

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

MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 30, 2010

MEMBERS PRESENT: B. Arietta, J. Bigelow, P. Dixon (Chair), R. Hedges, R. Hees, E. Lasensky, A. Mader-Clark, D. Maez, D. Mensing, L. Shaine, A. Vargas, J. Whittemore, P. Young, G. Zimmerman

MEMBERS ABSENT: J. Fox

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: C. Groom, K. Matsumoto, T. Nagel

STAFF PRESENT: M. Choy, S. Cocke, M. Espinosa, C. Goodrich, C. Harvey, J. Hurley, R. Lake, M. Martinez, J. McKim, T. Reavey, M. Scanlon, M. Simon, L. Snow

Chair Pat Dixon called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m. George Zimmerman led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Jim Whittemore said, on page 3 of 9, he asked if the documents could be provided in Word format. He asked if he could get the financial information in any form of fielded format.

Director of Finance Trish Reavey said she provided Mr. Whittemore, through Assistant District Secretary Rosemary Lake, feedback after discussing this with Deputy CEO of Finance and Administration Gigi Harrington and Ms. Harrington was not comfortable issuing financial statements in that format.

A motion (Bigelow/Hees) to approve the minutes of October 5, 2010 was passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

TA Director Karyl Matsumoto said she was extending holiday wishes to all on behalf of TA Chair Rosanne Foust who was unable to attend. On behalf of the TA Board, she thanked the CAC for the wonderful work they do and said the CAC vets the Board agenda so well she doesn't have to go through the material with a fine-tooth comb, which makes her work so much easier.

Richard Hedges and Elizabeth Lasensky arrived at 4:40 p.m.

PRESENTATION – HIGHWAY PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

Manager, Programming and Monitoring Melanie Choy presented Part 1: Context. She said staff would like feedback from the CAC on project criteria and prioritization. Ms. Choy reported:

- Staff is looking at New Measure projects for the Highway Program as part of the effort to develop a comprehensive plan that lists and prioritizes projects. The Plan will be developed in 2011 and updated on a regular basis.

- Staff met with an ad hoc committee of city managers and public works directors in 2007 to develop a set of key principles to pull into the Highway Plan effort which included:
 - All original Measure A funds will remain with original Measure A projects.
 - Like projects will compete with like projects.
 - Rotate funding in each sub category.
 - Local agencies participate in sponsoring projects.
 - Measure A dollars could contribute to the early phases of a project such as environmental, getting a project into a ready state to apply and capture other funds.
 - The focus would be leveraging funds for construction through other fund sources.
 - Geographic equity is part of an overall policy.

Barbara Arietta arrived at 4:46 p.m.

Mark Goga with Wilbur Smith & Associates reported on Part 2: Current Highway Plan (Plan) work.

- The planning process involved two parts: Part 1, which is completed, includes project assessment, prioritization methodology, and project prioritization. Part 2 includes full funding strategy, allocation and strategy.
- Discussion and input associated with Part 1 have been completed with the City/County Association of Government's (C/CAG) Technical Advisory Committee, the city managers and continuing with the CAC at this meeting and the TA Board subcommittee on December 2.

Doris Maez arrived at 4:48 p.m.

- Project scoring includes assessment of 27 nominated projects, 11 of which are key corridor projects as identified in the Expenditure Plan and described in the Strategic Plan. There are also 16 supplemental projects and they fall into highway, interchange or arterial types. Each of these projects can be distinguished as a coastside or bayside project and by who benefits geographically. There are also 13 carry-over projects from the original Measure A in a variety of states of completion.
- Methodology criteria were consistent with the Strategic Plan and included reduction of congestion and increased throughput on roads and highways based on non-weighted measures of need, readiness, policy consistency, effectiveness and sustainability.
- Projects were differentiated on scoring, weighting and ranking.
- Evaluation scores prioritized Key Congestion Corridor (KCC) projects and supplemental projects for freeway, interchange and arterial projects based on the total percentage of Highway Plan criteria.
- Next steps involve developing a full funding strategy for each project, Measure A allocation Plan and policy recommendations, adoption and biennial update and/or call for projects.

