns – as was the case with prior funding agreements under Senate Bill 60 in 1997 and Assembly Bill 1171 in 2001.

3. Voter Commitments

Funding for SRP cost overruns should not come at the expense of prior toll-funded commitments to projects in the bridge corridors – whether in the voter-approved Regional Measure 1 and Regional Measure 2 programs or Resolution 3434 regional transit expansion program. The Commission is gratified that the Governor's original proposal to redirect Regional Measure 2 funds to the SRP was rejected by the Legislature and was eventually withdrawn by the Administration. BATA will vigorously oppose this ill-fated idea's resurrection in any form.

4. Innovative Finance

An essential building block for a long-term SRP funding agreement involves transferring authority for the existing $1 seismic toll surcharge from Caltrans to the Commission acting in its role as BATA. With the administration of all three toll dollars consolidated under a single agency, BATA would be able to refinance existing toll-funded debt, draw on other uncommitted reserves, and thereby generate significant new SRP funding capacity.

5. Stronger Oversight

The toll consolidation strategy should go hand-in-hand with BATA providing intensive and transparent oversight of Caltrans' design and construction of SRP projects. Legislation recently approved by the state Senate (Assembly Bill 2366 – Dutra) outlined a comprehensive set of new BATA oversight tools, including: monthly reports on the status of SRP project costs and schedules, approval of key Caltrans SRP personnel, review and approval of bid documents and change orders, regular audits of both capital outlay and support costs, and the ability to withhold funds until outstanding issues are resolved. In the face of the third successive SRP cost overrun of at least $2 billion, Caltrans must be held more accountable for its management of the program. To that end, the Commission and its staff also will cooperate fully with the State Auditor's investigation of the SRP requested by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee.

6. Broader Reform

The repeated cost overruns in the SRP are symptomatic of a more fundamental crisis in the delivery of transportation infrastructure improvements in California. Simply put, projects take too long and cost too much. The Governor's California Performance Review (CPR) represents an opportunity to make systemic change in the way that Caltrans and its local partners plan, design, and build transportation capacity projects. The Commission will work with other regional transportation planning agencies throughout the state in fashioning a coalition to implement this broader reform agenda.

Bay Bridge East Span Model Resolution

WHEREAS, the Loma Prieta earthquake struck 15 years ago, killing 63 persons, collapsing and closing highways throughout the Bay Area and forcing the closure of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge for one month to make repairs to its damaged eastern span; and

WHEREAS, the Northridge earthquake struck Southern California 11 years ago, killing 51 persons and causing major highway damage; and

WHEREAS, thousands of California highway bridges have been retrofitted or replaced costing the State of California billions of dollars; and

WHEREAS, after years of engineering studies, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) concluded in 1996 that it was more cost-effective to construct a replacement structure rather than seismically retrofit the existing east span; and

WHEREAS, in February 1997, Governor Pete Wilson announced that the state would construct a replacement "skyway" bridge connecting Oakland to Yerba Buena Island, and that the Bay Area would have to contribute regional funds for an enhanced design; and

WHEREAS, in August 1997, Senate Bill 60 was signed by Governor Wilson to authorize the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to extend for up to two years the $1 toll surcharge enacted by the bill in order to fund the following enhancements: (1) a cable-supported suspension design; (2) a bicycle/pedestrian path; and (3) improvements to the Transbay Transit Terminal in San Francisco; and

WHEREAS, in July 1998, based upon the expert advice of a blue-ribbon panel of seismologists, geologists, bridge engineers, and architects, and after holding over two dozen public hearings and workshops throughout the Bay Area, MTC approved an extension of the toll surcharge for one and one-half years to include a Self-Anchored Suspension design and bicycle/pedestrian path in the new east span project based on cost estimates for those enhancements provided by Caltrans at the time; and

