

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

AGENDA

December 2, 2008 - Tuesday

4:30 PM

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Call to Order/Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes:
 - a. November 4, 2008
4. Public Comment
Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes
5. Transportation Authority Board Meeting Agenda for December 4, 2008
 - a. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for October 2008 (TA Item 3b)
 - b. Investment Plan for the San Mateo County Transportation Authority Investment Portfolio Invested through Tamalpais Wealth Advisors (TA Item 10a)
 - c. Authorization to Enter into a Measure A Funding Agreement with South San Francisco to Accelerate the Start of the South San Francisco Ferry Terminal (TA Item 10b)
 - d. Authorize the Redirection of Funds from the Crestview Project to Caltrain, the Priority One Program Under the 1988 Measure A Expenditure Plan (TA Item 10c)
 - e. Adoption of Measure A Strategic Plan 2009-2013 (TA Item 11a)
6. Report of the Chair (Pat Dixon)
7. Report of the Nominating Committee (Jim Bigelow, Randy Hees, Doris Maez)
 - a. Nomination of Officers 2009
8. Report from Staff (Joe Hurley)
9. Member Comments/Requests
10. Date, Time and Place of Next Meeting: Tuesday, January 6, 2009 at 4:30 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070
11. Adjournment

All items on this agenda are subject to action

CAC MEMBERS: Barbara Arietta • Jim Bigelow • Pat Dixon (Chair) • John Fox • Rich Hedges • Randall Hees • Steve Krause • Austin Mader-Clark • Doris Maez • Larry Shaine • Nancy Stern • April Vargas • Paul Young (Vice-Chair) • George Zimmerman

INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC

If you have questions on the agenda, please contact the Assistant Authority Secretary at 650.508.6223. Assisted listening devices are available upon request. Agendas are available on the Transportation Authority Website at www.smcta.com.

Date and Time of Boards and Advisory Committee Meetings

San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) Committees and Board: First Thursday of the month, 5 p.m. Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC): Tuesday preceding first Thursday of the month, 4:30 p.m. Date, time and location of meetings may be changed as needed.

Location of Meeting

The San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Office is located at 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, which is one block west of the San Carlos Caltrain Station on El Camino Real, accessible by SamTrans bus Routes: 260, 295, 390, 391, KX. [Click here for map.](#)

Public Comment

If you wish to address the Citizens Advisory Committee, please fill out a speaker's card located on the agenda table. If you have anything that you wish distributed to the Citizens Advisory Committee and included for the official record, please hand it to the Assistant Authority Secretary, who will distribute the information to the Committee members and staff.

Members of the public may address the Citizens Advisory Committee on non-agendized items under the Public Comment item on the agenda. Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes and items raised that require a response will be deferred for staff reply.

Accessibility for Individuals with Disabilities

Upon request, the TA will provide for written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings. Please send a written request, including your name, mailing address, phone number and brief description of the requested materials and a preferred alternative format or auxiliary aid or service at least two days before the meeting. Requests should be mailed to Rosemary Lake at San Mateo County Transportation Authority, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306; or email to cacsecretary@smcta.com; or by phone at 650-508-6223, or TDD 650-508-6448.

Availability of Public Records

All public records relating to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306, at the same time that the public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body.

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
1250 SAN CARLOS AVENUE, SAN CARLOS CA 94070
BACCIOCCO AUDITORIUM, 2ND FLOOR**

MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 4, 2008

MEMBERS PRESENT: B. Arietta, P. Dixon (Chair), J. Fox, R. Hedges, D. Maez
L. Shaine, N. Stern, P. Young (Vice-Chair), G. Zimmerman

MEMBERS ABSENT: J. Bigelow, R. Hees, S. Krause, A. Mader-Clark, A. Vargas

STAFF PRESENT: J. Hurley, M. Knuckles, R. Lake, M. Lee-Skowronek

Chair Pat Dixon called the meeting to order at 4:38 p.m. Barbara Arietta led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion (Zimmerman/Shaine) to approve the minutes of September 30, 2008, was passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Pat Giorni, Burlingame, said she is pleased that one-third of public comments in the correspondence file on the TA Strategic Plan expressed concerns for bicycle and pedestrian issues. She said there needs to be ways to get across the freeway and pedestrian overcrossings in the works are poorly conceived and overly expensive. Caltrans did not give proper accommodation and problems were caused. She requested that Caltrans fix the overcrossings out of their funding and not from Measure A funding.

