

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
COMMITTEE ON CONGESTION MANAGEMENT
AND AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)**

**MINUTES
MEETING OF JULY 31, 2006**

At 3:05 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairwoman Sepi Richardson in Conference Room C of San Mateo City Hall.

Members Attending: Jim Bigelow, Tom Davids, Linda Koelling, Linda Larson, Sue Lempert, Arthur Lloyd, Karyl Matsumoto, Barbara Pierce, Vice-Chairwoman Sepi Richardson, Lennie Roberts, Toni Stein, and Onnolee Trapp.

Staff/Guests Attending: Sandy Wong and Walter Martone (C/CAG Staff - County Public Works), Pat Dixon (Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee), Duane Bay (County Housing Director), Shelley Kilday (Sustainable San Mateo County), Jill Boon (County Public Works), Richard Cook (SamTrans), Marshall Loring (MTC EDAC), Mark Duino (C/CAG Staff – County Planning).

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Minutes of June 26, 2006 meeting.

Motion: To approve the Minutes as presented. Bigelow/Lempert, unanimous.

REGULAR AGENDA

3. New Sustainable San Mateo County Indicators Report.

Shelley Kilday, Director of Education for Sustainable San Mateo County gave a presentation that highlighted the major findings in the report titled “Indicators for a Sustainable San Mateo County – 2006 Report Card,” and pointed out those items that would likely be of most interest to C/CAG. A copy of Ms. Kilday’s presentation is attached to these minutes.

Comments from CMAQ Members:

- There was discussion about the pros and cons of the “Spare The Air Days” and providing free transit on smoggy days to improve air quality. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission is beginning to review whether the expenditure of these dollars is having a sustainable impact. They are also looking into suggestions that transit be free all the time.
- It was noted that there a number of very effective ads have been appearing on T.V. relating to Global Warming.
- There was discussion about recycling – under what conditions it is successful and ways to improve its effectiveness. It was suggested that future editions of the Sustainable S.M. Co. report show the outcomes of recycling efforts.
- Encouragement was given for promoting the wide circulation of Al Gore’s new movie on the environment. Copies should be provided to schools, and reward should be given to those who see it (such as free transit passes).
- Consideration should be given to the fuel and energy costs associated with food items that come

from long distances away. Encouragement should be given to buying locally grown food commodities. Grocers should be encouraged to identify the source of the produce they sell.

- It was noted that most San Mateo County jurisdictions are doing well with their recycling efforts. In some areas however, there are no weekly pick-ups of recyclables, there are language problems, and not enough attention is given to the waste produced from construction and demolition.
- Apartment buildings present additional challenges to recycling.
 - Turnover of the residents.
 - Language issues.
 - Limited space to store recyclables.
- The Town of Portola Valley has implemented a one-container system for recycling. The residents do not sort waste. It is all placed in a single container and sorted at the waste facility. This does not produce the same high quality of recyclables and much of the waste is composted. The use of this system is limited because only a few facilities are available for this type of recycling.
- It would be useful if a spreadsheet were developed that shows the pros and cons of sorting versus not sorting (single-stream).
- Another important strategy that must be promoted is to limit the amount of waste created. Consumers can help by demanding and purchasing items that are not subjected to excessive packaging and wrapping.

4. Review of potential candidate projects for the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) component of the Highway, Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006.

Sandy Wong provided the following presentation:

- If the voters approve the transportation bond in November 2006, the California Transportation Commission must develop program guidelines by December, nominations for projects must be submitted in January, and projects must be under construction by 2012.
- Of the \$4.5 billion that would be available for corridor mobility projects, \$1.8 billion (20%) will be available for Northern California projects selected through an open competition process.
- Due to these extremely ambitious timeframes, it is important to start lining up projects that may be potential candidates for funding.
- Even though the guidelines have not been developed, it is expected that congestion relief and project readiness will be very important criteria.
- Most of the projects on the list provided to CMAQ for consideration already have some of the scoping and environmental review completed.
- The first two projects on the list (Route 101 Auxiliary Lanes from Marsh Road to Embarcadero and then continuing south to Route 85) will likely be combined into one project if the Valley Transportation Authority agrees to join C/CAG and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority as an additional cosponsor.