WHEREAS, in September 2001, Assembly Bill 1171 was approved, which codified the Self-Anchored Suspension design in state law and funded cost increases for the new east span as well as other bridge safety projects by extending the $1 toll surcharge for another 30 years, and committed additional federal and state highway funds, continuing the precedent established in Senate Bill 60 for an equitable cost-sharing arrangement between statewide and local taxpayers in financing the toll bridge seismic retrofit program; and

WHEREAS, in January 2002, Governor Gray Davis presided over groundbreaking ceremonies to mark the start of construction of the new east span of the Bay Bridge; and

WHEREAS, construction work has continued since that time, with over 65 percent of the skyway portion of the bridge near the Oakland shore now completed, the west pier of the Self-Anchored Suspension now complete on Yerba Buena Island, the contract to construct the tower and east pier for the Self-Anchored Suspension span is 20 percent complete, and a total of over $200 million in design and construction work on the Self-Anchored Suspension span is already expended; and

WHEREAS, in August 2004, Caltrans reported additional cost overruns for the toll bridge seismic retrofit program, with the Self-Anchored Suspension portion of the new east span replacement project estimated to be responsible for approximately half of the cost increase; and

WHEREAS, in September 2004, Caltrans rejected the sole bid received to construct the superstructure of the Self-Anchored Suspension design and announced it was undertaking a review of the east span project to determine whether to redesign the bridge; and

WHEREAS, in December 2004, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger proposed to scrap the Self-Anchored Suspension design and replace it with a skyway alternative originally proposed by Governor Wilson seven years before; and

WHEREAS, independent reports from the Federal Highway Administration, Bechtel Infrastructure Corporation, and Caltrans Seismic Safety Peer Review Panel generally support retaining the current Self-Anchored Suspension design, with the seismic safety panel concluding: "Any change in bridge type or geometry could result in multi-year delays which are unacceptable from a seismic safety point of view. Furthermore, with recent and continuing increases in material and construction costs it is not clear that project delays will result in overall cost savings"; and

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Bay Area has experienced nine major earthquakes in excess of 6.5 or greater over the past 170 years, averaging a major earthquake every 19 years; and

WHEREAS, the U.S. Geological Survey has estimated a 62 percent probability of an magnitude 6.7 or larger earthquake within the next 30 years on the San Andreas and Hayward faults, both of which are adjacent to the east span; and

WHEREAS, such an earthquake could cause collapse of major sections of the existing east span cantilever truss structure, which is used by 180,000 persons every day; and

WHEREAS, such a collapse could kill or injure thousands of people and cause severe economic dislocation for businesses and workers in San Francisco, Oakland, and throughout the Bay Area and State of California; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] of [City/County] / endorses the principle that the fastest path to seismic safety for this critical component of the region's transportation infrastructure is to retain the Self-Anchored Suspension design that is 100 percent complete, fully permitted, and ready to construct; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] of [City/County] urges the California Legislature to retain the Self-Anchored Suspension design in state law and urges the Governor of California and Caltrans to advertise that design for construction bids as soon as possible; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] of [City/County] urges the California Legislature and Governor of California to promptly commence negotiations to achieve a fair and equitable cost-sharing agreement for the latest cost overruns for the toll bridge seismic retrofit program; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the Governor of California, the California Senate and Assembly, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and other appropriate agencies and officials.

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

December 14, 2004

To: Mike Nevin - MTC Representative
Sue Lempert - MTC Representative

From: Richard Napier
Executive Director C/CAG

Subject: Bay Bridge Briefing from BT&H and Caltrans on 12/10/04

On Friday 12/10/04 stakeholders including the CMA Directors received a briefing on the Bay Bridge decision from BT&H Secretary - Sonny McPeak and Caltrans Director - Will Kempton. The State's decision was to go with the Skyway design. The key points included:

1- In addition to the Independent Review Team (IRT) the Federal Government provided a Peer Review Team (PRT) to review the information. This team included individuals involved in other major public works projects nationally including the "Big Dig" in Boston. Reviewed and considered the Bechtel information.
2- While there was no complete consensus there was some key points that drove the decision.
3- Projected $200-500M lower cost for the Skyway design with a similar schedule.
4- The additional Environmental Reviews should not be a major problem.
5- Less environmental impact during construction for the Skyway.
6- While the projected savings up front is not clear, there is a significant savings on the backside due to much lower construction and schedule risk with the Skyway. Therefore, this should be considered the primary savings of the Skyway design.

