

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

MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 29, 2009

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: D. Mensing, A. Vargas

STAFF PRESENT: A. Fung, E. Glover, C. Harvey, J. Hurley, R. Lake, L. Larano

Chair Pat Dixon called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m. Richard Hedges led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion (Hees/Arietta) to approve the minutes of September 1, 2009 was passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Pat Giorni, Burlingame, said the new Measure A allocates 3 percent to the bicycle/pedestrian category. She asked if it would be possible to use new Measure A funding from the highway/traffic category to allocate more funding to the bicycle/pedestrian category in light of the recent passage of the California Complete Streets Act and AB 1581, which states the State of California recognizes bicyclists are legitimate users of the roadways.

ITEMS FOR REVIEW – OCTOBER 1, 2009 TA BOARD AGENDA

There was no discussion on the following items:

1. Approval of Minutes of September 3, 2009 – TA Item 3a
2. Update: South San Francisco Ferry Service – TA Item 6a
3. SamTrans Liaison Report – September 9 – TA Item 7a

Approve Amendment to the Fiscal Year 2010 Capital Budget and Allocation to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board for the South San Francisco Parking Lot Improvement Project in the Amount of \$1,515,000 – TA Item 10(a)

Director of TA Program Joe Hurley said the JPB has a project to reconstruct the South San Francisco Caltrain Station which included the refurbishments to the parking lot. Work on this project has been suspended in part due to the right of way negotiation with Union Pacific Railroad (UP) and the uncertainty of the scope of the High Speed Rail (HSR) project. Passengers are subjected to the parking lot disrepair and flooding in bad weather. The JPB has developed a plan to move forward with a separate project to address needed improvements including drainage pavement refurbishment as well as draining and lighting upgrades. Staff recommends amendment to the FY2010 capital budget by creating a new line item titled “South San Francisco Parking Lot Improvements” under the Caltrain program in an amount of \$1,515,000 and allocation of \$1.5 million to the JPB for 100 percent design, contracting and construction of the Caltrain station parking lot project.

George Zimmerman asked if the improvements will result in an increase in parking spaces. Mr. Hurley said there may be an increase in the number of paved spaces.

Jim Bigelow said any improvements to the South San Francisco Station are a step in the right direction. Improved facilities will benefit and enhance the ridership on Caltrain.

John Fox arrived at 4:41 p.m.

Mr. Hedges said he thought the station would be moved, and if so, how will the parking lot serve the station. He asked about current use and lighting and wondered if the funding, given the state of monies, could find a better use elsewhere.

Doris Maez said improvement costs would equal \$20,474 per space. She asked how that could factor into recovering the costs over time.

Paul Young arrived at 4:43 p.m.

Senior Engineer and Project Manager Allan Fung said project costs of \$1.5 million include all design and 25 percent contingency.

Randy Hees asked about future track arrangements and if the parking lot is going to be paved to standards of a new station or is to be a short-term situation. Deputy CEO Chuck Harvey said, to his knowledge, there are no plans to move the station from the current location. Concerns about track alignment relating to the HSR project are holding up the station reconstruction project in addition to yard tracks used by UP. Caltrain is in negotiations with UP to reconfigure the location of the designated tracks and also accommodate the station.

Mr. Hees asked if the project includes landscaping. Mr. Fung replied no. The project includes drainage improvements, curbs and gutters.

Larry Shaine asked if the project is funded with carryover funds from the old or new Measure A. Mr. Hurley said this is from old Measure A funding.

Barbara Arietta asked if cost of improvement per space is excessive. Mr. Fung said the project includes drainage lines and lighting in addition to paving.

Ms. Arietta asked about adding landscaping. Mr. Fung said this would increase costs because there would need to be irrigation and water lines installed to the site. Ms. Arietta asked for a cost estimate. Mr. Fung will report back to Ms. Arietta.

Mr. Bigelow asked if paving will be of any benefit to shuttle buses and to the area where shuttles enter the lot. Mr. Fung said the shuttle system will remain in the same location and the area will be paved where shuttles come into the parking lot.

Mr. Fox said people are concerned about the cost per parking spot, and if you think of this as part of a transportation system, if that amount of money is invested in facilities, that would encourage someone to get to the station by bicycle or pedestrian facility. It would cost less than \$20,000 and it takes one car out and is a more inexpensive way to solve the problem. He said the TA has

a responsibility to make sure they recognize the cost effectiveness of all modalities. If planned improvements are going to be done at the station and don't provide adequate facilities or a safe method to have pedestrian access, and if this could be done for an investment that is quite modest compared to what will be spent per parking space, we are missing the picture of the role of the TA.

