CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor

AGENDA

October 4, 2011 - Tuesday 4:30 PM

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Call to Order/Roll Call

3. Approval of Minutes from August 30, 2011

4. Public Comment
   Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes

5. Presentation on the Brown Act (Hanson Bridgett)

6. Program Report: Alternative Congestion Relief **(TA Item 12b)**

7. **Transportation Authority Board Meeting Agenda for October 6, 2011**

   a. Approval of Minutes of September 1, 2011 **(TA Item 4a)**

   b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for August 2011 **(TA Item 4b)**

   c. Authorize Approval of Annex to the 2010 Association of Bay Area Government's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan as the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan for the San Mateo County Transportation Authority **(TA Item 4c)**

   d. SamTrans Liaison Report
      - September 1, 2011 **(TA Item 8a)**
      - September 14, 2011 **(TA Item 8b)**

   e. Authorize Allocation $300,000 in New Measure A Local Shuttle Program Category Funds to the City/County Association of Governments in Support of the Countywide Congestion Relief Plan **(TA Item 11a)**

   f. Authorize Adoption of the Measure A Short-Range Highway Plan **(TA Item 12a)**

   g. Update on State and Federal Legislative Program **(TA Item 12c)**

8. Report of the Chair (B. Arietta)
   a. Certificate of Appreciation – Paul Young

9. Report from Staff (J. Hurley)

10. Member Comments/Requests

11. Date, Time and Place of Next Meeting: Tuesday, November 1, 2011 at 4:30 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

12. Adjournment

All items on this agenda are subject to action

CAC MEMBERS: Barbara Arietta (Chair) • Jim Bigelow • John Fox • Rich Hedges • Randall Hees • Elizabeth Lasensky • Jeff Londer • Doris Maez • Daniel Mensing • Larry Shaine • Laurie Simonson • April Vargas (Vice Chair) • James Whittemore • George Zimmerman

INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC

If you have questions on the agenda, please contact the Assistant District 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.

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

MINUTES OF AUGUST 30, 2011

MEMBERS PRESENT: B. Arietta (Chair), J. Bigelow, J. Fox, R. Hedges, R. Hees, E. Lasensky, J. Londer, D. Maez, D. Mensing, L. Shaine, L. Simonson, J. Whittemore

MEMBERS ABSENT: A. Vargas, G. Zimmerman

STAFF PRESENT: A. Chan, M. Choy, J. Hurley, N. McKenna, L. Snow

Chair Barbara Arietta called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m. Jeff Londer led the Pledge of Allegiance.

INTRODUCTION NEW MEMBER
Chair Arietta introduced new member Mr. Londer.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
A motion (Whittemore/Bigelow) to approve the July 5, 2011 minutes was passed. (Simonson and Londer abstained).

PUBLIC COMMENT
None

ITEMS FOR REVIEW – SEPTEMBER 1, 2011 TA BOARD MEETING
Authorize Allocation of $3,200,000 to the City of Pacifica for the San Pedro Creek/ Highway 1 Bridge Replacement Project (TA Item 10e)
Manager, Programming and Monitoring Melanie Choy reported:

- This is a special circumstance request that is outside of a typical call for projects or a short-range planning effort. The City of Pacifica (Pacifica) is requesting $3,200,000 of new Measure A funds from the Highway Program. Three million of the funding is for design and construction and $200,000 is for project management support of the design phase.
- The project replaces an existing bridge with a new one, which will raise the bridge to meet flood plain requirements and seismic safety standards.
- Pacifica is adding a bike facility to the project to connect existing bike routes in the area.
- The project is currently in the environmental phase; clearance is expected in a couple of months and the project is to be completed in 2013.
- If the allocation is approved, this funding in addition to Federal and State funds would fully fund the project.

Rich Hedges arrived at 4:40 p.m.

- In order to meet some project funding milestones, Pacifica submitted this request outside of the future call for projects. This is a qualified project under the new Measure A Expenditure Plan and listed in the Key Congested Areas. The project leverages a considerable amount of

funding; it includes 32 percent Measure A funds and 68 percent Federal and State funds with an overall project cost of about $10 million.
- The project was assessed and reviewed for urgency and needs to be fully designed and ready for construction by June 30, 2012 and Pacifica must meet a full funding requirement so not to put the Federal and State funds at risk. Measure A funds would fully fund the design phase of the project and allow Pacifica to proceed toward the June 30 deadline.
- The project has no impacts on the other two Measure A projects in the Key Congested Areas. This project and the other two total $24 million and this project represents $3.2 million or 13 percent of that total.
- Approval of the project is contingent upon continued availability of Federal and State funds and successful negotiation between the TA and Pacifica to provide the design.

