



AGENDA

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

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

September 4, 2012 – Tuesday

4:30 p.m.

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Call to Order/Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes from July 31, 2012
4. Public Comment
Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes.
5. **Transportation Authority Board Meeting Agenda for September 6, 2012**
 - a. Feature Presentation: Bayshore Intermodal Station Access Study
(TA Item 11a)
 - b. Update on Highway Call for Projects **(TA Item 11b)**
 - c. Authorize Solicitation of Letters of Intent for Grade Separations **(TA Item 11c)**
 - d. Update on State and Federal Legislative Program **(TA Item 11d)**
 - e. Authorize Acceptance of Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review and Outlook for Quarter Ended June 30, 2012 **(TA Item 10a)**
 - f. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for July 2012
(TA Item 4b)
 - g. Measure A Program Status Report **(TA Item 4c)**
 - h. Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report – 4th Quarter **(TA Item 11e)**
 - i. SamTrans Liaison Report – August 8, 2012 **(TA Item 7)**

- j. Approval of Minutes of August 2, 2012 **(TA Item 4a)**

- 6. Report of the Chair (B. Arietta)

- 7. Report from Staff (J. Hurley)

- 8. Member Comments/Requests

- 9. Date, Time, and Place of Next Meeting: Tuesday, October 2, 2012 at 4:30 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, 1250 San Carlos Ave, San Carlos, CA 94070

- 10. 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) • William Warhurst • 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 proceeding 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 Nancy McKenna 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 650-508-6279, 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.

Draft

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

MINUTES OF JULY 31, 2012

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: J. Bigelow, J. Londer, G. Zimmerman

STAFF PRESENT: J. Averill, C. Chung, J. Hurley, N. McKenna

Chair Barbara Arietta called the meeting to order at 4:31 p.m. and Rich Hedges led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Jim Whittemore said he would like the June meeting minutes to include his statement that he urges the Board to support the use of funding from Stanford to complete the Bay Trail in East Palo Alto. He said that he and all of his neighbors would vote for this and support the Board. He said we must complete the Bay Trail and create safe bicycle access for the people in East Palo Alto.

Mr. Whittemore said the new TA website does not have archived meeting minutes from 2011 and earlier. Assistant District Secretary Joshua Averill said the issue is being addressed and should be resolved this month.

A motion (Shaine/Hedges) to approve the minutes as amended passed (Simonson abstained).

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

ITEMS FOR REVIEW – AUGUST 2, 2012 TA BOARD MEETING

Director, Transportation Authority Program Joe Hurley asked to take the Local Shuttle Programming and Allocation agenda item first.

Authorize Approval of Local Shuttle Programming and Allocation of \$116,302 in New Measure A Funds From the Local Shuttle Program Category for Fiscal Years (FY) 2013 and 2014 for the City of Pacifica's Community Weekend Shuttle (TA Item 10a)

Interim Manager of Programming and Monitoring Celia Chung said this item is a carryover from the June TA Board meeting during which most of the shuttle program was approved. There were three applications that were not recommended for approval. Pacifica has revised its application and the evaluation panel is recommending Board approval.

Chair Arietta said CAC member George Zimmerman, who is absent, asked what the amount of patronage is, who would be served by this shuttle, and where it would go. Ms. Chung said since this is a new shuttle, the amount of patronage will be a projected number, not a number taken from previous surveys or studies. Pacifica projected 24 passengers per run or 100 percent ridership. This is almost 20,000 riders per year. This is a shuttle that runs between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. every Saturday and Sunday. The shuttle runs parallel along Highway 1 starting at the Linda Mar Shopping Center up to the Oceana Terrace Senior Housing. During the second year of this shuttle program, the route will extend south to Devil's Slide and could presumably pick up out-of-town visitors who want to avoid parking issues. Chair Arietta asked if the shuttle goes into the shopping areas at Rockaway Beach and Eureka Square. Mr. Hurley said the shuttle pulls into Rockaway around Nick's Restaurant and the Lighthouse Motel when traveling in the southbound direction. He said the shuttle is on the west side of Highway 1 around Eureka Square in order to service the tourist areas around the pier, then it will swing back and go to Oceana swimming pool and continue to the senior housing above Good Shepherd. It does not go into the Linda Mar parking lot but rather the park-and-ride lot across the street.

