

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
COMMITTEE ON CONGESTION MANAGEMENT
AND AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)**

**MINUTES
MEETING OF FEBRUARY 27, 2006**

At 3:06 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Vice-Chair Sue Lempert in the Council Chambers of San Mateo City Hall.

Members Attending: Jim Bigelow, Deberah Bringelson, Judith Christensen, Tom Davids, Vice-Chair Sue Lempert, Karyl Matsumoto, Irene O'Connell, Naomi Patridge, Barbara Pierce, Sepi Richardson, Lennie Roberts, and Antoinette Stein.

Staff/Guests Attending: Walter Martone and Geoff Kline (C/CAG Staff - County Public Works), Richard Napier (C/CAG Executive Director), Pat Dixon (Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee), Jill Boone (County Public Works – Recycleworks), Christine Maley-Grubl (Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance), Board of Supervisors President Jerry Hill, Marshall Loring (MTC Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee), Richard Cook and Paul Lee (SamTrans), Julia Scott (San Mateo County Times), Mayor John Lee (City of San Mateo), Mayor Tom Kasten (Town of Hillsborough), Ron Popp (City of Millbrae – representing Linda Larson).

1. Election of a Chair and Vice Chair to serve through June 30, 2006.

Motion: To elect Irene O'Connell as the Chair of CMAQ. Richardson/Patridge, unanimous.

Motion: To elect Sepi Richardson as the Vice-Chair of CMAQ. Bigelow/Lempert, unanimous.

2. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

- Marshall Loring from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee (EDAC) reported that the Committee is putting together guidelines for Transit Oriented Developments and is soliciting input. A copy of the draft guidelines was provided for the record. Staff will review them and a recommended response will be developed.

CONSENT AGENDA

3. Minutes of January 9, 2006 meeting.

Motion: To approve the Minutes as presented. Richardson/Bigelow, unanimous.

REGULAR AGENDA

4. Development of an energy strategy for San Mateo County.

Board of Supervisors President Jerry Hill made the following presentation:

- a) There is a need to develop a group that can be a forum for discussion and the development of policy for energy and other resources conservation such as water, and addressing conservation issues dealing with all utilities.
- b) CMAQ is an already established group that has the credibility and interest in this area to function in this capacity.
- c) The County would provide staffing for this new responsibility of CMAQ.

Discussion included:

- a) CMAQ should consider creating a subcommittee with expanded membership that can bring forth ideas and recommendations for the full Committee to consider.
- b) Some additional representatives to this subcommittee might include the construction industry, individuals who do procurement of internal building materials, additional environmental representatives such as the Sierra Club and other non profits, schools, housing construction representatives, the non profit group "Build It Green."
- c) A copy of the Sustainable Development Policy adopted by the County should be provided to CMAQ. A copy of the policy is attached to these minutes. Information on LEED Standards and the Green Building Council can be found at www.usgbc.org.
- d) The usage of benchmarks should be included in the Closing remarks on page 30.
- e) The program that is developed should also include the review of procurement policies and encouraging the purchase of items that take less energy to produce.
- f) Some recognition should be given to businesses that are already on board with these policies.
- g) The program should ensure that all utilities are included, such as PG&E, Cable T.V. providers, cell phone companies and others.
- h) Environmental groups should also include those groups that are focused specifically on energy.
- i) The list of potential representatives already seems very comprehensive. The group should not be so large that it cannot be productive.
- j) The term "indicators" needs to be defined to be either per capita consumption or total county consumption.
- k) It would be useful to develop "smart policies" that can be provided to the cities. We should not reinvent the wheel, but use examples from jurisdictions that are already doing a good job in this area.
- l) The recommended next step is to have CMAQ authorize the development of the proposed workgroup and allow staff to work out the details and come back to CMAQ with specifics, the recommended membership, and a schedule.
- m) The County already has developed a good list of guidelines that should be distributed to the cities and CMAQ. This would be especially important for those cities that are contemplating or already engaged in building projects.
- n) It is envisioned that the subcommittee would be 8 to 10 individuals. The CMAQ Committee could also play a role in bringing forward the broader viewpoints.
- o) Consideration should be given to creating a number of small groups by topic in order to bring in experts to the process.
- p) The County has a "green building" committee that can also be used to develop details of

these types of building programs and will be available to bring its advice to CMAQ.

Motion: To support the proposal in concept and to request staff to work out the specifics and return to CMAQ with additional recommendations. Bigelow/Richardson, unanimous.

5. Recommendations for the 2006-07 Expenditure Program for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) San Mateo County Program.

Walter Martone reported:

- a) These funds are derived from the four-dollar vehicle registration fee that is collected for the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to fund clean air programs.
- b) Forty percent of the proceeds of these fees are provided to each County to fund local programs.
- c) In San Mateo County, C/CAG is the designated Administrator for these funds.
- d) A number of years ago the CMAQ Committee recommended and the C/CAG Board adopted a policy to allocate these funds to the two transportation demand management programs in the County (Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance and the City of Menlo Park), and to the Countywide shuttle program operated by SamTrans.

Comments included:

- a) It was recommended that additional encouragement be given to shuttle programs that bring on line clean fuel vehicles and retire older polluting vehicles. It was suggested that this encouragement be in the form of incentives to address the added cost of these vehicles.
- b) It was noted that new shuttle applications are not being accepted for this program, however under C/CAG's Congestion Relief Program, cities can apply for new shuttles that they would like to initiate in their communities.

