

**SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (TA)  
1250 SAN CARLOS AVENUE, SAN CARLOS, CA 94070**

**MINUTES OF OCTOBER 1, 2015**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** D. Canepa, C. Groom, D. Horsley, C. Johnson,  
K. Matsumoto (Chair), T. Nagel, M.A. Nihart

**STAFF PRESENT:** J. Averill, J. Cassman, A. Chan, G. Harrington, J. Hartnett, J. Hurley,  
M. Martinez, N. McKenna, M. Simon, J. Slavitt, S. van Hoften

Chair Karyl Matsumoto called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) REPORT**

Barbara Arietta, CAC Chair, reported on the meeting of September 29, 2015 (see attached).

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 3, 2015**

Motion/Second: Canepa/Horsley

Ayes: Canepa, Groom, Horsley, Johnson, Nagel, Matsumoto

Abstain: Nihart

**ACCEPTANCE OF STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES FOR AUGUST 2015**

Motion/Second: Canepa/Horsley

Ayes: Canepa, Groom, Horsley, Johnson, Nagel, Nihart, Matsumoto

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT**

None.

**HIGHWAY CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT AD HOC COMMITTEE UPDATE**

Chair Matsumoto said the ad hoc committee (Directors Cameron Johnson, Carole Groom, and Chair Matsumoto) have met with staff. There is more funding requested than available, so the committee believes the Board should pay attention to the Key Congested Areas (KCA), which in this county is Highway 101. Committees of the Board have always considered geographic equity. In this case, although there were projects in the Tier III list that could have been considered for geographic equity, the committee felt it had to promote other projects for the greater good.

Director Johnson thanked staff for their help educating him in the process. The problem is the TA does not have enough money in the short term. There is a growing congestion problem and open questions about what would be the most effective solutions. He said he is satisfied with the approach, but there are a lot of tradeoffs to be made.

Director Mary Ann Nihart said the report states almost \$20 million is requested for the State Route 1/Manor Drive Overcrossing and Milagra Onramp in Pacifica. She said the request is actually \$1.2 million. Total funding is estimated to be \$23 million, but that's

without having done design or engineering, or knowing what the California State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) will require. She said the TA has been judicious in the funding process with Measure A money. In the 2004 Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) under Measure A funds and the Coastside Highway Improvements, item number one is the San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement Project and item two is the Manor Drive overcrossing. The San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement Projects is costing less than anticipated and Pacifica will be returning almost \$2 million of Measure A funds to the TA because Pacifica sought funding from other sources, and Pacifica is requesting \$1.2 million for the Manor Drive overcrossing, which is on the Measure A funding bill. She would like the TA to support the project.

### **PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD (JPB) REPORT**

The October 1 report is in the reading file.

### **REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Jim Hartnett, Executive Director, said a train struck a car in Burlingame on Friday and staff is reviewing all processes to see what can be done to improve the response to the impacted riders. Another strike occurred today in Burlingame.

Mark Simon, Senior Advisor, Strategic Initiatives, said a group of people met in June to discuss the traffic on Highway 101. There are high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes up Highway 101 until San Mateo County, and there is a concern this creates a bottleneck. There are other bottlenecks at Highway 92 and Highway 84. Assemblyman Kevin Mullin organized another meeting at which Mr. Hartnett spoke. There are two projects in the Highway Call for Projects (CFP) program the TA will review and potentially approve today that are elements of a solution. Mr. Simon said he is helping to organize other meetings with representatives of companies interested in working on solutions to this issue. There is no automatic constituency for carpool or toll lanes in this county. Data has to be gathered to establish whether carpool or toll lanes will improve traffic on Highway 101. The projects will need community and political outreach if these are true solutions. There is no plan for funding these projects, which could be \$300 million to \$500 million. There is a strong desire by private employers to financially participate because they are concerned that the congestion is putting companies at a competitive disadvantage for recruiting employees. This could be a groundbreaking opportunity for a partnership with these private employers.

Director Don Horsley said at the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) meeting, the indication was the average speed would only go up three miles per hour if carpool or toll lanes were implemented. Mr. Simon said there was a project initiation document that provided initial information, but the next big amount of information will come from the environmental report. It will get worse if nothing is done. There will need to be several elements to the solution.

Director Johnson asked if there was a discussion about bringing express lanes to San Mateo County and how they are working in Alameda County. Mr. Simon said that point was made by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The environmental work still has to be done.

Director Nihart asked if there was discussion about changing the rules of the use of the lanes. Mr. Simon said a lot of the focus was how to expedite the process. Most of issue is how to pay for it.