Doris Maez said the back end of Linda Mar is not very well served by SamTrans so this shuttle will be a real improvement for the community members.

Mr. Whittemore asked if people can bring surfboards on the shuttle. Ms. Chung said it wasn't discussed in the application but if someone suggested to the City of Pacifica its staff might try to get vehicles to accommodate surfboards.

Laurie Simonson asked if the route was a loop. Ms. Chung said it was an out-and-back route.

Larry Shaine asked if a city could apply for this program even though the project was a two-year Call for Project (CFP). Ms. Chung said new applications are no longer being accepted and in most cases a city will have to wait for the next CFP. Mr. Shaine said Foster City did not participate in this CFP and he hopes Foster City will reconsider next time. Mr. Whittemore pointed out the minutes from the June TA Board meeting where Ms. Chung said if there is a special circumstance with a sponsor and a good reason or compelling need staff would make a recommendation to approve a shuttle.

A motion (Whittemore/Vargas) to support the approval of the authorization was passed.

Alternative Congestion Relief Program: Smart Corridor (TA Item 11a)

Executive Director Rich Napier of the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) said one misconception about this program is that traffic is rerouted off the freeway onto local streets. When there is an accident, traffic tends to get off the freeway and get lost in the local streets. The purpose of the Smart Corridor is to provide a route around a freeway accident through city streets and back to the freeway. The project goes from El Camino Real and alternate routes from Interstate 380 to the Oregon Expressway in Palo Alto.

Mr. Napier said in major arterials between El Camino Real and Highway 101, the idea is that when something happens on Highway 101 and traffic flows into city streets, it will be directed to El Camino Real, a major route. In some places a local road will be used. The cities along with

C/CAG agree it is better for the traffic to be on one predictable corridor as compared to going throughout neighborhood streets.

Mr. Napier said C/CAG is installing dynamic, fixed and trailblazer signs and cameras, sensors, monitors, and a communications channel. During a non-incident, cities will be able to go online to this system, see what the traffic is like in their city, and program the signals remotely from a computer. Every route was walked by C/CAG engineering staff to determine where to put signs and cameras. There is no video recording with the cameras, they are real-time use only. This is not a “Big Brother”-type issue to report traffic violations. It is purely to look at the situation to determine how to optimize the signals during an incident.

Chair Arietta asked if this system is in any way connected to the red light cameras that exist today. Mr. Napier said no because C/CAG has an agreement with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the cities involved that bars C/CAG from recording any of the data. Recording data is not the intended use of the cameras.

Mr. Whittemore said the data should be recorded anyway. Mr. Napier said C/CAG is not allowed to use the data for any reason. It is a tool that could help law enforcement, not in the context of recording violations, but to assist in traffic management during an incident.

Mr. Whittemore asked if anyone in the city could log in and see the information. Mr. Napier said yes. Mr. Whittemore said as long as there are cameras broadcasting on a fiber optic network that anyone can log into the data should be recorded and taken advantage of the information. Mr. Napier said C/CAG has an agreement that it cannot record and retain the data, but the agreement does not prevent others from recording it themselves.

Ms. Maez asked what kind of tie-in or coordination exists with the FasTrack sensors on the freeway. She said such coordination could be another useful tool to anticipate when backups are going to occur. The camera may provide information about the cause of a backup but the sensors might give information which could anticipate a backup. Mr. Napier said the system does not tie into the FasTrack system at this time, but it eventually may because the basic equipment is being put into place and could lead to system integration. At this time there is no planned connection between the two.

Elizabeth Lasensky asked if there was any connection between this system and the bridges. Mr. Napier said no, the system is totally focused on Highway 101 and routing traffic that gets onto the local streets back onto the freeway. He said there is no focus on trying to make the bridges better, but once this is in place it will be providing extra resources so Caltrans might be able to do some things that could optimize the bridges. The infant stage of the program is putting the hardware and communications channels into place. Over the next week or so there will be more discussions about the broader integration aspects of how the system could be used. The system will evolve as it progresses.

