

Report of the TA Community Advisory Committee

Meeting of April 29, 2025

Committee Actions

6) (TA Board Item 11.a.) - Accept Quarterly Investment Report – *no Committee discussion, approved unanimously*

Consent Calendar - *all approved unanimously*

- **4a) Approval of Minutes of the CAC Meeting of April 1, 2025**
- **4b) (TA Board Item 5.a.) - Approval of Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting of April 3, 2025**
- **4c) (TA Board Item 5.b.) - Accept Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the Period Ending March 31, 2025**
- **4d) (TA Board Item 5.c.) - Awarding Contracts to AppleOne, Inc.; SearchPros Staffing, LLC; and Tellus Solutions, Inc. for On-Call Temporary Staffing Services for an Aggregate Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$1,250,000 for a Five-Year Base Term, with up to Two Additional One-Year Option Terms for an Aggregate Not-To-Exceed Amount of \$500,000**
 - Sandra Lang asked what services these companies provide. Staff said that this is the on-call bench of consultants that can provide a range of services. She asked about the timing of the contracts. Staff said there is an initial five-year period and then two one-year option terms.
- **4e) (TA Board Item 5.d.) - Authorize Funding for Regional Measure Participation Polling Activities**
 - Nheeda Enriquez asked about the timing of the measure (2030) relative to the polling (now). Staff said that the polling is not exclusive to Measure A and will help inform San Mateo's position on the potential regional transit funding measure. The polling done by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission had a very small sample from San Mateo County.

Other Items

- **3) Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda**
 - No public comment

- **5) (TA Board Item 10.a.) - San Mateo County Shuttle Program Update and Call for Projects Fiscal Years 2026 and 2027 Draft Recommendations**

- Vice Chair Mike Swire asked what the primary objective was of the shuttles. Staff said that the objective was to fund last-mile shuttles. He said that is the TA goal but asked shuttles are needed. Staff said that the shuttles provide last-mile connectivity to reduce ride share and solo driving. He said that page 13 in the TA Board of Directors packet shows that about 35 percent of shuttle riders would drive if we didn't have the shuttles; thus, about 65 percent of shuttle riders would still get to work without driving if the shuttles didn't exist. Thus, for two-thirds of riders, the shuttles aren't taking cars off the road - one of the goals of the program. He said that dollars per car trip avoided is a better metric than dollars per trip. Given that two-thirds of shuttle trips aren't avoiding a car trip, this implies that the costs of avoiding trips are double the dollar per trip figures quoted in the presentation. Staff said that this is a congestion relief program and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction is a goal. Staff said costs are high, but it keeps cars off the road. Staff said that the survey results do indicate, however, that there are other non-car options. He said that VMT was only one of many criteria. Staff said that those who would drive alone were the most frequent shuttle riders.
- Ms. Lang asked who the shuttle partners were. Staff said that Commute.org operates 17 shuttles and the other shuttles are operated by various entities. The program funds the operation of the shuttles. She also asked how they quantify on time performance. Staff said that it is the opinion of the rider, not an actual measurement of time. She asked whether accommodations are made for disabled people. Staff said that the providers need to accommodate disabled riders. She asked about scheduling. Staff said that Commute.org publishes schedules online and elsewhere.
- Ms. Enriquez asked about the biggest cost drivers of the shuttle program. Staff said that labor costs have been the largest driver. Also, storage is costly given real estate prices in the Bay Area. Shuttles are not near capacity. Staff said that increased ridership shouldn't increase costs significantly as most costs are fixed.
- Chair Barbara Arietta said that local community college students from schools such as Skyline College, College of San Mateo, and /Cañada College would like shuttle service between campuses. Staff said there are currently no plans for this but will entertain applications from the Community College District, in which a survey would need to be conducted to study the route and potential demand.

