

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

**AGENDA**

**March 31, 2009 - Tuesday**

**4:30 PM**

1. Pledge of Allegiance
2. Call to Order/Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes from March 3, 2009
4. Public Comment  
Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to three minutes
5. Program: TSM/Alternative Congestion Relief (TA Item 11c)
6. Transportation Authority Board Meeting Agenda for April 2, 2009
  - a. Approval of Minutes of March 5, 2009 (TA Item 3a)
  - b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for February 2009 (TA Item 3b)
  - c. South San Francisco Ferry Allocation Update (TA Item 6a)
  - d. SamTrans Liaison Report – March 3, 2009 (TA Item 7a)
  - e. SamTrans Liaison Report – March 11, 2009 (TA Item 7b)
  - f. Allocation of \$15,000 to the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance from Transportation Authority Measure A Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Funds of the Fiscal Year 2009 Operating Budget (TA Item 10a)
  - g. Authorize Award of Contract to PBS & J to provide Program Management Services for a Total Not-to-Exceed Cost of \$20,000,000 for a Five-year Period. (TA Item 10b)
  - h. Verbal Update on State Legislative Program (TA Item 11a)
  - i. Verbal Update on Federal Legislative Program (TA Item 11b)
7. Report of the Chair (Pat Dixon)
8. Report from Staff (Joe Hurley)
9. Member Comments/Requests
10. Date, Time and Place of Next Meeting: Tuesday, May 5, 2009 at 4:30 p.m.,  
San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium,  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070
11. Adjournment

*All items on this agenda are subject to action*

**CAC MEMBERS:** Barbara Arietta • Jim Bigelow • Pat Dixon (Chair) • John Fox • Rich Hedges • Randall Hees • Steve Krause • Austin Mader-Clark • Doris Maez • Larry Shaine • Nancy Stern • April Vargas • Paul Young (Vice-Chair) • George Zimmerman

## **INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC**

If you have questions on the agenda, please contact the Assistant Authority Secretary at 650.508.6223. Assisted listening devices are available upon request. Agendas are available on the Transportation Authority Website at [www.smcta.com](http://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. [Click here for map.](#)

### **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](mailto: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  
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY  
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070  
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor**

**MINUTES OF MARCH 3, 2009**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** B. Arietta, J. Bigelow, P. Dixon (Chair), J. Fox,  
R. Hedges R. Hees, S. Krause, A. Mader-Clark, D. Maez, L. Shaine,  
N. Stern, A. Vargas, P. Young (Vice Chair), G. Zimmerman

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None

**STAFF PRESENT:** T. Bartholomew, J. Hurley, M. Knuckles, R. Lake

Chair Pat Dixon called the meeting to order at 4:36 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Doris Maez wanted her comment on page 8 to read, “Everyone should review this plan which turns HOV lanes into combined HOV/HOT lanes.” Paul Young wanted his comment on page 8 to read, “When parking is free, you had to be there before 8:30 a.m. to get a spot.” With these corrections a motion (Hees/Bigelow) to approve the minutes of February 3, 2009 was passed.

**ITEMS FOR REVIEW – MARCH 5, 2009 TA BOARD AGENDA**

**Approval of Minutes of February 5, 2009 – TA Item 3a**

No discussion.

**Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for January 2009 – TA Item 3b**

George Zimmerman noted year-to-date revenues are under budget with interest income 38 percent worse than projected due to investment losses. He asked if this was due to the Lehman Brothers losses in the County Pool. Mr. Hurley said reduction of interest is twofold: Interest income reductions are affected by Lehman losses but are also reduced due to lower interest rates than projected.

Mr. Zimmerman asked where or which projects would be cut back as a result of TA investment losses. Mr. Hurley said dollars committed for specific projects will be honored.

Barbara Arietta asked if any projects have been saved by possible federal stimulus funding. Mr. Hurley said he couldn't say if any projects have been saved by stimulus funding and the rules associated with stimulus funding seem to be changing on a regular basis.

Mr. Hurley said the types of projects that will benefit from stimulus funding are projects that can get on the streets quickly such as road rehabilitation projects. He said if all these projects hit the street at the same time there will be a few contractors with a lot of work and they will be in the catbird seat as far as bidding because the contractors understand that cities need to obligate the stimulus money. This situation could be a concern for bidding on TA projects.

