

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, April 27, 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.
10 mins. |
| 2. | Minutes of February 23, 2009 meeting. | Action (Richardson) | Pages 1 - 4 | 3:10 p.m.
5 mins. |
| 3. | Emerging Directions for the Bay Area's Implementation of SB 375 | Potential Action (Droettboom) | Pages 5- 16 | 3:15 p.m.
45 mins |
| 4. | Receive an update on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding and direct staff to advocate for equitable allocation of the "freed up" bond funds resulting from State ARRA funds being directed to regional projects | Action (Wong) | Pages 17 - 21 | 4:00 p.m.
10 mins. |
| 5. | Status update on the San Mateo County Smart Corridors project | Information (Mokhtari) | Oral Presentation | 4:10 p.m.
10 mins |
| 6. | Progress update on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) | Information (Kott) | Pages 22 - 26 | 4:20 p.m.
15 mins |
| 8. | Executive Director Report | Potential Action (Napier) | Oral Presentation | 4:35 p.m.
5 mins |
| 9. | Member comments and announcements. | Information (Richardson) | | 4:40 p.m.
10 mins. |
| 10. | Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date (May 18, 2009 – Moved up due to Holiday). | Action (Richardson) | | 4:50 p.m. |

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.

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*

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 FEBRUARY 23, 2009**

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Pierce who presided over the meeting in Conference Room C at the City Hall of San Mateo.

Attendance sheet is attached.

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

Chair Pierce asked for self introduction by members.

2. Minutes of January 26, 2009 meeting.

Motion: To approve the Minutes of the January 26, 2009 meeting. Bigelow/O'Connell, Members Garbarino and Patridge abstained. Motion approved.

3. Review and recommend approval of staff recommendation, as presented at the meeting, on Local Street and Road projects for Economic Stimulus Funding (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009).

Sandy Wong made a staff presentation on the update of the Federal Economic Stimulus funding. There is no additional recommendation since the approval by the C/CAG Board at the February 5 and 12 meetings. The total amount for San Mateo County share has been decreased from \$12.7 million to \$10.7 million since the approval of the Federal Bill. However, there is proposed State implementation legislation that could potentially increase the dollar amount. Richard is working with the two San Mateo County MTC Commissioners, Sue Lempert and Adrienne Tissier on this issue. Staff have been working daily with all cities and the County Public Works staff on getting projects ready for Caltrans review.

Rich Napier, Executive Director, added that there are other transportation programs funded by Stimulus funds besides the Local Street & Road program. For San Mateo County, a \$7 million project for the southbound I-280 ramp metering between Highway 1 and I-380 is in the mix.

Member Lempert further explained why the San Mateo County share went down. She also said there has been concerns regarding Caltrans ability to handle the large workload in a short amount of time. And that C/CAG will be the "police" in helping the local projects to meet all necessary short deadlines. The TransBay Terminal Train Box is important to San Mateo County. However, the Joint Powers Board has concerns on the design details.

4. Review of the shuttle ridership statistics for the first two quarters of FY 08/09 (Information).

Tom Madalena provided a revised staff report correcting an error on the Menlo Park shuttle ridership. Tom presented the shuttle ridership statistics for the first two quarters of FY 2008/09. Shuttle funds are made available \$500,000 from the C/CAG budget with an additional \$300,000 in matching funds from the Transportation Authority for shuttles that take riders to Caltrain Stations. C/CAG Funding for the shuttle program is derived from the Congestion Relief Plan. Tom stated that this report was to keep the CMEQ updated on the performance of the shuttles. The ridership statistics listed by quarter were measured compared to the benchmark standards that have been established (They are \$15 per passenger

for door-to-door and \$6 per passenger for fixed route). The cost effectiveness on average for all of the shuttle routes fluctuates which may be affected by a number of factors including new shuttle programs, new routes, and station constraints at the Bayshore Caltrain station.

Approximately 41% of the shuttles were underperforming for the first quarter and 47% were underperforming for the second quarter. This is fairly consistent to FY 07/08. Tom mentioned that potential solutions could include sending a letter to inform jurisdictions of the potential of the C/CAG funding not being continued should the city be unable to improve the performance.

CMEQ members questioned as to why did the 2nd quarter ridership dropped across the board. Tom and Richard Cook of SamTrans explained the drop was due to decrease in gas price as well as the holidays. Mr. Cook added that typically, mid-day shuttles and door to door shuttles cost a lot more to operate because of labor intensive, serving "hard to serve" clientele. As an example, Redi-Wheel costs \$35 per passenger.

Chair Pierce asked if there is emission reduction standard associated with the shuttle program. The answer was no. Member O'Connell suggested to encourage city shuttle sponsors and operators to share success and best management practices. Member Bigelow encouraged the TAC to come back with more information and recommendations.

5. Recommendation of the Fiscal Year 2009/2010 Expenditure Program for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program for San Mateo County.

Tom Madalena presented the staff recommendation on the 2009/2010 TFCA Expenditure Program. The allocation is \$1,070,722. Approximately 5% would be allocated to C/CAG for administration of the program. The recommended allocation formula represents the same formula that was utilized last year. This includes 56% (or \$570,000) for SamTrans BART Shuttle Bus Program and 44% (or \$449,000) for the Alliance. Funding for the Alliance will go along with \$509,000 CRP funds for a total of \$958,000 for the Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program, including: Employer Outreach, Commuter Outreach, Incentive Programs such as Try Transit, Carpool and Vanpool Incentives, Bike to Work Day, etc.

Motion: Recommend approval of the Fiscal Year 2009/2010 Expenditure Program for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program for San Mateo County. Bigelow/O'Connell, Approved, unanimously.

6. Update on the San Mateo County Smart Corridors project (Information)

John Hoang provided an update on the San Mateo County Smart Corridors project. C/CAG is working with Caltrans to develop the System Engineering process, a federally required step for Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) projects. The environmental certification process is still in progress. C/CAG has retained Parviz Mokhtari as the Project Manager for this project.

Member Papan suggested to involve OES in Sacramento and possibly seek some additional funding. Member Robinson asked if the Smart Corridor system would be used for routine congestion management beside incident management.

7. Status update on the adoption of "San Mateo County Energy Strategy" (Information)

Richard Napier, C/CAG Executive Director, handed out a schedule on the adoption of the San Mateo County Energy Strategy by jurisdictions. He encouraged all jurisdictions, if not done so yet, to schedule the adoption at Council meetings.

8. Organization of the Utility and Sustainability Task Force (USTF) with respect to CMEQ.

Kim Springer provided background information on the Utility and Sustainability Task Force (USTF), its genesis and accomplishments thus far. The USTF was created as a subcommittee of CMEQ to develop the San Mateo County Energy Strategy. The Energy Strategy report has been adopted by the C/CAG Board, and is currently being adopted by various local jurisdictions. Efforts by the USTF also led to the establishment of local government energy baseline assessments and follow up climate action plans.