- John Fox asked how the volume of public shuttles compare to corporate shuttles. Staff mentioned that some historical data was provided in the agenda packet, although not comparing private with public. He asked whether employer shuttles pick up other riders on their routes to their primary destinations. Staff said employers typically pick up only their own employees; however, the shuttles funded by the TA are open to the public.
 - Rich Hedges praised the shuttle system, which is also funded through federal funds; he has used various shuttles in the past in San Mateo and Foster City.
 - Mr. Swire asked the evaluation of underperforming current shuttles. Staff said that concurrency review is only for new/revised shuttles, but the overall study will indeed look at all shuttles. He asked whether corporations could contribute to the program. Staff said that corporations do provide money to fund the shuttles.
 - Ms. Lang asked if there was a matching requirement. Staff said yes. She asked whether health centers used the service. Staff said that there have been such shuttles in the past but that they often underperformed.
 - Mr. Hedges said that localities/corporations can hire their own shuttles.
- **7) (TA Board Item 11.b.) - Fiscal Year 2026 Preliminary Budget**
 - Mr. Swire asked why Measure A revenue was two times Measure W revenue if they were both a half of one percent. Staff said that half of Measure W revenue goes to SamTrans, which is not managed by the TA.
 - Ms. Enriquez asked what caused the 2019 spike in revenues. Staff said that in that year the Wayfair decision applied sales tax to online purchases.
- **8) (TA Board Item 12.a.) - Legislative Update**
 - Mr. Swire asked why the TA wasn't supporting Assembly Bill (AB) 1014 - State highways: speed limits. Staff will ask the Government and Community Affairs team.
 - Ms. Lang asked whether enshrined programs are guaranteed funding. Staff said no, funding cuts might be required.
- **9) Report of the Chair**
 - "Bay Area Transit Agencies are reporting surges in ridership. Travelers are getting out of their cars and on to public transit.
 - In this achievement, Caltrain takes the lead. Its ridership has increased 48.9 percent year-over-year as of February 2025, with weekends seeing significant growth of 85 percent on Saturdays and 95 percent on Sundays, surpassing pre-

pandemic levels. The surge in ridership is largely attributed to the introduction of new electric trains and the improved service they provide.

- Caltrain reports that there's every expectation that these trends will continue as more people build Caltrain into their travel habits, thanks to the increased weekend and off-peak service.
- This growth in ridership is happening as transit agencies make major investments in improving the rider experience with an emphasis on boosting safety, cleanliness and reliability.
- As always, funding is needed for transportation projects.
- A bill authorizing a funding measure to help keep Caltrain, BART and other agencies running and improving Senate Bill (SB) 63 passed the California Senate Transportation Committee earlier this month.
- It is now in the Senate Revenue and Taxation Committee and is likely to pass while agencies, counties and transit riders work out important elements of how this bill will work.
- Members of the public are invited to voice their opinion on regional transportation funding to help keep Caltrain running and improving at the next Executive Board meeting of either Caltrain or the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, which will be held in San Carlos on May 1, 2025."
- Mr. Swire asked whether the increase in Caltrain ridership was indeed due to a decrease in car use. Staff said that they haven't seen data that analyzes the impact of transit ridership on driving.
- Mr. Hedges said that the new T-line from Caltrain to Chinatown and North Beach has helped drive Caltrain usage.

● **10) Report from Staff**

- Ms. Lang expressed interest in three categories listed on the staff survey of items for CAC deep dives.
- Mr. Swire recommended that the CAC not vote at this time, given the amount of information to digest. He also suggested a consideration for items in which a CAC member had promised to manage the hour-long discussion.
- Ms. Enriquez asked about the objectives of these sessions. Staff said that there is flexibility, in which the CAC can decide what it wants to accomplish.
- Ms. Lang encouraged the discussion to be interactive. It is important that there is a deliverable to the Board.
- Staff, the Chair, and the Vice Chair will define a process for selecting the topics for the coming year.

- **11) Member Comments/Requests**

- Mr. Londer announced that next month will be his last on the CAC. Several CAC members thanked him for his service on the Committee.
- Ms. Lang said that she presented the recent report on road quality to her paratransit group, which was very interested in the subject.
- Mr. Swire said that he attended last month's TA Board meeting. At the meeting, Director Corzo voiced her concern with the US101/SR 92 Direct Connector project. Also, Chair Romero said that the Board would revisit the project in the near future if the City of San Mateo opposes it. Mr. Swire said that the City of San Mateo recently had a presentation from TA staff on the project. The City Council (and audience) unanimously opposed the project and will be sending a letter to the TA and City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo (C/CAG) to that effect soon. He said that if the project is re-evaluated now, several million dollars could be saved instead of continuing the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process.
- Mr. Swire said that unfortunately the Burlingame City Council had recently reversed its plans for bike lanes on Trousdale, which is the site of recent traffic violence and part of the C/CAG Youth High Injury Network. The bike lanes would have been in front of Franklin Elementary and near Burlingame Intermediate Schools. The City of Burlingame had received \$400,000 in Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds (TDA3) grant funding, but the City of Burlingame was not reversing its commitment. He disagreed with the argument that there was too much car traffic to enable a bike lane. He urged the TA not to give money to cities that don't use grant money as promised and that the TA claw back funds in these cases.
- Mr. Hedges said that there are two projects at US 101/SR 92. The first is benign, funded, and will start soon. The larger Direct Connector project is more controversial, due to cost and the potential requirement for eminent domain and significantly higher costs. He noted that one of the options might be acceptable given the potential to avoid eminent domain. He asked where the flyover would land.

- **12) Date/Time of Next Regular Meeting: Tuesday, June 3, 2025, 4:30 pm**