

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

Draft

MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 1, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT: B. Arietta (Chair), K. Bond, A. Chen, E. El-Dardiry, J. Fox, P. Haynie, R. Hedges, K. Kuklin, J. Londer, O. O'Neill, S. Scruggs, S. Stamos, W. Warhurst

MEMBERS ABSENT: D. Bautista, J. Ward

STAFF PRESENT: J. Averill, C. Cubba, J. Hurley, L. Velasquez, N. Vigil

Chair Barbara Arietta called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. and Rich Hedges led the Pledge of Allegiance.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS

Kate Bond said she has lived in the county for 35 years, she is a gerontologist, and works with seniors in the community for whom transportation is always an issue.

Shaunda Scruggs arrived at 4:32 p.m.

An Chen said her family is in the hotel business in Palo Alto and the East Bay. She has been active in the Hillsborough schools and she is on the Stanford Hospital Facilities Board. With all her work, one thing they always talk about is traffic.

Essam El-Dardiry said he has lived in the county for six years and works for YouTube. He said he has a lot of family in the area that span a variety of ages and needs.

Pamela Haynie said she is a strategic planner, program director, manager of budgets, so she hopes that will bring an interesting light to the CAC.

Karen Kuklin said she has lived in the county for 20 years and is an architect.

Steve Stamos said he lives in San Mateo and works for the San Francisco County Transportation Authority and he is a fan of public transportation.

APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 4, 2016 MEETING MINUTES

Motion/Second: Hedges/Londer

Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta

Absent: Bautista, Fox, Ward

APPROVAL OF THE 2017 TA CAC MEETING CALENDAR

Motion/Second: Hedges/Londer

Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta

Absent: Bautista, Fox, Ward

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

ITEMS FOR REVIEW – NOVEMBER 3, 2016 TA BOARD MEETING

Acceptance of the Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review and Outlook for the Quarter Ended September 30, 2016 (TA Item 10a)

Motion/Second: Londer/Hedges

Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta

Absent: Bautista, Fox, Ward

Award of Contract to Mark Thomas & Company and AECOM Joint Venture to Provide On-Call General Engineering Consultant (GEC) Services for an Estimated Aggregate Not-to-Exceed Total of \$52.2 Million for a Three-Year Base Term (TA Item 10b)

Nita Vigil, Acting Director, Contracts and Procurement, said staff solicited a competitive procurement, four firms responded, none are Small Business Enterprises (SBE), but all have SBEs as subcontractors. This was a qualifications-based procurement.

John Fox arrived at 4:39 p.m.

Jeff Londer asked if the TA has allocated \$17.4 million a year to engineering services in the past. Ms. Vigil said there was a previous contract for the very same services. The \$17.4 million is actually an option year amount. The base term is \$52 million.

Mr. Londer asked if the TA uses it all every year. Joe Hurley, Director, TA Program, said the current GEC contract, which was entered into in 2007, expired last September. This is a GEC contract to use when the TA is asked to be the implementing agency on any component. This is a go-to source to do the work. It does not obligate the TA to spend this amount; it just gives the TA the contract authority capacity. This number is based on what staff estimates the needs to be for next five years. Under the recent contract the TA did not fully utilize the money because there was a slow start due to issues with matching funds for some projects. The US 101 Managed Lane (ML) Project has received support from the GECs under the recent contract and will from the new contract.

Mr. Londer asked what happens if there is one year that the TA does not use the full amount. Mr. Hurley said it carries over. This gives the TA the flexibility needed to adapt to a changing environment.

Ms. Scruggs said no SBEs or Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) submitted proposals. She asked what the definition is of an SBE or DBE, and what was the mechanism used to advertise the Request for Proposal (RFP). Ms. Vigil said the definition

is set by the State of California. She can send out the specific definition. There is a procurement website. Contract Officers reach out to the community to invite people to register on the website, and staff uses suggested vendors from previous procurement and conducts an extensive outreach.

Luis Velasquez, Senior Contract Officer, said typically what is considered an SBE is income driven. They have annual revenue of less than \$12.5 million aggregate. The primary contractors are not SBEs, but all of them include SBE/DBE firms as part of their bench. This means small businesses can get work from this contract

Ms. Scruggs said as background reference some cities don't score very well on RFPs for projects. There should be direct solicitation to groups that don't tend to submit in order to receive a diverse number of applicants for the proposals. When cities don't do well, it is an indication that they don't have the capacity and perhaps the TA should do more to assist them. If they never score well they will never get money. Perhaps the best methods to reach out to organizations that might fit the definition may not be the method that is currently being used. Mr. Velasquez said staff is working to develop a more formalized SBE program.

