

# 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 28, 2008 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.<br>10 mins. |
| 2. | Minutes of February 25, 2008 meeting.  | Action<br>(O'Connell)               | Pages 1-4           | 3:10 p.m.<br>5 mins.  |
| 3. | Update on the 2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor Study.   | Hoang<br>(Potential Action)         | Pages 5-9           | 3:15 p.m.<br>20 mins. |
| 4. | Fiscal Year 2008/09 Expenditure Program for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program for San Mateo County. | Information<br>(Madalena)           | Pages 10-13         | 3:35 p.m.<br>5 mins.  |
| 5. | Recommendation for the 4 <sup>th</sup> Cycle of the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Incentive Program.      | Action<br>(Madalena)                | Pages 14-19         | 3:40 p.m.<br>15 mins  |
| 6. | Draft C/CAG Budget for FY 2008/09.   | Information<br>(Napier)             | Hand out at meeting | 3:55 p.m.<br>10 mins  |
| 6. | Member comments and announcements.   | Information<br>(O'Connell)          |                     | 4:05 p.m.<br>10 mins. |
| 7. | Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date ( <b>May 19, 2008 – Due to Holiday</b> ).                           | Action<br>(O'Connell)               |                     | 4:15 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.

**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 25, 2008**

At 3:05 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Chair Irene O'Connell in Conference Room C of San Mateo City Hall.

Members Attending: Jim Bigelow, Judith Christensen, Sue Lempert, Arthur Lloyd, Karyl Matsumoto, Naomi Patridge, Barbara Pierce, Vice-Chair Sepi Richardson, and Onnolee Trapp.

Staff/Guests Attending: Richard Napier and Sandy Wong (C/CAG Staff), Pat Dixon (SMCTA CAC), Pat Giorni (Burlingame resident), Corinne Goodrich (SamTrans), Brian Perkins (Supervisor Tissier's office), and Marshall Loring (MTC EDAC).

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

Pat Giorni, resident of Burlingame, shared her positive experience in attending the Feb. 13-14, 2008 California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting held in Burlingame. She saw how funding allocation is made to bike and ped projects at the State level.

**2. Minutes of January 28, 2008 meeting.**

*Motion: To approve the Minutes of the January 28, 2008 meeting. Bigelow/Richardson, approved, unanimous.*

**4. Review and recommend endorsement of the Guiding Principles of the Grand Boulevard Initiative.**

(This item was moved up due to time constraint of the speaker.) Rich Napier, Executive Director of C/CAG, introduced this item and provided a brief background on the Grand Boulevard. He also stated that the late Mark Duino had done analysis which indicated that if 25% of the El Camino Real corridor is developed to a density of 40 units per acre or more, it would meet the San Mateo County housing allocation need.

Corinne Goodrich of SamTrans presented on this item. She gave a progress update on the Grand Blvd effort thus far, including the Existing Condition Report, establishment of committees and task forces, and the emerging common themes. The Grand Blvd Initiative has provided capital grant funding to five local improvement projects along the corridor. They include projects in Daly City, San Carlos, San Mateo, San Bruno, and Millbrae. Ms. Goodrich also mentioned that all five BART stations and six CalTrain stations are within a quarter mile of the El Camino Real/Mission Street corridor. However, the transit ridership by residents and workers within the quarter mile to the transit stations is not higher than that by other locations. It reflects that we have not made it conducive to transit usage. The Grand Blvd Task Forces and Committees have developed the Guiding Principles. So far, cities/agencies such as Belmont, Colma, Mountain View, Redwood City, SamTrans, San Bruno, and South San Francisco have already adopted or pending adoption of the principles. For more details on strategies to go along with these guiding principles, please visit: <http://www.elcaminoreborn.com/gp/GP.pdf>

CMEQ members had the following comments:

- City of San Mateo has already adopted a Plan for the El Camino Real corridor. The Plan encompassed similar principles as those recommended by the Grand Blvd Initiative. Some of the options the city had discussed included putting residential units above retails on the ground floor, and parcel assembly.
- These principles will not only serve individual cities, but it helps to integrate the entire corridor across jurisdictions.
- These Guiding Principles, once adopted, will become tools for city planning staff. They also act as a “carrot” to cities because some future funding programs may use these principles to evaluate projects or as to how an agency measures up.
- It’s important to look ahead five to ten years from now and anticipate future demand. For example, the market is shifting from strip mall to regional shopping. Therefore, we need to look for housing opportunities as well as keeping retails in the county.
- We must encourage green building practices also.