The State's position is reasonable. Even if currently it appears the savings is minimal, there is much less risk, will be more bidders, and more likely the final price will be significantly less for the Skyway design. Both Senator Torlakson and former Senator Burton were critical of the recommendation. It is recognized that other factors will also be included as part of the decision. Secretary McPeak did not discuss the funding approach other than to reiterate the State would pay for the demolition of the old bridge - $300M. Clearly there will be a battle over how to pay for the bridge. The following comments are provided on the funding.

1- Several CMA Directors support Bridge Tolls paying for the Bridge. This way the STIP is not reduced and provides discretionary County STIP funding. Whereas, if the State pays, it comes from the STIP at the expense of all the Counties in the State while preserving future bridge toll funding for MTC. They feel the fact that the Bay Area only has to contribute 13 cents on the dollar from the STIP is not compelling or fair. To them it comes down to who gets to program the money saved MTC (State/ STIP Pays) or the County (Bridge Toll Fees).

555 COUNTY CENTER FIFTH FLOOR, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063 PHONE: 650.599.1406 FAX: 650.361.8227

2- The Bay Area is probably at a disadvantage fighting over both the design and the funding. Accepting the design and fighting over the funding is a stronger position, since the Bay Area can say that it was the States decision and push for a larger State share.

Attached is an overview of the alternatives considered.

Please call me at 650 599-1420 (w) or 408 621-4433 (cell phone) if there are any questions or additional information needed.

RISKS RELATED TO SFOBB MAIN SPAN ALTERNATIVES FOR THE EAST SPAN SEISMIC SAFETY PROJECT

SAFETY RISKS	Alternative 1: SAS	Alternatives 3-5: Cable-Stayed	Alternative 6: Skyway
Seismic Safety	• Has been designed and modeled to meet seismic safety. • Independently checked. • Independently peer reviewed.	• Can be designed and modeled to meet seismic standards. • Seismic safety verification dependant on 60% design. • Requires additional independent checks and peer review.	• Can be designed and modeled to meet seismic standards. • Seismic safety verification dependant on 60% design. • Requires additional independent checks and peer review.
Design	• Design more complex. • Design complete.	• Design complex. • Design conceptual (5 percent).	• Design conventional. • Design conceptual (5 percent).
Environmental (Permits)	• All permits in place.	• BCDC permit would involve public hearings. • USCG amendment to bridge permit likely required (concerns about impacts to navigational channel). • USFWS amendment to Biological Opinion likely required (concerns about bird impacts although none shown currently to listed species). • PRT viewed risks as manageable.	• BCDC permit would involve public hearings. • USCG amendment to bridge permit likely required (concerns about impacts to navigational channel). • USFWS amendment to Biological Opinion likely required (concerns about bird impacts although none shown currently to listed species). • PRT viewed risks as manageable.
Impact on Adjacent Structures	• Adjacent structures designed for SAS.	• Impact to: W2, T1, E2, Skyway, and Yerba Buena Island viaduct.	• Impact to: W2, T1, E2, Skyway, and Yerba Buena Island viaduct.
Potential Award Date	• Fall 2005	• Spring 2008	• Fall 2007
Schedule (open to traffic)[1] IRT TY Lin Bechtel Department	• 2011 • 2011 • 2012 • 2012 - 2013	• 2010 • 2013 • 2013 • 2012 - 2014	• 2012 • 2012 • ---- • 2011 - 2013
Design Phase[1]	• Design is complete.	• 18-24 months to procure designer and complete design. • Difficult interface with adjacent structures.	• 12-18 months to procure designer and complete design. • Less difficult interface with adjacent structures.
Construction Phase[1]	• Construction will be very difficult. • Potential for delay is very high.	• Construction will be difficult. • Potential for delay is high.	• Construction will be less difficult. • Some potential for delay.