Mr. Hedges asked for a breakdown of drainage and other improvement costs and, specifically, what the parking improvements will cost because he thinks the project costs are steep. Mr. Fung asked if he wanted the breakdown by construction costs only because the \$1.5 million project cost includes many soft costs. Mr. Hedges said he only wants cost for the parking spaces without the drainage.

Charles King asked if you could scale one parking space out of the scenario and accommodate other things. Mr. Fox said to do only the parking lot and not recognize other modalities is missing the point because you may need less of a parking lot, and it may be beneficial to encourage other modalities.

Mr. Hurley clarified that this is a philosophical question and not a request to carve out components of this particular project but something to influence the TA's decision-making in the future.

Mr. Bigelow said when staff does station planning they are very good at accommodating Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements and use in station design. There would be a station designed if there were no HSR issues. He said that money doesn't come out of the fund; it comes out of Caltrain funds that come from the half-cent sales tax. Stations have bicycle capacity and lockers and there are accommodations beyond the car parking area. When the South San Francisco station is redesigned and comes before the CAC with plans, members can request specific design elements.

Mr. Hees said he would like to see an artist's rendition of the parking lot improvement project. He suggested, given the cost of the project, positive elements be included for bicyclists and pedestrians and a clean route for shuttles.

Paul Young asked what type of usage the parking lot has now and what are projections for use. Mr. Fung said 45-50 spaces are currently used and the projected use is 61-74 spaces by 2015.

Mr. Hees asked that Chair Dixon share CAC concerns about the project at the TA Board meeting including the need for pedestrian and shuttle pass ways through the lot and landscaping.

Public Comment

Pat Giorni, Burlingame, said the project should include more secure bicycle parking similar to the Palo Alto station project and the component should be included in this project and not put off for inclusion in the station reconstruction project.

Mr. Hees asked if the TA fund would be charged if work is done as part of this project.

Mr. Hurley said the dollar amount set aside for this project, as currently proposed, are tapping into the Caltrain old Measure A funds. Mr. Hurley said the new Measure A has a separate line item for bicycles/pedestrians.

Ms. Maez said this project is spending old Measure A funding, which didn't have a bicycle/pedestrian component and whatever the criteria were for those funds should continue. Mr. Hurley said the criteria with which the bicycle/pedestrian component will be spent in the new Measure A are still being developed.

Mr. Hees said if a station is being built and in the course of construction, bicycle/pedestrian issues are considered, will some items be charged to Caltrain funds and some items to bicycle/pedestrian funds depending on square footage for each element of the project, or would it be called a Caltrain improvement because it's essentially a component of that project and not an improvement versus a bicycle lane added onto a separate project. Mr. Hurley said staff has not yet decided.

Mr. Bigelow said if HSR comes in and messes up a station because of their improvements, the bicycle/pedestrian facilities should be a cost of that project, and not hitting the bicycle/pedestrian funds. He suggested this issue be agendaized for discussion at a later meeting.

Mr. Hedges said he would vote no because he does not have specific costs for the parking improvements, which can be provided by staff after the meeting.

A motion (Hees/Bigelow) to approve the parking lot improvements was passed with an 8/5 vote (Noes: Fox, Hedges, Krause, Mader-Clark and Maez).

Approve Amendment to the Fiscal Year 2010 Capital Budget in the Amount of \$11 Million and Allocation to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board for the San Bruno Grade Separation Project in the Amount of \$13.7 Million – TA Item 10b

Mr. Hurley said the JPB continues to develop the San Bruno Grade Separation Project. This is a project that will grade separate three crossings in San Bruno which score very high on a statewide competitive scoring system. The allocation will provide funding for 100 percent design, contracting and right of way acquisition associated with the grade separation project.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if this project would include an expanded overpass for HSR. Mr. Hurley said the project has been designed so not to preclude HSR coming through.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what is the source of these additional funds. Mr. Hurley said the third and fourth track would be funded by HSR. He said the \$13.7 million allocation from the TA to the JPB is for 100 percent design, preparation of the contract package and right of way acquisition.

Ms. Maez said the initial cost of the project was \$195 million and is now \$300 million. Mr. Hurley said it is important to define the different scopes of the work. The \$300 million has to do with a system to accommodate HSR.

