

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

**MINUTES
MEETING OF August 31, 2015**

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair O'Neill in Conference Room C at City Hall of San Mateo at 3:00 p.m. Attendance sheet is attached. Chair Garbarino presided the meeting at 3:05 pm.

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, introduces new C/CAG Staff, Jeff Lacap.

The CMEQ Committee acknowledges the retirement of Onnolee Trapp and Jim Bigelow and extends its appreciation for the contribution from these two long-standing CMEQ Committee members.

2. Approval of minutes of June 29, 2015 meeting.

Motion: To approve the Minutes of the June 29, 2015 meeting, Bigelow/Bonilla, Motion carried unanimously.

3. Receive a presentation and update from the 21 Elements Housing Program (Information).

Joshua Abrams provided a presentation on the 21 Elements Housing Program, supported by C/CAG to have all cities in San Mateo County to collaborate on housing policy, planning, and implementation within the county.

Member Lee asked about how will parking issues be handled with higher density housing. Abrams responded that the solution is to have a good a connection between land use and transportation options. He added that millennials currently have less car ownership and that the key is having transportation near housing to have the option of other modes of transportation. Member Lee commented that smaller cities like Milbrae have limited bus service which would preclude the solution suggested by Abrams.

Member O'Neill commented that millennials are still young, but once they start having kids, the car ownership will increase. Abrams responded that the housing trends of millennials are still being analyzed and that it's an open ended question.

Member Stone commented that there's an assumption that if there's an in-law unit or 2nd unit, there will be another vehicle added on the street, but it's not necessarily the case because senior citizens typically reside in in-law units and do not drive anymore. The City of Belmont has data that shows there will be plenty of on-street spaces for in-law units.

Member Pierce commented about a presentation made at the GBI and how interesting housing fees were calculated and that having a streamlined process that all jurisdictions share makes going forward with housing projects much easier.

Member Aguirre commented that 21 Elements is providing a playbook to make it easier on the jurisdictions. She also noted that new housing, especially in Redwood City, is being built within transit corridors and not within existing neighborhoods.

4. Review and recommend endorsement of the list of projects to be submitted to MTC for the update of the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) also known as Plan Bay Area 2040 (Action).

Jean Higaki presented this item and the staff recommendation regarding the list of projects to be submitted to MTC for the update of Plan Bay Area 2040.

The CMEQ committee received four public comments regarding the list of projects to be submitted to MTC for the update of the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) also known as Plan Bay Area 2040. Three of the public comments were specific to the Calera Parkway project in Pacifica (shown as attachments to the minutes of this meeting). The three speakers were in opposition to the project being forwarded to the MTC for the update of Plan Bay Area 2040. Another speaker representing Facebook had asked the committee to consider adding the Dumbarton Rail to the list before submitting to the MTC.

It was pointed out that the project description for the Calera Parkway project in the staff report did not match with the project description in the project's environmental document. The CMEQ committee directed staff to seek clarification.

Some Q&A from CMEQ members ensued.

Motion: To submit the list of San Mateo County projects to the C/CAG Board for consideration along with providing the CMEQ's concern regarding the Calera Parkway project in light of the concerns brought up by the public comment speakers, Lee/Stone. Motion carried unanimously.

5. Update on projects along the US 101 corridor (Information).

Sandy Wong provided an update on the US 101 corridor improvement strategies and will continue to provide regular updates on said project. Two Project Study Reports (PSR) have been approved by Caltrans: A) Provide carpool lane between Whipple Ave in Redwood City and I-380; B) Provide auxiliary lane between Oyster Point in SSF and the San Francisco County Line. C/CAG is working closely with the TA and Caltrans on the technical aspect of the project. Challenges with a project of this magnitude are the funding of the project, technical challenges, and what institutional procedural measures can be done to expedite the project delivery from ten to five years. Another meeting with the Bay Area Council and other applicable stakeholders is scheduled for September 15 and Assemblyman Kevin Mullins will chair the September meeting.

6. Executive Director Report (Information).

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, provided the following update:

The Smart Corridor Project was brought up due to the accident that occurred on US-101 over the weekend that caused closures on US-101 and major congestion on local streets. There will be a debriefing meeting with Caltrans to go over the Smart Corridor Project and how we can learn from the

events that occurred over the weekend and how we can improve the project. The project is currently in the final system integration stage and is scheduled to be completed by the end of this year.