Richard Napier posted three questions to the CMEQ: 1) Should USTF continue to operate? 2) If yes, what should be the representation be? 3) Should it report to CMEQ or to C/CAG Board directly? CMEQ members unanimously agreed that the work being done by such a group is important and ought to continue. In terms of representation, it should be broad representation.

Member Kersteen-Tucker would like to see some effort with regard to linking transportation and land use. Mr. Napier responded that the transportation and land use linkage is in the primary domain of CMEQ. In addition, the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) update has just begun. It will include a chapter for transportation/land use linkage.

Discussion among CMEQ members seem to suggest that USTF should be reformed and report directly to the C/CAG Board, with overlapping members with CMEQ. However, the reporting structure depends on whether there is desire to have more oversight on the work performed by the USTF or not. The USTF and its staff to discuss in more detail, including its membership, terms, and scope of work. CMEQ members who are on the USTF to report back at a future meeting.

Motion: Since the USTF has done an outstanding job, the next step is to have staff come back with options for the continuation of the USTF, including membership, reporting structure, etc. Bigelow/Koelling, Approved, unanimously

9. Executive Director Report.

Richard Napier announced that the C/CAG Board has nominated Tom Kasten to be the new Chair, and Carole Groom and Bob Grassilli to be the two new Vice Chairs. Elections will be at the March meeting. Richard also asked CMEQ members to save-the-day for the April 16, 2009 (6:00 PM) C/CAG Retreat. More detail will be sent out later.

10. Member comments and announcements

Member Matsumoto announced that this would be her last CMEQ meeting because she is stepping down after many years of being a member of CMEQ. Since member Garbarino of South San Francisco is now a CMEQ member, she felt that it well represented. The CMEQ committee expressed appreciation for member Matsumoto's contribution and hard work.

Member Bigelow announced that the High Speed Rail co-hosted by the local City where the meeting is being held at Millbrae, Palo Alto, and Redwood City will conduct three meetings at the three potential station cities. He will forward the meeting announcements tomorrow. He also stated that the Scoping comment period has been extended to April 4.

9. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:40 pm.

CMEQ 2009 Attendance Record				
Name	Jan 26	Feb 23		
Arthur Lloyd	Yes	Yes		
Barbara Pierce	Yes	Yes		
Daniel Quigg	Yes			
Gina Papan	Yes	Yes		
Heyward Robinson	NA	Yes		
Irene O'Connell	Yes	Yes		
Jim Bigelow	Yes	Yes		
Karyl Matsumoto	Yes	Yes		
Lennie Roberts	Yes	Yes		
Linda Koelling	Yes	Yes		
Naomi Patridge		Yes		
Onnolee Trapp	Yes	Yes		
Richard Garbarino	NA	Yes		
Sepi Richardson	Yes			
Steve Dworetzky	Yes	Yes		
Sue Lempert		Yes		
Zoe Kersteen- Tucker	Yes	Yes		
Other attendees at Feb. 23, 2009 meeting:				
Richard Napier, Sandy Wong, Tom Madalena,	C/CAG Staff			
Richard Cook	SamTrans			
Kim Springer	SM County Recycle Works			
Marshall Loring	MTC EDAC			
Ruth Peterson	SSMC			



Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Bay Conservation and Development Commission
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy

JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE — REGIONAL PLANNING PROGRAM

Date: March 12, 2009
To: Joint Policy Committee
From: Ted Droettboom, Regional Planning Program Director
Subject: Policies for the Bay Area's Implementation of Senate Bill 375

Attached is a draft set of policies which are proposed to guide the process through which the Bay Area's regional agencies will implement SB 375 (Steinberg). The draft policies were distributed to the JPC and to stakeholders in January so that there would be ample opportunity to consider and comment on the draft policies before they were submitted for adoption at the JPC's March meeting. Some stakeholders have provided written comments, and these are also attached to this memorandum.

The draft policies are essentially policies for making policies (i.e., "meta-policies"). They were developed by senior staff from all four of the JPC member agencies and are supported by the Executive Directors/Officers of each.

The draft policies are designed to facilitate the achievement of five qualities, which we believe are essential for the successful implementation of SB 375 and for the responsible and effective conduct of our ongoing regional planning responsibilities. These qualities are:

1. **Challenge** to the *status quo* and to business as usual, in recognition of the urgency and magnitude of the global climate-change imperative;
2. **Integration**
 - Between ABAG's and MTC's respective contributions to the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and, if required, the Alternative Planning Strategy (APS),
 - Between the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA),
 - Between analytic modeling results and planning choices,
 - Between the requirements of SB 375 and other ongoing and proposed regional planning initiatives undertaken by any and all of the four JPC member agencies,

- Between the efforts of the Bay Area and those of adjacent regions;
3. **Inclusion** of all the entities—local governments, congestion management agencies, transit providers, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), business, development and environmental interests—required to make the SCS real, achievable, and more than a paper plan;
 4. **Momentum**, continuing and building upon the climate-protection, focused-growth, transit-oriented-development, road-pricing and other related land-use and transportation planning initiatives already moving forward under the leadership of the JPC member agencies;
 5. **Impact** on the actual, on-the-ground production of greenhouse gases without compromising the region's overall objectives for economic prosperity, environmental sustainability and social equity.

Our approach to SB 375, as guided by these policies, will significantly change how we prepare the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and how we develop the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). It will also affect the planning activities of the Air District and influence the way BCDC prepares for change on the Bay's shoreline. In addition, the approach requires that the JPC play a considerably enhanced role in all regional planning products. SB 375 and our preparation of a Sustainable Communities Strategy clearly bring *joint* policy to the forefront and require that the JPC and its regional-agency members engage in an unprecedented partnership with other members of the Bay Area community.

RECOMMENDATION

I RECOMMEND:

- A. THAT the Joint Policy Committee adopt the attached Policies for the Bay Area's Implementation of SB 375 (the Policies); and
- B. THAT the Joint Policy Committee refer and commend the Policies for adoption by its member agencies.



Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Bay Conservation and Development Commission
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
P.O. Box 2050
Oakland, CA 94607-4756
(510) 464-7942
fax: (510) 433-5542
tedd@abag.ca.gov
www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy

JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE

Policies for the Bay Area's Implementation of Senate Bill 375

Introduction

SB 375¹ (Steinberg) was passed by the California State Assembly on August 25th, 2008, and by the State Senate on August 30th. The Governor signed it into law on September 30th, 2008.

The bill mandates an integrated regional land-use-and-transportation-planning approach to reducing greenhouse-gas (GHG) emissions from automobiles and light trucks, principally by reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Within the Bay Area, automobiles and light trucks account for about 26 percent of our 2007 GHG inventory² and about 64 percent of emissions from the transportation sector.