Mr. Hedges said occasionally the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has classes for SBE and minority-owned businesses on how to participate in Calls for Projects (CFP). Maybe this could be put on the TA website or send out e-mails to companies when those occur. Ms. Vigil said the TA SBE coordinator sponsored SBE outreach and invitations were sent around the region.

Chair Arietta asked if the city assesses what it is that they don't do well when they consistently score low. Ms. Scruggs said perhaps it is not that the cities don't know what they're doing, but that they don't have the capacity and perhaps the TA should provide assistance targeting those that don't score well because if they continue to not do well they never get dollars.

Mr. Hurley said the CAC may be confusing the issues. One issue is cities during a CFP process that don't score well as opposed to going through a competitive RFP process. Staff understands the level of outreach necessary to engage the SBEs. The Contracts and Procurement staff has done outreach. There was a meeting in this building in an effort to let SBEs network and to engage into the bigger enterprises and to collaborate.

William Warhurst said by definition if an SBE were to get this contract they would no longer be a small business. Ms. Vigil said there is a cap on how much earnings a business can make to be considered an SBE. The primes supplement the SBEs and use them as sub-consultants.

Mr. Warhurst said this is a successful outreach because the size of the contract is too large by definition to have SBE. Ms. Vigil said it could be an SBE when they propose, but they won't be once they get the contract.

Mr. Velasquez said when staff issues the document, there are instructions and forms that the prime has to submit to document the outreach they have done and they identify

the companies they are going to submit and summarize which are DBEs and SBEs. Staff conducts a pre-proposal meeting, publicizes it on the website, does outreach, publishes a solicitation in the local newspaper, and encourages SBEs to team up.

Mr. Londer asked if these companies are the same that the TA used before. Mr. Hurley said prior to this there were three different firms available, but the rules changed so the TA can only have one, and this one is a joint venture between two of the three GECs that the TA currently uses.

Motion/Second: Hedges/Londer

Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta

Absent: Bautista, Ward

Receive and File the Semi-Annual Measure A Program Status Report (TA Item 4e)

Motion/Second: Londer/Hedges

Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta

Absent: Bautista, Ward

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for Fiscal Year Ending June 2016 (Unaudited) (TA Item 4c)

Mr. Londer said the agenda says Fiscal Year Ending June 30, but the title of the report says Period Ending June 30, and the action says the month of June 2016.

Carl Cubba, Director, Treasury, said the description "period end" is synonymous with "year end" or "month end." They are accounting periods for financial reporting purposes. The report is only for the month of June, which is the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. Warhurst said the agenda says Fiscal Year Ending June but the report is only for June. He said the question was if the agenda should be amended to say this is the report for the month of June rather than fiscal year ending June so it will reflect a month instead of a whole year. Mr. Cubba said it is the report for the month of June, but it reflects the final month of the fiscal year.

Motion to change the agenda to Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the Period Ending June 30, 2016.

Motion/Second: Hedges/Londer

Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta

Absent: Bautista, Ward

Motion to accept the Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the Period Ending June 2016.

Motion/Second: Hedges/Londer

Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta

Absent: Bautista, Ward

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for September 2016 (TA Item 4d)

Ms. Haynie asked if the Fiscal Year is July 1 through June 30. Mr. Cubba said yes.

Motion/Second: Londer/Haynie

Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs, Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta

Absent: Bautista, Ward

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

Mr. Hurley said staff tracks all of the legislation that is pertinent to transportation and if the TA takes a position on any of the specific legislation it is shown in the agenda packet.

Program Report: U.S. Route 101/State Route 92 Interchange (TA Item 11a)

Mr. Hurley presented:

- Preliminary Planning Study (PPS)
 - TA (funding and implementer) and the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) (sponsor) joint effort with input from the California State Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the city of San Mateo, the city of Foster City, and consultant
 - Assess traffic deficiencies, develop project purpose and need
 - Develop alternatives with stakeholders; evaluate costs, impacts and benefits
 - Recommend short- and long-term projects to move forward into the Caltrans Project Initiation Document (PID) phase
- Previous studies include
 - State Route (SR) 92 Project Study Report (PSR)/Project Development Support (PDS) (2001)
 - US 101/SR 92 Area Study (2013)
 - SR 92/SR 82 Project Report (PR) (2014)
 - US 101 High Occupancy Vehicle PSR/PDS
- Project purpose: Improve traffic flow and safety, and increase mobility through the US 101/ SR 92 Interchange area by minimizing traffic conflict locations and improving peak-period travel times within project limits along US 101 and SR 92
- Project need: Overall substantial delay and congestion at the US 101 and SR 92 Interchange
- Alternatives development
 - Evaluated seven short-term and 21 long-term alternatives
 - Brainstorming session with cities of San Mateo and Foster City, C/CAG and TA