Mr. Harvey said the project to build the grade separation and the new station for the two-track alignment is a \$165 million project and less than the older estimate of \$195 million. The \$165 million project is to be fully funded with a combination of TA funds and also external funds including some Proposition 1B funds and some California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) grade separation funds. The project submitted to the City of San Bruno accommodates the two-track alignment and is also designed and staged in such a way that if the HSR alignment

is concluded and funding becomes available through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) stimulus money, the project could be sequenced so the other two tracks and the additional bridges for those two tracks could be added on to the project. This turns the project into a \$300 million project and all of that additional cost will be borne by the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) and not by the TA or Caltrain.

Ms. Maez asked if the original design presented to the San Bruno Grade Separation Citizens Advisory Committee is different from the design presented to the current San Bruno City Council.

Mr. Harvey said there are a few differences. If a four-track alignment is built, it will be wider than the original design and because of that there will not be a bridge on the east side on the grade separation. The concrete walls, enhancements of Posy Park and water feature are still included in the design.

Ms. Maez asked if the current station design includes elevators. Mr. Harvey said the current design has elevators in the estimate and preliminary designs. However, it is a subject staff is discussing with the City of San Bruno because the position of the JPB is that the elevators are not necessary. Staff is willing to have that discussion but Caltrain is ADA compliant without them and has many stations without elevators.

Mr. Bigelow said more than \$220 million has been applied for to use for the San Bruno Grade Separation Project, which would bring a four-track alignment. The new electrified Caltrain would be sharing tracks. The Baby Bullets could be running on the higher speed tracks and the locals could be on the other set of tracks. This means Caltrain is getting a gift to get two more tracks through a very difficult area. The HSR final application is due October 4 and in order to get Track 2 funds all planning, engineering and the environmental document must be completed by the end of 2011. Funds must be obligated and the project built by September 2012. If this project is derailed now the opportunity would be missed to get the \$220 million without a local match.

Mr. Shaine said when the project was put on hold about nine to twelve months ago he recalled project costs of \$95 to \$110 million. Interim safety improvements have been completed. He asked how project costs changed from \$165 million to \$195 million. Mr. Harvey said he didn't have the history on this and cannot answer the question. He doesn't think this estimate for the grade separation included a relocated station at that location.

Deputy Director Caltrain Capital Projects Liria Larano said the project was put on the shelf about three years ago and the estimate was \$195 million, which included the South Linden grade crossing. South Linden has been taken out of the scope and the base scope for the two tracks is \$165 million. The two track scenario does not include HSR but includes the substructure for the additional two tracks.

Ms. Maez asked if this also included Scott Street. Ms. Larano replied no.

Mr. Hedges asked how much has been spent for engineering and preliminary work. Mr. Harvey said about \$10 million for 65 percent at this time.

Mr. Hedges asked if this design change would enhance the station. Mr. Harvey said it would increase some of the visibility and site lines through the roadway underpasses but it is a substantial structural change and a complete redesign of the structure and station. It cannot be accommodated in the available timeframe to complete the design, bid and award. There is no flexibility in the timing and the TA must award or the money is gone and without the \$30 million Caltrain cannot afford to build the project.

Mr. Hedges asked if this has been a controversy for some time. Mr. Harvey said this is a design idea that came up when looking at the 35 and 65 percent submittals. A consultant looked at the impact and agreed that there are cost and schedule implications but they were hoping Caltrain could move the schedule to redesign, build and award this but staff cannot take that risk.

Mr. Hees said this is coming up fast and the CAC hasn't seen design elements. He asked what the schedule looks like for the CAC to see designs publicly and have a chance to comment. Mr. Harvey said staff is reviewing designs from San Bruno and moving up to the 65 percent level. San Bruno is having a special meeting tonight to discuss the project. Mr. Harvey said usually design submittal or review of designs is not something staff brings forward to the CAC.

Mr. Hees said staff has done this in the past. Mr. Harvey said staff can do this but approval of the design and the schedule of getting the bids out is something that the JPB and San Bruno have to maintain a schedule on or otherwise a contract cannot be awarded on time.

Ms. Arietta said it was awkward to have this on the agenda tonight when San Bruno is meeting at the same time on details of the project. She said if San Bruno has a negative outcome to their meeting tonight everything will be put on the shelf for several years. She asked if this could be on next month's TA agenda. Mr. Harvey said this would kill the project and there isn't funding available to continue design after the first of the month and the project has already been pushed out a month.