Larry Shaine asked for clarification of KCC and supplemental projects referencing the Woodside Road arterial (supplemental) between Highway 101 and El Camino Real. Mr. Goga said the Expenditure Plan distinguished projects into one of two broad categories, which reflect the commitment of funds. Voter-approved Measure A receipts are programmed into these two pots, and a larger share has been assigned to accrue into the KCC pot than supplemental pot because it was estimated the KCC projects had frontline importance and needed a commitment of funds rather than a renomination of projects that might dilute the potential for those to be completed. This provides that a targeted amount will be available to the KCC projects over the life of the new Measure A.

Mr. Shaine asked if there are provisions to move a project from KCC to supplemental given changing conditions. Mr. Goga replied no. Projects assigned to the KCC group are fixed and are the only ones that can draw funds that accrue in the KCC pot. There will be no new KCC projects over the life of Measure A unless the voters adopt a change.

Mr. Shaine said a lot of money could be spent on the interchange, which would then meet with a slow El Camino Real arterial.

Randy Hees suggested the definition of KCC and supplemental categories be identified early on in the presentation and the acronym, KCC, should be explained. He asked if there is a system to say original Measure A projects are gone and there is surplus money or, is there a way of adding new Measure A money into original Measure A projects. Mr. Goga said the issue cited is apparent and it is trying to be resolved.

Daniel Mensing arrived at 5:15 p.m.

Ms. Choy said staff is focusing on new Measure A funds and Mr. Hees' point may be looked into as a next step.

Mr. Hees said slide 5, referencing ad hoc committee key principles, mentions "Measure A dollars contribute to phases up to design." This is a technical term and he suggested using the term, "Up to a state of readiness." He said the slide on Project Differentiation listed, "27 Nominated Projects," and asked who nominated these projects, or are they identified projects. Mr. Hees said some are identified by the TA and it might be a better use of language unless they are truly nominated by outside agencies. Mr. Goga said they were. This was looked at in the original call for projects that were included in the nominations and in advancing into the voter measure. The typical project sponsors were cities. The Highway Plan will have greater documentation for the public to access understanding of that process and history.

Mr. Hees said the list of methodology criteria is critically important. He said Highway Plan Criteria on slide 13 are not in the same order as the Highway Plan Criteria on slides 14 and 15.

Mr. Zimmerman commended Mr. Goga on having periodic review every year to make sure priorities are in order because times and needs change. Mr. Zimmerman said it is important to highlight the overriding fiscal constraints the TA is currently operating under and will in the future.

Ms. Lasensky referenced the recently approved project in Menlo Park that will impact Marsh Road and access to the Dumbarton Bridge. She said, in anticipating future requests for funding or construction projects as times change, it is important to spell out how projects like that might be brought on, how they would be identified and how the funding would apply. Mr. Goga said the goal in Part 1 was to explain, from the static sense, how this would be examined. Discussion is now focused on the more dynamic issues without marginalizing projects already in the queue. The outcome is to have a program that will have opportunities for other projects spelled out in how they can be introduced either in the call for project, or if there is an urgent need, there is a funding/leveraging opportunity that will really benefit the county and represent a good value.

Barbara Arietta said she understands the project enumerators will draw the funds going forward.

Mr. Goga said these projects are currently known to be eligible for Measure A funds, which means they have not been withdrawn or completed by some other method.

Ms. Arietta asked what will happen to TA Project 615 Fassler Avenue to Westport Drive Project, which is controversial and not mentioned as a supplemental project in the Plan even though it is included in the TA Capital Project's Summary. Mr. Goga said this project was entitled under the original Measure A and identified in the 1988 Measure and its funding is drawn from the original account. He said there are several potential ways this project could, in the future, draw from the 2008 Measure. Right now it must be decided if it's fully eligible for monies under the earlier account, which have not been fully dispensed. He said, perhaps, that is how this project will leverage Measure dollars against whatever funding sources might be available to it.

Ms. Choy said staff has been currently focusing on the 2004 Measure and since that was not listed in the Plan it wasn't reviewed. She said staff may consider it as the Plan moves into Part 2, which is when all the funding is being reviewed for distribution amongst the projects. Staff might have to bring in the discussion of the original Measure projects. Staff is currently not proceeding this way. Staff might make a shift to look at this with today's feedback.