Randy Hees asked if the TA was doing some of the engineering and oversight work. Ms. Choy said the $200,000 is for a request that TA consultant services oversee the design work. The $3,000,000 funds both design and construction elements. Construction oversight is proposed to be done by Caltrans.

Mr. Hees asked how the timetable for this project relates to the Devil's Slide Tunnel Project. Director, TA Program Joe Hurley said there will be a delay of about a year in the opening of the Tunnel Project due to unanticipated ground movement. The bridge replacement project would be completed in around the same time based on the current schedule.

Mr. Hees said the creek involved supports a salmon run and asked if this was considered. Mr. Hurley replied yes.

Larry Shaine said there were issues with environmental clearance in previous projects in Pacifica. Ms. Choy said environmental clearance has been in the works on this project since 2000. There have been recent discussions between Caltrans and Pacifica to review last steps needed for clearance and the hope is that Caltrans can sign off on clearance in October.

Pacifica's Director of Public Works Van Dominic Ocampo said this project has been delayed due to funding issues. The project didn't achieve full funding until reauthorization of Measure A. All regulatory agencies that have been involved are supportive of the project.

Mr. Shaine asked if approval of the project affects the competitive nature of total funds for San Mateo County for funds for other projects outside of the coastside. Ms. Choy replied no. There are five corridors in the Key Congested Areas and the coastside is one of them. Each of the corridors has dollar amounts associated with them. There are three projects in the coastside category that have access to the $24 million amount and this doesn't affect other categories.

Jim Bigelow asked about the age of the current bridge. Ms. Choy said it is 50 years old.

John Fox said cherry-picking a special project should be done for truly extraordinary situations that the TA can justify and asked why this project is so extraordinary and what the time scale would be if left in the regular process. Ms. Choy said in order to secure Federal funds, there must be proof the project is fully funded. In addition, Pacifica needs to secure the funds now to begin the design work or actually do the design work and without the Measure A funds as the

local match, that cannot be completed. Other fund sources are earmarked and Pacifica has already requested an extension on one of the earmark funds. There are deadlines tied to the June 30 deadline. If this project was delayed until the call for projects anticipated later this year, Pacifica would not be able to access these Measure A funds to do the design work.

Mr. Fox asked what the date would be for the regular call for project. Ms. Choy said the call for projects is scheduled later this year and a decision on the program of projects either later this year or the beginning of next year.

Mr. Fox asked if the June 30 matching deadline is not possible to meet with a decision later this year. Ms. Choy replied yes because that leaves a six month window to focus on the design.

Mr. Fox said it would certainly be possible to get matching funds in a future Federal cycle.

Mr. Hurley said there is a series of Federal funds: TEA-21, ISTEA and SAFETEA-LU and there are rumblings if the funds haven't been utilized or obligated they may rescinded. He said there is also $3 million of State funds that would be lost if the project is not advanced and are not available to be moved to another project.

Doris Maez said she recently saw the San Pedro Avenue Bridge and it appeared to be in good shape. She asked if this bridge would provide the detour during construction. Mr. Hurley replied yes.

Mr. Ocampo said it has the same number of lanes and a temporary traffic light is being installed to help drivers coming out of Pedro Point.

Elizabeth Lasensky asked if the bridge will include bike and pedestrian lanes. Mr. Ocampo said there is no current bike facility but the replacement bridge will provide that.

Mr. Whittemore asked the following questions:

1. Why is the bike/pedestrian area being put on the east side away from a view of the ocean? Mr. Ocampo said this is the only way to connect the San Pedro Terrace Trail.
2. What type of precedent is there and how frequently is a project taken out of the normal call for projects? Ms. Choy said the only one done in the past is the Belmont Bike/Pedestrian Overcrossing Project.
3. How can a bridge replacing a bridge with the same number of lanes relieve congestion? Mr. Hurley said what was assessed is the congestion that would result in the event the bridge is no longer usable.