Mr. Napier said there are several funding sources. C/CAG used some of the \$4 Motor Vehicle Fee funds and it will use some of the \$10 Motor Vehicle Fee fund. The TA provided \$3 million for cash flow which C/CAG will pay back through State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds or other funds and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and

California Transportation Commission (CTC) also provided funding. The project is over \$35 million and C/CAG has been successful in getting \$25-\$30 million from the State. He said the important thing is that the local money from C/CAG and the TA is leveraged.

Mr. Napier said the project was coordinated closely with Caltrans. Consultants were hired and stakeholders were engaged in the project including the police and fire departments who are very interested in this tool. He said an important point to remember if a bypass is going to be utilized, the phasing along the route must be phased with less cross-traffic green-time so it will actually help get traffic through the incident location. This is exactly what the program does during an incident. During normal operations, Caltrans will have control of El Camino Real and the cities will have control of the local streets. He said the communication hub is in San Mateo and is routed via fiber optic cables in the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) tubes back to the Traffic Management Center (TMC) in Oakland. The concept is using intelligent transportation system technologies. C/CAG will also be setting up flush plans pre-establishing the negotiated signal timing. One of the reasons C/CAG has been involved in this project is because it involved collaborating with Caltrans and multiple regional jurisdictions and many cities.

Mr. Napier said there are several other benefits to the program. The alternate route would optimize the timing for incident management. The program would provide local event management timing options for El Camino Real to the local cities. A lot of additional equipment such as updated signal controllers is being provided at no cost to the cities.

Regarding the project status, Mr. Napier said the design is completed along El Camino Real and along the local roads. The demo project in the city of San Mateo has been completed. He said C/CAG received all the money for El Camino Real and the local roads and is initiating the system integration and design. C/CAG is out to bid for the construction of all the segments. The local streets construction will likely be under contract within next month. El Camino Real construction can start in the fall, and all construction will be complete some time in 2013. This sets in place the hardware but system integration will still need to be added into the TMC in Oakland.

Mr. Napier said C/CAG has worked together with various agencies including the TA, Caltrans, MTC and CTC for improved mobility in California.

Rich Hedges asked if there are first, second, and third tier local streets which would be used for alternate routes. He said when he attended a Public Works meeting about this issue in the past, some of the primary routes did not make sense. Mr. Napier said the routes have changed since that meeting. C/CAG worked with the local cities as it relates to prioritizing the primary routes. If traffic comes to a halt on one route, then it would be diverted to another route because the primary objective is to keep traffic moving. Mr. Hedges said traffic flow is problematic no matter what due to the design of the urban streets. Mr. Napier said the routing will begin several interchanges before and after the incident which will help distribute traffic on urban streets. Not all traffic will be exiting or entering the highway in one location.

Mr. Hedges asked if the signs will tell drivers where to get off the freeway rather than they simply must get off the freeway. Mr. Napier said there will not be any signs on the freeway directing traffic off of the freeway because C/CAG is not allowed to put signs on the freeway.

When drivers get off the freeway there will be small directional signs directing them to the alternate route and back to the freeway. The key aspect is having route signage so people will know where to go especially if they are not familiar with the area. The objective is to put them on the streets that have a reasonable ability to move the traffic.

Randy Hees asked how this technology would be tied into other technology such as smart phones. Mr. Napier said it will not be tied into smart phones directly at this time but it could in the future. At this time the TMC will change the signage on the streets and send some alarms to 511.org which could be accessed by a smart phone. The updates eventually get tied into 511.org by the TMC.

Mr. Hees asked what size of an event would trigger this program. Mr. Napier said it is defined in the agreement and must be a fairly significant incident consisting of a four-hour delay, approximately. Since the program allows Caltrans to control the local streets, a significant threshold was set.

Mr. Hees asked how this program would keep cars off of the non-official routes because he lives on a non-official route which traffic typically uses to bypass an incident. Mr. Napier said there is nothing that can be done specifically to address that other than to purposely create a path of least resistance along the desired route and traffic should naturally flow toward that path.