Director Terry Nagel said there is a huge number of new jobs in the county in comparison to few new housing units. It makes sense to study the idea of taxing companies that want to expand for the transit impact. Mr. Simon said a countywide housing taskforce has been established and they will discuss that option.

#### Public Comment

Andrew Boone, East Palo Alto, said he is concerned about possible expansion of Highway 101 in San Mateo County to accommodate more car traffic. This is one strategy of dealing with congestion on the highway and it won't work in the long term. There have been many decades of highway expansion and there is still terrible congestion. Reconfiguring the highway so the auxiliary lanes are through lanes will create more traffic. He asked the Board to find a way to make alternatives work.

### **FINANCE**

#### **Authorize Programming and Allocation of \$108,020,000 in Original and New Measure A Highway Program Funds to Eight Highway Projects**

Joel Slavitt, Manager, Programming and Monitoring, presented:

- CFP Status
  - Up to \$125 million is available for programming and allocation
  - 11 applications submitted from nine sponsors
  - \$158.09 million was requested
  - \$117 million in eligible requests for Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 and FY2017 timeframe
  - Total amount for staff recommended projects: \$108.02 million
  - Panel reviewed applications based on strategic plan criteria
    - Need: 35 percent (pre-environmental clearance)/15 percent (post-environmental clearance)
    - Effectiveness: 20 percent (pre-environmental clearance)/40 percent (post-environmental clearance)
    - Readiness: 20 percent
    - Funding leverage: 10 percent
    - Policy consistency and sustainability: 15 percent
  - Relationship of Highway Capital Improvement Program with CFP process
    - Provides context for current CFP
    - Preview of future funding needs
    - Needs far outweigh projected funding
    - Needs assessment of key hotspots to be conducted for future CFPs
    - Potential changes to future selection process to better ensure delivery of projects in areas of greatest need
- Final Recommendations
  - Tier I recommended for funding
    - State Routes 92/82 interchange improvements - \$16. million
    - Highway 101/Woodside Road interchange improvements - \$2,650,000

- Highway 101/Willow Road interchange improvements - \$56.4 million
- Highway 101/Holly Street interchange improvements - \$10,720,000
- Tier II recommended for funding
  - Highway 101 staged HOV lanes (Whipple Avenue to San Bruno) - \$8.5 million
  - Highway 101/Peninsula Avenue interchange improvements - \$2.5 million
  - Highway 101 auxiliary lanes (Oyster Point to San Francisco County line) – \$8 million
  - Highway 101/Produce Avenue interchange improvements - \$3,050,000
- Tier III not recommended for funding
  - State Route 1/Manor Drive overcrossing and Milagra Drive on-ramp
  - Ralston Avenue corridor complete streets improvements
  - Railroad Avenue extension
- KCA to Supplemental Roadway (SR) Ratios
  - Expenditure Plan: KCA 63 percent/SR 37 percent
  - 2012 CFP: KCA 46 percent/SR 54 percent
  - 2015 CFP: KCA 67 percent/SR 33 percent
  - Combined CFPs: KCA 64 percent/SR 36 percent
- Schedule
  - September 2015: Informational items to Board, CAC, C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee
  - August/September 2015: Staff met with subcommittee to discuss CFP award implications
  - October 2015: Board adopts 2015 Highway Program of Projects
  - October 2015 – spring 2017: Conduct needs assessment to determine hotspots and propose policy changes to focus delivery of highway projects in areas of greatest need

Director Horsley asked where the \$19 million remaining funds would come from if the Board approved the \$1.2 million funding request for the Manor Drive project.

Director Nihart said the San Pedro Creek project had funding from One Bay Area Grants, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible Transportation Equity Act, Federal grants, and other funds that came in, which is why the city of Pacifica is able to return some of the Measure A funding that was originally allocated.

Director Horsley said the total cost of the project is \$20 million and asked what the sources of that money would be. Mr. Slavitt said the project sponsor would be eligible to come back to the TA for future CFPs, and there are a number of other sources that Director Nihart mentioned.

Director Johnson asked why funding for the Holly Street bike bridge is ineligible for Highway Program funds. He said the current status quo is dangerous. The proposal from the city was to break the bike component off to separate bikes and pedestrians from car traffic but keep the existing footprint. April Chan, Chief Officer, Planning, Grants and TA, said the recommendation does not speak to whether this is a good project. She said she recognizes the city went through an extensive planning process to

find the right solution for the area. The TA provided highway and bike and pedestrian funding for the design of the project. At the end of planning process it was determined the best solution is for a separate structure. She said looking at the intent of the Measure A Program, a separate pot of money was provided for bike and pedestrian facilities. It is clearly stated in the TEP that bike and pedestrian overcrossing projects are to be funded with the bike program funds. It was clear in the CFP process that separate bike and pedestrian overcrossing structures are not eligible under the Highway Program.