7. Member comments and announcements (Information).

None.

8. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm.

The next regular meeting was scheduled for September 28, 2015.

Attachments:

- Public comment from Cynthia Kaufman
- Public comment from Chaya Gordon
- Public comment from Mike Ferreira

2015 C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee Attendance Report

Agency	Representative	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Alicia Aguirre	X	X						x				
City of Redwood City	Barbara Pierce	X	X		X				x				
City of Belmont	Charles Stone	X	X						x				
Town of Atherton	Elizabeth Lewis	X	X		X								
City of San Bruno	Irene O'Connell	X					X		x				
Business Community	Jim Bigelow	X	X		X		X		x				
Environmental Community	Lennie Roberts	X	X				X		x				
City of Pacifica	Mike O'Neill	X	X		X		X		x				
Agencies with Transportation Interests	Onnolee Trapp	X	X		X		X		x				
City of South San Francisco	Richard Garbarino	X	X		X		X		x				
Public	Steve Dworetzky	X	X		X								
City of Millbrae	Wayne Lee	X							x				
City of San Mateo	Rick Bonilla	NA	NA		X		X		x				
City of Pacifica	John Keener	NA	NA		X		X		x				

Staff and guests in attendance for August 31, 2015 meeting:

Sandy Wong, Jean Higaki, Jeff Lacap - C/CAG Staff
 Cary Wiest, Council Member from Atherton, sat in for Member Lewis
 Joshua Abrams - 21 Elements
 Cynthia Kaufman
 Chaya Gordon
 Juan Salazar
 Mike Ferriera

Public

Attachment to the August 31, 2015 Minutes

Cynthia Kaufman Member of Pacificans for Highway 1 Alternatives.

We have been working for 3 years to get the city of Pacifica and the relevant agencies to reject the Calera Parkway Project, which you have listed as a project to forward to the MTC for inclusion in the updated Plan Bay Area.

I am here to ask that you not include this project on that list for 6 reasons:

1. The project is inconsistent with the goals of Plan Bay Area. Performance target #1 looks for projects that cut greenhouse gas emissions and Performance target #9, asks for strategies that decrease Vehicle Miles Travelled. The CCP will increase emissions through induced driving. As the experience of Los Angeles shows, building more freeways tend to encourage more driving.

Performance target #4 asks that you reduce fatalities especially bike and pedestrian ones. Performance target #5 asks for increases in biking and walking. The CCP has minimal bike lanes. There is a traffic light one of the key intersections in the project that is used by many children crossing on the way to school and going to the beach. The project widens that stretch from a modest 4 lane road to something wider than 280. Caltrans says it considered an island in the middle for pedestrian to wait if they did not have time to cross, and decided against it because cars would be going too fast for that to be safe. So instead, children and seniors will need to run across something like a freeway.

My second point: Our last election showed that a very strong majority of people in Pacifica do not want this project. No members of our current city council are advocating publically for this project. It is moving forward on inertia.

3. There are currently 3 lawsuits pending that challenge this project, two that challenge it in federal court based on the endangered species act, and one in superior court that challenges the EIR. That one alleges, among other things, that Caltrans failed to offer specific plans, as is required for an EIR; the EIR does not say how long traffic delays will be during construction; and it says sound walls may be built, but does not specify where they would be, so the public has not been able to weigh in on them.

4. The EIR for the project says that as a best case scenario the project will eventually shave a minute and a half off of commute times. So there is a huge expense, with years of inconvenience, a permanent massive ugly project, and a permanent loss of safety, for an incredibly small gain in traffic flow.

5. On a personal note I want to say that I have a 13 year old who crosses the road there all the time, and I will not let her cross if this project goes through.

6. Nationally people are driving less. The traffic problems we face in Pacifica can easily be solved with a variety of soft alternatives, such as better light timing, better engineering of the ways people get on and off that stretch, safe routes to schools, increased transit, and staggered school start times. We would like help working on that combination of alternatives. This project is a holdover from a 1950s Caltrans

mentality, one that Plan Bay Area, and indeed Caltrans' own new mission statement, have solidly rejected. Please do not burden our town with a brand new dinosaur. Take this project off the list.