Mr. Ocampo said the addition of a multi-purpose trail provides another safe alternate form of transportation, which will help with congestion.

4. What is the life expectancy of the bridge? Mr. Ocampo said 50 years.
5. The bridge is being raised five feet and if the whole road structure will be raised, how will that incorporate sea level rise projections. Mr. Ocampo said the approaches would be raised in accordance with the hydrology report.

6. Will the 50-year bridge survive the 50-year projected rise in sea level? Mr. Hurley said the hydrology study probably has that information and he will provide this to Mr. Whittemore.
7. If something fails and the projected one-time only $3 million flies out the window, is there a way to get back the $3 million for another project. Ms. Choy said the project has a design phase, which is funded partially with Measure A and some other funds. At that point, the TA is making the decision to fund that phase. If the construction funds for the Federal funds don't pan out, staff will come back to the TA and TA CAC with updates and options and this contingency is written in the award. The $3 million is going to both the design and construction phases. The status and availability of funding will be monitored.

A motion (Bigelow/Hees) to recommend the TA Board support the allocation of $3,200,000 to the City of Pacifica for the San Pedro Creek/Highway 1 Bridge Replacement Project was approved.

PRESENTATION – HIGHWAY PROGRAM: CALERA PARKWAY (STATE ROUTE 1/CALERA PARKWAY PROJECT) (TA Item 11a)

Mr. Hurley reported:

- The project is a partnership between Caltrans (California Department of Transportation), the City of Pacifica (Pacifica) and the TA.
- The project is located on State Route 1 within the city limits of Pacifica.
- The purpose of the project is to address traffic congestion in the morning and afternoon peak travel periods. Traffic backs up at the intersections of Reina Del Mar and Fassler avenues and affects feeder roads that back up with traffic for about a mile or two depending on the time of day.
- The project is trying to environmentally clear a project that will result in sustainable congestion relief with minimal impact to the environment, adjacent residents and business and that is financially feasible.
- A number of concepts have been explored: highway widening, grade separations, roundabouts, frontage roads, signal timing changes, increased transit and reversible lanes.
- Environmental constraints included proximity of homes and businesses, topography, archaeological resources, historic property, Calera Creek, two endangered species, wetlands and the coastal zone.
- The project will widen four lanes to six at a length of 1.3 miles, add standard 10-feet shoulders and improvements to bike and pedestrian access, and include a 16-foot wide landscaped median.
- Public input included a scoping meeting in March 2010, informational meeting in June 2010, and circulation of the draft environmental document on August 8, 2011 with review until October 7, 2011. A public meeting is scheduled for September 22, 2011.
- The environmental document involved 14 technical studies and describes project alternatives, potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures.
- As the lead agency, Caltrans will either, issue environmental approval, require additional studies or abandon the project.
- No decisions have been made on funding subsequent phases of the project.

Mr. Hees asked when the decision is made for a narrow or wide median. Mr. Hurley said this is part of the final environmental document.

Mr. Fox asked what has the volume to carry all of this traffic. In the morning when everyone is leaving and gets past the signal at Reina Del Mar Avenue, traffic opens up and there is no congestion.

Mr. Fox asked if the signalization causes the delay. Mr. Hurley replied yes and said the question is how to get more vehicles through there more efficiently.

Mr. Fox said the widening at the signalization provides 50 percent more capacity per time interval and the green light basically is the thing. He said this is assuming the patterns of use and where people live and work, and these transportation modalities are changing looking forward; is there any ability to estimate with reverse commuting or would change in the patterns of businesses change this an any way. Mr. Hurley said right now all traffic projections are based on the Association of Bay Area Government's demographic projections and currently approved land uses; based on these projection we don't anticipate a shift in traffic patterns in this area.

Mr. Shaine asked if funding dates to original Measure A money. Mr. Hurley replied yes. There is not enough original Measure A money to fully fund this project so it would have to tap into new Measure A funding. The ratio would depend upon how the balance of the original Measure funding is used.

Ms. Lasensky asked how far this project is from the San Pedro Creek Bridge Project and how much disruption would there be if both projects are funded. Mr. Hurley said San Pedro Creek Bridge Project is about 1.5-2 miles from the southern end of the Calera Project. If the San Pedro Creek Bridge Project goes according to schedule, it will be completed before the Calera Project goes to construction.