[1] These schedules are conservative, based on normal procurement practices. The Department will make every effort to accelerate this process.

RISKS RELATED TO SFOBB MAIN SPAN ALTERNATIVES FOR THE EAST SPAN SEISMIC SAFETY PROJECT

COST RISKS	Alternative 1: SAS	Alternatives 3-5: Cable-Stayed	Alternative 6: Skyway
State Legislation	• Fiscal package required. • Extension of CEQA exemption required. • Extension of seismic retrofit procurement provisions required.	• Fiscal package required. • Extension of CEQA exemption required. • Extension of seismic retrofit procurement provisions required. • Legislation required to allow redesign.	• Fiscal package required. • Extension of CEQA exemption required. • Extension of seismic retrofit procurement provisions required. • Legislation required to allow redesign.
Constructibility	• Designed. • Reviewed. • Very unconventional construction.	• Very preliminary design. • More review needed (IRT has conducted initial review). • Unconventional construction.	• Very preliminary design. • More review needed (Substantial Bay Area experience with this bridge type). • Conventional construction.
Pool of Bidders[1]	• Up to two.	• Four to six.	• At least one.
Capital Cost IRT TY Lin/MN Bechtel Department	• - • $1.2-1.4B • $1.9-2.1B • $1.8-2.1B	• $0.75-0.9B • $1.0-1.5B • $1.7-1.8B • $1.5-1.7B	• Up to $1.1B • $0.8-1.0B • $1.3-1.7B • $1.3-1.6B[1]
Project Management/Capital Outlay Support	• Significant construction complexities create potential for higher support costs.	• Will require redesign costs. • Construction complexities may lead to higher support costs.	• Will require redesign costs. • Lower support costs anticipated due to conventional construction.

AESTHETIC RISKS	Alternative 1: SAS	Alternatives 3-5: Cable-Stayed	Alternative 6: Skyway
Local Expectations and Acceptance	• High acceptance in 1998.	• Previously rejected by region in 1998. • Limited opposition expected today.	• Previously rejected by region in 1998. • Some opposition expected today.
Aesthetics (Look of Bridge)	• Has had public consensus.	• Similar appearance to SAS.	• Not a cable-supported structure.

IRT estimate includes:

- Capital cost of the main span, and main span foundations E2/T1 and W2 (modifications).
- No cost for impacts to adjacent contracts.
- Design costs ($25 million).
- Escalation to mid-point of construction.
- Contingencies of $100M are included in the cable-stayed estimate.

Bechtel estimate includes:

- Capital cost of the main span, and main span foundations E2/T1 and W2.
- Cost of impacts to adjacent contracts including termination, redesign, or modification to on going contracts.
- Design costs.
- Escalation – 5% per annum was used for specific portions of the work.
- Contingency was developed based on a probable risk analysis.

TYLin/MN estimate include:

- Capital cost of the main span, and main span foundations E2/T1 and W2.
- Cost of impacts to adjacent contracts including termination, redesign, or modification to on going contracts.
- Design costs ($30 to $50 million).
- Escalation – no indication that the estimate was escalated to mid-point of construction.
- Contingency – a specific contingency was not provided other than the estimated cost range shown.

Department estimate includes:

- Capital cost of the main span, and main span foundations E2/T1 and W2.
- Cost of impacts to adjacent contracts including termination, redesign, or modification to on going contracts.
- Design costs ($65 million).
- Escalation – estimates are escalated to the mid-point of construction.
- Contingency – 10% to 15% on re-advertise, 20% to 30% on redesign.

[1] Based on Industry outreach program
[2] These costs could increase by $200M if there is a substantial delay in obtaining permits.