Comments from the CMAQ included:

- The identification of “congestion hot spots” was based on work done as part of the reauthorization of the Measure A Program, the Countywide Transportation Plan, and the analysis of potential solutions to the traffic problems associated with the connection of the Dumbarton Bridge to the north and south employment centers along Route 101.
- The San Mateo County Transportation Authority is in the process of updating its Strategic Plan. The C/CAG Travel Forecasting Model is being used to test the impacts of the various improvement projects that are in the current Measure and proposed for the reauthorized Measure. Cities that submitted projects for the Measure need to update their fact sheets on these projects.
- The list of projects that C/CAG Staff is presenting for the Bond is not prioritized. After the policies and rules for the funds are determined, the list will be revised so that the most competitive projects

have the highest priority. This information will be brought back to CMAQ and C/CAG before it is submitted to the California Transportation Commission.

- The Route 92 Truck Climbing Lanes Project should have a better project description to show that it helps to support trucking related to the farming industry on the Coastside.
- The list of projects should clearly state that it is a “Potential” list of projects that is not listed in any “priority order.” This will help to allay any false impressions about the list.

5. Update on C/CAG’s role in the Regional Housing Needs Allocation Process (RHNA).

Mark Duino provided the following report:

- Every seven years the cities and counties must provide a plan on how they will meet certain housing production targets (also known as RHNA). That cycle is starting at this time.
- The State of California establishes targets for each of the regions in the State. The regional planning agencies (ABAG for the Bay Area) receive a number that they must then allocate to the cities and counties in their regions.
- Recent changes in the law now allow cities and counties to create subregions for the purpose of developing a methodology and approving allocations to each of the members of the subregion. C/CAG has explored the possibility of creating a subregion composed of its member jurisdictions.
- In order to continue with the process of creating a subregion, the jurisdictions willing to create the subregion must by August 31, 2006, each adopt a resolution in support of this effort. To date 16 cities representing 62% of the population in San Mateo County have adopted resolutions.
- C/CAG is the only group in the Bay Area that is pursuing the creation of a subregion at this time.
- If the subregion is formed, the body must by December 2006, develop a methodology for the allocation of the housing production targets among its members.

Comments by the CMAQ members and responses to questions included:

- There was discussion about the chart distributed by ABAG that gives a grade to jurisdictions on how they have succeeded in reaching their housing targets. It was noted that the numbers and the grades do not appear to be justified. Although San Mateo County is often cited as a leader in finding innovative ways to achieve these goals (for example its Transit Oriented Development program), it received a grade of “F.” This chart is an example of statistics that have been skewed to the point that they are meaningless. There are a number of examples where a jurisdiction has received an A or A+ and the number of units constructed are minimal or none. The chart also does not recognize the fact that much of the land in San Mateo County is preserved as green space and cannot be built on.
- The system established by the State for allocation of housing targets is all “demand” driven and gives no consideration to the “supply” side of the equation.
- The proposed role for C/CAG in this RHNA process will be one of facilitation. This will not be a process that empowers a majority of jurisdictions to impose requirements on a minority of jurisdictions.
- By December 2006 the subregion must determine the decision making process it will employ and the methodology that will be used to allocate the housing targets. Some of the issues that will need to be determined is whether trades will be permitted, under what circumstances, and what types of trades will be allowed including the items to be traded. Due to the tight time frame, it is critical that the process be kept simple.
- Although there is not strict enforcement of the targets by the State, it is the law and the collective number for the jurisdictions in the County must equal the Countywide total allocated by ABAG. If it does not, the State will reject the Housing Elements for the local jurisdictions in the County.

6. Member comments and announcements.

- None

7. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date for August 28, 2006.

The next regular meeting will be on August 28, 2006. At 4:27 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.