SB 375 explicitly assigns responsibilities to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to implement the bill's provisions for the Bay Area. Both agencies are members of the Joint Policy Committee³ (JPC). The policies in this document were approved by the JPC and provide guidance to the two lead regional agencies in fulfilling their responsibilities in collaboration with their JPC partners, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC).

Bay Area Climate-Protection Context

On July 20th, 2007, the JPC approved a *Bay Area Regional Agency Climate Protection Program*⁴. This program has as a key goal: "To be a model for California, the nation and the world." Following from this key goal is a supporting goal: "Prevention: To employ all feasible, cost-effective strategies to meet and surpass the State's targets of reducing greenhouse-gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050." In pursuit of these goals, MTC's current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update, *Transportation 2035*⁵, has evaluated transportation strategies and investment programs relative to a target of reducing GHG emissions from on-road vehicles in the year 2035 by 40 percent compared to 1990 levels. ABAG has established the same target for assessing alternative land-use scenarios in the

¹ http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/07-08/bill/sen/sb_0351-0400/sb_375_bill_20080930_chaptered.html

² Bay Area Air Quality Management District, *Source Inventory of Bay Area Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, December 2008 (http://www.baaqmd.gov/pln/documents/regionalinventory2007_003_000.pdf)

³ The Joint Policy Committee (JPC) is a regional planning consortium of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD or the "Air District"), the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)

⁴ <http://www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/JPC%20Action%20on%20Climate%20Protection.pdf>

⁵ http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/2035_plan/index.htm

development of the latest iteration of the region's policy-based forecast of population and employment: *Projections 2009*⁶.

The Bay Area's regional agencies have clearly recognized the primacy of the climate-change challenge as a driver of public transportation and land-use policy, and we have embraced the urgency of GHG reduction. The momentum established by our policies and actions to date will carry over into our implementation of SB 375. We do not regard SB 375 as a vexatious new requirement, but rather as an instrument to assist us in continuing and accelerating the climate-protection journey upon which we have already embarked. We are genuinely concerned with making real and measurable progress in reducing the impact which motor-vehicle travel has on the global warming problem. That concern will be paramount in our approach to SB 375 and is reflected in the policies which follow.

Policy Subject 1: Setting Targets

SB 375 requires that the California Air Resources Board (CARB) set GHG-reduction targets for cars and light trucks in each California region for the years 2020 and 2035. CARB must release draft targets by June 30, 2010 and adopt targets by September 30, 2010.

To assist in establishing these targets, CARB is required to appoint a Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) composed of representatives of Metropolitan Planning Organizations⁷ (MPOs), affected air districts⁸, the League of California Cities (the League), the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), local transportation agencies⁹, and members of the public—including homebuilders, environmental organizations, environmental-justice organizations, affordable housing organizations, and others. The Advisory Committee is tasked with recommending factors to be considered and methodologies to be used in establishing the targets, not recommending the targets themselves—though MPOs are explicitly permitted to recommend targets for CARB's consideration.

In recommending factors to be considered and methodologies to be used, the Advisory Committee may consider any relevant issues, including, but not limited to, data needs, modeling techniques, growth forecasts, the impacts of regional jobs-housing balance on interregional travel and GHG emissions, economic and demographic trends, the magnitude of GHG-reduction benefits from a variety of land use and transportation strategies, and appropriate methods to describe regional targets and to monitor performance in attaining those targets. The advisory committee shall provide a report with its recommendations to CARB no later than September 30, 2009, and CARB must consider the report before setting the targets. After the publication of the Advisory Committee Report, MPOs are required to hold at least one public workshop in their region. In establishing the targets, CARB is also required to exchange technical information with MPOs and associated air districts.

The prescribed target-setting process, including the multi-sector RTAC, creates a dynamic between *need* (i.e., the reduction required to contribute to the state's overall greenhouse-gas-reduction targets) and *feasibility* (i.e., the perceived probability of satisfying that need through

⁶ <http://www.abag.ca.gov/planning/currentfcst/news.html>

⁷ In the Bay Area, the Metropolitan Planning Organization is MTC.

⁸ In the Bay Area, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

⁹ In the Bay Area, this might include Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs), transit providers, and the transportation planning/streets-and-roads arms of local governments.

available regional planning and implementation mechanisms.) That dynamic may be premature and limiting. Until one goes through the actual process of producing and evaluating a target-based plan, the feasibility of that plan, and the target to which it responds, is mostly just conjecture. The necessity to limit the target based on an *a priori* judgment of feasibility is also obviated by the legislation's provision of an escape valve, the Alternative Planning Strategy (APS), which provides a mechanism to identify additional measures if target achievement proves not to be feasible in the initial plan, the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

In the 2009 RTP update and in the *Projections 2009* process, ABAG and MTC have established very aggressive GHG-reduction targets, based on the transportation sector's large contribution to the region's GHG inventory and on the science-based need to reduce GHGs to 80 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2050. The Bay Area's regional agencies are committed to achieving a significant reduction in transportation-related GHGs and are opposed to constraining that reduction by setting targets that are too low and that do not provide sufficient challenge to business as usual. We also want to ensure our efforts are rewarded with observable progress, not just with well-intentioned but unimplemented plans.

Policy 1:

The Bay Area regional agencies will fully participate in CARB's regional target-setting process. This participation will occur, to the extent possible, through the RTAC process, through the exchange of data and information with CARB, and through the authority given MPOs to independently recommend targets for their regions.

In their participation, the Bay Area regional agencies will seek factors, methodologies, and targets that *do not* limit this region's ability to achieve significant GHG reductions and that *do* provide significant challenges to current trends and habits.

The regional agencies will also seek unambiguous and accurate metrics of target achievement, so that performance relative to the targets can be confidently and unarguably assessed.

Policy Subject 2: Modeling the Relationship between Transportation and Land Use

Travel models (mathematical simulations of travel behavior relative to the regional transportation system and the distribution of land uses) are used to compare the impact of alternative transportation strategies, alternative investment packages and alternative land-use patterns. The land-use patterns that are fed into the travel models are also, in part, generated by mathematical models of economic and demographic trends.

SB 375 requires that the California Transportation Commission (CTC), in consultation with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and CARB, maintain guidelines for travel models. The guidelines must, to the extent practicable within resource constraints, account for:

- The empirical relationship among land-use density, automobile ownership, and vehicle miles traveled (VMT);
- The impact of enhanced transit service on vehicle ownership and VMT;
- Induced travel behavior and land development likely to result from highway or rail expansion;

- Mode splits between automobile, transit, carpool, bicycle, and pedestrian trips;
- Speed and frequency, days, and hours of operation of transit service.

SB 375 also requires that MPOs disseminate the methodology, results, and key assumptions of their travel models in a way that would be usable by and understandable to the public.

Models will be key tools in developing and assessing the alternative transportation and land-use strategies required to implement SB 375. MTC is currently replacing its travel model with a new instrument more attuned to the CTC guidelines. ABAG is about to update its land-use forecasting models.