Mr. Hees asked if this program will be expanded east/west as well as north/south along Highway 101. Mr. Napier said the reason this is planned this way is because El Camino Real is very convenient to use as an alternate to Highway 101. He said east/west problems have not been addressed but it might be something to consider once the program is put into use and demonstrates how well it is integrated.

Mr. Shaine asked if the automated control of the signals on El Camino Real is funded. Mr. Napier said C/CAG is upgrading all the controls to the latest design and technology. San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) could easily add in the signal preemption and priority equipment. A traffic engineer can log into the specific URL and program the parameters. This whole system requires a person to intervene and to make a decision so it is not totally automated.

Mr. Shaine asked if there will be a similar system to Bus Rapid Transit which can control the signals to some extent. Mr. Napier said it is possible to do because the latest controllers are being installed from Interstate 380 south. SamTrans would have a card they could plug into the controllers and the busses would have a transmitter.

Mr. Shaine said the map from the presentation shows four cameras outside the county and asked how they are being funded. Mr. Napier said San Mateo County is paying for those cameras to the benefit of the entire project.

William Warhurst asked if the concept of this project is not to help the people who are trapped in the congestion on the highway near the scene of an accident but rather the residents around the accident location who are inundated with traffic. Mr. Napier said that is correct. C/CAG is not allowed to direct traffic off the freeway and since traffic exits at any point on the highway to get

around the accident the signs being installed are intended to help direct traffic around the incident and back to the highway reducing congestion on the city streets.

Mr. Hurley said this project is helping both the highway and city street congestion because the traffic on the highway will spill out onto local streets.

Mr. Warhurst said Redwood City replaced all the traffic signals on El Camino Real and asked if that was part of this project. Mr. Napier said Redwood City installed some updated systems and this project is integrated with them.

Mr. Warhurst said this project is similar to opening the drain wherever the traffic is built up to help allow the traffic to flow faster and away from the problem area. Mr. Napier said that is true because cars might exit the highway an exit or two before or after the accident which will change how the traffic will need to flow.

John Fox said when this program goes into action there must be communication with the police and services in the municipalities. Mr. Napier said when the program activates the system will know which cities the program will affect and will know to contact those cities. When there is a major incident there is a communication protocol to the incident commander. He said C/CAG is going to automate the system as much as possible with automatic calls or emails so cities will know there has been an incident, but there will still be a need for manual calling at the higher level. Mr. Fox said the police would need to know immediately when an incident occurs so they could respond. Mr. Napier said that issue was brought up in the planning because of an example in which the city was not notified for four to six hours that an incident occurred. That was an example of extremely poor communication and this tool will improve upon it.

Ms. Simonson asked if it is Caltrans alone or Caltrans and the cities that will take control of the streets when the program is triggered. Mr. Napier said all the streets that are part of the system will be controlled only by Caltrans during a major incident which is about 0.2 percent of the time. The cities have agreed to this condition.

Ms. Simonson asked if the signs will be dark during regular traffic when there are no incidents. Mr. Napier said in some cases they will be dark and in some cases it will be useful to have them on, but it depends on the area and situation. Ms. Simonson said when a sign is lit up people actually slow down to read it and doing so causes traffic. She is concerned that if signs have unnecessary communications on them they will cause traffic jams.

Ms. Simonson said the presentation contains the abbreviation MVDS and asked what it stands for. Mr. Napier said it is a sign that can be controlled and turned on and off.

Ms. Simonson asked where the revenue source is that would pay back the TA local sales tax of \$3 million. Mr. Napier said C/CAG controls the State and Federal Discretionary Transportation Funding and the \$10 Motor Vehicle Fee raises \$7 million a year which will be used.

Daniel Mensing asked how far south on El Camino Real the signage is controlled. Mr. Napier said there is no signage south of San Mateo County because there wasn't time to work through an agreement with Palo Alto, but C/CAG anticipates doing that later.

Mr. Mensing asked what has been done to educate the public to what this signage means and how to use it. Mr. Napier said an outreach program is yet to be done. The design was just completed and C/CAG is just getting ready to do the construction so eventually there will be some educational outreach for the public and city staff.