***Member Bigelow made the motion to recommend endorsement of the Guiding Principles of the Grand Boulevard Initiative, and to encourage more green building practices. Member Christensen seconded the motion. Motion was passed unanimously.***

**3. Report on Partnerships for Water Reuse Workshop October 29, 2007**

Member Pierce provided a report on the Partnerships for Water Reuse Workshop she attended. She stated that land-use, water resource, and water treatment, are like a three-legged stool. They are interconnected and go hand-in-hand when it comes to environmental protection. The Workshop brought together waste water treatment agencies, local agencies, and water supply agencies to collaborate on the issue of water reuse. The idea is treated waste water can be put into streams and then become a water source again.

There are many potential options, i.e., South Bayside Water Association could provide reuse water for cities to purchase, the idea is that nearby cities could collaborate on a solution to save money; reuse water can be used for landscaping and for the recharge of aquifer; the capturing rain water run off, etc. It was suggested that when the Utility and Sustainability Task Force (USTF) bring forward the draft Energy Strategy (expected in April or May), CMEQ will bring back this water reuse issue so that it can be integrated into the Energy Strategy, and it may lead to a good project for C/CAG to champion.

CMEQ thanked member Pierce for bring this item to the committee. Chair O’Connell also suggested members to visit [www.WaterEducation.org](http://www.WaterEducation.org) for additional information.

**5. Review and comment on the revised list of projects for initial submittal to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for consideration in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update (*Transportation 2035*).**

Sandy Wong presented the revised list of projects for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. Revisions incorporated comments from CMEQ at the last meeting. Changes include:

- Consolidating, or bundling of, projects in the following categories/programs: 1) transit station and access improvement, 2) grade separations, 3) bike/pedestrian improvements, 4) intelligent transportation system (ITS).

- Addition of East Palo Alto Bay Road project.
- Addition of National Park Services' park access projects in San Mateo County.
- Deletion of the Bayfront Expressway Extension from Marsh to Woodside Road.

Sandy stated that staff is working with all project sponsors in obtaining project detail information to be submitted to MTC by the March 5<sup>th</sup> deadline. Rich Napier, Executive Director of C/CAG, mentioned that he attended a MTC sponsored RTP Workshop along with Member Lempert and C/CAG Board member O'Mahony. Issues raised by San Mateo County attendees included 1) FOCUS Priority Development Area (PDA) projects should not take away money from existing programs, but rather, build on relevant existing programs and seek new funding. 2) Urge the MTC commission to preserve local discretionary funds.

Member Lempert added MTC is making a big effort to obtain input from all stakeholders and groups. However, it's interesting to observe that individuals or groups that come forward to provide input to the Commission don't necessarily represent majority interests. In terms of PDA, the Joint Policy Committee, comprised of the Air District, ABAG, MTC, and BCDC, mapped out where does it make sense for developments of job and housing to occur, i.e., near transportation centers. The difficulty lies in where money should come from. For all the existing programs such as bike/ped program, Transportation for Livable Community (TLC) program, Roadway and Transit programs, proponents of these program advocate for not taking away money from their respective programs.

Public member Giorni commented on that various bike/ped related projects are now shown as consolidated into a \$75 million Bike/Ped programmatic category. However, there are eight San Mateo County bike/ped projects in the MTC Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). It is not clear as to how those eight projects are included in the \$75 million program.

Mr. Napier responded that the RTP is a planning document rather than a programming document. The purpose of putting a programmatic category for bike/ped, with undefined projects, is to provide flexibility in the future. It means that all projects are eligible to compete for funding in the future. If we specify each individual bike/ped project in the RTP at this time, it will preclude projects currently unidentified to move forward with the RTP time horizon. The estimated \$75 million is the best available staff can anticipate.

Member Bigelow added that although the specific bike/ped program is \$75 million, in reality, there are a lot more than that being spent on bike/ped improvements. An example would be the US 101 Auxiliary Lanes from 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave to Millbrae Ave included two new bike/pedestrian overcrossings over US 101.

***Motion: To recommend approval of this list of projects for submittal to MTC. Patridge/Matsumoto, approved, unanimously.***

## **6. Member comments and announcements.**

Member Pierce announced the Joint Policy Committee (JPC) on Regional Planning and Programs meeting will be held at 400 County Center, Redwood City on March 27, 2008 at 6:30 PM.

Member Patridge was happy to share with the group that the City of Half Moon Bay will host the LPGA Tournament in October.

Member Bigelow stated the California High Speed Rail Bond for \$10 billion will be on the November 2008 ballot. Congresswoman Feinstein and the Governor will be Co-Chair of the High Speed Rail Committee.