This is an opportune time to ensure that the region's models are integrated and can be used in an iterative manner, with not only the land-use models feeding into the travel model but with the travel model also feeding back into the land-use models so that the development impacts and requirements of various transportation measures and investments can be more confidently evaluated and so that a mutually reinforcing land-use *and* transportation strategy can be constructed. At present, the relationship is very linear and one-way, with the land-use forecast informing the travel model but the travel model only indirectly influencing how we forecast land use. Achieving two-way integration will require a much closer working relationship between ABAG and MTC staff engaged in modeling and forecasting than has heretofore been the case.

While the models are very technical and complex, it is also a worthy and responsible objective to aim for more public transparency of model methodologies, assumptions and particularly limitations.

Policy 2:

The Bay Area regional agencies will work together to construct an integrated and transparent modeling system which facilitates technical, decision-maker and public understanding of how land-use and transportation decisions can be coordinated so as to reduce GHG emissions.

Policy Subject 3: Preparing a Sustainable Communities Strategy and an Alternative Planning Strategy

SB 375 requires that each MPO (MTC and ABAG in the Bay Area) prepare a sustainable communities strategy (SCS). This strategy is to, among other things, constitute the land-use forecast for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and must comply with federal requirements for that forecast, including most importantly that it be judged to be realistically attainable during the twenty-five-year period of the RTP. One criterion for judging realistic attainability is congruence with local-government general plans, specific plans and zoning.

The SCS shall be adopted as part of the RTP¹⁰ and shall:

- Identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region;
- Identify areas within the region sufficient to house *all* the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population, over the course of the planning period of the RTP

¹⁰ The next RTP update, and the first to which SB 375 will apply, is scheduled to be adopted in March 2013.

(i.e., 25 years), taking into account net migration into the region, population growth (presumably referring to natural increase), household formation, and employment growth;

- Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need;
- Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region;
- Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region;
- Consider state housing goals;
- Forecast a development pattern for the region, which when integrated with the transportation network and other transportation measures and policies, will achieve, to the extent practicable, the targeted greenhouse-gas emission reduction from automobiles and light trucks, while also permitting the RTP to comply with the Clean Air Act;
- In doing all of the above, consider spheres of influence that have been adopted by LAFCOs.

Some believe that the SCS is just ABAG's *Projections* under another name and with slightly different prescriptions and constraints. It is much more than that. While the SCS will, in part, play a role similar to *Projections* in the RTP, it is not just a land-use forecast, but a preferred development pattern *integrated* with the transportation network and with transportation measures and policies. It approaches in intent and content a comprehensive land-use and transportation plan for the region. As such, it should play a more fundamental guiding role for the RTP than does *Projections*, which is mostly used now for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and for air quality conformity analysis accompanying the RTP.

Before adopting the SCS, we will be required to quantify the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions projected to be achieved by the SCS and identify the difference (if any) between that reduction and the CARB targets for the region.

If the SCS is unable to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to the targeted levels, then we must prepare an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) showing how the greenhouse-gas targets would be achieved through alternative development patterns, infrastructure, or additional transportation measures or policies. The APS is a separate document from the RTP but may be adopted at the same time as the RTP. In preparing the APS, we are required to:

- Identify the principal impediments to achieving the targets through the SCS;
- Describe how the GHG targets would be achieved by the alternative strategy and why the development pattern, transportation measures and transportation policies in the APS are the most practicable choices for the achievement of those targets;
- Ensure that the APS complies with all the federal requirements for an RTP "except to the extent that compliance with those requirements would prevent achievement of the GHG targets" (i.e., the APS is essentially exempted from the criterion of realistic attainability);
- Develop the APS in the same manner and consider the same factors as we would to develop an SCS.

The APS is essentially a more aggressive GHG-reduction strategy than would be permissible under the federal requirements for an RTP—i.e., financially constrained and with a realistic land-use forecast.

As the SCS is an official part of the RTP, it is required by federal law to be internally consistent with the other parts of the RTP, including the financially constrained transportation investment package. This is what gives the SCS its power: transportation projects identified for funding in the RTP investment package must be consistent with the SCS¹¹.

As the APS is not included in the RTP and therefore does not influence transportation investment, its potential impact is much more limited. It serves essentially two purposes, the first explicit in the legislation, the second implicit: (1) to provide access to some California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) concessions for qualifying development projects¹², and (2) to provide a means through which the state can be informed of additional powers, authorities or resources required to meet regional GHG-reduction targets.

The Bay Area's regional agencies are committed to making a real difference in reducing GHGs. Therefore, it is in our interest to achieve as much progress toward this region's targets in the SCS as possible. Those land-use changes, transportation measures and transportation policies which can only be identified in the APS are essentially those that we have conceded cannot be implemented; that is, we cannot provide the required assurances to the federal government that those changes, measures, and policies meet the realism test—at least not within the current distribution of authorities. If the changes, measures and policies are not real, then the GHG reductions are also not real. We will not attain the on-the-ground improvement we desire and need.

Meeting the realism test for the SCS requires two preconditions: (1) alignment of local land-use policy with the preferred land-use pattern in the SCS¹³ and (2) authority and resources to undertake the required transportation policies and measures. To maximize our probability of success, we need to be acquiring those preconditions now, building upon the momentum that we have established with the target driven RTP, *Transportation 2035*, with the performance-based

¹¹ The legislation specifically excludes a subset of investment projects from this requirement, including those contained in the 2007 or 2009 Federal Statewide Transportation Program (STP), those specifically listed in a sales tax ballot measure approved before the end of the 2008, and arguably those funded through Proposition 1-B (2006). Further the legislation does not require a sales tax authority to change the funding allocations approved by voters for categories in a sales tax measure adopted before the end of 2010.

¹² CEQA concessions are extended to two potentially overlapping types of development projects: (1) a residential or mixed-use project consistent with an SCS or APS; and (2) specifically defined "transit priority projects" (TPPs). Subject to incorporating mitigation measures from previous reviews, the EIRs for SCS- or APS-consistent projects will not be required to address growth-inducing impacts, global warming impacts, or regional transportation network impacts. Further SCS- or APS-consistent development projects will not have to prepare a reduced-density alternative to address local traffic impacts. TPPs will be exempt from CEQA review if they are consistent with an SCS or APS and comply with a long list of other mandatory and optional criteria.

¹³ SB 375 explicitly provides that neither the SCS nor the APS will regulate the use of land or supersede the exercise of the land-use authority of cities and counties. It further stipulates that there is no requirement that a city's or county's land-use policies and regulations, including its general plan, be consistent with the RTP (including the SCS) or with the APS. Therefore, alignment of local land-use policy with the SCS will have to be voluntary.

Projections 2009 and with the Bay Area's voluntary development and conservation strategy, *FOCUS*¹⁴.

