

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS COMMITTEE ON CONGESTION
MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (CMEQ)**

**MINUTES
MEETING OF November 25, 2013**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Garbarino in Conference Room C at City Hall of San Mateo at 3:02 pm. Attendance sheet is attached.

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

Chair Garbarino welcomed new CMEQ Committee Member Mike O'Neill from Pacifica.

2. Approval of Minutes of October 28, 2013 meeting.

Motion: To approve the Minutes of the October 28, 2013 meeting, Pierce/Trapp. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Receive a presentation on the Economic & Housing Opportunities (ECHO) Assessment phase 2 Study.

Sujata Srivastava of Strategic Economics, a consultant retained by SamTrans, provided a presentation on the Economic & Housing Opportunities (ECHO) Assessment Phase II study, which focused on removing barriers to implementing the vision of the Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI). The study was funded by a TIGER II grant and examined the challenges and contexts for development in four cities along the El Camino Real corridor: Daly City, South San Francisco, Belmont, and Mountain View. The study produced a guidebook of strategies for all cities on the corridor to use to address barriers to implementation.

Ms. Srivastava's presentation highlighted three key strategies:

- **Plan for vibrant activity nodes.** Given that supporting 43 miles of mixed-use along the corridor is likely not a viable strategy for development, the study recommended that cities concentrate activity and public resources in high intensity nodes and highlighted key considerations for identifying potential opportunity sites.
- **Align land use regulations with market and physical conditions.** The study recommended that cities set zoning, parking, and other regulations to enable new investment in the short-term and support a long-term vision of transformation. For example, the study suggested that cities adjust zoning to reduce on-site parking requirements or allow feasible building types.
- **Coordinate public and private investments.** The study recommended that cities target public improvements in key activity nodes rather than spread resources out throughout the corridor. Additionally, citing the projected increase in property values along the corridor of \$35 billion, the study recommended that cities consider new strategies for getting private development to contribute to public improvements, such as implementing assessment districts or impact fees.

Member Lewis asked about bicycles as a mode of transportation on El Camino Real and expressed concern about the speed of cars on the stretch of El Camino Real located in Atherton, where the road takes up three lanes in both directions. She mentioned that Atherton is in conversation with Caltrans about potentially replacing the outside lanes with bicycle paths. Ms. Srivastava responded that

although Strategic Economics does not serve as the transportation consultant for the GBI, she has heard several conversations about balancing the needs of different users on El Camino Real and suggested that the issue of making travel safer for bicycles and pedestrians varies across the corridor.

Member Papan asked about the methodology for determining the projected \$35 billion increase in property values along the El Camino Real corridor by 2035. Ms. Srivastava responded that the estimate is based on household and employment projections from Plan Bay Area and C/CAG. She added that the values of new housing units and construction were applied to these projections to estimate the increase in assessed property values.

Member Pierce asked if other cities along the El Camino Real corridor that were not examined as part of the study would be able to use the findings of the study or if a consultant should be hired to better understand local conditions. Ms. Srivastava responded that the general principles of the study could be applied to most places along the corridor but that if a city wanted to determine the answers to specific questions, such as the amount of community benefits that would result from higher densities, hiring a consultant would be recommended.

4. Review and recommend approval of the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding for the South San Francisco Grand Boulevard Complete Streets project in an amount of \$1,991,000.

Tom Madalena, C/CAG staff, presented the South San Francisco Grand Boulevard Complete Streets project and discussed how it was selected and recommended for funding from the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). In June 2011, the C/CAG Board made a commitment to using up to \$2 million of State Transportation Improvement Program-Transportation Enhancement (STIP-TE) funds, which are now known as TAP funds under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), towards a Complete Streets project on El Camino Real/Mission Street. The Board reaffirmed this commitment in May 2013 as part of adopting the OneBayAreaGrant Program and approved allocating \$1,991,000 in STIP-TE funds towards a Complete Streets project that would be selected amongst the four TIGER II Complete Streets case study projects in Daly City, San Bruno, San Carlos, and South San Francisco.

San Bruno, San Carlos, and South San Francisco applied for the TAP funds, which were supplemented by additional funding that SamTrans received through a Transportation, Community, and Systems Preservation Program (TCSP) grant, to bring their preliminary Complete Streets project design packages completed under TIGER II from 40% design to 100% design. Tom described that the three projects were evaluated by a review panel based on their readiness, availability of match, incorporation of green street design elements, level of utility conflicts, and transferability to other jurisdictions, among other evaluation measures. Based on these criteria, the South San Francisco project was recommended for funding.

According to Tom, the South San Francisco project includes wider sidewalks, improved transit stops, 105 new trees, frontage planting, and tree wells as well as pervious medians, sidewalks, and if approved by Caltrans, pervious paving for curbside parking along El Camino Real.

Member Dworetzky asked about the location of the project. C/CAG staff responded that the project is located just north of Westborough Boulevard on El Camino Real.

Motion: To recommend approval of the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding for the South San Francisco Grand Boulevard Complete Streets project in an amount of \$1,991,000, Pierce/Lewis. Motion carried unanimously.

5. Review and recommend approval of the Call for Projects for the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for Fiscal Year 2014/2015 & Fiscal Year 2015/2016.

Tom Madalena, C/CAG staff, presented the Call for Projects for the second cycle of the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program. The \$7 million in funding for the two-year program is provided by C/CAG Congestion Relief Plan Program funds, which provide \$500,000 per fiscal year, and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Measure A Program funds, which provide approximately \$3 million per fiscal year. According to Tom, the Call for Projects and scoring criteria are very similar to those used during the last cycle, and only a few changes were made to make the application more straightforward and adjust performance measures for inflation.