Ms. Arietta said, according to the TA Capital Project's Quarterly Report, this is funded through the first quarter of Fiscal Year (FY) 2011. She asked if there are any plans beyond that. Mr. Goga said the actual programming of monies that aren't part of this process, either the 2004 Expenditure Plan process or other commitments that were made to the project beforehand and are pending, are not part of the purview right now.

Ms. Choy said decisions are made a phase at a time and once a project completes a phase, staff then entertains funding for future phases on that project. Funding for that future phase has not been discussed because the current phase has not been completed.

Mr. Whittemore asked about the acronym, CIP. Mr. Goga said CIP is a Comprehensive Investment Expenditure Plan [sic].

Mr. Whittemore asked if this Plan is a new methodology for prioritizing things by assigning points and trying to divide them into the existing pool. He asked how this is different from the prior methodology, what is its intended improvement, and is there a specific project in the past that would have not occurred by adopting this process.

Mr. Goga said the intent of funding measures is to apply to a broad group of projects that may come forward and not have their own prioritization already assigned. Communities struggle with this because priorities change. So the intent is to try and cement a process by which communities can find a transparent reflection of how those monies will come forward, and what is the avenue for them to be assigned to an improvement that will benefit the community. Measure A sales tax monies apply to more than just the Highway Program and that is why this process is a subset of a bigger one. It is important because interest is so high and the amount of money can't pay for everything. The honest attempt is to objectively distinguish projects in consideration of the Strategic Plan. Mr. Goga couldn't speak to a past example but said it is best to look forward.

Mr. Whittemore said he has no complaints with weighting of numbers and the Plan seems logical. His concern was how it has changed from the past and is staff certain it's an improvement.

Mr. Hees said the original Measure A had a very rigid list of projects and the bigger problem concerned which would go first. This was decided by which could rise to the top through engineering, funding and political support.

Jim Bigelow said the Plan doesn't indicate local consensus of a community or a city council or several cities. For example, if a project is weighted 45 percent on the first item and that is achieved, but then hits a wall in acceptance of the final product, how is that addressed. Some large projects are very complicated and some are much simpler so some could get to an environmental clearance faster than a complicated project. He said, if the smaller project can move faster in the process and get to a state of readiness, but there is a bigger project that may score very high on congestion relief, is there satisfaction in the new scoring with the limited funds in the new Measure, that over time the most could be achieved in congestion relief through this scoring method and that some smaller projects wouldn't jump ahead and eat the limited funds in the category. Mr. Goga said there is a high need for consensus in the community. The goal with the Plan is to set a process in place for money to flow to projects. In reviewing future commitment of funds to the point of a project being ready for construction, the CIP tries to reflect an honest programming forward pace of that project so all supporting the project can see those dates out there. If there is a consensus issue, there is potentially some pressure to build towards that milestone due to future funding commitment hinging on consensus. Mr. Goga said the Plan doesn't focus on phasing at the outset. It is inherent on the project sponsor to know that if they elect to phase something, the phased piece for advancement, relative to the others, might have to show equal or better value.

April Vargas referenced the slide on project differentiation and said it wasn't clear if the 13 carry-over projects from the original Measure were included in the 27 projects or were in addition to the 27. Mr. Goga said these are included. She suggested the sentence read, "13 carry-over projects from the original Measure are included in this total."

Ms. Vargas asked about slide 15, Highway Plan Criteria-Effectiveness: Additional point if a top performer among comparable projects. She asked for clarification of a top performer. Mr. Goga said this is in comparison to like projects. He said if three interchange projects were assigned to the supplemental category, and one project had an opportunity to eliminate person delay hours by one million hours annually, another could do it by a half a million and a third by 100,000; that might be one indicator to order those three points.