Attachment to the August 31, 2015 Minutes

COMMENTS BY CHAYA GORDON

Page 1

CCAG/CMEQ August 31, 2015 3 PM Agenda Item 4. Review and recommend endorsement of the list of projects to be submitted to MTC for the update of the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) also known as Plan Bay Area 2040.

Good afternoon. My name is Chaya Gordon, I live in Pacifica, and I am speaking today as a representative of Pacificans for Highway 1 Alternatives. PH1A now has 700 supporters.

The Caltrans Project to widen highway 1 in Pacifica is on your list for inclusion in the updated Plan Bay Area. What you may not know is that the majority of people in Pacifica have serious objections to it. I would like to share some of them with you, so you can understand why the Project should not be forwarded to the MTC.

#1 The project information in your meeting packet is wrong. The correct information I am citing comes from the Caltrans Final Environmental Impact Report.

The Project Title is correct: Construct Route 1 north and southbound lanes from Fassler to Westport Drive in Pacifica. But the Project Description only refers to the addition of a northbound lane. Also, contrary to your project description, there is nothing in the FEIR about coordinating the traffic signals, about a 3rd coordinated signal, or about the intersection at Westport Drive being closed.

It seems like a bad idea to approve a project until you know that its information is accurate. Caltrans often refers to it as adding 1 lane in each direction, neglecting to mention that the plan includes various other lanes and medians for a total of 144 feet,

COMMENTS BY CHAYA GORDON

Page 2

CCAG/CMEQ August 31, 2015 3 PM Agenda Item 4

more than double its current width. The errors in your project description are significant, and compound the errors that Caltrans often makes about the project.

The project listed is very different from the one in Caltrans' FEIR. Where did this project come from? Do you know who the sponsor or funding agency is? Your due diligence requires you to make sure the project description is correct and that you know who changed it, if the changes are deliberate. It also requires you to really examine the issues, and not just rubberstamp the project.

#2 Coordinating the traffic signals is an alternative that needs to be implemented, but Caltrans has NEVER included it. In fact, Caltrans rejected all alternatives but build and build bigger. It's no wonder that the California 2014 State Smart Transportation Initiative found that Caltrans' practices do not match current conditions.

#3 There is significant public opposition to the widening project. In Pacifica's City Council election last November, 2 of the 3 candidates elected put opposing the Caltrans Plan front and center in their campaigns. This sent a clear message: the majority of voters do not support it.

Most of all, the residents of Pacifica want to maintain Pacifica's natural beauty and small-town coastal atmosphere. It starts with not widening Highway 1, our Main Street. I have just given you many reasons that support your removing the Calera Parkway Project from the list of projects you forward to the MTC.

Thank you very much.

Attachment to the August 31, 2015 Minutes

Good afternoon Committee Members,

My name is Mike Ferreira. I am a former council member in Half Moon Bay and I am now the Conservation Chair for the Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter as well as a member of its Executive Committee and Political Committee. I am also the Chapter's representative to the 3 Chapter Working Group that deals with SB 375, AB 32 and the pending SB 340 issues as relating to MTC's & ABAG's Plan Bay Area.

The Sierra Club has consistently opposed the Calera Parkway widening project from its beginning and we have supported litigation against the project financially and otherwise. We expect to continue to do so.

The previous speakers have used some of my best lines so I'll try to cover other ground.

We regard the Calera Parkway Project as one of the worst in the Bay Area. This project - at \$59 million - is a prime example of using a shotgun to kill a fly. I now live in Moss Beach and frequently drive northward through Pacifica at commute time and, when schools are not in session, it's a breeze. Sometimes in the summertime I am able to drive through at morning commute time and catch all green lights, never having to stop. It seems to us that a much better and much less expensive approach would be to work with the school district to achieve a solution rather than spending huge sums for a big concrete solution that would have doubtful success - and only marginal success even if it worked.

In closing, I would like to express the Club's support for the BRT portion of the plan. BRT does not need to be "dedicated lane" in order to be successful and the Club regards this portion of the plan to be a commendable use of public funds.

Mike Ferreira
Conservation Chair
Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter

PS I was speaking extemporaneously and I have tried to limit this text above to the gist of what I said during a limited period of time. This does not, can not, encompass all of our positions regarding the projects above or the plan itself.