Transportation 2035 has been instrumental in introducing climate protection as a core regional transportation planning objective to the CMAs and to other transportation planning and operating agencies. The *Projections 2009* process has initiated a productive discussion with local-government officials on the impact that land-use and development has on transportation GHGs. *FOCUS* has provided mechanisms, priority development areas (PDAs) and priority conservation areas (PCAs), through which the regional agencies and local governments can partner on achieving a land-use pattern that contributes to lower VMT and hence fewer GHG emissions.

To enable the region to prepare a genuinely effective SCS in association with the 2013 RTP, the cooperative policy discussions begun with the 2009 RTP and with *Projections 2009* need to continue and accelerate over the next few years and into the formal beginning of the SCS process. A successful SCS will not be proposed and imposed by the regional agencies, but will be built and owned cooperatively at all levels by all the transportation and land-use authorities in the Bay Area.

We also need to make substantial progress on the implementation of the PDAs and PCAs, so that local governments have concrete examples upon which to draw when constructing local plans that are consistent with the SCS. And we need to establish trust among local governments that substantial regional and state assistance to PDAs and PCAs is truly forthcoming. Full local-government participation in the *FOCUS* PDA and PCA initiatives is conditioned on the provision of incentive funding. In *Transportation 2035* MTC established a \$2.2-billion¹⁵ Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) account to, in part, assist PDAs and transit-oriented development. Early programming of dollars in the TLC account can set a positive stage for an SCS that enjoys local-government support and, therefore, is more likely to be realistically attainable.

Policy 3

The Bay Area regional agencies are committed to achieving the region's GHG-reduction targets through the SCS and will prepare an APS only as a last resort.

To assist in the preparation of a realistic and attainable SCS, the regional agencies will:

- Form a partnership with local transportation and land-use authorities and with other relevant stakeholders to cooperatively prepare an SCS, beginning no later than the end of 2009;
- Begin programming and allocating funds from the \$2.2 billion TLC account no later than fiscal year 2010-11 so as to demonstrate a tangible commitment to priority development areas that assist in reducing GHGs;
- Initiate joint programming of regional-agency funding (e.g., MTC and BAAQMD grants) to achieve synergies and maximize combined impact;

¹⁴ <http://www.bayareavisoin.org/initiatives/index.html>

¹⁵ As a federal requirement, enumerated in escalated dollars of the day.

Policy 3 continued

- Give priority consideration to SCS-supportive incentives in the allocation and programming of new funding (e.g., the federal stimulus package) as it becomes available to the regional agencies;
- Advocate for early and appropriately directed incentives for PDAs and PCAs from existing state programs and for the creation of additional incentive mechanisms through new state legislation in advance of the SCS;
- Work with federal agencies to ensure that fiscal constraints and realism tests account for reasonable and probable changes in policy and financial capacity between plan initiation and the RTP horizon year;
- Advocate for road pricing and other transportation measures and authorities that can contribute to reducing VMT and hence GHGs.

Policy Subject 4: Achieving Consistency with Adjacent Regions

As referenced under Policy Subject 3, the SCS will be required to identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population, taking into account net migration into the region, natural increase, household formation, and employment growth.

This is a substantial departure from present regional-planning practice, which has assumed some spillover of Bay-Area-generated housing and transportation demand into adjacent regions, particularly into the Central Valley. We can plan to accommodate all our population growth, but our plans are unlikely to be realized if they are not consistent with those of our neighboring regions, who may continue to plan on the basis of accommodating exogenous demand from the Bay Area. Early and frequent discussions with surrounding regions to coordinate assumptions and policies is, therefore, required.

Policy 4:

The Bay Area regional agencies will initiate discussions and consult with our neighboring regions throughout the model-development and SCS planning processes to facilitate consistency in assumptions and policies.

Policy Subject 5: Synchronizing and Conforming the SCS and the RTP with the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)

SB 375 requires that the RHNA/housing element cycle will be synchronized and coordinated with the preparation of every other RTP update, starting with the first update after 2010 (i.e., 2013). RTP updates occur every four years, and housing elements must be adopted by local governments eighteen months after the adoption of the RTP. With a few exceptions, the region will now be on an eight-year RHNA cycle and local governments will be on eight-year housing-element cycles. In addition to synchronizing with the preparation of the RTP and the SCS contained therein, the RHNA allocation must be consistent with the development pattern included in the SCS, and the resolution approving the RHNA shall demonstrate that it is

consistent with the SCS. Housing elements and associated local zoning adopted pursuant to the RHNA may be among the most important means for making the SCS real.

The 2008 ABAG RHNA process was the first in the state to explicitly connect the regional housing allocation to the sort of focused-growth and transit-oriented development principles which are likely to be central to the SCS. We, therefore, have a head start on the consistency requirements of SB 375. However, many of jurisdictions that received higher RHNA numbers as the result of the newly applied principles also persuasively argued that they required additional resources to respond to the infrastructure and service requirements of more housing and population. A more intimate connection with the RTP will be required to assist resources to flow in the same direction as housing requirements.

Existing law makes MTC responsible for the RTP and ABAG responsible for the RHNA. SB 375 makes both agencies jointly responsible for the SCS, though the SCS will also be adopted as part of the RTP. To ensure coordination and complementarity and to ensure that both agencies are fully cognizant of their commitments to each other and of their joint commitments to other partners and the region, all three instruments—the RTP, the RHNA and the SCS—should be developed and adopted together as a regional-agency partnership.

Policy 5:

The SCS, RTP and RHNA will be developed together through a single and integrated cross-agency work program.

Progress and interim products in the cross-agency work program will be reported *first* to the JPC, and through the JPC to the committees, boards, and commission charged with making draft and final decisions on each of three policy instruments: MTC for the RTP, ABAG for the RHNA, and both for the SCS.

The JPC may, from time to time, form subcommittees, including additional representatives from each of the agencies, to facilitate broadened vetting of significant draft documents.

To the extent feasible, policy reports and adopting resolutions for each of policy instruments will reference implications for the other instruments so that all decisions are cognizant of interdependencies.

Policy Subject 6: Providing CEQA Assistance

SB 375 provides various levels of CEQA assistance to housing and mixed-use development projects based on their conformity with a number of criteria, including consistency with an SCS or APS. However, the legislation only vaguely defines “consistency” and then in manner which may not be compatible with current Bay Area regional land-use planning practice. One approach to clarifying “consistency” is the preparation of a programmatic environmental impact review (EIR) for the SCS (and for the APS, if required). Development projects, as well as infrastructure projects, might also be able to “tier off” this EIR, and thus become eligible for additional CEQA assistance in addition to that provided through SB 375. The feasibility of this approach, and of alternatives, requires the resolution of a number of technical and legal issues, including the relationship to the EIR presently prepared for the RTP. Work to resolve these issues needs to occur as soon as possible as it will clearly affect the manner in which we prepare the SCS/APS.