**7. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.**

At 4:38 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** April 28, 2008  
**To:** Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee  
**From:** John Hoang  
**Subject:** Update on the 2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor Study  
(For further information contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the CMEQ Committee receives an update on the 2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor Study. This item is for information only. No action is required.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

\$589,000 jointly funded by C/CAG (25%), San Mateo County Transportation Authority (25%), and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (50%)

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Funding for C/CAG's share is from the federal planning funds provided to C/CAG by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The 2020 Gateway Study was one of the recommendations from the Bay Crossing Study. The purpose of the Study, which began in 2003, is to identify short, medium and long-term options for addressing congestion issues relating to the approaches to the Dumbarton Bridge and Highway 101 between Routes 84 and 85. The objective of the study is to define and evaluate traffic improvements in the study area that address the Study goals which includes: facilitating access; enhancing economic opportunities; optimizing use of existing infrastructure; reducing congestion and local community impacts; and minimizing environmental impacts on sensitive resources.

Study accomplishments to date includes the establishment of the universe of potential project alternatives, preliminary review and identification of potential issues, and the development of next step strategies to further evaluate and implement specific projects. An assessment of relative benefits, costs, and impacts for these project alternatives was conducted and summarized in assessment tables that utilizes a simple "high-medium-low" approach.

## **ATTACHMENT**

- Universe of Alternative Assessment Matrix

HIGHWAY 101

ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <i>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</i>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <i>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</i>		Visual/Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
A	Route 101 Auxiliary Lanes	MV, PA	See "Comparison" Chart (ALT 1)						
B	Reconstruct Embarcadero/Oregon Interchange	MV, PA	⊙	⊙	\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
C	Reconstruct San Antonio interchange and eliminate southbound on ramp at Charleston	MV, PA	●	-	\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
D1	Widen freeway to 10 lanes (County Line to Shoreline)	MV, PA	●	-	\$\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
D2	Widen freeway to 10 lanes + Aux Lanes (County Line to Shoreline)	MV, PA	●	-	\$\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
E	Widen freeway to 10 lanes + Aux Lanes (Whipple to County Line)	RC, MP, EPA, PA	●	-	\$\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
F	Route 101 Elevated Express Lanes	MV, PA, EPA, MP, RC	See "Comparison" Chart (ALT 2)						
G	Improve local ability to cross 101	MV, PA, EPA, MP, RC	-	-	\$\$	-	-	⊙	⊙

CONNECTING BRIDGE AND HIGHWAY 101

ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <i>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</i>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <i>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</i>		Visual/Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
H	Grade Separations on Bayfront Expressway	EPA, MP	See "Comparison" Chart (ALT 3)						
I	Extend Bayfront Expressway to Woodside Road	MP, RC	●	⊙	\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	○	○
J	Construct direct flyover connection between Bayfront/ Marsh and 101 north of Marsh	MP, RC	⊙	⊙	\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	○
K	Elevated Direct Connections between Bayfront and 101 along Willow Road Corridor	EPA, MP	This project has been replaced by improvement CC						
L	Elevated roadway along Dumbarton RR corridor between University and 101	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	⊙
M	New 101 South connection through East Palo Alto (Expressway south of University)	EPA, MP	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	○	○	○	○
N	New 101 South connection skirting East Palo Alto (Expressway/viaduct along edge of bay)	EPA, PA	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
O	Tunnel beneath East Palo Alto	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	●	●	●	⊙
P	San Francisquito Creek Diversion Structure and Roadway (dual use tunnel facility)	EPA, PA	⊙	⊙	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	○	⊙
P1	Route 101 flood control project potentially down Willow Road.	EPA, MP	-	-	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	○	⊙

Location Key

EPA	East Palo Alto	MP	Menlo Park	MV	Mountain View	PA	Palo Alto	RC	Redwood City
-----	----------------	----	------------	----	---------------	----	-----------	----	--------------

Construction Cost Key

\$\$\$\$\$	>\$500M	\$\$\$\$	\$200M-\$500M	\$\$\$	\$50M-\$200M	\$\$	\$1M-\$50M	\$	<\$1M
------------	---------	----------	---------------	--------	--------------	------	------------	----	-------

ASSESSMENT KEY

	TRAFFIC BENEFITS	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
●	Improvement	Less-Than-Significant
⊙	Small Improvement	Less-Than-Significant <i>(w/ MITIGATION)</i>
○	Degrade	Significant
-	No Change	None