PRESENTATION – FINAL DRAFT TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY STRATEGIC PLAN

Director of Planning and Development, Marian Lee-Skowronek said at the last meeting of the TA CAC, staff provided an update on Strategic Plan (Plan) outreach and provided information on key components of the draft Plan. The Plan was posted and released to the public on October 20 for a two week comment period, which closed on November 3. Fourteen public comments were received with the following key themes:

- The key message on funding allocation was there was too much money for the Highway Program versus the Bike/Pedestrian Program.
- Many projects are anticipated but the TA will not have enough money to fund all projects. The TA may have to think about early delivery and financing mechanism for cost containment. The Plan indicates projects will be funded as money becomes available and there may be cases for advancing, where advancing funds is necessary, and those would be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- There was a comment about emphasizing the environmental benefits associated with projects. Current criteria relate to environmental impact and a clarification will be included to highlight environmental benefits.

- The actual amount of money for the Bike/Pedestrian Program is small relative to the larger programs and the TA needs to be prudent about how the money is used in order to make the best investments in bike/pedestrian facilities.

Chair Dixon asked if bike/pedestrian programs will include accommodations for motorized/hand wheelchairs. Ms. Lee-Skowronek said yes.

- In addition to being careful on how to use bike/pedestrian money, it will be important to find opportunities in highway projects to accommodate bike/pedestrians in other programs.
- Bike/pedestrian comments indicated an interest in cost-effective projects and these are included in example criteria and performance measures. Bike/pedestrian responders want to ensure that bike routes and efforts related to education and publicity about safety are eligible projects. These projects are eligible.
- The Plan is at a policy level but it is also important to note which projects were called out as interest areas by the public. Highway interest included Highway 101 and State Route 92. Caltrain needs to do enough improvements in order to support transit-oriented-development.
- There was a request related to process for more specifics on the make-up of the project review committee in addition to a request to suggest a mandatory coordination with all of the multiple agencies and stakeholders that may get involved in the process. This is addressed very generally in the Plan and talks about projects having to go through a planning process, which would entail working with a project review committee. The Plan talks about having a project review committee but doesn't specify members. Those are program specific and some could be project specific. The best time to address the specificity related to topics would be post-Strategic Plan adoption.
- The final set of public comments related to the status of projects from the 1988 Measure A program.

Larry Shaine said bike/pedestrian funding is a substantial increase over the 1988 Measure A.

Richard Hedges said he is not concerned about a lower level of funding but rather how the funding is used. He referred to a public comment about taking 2.5 percent from the 22.5 percent category for Streets and Roads. He doesn't think the TA can do this but thinks the TA can award money for projects with the city or county in which they actually do those improvements for bike facilities within the project. This would encourage planners to include those in the project recommendations. The TA could put language into criteria for approving projects, which would result in getting leverage from the streets and roads money whether the TA actually put money into the project.

Ms. Lee-Skowronek said the pass through of money is based on language in the Expenditure Plan. The TA passes money through based on the formula to each of the cities in the county and within the general guidelines of the Expenditure Plan. The cities actually decide how they will spend the money. The TA will be asking for progress reports to ensure the cities follow the general guidelines. The Plan currently states the TA basically does not give anything additional conditions to the cities on how they spend the money other than what is outlined in the Expenditure Plan.

Mr. Shaine said there has been a review of a project in Foster City asking that TA money from the Streets Program be used money for school crossing guards. He said a legal decision indicated the city could not use the program funds for the crossing guards.