Director Johnson asked if the ineligibility is the legal standard or just an interpretation. Joan Cassman, Legal Counsel, said she would not say it is illegal, but given the confines of this CFP and the rules that were established in seeking proposals from sponsors to submit requests for grants for highway projects, staff was clear that requests should not include separate bicycle overpass facilities. She said it is the integrity of the process that must be upheld. It would be unfair to other sponsors to consider a request that does not comport to rules. She said in the Original Measure A, there was a bike and pedestrian category and was funded with 0.001 percent of the annual funding. For the New Measure A, there was a desire to support bike and pedestrian projects in a more substantial matter, and the funding elevated to 3 percent. There is a separate category for bike and pedestrian projects expressly stating the intent was for separate overpass projects. In the Highway Program, there is no discussion of separate bike overpass projects. There has been a consistent policy, precedent and practice that the TA has not used highway funds in that manner.

Director Johnson said another concern is if the two construction projects were built separately, it would result in potentially several million dollars in inefficient construction costs, but if they were done simultaneously it would save costs. He asked if staff shares that view and if the TA will take this into account when looking at bike and pedestrian sources of funding. Ms. Chan said two separate construction contracts could potentially add to the cost. She said the construction is expected to start December 2016, and there are a number of funding calls that staff will be pursuing, including the TA bike and pedestrian CFP, which will start next month. MTC and the State will start their Active Transportation Program early next year. Staff is happy to work with San Carlos to help get money from the various funding sources. She said there may be ways around the extra costs and staff can work with the city.

Ms. Chan said based on technical qualities, the Milagra Drive Project did not score well in effectiveness, readiness, or funding leverage. In terms of the benefits compared to other projects to regional traffic relief efforts, it did not score well. Staff discussed how this project could be a better competitor next time or for other funding. One way would be to increase funding brought to project. There could be some cost savings from other projects that Director Nihart mentioned, and the savings from the highway project could possibly be used for this project.

Director Nihart said this is what Pacifica voters wanted Measure A taxes for. She said the city of Pacifica has been holding onto this project for quite some time and they are only asking for \$1.2 million. It is a KCA and Pacifica is bringing \$990,000 to the table, and the city goes after other funding sources and will not rely on the TA for the entire

cost of the project. This has been considered a hazard since the 1980s. She would like this project added to the approved project list.

Director Nagel said she thought the Milagra Drive Project might help the area qualify as a Priority Development Area (PDA). Mr. Slavitt said the Milagra on and off ramp is fully funded with developer fees.

Director Nagel asked what the next opportunity for funding for highway projects will be. Mr. Slavitt said CFPs are every two years.

Director Nagel asked if there is funding left from the Original Measure A. Mr. Slavitt said there is \$16.1 million remaining.

### Public Comment

Paul Krupka, Project Manager, Highway 101 Woodside Road Interchange Project for the city of Redwood City, thanked the Board. He said he is grateful for the work done on the CFP and for the staff recommendation to grant funding for the project in this cycle. This funding is critical to keep the project moving. Redwood City is making good use of the funding granted to them for the project approval and environmental document phase, and they will be bringing to the Board an overview of the draft environmental document.

Andrew Boone, East Palo Alto, said the TA already awarded highway program funds to the Holly Interchange in 2012 for the environmental review, which included the pedestrian bridge. The decision should be whether this is a good investment of \$3 million so people can cross the highway safely, which is a requirement of complete streets. This interchange can't be constructed without the separate pedestrian bridge.

Barbara Arietta, CAC Chair, said the CAC was concerned about the reason being given for the non-recommendation of the Coastside project, which was that the project did not compete as well regionally or countywide. The CAC understands the funding challenges and constraints that face the TA, but the entire CAC has concerns about the lack of geographic equity in the determination of which projects should be funded. This project is the only Coastside project applying in this CFP. There are serious transportation problems on the Coastside, and the residents are faced with no viable alternatives and must rely on driving. Because geographic equity was not used, the CAC asked this be brought back into the decision making process.

Emma Shlaes, Policy Manager, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, said she does not believe the Holly Interchange bike and pedestrian overcrossing should be ineligible for highway funds. It is part of the interchange redesign. It is not a standalone bike and pedestrian overcrossing, it is part of the overall project. The TA incorporated the complete streets idea in the new Strategic Plan. If a true complete streets design cannot be achieved on the interchange, then funding should be provided to alternatives, which is the bike and pedestrian overcrossing.

