

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

### AGENDA

#### Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

**Date:** Monday, January 26, 2009 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.  
**Place:** San Mateo City Hall  
330 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo, California  
Conference Room C (across from Council Chambers)

PLEASE CALL SANDY WONG (599-1409) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

- |     |  |                                     |                      |                       |
|-----|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1.  | Public comment on items not on the agenda  | Presentations are limited to 3 mins |                      | 3:00 p.m.<br>10 mins. |
| 2.  | Minutes of November 17, 2008 meeting.  | Action<br>(O'Connell)               | Pages 1 - 2          | 3:10 p.m.<br>5 mins.  |
| 3.  | Nomination and election of Chair and Vice Chair  | Action<br>(O'Connell)               | Pages 3              | 3:15 p.m.<br>5 mins.  |
| 4.  | Review and recommend approval of the guidelines and process for Economic Stimulus funding for streets & roads projects | Action<br>(Wong)                    | Pages 4 - 7          | 3:20 p.m.<br>15 mins. |
| 5.  | Presentation on the Regional High Occupancy/Toll (HOT) lane  | Information<br>(Fremier & Bourgart) | Oral<br>Presentation | 3:35 p.m.<br>45 mins  |
| 6.  | Update on the US 101 carpool (HOV) lane study  | Information<br>(Kott)               | Pages 8 - 9          | 4:20 p.m.<br>5 mins   |
| 7.  | Discussion and recommendation on committee support for energy efficiency and green house gas emissions                 | Action<br>(Napier/Springer)         | Oral<br>Presentation | 4:25 p.m.<br>10 mins  |
| 8.  | Update on the San Mateo County Smart Corridors project   | Information<br>(Hoang)              | Verbal Update        | 4:35 p.m.<br>10 mins  |
| 9.  | Executive Director Report  | Potential Action<br>(Napier)        | Oral<br>Presentation | 4:45 p.m.<br>5 mins   |
| 10. | Member comments and announcements.   | Information<br>(O'Connell)          |                      | 4:50 p.m.<br>10 mins. |

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

11. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting      Action      5:00 p.m.  
date (February 23, 2009).      (O'Connell)

**NOTE:**      **All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee.  
Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.**

**NOTE:**      ***Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and  
participating in this meeting should contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406, five  
working days prior to the meeting date.***

Other enclosures/Correspondence - None

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

**MINUTES  
MEETING OF NOVEMBER 17, 2008**

The meeting was called to order by Chair O'Connell in the SamTrans 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Dinning Room.

Members Attending: Jim Bigelow, Judith Christensen, Arthur Lloyd, Karyl Matsumoto, Naomi Patridge, Barbara Pierce, Vice Chair Sepi Richardson, Onnolee Trapp, and Steve Dworetsky.

Staff/Guests Attending: Richard Napier, John Hoang, Jean Higaki, Joe Kott (C/CAG Staff), Pat Dixon (TA CAC), Joe La Mariana, Kim Springer, and Alexis Petru (San Mateo County Recycle Works).

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

None.

**2. Comments from the Chair.**

Chair O'Connell made the observation that during the last meeting, discussions went a bit off topic. In order to keep meetings on target and on schedule, sometimes it would be more efficient to direct staff to bring back relevant information to a future meeting for meaningful discussion. She requested that members direct any specific topic for discussion to the Chair or the Executive Director's if that topic is not specifically on the agenda.

In addition, Chair O'Connell mentioned that any side conversation during presentations can be distracting. Therefore, side conversations should be avoided during presentations.

**3. Minutes of October 27, 2008 meeting.**

*Motion: To approve the Minutes of the October 27, 2008 meeting. Approved unanimously.*

**4. Review and recommend approval of the Final San Mateo County Energy Strategy Report.**

Kim Springer and Alexis Petru of San Mateo County Public Recycle Works made a presentation on the Final San Mateo County Energy Strategy report. Member Pierce thanked all those who participated and made contributions to the report.

*Motion: Recommend approval of the Final San Mateo County Energy Strategy Report. Bigelow/Christensen, approved, unanimously.*

**5. Review and comment on the program and performance measures for SB348 –  
Reauthorized \$4 vehicle license fee on motor vehicles registered in San Mateo County.**

John Hoang made a presentation on the program and performance measures for the reauthorized \$4 vehicle license fee for motor vehicles registered in San Mateo County.

Comments from CMEQ included: Should look into the installation of new pervious surface medium strips in roadway projects. Try to leverage funds from the State program relating to new pervious surfaces. Also, consider recycled tire sidewalks projects.

