

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

**August 20, 2015  
MINUTES**

The meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices located at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Dining Room, San Carlos, CA. Co-chair Hurley called the meeting to order at 1:18 p.m. on Thursday, August 20, 2015.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Joel Slavitt – SMCTA; Ellen Barton – County of San Mateo; Jean Higaki, Jeff Lacap, John Hoang – C/CAG; and other attendees not noted.

**1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.**

None.

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

As shown on the agenda.

**3. Approval of the Minutes from June 18, 2015.**

Approved.

**4. Receive information on the Measure A Highway CIP**

Joel Slavitt, SMCTA Manager, presented information on Measure A Highway Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for FY 2016-FY 2025 reviewing the CIP goals and development process highlighting the costs, funding, and shortfall as well as identifying potential policies options to address the findings including program imbalance, timing of needs, and funding large projects. Mr. Slavitt also provided the “Summary of Identified Project Cost vs. Project Funding” and “Summary of Costs by Project” tables and indicated that the TA Board will review the draft recommendations in September and take action on the CIP policy and programming in Oct/Nov.

Discussions were as follows:

- Clarification was made that KCA (Key Congested Areas) and SR (Supplemental Roadways) categories were set by the Expenditure Plan.
- For larger projects on US-101, outside funds (e.g., private) or bond funds will be needed. In addition, projects need to be ready. It was suggested that a subcommittee may be set up to address bond. Also, there is only so much debt capacity therefore there is a need to balance.
- Regarding the issue of private funding contribution, consideration should be made for looking into implementing a traffic impact fee (TIF) for the region. Most cities that currently have a TIF address local funding rather than regional. There is a lack of regional fee collection currently. It was mentioned that Contra Costa County already has a county level TIF. Consideration should also be made for public/private partnership.
- With TIF, consideration should be taken for existing development projects versus new development projects.

- There is a need to include bike, pedestrian, and transit when looking at capacity options.
- It was noted that some cities may have some cash on hand from past city-level TIF.
- Staff will take the TAC's suggestions for a TIF into consideration and form a smaller subcommittee to perform a nexus study.

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

Jean Higaki presented on the list of project to be submitted to MTC for the RTP/SCS update (updated every four years) highlighting the Plan Bay Area 2040 targets and schedule (adoption by early summer of 2017), outreach activities undertaken by C/CAG, and MTC planning to conduct project level performance assessments during winter 2015. There is a change in the formula used which results in less money overall. A list of "Proposed Projects for the Update of the Plan Bay Area 2040" was provided. The list, currently financially unconstrained, may be further reduced based further constraints imposed.

**6. Update on projects along the US-101 Corridor**

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, provided an update regarding current developments associated with the US 101 Corridor. There are a lot of interests from various groups, especially the business community, that are looking for solutions to relieve congestion on the 101 corridor. Since the last TAC meeting, the Bay Area Council held a meeting that included C/CAG, SMCTA, MTC, Caltrans, and SamTrans to discuss what the HOV/HOT project would look like. Currently, there is no consensus as to what the project will look like as far as providing for carpool lanes or express lanes. Assembly member Kevin Mullin has been engaged and there is currently a spot bill in place that may help San Mateo County with coming up with a solution. The potential solution may include improvements to highway, Caltrans, bike/pedestrian, private transit, 1<sup>st</sup>/last mile, public/private partnership, east/west connection. There is a follow up meeting scheduled for Sept 15<sup>th</sup> with the Bay Area Council. There are also concurrent discussions with the business sector and MTC with regards to seeking out additional money to fund the project. MTC is also working with SamTrans to facilitate more transit on freeway.

Co-chair Hurley added that C/CAG and TA staff met with Secretary of Transportation, Brian Kelley. Mr. Hurley mentioned that data collection and analysis will need to be performed to come up with the appropriate solution. C/CAG consultant and Caltrans will be doing the analysis. Currently, there are three options: 1) do nothing, 2) converting the #1 lane to HOT lane (also consider enhanced bus service), and 3) adding a lane (time consuming and expensive). There are also policy solutions that need to be considered that addresses express lane (support and opposed), carpool requirements of 2+ (currently on 101) or increasing to 3+ occupancy thus creating excess capacity.

It was suggested that analysis for the project should consider impacts to local street specifically major arterials and collectors. The TAC can help staff with defining the purpose and need as the project begins the environmental phase.

**7. Regional Project and Funding Information**

Jean Higaki reported on the 2016 MTC project delivery plan, Inactive project list, MTC Federal Obligation Status for FY15-16, PMP Certification status, and the Bay Area Grant Proposal (OBAG 2). OBAG has less money due to lower revenue and a change in the formula.

Comments and discussions were as follows:

- How much money were available pre-OBAG and how much money is being proposed? As far as local streets and roads (LSR) under OBAG2, funds are not separated for the different programs therefore we will need to maintain approximately the same the ratio as in the past.
- It was mentioned that MTC has a resolution to “fix it first” but are not implementing its policy. Funds from MTC are both STP and CMAQ and in the past C/CAG tries to maximize STP funds for pavement projects.
- It is important that cities clarify to the legislature what the money is being spent on and that not all funding goes to roads. We need to provide lobbyist the right information.
- Since MTC is not planning to have PTAP 17, cities will need to use their own money to pay for the inspection work.

### **8. Executive Director Report**

Sandy Wong introduced new C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap. Ms. Wong mentioned that C/CAG is currently updating the travel demand model, indicating that some cities are participating and asking cities to be involved to assure that more accurate information be provided to CCAG for incorporation in model update. A follow up message will be sent to the City Manager as a reminder for cities to be engaged in the process.

The State Assembly Select Committee on transportation is hosting an informational hearing tomorrow on improving Bay Area transportation system. City staff is free to attend. A new emergency bill, AB 779, recently released, will change the congestion management monitoring performance standard. Currently, LOS is the measurement but if passed, the Bill will require CMAs to come up with alternative measures. This emergency bill will go into effect immediately. C/CAG staff is developing recommendations.

With regards to the MTC and ABAG agency issue, C/CAG and TA has not taken any position on the matter.

### **9. Member Reports**

None.

Meeting adjourned at 2:37 p.m.