Ms. Vargas referenced Highway Plan Criteria-Sustainability: Project Supports Transit and/or Transit Oriented Development (TOD). She said there is increased interest and concern in the county that not only does the county have to provide roadway space for people who want to drive but there needs to be a commitment on the part of all transportation agencies to find innovative ways to get people out of their cars. She said the county has done a lot with bicycle and shuttle programs and asked if those types of concerns would be covered in this criterion. She said this could be spelled out more specifically as alternative forms of transportation so it's doesn't appear these types of issues have been forgotten in favor of more and more lanes and cars. Mr. Goga said this is a wonderful consideration and not defined in the Strategic Plan that relates directly to the Highway Plan because the Highway Plan is really talking to the points of that infrastructure and the variety of

vehicles included and how throughput can be improved and mitigate growing congestion. He said as projects come forward that offer alternative modes of travel as part of their definition, there could potentially be consideration. He said Ms. Vargas' comment might help staff to add something in if it is consistent with Strategic Plan guidance.

Paul Young left at 5:41 p.m.

A motion (Hees/Bigelow) that the CAC make a statement for the chair to carry through to the TA Board that the CAC heard the Highway Program Implementation update and is generally pleased with the direction, completeness, logic and process was approved.

ITEMS FOR REVIEW – DECEMBER 2, 2010 TA BOARD AGENDA

There was no discussion on the following items:

1. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for September 2010 – TA Item 3c
2. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for October 2010 – TA Item 3d
3. Approval of 2011 Board of Directors Meeting Calendar – TA Item 3e
4. Adoption of the Amended Conflict of Interest Code – TA Item 3f
5. SamTrans Liaison Report – October 13, 2010 and November 10, 2010 – TA Items 7a and 7b
6. Acceptance of the Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Review and Outlook for the Quarter Ended September 30, 2010 – TA Item 10a.

Approval of Minutes of October 7, 2010 – TA Item 3a

Mr. Whittemore questioned the word “consist” on page 3 of 9. Mr. Hees suggested these comments are made by the TA and not to be changed by the CAC.

Mr. Zimmerman asked, on page 8 of 9, if construction for the US 101/Broadway Interchange will take from winter 2016 to completion in 2035. Director of TA Program, Joe Hurley said the year 2035 was a point of reference of how the intersections within the interchange are expected to operate in the future. Construction is scheduled to be a three-year period to be completed in 2016 if it begins in 2013.

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the Period Ending June 30, 2010 – Unaudited – TA Item 3b

Mr. Whittemore asked when the reports will be audited. Ms. Reavey said the final audited statements are scheduled for release in mid-December.

Mr. Whittemore asked if this was the normal timeframe. Ms. Reavey said the normal timeframe is between the end of November and mid-December.

Resolution of Appreciation to Outgoing Board Member, Rich Gordon – TA Item 6a

A motion (Zimmerman/Hees) to sincerely endorse the resolution of appreciation in the context of transportation and for his outstanding endeavors and leadership in transportation planning as an elected official in San Mateo County was approved.

Authorize Allocation of \$80,000 of Measure A Funds to the San Mateo County Transit District for the Regional Bicycle Sharing Demonstration Program – TA Item 10b

Manager, Planning and Research Marisa Espinosa said the allocation would support a three-year pilot bicycle sharing demonstration project. The project in San Mateo County is being led by SamTrans in partnership with both San Mateo County and Redwood City. The project will provide bicycles for short-term use twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week at self-service kiosks so people can check out bicycles. There will be bike stations and pods along transit corridors and near activity centers and attractions. This project will leverage over \$4.2 million from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) through a Climate Initiative grant and \$2.2 million from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. The program is a regional program so each county will have partners involved to make sure the program is implemented. The program will be tested for success and evaluated for scaling up.

Mr. Zimmerman asked who shares what. Ms. Espinosa said the bikes are for public use and there would be a system in place where people could use a Smart Card-type system, check out a bike, and ride. This type of program is available in Washington, D.C., Denver and in major European cities.

Chair Dixon said Caltrain commuters could check out a bike for their last-mile connection.

Ms. Lasensky asked how the requirement for helmets fits into a bike share program. Ms. Espinosa said staff will be working out the actual operational activities over the next several months. Some projects have and some have not required helmets.