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

December 3, 2004

The Honorable Gene Mullin
California State Assembly
State Capitol, Room 2170
Sacramento, CA 95814

LEGISLATION RELATED TO STORM SEWER PROGRAMS AND TAXATION

Dear Assemblyman Mullin:

The City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) would like to enlist your help in securing funding for local jurisdictions to pay for mandated stormwater pollution prevention programs. Three years ago when new clean water requirements were mandated by the State, San Mateo County jurisdictions experienced increased costs that grew from $500,000 to $1,500,000 per year. The requirements and the cost continue to grow, but there are no revenues to draw upon except General Funds.

Under Article XIII D, Section 6(c) of the Constitution (Proposition 218), property related fees or charges could only be imposed with a majority vote of the property owners subject to the fee, or by a two-thirds vote of the electorate residing in the affected area. The Constitution specifically exempts fees or charges for sewer, water, and refuse collection services from this voting requirement. Generally civil engineers and local administrators consider storm sewers as part of municipal sewer and water systems. However in June 2002 the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association sued the City of Salinas over the legality of imposing parcel fees for storm sewers under the sewer and water exemption in the law. Although the Trial Court sided with the City, it was later overturned in the Appeals Court. The Court stated that the term "sewer services" was ambiguous and suggested that the voters would need to clarify what was intended by "sewer services."

During the 2003-04 Legislative session, Assemblyman Tom Harman from Huntington Beach introduced ACA 10. This bill would have allowed the voters of California to decide if stormwater pollution prevention programs should be exempt from the voter approval requirement in the same way as sewer, water, and refuse collection services. This bill would have followed the Court's suggestion and allowed the voters an opportunity to clarify what was intended by this provision. The bill passed the Assembly Local Government, Elections-Redistricting and Constitutional Amendments, and Appropriations Committees, but never made it to the Assembly Floor for a vote. Assemblyman Harman feared that he would not have enough Republican votes to ensure a two-thirds majority. We would be very appreciative if you would consider working with Assemblyman Harman to advance this issue.

ITEM 8.1

555 COUNTY CENTER 5TH FLOOR, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063 PHONE: 650.599.1465 FAX: 650.361.8227

The ability of local governments to develop revenue sources to pay for State mandated programs is critical if we are to maintain fiscal solvency. A bill similar to ACA 10 that gives the voters the right to clarify a provision that was previously adopted by the voters should have bipartisan support. We would like the opportunity to work with you on developing a Statewide coalition to pass this or similar legislation.

Please feel free to contact C/CAG's Executive Director, Richard Napier, at 650 599-1420 if you need additional information. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Deborah E.G. Wilder

Deborah E.G. Wilder
C/CAG Chair

cc: Assemblyman Tom Harman
Geraldine O'Connor, District Director, Assemblyman Gene Mullin's Office

SAN MATEO COUNTY
Transportation Authority

BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2004

MARK CHURCH, CHAIR
JOHN LEE, VICE CHAIR
JOE GALLIGAN
RICH GORDON
MICHAEL P. GUINGONA
LEE J. PANZA
IRA RUSKIN

MICHAEL J. SCANLON
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

December 9, 2004

Richard Napier
Executive Director
City/County Association of Governments
555 County Center, Fifth Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Dear Rich,

It's impossible to thank each of the more than 162,000 San Mateo County residents who cast their ballots for Measure A on November 2. But it is possible to thank the people who worked hard to make sure those voters turned out and delivered a sweeping victory for the future of transportation and transit in our community.

Any such list would have to include you. From the beginning, renewing and extending our half-cent sales tax and the creation of a new Transportation Expenditure Plan was a grass-roots effort that included countless community contacts by our Transportation Authority staff and the gathering of the coalition of local government, business, labor and community leaders and concluding with a highly effective campaign that informed the voters on all fronts.

As we looked around the Bay Area at other transit ballot measures, we were struck at one thing that set our effort apart from others – the unprecedented and unanimous support Measure A had from our cities. Such unanimity, in addition to being simply astounding, is a tribute to you and your folks at C/CAG and the continuing education you provide that helps our city council members understand the issues facing not only their community, but our entire county. San Mateo County has a reputation for putting aside parochial interests and working together on consensus issues. That reputation is well deserved – the success of Measure A demonstrates it – and you are a major reason why. Thanks, Rich.