Ms. Maez asked if the landscaped median would take quite a bit of property on the east side of the project. Mr. Hurley said there would be additional right-of-way take but the alignment of the landscaped median is done in a way to utilize available land and minimize impact to businesses and residents.

Mr. Hedges asked if the project has enough support in Pacifica to go forward. Mr. Hurley said the team involved is following the process laid out by the National Environmental Policy Act and California Environmental Quality Act. It is important that all parties be respectful of and follow the process. If there are concerns with what is being presented there is a forum to submit comments to Caltrans. Pacifica didn't think it was appropriate to take a position on the project until the science was allowed to play out.

Mr. Hedges asked how much of the process has to take place for Pacifica to approve the project. Mr. Hurley said the TA will be looking to Pacifica to take a position before any additional funding for the project goes forward.

Mr. Hees said this project came to the CAC about ten years ago and CAC members went to Pacifica to talk to people who had environmental concerns. Some were against any type of project, but this project seemed to have incredible support in the community where it's taking place.

Chair Arietta said she went to the Climate Action Task Force and heard about vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas (GHG) increases. She calls these auxiliary lanes that take people from Fassler to Reina Del Mar avenues because it's doing the function of one and she doesn't consider it a freeway. Mr. Hurley said it is technically not an auxiliary lane because that is for ingress and egress to the freeway. This project addresses the demand to get through the two signalized intersections.

Chair Arietta said these lanes might be in direct contradiction to AB 32 and SB 375 with GHG increases. Mr. Hurley said roadway widening does not necessarily result in degraded air quality. The auxiliary lanes on Highway 101 actually realized a 12 percent reduction in carbon monoxide emissions and this project would realize similar benefits. He said if drivers tolerate a 40-minute commute as opposed to a 20-minute commute that does nothing as far as reducing vehicle miles traveled.

Mr. Fox asked about the roundabout idea, which seems to get around the delay at the traffic light. He asked about the actual variations in the numbers keeping it at the original width and going to roundabouts. Mr. Hurley said it has to do with the diameter of the roundabout necessary to accommodate this volume of traffic and the environmental impacts associated with the large footprint of this alternative.

Mr. Fox asked about a grade separation, cloverleaf, flyover or reversible lane option. Mr. Hurley said the reversible lane did not work out because of the tight proximity and operating costs. There were issues with visual impacts, groundwater issues and cultural areas with a grade separation.

Ms. Maez said the area by Rockaway Beach and Fassler Avenue might be vulnerable to sea level rise because that area gets hammered by waves. Mr. Hurley said that was a factor addressed in terms of the hydrology study.

Daniel Mensing asked if all options were explored in depth. Mr. Hurley said the team consultants completed all analyses and objectively assessed all of the 14 alternatives, which are included in the environmental document posted on the TA website.

Chair Arietta asked why there couldn't be a grade separation. Mr. Hurley said it had to do with right-of-way impacts, and there were some groundwater issues and issues with cultural sites.

Mr. Hurley encouraged the CAC to direct any questions or concerns from the public about the project to Caltrans so they can be formally considered. The Draft Environmental Document is available on the TA, Caltrans and Pacifica websites.

Chair Arietta asked about the Pacifica city council making a final decision on the project after the public meeting. Mr. Hurley said that will be Pacific's call and called to question prior to any additional Measure A funding.

ITEMS FOR REVIEW – SEPTEMBER 1, 2011 TA BOARD MEETING (Continued)
Approval of Minutes of July 7, 2011 (TA Item 4a)
Mr. Fox said there was a comment in the section on the bike/pedestrian call for projects that we should learn from what happened and try to do better. He said various Peninsula bike/pedestrian groups are very upset on how this played out and this comment would be very beneficial.

Information on Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the Period Ending June 30, 2011 (TA Item 4b)
Mr. Whittemore commented it takes four months to close the books and he wouldn't have the information before receipt of the November 3 TA agenda packet.

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for July 2011 (TA Item 4c)
Mr. Whittemore said interest income is 6.8 percent down from projections in the first month of the year and asked if that should be rebaselined for the entire year. Director, Budgets and Grants April Chan said staff monitors the numbers and will likely bring an item back as a mid-year adjustment.

