

2015 TAC Roster and Attendance				
No.	Member	Agency	Jan	Feb
1	Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	x	x
2	Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	x	x
3	Afshin Oskoui	Belmont Engineering	x	x
4	Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering	x	
5	Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x	x
6	Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning		
7	VACANT	Caltrans		
8	Sandy Wong	C/CAG	x	x
9	Brad Donohue	Colma Engineering	x	x
10	John Fuller	Daly City Engineering		x
11	Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x	x
12	Mo Sharma	Half Moon Bay Engineering		x
13	Paul Willis	Hillsborough Engineering	x	x
14	Jeff Moneda	Foster City Engineering	x	
15	Jesse Quirion	Menlo Park Engineering		
16	Chip Taylor	Millbrae Engineering		x
17	Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering		
18	Jessica Manzi	Redwood City Engineering	x	
19	Jimmy Tan	San Bruno Engineering	x	x
20	Jay Walter	San Carlos Engineering	x	x
21	Brad Underwood	San Mateo Engineering	x	x
22	James Hinkamp	San Mateo County Planning	x	
23	Brian McMinn	South San Francisco Engineering		x
24	Billy Gross	South San Francisco Planning	x	
25	Paul Nagengast	Woodside Engineering	x	
26	Kenneth Folan	MTC		

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP) TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

February 19, 2015
MINUTES

The meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices located at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, 4th Floor Dining Room, San Carlos, CA. Co-chair Porter called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. on Thursday, February 19, 2015.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Jim Bigelow - C/CAG CMEQ; Joel Slavitt - TA; Pete Rasmussen - TA; Ellen Barton - San Mateo County; Lee Taubeneck; Rick Dowling - Kittleson; Winnie Chung - MTC; Karen Kinser - Brisbane; Jean Higaki, Wally Abrazaldo - C/CAG; John Hoang - C/CAG and other attendees not noted.

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

Jim Bigelow commented that businesses are having problems with increasing commute time. An increase in sales tax is needed. Large companies may be able to come up with money to help projects along.

2. Issues from the last C/CAG Board meeting.

As noted on Agenda.

3. Approval of the Minutes from January 15, 2015.

Approved.

4. Solicitation of Letters of Interest for the Measure A Highway Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

Joel Slavitt, SMCTA Manager, thanked the TAC for providing input into the Measure A Implementation Plan update. Slavitt reported that solicitation for interest for the upcoming Highway call for projects will be released after the March 5th and due at the end of the month. The call for projects is expected to be released in May and awarded in October and the results will tie in with the development of the 2016 STIP. For the letters of interest, the TA is asking for a list of projects cities are considering for the next 10 years, including scope, schedule, phasing, budget, and other funding sources information.

Projects include both arterials and highways. For projects that have multiple phases that extend past 10 years, additional information may be requested by the TA. Cost should be today's dollar. TA will provide cities a standard form to complete.

5. Receive a presentation on the San Mateo US 101 Express Lane Feasibility Study

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, reported that the TAC had previously provided input on the study's scope of work. The C/CAG Board approved a joint study with MTC to look at two concepts of providing express lanes on US 101.

Rick Dowling presented findings from the Study, which was a preliminary high level assessment of high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes on US 101 between Whipple Avenue and the San Francisco County Line which included two concepts: 1) HOV-to-HOT (Innovative Add

HOT Lane/Hybrid HOV/HOT) (\$259 million), and 2) General Purpose-to-HOT (Convert HOT Lane) (\$108 million). Dowling presented a comparison between the two options.

The Study indicates that Concept 1 will decrease congestion on US 101, I-280, and streets; generate minor new revenues to invest in mitigations; result in lesser increase in transit crowding/increased HOVs; and result in lesser increase in GHG. Concept 2 will increase congestion on US 101, I-280 and streets; generate minor new revenues to invest in mitigations; result in greatly increased transit ridership and services/increased HOVs, and result in lesser increase in GHG.

Highlights of discussion items are as follows:

- Although not addressed in the current study, future studies should look at 3+ occupancy.
- The current Study did not look at the segment north of I-380 since this segment up to the SF County line does not currently have auxiliary lanes.
- The time horizon for the Study is 2040. It was suggested that future studies needs to consider a longer term outlook. Future studies should consider short-term fixes in addition to long-term strategic planning and outlook.
- It was suggested that further studies include analyses on capacity versus fees, including 2+ versus 3+ occupancy.
- The Committee generally agreed that the preferred alternative is Option 1 and that Option 2 appears to have no value and should not be analyzed further. However, there were also suggestions that continuing to include Option 2, although less desirable, would be beneficial.
- Option 1 should consider an alternative to expand right-of-way even though there may be significant costs involved.
- C/CAG should consider focusing attention at State officials and encourage introduction of legislation to shorten the process needed to implement HOT lanes.
- Cost for HOT lanes is significant therefore the TA should look at bonding to deliver the project early. Also, considerations should be made to increase the local sales tax.
- C/CAG is working with MTC and the Bay Area Council to expedite projects.
- The upcoming renewal of the Congestion Relief Program (CRP) will look at short term solution.
- Including I-280 and transit would result in a corridor study. Future studies should also include enhanced transit services.

The motion was that Option 1 is the preferred option and should be pursued further and any additional efforts performed on Option 2 should be minimized.

6. Receive information about the upcoming Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 call for projects

Ellen Barton, San Mateo County, presented information on the next ATP Cycle 2 call for projects and that Caltrans will be holding a workshop on February 25, 2015.

Cities are not required to have an ATP Plan in order to apply. It was suggested that cities should be allowed to submit an application to more than one eligible category for better distribution of funds. It is anticipated that the 40% ATP funds for populations greater than 200,000 will remain unchanged.

7. Regional Project and Funding Information

Jean Higaki reported on the FHWA policy for inactive projects, Caltrans policy for management of Inactive Obligations, and current and upcoming call for projects that includes ATP and the SGC (Strategic Growth Council) workshop. Caltrans will be holding a workshop on Section 106 procedures and Cycle 7 Local HSIP Webinar.

8. Executive Director Report

Sandy Wong, Executive Director, reported that today is the deadline for submitting concept applications to the affordable housing community grant for cap and trade. It is anticipated that the cap and trade program will have more money in the coming next years. We are working on the next year's budget and plan to keep the member fees and CRP fees the same as last year, however, new population data will result in minor shifts to each city's fee amounts. Draft fees will be presented to the city managers tomorrow. Updated trips generated information used in the fee calculations will be used.

9. Member Reports

None.

Meeting adjourned at 2:3 p.m.