Tom reported that this item was presented to the C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) last week, where a discussion ensued regarding the eligibility of shuttle projects that serve school children. According to Tom, these types of projects are not precluded by the shuttle program application guidelines, but project sponsors that propose to provide service to school children may subject themselves to additional state and federal regulations, specifically as they relate to safety around transporting school children. Tom cited a legal determination a few years back that was received by the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance that said if a shuttle route serving a school was open to the public, circuitous, and stopped at a number of destinations in addition to the school, these additional regulations would not apply.

According to Tom, the Transportation Authority is now seeking an opinion from its legal counsel as to whether or not its funds can be used for school service. The C/CAG TAC recommended approval of the Call for Projects with additional language stating that shuttles that primarily serve school children would be eligible for funding pending the decision from the Transportation Authority's legal counsel.

Member Kersteen-Tucker asked whether funding was available only for new projects, or if existing projects were also eligible. Tom responded that funding is offered on a competitive basis and that both new and existing shuttles are eligible. He added that while all projects compete against one another, there are slightly different application questions for new and existing shuttles (i.e. new shuttles will not be asked to provide any performance information).

Member Kersteen-Tucker asked a follow-up question about how underperforming shuttle programs are provided with additional assistance. Tom responded that while C/CAG staff do not provide additional assistance to these programs, project sponsors are encouraged to obtain additional support from SamTrans and the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance. Additionally, he mentioned that program funds could be used to fund marketing efforts that could help increase ridership.

Member Lentz asked about the typical timeframe for making changes to an existing shuttle service. Tom suggested that the timeframe could vary based on existing community processes for planning shuttles. He said that tweaking an existing shuttle may not be as complicated as planning for new service, which could take over a year because of the time needed for community meetings and local working group sessions.

Member Papan asked about the \$100,000 that the Transportation Authority set aside for the technical assistance workshop and the technical assistance to shuttle project sponsors. Tom responded that he was not aware of the amount of money spent on the workshop or providing technical assistance to cities, as the money is not under C/CAG control. He believes that most of the \$100,000 will not be drawn down unless the cities tap into the technical assistance provided by SamTrans and the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance.

Member Olbert asked why congestion relief was not included as a factor in the need criteria section of the program application. Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, suggested that certain effectiveness measures, such as shuttle ridership, may provide some information on congestion relief. Member Roberts added that congestion relief is likely covered by an effectiveness criterion that asks applicants to describe the extent to which their proposed shuttles reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trips and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

Motion: To recommend approval of the Call for Projects for the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for Fiscal Year 2014/2015 & Fiscal Year 2015/2016 with the amendment that congestion relief be included as an element under the need criterion, Olbert/Pierce. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion: To recommend that the CMEQ committee be informed as to how the \$100,000 in Transportation Authority funding for technical assistance to shuttle project sponsors was spent, Olbert/Papan. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Receive an update on the potential stormwater funding initiative.

Matt Fabry, C/CAG staff, provided an update on the initiative for C/CAG and its member agencies to raise funds to comply with regional stormwater permit mandates. He reported that because C/CAG was unsuccessful in its efforts to obtain enabling legislation during the recent legislative session, staff have more time for this work and are considering a revised approach, which will require approval from the C/CAG Board, as staff are proposing to access funds that were originally allocated to later phases of the project.

Matt explained that the improved approach is guided by the experiences of Contra Costa County, Los Angeles County, and the Santa Clara Valley Water District in seeking authority to put forth special taxes or property related fees. The experiences of these jurisdictions suggest that C/CAG could benefit from a stronger community engagement process. Thus, the revised approach involves staff meeting with municipalities in early 2014 to better understand local needs and concerns and to identify key community stakeholders. Another component of the approach is the development of a communications tool based on the findings of the planned public opinion research to communicate how funds will be spent and provide the public an opportunity to provide input.

Matt also described C/CAG's revised legislative approach, which is to seek the authority for C/CAG to develop and approve a countywide water pollution prevention plan for which the agency has the ability to impose a plan implementation fee, which can take the form of a special tax or property related fee. If the legislation passes and an urgency clause is successfully attached, C/CAG could move forward with a funding initiative as early as mid-2014.

Member Papan asked about the information that C/CAG currently has on cities' needs and concerns. Matt responded that a preliminary analysis has been conducted, but that C/CAG has not received much feedback from cities on the findings of this analysis.

Member Olbert asked about what would happen if C/CAG were not successful in obtaining legislation to move forward with a funding initiative. Matt responded that the plan may be for the County or local cities to consider their own funding initiatives, but added local jurisdictions have not expressed interest in doing this at this time.

Member Lentz asked about the average tax or fee that homeowners would have to pay under the funding initiative. Matt responded that amount would be in the range of \$17 to \$35 per single-family home. He added that this could potentially raise \$12 million in funding.

7. Review and approval of the CMEQ meeting Calendar for 2014.

Motion: To approve the CMEQ meeting calendar for 2014, Olbert/Lentz. Motion carried unanimously.

8. Executive Director Report.

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, reported that C/CAG Board Vice Chair Mary Ann Nihart will act as Chair until the Board holds new elections in March 2014. The current Board Chair, Brandt Grotte, decided not run for reelection to the San Mateo City Council.

Sandy also reminded the committee that the CMEQ Committee holds annual elections for the Chair and Vice Chair positions during its January meeting.

7. Member comments and announcements.

Member Olbert discussed the presentation provided by PG&E at the last C/CAG Board meeting as well as the interchange between PG&E staff and various C/CAG Board members.

8. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

The next regular meeting was scheduled for January 27, 2014.