DRAFT 3/12/2009

Policy 6:

In consultation with appropriate CEQA authorities, the regional agencies will develop and finalize, no later than June 2010, a functional design for the structure and content of the SCS, the APS and associated environmental impact review documents sufficient for these to be confidently employed as the basis for determining eligibility for CEQA assistance as contemplated in SB 375 and, if feasible, to provide additional CEQA assistance for projects which contribute positively to environmental objectives for the region.

Policy Subject 7: Aligning Regional Policies

While ABAG and MTC develop the region's first SCS, the Air District and BCDC will also be putting together policies and regulations that will affect the region's distribution of land uses and the placement of public infrastructure. Both agencies may, as well, propose projects which could be included in the RTP.

In its effort to control criteria pollutants (e.g. ozone precursors and particulate matter), the Air District may, under existing authority, consider an indirect source rule (ISR) that regulates the construction and long-term transportation impacts of land development and requires mitigation or payments in lieu for development which does not meet established standards. Of particular concern is development which is deemed to increase automobile travel and hence vehicle emissions. The Air District may also seek to limit development in certain areas so as to reduce exposure to noxious particulate matter and other localized air toxins.

BCDC will be preparing an adaptation plan to prepare for inevitable sea-level rise and storm surges affecting areas on and near the Bay shoreline. This will have implications for the location of future development and perhaps for the relocation of present development and infrastructure.

It is essential that both the Air District's work and BCDC's be aligned with the SCS so that the regional agencies complement and do not contradict one another. Confusion will not contribute to the multi-level collaboration required to achieve a sustainable communities strategy that works.

Policy 7:

Starting immediately, all regional-agency policies affecting the location and intensity of development or the location and capacity of transportation infrastructure will be vetted through the JPC and evaluated against the filter of the emerging SCS.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 27, 2009
To: Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee
From: Sandy Wong
Subject: Receive an update on the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding and direct staff to advocate for equitable allocation of the “freed up” bond funds resulting from State ARRA funds being directed to regional projects

(For further information contact Sandy Wong 599-1409 or Jean Higaki at 599-1462)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ receive an update on American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding and direct staff to advocate for equitable allocation of the “freed up” bond funds resulting from State ARRA funds being directed to regional projects.

FISCAL IMPACT

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding, also known as Economic Stimulus funding will be directed towards specific capital projects. It will have no impact on C/CAG budget. Staff time spent on this item has been incorporated into adopted C/CAG budget.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

ARRA (Economic Stimulus) funds come from Federal funds.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

At the February 25, 2009 MTC Commission meeting, the MTC adopted the Bay Area spending plan for the initial \$154 million regional ARRA fund through the Surface Transportation Program as follow:

	<u>Bay Area</u>	<u>San Mateo County</u>
System Preservation (Local Road Rehabilitation)	\$122 million	\$11.08 million (Tier 1)
Safety program	\$13 million	\$ 0
Smart Highway (Freeway Performance Initiative)	\$19 million	\$7 million

C/CAG staff have been working with all 21 jurisdictions in San Mateo County on the Local Street & Road projects funded by the \$11.08 million for streets/roads system preservation.

In addition, MTC has approved a \$7 million project in the Smart Highway category for the San Mateo County southbound I-280 ramp metering between I-380 and Highway 1 (in the vicinities of cities/town of Daly City, Colma, South San Francisco, and San Bruno). Ramp metering on the northbound direction for this segment of the freeway has already been deployed in October 2008. This southbound I-280 ramp metering project is consistent with the C/CAG Ramp Metering Program.

At the end of March, the Governor signed a legislation which suballocated a portion of the State share of ARRA funds to regions including MTC. As a result, MTC received an additional \$157.3 million ARRA funds for the Highway Element. At the time this staff report is prepared, MTC Commission is scheduled to approve, at their April 22 meeting, to direct the \$157.3 million State element of Highway ARRA funds as follows. The key criteria for these projects are the ability to meet the State deadline for contract award.

- \$23.4 million for Local Streets and Roads System Preservation for nine counties based on formula. San Mateo County's share is \$2.13 million. Using the C/CAG approved process, the \$2.13 million will be spread amongst the 21 jurisdictions based on the approved formula. This will fully fund the Tier 2 Local Streets & Roads projects.
- \$120.3 million to stalled Prop 1B projects (Caldecott Tunnel and Marin I-580/101 Connector). Both projects are ready and can have contract award within 6 months. This effort will "free up" bond funds which will be available for other projects in the Bay Area. However, MTC does not have a proposal on how to allocate the "freed up" bond fund yet.

(Staff recommendation: That the CMEQ direct staff to advocate for equitable allocation of the "freed up" bond funds resulting from State ARRA funds being directed to the Caldecott Tunnel and Marin I-580/101 Connector projects.)

- \$13.5 million for the ready to go High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lane projects in the region.

ATTACHMENT

- Tier 1 and Tier 2 ARRA funding for Local Street and Road Projects.

SAN MATEO COUNTY
American Recovery and Reinvestment Act
Tier 1 and Tier 2 LS&R System Preservation Projects
For approval at April 22, 2009 MTC Commission Meeting
SAN MATEO COUNTY

