

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

**MINUTES
MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 27, 2004**

At 3:02 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Chairman Marland Townsend in Conference Room C of San Mateo City Hall.

Members Attending: Duane Bay, Jim Bigelow, Tom Davids, Linda Larson, Sue Lempert, Arthur Lloyd, Barbara Pierce, Sepi Richardson, Lennie Roberts, Chairman Marland Townsend, and Onnolee Trapp.

Staff/Guests Attending: Walter Martone, Sandy Wong, and Geoffrey Kline (C/CAG Staff - County Public Works), Pat Dixon (Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee), Tom Madalena and Mark Duino (C/CAG Staff – County Planning), Sylvia Gregory (Peninsula Rail 2000), Joseph Hurley (Transportation Authority), Corinne Goodrich (SamTrans), John Draper, John Root, Lory Lawson, Noemi Avram, and Keith Maillard (Leadership 2004), Michael Berube (Berube Co.), and Christine Maley-Grubl (Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance).

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

- None.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Minutes of August 30, 2004 meeting.

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

REGULAR AGENDA

3. Presentation on Transit Oriented Development by the Foster City/San Mateo/Hillsborough/Burlingame 2004 Leadership Class.

Noemi Avram and Keith Maillard representing Leadership 2004 made a power point presentation on the results of a study that was conducted by their group on housing Transit Oriented Development (TOD) effectiveness. The Leadership 2004 program was sponsored by the Chambers of Commerce and the Cities of Foster City, San Mateo, Hillsborough, and Burlingame. A summary of the major points from the presentation included:

- There is no single definition of TOD. It means different things to different people – developers, planners, transportation officials, etc.
- The Leadership 2004 group identified four measures of effectiveness to evaluate TOD based on:

- use of transportation (public transit)
- relative change in the use of cars
- use of amenities within the TOD
- motivation to live in a TOD
- The following TOD projects were reviewed – Franklin Street Development in Redwood City, The Crossings in Mountain View, Bayview Meadows in San Mateo.
- The results of the review showed:
 - 65% of the residents of TODs that responded to the surveys and interviews did not use public transit.
 - The balance of the individuals used transit primarily for work and leisure activities.
 - Many of the respondents did not view themselves as living in a TOD.
 - 75% of the respondents commuted within a radius of 15 miles from the TOD.
 - 41% felt they were driving the same amount as they did before living in a TOD.
 - An equal number of respondents said they had changed their driving habits.
 - The number and type of amenities and services that were located within the TOD were less important than having these amenities across the street or within close walking distance of the TOD.
 - Those living in the community 5 years or more did not use public transportation. Only the more recent residents.
 - More parking was the number one concern of the respondents, followed by more small businesses, followed by safety, followed by a sense of neighborhood and community.
 - Quality of schools, closeness of shopping and retail services were the primary reasons cited for moving to the TOD. Access to transit was not a motivating factor.
- Conclusions of the study included:
 - The development of TOD should be focused more on types of retail and commercial enterprises that can be located in and near the TOD.
 - In order to make a real impact on travel habits of potential TOD residents, more effort needs to be devoted to the marketing of the benefits using transit for the residents of the TOD and the community in general.
 - The transportation system needs to become more efficient and reliable.

Some of the comments by CMAQ and the audience included:

- Surprised that affordability was not a factor in choosing TOD to live in. It is important that the TOD include a mix of both rental and owned units.
 - The developments that were considered in this Study were not really “affordable.” Therefore this issue was not really a factor for the individuals interviewed. Perhaps having TOD that included more “affordable” units would attract a population that would be more likely to ride transit.
- The survey that was administered was responded to by approximately 300 individuals.
- The Bay Meadows Program was not really a TOD, it was more of a transit adjacent project. The Racetrack actually blocks access to the rail station. The new, proposed development on that site will definitely be more of a TOD.

- There is a small apartment building in Burlingame that is not really identified as a TOD, but it meets all of the criteria. Their numbers are outstanding – with 30%-35% of the residents using transit.
- It was hoped that the Franklin Development that included commercial and residential would be a good match between the workers and the affordability of the units. The opposite occurred. The jobs paid low wages and the units were very expensive. Another outcome of this development was to cause the property values of the surrounding area to greatly increase, even though they had been more modestly valued before the development.
- This study seems to validate the fact that it is extremely difficult to change the travel habits of individuals.
- The study shows that 35% of the respondents are using transit. This is actually an extremely positive statistic for TOD. The rate in the Bay Area population in general is less than half that number. In San Mateo County only 3% of all trips and 7% of work trips are by transit. This study shows that TOD is producing five times that rate.
- Both the Bay Meadows and Franklin Street Developments had an affordability component of 10% and 15% respectively.
- It may be more important that the location of the jobs be close to transit than the residence.
- The study showed that there was a high degree of turnover in the residents at these developments. It is important to develop a sense of ownership and community in these developments.
- The turnover rate may have been a factor of the economy and individuals having to relocate in order to secure employment. The TOD may have been a safe place to establish a temporary residence while one is searching for permanent employment.
- The Countywide Transportation Plan shows that the current usage of transit in San Mateo County is 7%-10% and the goal is 20%. Therefore this study shows that TOD has a higher transit usage than the Countywide average.
- The tone of the presentation seemed to indicate that TOD does not work. However the actual data presented shows that TOD actually produces significantly better results than we currently are getting with other transportation programs.