Chair Dixon said projects need to be shovel-ready to receive stimulus money. Mr. Hurley said the priority for stimulus money seems to be speed rather than quality of the project.

Rich Hedges asked if there will be stimulus money for long-term transportation projects. Mr. Hurley said there are project requirements for 90 and 180 day time periods.

Ms. Arietta said it would seem all transportation departments and administrations hopefully have ongoing dialogue to educate staffs about the fact that if everybody has shovel-ready projects this will put them back in the catbird seat for the contractor. Mr. Hurley said a focus of the stimulus funding application is how many jobs can be created and how quickly.

Ms. Maez said there doesn't seem to be any qualifications about the quality of the jobs. Mr. Hurley said that is the discussion and if there is a prevailing wage, there must be compliance.

April Vargas arrived at 4:49 p.m.

Jim Bigelow said he spent a day last week at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). There is a third component to stimulus funding, which is \$8 billion for High Speed Rail (HSR).

1. HSR has projects in Southern California and on the Peninsula including 100 percent for grade separation in San Bruno because it's ready with four tracks. HSR projects include Caltrain electrification as long as the final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) gets approved soon. The HSR paper discusses the train box at the Transbay Terminal, which is a \$400 million project. It is a problematic project between Caltrain, HSR and Transbay Terminal staffs due to adequacy of tracks and a longer throat required for the length of HSR trains.
2. There are six grade separations between Anaheim and Los Angeles, which total \$2 billion. Those funds are to be obligated by the end of 2011; but it is stimulus money.
3. If the TA could receive stimulus funding for the San Bruno grade separation it could make up for the Lehman Brothers losses.

Mr. Hedges said Mr. Bigelow's comments refer to long-term stimulus funding because HSR and other infrastructure projects are beyond 180 day projects.

Mr. Bigelow said the MTC will review at their March meeting which projects they will be advocating for in Washington D.C. in April.

Randy Hees asked if the South San Francisco Ferry Project is close to shovel-ready and if it could receive federal stimulus funding. Mr. Hurley said this is correct. The TA is not the project sponsor. The Water Emergency Transit Authority (WETA) is pursuing stimulus funding as an additional funding source.

### **South San Francisco Ferry Allocation Update – TA Item 6a**

Mr. Hurley reported:

1. The funding agreement has not yet been executed. The TA and WETA legal staffs are working on issues with insurance requirements that were identified in the agreement.
2. WETA's Board will meet on March 5 to take up the funding agreement.
3. WETA has issues with funding sources including Prop 1B money, which is to pay the lease from the Department of Boating and Waterways for the terminal and berths. Prop 1B funding is on hold by the state so there could be the potential exchange of funds with stimulus funding.

Larry Shaine asked if the resignation of the executive director of WETA would affect progress of the project. Mr. Hurley said WETA's Chief Financial Officer Nina Reynolds is the Interim Director.

**SamTrans Liaison Report February 11, 2009 – TA Item 7a**

No discussion

**Program**

**Verbal Update on State Legislative Program TA Item 10a**

No discussion

**Verbal Update on Federal Legislative Program – TA Item 10b**

No discussion

**Capital Projects Status Report – 2nd Quarter Fiscal Year 2009 – TA Item 10c**

Mr. Zimmerman said the reduced print in the report is a challenge to read. He asked if Project 00727-Downtown Extension, describes only planning and design stages. Mr. Hurley said this is correct and the project has to do only with preliminary engineering associated with the Downtown Extension between the 4<sup>th</sup> and King Caltrain station and the Transbay Terminal.

Mr. Shaine said the word, “spur,” used in the Dumbarton Rail Spur Project is confusing because the Dumbarton Rail phase is not a spur but the entire bridge. Mr. Hurley said the word, “spur,” will be removed from the report. He said the Capital Projects Status Report is a work in progress and comments are welcomed.

Mr. Bigelow said the pedestrian bridge at Broadway in Burlingame was dedicated and opened but seems to be closed. Mr. Hurley said he was not aware of any closure there is a temporary adjustment to the westside landing, but that did not close the passenger overcrossing.