WILLOW ROAD

ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <i>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</i>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <i>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</i>		Visual/Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
Q	Short-term operational improvements on Willow Road	EPA, MP	See "Comparison" Chart (ALT 4)						
R	Prohibit left turns during peak travel periods	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	⊙	-
S	Prohibit local cross traffic during peak travel periods	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
T	Exit/Entrance Right Turn pockets on Willow	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	-	⊙
U	Set back curb line one lane width from traveled way at driveways	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	○
V	Eliminate driveway access on Willow	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
W	Eliminate selected signalized intersections: · Newbridge St · Ivy Dr · Hamilton Ave	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
X	Eliminate signalized intersections and allow right turns only on/off Willow	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
Y	Eliminate signalized intersections and prohibit any access from local streets	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
Z	Widen Willow one lane each direction	EPA, MP	●	●	\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
AA	Grade separations at selected intersections: · Newbridge St · Ivy Dr · Hamilton Ave	EPA, MP	●	●	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
BB	Pedestrian over crossing at Ivy Dr (near Mid-Peninsula High School)	EPA, MP	-	-	\$\$	○	-	-	⊙

WILLOW ROAD (CONT'D)

ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <i>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</i>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <i>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</i>		Visual/Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
CC1	Elevated viaduct expressway structure · 2 lanes in each direction	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	○
CC2 (Alt 6)	Elevated viaduct expressway structure · 1 lane in each direction	EPA, MP	See "Comparison" Chart (ALT 6)						
CC3	Elevated viaduct expressway structure · Reversible 2 lanes	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	⊙
CC4	Elevated viaduct expressway structure · 3 lanes with reversible middle lane	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	⊙
DD1	Depressed expressway · 2 lanes in each direction	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	○
DD2	Depressed expressway · 1 lane in each direction	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
DD3	Depressed expressway · Reversible 2 lanes	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
DD4	Depressed expressway · 3 lanes with reversible middle lane	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
EE	Grade separations at all intersections (over crossings or under crossings)	EPA, MP	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
FF	Tunnel Expressway (maintaining existing facility at grade)	EPA, MP	●	●	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
GG	Willow Road Depressed/Cantilevered Express Lanes	EPA, MP	See "Comparison" Chart (ALT 7)						

ASSESSMENT KEY

	TRAFFIC BENEFITS	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
●	Improvement	Less-Than-Significant
⊙	Small Improvement	Less-Than-Significant (w/ MITIGATION)
○	Degrade	Significant
-	No Change	None

Location Key

EPA	East Palo Alto	MP	Menlo Park	MV	Mountain View	PA	Palo Alto	RC	Redwood City
-----	----------------	----	------------	----	---------------	----	-----------	----	--------------

Construction Cost Key

\$\$\$\$\$	>\$500M	\$\$\$\$	\$200M-\$500M	\$\$\$	\$50M-\$200M	\$\$	\$1M-\$50M	\$	<\$1M
------------	---------	----------	---------------	--------	--------------	------	------------	----	-------



UNIVERSITY AVENUE

ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <i>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</i>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <i>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</i>		Visual/Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
HH	Short-term operational improvements on University Avenue	EPA	See "Comparison" Chart (ALT 7)						
II	Prohibit left turns during peak travel periods	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	⊙	-
JJ	Prohibit local cross traffic during peak travel periods	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
KK	Entrance/Exit Right Turn pockets on University	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	-	⊙
LL	Set back curb line one lane width from traveled way at driveways	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	○
MM	Eliminate driveway access on University	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
NN	Eliminate selected signalized intersections: • Bell • Runnymede • Kavanaugh	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
OO	Eliminate signalized intersections and allow right turns only on/off University	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
PP	Eliminate signalized intersections and prohibit any access from local streets	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
QQ	Widen University one lane each direction	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
RR	Grade separations at selected intersections: • Donohoe • Bay	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○

UNIVERSITY AVENUE (CONT'D)

ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <i>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</i>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <i>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</i>		Visual/Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
SS1	Elevated expressway/viaduct along University corridor • 2 lanes each direction	EPA	⊙	●	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	○
SS2	Elevated viaduct expressway structure • 1 lane in each direction	EPA	○	●	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	⊙
SS3	Elevated viaduct expressway structure • Reversible 2 lanes	EPA	⊙	●	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	⊙
SS4	Elevated viaduct expressway structure • 3 lanes with reversible middle	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	○
TT1	Depressed expressway • 2 lanes each direction	EPA	⊙	●	\$\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	○
TT2	Depressed expressway • 1 lane in each direction	EPA	○	●	\$\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
TT3	Depressed expressway • Reversible 2 lanes	EPA	⊙	●	\$\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
TT4	Depressed expressway • 3 lanes with reversible middle lane	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	○
UU	Grade separations at all intersections (over crossings or under crossings)	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
VV	Tunnel Expressway, (maintain existing facility at grade)	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	●	●	●	⊙
WW	University Avenue Depressed/ Cantilevered Express Lanes	EPA	See "Comparison" Chart (ALT 9)						