John Fox said there were several public comments regarding major interchanges over Highway 101 or other major streets. He asked if this was a county jurisdiction or a Caltrans project when an interchange crosses Highway 101. Director of TA Programs Joe Hurley said for the TA to make any modifications to the State Highway System which includes interchanges, Caltrans approval is required through the encroachment permit process. There is also the option for Caltrans as the owner operator to make a modification.

Mr. Fox said that when major interchanges are designed, part of the design goal is to incorporate bike/pedestrian facilities as portions of the design and not to build a separate pedestrian overcrossing that would use up the 3 percent of TA bike/pedestrian money. He said the Marsh Road interchange at Highway 101 really has no provision for bikes/pedestrians and that is a design flaw. The goal of having a template is to say there must be a review that examines the provision for bikes/pedestrians and also for connectivity to parks and downtown.

Mr. Hurley said that in the past bike/pedestrian details have been included if they are considered to be mitigation associated with the highway project or a condition of the permit. An example is the 3rd to Millbrae Auxiliary Lane Project. As a San Francisco Bay Conservation Development Commission (BCDC) permit condition, the TA had to build a new pedestrian overcrossing south of the Broadway Interchange, which was funded by TA highway dollars.

George Zimmerman asked Mr. Fox if he was advocating, that in both the bike/pedestrian and individual city allocations, that there be some subregional coordination so what city A is doing is coordinated with what adjacent city B is doing with regards to bikes or any other types of improvement. Mr. Fox said if you look at some advocacy issues and someone wants to be a commuter, lives in Burlingame and wants to get to Millbrae for a job, and there is not some sense of connectivity with the people who design the total networks, you often discover that there are barriers or routing aspects. He suggested the TA come up with a check off list when thinking about how to use these funds and to consider connectivity to neighbors and integration into existing destinations. Mr. Hurley said the TA is moving in that direction to be consistent with the Regional Plan.

Chair Dixon asked how and from which groups would a review committee be chosen.

Ms. Lee-Skowronek said the participants that have been involved with the Plan process were very helpful and would inform the TA as to who should be on the committee and this would probably go through various filters.

ITEMS FOR REVIEW – TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY BOARD MEETING AGENDA OF NOVEMBER 6, 2008

Minutes of October 2, 2008, page two of five - TA Item 3a

Mr. Zimmerman asked about TA Investment Advisor Bill Osher. Mr. Hurley said Mr. Osher is with Tamalpais Wealth Advisors (TWA). The TA entered into a contract last August with TWA and they advise Chief Financial Officer Gigi Harrington in terms of investment of TA funds.

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for September 2008 – TA Item 3b

Mr. Zimmerman asked how much TA money was lost in the San Mateo County financial pool. Mr. Hurley said \$22 million.

Doris Maez asked if the loss of \$22 million affects the status of projects underway or planned. Mr. Hurley said the TA has not assessed the impact to individual project at this time. The TA will explore opportunities to recover the loss in order to minimize impacts to the program.

Ms. Arietta said a particular committee has been put in place for the entire county to try and recover funds either by bankruptcy proceedings or through the \$700 million bail out.

Approval of 2009 Meeting Calendar – TA Item 3c

No discussion.

Adoption of the Amended Conflict of Interest Code – TA Item 3d

No discussion.

Program Unexpended Funds from the 1988 Transportation Authority Expenditure Plan to Preserve Funding for 1988 Plan Categories – TA Item 10a

Mr. Hurley reported:

- During Strategic Plan outreach sessions and through meetings with the city managers, the importance of preserving the original 1988 Measure A dollars for 1988 projects was stressed.
- The language of the 1988 Measure specified that funding associated with any project deemed infeasible may only be redirected to the number one priority program, which was defined as Caltrain.
- Criteria for infeasibility included lack of a project sponsor, insurmountable issues associated with funding or environmental issues or a lack of support for the project.
- The \$3 million 280 Crestview Drive Project was deemed infeasible because Caltrans and the City of San Carlos withdrew support for the project and the funding. There were also a number of environmental issues and local options from the local community.
- All 1988 unexpended funds will be redistributed based on adjusted percentages of sales tax revenues.
- The \$25 million corpus of the Paratransit Trust Fund and remaining interest earnings will be transferred to SamTrans in January 2009 for continued administration in perpetuity.