Ms. Maez said because of funding partners she suspects similar projects are being done in adjacent counties. She asked what kind of coordination exists with San Francisco and Santa Clara counties on this project. Mr. Napier said C/CAG is counting on Oakland to help tie the systems together. He said there is the Silicon Valley Smart Corridor which is located farther south in San Jose. Ms. Maez said there is a communication factor to consider. If an incident is affecting Redwood City it will probably affect Palo Alto and others. Mr. Napier said as more of these come up there will be a significant investment in tying them together.

Mr. Whittemore said MVDS stands for Motor Vehicle Detection System. He asked why this program uses fiber optic and not wireless. Mr. Napier said in other places it caused leased line situations which are problematic in terms of funding to support them and keep them operational from an ongoing call standpoint. Caltrans is trying to create a fiber optic system, but the project uses wireless in locations where there have been issues getting fiber optic in place. The project uses cameras and demands a lot of bandwidth which is limited by wireless.

Mr. Whittemore asked if C/CAG is laying private fiber optic or buying capacity on existing lines. Mr. Napier said both are true. In some places the project is connected through some fiber optic that BART put in. Within the county, C/CAG is putting in new fiber optic lines but C/CAG is borrowing conduit significantly reducing the amount of work that would need to be done.

Mr. Whittemore asked if the new cable that was laid for free by Comcast was used for the trial in downtown San Mateo. Mr. Napier said a private fiber was put down.

Mr. Hedges said most cities televise their city council meetings and it would be a great place to present the program.

Chair Arietta said central communications broadcast stations have their own monitors and scan incidents all the time. However, perhaps some coordination that would come from the Oakland TMC should contact every news department of radio and TV stations to alert the public.

Mr. Napier said this is a tool for Caltrans to minimize the pile up of traffic at an incident. This will help to get the word out but the primary focus is on the signals and managing the traffic.

Mr. Hurley said the focus is more on the incident but what the San Mateo County voters have tasked the TA CAC and the Board to do is to try to squeeze the efficiency of the infrastructure system currently in place so at times when there are no incidents we are still maximizing it. Mr. Napier said one of the things that he anticipates is that there is not a plan for Highway 101 and C/CAG hasn't tried to address it here, but this project makes it very easy to add cameras and signs because all that would need to be done is run a cable at maximum half the distance between the interchanges. Mr. Napier said at some point something separate from this relative to Highway 101 will need to be done including providing additional information, additional

monitoring, an array of things, which is something that C/CAG also plans on doing once the communication system is in place.

Mr. Shaine said he realizes the CAC doesn't have to vote on this but he recommends the CAC Chair's meeting summary to the Board include comments that this project has the CAC's enthusiastic approval and it is well planned and thought out.

Authorize Approval of the Allocation of \$11,678,056 in New Measure A Funds to the San Mateo County Transit District for Application Towards its Share of Caltrain's Fiscal Year 2013 Capital and Operating Budgets and to Support its Fiscal Year 2013 Paratransit Program (TA Item 10b)

Mr. Hurley said the TA makes these allocations annually. There are three components to this report, capital improvements on Caltrain, the San Mateo County share of the Operating Component, and the Paratransit Program for a total of \$12 million dollars.

Mr. Whittemore said the Capital Expenditures of \$3.9 in FY2013 was only \$3 million in FY2011 and has gone up considerably. He asked given the authorization of the electrification of Caltrain if there shouldn't be a reduction of the need in this category going forward. Mr. Hurley said there are still needs in terms of track work, maintenance and State of Good Repair projects.

Mr. Whittemore said Caltrain has deferred almost all of the long-term maintenance for a long time and has had this conversation for the last two years about deferral of long-term needs because of the short-term financial constraints. He said for all that increased money it really is just to do the basic minimum and asked if it is an equal payment from all three institutions. Mr. Hurley said it is an equal payment and the associated costs have gone up. He said the reason it is \$3.9 is because the TA had some carryover money from the previous year. The TA didn't expend all the money that was budgeted so it was carried over from FY2012 to FY2013.

