

2010 TAC Roster and Attendance					
Member	Agency	Jan	Mar	May	Jun
Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	x			x
Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA	x	x	x	x
Duncan Jones	Atherton Engineering		x	x	x
Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering		x	x	
Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x	x	x	x
Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning				
Sandy Wong	C/CAG	x	x	x	x
Gene Gonzalo	Caltrans				
Robert Ovardia	Daly City Engineering	x	x	x	x
Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x	x		x
Ray Towne	Foster City Engineering	x	x	x	
Mo Sharma	Half Moon Bay	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Chip Taylor	Menlo Park Engineering	x	x	x	x
Ron Popp	Millbrae Engineering	x	x	x	x
Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering	x	x	x	x
Peter Vorametsanti	Redwood City Engineering	x	x	x	x
Klara Fabry	San Bruno Engineering	n/a	x	x	x
Robert Weil	San Carlos Engineering		x	x	x
Larry Patterson	San Mateo Engineering	x	x	x	
Steve Monowitz	San Mateo County Planning	x			
Dennis Chuck	So. San Francisco Engineering	x	x	x	x
Kenneth Folan	MTC				

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
FOR THE
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)**

**June 17, 2010
MINUTES**

The one hundred eighty seventh (187th) meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, Bacciocco Auditorium. Co-chair Porter called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m. on Thursday, June 17, 2010.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: John Hoang – C/CAG; Jean Higaki – C/CAG; Jim Bigelow – C/CAG CMEQ; Leticia Alvarez - City of Belmont; Dave Bishop – Town of Hillsborough

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None.

2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMEQ meetings.

As shown on the Agenda.

3. Approval of the Minutes from May 20, 2010.

Approved.

4. Review and Recommend Approval of a \$10 Vehicle License Fee Expenditure Plan

John Hoang presented information on the proposed \$10 Vehicle License Fee (VRF) plan including background on Senate Bill 83 that enabled C/CAG to impose the fees. Hoang highlighted the polling results and indicated the tight timeframe for adopting the Expenditure Plan and placement of the VRF Measure on the November 2010 ballot, which will require the Board to adopt a “Ballot Measure Resolution” at a special July Board meeting. Hoang presented an overview of the draft Expenditure Plan and identified key issues. Discussions and recommendations TAC members were as follows:

Countywide Programs

The projects/programs under the countywide category will be administered by C/CAG. These projects would not be competitive. “Senior and disabled transit services” should be combined with “transit operations” and that Safe Routes to School (SR2S) include transit also, and be renamed “Safe Routes to School and Transit”. The SR2S program will fund the countywide program C/CAG is currently developing.

It was proposed to include bicycle and pedestrian projects under the list of eligible projects under the County Programs category. However, there are other pots of money that are available for bike/ped projects in the county (e.g., TDA Art. 3, Measure A, etc) therefore allocating funds specifically for bike/ped under the VRF Countywide category and would not be feasible.

The NPDES program listed under Countywide would provide funding to address shortfalls in meeting the Municipal Regional Permitting (MPR) requirements, which includes keeping trash and oil out of the system, which relates directly to operations and maintenance. It is important to assure that NPDES is funded since there is already an annual deficit of about \$750K for monitoring efforts and studies. For the NPDES, staff needs to make sure titles are descriptive enough and tasks are (i.e., trash elimination, green streets (LID), pcb/mercury elimination and monitoring.)

The ITS and Smart Corridors, which will primarily fund operations/maintenance activities, should be combined to allow more flexibility and be called “Regional Traffic Congestion Management”. Maintaining the category at a broad 50% is fine and allows flexibility, with the understanding that TAC will establish the detailed allocation plan. The Programs would be reviewed and updated every 5 years. Staff will need to make sure that approved measure language would not restrict or limit the types of changes C/CAG can make to the program every 5 years.

Local Streets and Roads Programs

The program would be on a reimbursement basis, similar to the current \$4 VRF, rather than a straight annual distribution to the cities/County. This allows C/CAG to monitor performance and provide annual reports that shows how the money is being spent. It was proposed that the LSR Programs’ percentage split be increase to 60%, however, keeping distribution at a 50/50 is more balanced and may be a better option. Considerations were made to not consider a guaranteed minimum amount to smaller cities and doing a straight allocation based on the Measure A formula. The program flexibility is good and allows jurisdictions to choose which projects to apply the funds to. The titles for the proposed programs and projects need to be refined to provide better descriptions, for instance, it was suggested that the Traffic congestion management be renamed to read “Roadway Maintenance and Traffic Congestion Management”.

Ballot

There are concerns about the \$18 VRF for parks measure that will also be on the November ballot and how it may affect the \$10 VRF. Also, current legislation allows for a simple majority vote on the \$10 VRF. There is also a possibility of a ballot measure that would restrict what can be considered a fee and therefore would require a 2/3rds vote for all taxes and fees. There may be opportunities to market the VRF measure regionwide if other counties are also placing a measure on the ballot. The order listed on ballot would be important as well as the possibility that November 2010 ballot may be a big with a lot of measures.

Term

Polling results indicate that we should look at expiration date. Although it may not make much of a difference there should be an expiration, similar to Measure A. Proposed options were 10 years or between 20 to 25 years.

The final TAC recommendations were as follows:

- No minimum guarantee amount for smaller cities under Local Streets and Roads category.
- Implement full \$10 VLF immediately on top of the current \$4 VLF. (\$14 for first 2 years)
- Program as presented with updated language provided by the TAC
- Have a term of 20 years.
- The percentage split between LSR and Countywide programs would be 50/50. Administration (up to 5%) would be taken out of the countywide program.

Public comment

Jim Bigelow stated that the TAC does a great job and to keep it up.

Rich Napier, C/CAG Executive Director, indicated that staff is working on the ballot language, measure statement, and resolution. The process from this point forward is to discuss the VRF item at the City Manager's meeting on June 18th, present the item along with the TAC recommendations at the June 28th CMEQ meeting, and present to the Board for final adoption in July. All materials are due to the County's Elections office the first week of August.

For cities that are considering assessing property/parcel related fees to fund pertinent sections of the MPR, it was mentioned that complying with Prop 218 is a mail-in process and therefore increasing fees would not need to be placed on the November ballot. The City of Menlo Park has samples of how to estimate costs.

5. Regional Project and Funding Information

Jean Higaki presented the regional and project funding status provided by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), reminding jurisdictions to submit invoices into Caltrans. Higaki also indicated that MTC/Caltrans has started to monitor the HSIP and SRTS program lists also, in addition, reminded jurisdictions to update information the TIP. Updates are due today.

6. San Mateo County Smart Corridor Project Update

Richard Napier announced that a Stakeholders Meeting has been set for June 24, 2010, 11:30 a.m. -1:30 p.m. to be held at the Foster City Community Center and encourage cities' located within the current project limits as well as other cities to attend the meeting.

7. Executive Director Report

None.

8. Member Reports

None.

End of meeting at 3:50 p.m.