#### COMMITTEE ACTION ITEMS

- Item 5: Consent Calendar items approved unanimously:
  - (5.a) Minutes of the CAC meeting of 8/1/23 Mike Swire asked that the Minutes be updated to reflect his Member Comment on the results of his informal survey on Nextdoor which suggested that a high majority of Mid-Peninsula residents do not believe the recent 101 Express Lane project was a good use of taxpayer money as it didn't seem to reduce congestion.
  - (5.b) **TA Board Item 5.b** Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the Period Ending July 31, 2023
  - (5.c) **TA Board Item 5.c** Acceptance of Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report for 4th Quarter Fiscal Year
    - Sandra Lang asked whether the cost of the 101/Peninsula Avenue Interchange project might change. Staff confirmed that the cost could change significantly depending on the choices of the project sponsor, the City of San Mateo, and the necessary right-of-way acquisition.
    - Gus Mattammal noted that the Gray Whale Cove project was very important in protecting pedestrians, including children, and wondered why it has been on pause for four years. Staff responded that there was a disagreement between Caltrans and the County over who would pay for maintenance costs.
  - (5.d) TA Board Item 5.d Deprogramming and Deallocation of Three Pedestrian and <u>Bicycle Program 2022 Cycle 6 Projects</u> – Vice Chair John Fox wanted to confirm that these funds would be reallocated to other bike/ped projects. Staff confirmed.
  - (5.e) **TA Board Item 5.e** Program and Allocate \$9,650,560 in Measure A Funds to the San Mateo County Transit District for the SamTrans Paratransit Program and Caltrain
- <u>Item 11: **TA Board Item 15.a** Approval of Policy for Settlement of General Liability Claims</u> approved unanimously
  - Karen Kuklin asked whether such a policy might encourage incremental claims. Shayna van Hoften, Legal Counsel, said that this was unlikely and that claims for funders, like the TA, are rare.

#### INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- Item 2: Announcement of New and Continuing CAC members:
  - o (2.a) Doug Bojack returning member; lives in Burlingame
  - (2.b) Giuliano Carlini new member who is recently retired; lives in Belmont
  - (2.c) Nheeda Enriquez new member who has lived in San Carlos for eight years

- o (2.d) Sandra Lang continuing member; lives in Burlingame
- (2.e) Allie Paul new member who bikes to work; lives in San Bruno
- Item 6: Brown Act and CAC Role Orientation
  - The TA's Legal Counsel summarized the Brown Act and the role of the CAC in assisting the TA Board
  - Chair Barbara Arietta asked for more detail on Rosenberg's Rules of Order, which were suggested in lieu of Robert's Rules.
  - Other CAC Members asked about social media and the Brown Act.
- <u>Item 7: **TA Board Item 5.a** Approval of Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting of August</u> <u>3, 2023</u> - no discussion
- Item 8: TA Board Item 10.a 101 Corridor Connect Program Update
  - Staff provided a summary of the program, its goals, and process. There was considerable interest in and enthusiasm for the Program among CAC Members, who had many questions.
  - Ms. Kuklin asked whether the adjacent counties are pursuing a similar Program. Staff was not aware of similar efforts in the adjacent counties, but promised to align efforts where possible.
  - Ken Chin asked how the Project was funded and if the use of the funds are compliant with the Strategic Plan. Staff confirmed it is and the program is funded through highway program oversight funds that were budgeted for this purpose.
  - Mr. Swire asked why the Program focused on the 101 corridor and excluded some municipalities. Staff said that the area covered by the program builds on the Caltrans multi-county US 101 Corridor multi-modal plan.
  - Mr. Swire asked why the Program was prioritizing the North part of the County when Phase III of the Express Lane project was uncertain and could change the needs adjacent to 101 in this area. Staff said the projects included in 101 connect would be prioritized by the local communities. Also, staff does not have a preconceived notion of the project mix, rather, the TA is looking at ways to more holistically improve mobility along the corridor.
  - Ms. Lang and Mr. Carlini asked why the Program focus was on the 101 corridor. Staff said that the 101 corridor is the most heavily traveled commute corridor in the County and is called out specifically in SB1 legislation. Staff also noted the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) will be updating its county-wide transportation plan which covers all of San Mateo County.