ASSESSMENT KEY

	TRAFFIC BENEFITS	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
●	Improvement	Less-Than-Significant
⊙	Small Improvement	Less-Than-Significant <i>(w/ MITIGATION)</i>
○	Degrade	Significant
-	No Change	None

Location Key

EPA	East Palo Alto	MP	Menlo Park	MV	Mountain View	PA	Palo Alto	RC	Redwood City
-----	----------------	----	------------	----	---------------	----	-----------	----	--------------

Construction Cost Key

\$\$\$\$\$	>\$500M	\$\$\$\$	\$200M-\$500M	\$\$\$	\$50M-\$200M	\$\$	\$1M-\$50M	\$	<\$1M
------------	---------	----------	---------------	--------	--------------	------	------------	----	-------

**INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS)**

ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <i>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</i>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <i>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</i>		Visual/Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
XX	Install traffic signal interconnect/communications infrastructure on arterials between Middlefield Road	ALL	⊙	⊙	\$\$	-	-	-	-
YY	Install transit signal priority to support high-patronage bus routes.	ALL	⊙	⊙	\$\$	-	-	-	-
ZZ	Install trailblazers and/or arterial CMS to provide route guidance information	ALL	⊙	⊙	\$\$	-	-	-	-
AAA	Prepare Incident Management and Traveler Information Plan for Corridor	ALL	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	-	-

**OTHER**

ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <i>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</i>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <i>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</i>		Visual/Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
BBB	Study the possible designation of East Bayshore (San Antonio to University) as a reliever route to provide congestion relief and for incident management on Route 101 Improve operations at intersections Install directional signage to help keep commuters off residential streets	PA, EPA	-	-	\$	-	-	-	-
CCC1	Improve 101/University interchange Construct Phase 2 improvements (Part A = SB direct connect off-ramp, Part B = Bike access)	PA, EPA	⊙	⊙	\$\$	●	●	●	●
CCC2	Improve 101/University interchange Improve on-off connections for northbound traffic	PA, EPA	⊙	⊙	\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
DDD	Define residential traffic management elements that complement high priority capital improvements	ALL	-	●	\$	-	-	●	-
EEE	Extend Central Expressway to Sand Hill Road	PA	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	○	○	○	○

Location Key

EPA	East Palo Alto	MP	Menlo Park	MV	Mountain View	PA	Palo Alto	RC	Redwood City
-----	----------------	----	------------	----	---------------	----	-----------	----	--------------

Construction Cost Key

\$\$\$\$\$	>\$500M	\$\$\$\$	\$200M-\$500M	\$\$\$	\$50M-\$200M	\$\$	\$1M-\$50M	\$	<\$1M
------------	---------	----------	---------------	--------	--------------	------	------------	----	-------

ASSESSMENT KEY

	TRAFFIC BENEFITS	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
●	Improvement	Less-Than-Significant
⊙	Small Improvement	Less-Than-Significant <i>(w/ MITIGATION)</i>
○	Degrade	Significant
-	No Change	None

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** April 28, 2008

**To:** Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

**From:** Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee

**Subject:** Fiscal Year 2008/2009 Expenditure Program for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program for San Mateo County

(For further information or questions contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460)

## RECOMMENDATION

This is an informational item for the CMEQ Committee. The TFCA Expenditure Program for FY 2008/2009 was approved at the April 10, 2008 C/CAG Board of Directors meeting.

## FISCAL IMPACT

The allocation of TFCA funds for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008/2009 is expected to be approximately \$1,193,400 of which \$57,400 (approx. 5%) will be allocated to administration. It is recommended that the remaining funds (\$1,136,000) be distributed based on the policies adopted in past years by C/CAG with modifications detailed in the discussion section. The following table shows how the funds would be distributed based on these policies. The funding provided in these categories for the past three years is also shown.

<i>CATEGORY</i>		<i>2005/2006</i>	<i>2006/2007</i>	<i>2007/2008</i>	<i>2008/2009</i>
Employer Based Shuttle Projects	SamTrans	\$605,000	\$638,000	\$576,000	\$636,000
	Menlo Park	\$40,000	\$45,000	\$0	See Background /Discussion
County-wide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program (Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance)		\$430,000	\$450,000	\$453,000	\$500,000
Administration		\$50,000	\$50,800	\$49,099	\$57,400
Totals		\$1,125,000	\$1,183,800	\$1,078,099	\$1,193,400

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) is authorized under Health and Safety code Section 44223 and 44225 to levy a fee on motor vehicles. Funds generated by the fee are referred to as the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funds and are used to implement projects to reduce air pollution from motor vehicles. Health and Safety Code Section 44241(d) stipulates that forty percent (40%) of funds generated within a county where the fee is in effect shall be allocated by the Air District to one or more public agencies designated to receive the funds, and for San Mateo County, C/CAG has been designated as the overall Program Manager to receive the funds.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