Treasury Manager Lori Snow said she is responsible for making these projections. She said a number of things have changed since the budget was set in February 2011. In the last few weeks the Feds said the interest rates will be kept at historically low levels and there won't be an opportunity, at least for U.S. securities and treasuries interest rates to rise within this budget year. The budget portfolio also has quite a number of securities that were callable and in the past two months, the TA has had a significant amount of those securities called, which has decimated the initial interest rate projections.

Mr. Hedges asked how the TA did on the "yield to call," versus "yield to maturity," and asked why the TA is not buying California securities. Ms. Snow said she would need to research on the individual security basis and can provide the information. She said staff has researched California securities and it is outside the investment policy. Ms. Snow will check to see if it outside the policy or law.

Mr. Whittemore said administrative expenses are lower than projected and asked if these should be rebaselined. Ms. Chan said staff monitors this and during adjustments can make appropriate changes.

Mr. Whittemore asked why CSI Capital is holding only one Treasury Inflation Protected Security (TIPS) in the portfolio. He is very concerned about the 76 percent exposure to agency debt in the portfolio. Ms. Snow said TIPS were purchased in late 2008 but those types of yields haven't been seen since then and are not preferred at this point and not often available.

Mr. Whittemore asked about the realized loss of $24,000 in July. Ms. Snow said she thought it was due to one particular security that had matured and will follow up.

Mr. Hedges asked who sets the policy that California securities are outside the investment policy. Ms. Snow said the Board adopts the investment policy usually based on recommendations from Board members, consultants or staff. She will follow up on the California statute.

A motion (Shaine/Hedges) to support acceptance of the Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for July 2011 was approved.

Mr. Hurley suggested specific questions could be communicated to staff prior to the meeting so everyone could be better prepared to respond.

Mr. Whittemore asked if it's a Brown Act violation if he communicates with staff before the meeting. Mr. Hurley said legal counsel will be briefing the CAC on the Brown Act at the October 4 meeting and can answer this question.

Mr. Hedges asked that Chair Arietta share his question about California securities with the TA Board in her CAC report. Mr. Hurley said it is best to discuss offline with staff and then bring it to the board if there is dissatisfaction with the answer. Mr. Hedges agreed with Mr. Hurley.

Sam Trans Liaison Report – July 13, 2011 (TA Item 7)
Mr. Whittemore said he had a question on the agenda item to authorize executing a 3-year, $300,000 use agreement for Pico Boulevard in San Carlos and would like to follow up with Executive Officer Public Affairs Mark Simon.

Acceptance of Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review and Outlook for the Quarter Ended June 30, 2011 (TA Item 10a)
Mr. Whittemore asked if a Committee on Uniform Security Identification Procedures column could be added to the chart on investments.

A motion (Hedges/Hees) to support acceptance of the Quarterly Investment Report was approved.

Authorize Amendment to Increase the Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 Budget in the Amount of $2,733,100 for a Total of $87,842,002 (TA Item 10b)
Mr. Hees asked if this is the amount of money to be used for Caltrain capital items. Ms. Chan said the TA board, at its June meeting approved taking a certain amount from SamTrans and putting it into the TA Budget to allow it to be used for capital projects. In return the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority will provide the operating funds required to the Caltrain Operating Budget. This is a continuation of an item the TA Board already approved for $2.73 million to be amended into the TA Budget. The funding source is Proposition 1B State/local partnership money. There are two separate line items the TA is amending in the Budget: A grant source is being brought in to revenue and giving it over to Caltrain as an expense, which is a neutral expense in terms of Measure A.

Mr. Whittemore said he thought the amount was $3.7 million, not $2.7 million. Ms. Chan said it was subject to how much each of the Joint Powers Board (JPB) partners could contribute to the Capital Budget. The lowest common denominator was San Francisco that could only contribute $2.73 million, so the fund swap is $2.73 million.

Mr. Whittemore asked how the budget gap was closed. Ms. Chan said staff is looking at the SamTrans budget to see how to come up with the extra $1 million that needs to go into the Caltrain Operating Budget.

Mr. Bigelow said this action keeps Caltrain on track with the current level of service for FY2012.

A motion (Bigelow/Hedges) to support authorizing an amendment to the FY2012 Budget in the amount of $2,733,100 was approved. (Whittemore voted no).