- Shortlisted nine basic alternatives
- Presented to Caltrans
- Revised alternatives based on Caltrans comments; cost estimates, impact evaluations, design exceptions and traffic operations benefits incorporated into final PPS June 2016
- Naming convention for alternatives
 - Short-term alternatives: A
 - Projects that can be implemented more quickly through streamlined Permit Engineering Evaluation Report (PEER) Caltrans process
 - Projects with relatively low total cost (less than \$10 million)
 - Long-term alternatives: X, Y, Z
 - Projects that require full Caltrans oversight process (planning, environmental, design) and take longer to implement
 - Projects with relatively high total cost (more than \$10 million)
 - Projects that provide more traffic and safety improvements
- Alternatives rated on various criteria
 - Safety
 - Low: No improvement to weave/merge areas; minimal mobility improvement could potentially lower rear-end type of accidents
 - High: Clear safety improvement by eliminating unsafe merges at weave conflict locations
 - Environmental
 - Low: Minimal impact that could likely be cleared with Categorical Exemption/Categorical Exclusion (CE/CE) approval
 - Medium: Not CE/CE, but avoids adverse impacts and may qualify for Initial Study/Environmental Assessment approval
 - High: Adverse impacts requiring Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement
 - Right of way
 - Low: May have only temporary construction easement requirements
 - Medium: May require partial right of way acquisitions or sliver takes
 - High: Full right of way acquisitions potentially requiring relocations
- Summary of alternatives along US 101
 - 1X (\$52 million) improves weaving and operations, high safety benefit, needs further evaluation to determine impact to local traffic circulation, medium environmental impact, medium right of way impact
 - 1Y (\$89 million) improves weaving and operations (northbound only), high safety benefit, needs further evaluation to determine impact to local traffic circulation, medium environmental impact, high right of way impact
 - 2X (\$93 million) improves operations for ML users (westbound SR 92 to US 101) and operations for US 101, low safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, medium to high environmental impact, medium right of way impact

- 3A (\$3.3 million) low operations benefit, low to medium safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, low environmental impact, no right of way impact
- 3X (\$6.5 million) operational benefit (northbound only), low to medium safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, low environmental impact, low right of way impact
- Summary of alternatives along SR 92
 - 7A (\$7 million) improves operations for ML users (westbound SR 92 to southbound US 101 only), low safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, low environmental impact, no right of way impact
 - 8A (\$3.5 million) improves weaving and operations, high safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, low environmental impact, no right of way impact
 - 8X (\$40 million) improves weaving and operations, high safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, high environmental impact, low right of way impact
 - 8Y (\$58 million) low weaving improvement, low safety benefit, no impact to local traffic circulation, high environmental impact, medium right of way impact
 - 8Z (\$103 million) improves weaving and operations, high safety benefit, needs further evaluation to determine impact to local traffic circulation, high environmental impact, medium right of way impact
 - 8ZX (\$154 million) improves weaving and operations, high safety benefit, needs further evaluation to determine impact to local traffic circulation, high environmental impact, high right of way impact
 - 9A (\$500,000) low operations benefit, low safety benefit, needs further evaluation to determine impact to local traffic circulation, low environmental impact, no right of way impact
 - 9Y (\$47 million) improves weaving and operations, high safety benefit, needs further evaluation to determine impact to local traffic circulation, high environmental impact, medium right of way impact
- Recommended alternatives and packages
 - Short term: Alternatives 3A, 7A, 8A, and 9A (\$14 million)
 - Long term reduced package: 1X, 3X, 8X, 9Y (\$146 million)
 - Long term alternate package: 1Y, 3X, 8Z, and 9Y (\$246 million)
 - Long term primary package: 1X, 2X, 3X, 8ZX, and 9Y (\$353 million)
- Next steps
 - Project sponsor(s) to determine which alternatives to advance using stakeholder input, regional goals and anticipated funding ranges
 - Sponsor to pursue Measure A or other source to fund effort
 - Engage Caltrans with pre-PID meeting to discuss project purpose and need and project development path
 - Prepare PEER, PID, and PR or PID as appropriate to program funding; gain project approval

Mr. Hedges said the cost seems low. The biggest problem with flyovers over the lagoon is there are several permitting agencies for work in that area.

Ms. Scruggs asked what will happen to the land beneath the two cloverleaves that are being eliminated. Mr. Hurley said it will probably be used for stormwater runoff.

Ms. Scruggs said according to an article she read in the Daily Journal, changes to the SR 92/El Camino Real or SR 92/US 101 interchanges might impact the housing along Ivy Street in San Mateo.

