

2010 TAC Roster and Attendance							
Member	Agency	Jan	Mar	May	Jun	Aug	Oct
Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	x			x	x	x
Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	x	x	x	x	x	
Duncan Jones	Atherton Engineering		x	x	x	x	x
Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering		x	x		x	x
Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x	x	x	x		x
Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning					x	
Gene Gonzalo	Caltrans					x	
Sandy Wong	C/CAG	x	x	x	x	x	
Robert Ovardia	Daly City Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x
Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x	x		x		x
Ray Towne	Foster City Engineering	x	x	x		x	
Mo Sharma	Half Moon Bay	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	x
Chip Taylor	Menlo Park Engineering	x	x	x	x		x
Ron Popp	Millbrae Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x
Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering	x	x	x	x		x
Peter Vorametsanti	Redwood City Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	
Klara Fabry	San Bruno Engineering	n/a	x	x	x	x	x
Robert Weil	San Carlos Engineering		x	x	x	x	x
Larry Patterson	San Mateo Engineering	x	x	x		x	x
Steve Monowitz	San Mateo County Planning	x					
Dennis Chuck	So. San Francisco Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x
Kenneth Folan	MTC						

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)  
FOR THE  
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)**

**October 21, 2010  
MINUTES**

The meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, Bacciocco Auditorium. Co-chair Porter called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m. on Thursday, October 21, 2010.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: John Hoang – C/CAG; Jean Higaki – C/CAG; Jim Bigelow – C/CAG CMEQ; Lee Taubeneck – Caltrans; Khee Lim – Millbrae; Anthony Riddell – Millbrae; Marian Lee – TA/Samtrans

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

None.

**2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMEQ meetings.**

As shown on the agenda.

**3. Approval of the Minutes from August 19, 2010.**

Approved.

**4. Highway Plan Implementation Plan Update (New Measure A)**

*(This item was moved up on the agenda)*

Marian Lee (Samtrans/Transportation Authority) and Mark Goga (consultant) provided a presentation on the New Measure A Highway Plan Implementation Fall 2010 Update. The presentation included an overview and update of the planning process, the proposed scoring process which includes assessment of projects, methodology in the development of the highway plan criteria and application, and prioritization of projects.

Discussions/comments included the following:

- The 45% weight for the “Effectiveness” criterion seems high compared to 20% for “Readiness”.
- The “Need” criterion should take cost into consideration also.
- Consider that although a project may be effective, the project may not have enough money secured.
- The “Sustainability” criterion does not necessarily apply to Highway projects since there are no measurable factors therefore consider removing. It would be useful to provide examples of projects that would score high on “Sustainability”.
- Consider adding a criterion (third point) under Sustainability” that reflects a project's potential to impact air quality or emissions. For example - Project #23 could benefit in priority if reduced emissions were considered.

- Increase percentage for “Readiness” and reduce percentage for “Sustainability” to 5%. It was countered that “Sustainability” should not be lowered but should factor in bicycle and pedestrian projects. It was also mentioned that the percentage for “Effectiveness” should remain higher than “Readiness”.
- Identify projects that can be phased as part of the funding strategy. These projects would affect scoring of the “Readiness” criterion.
- Consider the definition of project need and whether this could be adapted to future conditions over the course of a 25-year period.
- Consider having a policy to pull and re-allocate money from projects at critical decision points as appropriate.
- The question was raised as to why the SR92 aux lanes and interchange improvement project received no points for “Readiness” when a PSR has already been completed.
- It was mentioned that additional outreach will extend the C/CAG CMEQ Committee for policy considerations.

TAC members were asked to forward any additional comments they may have to Melanie Choy at the TA.

## **5. Sustainable Community Strategy Process in San Mateo County**

*(This item was moved up on the agenda)*

Richard Napier, Executive Director, informed the committee that cities would be receiving a letter from C/CAG regarding formation of a sub-region. For San Mateo County, a lot of the pieces are already complete, for instance, the Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI) and other studies within the County. It’ll be important to involve all the planning directors and seek the respective councils approval to form a sub-region to work together. C/CAG, the TA/Samtrans and County Planning Dept. will be seeking more clarity from ABAG. Marian Lee, TA/Samtrans, added that the GBI already has a vision for the corridor that could meet the SCS requirements and that we are not redoing work already performed as part of the GBI.

Member Ovadia asked if there had been any discussions with ABAG regarding water limitations? Many cities will hit the allocation limits with the PUC. Member Murtuza indicated that based on a plan being developed by San Francisco, a premium surcharge might be applied to cities that exceed their allocations. The response was that these concerns would be brought up at the meeting with ABAG.

Member Breault inquired about the role of the sub-region. Response was that the sub-region process would feed into the region. Breault also mentioned that GBI might not apply to other isolated pockets of TOD or PDA type development.

## **6. Recommend approval of the call for projects for the 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle of the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program**

Tom Madalena presented the proposed 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle TOD Housing Incentive Program to promote smart growth and increase of housing stock in San Mateo County.

Member Taylor inquired whether there was a maximum amount per project and whether matching was required. Response was that there was no maximum but there is a minimum of 11.47% for federal funds. Cities will receive the full amount of the grant. Regarding meeting

the 2-year timeframe, are there enough projects to meet the goal? Cities can reapply for funds in a subsequent cycle if the project was not completed within the original cycle that funds were awarded. Richard Napier, Executive Director, added that money is rolled over to subsequent cycles if unspent. Chair Porter inquired as to the types of projects eligible for the program and use of funds. Response was streetscapes, sidewalk enhancements, etc and that the money can be used anywhere in the city. Member Ovadia inquired whether the money would be pushed towards PDA? Response was that C/CAG's position is for project within the PDA areas, the TOD money could be spent anywhere in the city. There is on-going discussion with MTC to address projects outside the PDA.

Item approved.

#### **7. Regional Project Funding Information**

Jean Higaki provided information relevant to the project delivery and federal and regional policy issues affecting local agencies.

#### **8. Executive Director Report**

Rich Napier, Executive Director, clarified information regarding call for projects and unused funds within the County. Unused funds from past call for projects are typically rolled over to the next cycle.

Member Weil mentioned that it would help cities if funding are made available for advanced planning efforts, especially planning for the PDAs. This might lead to more cities having projects ready when funding opportunities become available.

#### **9. Member Reports**

None.

End of meeting at 2:40 p.m.