**Program Report: Transit (Caltrain Electrification) – TA Item 10d**

No discussion

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR – PAT DIXON**

- Attended the Caltrain celebration for completion of improvements at the California Avenue and Palo Alto Caltrain stations on February 26.

Mr. Zimmerman said the brief presented by former state senator Becky Morgan on the evolution of the state purchase of Caltrain from Southern Pacific and formation of the Caltrain Joint Powers Board was interesting. It demonstrates when there is leadership, things get done.

- A HSR outreach meeting is scheduled for tomorrow in Redwood City at the Veteran's Memorial building at 7 p.m.

Ms. Maez said she attended the HSR outreach meeting in Millbrae and was disappointed not to hear anything that led to meaningful discussion.

Mr. Hees said HSR is asking the public for concerns about HSR impacts but, based on environmental rules, they are not really supposed to make any statements because they have

not done enough research. HSR staff should only be gathering information from the public. HSR staff is asking the public for concerns but ending up with a hodgepodge of complaints.

John Fox said people will pay attention to HSR when it is happening down their street. This, in a way, highlights the decision to do the routing through San Jose up the Peninsula. It would make more sense for HSR to come in from the East Bay but San Jose insisted, and used its clout basically to say, every train has to go through San Jose, which sets up conflict on the Peninsula. He said there is still an ongoing lawsuit on a decision to route HSR through the Pacheco pass rather than the East Bay. He said it might be more politically acceptable to people if HSR came in from an East Bay terminus or something that splits with some trains going north and some going south with the last bit of service running on the Caltrain right of way without the HSR component. His comments were in the context of what people hear from the public.

Mr. Hees said there are many hysterical inaccurate community responses to HSR. He said if he were a Caltrain official he would be very careful at this point to distance himself even though Caltrain could support HSR by adding true facts. He said if the numbers are correct a majority of Palo Alto citizens are not marching in the streets with HSR concerns. Palo Alto is likely not to be one of the highly impacted cities compared to San Mateo and Burlingame.

Austin Mader-Clark said people interested in transportation who live along the corridor are vocal against HSR coming up the Peninsula. She said most people without involvement in HSR, and people who live in San Francisco and along the Peninsula want HSR to go into San Francisco and don't want to fly out of San Francisco. They want HSR to get them to Los Angeles in two and one-half hours.

Chair Dixon said people think HSR will travel at 125 miles per hour along the Peninsula, which is not the case; HSR trains will travel the same speed as local trains.

Mr. Hedges asked if HSR has the power of eminent domain. Mr. Bigelow said when HSR gets into the project level to do construction they will have a mechanism in place to help them statewide, perhaps through Caltrans, to do right of way acquisition along the Caltrain corridor, possibly as a joint venture project.

## **REPORT FROM STAFF**

Mr. Hurley reported:

1. Paratransit funding losses:
  - a) CAC members shared concerns at the February meeting regarding paratransit trust fund financing, impacts on service and budgets that may be affected by the Lehman Brothers losses in the County Pool.
  - b) A formal presentation will be scheduled in the future to address these concerns in greater detail.
  - c) There is a District commitment that there will be no adverse impacts to paratransit services as a result of financial losses. SamTrans is going to fund any deficiency that would have occurred as a result of funding deficiencies through the one-half cent sales tax.
  - d) SamTrans' Fiscal Year 2009 operating budget has \$14 million for paratransit service. Of that \$14 million, about 55 percent was paid for by SamTrans' one-half cent sales tax,