Responsible Agency (agency to receive funds)	Project name	Project Location	Description of Work	IDs: TIP ID Fed Proj No. EA	Phase	Local Funding	Federal Funding (Non-Economic Recovery)	ARRA Tier 1 Funding	ARRA Tier 2 Funding	Total Funding
								\$11,080,000	\$2,130,000	
						\$2,544,000	\$631,000	\$11,080,000	\$2,130,000	\$16,385,000
Atherton	Atherton Roadway Rehabilitation	Atherton Ave from Stern Lane to Elena Avenue	Reconstruct Atherton Ave from Selby Lane to Elena Avenue	REG090030	PE:					\$718,000
				ESPL-5261(006)	ROW:					
					CON:	\$250,000		\$392,000	\$76,000	
Belmont	2009 Belmont Overlay	Sixth Avenue between O'Neill Avenue and Harbor Boulevard; Carlmont Drive between Hastings Drive and Alameda de	Overlay of streets including Sixth Avenue, Hallmark Drive, Carlmont Drive, and Cipriani Boulevard etc.	REG090030	PE:					\$564,000
				ESPL-5268(015)	ROW:					
					CON:	\$100,000		\$389,000	\$75,000	
Brisbane	Brisbane - Bayshore Blvd Overlay	Bayshore Blvd in Brisbane	AC overlay of federal aid eligible arterial completely within existing paved public ROW.	REG090030	PE:					\$231,000
				ESPL-5376(006)	ROW:					
					CON:	\$100,000		\$110,000	\$21,000	
Burlingame	Burlingame Various Streets Resurfacing	Airport Blvd and Trousdale Drive	AC Overlay a portion of Airport Blvd and the lower portion of Trousdale Drive	REG090030	PE:					\$551,000
				ESPL-5171(016)	ROW:					
					CON:	\$0		\$462,000	\$89,000	
Colma	Colma - Serramonte Blvd Pavement Rehabilitation	Serramonte Blvd in Colma	Pavement rehabilitation to include base repairs, crack sealing, Asphalt Grinding, AC Overlay, and striping	REG090030	PE:					\$217,000
				ESPL-5264(003)	ROW:					
					CON:	\$86,000		\$110,000	\$21,000	
East Palo Alto	East Palo Alto Various Streets Rehabilitation and Resurfacing	Bay Road, Pulgas Avenue and Woodland Avenue	Provide preventive maintenance for street pavements and the repair of failed pavement sections as well as applying various maintenance and rehabilitation strategies such as the application of slurry seal, cape seal, and asphalt concrete overlay at various streets in the Plao Alto Park Neighborhood of the City of East Palo.	REG090030	PE:					\$421,000
				ESPL-5438(008)	ROW:					
					CON:	\$0		\$353,000	\$68,000	
County of San Mateo	San Mateo County Various Streets Resurfacing	Various streets in the Countywide street overlay; Broadmoor Village, Burlingame Hills, San Mateo Hills, Emerald Lake Hills and West Menlo Park areas in the County of San Mateo	Resurface portions of various street in the Burlingame Hills, Broadmoor Village, San Mateo Highlands, and Menlo Oaks Areas of the County, including, but not limited to, planing asphalt concrete pavement (2" max.), placement of pavement reinforcing fabric and an asphalt concrete overlay, re-striping of the newly resurfaced roadway, and placement of new pavement markings, legends and markers.	REG090030	PE:					\$1,726,000
				ESPL-5935(054)	ROW:					
					CON:	\$0		\$1,448,000	\$278,000	

SAN MATEO COUNTY

Responsible Agency (agency to receive funds)	Project name	Project Location	Description of Work	IDs: TIP ID Fed Proj No. EA	Phase	Local Funding	Federal Funding (Non-Economic Recovery)	ARRA Tier 1 Funding	ARRA Tier 2 Funding	Total Funding	
								\$11,080,000	\$2,130,000		
						\$2,544,000	\$631,000	\$11,080,000	\$2,130,000	\$16,385,000	
Daly City	Street Resurfacing 2009	Callan Blvd, Mission Street, Glenwood Ave, Carter St. Hillside Blvd., and John Daly Blvd.	Resurfacing of various Federal-Aid roadways in Daly City. Streets selected for resurfacing will depend on allocated federal funding and could include Callan Boulevard (Serramonte Boulevard to Hickey Boulevard), Mission Street (Wellington Avenue to Crocker Avenue) and Glenwood Avenue (Eastgate Drive to Lake Merced Boulevard), Carter Street from Guadalupe Canyon Parkway to Geneva Avenue, Hillside Boulevard from East Market Street to Mission Street, and John Daly Blvd. (Sheffield Drive to Cliffside Drive). Includes sidewalk and ramp improvements.	REG090030	PE:					\$1,363,000	
				ESPL-5196(032)	ROW:						
					CON:	\$0		\$1,143,000	\$220,000		
Foster City	Foster City Blvd Resurfacing Project	Foster City Blvd from F.C. Blvd. Bridge to Beach Park	Foster City Blvd Resurfacing Project (from F.C. Blvd Bridge to Beach Park Blvd.)	REG090030	PE:					\$440,000	
				ESPL-5409(015)	ROW:						
					CON:			\$369,000	\$71,000		
Half Moon Bay	Half Moon Bay Downtown Streets Rehabilitation	Downtown Half Moon Bay Streets	Street rehabilitation	REG090030	PE:					\$210,000	
				ESPL-5357(005)	ROW:						
					CON:			\$176,000	\$34,000		
Hillsborough	Hillsborough 2009 Asphalt Overlay	Ralston Ave, Parrott Dr., Black Mountain Rd, and Tartan Trail in Hillsborough.	Asphalt overlay of four urban collectors: 1) Ralston Ave. from Chateau Dr. to Pepper Ave., 2) Parrott Dr. from Salmark Ct. to Melrose Ct., 3) Black Mountain Rd. from Marlborough Rd. to Southdown Ct., 4) Tartan Trail. From Black Mountain Rd. to Crystal Springs Rd., and 5) Hayne Rd. from Robinwood Ln. to Black Mountain Rd. The 2-inch overlay and minor base repairs will provide an adequate structural section for each of these distressed roadways.	REG090030	PE:					\$813,000	
				ESPL-5191(004)	ROW:						
					CON:	\$421,000		\$329,000	\$63,000		
Menlo Park	Menlo Park Various Resurfacing of Various Federal Aid Routes	Haven Ave, Live Oak Ave, Monte Rosa Dr.	The project would resurface the following local arterial streets using recycled rubberized asphalt technology: Haven Avenue (Marsh Rd to City limit), Live Oak Avenue (University Dr to El Camino Real), Monte Rosa Drive (Siskiyou Dr to Avy Ave) – all Federal Aid Routes.	REG090030	PE:	\$35,000				\$710,000	
				ESPL-5273(020)	ROW:						
					CON:	\$40,000		\$533,000	\$102,000		
Millbrae	Millbrae 2009 Various Streets Repair	Broadway (Ludeman to Millwood) and Magnolia (Taylor to Richmond & Anita to Helen)	Street rehabilitation	REG090030	PE:					\$565,000	
				ESPL-5299(011)	ROW:						
					CON:	\$183,000		\$320,000	\$62,000		
Pacifica	City of Pacifica Various Fed Aid Street Pavement Rehabilitation Project	Manor Drive, Monterey Road, and Oddstad Blvd.	Pavement Rehabilitation on Fed Aid Streets within Pacifica, including sidewalk improvement.	REG090030	PE:					\$777,000	
				ESPL-5350(016)	ROW:						
					CON:	\$100,000		\$568,000	\$109,000		
Portola Valley	Portola Valley FY 2008-09 Various Streets Resurfacing	Portola Road, Cervantes Road, and Westridge Drive	Street resurfacing of Federal Aid roads and local roads	REG090030	PE:					\$196,000	
				ESPL-5390(004)	ROW:						
					CON:	\$0		\$164,000	\$32,000		