***Motion: Recommend approval of the program and performance measures for SB348 – Reauthorized \$4 vehicle license fee on motor vehicles registered in San Mateo County. Approved, unanimously***

**6. Review and approval of the CMEQ 2009 meeting calendar.**

CMEQ members agreed to accept the 2009 CMEQ meeting calendar as recommended by staff with the following changes:

- a) Cancel the July and December meetings.
- b) Changed the September meeting from 28<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup>.

***Motion: Approval the CMEQ 2009 meeting calendar with changes stated above. Bigelow/Lloyd. Approved, unanimously***

**7. Executive Director Report.**

Richard Napier, Executive Director of C/CAG, provided updates on State legislations. Transit funding will be severely impacted by the State budget.

**8. Member comments and announcements**

This was Member Christensen's last meeting. Members expressed their appreciation for her contribution to the CMEQ committee.

Member Bigelow mentioned that HNTB Consulting was retained by the High Speed Rail Authority for the study of the peninsula segment of the corridor. He suggested presentations to CMEQ and C/CAG meetings sometime early next year.

**9. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.**

Meeting was adjourned.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** January 26, 2009

**To:** Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee

**From:** Sandy Wong

**Subject:** NOMINATION/ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

(For further information or questions contact Sandy Wong at 599-1409)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the CMEQ Committee elect a Chair and a Vice Chair to serve for the next year.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

None.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Not applicable.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Each year the CMEQ Committee selects a chair and a Vice Chair to lead the Committee for the next year. Irene O'Connell currently serves as the Chair and Sepi Richardson serves as the Vice Chair. They were both re-elected at the January 28, 2008 CMEQ meeting. Both are eligible to continue in the respective capacity for another year if elected by the Committee.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

None.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** January 26, 2009  
**To:** Congestion Management & Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ)  
**From:** CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**Subject:** Review and recommend approval of the guidelines and process for Economic Stimulus funding for streets & roads projects  
  
(For further information contact Sandy Wong 599-1409)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the CMEQ review and recommend approval of guidelines and process for Economic Stimulus funding for streets & roads projects as recommended by the TAC.

TAC recommendation – See attached.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

The dollar amount for transportation from the Economic Stimulus fund is unknown. Consequently, the San Mateo County share of this funding is unknown.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Economic Stimulus funds for local streets and roads come from Federal transportation funds.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

At the January 9, 2009 MTC Local Streets And Roads Working Group meeting, consensus was made to distribute Federal Economic Stimulus funding for streets and roads when/if it comes through MTC to the Bay Area using the formula previously agreed upon by the said Working Group for Surface Transportation Program (STP) Local Street and Road fund distribution. This formula factors in population, lane miles, shortfall needs, and performance from each jurisdiction. It will provide approximately 11% of Bay Area funds to San Mateo County for Local Streets and Roads.

MTC staff has informed the Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies (CMA) to prepare for submittal of final project selections within a few days of Enactment of the Economic Stimulus Bill. In anticipation of this requirement and in light of the unknowns in the Economic Stimulus approval date (current target is February 18) and its dollar amount, the TAC recommended the general guidelines and process as outlined in the attached for project selection. The recommendation will be presented to the C/CAG Board for consideration at the February 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. One of the critical issues is the ability of project construction award in a very short time, be it 37 days, 90 days, or 120 days.

## **ATTACHMENT**

- TAC Recommendation.
- “What-If” analysis using “Measure A” formula.

**Local Streets & Roads Projects for Economic Stimulus Funding  
TAC Recommendations  
From January 15, 2009 meeting**

**Background Information:**

- 1- Although subject funds are for transportation, the bigger goal is immediate jobs creation.
- 2- Contract award in extreme short timeframe.
- 3- Use it or lose it.

**Unknowns (proposal in discussion):**

1. Size of funding (\$16 million - \$64 million for San Mateo County?)
2. Local match requirements (0%, or 11.5%, or 50%?)
3. Absolute deadline to contract award (37 days, 90 days, 120 days, or 180 days after Enactment?)
4. Exact split between pavement maintenance and other types of improvement (up to 50% can be spend on non-pavement?)
5. Non-awarded funds will be redistributed to other states 90 days after enactment

**Principles in San Mateo County:**

1. Job creation now - Project readiness and ability to meet MTC, State, and Federal requirements
2. No loss of funds to the County. Adopted penalty applied if agency loses funds.
3. Past delivery performance.
4. Unique situations that merit special consideration.
5. Geographic equity.