Mr. Whittemore asked who receives the \$80,000 allocation. Ms. Espinosa said SamTrans. He asked if this could be held in hostage to SamTrans opening Pico Boulevard to bicycles. He said he would vote no on the resolution.

Mr. Hees made a motion to support the allocation and to attach an amendment saying we are very concerned about Pico Boulevard.

Mr. Hurley said he would have an offline discussion with Mr. Whittemore on his concerns about Pico Boulevard. Mr. Hurley said he wanted to uncouple the issues because bike share is a very valuable program and he would take up the discussions of Pico Boulevard with Mr. Whittemore after the meeting.

Mr. Whittemore asked that the Pico Boulevard item be agendaized for the January meeting. He said he wanted to state to the TA Board that some of us at least share the concerns of the bicyclists who are concerned about Pico Boulevard. He said he supports the \$80,000 allocation.

Mr. Hees said, in his motion, the way he expected it is not so much that we are holding it hostage but we want to mention Pico Boulevard.

Rich Hedges assumed vetting for the bike share program will be like car share where it will be known in advance who is going to be part of the program and it will be fairly certain bikes will be returned. Ms. Espinosa said the program design will be developed over the next few months. Typically, for those types of programs, there is a subscriber base and they have to provide some type of identification in advance to be able to check out a bicycle. This is tied to a credit card or

some other form of payment so the user can be tracked if they are delayed in returning the bike or something happens to the bike.

Mr. Hedges asked if there would be a cost associated with checking out a bike. Ms. Espinosa said the idea behind having a subscription base is that it would help to make the program sustainable in the long run. As the program is developed, staff would look to see what is the appropriate pricing level.

Ms. Maez was concerned about liability. Ms. Espinosa said this will be part of program development and looking at risk management issues and liability.

A motion (Arietta/ Whittemore) to authorize allocation of \$80,000 to the San Mateo County Transit District was approved.

Authorize Allocation of \$120,000 in Measure A Funds to the San Mateo County Transit District for Making the Last Mile Connection Pilot Program – TA Item 10c

Manager, Strategic Development Corinne Goodrich said this allocation of FY2011 Alternative Congestion Relief funds as matching to a \$1.5 million grant from MTC is for the last mile connection. The program is administered by SamTrans in partnership with the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG), the Peninsula Congestion Relief Alliance (Alliance), San Mateo County and Redwood City. Strategies of SB 375 (transportation planning and sustainable communities) being developed for the Bay Area will not kick in for five to 20 years as development patterns are changed. This project will show what Transit Demand Management can do right now to change people's behavior in how they travel with a focus on employers, employees and residents in downtown Redwood City. Strategies include regional bike sharing, electric vehicle charging stations, short-distance vanpools, targeted employer marketing, and a telecommute program. SamTrans will do three carpool pods and targeted residential marketing.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if Caltrain would be incorporated into the program because public employers gave Caltrain discounts in the past. Ms. Goodrich said absolutely. She said this program doesn't provide discounts to ride Caltrain but Caltrain would be actively marketed. The focus of this program is the Redwood City Caltrain Station.

Mr. Hees asked, with the new Measure A and uncoupling of shuttles from transit systems management, what does \$120,000 do within the budget and how does it fit in with the Strategic Plan and spending limits. Mr. Hurley said there is sufficient capacity to cover this allocation and this is considered a special circumstance because there is an opportunity to leverage other dollars.

Ms. Lasensky said people work odd hours and weekends and asked if various work styles will be accommodated especially considering Caltrain and SamTrans service changes. Ms. Goodrich said many of these measures could be used almost any time of the day but there are always challenges with some schedules. She said the goal of the program is to market what is currently available and to market some new alternatives. She said there will be a lot of hands-on work with employers and employees to explain all options available.

Mr. Bigelow said he is a member of C/CAG's Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee representing business. He introduced TA Director Terry Nagel and said, through her

suggestions and working with C/CAG, they are in the process of reaching out to all of the chambers, and the San Mateo County Economic Development Association to push a program for increasing transit ridership and tax deductible benefits by employers.