Allocation of \$11,000,000 of Measure A Funds to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers for the Caltrain Grade Crossing Safety Improvement Program in San Mateo County – TA Item 10b

Mr. Hurley said this is the second and final phase of safety improvements at the Caltrain at grade railroad crossings in San Mateo County, which includes 25 crossings. Safety improvements include quad gates in some locations, raised medians to eliminate the opportunity for cars to go around vehicles that are stopped, pedestrian gates at all four quadrants and advanced preemption and coordination between the roadway and railroad crossings signals.

Mr. Shaine asked if grade crossings have been prioritized for safety improvements. Mr. Hurley said he was not aware of a prioritization within the contract.

Mr. Fox said it may be worthwhile to address mitigation, in some kind of hazard priority, because of some unique feature that may make one grade crossing more dangerous in one place than another.

Public Comment

Pat Giorni, Burlingame, said she couldn't find information on TA Project 734 but did find the Caltrain project for improvements at four railroad bridges for the Poplar, Tilton, Santa Inez and Mt. Diablo railroad bridge crossings in San Mateo. She asked why TA Project 734 and the Caltrain railroad bridge crossing projects weren't tied together. She said Caltrain was not going to include roadbed work under the railroad bridges because it was the responsibility of the City of San Mateo. Mr. Hurley said Project 734 is an \$11 million project called the San Mateo County Local Safety and Access Improvement Program. This program would make safety improvements at at-grade crossings on the Caltrain corridor in San Mateo County and is distinctly separate from the improvements at the four bridge rail crossings in San Mateo.

A motion was passed to recommend endorsement of TA Item 10a to program unexpended 1988 Measure A funds and Item 10b, which allocates \$11 million of Measure A funds to the Caltrain for grade crossing safety improvements. The motion included a request for prioritization of grade crossings for safety improvement projects before project implementation.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR – PAT DIXON

- Jim Bigelow and Randy Hees were absent from the meeting and expressed interest in being on the Nominating Committee for 2009 officers. Mr. Zimmerman also expressed interest. Chair Dixon will contact Mr. Bigelow and Mr. Hees to confirm their interest in the Nominating Committee.
- There will be a holiday appreciation dinner following the December 2 CAC meeting.

REPORT FROM STAFF

Mr. Hurley reported:

- Attended a California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting in Riverside and \$2 million was allocated at that meeting for the Smart Corridor Project on Highway 101 for the design effort.
- The CTC discussed the possibility of a federal stimulus transportation package.
- Proposition 42 funding may be on the table for consideration by the governor to help address the current budget crisis.
- Repair work was completed on the Dumbarton Bridge due to vandalism.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Mr. Hedges said he spoke at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and urged them, through their legislative efforts, to push Congress for stimulus for infrastructure and to not give any more money and checks to people to pay down their credit cards because you get an eight to one bang for every infrastructure project done in dollars returned. Congressman Tom Lantos received the John C. Foran award for transportation excellence.

Ms. Maez said she visited Missouri and the California roadway system is far superior, especially with signage.

Mr. Shaine said a CAC member or alternate should be considered for citizen input on any planned TA project review committee.

Mr. Shaine said Caltrans should remove the Bay Meadows racetrack signs on north and southbound Highway 101 at Highway 92.

Paul Young said a family member lives and commutes to work in San Francisco by bicycle. There is a grass roots network that determines bike routes to take based on the number of stop signs and lights and grade elevation. A mass of riders travel these routes for increased safety for all.

NEXT MEETING

The next regular meeting of the TA CAC will be held on Tuesday, December 2, 2008, at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070.

ADJOURNMENT

5:31 p.m.