Rich Hedges, Foster City, said staff picked some dangerous intersections to fix. He said at the CAC meeting, he asked the chair to talk about the Milagra Drive issue. He asked the Board to look for some opportunities to fund this project.

Chair Matsumoto said she would like to continue this discussion to the next meeting. She said the ad hoc committee thought they covered all the concerns, but some new issues have been brought up today. She said she would hope if Board members have other concerns they would bring them to staff instead of bringing them up during the Board meeting so the committee could be made aware of them.

Director Horsley said when the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee reviewed the Holly Interchange project, it was thought of as a single project. They were never considered as separate projects. Chair Matsumoto said when the CFP came out, that was delineated.

Director Nagel asked if it would be helpful to get the \$1.2 million for the Milagra Drive Project in order to qualify as a PDA, which would make it eligible for other funding. The gap in funding is the main question. She asked if the TA would be obligated to spend more later if the TA funded part of the project now. She asked if San Carlos would save money if the bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing was built at the same time as the rest of the project.

Ms. Chan said if a project is listed as a PDA, the chances of competing well may be increased. If this decision is delayed one month, it should be fine, but there are number of projects that have to demonstrate there is funding in order to go to Caltrans, because they have to have funding available and executed cooperative agreement before they can proceed.

Joe Hurley, Director, TA Program, said everything would be delayed. The concern is to get a solution as soon as possible for the Highway 101 corridor. The environmental document is a step in that direction, so this will delay working toward a solution.

Mr. Hartnett said one option is to move projects forward that there is a clear consensus on and delay the vote on some items that the Board still has questions on.

Director Nihart said a PDA is not required. Adding things to the intersection increases congestion. She said she won't be at the next Board meeting.

Director David Canepa thanked the ad hoc committee for identifying the area of challenge, which is Highway 101. He said as elected officials the directors look at what is best for their city, but this should be looked at from a regional perspective. He said he makes a motion to approve this item tonight and look at funding options for Milagra Drive at a future meeting.

Director Nagel said she would second the motion if the bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing at Holly Street is included to be reviewed at the next meeting.

Ms. Cassman said the Board is prepared to go forward with the recommendation that has been presented, and two items will be brought back to the Board for further consideration next month. The two items are the Milagra Drive project and the Holly Interchange bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing.

Director Groom asked for a written legal opinion on what is eligible for highway program funds.

Motion/Second: Canepa/Nagel

Ayes: Canepa, Groom, Horsley, Johnson, Nagel, Nihart, Matsumoto

## **PROGRAM**

### **Update on State and Federal Legislative Program**

Gus Khouri, Khouri Consulting, said he worked closely with the Self-Help Counties Coalition on Assembly Bill 194 that would allow pursuing high-occupancy toll lanes. He worked to ensure there is an amendment in the legislation that would require cooperation between C/CAG and MTC if and when the discussion arises. That bill is before the governor and the indications are that he will sign it.

Mr. Khouri said the bill that would have raised the local sales tax cap rate from 2 to 3 percent was vetoed. Language was added to Senate Bill 705 that would allow the TA to go out for a half-cent sales tax measure at the Board's discretion. He said he got a strong indication from the governor's office that the governor would be inclined to sign the bill.

No Federal update.

## **REQUESTS FROM THE AUTHORITY**

None.

## **WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO THE AUTHORITY**

No discussion.

## **REPORT OF LEGAL COUNSEL**

No discussion.

## **DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING**

November 5, 2015 at 5 p.m. in the San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070

The meeting adjourned at 6:28 p.m.



Good evening Madame Chair and Members of the Board. I have the following to report from this past Tuesday's meeting of the CAC:

(TA Item 4a) The CAC reviewed the TA Board Minutes of September 3, 2015, without questions or comments.

(TA Item 4b) The CAC supported the action before the Board to accept the Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for August 2015, without questions or comments.

(TA Item 10a) The CAC received a comprehensive presentation from Joel Slavit, Manager of Programming and Monitoring, on the Measure A 2015 Highway Program Funding Recommendations, which included a recap of the Call for Projects (CFP) Status, Final Recommendations, Key Congested Area (KCA) - Supplemental Roadway (SR) Ratios and a schedule of the timeline for completion of the various activities involved.

The CAC did vote to support the Programming and Allocation of \$108,020,000 in Original and New Measure A Highway Program Funds to Eight Highway Projects, however, it amended its supporting motion to state that it was supporting this with the additional proviso that I report to you the following comments and concerns that were brought up at our CAC meeting on Tuesday evening concerning the selection process employed for these recommended and/or denied projects.