Mr. Warhurst asked if on the list of recommended alternatives there are any quantifications of how much traffic would be improved by any metric that is normally used for these packages. Mr. Hurley said that would be done as part of the PID. This study identifies the problem that contributes to the congestion and what it would take to mitigate if not eliminate the problem.

Mr. Stamos said two new stoplights are being installed on El Camino Real. He asked if staff is anticipating significant traffic impacts with those lights. Mr. Hurley said they will be coordinated with the existing signals to move traffic through the area smoothly.

Mr. Stamos asked what the timeline is for the next steps on the improvements to the SR 92/US 101 Interchange. Mr. Hurley said staff is targeting to issue a CFP in the fall next year.

Adoption of Conflict of Interest Code (TA Item 4f)

Motion/Second: Hedges/Haynie

Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs,
Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta

Absent: Bautista, Ward

Approval of 2017 Board of Directors Meeting Calendar (TA Item 4b)

Motion/Second: Londer/Haynie

Ayes: Bond, Chen, El-Dardiry, Fox, Haynie, Hedges, Kuklin, Londer, O'Neill, Scruggs,
Stamos, Warhurst, Arietta

Absent: Bautista, Ward

Approval of Minutes of October 6, 2016 (TA Item 4a)

No discussion.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR – BARBARA ARIETTA

See attachment for Chair Arietta's complete report.

REPORT FROM STAFF – JOE HURLEY

Mr. Hurley said a scoping meeting for the US 101 ML Project was held October 27. This provided a forum for good, engaged discussions with the public. The public shared concerns about social equity, enforcement, time of implementation and funding. The intent of the scoping meeting was to solicit input from the community in terms of what things need to be considered in the environmental process. Comments will be welcome through November 18. The environmental document being prepared will explore the alternatives and assess the environmental impacts associate with those alternatives. This will take 28 months. Technical studies will be prepared, the results are

put together, and a draft document will be circulated to public, which includes a public comment period. The draft won't go out until next summer at the soonest.

Mr. Warhurst said he could not find any reference to the scoping meeting on the TA website. Mr. Hurley said it was on the home page under current issues.

Mr. Warhurst said it was not there the day before the meeting. The most current news on the TA website was from June. It is sometimes hard to know what all the feasible alternatives are. Mr. Hurley said it was shared at the meeting and should now be on the website. He will send out a link to that information.

MEMBER COMMENTS/REQUESTS

Mr. Stamos asked if staff will be coordinating with San Francisco and Santa Clara counties on creating a contiguous managed lane. Mr. Hurley said staff has been meeting extensively with San Francisco. This environmental document looks at the project through Interstate 380, but the TA is also in discussions with San Francisco about Interstate 380 north to Interstate 280 and off to King Street.

Mr. Fox left at 6:07 p.m.

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, November 29, 2016 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070

Adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

From: Barbara Arietta <barietta@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 12:07 PM
To: Averill, Joshua
Subject: **** CHAIR'S REPORT TO CAC - 11/1/2016****

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2040

The public comment period for the San Mateo County Public Transportation Plan ended on October 31, 2016. The City/County Association of County Governments (CCAG) recently held three public workshops looking for public input on updating the current San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan, which is a comprehensive document that aims to create consistent planning goals through 2040.

It's the second rendition of the 2010 Plan that was issued in 2001 and provides keen insight into how mobility patterns of those who live or work in San Mateo County have changed. I have reported below some highlights of information from the draft document.

By 2040, total travel in San Mateo County is due to increase by 22 percent from 2015 levels. Transit is expected to grow by 67% and biking is projected to grow by 64%. However, the automobile is predicted to continue to reign supreme, according to the draft document.

An estimated 70 percent of those who commute to work in the County drive alone, and by 2040, there will be an estimated 116,000 car trips from those commuting solo or via a rideshare.

Outside of heading to work only 47 percent of people drive when traveling around San Mateo County.

The average San Mateo County household has 2.7 cars and there are more registered vehicles than licensed drivers. Street and highways remain in high demand.

In 2013, the county's estimated 2,100 miles of roads accommodated 18.7 million vehicle miles traveled everyday.

In 2015, almost a dozen high traffic road segments received an "F" grade during peak travel times...many are along Highway 101 and connector freeways that lead to Interstate 280 and the East Bay.

By 2040, the county's population is expected to increase by 150,000 residents and another 70,000 jobs will be added.

Expanding highways to account for cars is neither economically nor geographically feasible throughout most of the county. Therefore promoting mass transit and using technology to promote mobility is key, according to the draft.

By 2040 an estimated 448,000 people will travel into and out of San Mateo County every day, which will be a 24% increase.

Respectfully submitted,

BARBARA ARIETTA
Chair, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, CAC