SAN MATEO COUNTY

Responsible Agency (agency to receive funds)	Project name	Project Location	Description of Work	IDs: TIP ID Fed Proj No. EA	Phase	Local Funding	Federal Funding (Non Economic Recovery)	ARRA Tier 1 Funding	ARRA Tier 2 Funding	Total Funding
Redwood City	Redwood City Various Streets Overlay	Jefferson Ave between Farmhill Blvd. and County Limits at various location and Roosevelt Ave from Ukton to Alameda de Las	AC Overlay of various segments of Jefferson Ave and Roosevelt Ave, and bike lane striping. +Alt. A - AC Overlay of Veterans Blvd	REG090030 ESPL-5029(020)	PE: ROW: CON:	\$2,544,000	\$631,000	\$11,080,000	\$2,130,000	\$16,385,000
Redwood City	Redwood City - El Camino Real/Broadway Streetscape	El Camino Real between Broadway and Brewster in Redwood City	Redwood City: Downtown; Streetscape improvements including crosswalks, sidewalk and additional lighting enhancements to the pedestrian route.	REG090007 ESPL-5029(???)	PE: ROW: CON:	\$0		\$533,000	\$203,000	\$736,000
San Bruno	San Bruno Various Roadway Resurfacing and Overlays	De Soto Way, Crestwood Drive, Masson Ave, Elm Ave, and Euclid Ave in San Bruno	Provide a 2-inch & 2 1/2-inch overlay, wedge grinding, dig out repair, pavement grooving, crack sealing, slurry seal, adjusting and replacing manholes, monuments and valves to grade, re-striping, new traffic loops, and minor repair to sidewalk as shown on the Contract Drawings (Please refer to the enclosed list of roadway locations and limits), and minor sidewalk improvement	REG090030 ESPL-5226(016)	PE: ROW: CON:	\$300,000	\$631,000	\$553,000	\$106,000	\$959,000
San Carlos	2009 Pedestrian Improvement Project	Various streets in San Carlos	Curb ramps, crosswalks, and pavement markings on various streets	REG090007 ESPL-5267(013)	PE: ROW: CON:	\$0		\$469,000	\$90,000	\$559,000
San Mateo	City of San Mateo FY 2008-09 Various FAU/MTS Streets Rehabilitation	Various streets in San Mateo	Grind 1.5" AC and overlay 1.5" AC, make 4" deep localized base failure repair, repair broken curb and gutter, adjust utility manholes to grade, install video detector camera, reinstall traffic striping and legend and perform street sweeping during and after street rehabilitation. Bike lanes at some locations.	REG090030 ESPL-5102(034)	PE: ROW: CON:	\$0		\$1,296,000	\$249,000	\$1,545,000
South San Francisco	South San Francisco FY 2008-09 Various Streets Resurfacing	East Grand Avenue between Forbes Boulevard and Haskins Way resurface roadway	Install New Asphalt Concrete Pavement Surfacing, including pavement grinding, milling, structural base repairs, new pavement striping, raise utility covers to grade, install traffic detectors and install new ADA ramps and associated work.	REG090030 ESPL-5177(022)	PE: ROW: CON:	\$660,000		\$840,000	\$161,000	\$1,661,000
Woodside					PE: ROW: CON:					\$0
						\$2,544,000	\$631,000	\$11,080,000	\$2,130,000	\$16,385,000

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 27, 2009
To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee
From: Joseph Kott
Subject: Progress Update on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP)
(For further information contact Joseph Kott at 599-1453)

RECOMMENDATION

This item is presented for information only. Please advise staff if you would like further information or follow-up.

FISCAL IMPACT

The Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Update is already included in the C/CAG staff work program.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funding for the CTP Update preparation comes from C/CAG transportation funds.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Countywide Transportation Plan Update is intended to provide San Mateo County with a long-range, comprehensive transportation planning document that sets forth a coordinated planning framework and establishes a systematic transportation planning process for identifying and resolving key transportation issues. The CTP will articulate clear transportation planning objectives and priorities and to promote consistency and compatibility among all transportation plans and programs within San Mateo County.

The current Countywide Transportation Plan was adopted by the C/CAG Board on January 18, 2001. Since that time, BART has been extended to SFO and Millbrae, the Caltrain Baby Bullet has come into service, and San Mateo County has experienced significant changes in economic conditions. In addition, interest in planning for a sustainable transportation system has increased with concerns about greenhouse gas emissions and global warming.

On January 15th and March 19th, staff presented the C/CAG TAC with a proposed outline, timeline, and a documents solicitation for the CTP Update. Staff has convened an

informal CTP Update Working Group (see Attachment A for list of members) and begun soliciting and collecting pertinent information from agencies countywide (see Attachment B for list). The Working Group has met on 27 February, 27 March, and 24 April and will meet monthly for the duration of the project. The CTP Update CTP work schedule is shown on Attachment C.

ATTACHMENT A

Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Update Working Group Roster

ATTACHMENT B

Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Update Provisional List of Documents Solicited from Agencies

ATTACHMENT C

Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Update Provisional Schedule of Work

ATTACHMENT A

Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Update Working Group Roster

Bob Beyer,
City of San Mateo

April Chan
Samtrans

Melanie Choy
SMTA

Marisa Espinosa
Samtrans

Bill Meeker
City of Burlingame

Steve Monowitz,
San Mateo County

Tatum Mothershead
City of Daly City

ATTACHMENT B

**Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Update:
Provisional List of Documents Solicited from Agencies**

1. Most recent (since 2001) comprehensive or general plan (as applicable).
2. Most recent (since 2001) strategic plan (as applicable).
3. Most recent (since 2001) area plans (as applicable)
4. Most recent (since 2001) specific plans (as applicable)
5. Most recent (since 2001) transit operations plans (as applicable)
6. Most recent (since 2001) citywide bicycle and/or pedestrian plan (as applicable)
7. Any other plans, studies, EIRs, etc. that the agency believes would be salient to a countywide transportation plan

Note: This list does not included C/CAG's own studies, plans and reports, as well as those prepared by MTC, ABAC, and other regional agencies, all of which are being compiled by C/CAG staff for the CTP Update.

ATTACHMENT C: COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE: PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Work Task	Month/Year																	
	09									10								
	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul
WG Meeting	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Data Collection																		
CTP Web Site																		
Online Public Survey																		
Tech Memo #1: Existing Conditions						T												
Determine Future Scenarios (3)																		
Transportation Forecasting																		
Tech Memo #2: Future Conditions										T								
Presentation to TAC/CMEQ/CCAG Board										X								
Public Workshop #1										X								
Set Goals/Objectives																		
Draft Land Use/Transportation Chapter																		
Draft Roads Chapter																		
Draft Bikeways Chapter																		
Draft Pedestrian Chapter																		
Draft Pedestrian Chapter																		
Draft Public Transit Chapter																		
Draft TDM/TSM Chapter																		
Draft ITS Chapter																		
Draft Parking Chapter																		
Draft Pricing Chapter																		
Draft Energy & Environment Chapter																		
Draft Financial Chapter																		
Prepare Administration Draft of CTP																		
Presentation to TAC/CMEQ/CCAG Board																		
Public Workshop #2																		
Draft Evaluation & Implementation Chapter																		
Prepare Revised Draft CTP																		
Adoption by TAC/CMEQ/CCAG Board																		
Publication of Final CTP																		

Key:
 X = Meeting; T = Technical Memorandum; CTP = Countywide Transportation Plan