Ms. Simonson said the staff report explains the Transportation Expenditure Plan and how it coordinates with the operating costs but didn't address the capital expenditure part. She asked if the TA is authorized to use Measure A funds towards capital. Mr. Hurley said prior to the New Measure A, the funds were limited to capital only but the New Measure A allowed operating to be a qualified expenditure.

Chair Arietta said Mr. Zimmerman wanted to emphasize that equal shares should be employed because in the past both San Francisco and Santa Clara counties have not paid equal shares. Mr. Hurley said that is true and there is a list of system-wide improvements that are necessary. The amount of programmed funding is driven by the county that is willing to bring the least amount of money to the budget and is where the shares are capped off, so no county will pay more than another. He said the bottom dollar amount any county is willing to contribute becomes the benchmark for the other two counties.

Mr. Shaine asked if the formula is based on boardings. Mr. Hurley said not with capital. Capital is based on thirds because they are considered system upgrades. Operating is based on the morning boarding formula.

A motion (Hedges/Shaine) to approve the support of the allocation passed.

Update on State and Federal Legislative Program (TA Item 11b)

Chair Arietta said Mr. Zimmerman asked for more information regarding the staff report statement, “Reauthorization of passenger rail programs, including High Speed Rail (HSR), was not included in the legislation and will need to be reauthorized before the expiration of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act in 2013.” Mr. Hurley said he will have to get back to the CAC with an answer.

Mr. Hees asked if the next agenda could include some explanation of where HSR is in the authorization pathway. He said it appears a lot of decisions have been made and it looks like the blended system was approved. Mr. Hurley said he will ask Seamus Murphy, Director, Government and Community Affairs to respond to this question and other associated Legislative issues at the next meeting. Mr. Hees said he’d like to know what has been accomplished and what is left open such as where funding exists and when it will be in jeopardy.

Mr. Hedges said the Federal Transportation Bill was passed. He said the funds are short over \$24 billion dollars and the funds were replaced with money from the General Fund. He said with the emphasis on increased mileage to as high as 54 miles per gallon in the future our roads would get less and less gas tax so a new way to fund these highways has to be found.

Mr. Warhurst asked if the Legislature previously passed half the money Caltrans needs for upgrades and if Caltrans got the other half together now. Mr. Hurley said this is a complicated situation so he will bring someone in to the next meeting to explain the answers.

Chair Arietta said she attended a meeting where Director of Caltrain Modernization Marian Lee gave an update and she will relay that information in her report.

Ms. Simonson said a paragraph in the staff report on agenda item 11b is missing some words. She said it reads, “Several additional before the Caltrain...” Chair Arietta said there is a partially incorrect date as well because it reads, “On July 18, the governor signed State Bill 1029,” and she said the governor actually signed it first on July 13 and a second time on July 18.

Mr. Shaine said he would like an update on the State Attorney General’s findings of the validity of the \$9 billion bond that was passed for HSR as it relates to the phased approach to construction and whether or not San Mateo County is part of the bookends.

Ms. Maez said she is curious if the transit funding or highway funding would be affected by the touted message that if the tax rates don’t change by the end of the year there will be drop-dead cuts and asked if that would include this type of funding.

Mr. Hurley said he was not in a position to provide an answer for those questions but he will make sure to get the answers for the group.

Approval of Minutes of June 7, 2012 (TA Item 4a)

No discussion

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for May 2012 (TA Item 4b)

Mr. Whittemore said the main chart under Total Excess Deficit for the 11 months of FY2012 ending in June shows the current actual in excess of almost \$22 million and yet the staff projection has it listed as a deficit of \$14 million. He is curious why it is so far off 11 months into the year. Chair Arietta commented that it is in effect a \$35 million dollar difference.

Mr. Whittemore said the CAC won't see the audited numbers for June year end until November 1. Mr. Hurley said he will come back with answers for the next meeting.

A motion (Hedges/Maez) to support the acceptance was passed.