- 22 percent was paid by TA sales tax, about 4 percent by farebox revenue and some state funding.
- e) Any reduction in paratransit funds due to Lehman losses will be backfilled with the SamTrans' one-half cent sales tax, which will ensure no adverse effects on paratransit services.
2. Smart Corridor Project:
- a) CAC members raised concerns at the February meeting on the Smart Corridor Project.
  - b) The goal is to have a project in place to deal with traffic congestion and lessen impacts on local streets as a result of a major incident on Highway 101.
  - c) Rich Napier, Executive Director City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) of San Mateo County recounted two stories of being involved in highway incidents with associated problems. The Smart Corridor Project will try to enhance and make the roadways more intelligent and plan the most appropriate focused route around an incident to reduce traffic impacts on local streets and roads with cameras and sensors and signal timing systems. Mr. Napier suggested a presentation on the Smart Corridor Project be made to the CAC at a future date.
3. Attended a conference last month on alternative delivery methods. Typically when a contract goes out, the project is designed, put out to bid and bids are submitted, which can be a time consuming process. Alternative delivery methods are replacing this process, which is called design-build. In this process only a portion of the project would be designed and then the contractor who would be tasked with building it would participate in development of the project. The TA is looking at this process in order to accelerate project delivery.
4. The CAC membership should represent the county as a whole. Outreach has been unsuccessful in recruiting students.

### **COMMITTEE COMMENTS**

Steve Krause is looking forward to future presentations on paratransit funding and the Smart Corridor Project. The CAC should be a forum to learn about issues in order to communicate effectively with the community.

Nancy Stern said there is no representation on the CAC from East Palo Alto.

Mr. Fox said east Menlo Park has needs for transit, connectivity and ease of access and would be a good constituent to identify.

Ms. Mader-Clark attended a national biodiesel conference in San Francisco. One highlight was the cooperation in the different departments in the City of San Francisco to work together for restaurant grease collection, which is turned into biodiesel fuel. She said 20 percent of diesel vehicles in San Francisco now use biodiesel, which lowers emissions by 60 percent.

Paul Young asked if there has been any thought for alternative delivery methods with design/build/maintain. Mr. Hurley said this has more to do with Caltrans activities. The contractor is involved in part of the design and they become responsible for maintenance, which may mean moving to privatization of the state system.

Mr. Shaine asked if there will be any high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes on Highway 101 in the 3<sup>rd</sup> to Millbrae Auxiliary Lane Project. Mr. Hurley said this will be up for discussion and the TA, MTC and C/CAG have engaged a consultant to collect data and study HOV and High

Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes on Highway 101 with a draft of findings to be finalized this summer.

Mr. Shaine asked who is paying for the HOV/HOT lane study. Mr. Hurley said MTC is paying but the TA and C/CAG have oversight.

Ms. Maez suggested sources for CAC representation from East Palo Alto may come from Peninsula Interfaith Action that uses congregations for community action work. Mr. Hurley said this would be a good lead for CAC applicants.

Chair Dixon said that in order to pass HOV/HOT lanes in San Mateo County, it will be necessary to allow single drivers in HOV lanes.

Mr. Hees said HOT lanes bother him because they take something, theoretically, he paid for in tax dollars and will be charged to use. On the other hand there is a great deal of evidence that freeways are undervalued and therefore, we use it wastefully. It is like parking - when you start charging a nominal fee people stop wasting the resource; HOT lanes may actually reduce traffic.

Mr. Hedges said MTC, without characterizing what they are saying, intends to use seed money to build the first HOT lanes and HOT money to expand the system. He thinks this is really a mechanism to not only maintain the roads but to raise revenue because it is impossible to raise the gas tax in California.

Mr. Hurley said in terms of the HOT lane component you can only have a HOT lane if there is excess capacity in the HOV lane. If HOV lanes fill up there is no HOT component. The priority is to preserve the lane for HOV users.

Mr. Hedges asked if the project will be done by congestion pricing.

Mr. Fox said congestion pricing models should be reviewed and he offered to do a presentation at a future meeting. He said until resources are priced, if the idea in building HOT lanes is to have more transit capacity; the HOV model gets more people per 8-12 feet of concrete per minute or hour than the HOT model. If the plan is to raise revenue, but reduce the actual capacity of the roadway and not give those people who carpool or ride in a multiple occupancy vehicle the benefits of time, then he thinks we are going down the wrong path because you would then have to do congestion pricing across the roadway and charge the people effectively less who are in a multi-occupancy vehicle.

Mr. Hurley said there was a proposal to raise the state gas tax 12 cents a gallon but was eliminated in budget discussions.

#### **NEXT MEETING**

The next regular meeting of the TA CAC will be held on Tuesday, March 31, 2009 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

6:04 p.m.