Mr. Whittemore asked if \$1.8 million will last through both the two-year program and the six-month evaluation and if the \$120,000 TA allocation is the sum total of the investment of this for Measure A. He asked if all funding sources were secured. Ms. Goodrich said the Alliance will line up employers who will implement the vanpool and it will depend on the employer. She said the funding is secured.

Austin Mader-Clark asked if the electric vehicle chargers could be solar or renewable.

A motion (Bigelow/Hedges) to aggressively urge support and leveraging and continued countywide outreach for the Last Mile Connection Pilot Program was approved.

Mr. Shaine asked about timing. Ms. Goodrich said funding is expected in March and it will take a year to develop implementation.

Update on State and Federal Legislative Program – TA Item 11a

Mr. Hurley said Government Affairs Manager Seamus Murphy had a schedule conflict but invited the CAC to forward any questions/comments for follow up by Mr. Murphy.

Program Report: Pedestrian and Bicycle – TA Item 11b

Senior Planner Stacy Cocke said this presentation covers Measure A Pedestrian and Bicycle Program (bike/ped), call for project details and upcoming schedule. Ms. Cocke reported:

- The policy has been anchored by the 2004 Expenditure Plan, the Strategic Plan and Implementation Plan, which outlines a biennial call for projects, the project evaluation and criteria.
- The goal is to encourage programs that encourage bikes and walking. Three percent of the Measure A funds are allocated for bike/ped projects. The upcoming call for projects is for FY2012-2013.
- Anyone can initiate a project but a city or the county must sponsor the project. There will be an application workshop with site visits and the TA and C/CAG will evaluate, and prioritize applications. Staff will solicit CAC input on the list of recommended projects for funding followed by TA Board approval. The call for projects will be in January 2011, applications are due mid-March with TA Board adoption in July.
- Evaluation scoring criteria include project need, consistency, readiness, effectiveness and sustainability.

Ms. Maez asked if criteria will be weighted similar to the Highway Plan. Ms. Cocke responded that the Implementation Plan outlines the actual scoring criteria but doesn't weight or assign numbers.

Ms. Vargas asked if the number of projects for approval will be determined by how much each costs or will there be a minimum number of projects evaluated. Ms. Cocke said there is no idea of how many projects will be seen and there is no proposal to set a maximum or minimum value. The deciding factor will be how much money will be in the TA and C/CAG pots to spend.

Mr. Whittemore asked about project outreach. Ms. Cocke said this is not finalized but will be similar to the initial process done with the shuttle call for projects. The goal is to give everyone a heads up in advance in order to set aside resources needed to fill out the application.

Chair Dixon asked if the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) is up and running. Executive Director Michael Scanlon said the committee has had two meetings. Ms. Cocke said she has discussed the program with BAC liaison Todd McIntyre, Manager, Community Relations.

John Hoang from C/CAG presented an update on the Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (Plan).

Mr. Hoang reported:

- C/CAG is working in partnership with the TA.
- A pedestrian component is being added to the Plan.
- Input is being requested from all cities in the county because the cities will be constructing the projects.
- There are 247 miles of existing bikeways and conditions have been identified as to which projects to include. A preliminary goal is to include an additional 256 miles of on and off-street bikeways.
- The goal of the countywide Plan will be to improve safety built on strong local support in conjunction with locally adopted plans.
- Project grouping identifies all the bikeway routes including El Camino Real and coastal corridors, major crossings, access to transit and regional trails.
- The Plan will provide a countywide vision to identify bike/ped zones, develop a countywide bikeway network, identify funding and encourage cities and the county to implement projects.
- Surveys were completed with cities through July to November. Scheduling includes an open house in October, public review of the draft in January, final draft in February and the final plan in March.
- Project website is sanmateocountybikepedplan.org

Ms. Maez asked about provisions for motorized transit on trails including Segways and electric bikes. Mr. Hoang said there may be motorized vehicles that will utilize the same facilities. This has not been discussed but will be taken into consideration.

Ms. Arietta said there is quite a bit of Segway use in Pacifica. She asked about improvements for coastal access including Pacifica. Mr. Hoang said Half Moon Bay has been extending their bike/ped path along Highway 1. He said Pacifica identified some projects that lead to the new tunnel.