4. Report on the results of the second cycle Transit Oriented Development Program Housing Incentive Program.

Geoff Kline reported on the actual outcomes of the second cycle of C/CAG's TOD Housing program:

- \$410,000 was set aside for San Mateo City, \$310,000 for San Mateo County, \$236,000 for Millbrae, and \$529,000 for San Bruno.
- Staff will be developing new guidelines for the third cycle that are consistent with the MTC Guidelines.
- There will be approximately \$1.3 million available to fund a second cycle.
- Six projects lost their eligibility because they failed to begin construction on the development within two years of the approval of the allocation.

Motion: To accept the report on the second cycle of the Transit Oriented Development Program Housing Incentive Program and to direct C/CAG staff to prepare recommendations for the third cycle process of the program and provide these recommendations to CMAQ for consideration. Bigelow/Richardson, unanimous.

5. Evaluation of the Measure A Program as part of the monitoring of the Congestion Management Program.

Walter Martone reported:

- This report was requested by C/CAG and CMAQ over a year ago.
- Under the CMP C/CAG is required to review all of the new transportation projects in the County every two years to determine their effectiveness. This includes projects both funded by C/CAG and by other sources.
- Fehr & Peers conducted the review of the Measure A projects and recently completed its report. Staff has not yet analyzed the report and therefore is not commenting on it. However it has been mentioned in the press and therefore staff wanted to call it to the attention of the CMAQ.
- The results of this analysis will be incorporated into the update of the Congestion Management Program for 2005.

A number of CMAQ members noted that the report was well done and very informative. C/CAG staff was requested to send a copy of the report to all of the San Mateo County cities and post on the C/CAG website.

6. Report on State Transportation Funding Issue and approval of Resolution 04-19 encouraging the State to protect the State Transportation Funding Sources.

Walter Martone provided the following report:

- There has been significant press coverage recently about the lack of transportation funding.
- The Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies are attempting to clarify for the public and the press that the lack in funding is not due to any reductions in funds. However it is primarily due to the State and Federal Government taking transportation funds and using them for other purposes.
- Over the most recent five-year period, over \$6 billion in transportation funds were taken and used for non-transportation purposes.
- The impact on San Mateo County over that same five-year period was the loss of \$98 million.
- Although these funds would still not have fully met the unmet need, it would have made a significant difference in the number of transportation improvements that could have been completed.

Motion: To recommend that C/CAG adopt alternative one as stated in the staff report. Bigelow/Roberts, unanimous.

7. San Francisco – Oakland Bay Bridge Funding Issue.

Walter Martone shared with the CMAQ the MTC proposal for funding the Bay Bridge construction shortfall. This was embodied in AB 2366 introduced by Assemblyman John Dutra. Unfortunately the Legislature adjourned without taking action on AB 2366 or finding another solution. In the mean time an audit was done to determine the source of the cost overruns. Although some of the cost was attributable to the innovative design of the new suspension structure, the majority of the added cost was due to poor original estimates, delays in construction, and the resulting increased costs of materials.

There continues to be debate over whether the State should assume the majority responsibility for the cost of this bridge because it owns the facility and has taken this responsibility for other bridges damaged in earthquakes. A recent analysis however shows that if the State were to pay as much as 50% of this cost overrun, it would not have any funds left for additional transportation projects anywhere in the State for at least the next four years. Therefore it is most likely that some cost sharing arrangement will have to be made between the Bay Area and the State. We are very concerned however, that the State not try to divert money from the recently passed Regional Measure 2 toll increase to pay for the overruns. These funds were approved by the voters and dedicated to specific transportation priorities that should not be postponed (including the Dumbarton Rail extension).

Jim Bigelow pointed out that the current Bay Bridge is not fully anchored to bedrock and that another earthquake could be a disaster bigger than anyone has anticipated.

Sue Lempert indicated that MTC is very reluctant to request another toll increase on top of the one just adopted by the voters. However it is inevitable that it will happen some time in the future. The State has the ability to take away the Regional Measure 2 funds, but MTC and others have so far successfully lobbied to protect these funds. The hope is that because Senator Don Perata is now the Senate Leader and a representative from the Bay Area, and the author of Regional Measure 2, he will be successful in negotiating a deal with the Legislature and the Governor that minimizes the negative impact on Bay Area funds. Some members of the MTC Board are now beginning to openly discuss whether there needs to be reconsideration of the Bridge's design to find a less costly option.

8. Adjournment.

It was decided that there were not sufficient items to warrant having a CMAQ meeting in October. Therefore the next regular meeting was scheduled for November 29th. At 4:30 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.