Authorize Allocation of $10,113,100 in New Measure A Funds (TA Item 10c)

- **$2,733,100 to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board for San Mateo County's Share of Local Match for Caltrain's Fiscal Year Capital Budget**
- **$4,920,000 to the San Mateo County Transit District for a Portion of San Mateo County's Share of Caltrain's Fiscal Year 2012 Operating Budget**
- **$2,460,000 to San Mateo County Transit District for its Paratransit Program for Fiscal Year 2012 Operating Budget**

Mr. Bigelow said the new Measure A allows the TA the option to consider splitting some funds for operations as well as capital and providing SamTrans, as a partner in the JPB, money to maintain Caltrain's 86-train schedule.

A motion (Bigelow/Hedges) to support authorizing the allocation of $10,113,000 in new Measure A funds was approved.

Authorize Allocation up to $398,103 in New Measure A Funds to the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance (Alliance) to Support the Countywide Alternative Congestion Relief Program for FY2012 (TA Item 10d)

Mr. Whittemore asked what is provided with these dollars. Ms. Choy said this money funds the Alliance to do outreach to expand employer participation in the shuttle program, employer promotion of alternatives to driving, an emergency ride home program, a bike rack/locker incentive program, etc.

Mr. Whittemore said he was looking for measurable performance statistics. Ms. Choy said the Alliance provides quarterly reports that assess how close they come to meeting goals.

Mr. Bigelow said Alliance Executive Director Christine Maley-Grubl has presented information to the TA Board and CAC. As a funding partner, C/CAG, collects and reports on all details of shuttles, ridership, etc.

Mr. Fox left a 6:04 p.m.

Ms. Simonson asked if this is an annual allocation, and if so what was the allocation for the prior year. Ms. Choy said the same allocation was made in the prior year. This program category continues in the new Measure A and there is a plan to do a future call for projects. In the absence of that, the TA is funding the existing program at the original Measure A levels that has been done for the last three years.

Ms. Maez left at 6:07 p.m.

Mr. Hurley said Ms. Maley-Grubl was to present at this meeting but had to be rescheduled to October due to the necessity of presenting the Calera Parkway Project.

Mr. Whittemore asked if the allocation is for overhead for the Alliance. Ms. Choy replied yes; these funds support Transportation Demand Management programs and not direct operation of shuttles.

A motion (Shaine/Hedges) to support the allocation of $398,103 in new Measure A funds to the Alliance for Alternative Congestion Relief Program for FY2012 was approved.

Authorize Expenditure of $11.3 Million of Original Measure A Funds to the 101/Broadway Interchange Project for Right-of-Way and Utility Relocation Activities (TA Item 10f)

A motion (Mensing/Shaine) to support the expenditure of $11.3 million to the 101/Broadway Interchange Project was approved.

Measure A Program Status Report as of June 30, 2011 (TA Item 11b)
No comments

Update on State and Federal Legislative Program (TA Item 11c)
No comments

Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report- 4th Quarter Fiscal Year 2011 (TA Item 11d)
Mr. Whittemore asked about the status of Tilton Avenue. Mr. Hurley will follow up.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR – BARBARA ARIETTA

- SB 791 will raise needed transportation funds including bike/pedestrian projects and empower regional transportation agencies.
- There is a public meeting on the Calera Project on September 22 in Pacifica.
- Attended the July 20 groundbreaking in Menlo Park for the Highway 101 Auxiliary Lane Project – Marsh Road to University Avenue.
- Preliminary results of the Caltrain Capacity Analysis for a blended system are available.
- The ribbon cutting ceremony for the Belmont Bicycle/Pedestrian Overpass Project was scheduled for the last week of September.

Mr. Hurley said project completion has been delayed due to railing issues and the ribbon cutting ceremony will rescheduled to October or November.

REPORT FROM STAFF – JOE HURLEY

- The most recent Ramp Metering Project funded through the Alternative Congestion Relief Program went online today at southbound Highway 280 between John Daly Boulevard and Highway 380.
- Read a resignation letter from CAC member Paul Young noting current scheduling conflicts with educational commitments.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS
Ms. Simonson received an email on SB 791 and will forward to staff to forward to the CAC.

Mr. Bigelow said the Caltrain Capacity Analysis PowerPoint is available at caltrain.com. There will be a Dumbarton Rail CAC panel meeting next month in the East Bay.

Ms. Lasensky said she would like to see a status report on bike/pedestrian programs that have been funded.

Date and Time of Next Meeting
Tuesday, October 4, 2011 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:25 p.m.