**Project selection option A (formula-based):**

1. Jurisdictions to submit projects that can be awarded in 90 days in prioritized order.
2. Jurisdictions to submit projects that can be awarded in 120 days or 180 days etc., as contingency projects in prioritized order. (This is necessary because of unknown #3 above.)
3. Task Force will review all project submittals and screen out projects not meeting the minimum qualifications (see below).
4. Calculate each jurisdiction's share based on Measure A formula. *Special consideration: for smaller jurisdictions, provide a minimum so that meaningful project(s) can be achieved. For example, if there is \$10 million, \$20 million, or \$30 million available countywide, jurisdiction's minimum share could be \$200K, \$300K, or \$400K, respectively. TAC recommends the minimum for jurisdiction's share to be set at 1% of the countywide total, up to \$400,000. This will result in slightly lower shares for not-so-small jurisdictions as compared to if Measure A formula was used strictly.*
5. Fund all projects that meet minimum qualifications up to the amount of jurisdiction's share.
6. Any remaining funds (resulting from some jurisdictions with less projects than their share) will be awarded by a "bonus" round. The Task Force will have discretion on how the "bonus" funds will be allocated. For example, it could be based on prorated share of each jurisdiction, or other criteria developed by the Task Force.
7. Projects larger in value than the expected funding share and are "shovel ready" could bid the unfunded portion as "Add-Alt". In case other projects "fail", money could be moved to fund the "Add-Alt".
8. If final Bill specifies 50% funds shall be awarded in 90 days, remaining 50% in 180 days, above steps could be applied similarly.

### **Minimum Project Qualifications:**

1. Maintenance and rehab projects on the Federal-Aid road system or safety projects on any road. (Refer to Caltrans Local Assistance Program Guidelines Chapter 9 for safety project definition.)
2. Projects ready to award in 90 days (or number of days as specified by MTC).
3. Ability to meet all Federal requirements, ie, local match, and follow the Caltrans process.
4. DBE requirements.
5. See "Project Submittal Information Sheet". Task Force will determine which items can be used as "fatal flaw" to screen out projects. For example, projects that require more than extensive environmental document that a Categorical Exemption (CE) and have not received CEQA/NEPA approval will be screened out. Another example could be if a project requires excavation and has not received clearance from affected agencies, it will be screened out.

### **Other Considerations (Penalty):**

If a project sponsor fails to deliver project(s) after funding is approved due to lack of timely actions or misrepresentation on project information as part of submittal, and money is lost to the County, the jurisdiction is prohibited from receiving federal STP funds in the next cycle.

### **Proposed Schedule:**

January 15, 2009 – TAC recommend process  
January 26, 2009 – CMEQ recommend process  
February 1, 2009 – Project Submittals Due to C/CAG  
February 12, 2009 – C/CAG Board approve process

If Bill is approved and MTC request CMAs to submit project BEFORE the March 12, 2009 C/CAG Board meeting, C/CAG Board will delegate the final project selection to the Executive Director along with a Task Force. **The TAC Co-Chairs will develop the Task Force.** This Task Force may be the TAC or its modified composition, to be recommended at the January 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, and approved by C/CAG on February 12<sup>th</sup> as part of the process. Task Force MUST meet within one to two days after Bill is approved to meet MTC schedule. Potential window: between Feb 13 and Feb 19.

If Bill is approved and MTC request CMAs to submit project AFTER the March 12, 2009 but before the April 2009 C/CAG Board meeting, project selection will be:

February 19, 2009 TAC recommendation  
February 23, 2009 – CMEQ recommendation  
March 12, 2009 – C/CAG Board final approve