Motion: To strongly support the recommendations of the Technical Advisory Committee as presented by staff and to take advantage of any emissions reduction funding that might become available to increase the number of clean fuel vehicles in the San Mateo County shuttle fleet. Bigelow/Stein, unanimous.

6. Review and approval of proposal for application and scoring of Surface Transportation Program (STP) projects.

Geoffrey Kline reported:

- a) This program includes \$5.5 million for local streets and roads repaving and resurfacing only.
- b) The funds start October 2006 and are good for three years.
- c) The emphasis on this program will be on "readiness" so that only projects that can be implemented within a short period of time will be eligible. This means that the funds will be distributed and used to benefit the community sooner. There will also be less opportunity for the monies to be taken back and reprogrammed to

- other counties.
- d) These funds are federally derived and are administered by Caltrans.
 - e) Any single jurisdiction can submit up to ten projects and receive a maximum of one million dollars for their combined competitive projects.
 - f) The scoring system has been designed with maximum objectivity as the goal.
 - g) A special emphasis is being placed on the provision of local matching funds.

Comments included:

- a) Examples of the types of projects that are eligible include things that are considered “curb to curb.” This basically means the surface that is use by vehicles. Things outside this surface area are considered amenities and area not eligible.
- b) The criterion for a regional project means that the project will benefit a larger component of the population instead of a project that benefits only a single neighborhood.
- c) Staff or a subcommittee of the Technical Advisory Committee may do the grading of the projects.
- d) It was noted that the criteria for regional projects could be a problem for some of the cities, especially if it requires that the project be done on a State roadway.
- e) Applications will be accepted from cities, the County, Caltrans, the Transportation Authority, and the Joint Powers Board. Because this is considered a local streets and roads program, it is expected that only the cities and the County will be submitting applications.
- f) Applicants that commit to providing greater amounts of matching funds will have an advantage in the scoring.
- g) There was discussion about the use of recycled tires in asphalt for resurfacing projects. Concern was expressed that this could add to the cost of projects and make it unaffordable for some cities. It was noted that there are programs available (California Solid Waste Management Board) where jurisdictions can apply for 50% funding to offset these added costs. As part of the next cycle of this local streets and roads project, consideration should be given to coordinating with this funding source.
- h) Encouragement should be given for Caltrans to begin using this type of pavement. If a large consumer such as Caltrans became a customer, it might begin to drive down the cost. Also consideration should be given to having bonus points on the scoring for using this material. This would be a good topic for the new Energy Subcommittee to discuss.
- i) Pedestrian projects are only eligible if they are things on the pavement – such as markings, curb cuts for handicap access. Blinking lights installed on the pavement are not eligible.

Motion: To approve the recommendations as presented. Richardson/Bigelow, unanimous.

7. Introduction and discussion of Joint Principles for Improvements on El Camino Real.

Richard Napier provided the following presentation:

- a) The purpose of this document is to get Caltrans to commit to being flexible in working with local jurisdictions on design standards for El Camino Real roadway projects.
- b) This flexibility is needed so that the cities can be creative in developing an attractive and functional transportation network on the corridor.
- c) It is important to preserve the through lanes on El Camino Real so that capacity is not compromised, and the potential for other improvements (such as bus rapid transit) is preserved.
- d) Turning movements on the road are not affected by this potential policy.
- e) C/CAG's Transit Oriented Development program will have its eligibility criteria expanded to include all developments on El Camino Real, regardless of their proximity to a rail station.
- f) This program is also intended to support the efforts of the cities to develop and/or maintain a unique character for their segments of El Camino Real.

Comments included:

- a) Concern was expressed over creating an exclusive bus lane. This restriction on the use of one of the lanes on El Camino Real could have a negative impact on commerce and economic development.
- b) Bicycles and pedestrians need to be on an equal footing with cars and transit vehicles. They should not be treated as second-class citizens. Improvements for bikers and walkers should be considered on a case-by-case basis as equal with other improvements.
- c) The last two sentences in the second paragraph should be modified to read, " This includes mobility for multiple modes of transportation such as public transit, private and commercial vehicles, and bicycle and pedestrian movement along and crossing the corridor.
- d) It is important to make buses a more successful mode of travel on El Camino Real. Alternatives should be explored to creating a dedicated lane for buses.
- e) The recognition of car repair shops and other service businesses on El Camino as a needed element of a successful El Camino real program is very important.
- f) This program will not duplicate the efforts of the Grand Boulevard. It will not be addressing things such as design issues that are a focus of the Grand Boulevard project.

Motion: To approve the recommendations as presented with the second paragraph changes noted in comment c). Lempert/Richardson, unanimous.

8. Member comments and announcements.

- a) Barbara Pierce reported on an article about volcanoes and global warming that relates to the information C/CAG received recently.
- b) Jim Bigelow reported on the changes to Geoff Kline's voice mail message and the announcement of his impending retirement. The CMAQ members provided accolades to Geoff for his service to the Committee and C/CAG.
- c) Deberah Bringelson reported that the Peninsula Policy Partnership is hosting a candidate's forum on April 12th from 8:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. at Dominique's in San Mateo.
- d) Sue Lempert reported on the new bike improvements that have recently been made at the

Caltrain station in San Francisco.

- e) Richard Napier reported that the Governor's staff are not receiving support from the Legislature on their proposal to have Caltrans select the transportation projects to be included in the Infrastructure Bond.

7. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.

The next regular meeting of CMAQ will be on March 27, 2006. At 4:43 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.