Information on Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the Period Ending June 30, 2012 (TA Item 4c)

Mr. Whittemore said the report states that the TA is not going to be able to compile and present the year-end numbers before the November Board meeting because the TA has to go through a lot of extra diligence and review. He said the CAC may not see the report until two days before the Board meeting as it normally would. He said in the private world no one would take this much time for an audited annual report but he understands the need for the time and asked if any preliminary release of the information can be shared before the final publication. Mr. Hurley said the plan is the CAC will not see the information any sooner than two days before the November Board meeting just like with any other item, so the CAC will see the report at the October 30 CAC meeting.

SamTrans Liaison Report – June 13, 2012 (TA Item 7)

No discussion

REPORT OF THE CHAIR – BARBARA ARIETTA

Chair Arietta reported:

- Adina Levin from Friends of Caltrain is now on the JPB CAC along with three other new members.
- Chair Arietta attended the last Caltrain CAC meeting and Ms. Lee gave an update on Caltrain Modernization, including electrification, Positive Train Control, and HSR.
- Later this year a Caltrans committee will be seeking applicants who are willing to pay a fee to be a part of the historic opening of the Devil's Slide Tunnel. They want vehicles representing different decades of the past century of motor vehicles from the 1950's muscle cars to the 2012 hybrids. Fees for driving through the tunnel range from \$100 to \$3,000. Mr. Whittemore said he would pay \$3,500 if they will take only pedestrians and bicycles first.
- There is schedule change for the Measure A Highway CFP. The original schedule showed the TA Board expected approval of the funding recommendations at their September 6 meeting but the revised schedule shows the draft funding recommendations presented as an information item to the TA Board on September 6 and the expected Board approval in October.

Mr. Whittemore said the call period for the Highway CFP has ended so the TA is in the analysis stage. He requested a list of the locations of the items that have been submitted because he would like to visit each location before he votes. Mr. Hurley said the list will be presented in

September and the action will be taken the following month so there will be sufficient time to visit the locations.

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

Mr. Shaine asked if the latest Caltrain funding arrangements included money for passing tracks. Mr. Hurley said it only includes the Advanced Signal System/PTC, electrification of the system, and rolling stock. Chair Arietta said the revised environmental document will be looking at those types of issues.

Ms. Lasensky said she thought with electrification and more trains, grade separations would be required. Chair Arietta said the speed at which the trains will operate does not legally require there to be grade separations. However, the cities disagree. Mr. Hees said the Public Utilities Commission rules are tied into the Federal Railroad Administration rules that say if three tracks cross a street, grade separations are required, or if the trains go over a certain speed grade crossings are required. Chair Arietta said that speed is 110 miles per hour and at this point Caltrain is not legally required to have them because the trains do not go that speed. It doesn't mean Caltrain won't build them but it is not legally required to.

Ms. Maez said this may be one of the reasons that Senator Joe Simitian voted against that passage because he was concerned that there was not enough funding identified to complete the project.

REPORT FROM STAFF – JOE HURLEY

Mr. Hurley reported:

- The Highway CFP is moving forward.
- On behalf of the TA and the District, he thanked the CAC for its support of the Memorandum of Understanding for the early investment project.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Mr. Whittemore said he would like to see the response to the letter from the public about biodiesel fuel alternatives for trains. Mr. Whittemore said he has an urgent need to make these points: He said the United States has low interest rates in order to force people out of cash and into some sort of equity holding and that cannot be sustained much longer. The 10-year interest rate is at 1.5 percent but no one can buy a 10-year bond at that rate. He said what the U.S. has done is taken the entire balance sheet of the Federal Government in the last seven years and converted it to a floating rate mortgage—an adjustable rate mortgage with a balloon payment. He said the same thing that happened to the homeowners is going to happen to the government because money doesn't have its underlying worth any longer. The second interest rates go up 1.5 to 2 percent this portfolio will take a significant capital loss despite the fact that it is being run superbly by bright people. He said you need to understand that we have mortgaged the entire future on short-term debt and floating rates and the due date is coming. According to the *Wall Street Journal* taxpayers will start paying the interest and the first year interest will be \$380,000,000 and will be that plus more for the next 30 years. He said this is coincidentally about the same amount that education budget will be cut if sales tax does not pass in November.