Best regards,

Michael J. Scanlon
Executive Director

Mark Church
Chair

ITEM 8.2

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
1250 San Carlos Ave. — P.O. Box 3006
San Carlos, CA 94070-1306 650.508.6219
www.smcta.com

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

December 10, 2004

Office of the Director
California Department of Motor Vehicles
P.O. Box 932328 Mail Station F-101
Sacramento, CA 94232-3280

IMPLEMENTATION OF CHAPTER 2.65 (COMMENCING WITH SECTION 65089.11) OF DIVISION 1 OF TITLE 7 OF THE GOVERNMENT CODE AND SECTION 9250.5 OF THE VEHICLE CODE, RELATING TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT

On September 30, 2004 Assembly Bill No. 1546 (Chapter 931) was filed with the Secretary of State. This new law authorizes the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) to impose an annual fee of up to $4 on motor vehicles registered within San Mateo County for a program for the management of traffic congestion and stormwater pollution within that county. In order to impose the fee, C/CAG must first adopt a resolution providing for both the fee and a corresponding program for the use of the funds, by a vote of its members representing two-thirds of the population of San Mateo County.

On December 9, 2004 the C/CAG Board held a noticed public hearing and adopted Resolutions 04-37 and 04-38 establishing the fee, adopting the program and budget, and authorizing an agreement with the California Department of Motor Vehicles for the collection of the fee. Enclosed are copies of these resolutions. This action of the Board was unanimously approved by the 14 members present representing 581,661 residents of the County. This exceeds the two-thirds requirement in the law (471,441 residents).

Therefore on behalf of the C/CAG Board, we respectfully request that the California Department of Motor Vehicles take the necessary steps for the implementation and collection of the $4 increase in the registration fee for motor vehicles in San Mateo County effective July 1, 2005. We have already met with Eric Bentzen on your staff to review the steps that will be necessary to implement this new law. We look forward to working together with your Department on this new project.

Please feel free to contact me at 650 599-1420 if you have any questions. Thanks you.

Sincerely,

Richard Napier, Executive Director

cc: Rudy Modelo, Registration Policy and Automation
Eric Bentzen, Revenue Compliance and Policy

ITEM 8.3

555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063 PHONE: 650.599.1406 FAX: 650.361.8227

CCAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

December 15, 2004

Doug Kimsey
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
101 8th Street
Oakland, California 94607

Dear Doug:

RE: Comments on the Draft Document Entitled, "Protecting the Bay Area's Aviation Resources" Prepared for the Regional Airport Planning Committee (RAPC) October 2004

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced document. The draft text is concise and well written. However, I think the document could be improved by making some revisions, as suggested below.

I have divided my comments into two categories: (1) Organizational Content and (2) Specific Content. My specific comments are as follows:

<u>Organizational Content</u>

1. I suggest the document chapters be reorganized, as follows, to present a more logical flow to the chapters:

   Introduction
   Why Airports Are Important to the Bay Area
   The Consequences of Not Protecting Airports
   Key Questions to Ask When Evaluating Proposed Land Use/Zoning Actions Near Airports
   New Chapter: "Potential Local Agency Actions to Help Protect Bay Area Aviation Resources"
   The Final Action
   Where to Go to Get Answers

   The content of the new chapter is addressed in the Specific Content section that follows.

Airport Land Use Committee

ITEM 8.4

555 COUNTY CENTER, 5TH FLOOR, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063 • 650/599-1406 • 650/594-9980

2. The graphics are too cartoonish and do not convey the serious tone/message of the document. The graphics should be revised to illustrate and support the key themes in the document. The style and type of graphics should also reflect the intended audience for the document (i.e. elected officials, professional staff, developers, etc.).

3. Many elected officials/policymakers and others who may read the document are not familiar with the number and location of the airports in the Bay Area. Therefore, I suggest the document include an additional appendix that lists all of the airports in the Bay Area by county and by type of airport (i.e. general aviation, commercial service, or both).