Mr. Zimmerman motioned to endorse the project including the comment that it is awkward in the context that if nothing is done it will be too late. He asked that staff come back to the CAC with design elements.

Mr. Hees seconded the motion.

Mr. Hedges proposed an addendum to the motion that there is a contingency to the motion of what San Bruno decides at their meeting tonight.

The motion (Zimmerman/Hees) to recommend support of the grade separation project with the additional comments on timing and the addendum was approved.

Program - Caltrain Grade Crossing Safety Improvements

Mr. Fung reported:

The presentation is timely because September is Rail Safety Month.

- Project goals include improved safety for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists; minimizing impacts to cities during construction; and safety during construction.

- Improvements included pedestrian gate arms; emergency swing (exit) gates, fencing; guardrails; tactile warning tiles; pavement markings; median islands and crossing gates; and signs and signal component upgrades.
- The project included 25 at-grade crossings in San Mateo County.
- Construction was performed at night to minimize noise and to keep crossings open.
- Project completion is scheduled for July 2010

Chair Dixon said the yellow tactile warning tiles are dangerous for people who must use a cane or walker and asked if they could be ground down a bit. Mr. Fung replied no because these meet ADA standards.

Steve Krause asked what purpose the islands served at rail crossings. Mr. Fung said they keep cars from going around the lowered gates.

Mr. King asked what the estimate is for the cost of each grade crossing. Mr. Fung said it was a lump sum contract.

Mr. King said because East Palo Alto has no grade crossings or other rail infrastructure how is this money allocated to accommodate some other transportation needs in East Palo Alto. Mr. Hurley said specific dollar amounts are set aside for specific programs and East Palo Alto doesn't have any grade crossings and will not be a candidate.

Ms. Maez said there is anticipation that HSR will go through and asked how much of what is being spent on the grade crossings are sunk costs. Mr. Hurley said these are needed improvements.

Mr. Hedges said the press conference concerning fatalities on the Caltrain corridor was excellent in requesting that the public and family members help Caltrain in combating tragic deaths on the tracks.

Construction Outreach Specialist Ellen Glover said she works on the grade separation project as a project construction outreach specialist and encouraged support of the grade crossing project because of the immediate safety need.

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for June 2008 (unaudited) – TA Item 3b

Mr. Zimmerman said the Statement of Revenues and Expenses for June 2009 (unaudited) shows that revenues are down and the TA is basically a capital funding agency. Mr. Hurley said sales tax revenue is down. He said unencumbered dollars that have not been earmarked for projects will take a hit but allocations that have been recommended will not be affected.

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for August 2009 – TA Item 3c

Ms. Maez asked why administrative costs spiked during certain months. Mr. Hurley did not know but will provide information to Ms. Maez.

Verbal Update on State and Federal Legislative Program

Mr. Zimmerman asked for an update on transit village assembly bills. Mr. Hurley said AB 338 and AB 1158 are double-joined, which means if one bill fails, both fail. AB 338 expands the area included in a transit village to include all land within no more than one-half mile of the main entrance of a transit station and allows creation of an infrastructure financing district not subject to general public approval. There are restrictions on how the funds can be used and 20 percent of the revenue must be used to create moderate to low-income housing within the transit village itself. AB 1158 introduces an education component to allow educational facilities to be part of the transit village.

Mr. Shaine asked if carryover funds from the old Measure are exhausted. Mr. Hurley said a very small amount of money is available.

Public Comment

Pat Giorni, Burlingame, referred to the Belmont Overcrossing Bridge Project and said a member of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) of the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) asked about the 3 percent BPAC was to receive. She asked if this was old or new Measure A for the \$500,000 C/CAG is rolling over to next year. Mr. Hurley said the old Measure A program had about .7 percent for the bicycle/pedestrian program. The new Measure A program allocated 3 percent for the bicycle/pedestrian category. The money for the Belmont pedestrian overcrossing is coming from the new Measure A. In this instance, BPAC is an advisory group to C/CAG and has no authority over the 3 percent. BPAC deals with Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 funding.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR – PAT DIXON

- Attended the San Mateo grade crossing improvement celebration.
- Encouraged members to attend tomorrow's HSR meeting.

REPORT FROM STAFF

No report

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

None

NEXT MEETING

The next regular meeting of the TA CAC will be held on Tuesday, November 3, 2009 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070.

ADJOURNMENT

5:57 p.m.