After Joel Slavit's presentation, the CAC asked if geographical equity had been employed and was told not as part of the scoring of projects. We were told that geographic equity is monitored over multiple calls for projects to safeguard against an uneven distribution of Measure A funding and would be considered if project selection/funding became out of balance, The CAC then questioned the apparent lack of geographical equity in the decision making process, specifically in reference to the denial of the request from the coastside for improvements to the SR1/ Manor Drive Overcrossing and Milagra On-ramp in Pacifica, an area that, historically, has had extremely heavy traffic congestion, and which congestion continues to grow exponentially, as the years pass by. And, because of this continuously developing traffic congestion in the Manor District throughout the years, the Manor Drive Overcrossing has developed two very dangerous intersections adjoining it that present a very critical need for both new traffic signs and space widening, in order to protect the safety of both drivers and pedestrians.

One of the concerns brought up for discussion at the CAC was the reason being given for the non-recommendation of this particular coastside project, which was that "the project did not compete as well regionally or countywide", which leads to the following dilemma.

Even though the CAC fully understands the funding challenges and constraints that face the TA

moving forward , the entire CAC has asked me to express their concerns to you this evening concerning the apparent application, or lack thereof, of geographical equity, utilized in the determination of which current projects should be funded, in particular this project on the coastside, which is competing with projects from other regions of the county . One of the main concerns is that, in actuality, the coastside is a "region" in itself and, thus, should be competing with cities and areas within in its own "region" and not cities in other regions of the county, that is, if the TA were to employ the principle of true geographical equity...This particular coastside project is the only one from the coastside region applying in the current Call for Projects.

The serious transportation problem on the coastside is that the coastside region is populated by residents who are faced with a lack of viable alternatives and must rely heavily upon driving, and thus contributing to the increased congestion within it's own confines. Pacifica, alone, has the population of at least two peninsula cities combined, to say nothing of the amount of cars housed in the mid-coast or south coast households...

Because we were advised that geographical equity was not part of the criteria used to determine these current recommendations and non-recommendations for the Measure A Highway Program Call for Projects, the CAC has asked that I bring this issue before you this evening for your further consideration of bringing it back into the decision making process in the approval and/or denial of current projects and projects moving forward, especially concerning the current coastside project.

The crux of the matter is that the coastside projects should be competing within their own coastal region, not with peninsula projects, whose regional areas present an entire different set of transportation issues, per se. By having projects from the coastside region compete with projects from the peninsula region, as it were, coastside projects will, most likely, always "pale by comparison", and either be greatly cut back or not be recommended at all... due to either expedient circumstances, and/or possible size of project

The CAC thanks you for your consideration this evening of this issue and the CAC's request to give further thought into putting Geographical Equity back into the decision making process, as a criteria for project recommendations, before making a final decision when it comes to approving or denying projects in the Measure A Highway Program Call for Projects, both in this instance and moving forward.

(TA Item 11a) The CAC received a comprehensive update from Schweta Bhatnagar, Government Affairs Officer. Her report went into detail about the state issues and federal issues that the staff continues to monitor including Senator Beal's SB 9 and Senator Hill's SB 705. The CAC was also advised that Governor Brown's \$3.6 billion proposal to fund State highways, goods movement, local streets and roads, public transit, complete streets and loan repayments failed to pass during the last days of regular session. However, the CAC was glad to hear that the Legislature has created a specific new

committee, which will meet during the Transportation Special Session, in order to help devise a transportation funding plan.

**CAC Chair's Report:**

In my own Chair's Report to the CAC I advised the following:

Our former member, Jim Bigelow, has recently reported to me that he was invited to a U.S. Dept. of Transportation (DOT) Forum in Sacramento. This was the first of 11 "Megaregion" forums to be hosted by the DOT for key areas in the United States. This was a meeting to look ahead for 30 years and provide input into the issues facing transportation mobility in the U.S. Our Megaregion, according to the DOT, includes Reno, Sacramento and the Bay Area.

Jim has asked the CAC to review that report and provide responses to the DOT directly. The report can be accessed as a Draft Report of 260 pages or as a Blue Paper, which is more of an Executive Summary from the DOT's website at [Beyond Traffic: US DOT's 30 Year Framework for the Future](#).

Jim advises that the DOT is looking for input on this report and is looking for responses and suggestions from the general public that will eventually go to a final report.

**Staff Report:**

Joe informed the CAC of a meeting that occurred on September 15 chaired by Assembly Member Mullin which was attended by a number of stakeholders that are working to identify and advance solutions to the congestion on the 101 Corridor.

Respectfully submitted,

**BARBARA ARIETTA**

Chair, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, CAC