Specific Content

Airport/land use compatibility is a key theme in the draft document. Since land use and zoning decisions in the airport environs are a cornerstone of "home rule" the document should provide some guidance to local elected officials, regarding what local agencies can do to help protect the Bay Area's aviation resources.

As mentioned above, I suggest the draft document include a new chapter that contains a list of suggested local agency actions and other efforts that would help them achieve airport/land use compatibility. The new chapter would be entitled, "Potential Local Agency Actions to Help Protect Bay Area Aviation Resources" and include the following:

Potential Local Agency Policy Actions:

1. General Plan Amendments:
   a. Adoption of amendments to the Land Use, Housing, Noise, and Safety Elements of the general plan to address airport/land use compatibility (i.e. incorporate land use compatibility criteria from the relevant airport land use plan)
   b. Adoption of an Aviation Element of the general plan
   c. Adoption of an airport area specific plan
   d. Adoption of infill development policies

2. Zoning Regulations:
   a. Adoption of airport land use plan safety zones
   b. Adoption of Federal Aviation Regulations FAR Part 77 height restrictions
   c. Adoption of compatible zoning designations within the airport environs area
   d. Adoption of a list of prohibited land uses within the airport environs
   e. Adoption of an airport overlay zone or combining district

3. Buyer Awareness Measures Within the Airport Environs
   a. Require the project sponsor/property owner to grant an avigation easement to the airport proprietor, as a condition of approval of proposed development within the airport environs
   b. Require recorded deed notices or real estate disclosure notices, re: potential airport impacts, as part of real estate transactions

Local Agency Staff Coordination/Awareness/Training:

1. State-Mandated Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Review Process
   a. Coordinate proposed local agency land use policy actions with ALUC staff
   b. Submit proposed local agency land use policy actions to the ALUC for review

2. Staff Training/Awareness
   a. Basic understanding/awareness of the scope and nature of airport operations, aircraft flight patterns, and aircraft noise contours
   b. Basic understanding/awareness of the relevant airport master plan
   c. Basic understanding/awareness of the Caltrans Airport Land Use Panning Handbook
   d. Staff attendance at ALUC workshops/seminars and similar training options

I hope these constructive comments will help you revise the draft document to convey the intended message and meet the needs of its target audience.

Sincerely,

David F. Carbone, San Mateo County ALUC Staff

cc: Richard Napier, CCAG Executive Director
CCAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Members
Mark Larson, San Mateo County Airports Manager

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

December 20, 2004

The Honorable Tom Harman
State Capitol - Room 5158
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: REINTRODUCTION OF ACA 10

Dear Assemblyman Harman:

The City/ County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) would like to encourage you to reintroduce ACA 10. The C/CAG Board is currently reviewing the State Legislative Priorities and will most likely make this its top priority. During the 2003-04 session we were able to secure the endorsements of 14 agencies and jurisdictions for ACA 10. We are confident that our efforts in this new session will exceed that number. In fact we intend to expand our efforts to other areas of the State and also bring in a number of Statewide organizations to this coalition. We have already started the discussions with the League of California Cities to ensure that they are active and aggressive supporters for this legislation. We have also renewed our contract with Advocation to assist C/CAG in achieving these priorities. We would look forward to again working with you and your staff to secure passage of legislation that meets the goals and intent of ACA 10 from that 2003-04 Legislation session.

Your consideration of reintroducing ACA 10 is appreciated. You may wish to contact Asemblymember Mullin since he has indicated interest in working on this issue. Please do not hesitate to call on us for help in any capacity where you think we can be of assistance. Our Executive Director, Richard Napier, can be reached directly at 650 599-1420.

Sincerely,

Deborah E. G. Wilder

Deborah E.G. Wilder
Chair

cc: Honorable Eugene Mullin, CA State Assembly
Wes Lujan, Advocation (Lobbyist for C/CAG)

ITEM 8.5

555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063 PHONE: 650.599.1406 FAX: 650.361.8227