Mr. Hedges said there has been a tremendous increase in immigrants riding bikes to work and doing so in many unsafe places. The downtown business community in San Mateo has asked for safer bikeways for workers. He said there is a lot of effort to make the bike plan safer in these congested areas even if it means shrinking automobile lanes. Gas prices will continue to escalate and there will be more and more people who work for low wages biking to work.

Ms. Lasensky asked if there will be facilities on bikeways for bike repair, first aid stations and call boxes for emergencies. Mr. Hoang said C/CAG is addressing facilities at Caltrain stations. He said C/CAG would look to the cities and county for this because they will be designing the projects; this is a good point to address for inclusion in the Plan.

Mr. Hees said the schedule indicates C/CAG will be issuing a call for projects potentially before the final draft of Plan and asked how C/CAG will tell people what they should be submitting if they don't have the regional plan to be in compliance with what is being put out. Mr. Hoang said C/CAG is working with the cities and he feels confident once the draft Plan is out, most of the categories of the projects won't change that much.

Mr. Whittemore said the open house was excellent. He said this process is further along than people think and suggested people go to the website for additional information and maps.

Chair Dixon constantly sees bicyclists who don't pay attention to arterials or signals. She said it should be made clear that bicyclists should have to get insurance in the same way as automobiles drivers.

A motion (Whittemore/Hedges) to support the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan was approved.

Capital Projects Status Report – 1st Quarter Fiscal Year 2011 – TA Item 11c

Mr. Hurley said the report is in the agenda package and he will be happy to respond to any questions.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR – PAT DIXON

Appointed Mr. Hees, Mr. Bigelow and herself to the nominating committee for 2011 officers.

REPORT FROM STAFF – JOE HURLEY

Mr. Hurley applauded the CAC and their continued contributions to the quality of life in San Mateo County. He said he never ceases to be amazed by the commitment of the group to better the community, their level of effort in preparation for the meeting and depth of questions asked. He reiterated Director Matsumoto's comments that she appreciates the efforts this group does because when the agenda comes before the TA Board, it has been scrutinized.

Mr. Scanlon congratulated the CAC and extended thanks for the great job done. He said his work puts him in contact with people across the nation and he takes pride in how fortunate he is to talk about how engaged our CACs are and about the level of commitment that is reflected by the members. He said the CAC is well represented at TA Board meetings by Chair Dixon, Mr. Bigelow and other CAC members and the perspective brought is very important. Mr. Scanlon said people from generations to come will benefit because of the work done by the CAC. He wished all a safe and great holiday season.

Mr. Scanlon said he has seen six to seven pages of comments come across his desk from the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition about bike plans. He said the bike community is very involved.

Chair Dixon introduced Deputy CEO Chuck Harvey and Executive Officer Public Affairs Mark Simon.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Mr. Whittemore said there was a bad article in the October 6 *San Mateo County Times* about salaries, which included misinformation. He asked if he could have a copy of the statement read by

Mr. Harvey in response to this article. Assistant District Secretary Rosemary Lake will provide copies to members.

Mr. Whittemore said there is a toy drive at the District lobby on December 4 from 5-6 p.m. He said there is a San Mateo city council meeting on January 18 on the Hillsdale Caltrain Station relocation. He asked if the property transaction at 85 Natoma, San Francisco, is complete for the downtown extension. Mr. Hurley said staff expects to hear on December 1.

Mr. Bigelow requested the C/CAG presentation be emailed to all members.

Mr. Shaine said the original Measure A allocation for bicycles was minimal and he is amazed at the transition from the original Measure A to today.

Ms. Maez expressed her excitement that the San Bruno Grade Separation Project is underway.

Mr. Hedges said this is the best of times because the TA Board is so great and the worst of times facing funding obstacles.

Committee members wished everyone happy holidays.

Chair Dixon introduced TA Director Carole Groom, TA project manager Jim McKim, and Manager, Finance Treasury Lori Snow.

Date and Time of Next Meeting

The next regular meeting of the TA CAC will be held on Tuesday, January 4, 2011 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070.

Adjournment – 6:52 p.m.