*The TFCA Expenditure Program for FY 2008/2009 was approved at the April 10, 2008 C/CAG Board of Directors meeting.*

As the Program Manager for the TFCA funds, C/CAG has allocated these funds to fund projects in San Mateo County operated by SamTrans, the City of Menlo Park, and the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance (Alliance). For nine of last ten years the C/CAG Board has allocated the funds for the SamTrans and City of Menlo Park Shuttle Bus Programs and the Alliance Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program. It is recommended that the same methodology be used for the FY 2008/2009 TFCA Program allocation with the exception of the Menlo Park Shuttle Program. The Menlo Park Shuttle Program has had difficulties meeting the cost-effectiveness policy described below. The City of Menlo Park has been encouraged to apply for shuttle funds from the C/CAG Local Shuttle Program under the Congestion Relief Program. The four percent or approximately \$45,000 in TFCA funds that had been allocated to Menlo Park in the past has been directed to the Alliance for the FY 2008/2009 Expenditure Program recommendation. As a result, \$45,000 would be subtracted from the \$550,000 that was budgeted for the Alliance from the Congestion Relief Program. Since the March 31st Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee meeting was cancelled, the CMEQ Committee agreed that staff could take the recommendation from the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee directly to the C/CAG Board of Directors due to the consistency with past funding recommendations.

- It is recommended that the SamTrans Shuttle Program receive an allocation of \$636,000 for its current shuttle program and maintain the existing cost sharing formula with SamTrans contributing approximately 25% of the cost of these shuttles and the remaining 25% through employer contributions. This funding recommendation shall be contingent upon SamTrans submitting an acceptable work plan for use of the funds.
- It is recommended that Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance receive an allocation of \$500,000 in TFCA funds and receive \$505,000 from the Congestion Relief Plan for a total allocation of \$1,005,000 for its County-wide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program. The funds allocated for the Alliance are subject to the submission of an acceptable work plan for use of the funds.

The following are the C/CAG Board policies that will continue to be in effect for the FY 2008/2009 Program.

Overall Policies:

- Cost Effectiveness, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), will be used as initial screening criteria for all projects. Projects must show a cost effectiveness of less than \$90,000 per ton of reduced emissions based upon the TFCA funds allocated in order to be considered.

Shuttle Projects:

- Shuttle projects are defined as the provision of local feeder bus or shuttle service to rail and ferry stations and airports.
- All shuttles must be timed to meet the rail or ferry lines being served.
- C/CAG encourages the use of electric and other clean fuel vehicles for shuttles.
- Beginning with the 2003-04 TFCA funding cycle, all vehicles used in any shuttle/feeder bus service must meet the applicable California Air Resources Board (CARB) particulate matter standards for public transit fleets. This requirement has been made by the BAAQMD and is applicable to the projects funded by the Congestion Management Agencies.

If the recommendations are accepted, the following is a summary of the C/CAG TFCA Program for FY 2008/2009:

<b>Project</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Administration	\$57,400
SamTrans	\$636,000
Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance	\$500,000
Total funds obligated	\$1,193,400
Total funds anticipated	\$1,193,400
Balance	\$0

**ATTACHMENTS**

- Resolution 08-09

## **RESOLUTION 08-09**

### **A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY AUTHORIZING THE ADOPTION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2008/2009 EXPENDITURE PROGRAM FOR THE TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR CLEAN AIR (TFCA) PROGRAM FOR SAN MATEO COUNTY**

**WHEREAS**, the City/County Association of Governments has been designated the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Manager for San Mateo County; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments has approved certain projects and programs for funding through San Mateo County's 40 percent local share of Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) revenues; and,


**WHEREAS**, the City/County Association of Governments will act as the Program Manager for approximately \$1,136,000, of TFCA funded projects; and,

**WHEREAS**, the approximate \$1,136,000 funding is to be adjusted to the actual amount when it becomes available, and to be incorporated into individual contracts; and,

**WHEREAS**, the projects included in this expenditure program are the most appropriate and cost-effective strategies currently available within the County for reducing motor vehicle emissions. All proposed expenditures will be consistent with the *Clean Air Plan* and Section 44241(b) of the California Health and Safety Code; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County that the C/CAG Staff is authorized to submit the Fiscal Year 2008/2009 Expenditure Program for the San Mateo County TFCA Program to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

**PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED THIS 10<sup>th</sup> DAY OF APRIL 2008.**



Deborah C. Gordon, C/CAG Chair

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** April 28, 2008  
**To:** Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee  
**From:** Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee  
**Subject:** Recommendation for the 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle of the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program