- Mr. Carlini asked whether polling local communities might fail to identify regional projects. Staff said that they will identify regional opportunities based on local input.
- Mr. Carlini also suggested that, in leveraging older local plans, that the TA consider newer/updated realities. Staff said that working groups and community engagement will ensure that projects reflect current needs.
- Mr. Mattammal asked about the objective of the project inventory. Staff said that the list will help them prioritize projects and identify gaps.
- Vice Chair John Fox asked whether the Program might look at work being done include the El Camino Real Grand Boulevard Initiative. Staff confirmed this would be appropriate.
- Allie Paul asked when the implementation would begin. Staff confirmed that implementation would start after they received necessary feedback from all parties.
- Item 9: **TA Board Item 10.b** 101/92 Mobility Hub and Smart Corridor Concept Plan Progress
  Update
  - Staff provided an update on the Plan, its components, the process, and input from the community.
  - Mr. Chin asked whether the project would include restrooms. Staff said that currently only bus operator restrooms were being considered, although this may change.
  - Mr. Chin asked what outreach the TA had undertaken to nearby Fiesta Gardens School. Staff mentioned they had spoken with Parent/Teacher Association members. Mr. Chin, who also serves as the Vice President of the San Mateo-Foster City School District Board, recommended that the TA also reach out to the School Board, too.
  - Mr. Swire endorsed the need for a protected bike lane given current safety and comfort concerns. He also recommended the project extend one additional block to Bridgepointe Shopping Center, especially given the expected traffic once Chick-fil-A arrives.
  - Mr. Swire questioned whether the new Express Buses would succeed given previous challenges and the existence of Caltrain, serving similar routes. Staff mentioned that Caltrain serves a different demographic than SamTrans. Mr. Swire questioned whether the Express Bus user might be different than the average SamTrans user if fares are higher.
  - Mr. Carlini advocated that the bike lane be 100% protected as even a small gap would discourage many new riders. He also suggested that Caltrain could serve the same customers as the Express Buses, given Caltrain's current rider shortfall. He also urged caution with USB chargers due to security concerns.

- Item 10: **TA Board Item 11** Federal and State Legislative Update
  - Chair Arietta asked if Ms. Linehan had found out any info about the question she asked last month about the point of contention from LA Metro about the new transportation trailer bill possibly removing that agency's control over its budget and put it under control of the State and any impact it might have on the TA. Ms Linehan said she had looked into it and everything was okay and there was no negative impact on budget control for the TA from this bill.
  - Mr. Carlini expressed concern over a federal government shutdown. Staff said that this was unlikely and had not occurred recently.
- <u>Item 12: Report of the Chair</u> Chair Arietta reported that Caltrain recently was allocated a state grant that will allow Caltrain to operate a zero-emission train on both the electrified and non- electrified rail corridor between San Francisco and Gilroy. This \$80 million award is for one battery-equipped electric multiple unit (BEMU) train and the associated research and development, leading the way for Caltrain to operate a fully zero emission service in the future.
- <u>Item 13: Report from Staff</u> Peter Skinner, Executive Officer, Transportation Authority, said that the CAC will be trialing a new process for producing the Report of the CAC (i.e., this document). Previously, the Chair or Staff would produce this report. Starting with this Report, individual CAC Members, with the Chair's consent, are encouraged to develop a draft for presentation to Staff and then the Board. It is important that authors are equitable in considering the comments of all CAC members and avoid inclusion of comments that were not discussed in the CAC meeting. Mr. Swire volunteered and produced this report.
- Item 14: Member Comments / Requests
  - Mr. Chin resigned from the CAC due to personal constraints. He thanked staff and CAC for their hard work and successes.
  - Several Members thanked Mr. Chin for his contributions and service to the CAC.
- Item 15: Next meeting of the CAC will be October 3, 2023