

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

**MINUTES
MEETING OF April 26, 2004**

At 3:05 p.m., the meeting was started by Chairman Marland Townsend in Conference Room C of San Mateo City Hall.

Members Attending: Duane Bay, Jim Bigelow, Tom Davids, Karyl Matsumoto, Irene O'Connell, Barbara Pierce, Sepi Richardson, Lennie Roberts, Toni Stein, and Chairman Marland Townsend.

Staff/Guests Attending: Rich Napier (C/CAG Executive Director), Walter Martone, Sandy Wong, and Geoffrey Kline (C/CAG Staff - County Public Works), Pat Dixon (Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee), Richard Cook (Samtrans), Steve Morrison (Water Transit Authority), Jim Kelly (Bay Rail).

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

- None.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Minutes of January 26, 2004 meeting. The following correction was noted:

- Page 2, item # 3 - The business communities ~~are fixated with BART, and they always ask when is BART coming down the peninsula. But BART is too expensive. We need to present the benefits of Caltrain to the business community~~ appreciate both BART and Caltrain; however due to the cost of these systems, it is important to clearly present the benefits of the improvements that are proposed.

Minutes of February 23, 2004 meeting. The following correction was noted:

- Page 6, item # 8 - Public opinion polling in San Mateo County shows that both Caltrain and BART are ~~both very important~~ statistically equal in importance to the voters.

Motion: To approve the Minutes as amended. Bigelow/Roberts, unanimous.

REGULAR AGENDA

3. Transportation 2030 (T-2030) Project Submittal.

Sandy Wong explained the difference between the three project categories.

- Committed = projects where 100% of the funding has been identified for the project.
- New commitments = projects that can be fully funded with anticipated revenues (STIP, STP and CMAQ funds). It is expected that San Mateo County will receive \$478.2 million

in these funds over the next 25 years.

- Big tent = these are projects that can only be funded if new sources of funds are authorized. The new funds that are considered a potential include a new gas tax and the reauthorization of the Measure A program (\$1.552 billion total).

If the reauthorization of the Measure A program is approved by the voters, a number of the Big Tent projects will be moved to the New Commitments category. It was noted that the columns of numbers do not properly add up; therefore staff needs to recheck the numbers.

All of these projects had been presented to CMAQ and C/CAG at previous meetings and will now be included in San Mateo County's formal submittal for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Plan.

Motion: To approve the submission of projects for the Regional Transportation Plan as presented. Bigelow/Matsumoto, unanimous.

4. Update on the reauthorization of the Measure A program.

Howard Goode, Joe Hurley, and Richard Napier provided the report:

- The local share component of the program has been very popular with the individual cities and also the voters (based on polling). The Transportation Authority wanted to increase this share, but did not want to reduce spending in any of the other categories. Therefore they decided to extend the program from 20 to 25 years and use the added revenue to increase the local share from 20% to 22.5% and to provide an additional \$100 million for the supplemental road project category.
- The new Measure A Plan (included all of the recent changes) must now be adopted by a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population in the County. After that approval, the Plan goes to the Board of Supervisors for approval. The Board has the final say on whether the Measure gets included on the November 2004 ballot.
- Other changes to the Plan that were adopted by the Transportation Authority Board include:
 - Dividing the Alternative Congestion Relief Programs category into .8% for Transportation System Management programs and .2% for Intelligent Transportation System planning.
 - Requiring that any ferry program funded must be cost effective.
- The Plan has now been sent to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for a review of consistency with the Regional Plan. This approval is expected.

Discussion/questions:

- The Plan should also include an analysis of the impacts of the proposed projects on air quality. Staff noted that the review by MTC includes air quality modeling to determine whether the Plan meets the goals of the Regional Transportation Plan for air quality improvement. The Transportation Authority Board has made a finding that the Plan will improve travel times and hence improve air quality.
- It was pointed out that on page 18 of the CMAQ packet (Draft Transportation

Expenditure Plan TA Board Changes), a number of items that show that C/CAG had approved it, were actually never approved by C/CAG. These include 2. Decrease or eliminate Ferry Program, 3. Eliminate BART Funding, 5. Increase Local Share.

5. Second Cycle Federal Funding for FY 2005/06 and FY 2006/07 for Surface Transportation Program (STP) Local Streets and Roads Shortfall.

Geoff Kline reported that this funding source represents the Federal allocation for the maintenance of local streets and roads that have been determined to be of regional significance. This network of roads is referred to as the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS). The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) approved a program whereby these funds would be allocated among all of the cities and the County based on a formula that included population and road miles maintained (similar to the local share for the Measure A program). Since that recommendation was adopted, staff has determined that a straight allocation process may not be permitted by MTC. Therefore a compromise process for allocating the funds is being proposed. This new process would still provide the cities and County with an allocated amount of funds, but certain requirements would have to be met:

- The jurisdiction must use the funds on a project that will cost at least \$100,000. If the jurisdictions' allocation is less than \$100,000, they may combine it with other funds to total \$100,000 or more. The reason for setting this limit is because the paperwork and process for obligating Federal funds is time consuming, extensive, and too much effort to expend for very small projects. It was also noted that two or more jurisdictions can pool their funds to do a joint project.
- In order to be eligible for the funds, the jurisdiction must attend a workshop that will explain the application process and the funds obligation process. It was felt that failure to attend such a session would give an indication that the jurisdiction was not serious about the project and could put C/CAG at risk of losing the funds.
- No scoring system would be needed. Compliance with the above two conditions and submission of an eligible project within the deadline would secure the funds for that jurisdiction.

Under discussion it was recommended that jurisdictions be strongly encouraged not to do construction during months where smog levels are the highest. It was recognized that this may not always be possible because of the short time frame to complete projects and the fact that construction generally cannot occur during the rainy season.

Motion: To approve the plan for distribution of the Federal funds as presented by staff. Bigelow/Richardson, unanimous.

6. C/CAG Transportation Budget for Fiscal Year 2004-05.

Richard Napier provided the report:

- Member agency assessments will be the same for 04-05 as they were for 03-04. Members will also be eligible to receive transportation grants equal to ½ of their Congestion Relief Plan assessment for 03-04 and 04-05 to pay for transportation projects as determined by the local jurisdiction.

- The C/CAG General Fund is being stretched very thin. Staff will be working on alternative ways to fund C/CAG's responsibility as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). If these costs could be borne by the transportation program of C/CAG's, it would provide relief to the General Fund.
- Matching funds from the Transportation Authority for various programs operated by C/CAG, have been carefully coordinated with the budget that is being developed by the Transportation Authority.

Motion: To receive the budget as presented. Richardson, O'Connell, unanimous.

7. Update on the Intelligent Transportation System Strategic Plan.

Walter Martone and Sandy Wong provided a brief power point presentation and update on the status of the Intelligent Transportation System Strategic Plan being developed by C/CAG under contract with DKS Associates. A copy of the presentation is on file with C/CAG.

8. Update on the 2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor Study.

Walter Martone and Sandy Wong provided a brief power point presentation and update on the status of the 2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor Study being developed by C/CAG under contract with Kimley-Horn. A copy of the presentation is on file with C/CAG.

9. Adjournment.

At 4:58 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.