(For further information please contact Tom Madalena at 650-599-1460)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the CMEQ Committee consider the approval of the following projects (presented in attached summary) for the 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle of the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

This initiative will help cities that are approving Transit Oriented Development (TOD) projects receive money earmarked for transportation projects. The cities with qualified projects that begin construction on TOD housing within 2 years will receive the financial incentive once the project is built.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

There is \$3,000,000 available for the 4th Cycle of the program. The funding sources include the State Transportation Improvement Program and the Transportation for Livable Communities Program. All unused funds will be returned to the program for use in a later cycle.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The objective of this program is to encourage high-density housing (greater than 40 units per acre) within 1/3 of a mile of a BART or Caltrain station or on El Camino Real/Mission Street in San Mateo County. For eligible housing projects, C/CAG will make a commitment to program the incentive funds to a transportation project identified by the sponsor if the housing is under construction within two years.

There are 10 projects that are being recommended for approval for the 4th Cycle of the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program. There were a total of eleven applications received. One application did not qualify since it was a Specific Plan project and not a housing

affordable to low and moderate-income households. Based on the number of bedrooms approved there will be \$1,202 available for each bedroom built and an additional \$125 available for each affordable bedroom built.

In order to determine the dollar amount for each bedroom we multiplied the number of bedrooms and affordable bedrooms times \$2000 and \$250, respectively. From this we determined the percentage share that each category (regular bedrooms and affordable bedrooms) would have with an unlimited amount of money. It was calculated that of the \$3,000,000, 98% of it would be available for regular bedrooms and 2% would be available for affordable bedrooms. Given this breakdown we have \$1,202 available for each regular bedroom and \$125 available for each affordable bedroom.

Example:      2,446 bedrooms X \$2000 = \$4,892,000 == 98% of \$5,012,250  
                 481 affordable bedrooms X \$250 = \$120,250 == 2% of \$5,012,250

\$3,000,000 X 98% = \$2,940,000  
\$3,000,000 X 2% = \$60,000

\$2,940,000 / 2,446 = \$1,201.96  
\$60,000 / 481 = \$124.74

The ten projects being recommended for funding during this cycle demonstrate that there are a number of new high-density residential projects on the horizon in San Mateo County. From the new San Carlos Transit Village to the Mission and Westlake Mixed-Use project in Daly City, there continues to be new high-density infill projects. For the 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle of the program the program was made available to projects that are on the El Camino Real/Mission Street. For the 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle there are five projects that are on the El Camino Real/Mission Street. Four of the five that are on the El Camino Real/Mission Street are also within 1/3 mile of a transit station.

#### ATTACHMENT

Summary of Recommended Projects - 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle



## Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program

### Summary of Recommended Projects – 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle

Applicant:	City of San Mateo
Project Name:	Goodyear Site/Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition
Address:	2901 and 2905 S. El Camino Real, San Mateo, CA
Description:	The Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition proposes to demolish two existing commercial buildings onsite, and construct a 4 story mixed-use building with 67 affordable residential units and approximately 2,698 square feet of commercial space.
Number of Units:	67 units
Number of Bedrooms:	153
Density:	67 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	1,350 feet from Caltrain, El Camino Real
Non-Residential Uses:	2,698 square feet of commercial
Affordable housing incentive:	100% (153 bedrooms)
<i>Eligible for \$</i>	\$203,000

Applicant:	City of San Mateo
Project Name:	Delaware Place
Address:	2090 South Delaware Street, San Mateo, CA
Description:	This is a 111 unit residential project on a 2.37-acre parcel. The project will include a mix of one, two and three bedroom units in buildings that vary in height from 2 to 4 stories.
Number of Units:	111 units
Number of Bedrooms:	213
Density:	47 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	1/4 mile
Non-Residential Uses:	NA
Affordable housing incentive:	10% Affordable (22 bedrooms)
<i>Eligible for \$</i>	\$259,000

Applicant:	City of Daly City
Project Name:	Mission & Westlake – Mixed Use
Address:	6800 Mission Street (at Westlake Ave.), Daly City, CA
Description:	This project fronts Mission Street and is comprised of 36 residential units and 5,900 square feet of retail/office space. The project site is approximately 0.4 acres.
Number of Units:	36 (32 two-bedroom units, 4 three-bedroom units)
Number of Bedrooms:	76
Density:	90 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	Mission Street
Non-Residential Uses:	5,900 square feet of retail/office space
Affordable housing incentive:	20% (17 bedrooms)
<i>Eligible for \$</i>	\$93,000