**"What-If" Analysis using "Measure A" Formula**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Measure A Share</b>	<b>If \$10M Co-wide</b>	<b>If \$15M Co-wide</b>	<b>If \$20M Co-wide</b>	<b>If \$30M Co-wide</b>
ATHERTON	1.886%	\$189,000	\$283,500	\$378,000	\$567,000
BELMONT	3.543%	\$354,000	\$531,000	\$708,000	\$1,062,000
BRISBANE	0.818%	\$82,000	\$123,000	\$164,000	\$246,000
BURLINGAME	4.206%	\$420,000	\$630,000	\$840,000	\$1,260,000
COLMA	0.299%	\$30,000	\$45,000	\$60,000	\$90,000
DALY CITY	10.413%	\$1,041,000	\$1,561,500	\$2,082,000	\$3,123,000
EAST PALO ALTO	3.215%	\$321,000	\$481,500	\$642,000	\$963,000
FOSTER CITY	3.364%	\$336,000	\$504,000	\$672,000	\$1,008,000
HALF MOON BAY	1.596%	\$160,000	\$240,000	\$320,000	\$480,000
HILLSBOROUGH	3.000%	\$300,000	\$450,000	\$600,000	\$900,000
MENLO PARK	4.851%	\$485,000	\$727,500	\$970,000	\$1,455,000
MILLBRAE	2.917%	\$292,000	\$438,000	\$584,000	\$876,000
PACIFICA	5.174%	\$517,000	\$775,500	\$1,034,000	\$1,551,000
PORTOLA VALLEY	1.488%	\$149,000	\$223,500	\$298,000	\$447,000
REDWOOD CITY	9.612%	\$961,000	\$1,441,500	\$1,922,000	\$2,883,000
SAN BRUNO	5.034%	\$504,000	\$756,000	\$1,008,000	\$1,512,000
SAN CARLOS	4.271%	\$427,000	\$640,500	\$854,000	\$1,281,000
SAN MATEO	11.797%	\$1,180,000	\$1,770,000	\$2,360,000	\$3,540,000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	7.649%	\$765,000	\$1,147,500	\$1,530,000	\$2,295,000
WOODSIDE	1.683%	\$168,000	\$252,000	\$336,000	\$504,000
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO	13.184%	\$1,318,000	\$1,977,000	\$2,636,000	\$3,954,000
COUNTY TOTAL	100.000%	\$9,999,000			

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** January 26, 2009  
**To:** Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee  
**From:** Joseph Kott, Transportation Planning and Programs Manager  
**Subject:** Feasibility Study of an HOV Lane on Highway 101 between Whipple and the San Francisco County Line

(For further information or questions contact Joseph Kott at 599-1420)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee receive the information report on the upcoming feasibility study.

## **FISCAL IMPACT & SOURCE OF FUNDS**

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission is funding the 101 HOV Lane Study.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

C/CAG and the TA, in partnership with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Caltrans, are beginning an MTC-funded study to evaluate the feasibility of a high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction on Highway 101 between Whipple and the San Francisco County line. The study will endeavor to answer a number of questions regarding the potential benefits, impacts, and other effects of an HOV lane in this freeway section. Should an HOV lane be deemed feasible, the study will also investigate the potential to implement the HOV lanes as a High occupancy toll (HOT) lanes. It is important to emphasize that this is a technical research and data gathering effort, rather than creation of a plan to proceed with implementing an HOV lane. If the technical research and data gathering results merit further investigation, staff may recommend an extensive public outreach effort as part of any plan to create HOV or HOT lanes on Highway 101 in San Mateo County. It is anticipated that the feasibility study will take between six months and one year to complete.

## **ATTACHMENT**

Attachment A provides additional detail on the technical issues to be addressed in the study.

## ATTACHMENT

### Draft Study Questions for Evaluation of HOV/(HOT) Lanes in San Mateo County on Highway 101 South of Whipple

**Study Limits:** 101 from Whipple to SF County Line

**Methods:** Case studies and computer simulation modeling

**Questions:**

1. If a 3 mixed-flow+1 high occupancy lane configuration works on Highway 101 south of Whipple, why can't it work north of Whipple? In the Bay Area are there freeway sections similar to the San Mateo study section, having a 3+1 cross-section? If so, what is the daily traffic volume and operating performance (e.g. volume to capacity ratio) of these sections?
2. Can an HOV lane be added in each direction on 101 between Whipple and the San Francisco County Line?
- 3.a. What are the system-wide benefits (e.g. in changes in person hours of delay) of HOV/(HOT) lanes for 101 in SM County? [Performance Measure]; and
- 3.b. What are the impacts (e.g. in changes in person hours of delay) for single-occupant vehicles (SOVs) and high occupancy vehicles (HOVs)? [Performance Measure]
4. What are the benefits to transit (e.g. average transit vehicle trip time savings, reduced transit patron hours of travel, increased transit patronage/mode share)? Are there impacts to Caltrain? If so, what are they (i.e. ridership, revenue)? [Performance Measure]
5. What, if any, impact on local streets and roads? [Performance Measure]
6. What are the technological issues in implementing HOV/(HOT) lanes?
7. What are the revenue implications of HOV/HOT lanes?
8. What are cost (initial capital, operations, maintenance, and enforcement) implications?