Ms. Simonson asked if the property being discussed on the TA agenda is for the Broadway Interchange. Mr. Hurley said it was.

Mr. Messing left at 6:15 p.m.

Mr. Vargas said the Calera Parkway Project continues to be an issue of dismay to some people in Pacifica. She said there have been concerns the public process was not followed adequately, there have been California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) violations, and there is extreme disappointment in the City Council of Pacifica because the residents think the council has backed away from its responsibility. She said people are asking what can be done and what happens next. She said she heard reports the money has been allocated and the planning is proceeding. She asked if it is still the case the final environmental document will be released in September or October to allow for all the comments to be responded to. Mr. Hurley said the CEQA process was followed and knows of no violation of the CEQA process. He said it is important to recognize the comments received from the public may not be a representation of the residents as a whole. There are supporters and opponents of the project. He said the CEQA process is being followed and the team is being very careful to ensure it is being followed correctly. The TA has received many public records requests and all of that information has been provided. The TA is now probably looking more at the end of the year or first part of next year to publish the environmental document because identifying the preferred alternative had to be included and the council has to be given an opportunity to weigh in as the environmental process moves forward.

Ms. Vargas said another source of angst was the message board that went up before the southern portals of Devil's Slide. She said she did not remember voting for the message board or seeing it while she was on the Aesthetics Committee. She asked if it is the style of message board that is being used throughout the highway system. Mr. Hurley said Caltrans spent many months reviewing the aesthetics near the portals making sure they were consistent with the surrounding area. He said the sign structure came as a surprise and he will look into it to find out more about it. Ms. Vargas asked to find out who designed it and when it was approved. She said some of the people may feel betrayed by the sign because it does not fit in with the aesthetics. She said the sign should not be used except for emergencies or one-way traffic control because it would be distracting to drivers otherwise. Mr. Hurley said an incident on the road is the number one priority to determine when the sign would be used; an Amber Alert is the next priority. He said if the sign is illuminated all the time people tend to ignore the sign when a priority message is displayed.

Chair Arietta said she also receives a lot of messages from residents of Pacifica and those people definitely support the Calera Parkway Project.

Mr. Shaine said we should find a way to reserve a special place for Joe Hurley on the Devil's Slide Opening because this was the last project he worked on when he was employed by Caltrans. He said in addition to the sales tax proposed by the Governor, the County Board of Supervisors just voted to put a half-cent sales tax on the San Mateo ballot which might be controversial.

Mr. Shaine said the next meeting is scheduled for the day after Labor Day and might be a bad date to have the meeting and asked if it could be changed. Mr. Hurley said we do not have the flexibility to change the date.

Ms. Lasensky said Caltrain can't be modernized and electrified soon enough and more trains can't be added soon enough. It is both good news and bad news that the trains are packed.

Mr. Hedges said Muni in San Francisco links up with Caltrain, goes to the Marin Headlands, and only runs on Sundays. He said it costs \$1 each way. He said Caltrain from San Mateo is \$4.50 one way and \$5 for round trip, so for about \$11 he and his wife went to Marin Headlands and Fort Cronkhite. He said the bus runs every hour on the hour until pretty late at night. He saw an article that Las Vegas has a fairly detailed proposal for HSR to connect to Palmdale. He said one thing we lack in this country is vision and he hopes what vision exists doesn't go away due to lack of money and he will fight for these types of things. Caltrain is packed on Sunday. He took BART at 7:20 in the morning and it was packed by the time he got to Embarcadero. The Bay Area is using transit. He said there was a proposal brought up by San Francisco to dip into lifeline money to give out discounted children's passes but Alameda County experimented with it but had some bad times with it including truancy and other issues. He said similar proposals for Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and another agency would take 60 percent out of lifeline funds. He said lifeline funding goes to paratransit, and passes for people who are in work training. He is glad the proposal failed not because he wanted to deprive kids of the discounted tickets but because there's only so much money and he said you can't deprive parents of children the lifeline money because it helps low income people get to work.

Date and Time of Next Meeting

Tuesday, September 4, 2012 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.