Applicant:	City of Daly City
Project Name:	Peninsula Habitat for Humanity
Address:	7555 Mission Street (at A Street), Daly City, CA
Description:	This project consists of a 36-unit project on a 0.7-acre site. 100% of the units are to be designated for low-moderate income households. The project fronts Mission Street and is within one-third mile of the Colma BART station.
Number of Units:	36 residential units
Number of Bedrooms:	106
Density:	51 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	600 feet from BART, Mission Street
Non-Residential Uses:	NA
Affordable housing incentive:	100% affordable (106 bedrooms)
<i>Eligible for \$</i>	\$141,000

Applicant:	City of Daly City
Project Name:	American Senior Living – Monarch Village
Address:	165 Pierce Street (at Sullivan Ave.), Daly City, CA
Description:	This project combines 208 residential units with 15,400 square feet of retail space. Fifteen percent of the units are to be designated for low-moderate income seniors.
Number of Units:	208 residential units
Number of Bedrooms:	229
Density:	57 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	<1000 feet to Colma BART
Non-Residential Uses:	15,400 square feet of retail space
Affordable housing incentive:	15% affordable (34 bedrooms)
<i>Eligible for \$</i>	\$279,000

Applicant:	City of Millbrae
Project Name:	Park Paradise
Address:	Millbrae Station Area between Broadway and El Camino Real at Chadbourne Ave. Millbrae, CA
Description:	This project will include 146 condominium units and 22,000 square feet of transit oriented retail on El Camino Real. There will be 20 low-moderate housing units supported by developer contributions and Millbrae Redevelopment Agency housing assistance. Additionally, the project will include a public frontage road on El Camino Real.
Number of Units:	146 condominiums
Number of Bedrooms:	292
Density:	60 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	600 feet from Millbrae Station, El Camino Real
Non-Residential Uses:	22,000 square feet of transit oriented retail
Affordable housing incentive:	10% affordable (30 bedrooms)
<i>Eligible for \$</i>	\$355,000

Applicant:	City of San Bruno
Project Name:	Parcel 3 & 4 Condominiums at The Crossing
Address:	470 San Mateo Avenue, San Bruno, CA
Description:	This project consists of 350 market rate units. The Crossing is a 20-acre transit oriented development with an emphasis on pedestrian activity located within the Navy Site Specific Plan Area in San Bruno.
Number of Units:	350 market rate condominiums
Number of Bedrooms:	544 bedrooms
Density:	58 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	1/3 mile from BART
Non-Residential Uses:	NA
Affordable housing incentive:	NA
<i>Eligible for \$</i>	\$654,000

Applicant:	City of San Bruno
Project Name:	Peninsular Plaza
Address:	400-418 San Mateo Avenue, San Bruno, CA
Description:	This project will be a three story mixed-use building with two floors of condominiums over ground floor commercial use and underground parking.
Number of Units:	48 units
Number of Bedrooms:	93
Density:	48 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	1/3 mile to Caltrain
Non-Residential Uses:	15,545 square feet of commercial space
Affordable housing incentive:	17.5% affordable (16 bedrooms)
<i>Eligible for \$</i>	\$114,000

Applicant:	City of San Carlos
Project Name:	San Carlos Transit Village
Address:	East side of El Camino Real from Oak St. to San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA
Description:	This project will include four story residential buildings over parking garages as well as 34,600 square feet of retail/commercial space. A multi modal transit station and drop off point are proposed south of the depot. A pedestrian plaza and public gathering space in front of the historic depot are also proposed.
Number of Units:	281 units
Number of Bedrooms:	532
Density:	55.8 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	Adjacent to San Carlos Caltrain Station, El Camino Real
Non-Residential Uses:	34,600 square feet of retail/commercial space
Affordable housing incentive:	15% (79 bedrooms)
<i>Eligible for \$</i>	\$649,000

Applicant:	City of Menlo Park
Project Name:	Derry Mixed-Use Project
Address:	580 Oak Grove Avenue, Menlo Park, CA
Description:	Ten three-story buildings including 108 residential condominium units and 24,925 square feet of commercial condominium space would be constructed, along with 301 parking spaces in a partially submerged parking garage.
Number of Units:	108 residential condominium units
Number of Bedrooms:	208
Density:	40 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	75 feet from Caltrain Station and 150 feet from El Camino Real
Non-Residential Uses:	12,275 sq. ft. of office space and 12,650 sq. ft. of retail space for a total of 24,925 sq. ft. of commercial space
Affordable housing incentive:	15% affordable (24 bedrooms)
Eligible for \$	\$253,000

Note – Grant amounts are rounded to the nearest \$1,000 per State and Federal requirements.