

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
COMMITTEE ON CONGESTION MANAGEMENT
AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (CMEQ)**

**MINUTES
MEETING OF JANUARY 29, 2007**

At 3:00 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, William Dickenson, Linda Larson, Sue Lempert, Arthur Lloyd, Karyl Matsumoto, Chairwoman Irene O'Connell, Barbara Pierce, Vice-Chair Sepi Richardson, Lennie Roberts, and Onnolee Trapp.

Staff/Guests Attending: Richard Napier, Sandy Wong, Tom Madalena, and John Hoang (C/CAG Staff), Pat Dixon (Transportation Authority Citizens Advisory Committee), Christine Maley-Grubl (Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance), Richard Cook and Ana Chavez (SamTrans), Marshall Loring (MTC EDAC), Teifion Rice-Evans (EPS), Christine Leslie (SAMCEDA).

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None.

CONSENT AGENDA

2. Minutes of September 25, 2006 meeting.

Member Larson pointed out that on page 1 of the September 25, 2006 minutes, the third bullet from the bottom should specify to what program that bullet is referenced to. (*Reference: That item was referring to the Congestion Relief programs.*)

Motion: To approve the Minutes as amended. Bigelow/Larson, approved, member Roberts abstained.

REGULAR AGENDA

3. Review and approval of the 2007 CMEQ meeting Calendar.

Chair O'Connell questioned whether the July 30th meeting date is necessary since the C/CAG Board does not meet in the month of July. The committee decided to keep that the July 30th meeting date for now just in case it will be needed.

Motion: Approval of the 2007 CMEQ meeting calendar as presented. Richardson/Bigelow, unanimous.

5. Recommendation on approval of the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Augmentation for San Mateo County.

This item was moved up ahead of Item 4. Sandy Wong reported that since Prop 1B was approved last year by California voters, it will bring \$2 billion for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). As a result, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) will adopt an augmentation to the 2006 STIP. Deadline for county's Congestion Management Agencies to submit their respective 2006 STIP Augmentation to MTC is February 28, 2007. San Mateo County's target share is approximately \$23 million for highway program and \$9 million for transit program. For the highway program, the bulk of the money will go to cover cost increase for the 3rd to Millbrae auxiliary lane project. For the transit program, two projects recommended for funding include the South San Francisco CalTrain Station & Access Improvement project and the Daly City BART Station improvement project.

Criteria used in selection of projects for funding were primarily based on project readiness and other funding commitments in the project. All candidate projects for STIP funding must have approved Project Study Report (PSR) or equivalent. For transit projects, primary input came from transit partners including SamTrans, JPB, and BART. Member Larson mentioned that the Daly City BART station is the oldest station and it is difficult to find ways around it. Improvements should include signs to and from the freeway.

Motion: Recommend approval of the San Mateo County 2006 STIP Augmentation, Bigelow/Larson, Unanimous.

4. Recommendation on the Approval of the San Mateo County Congestion Relief Program (CRP) Reauthorization.

Richard Napier, C/CAG Executive Director, reported that the Congestion Relief Plan (CRP) reauthorization was discussed at the December 2006 C/CAG Board meeting. The Board generally favored a 4-year renewal term and directed staff to solicit input from jurisdictions, and asked C/CAG members be ready to vote on this item at the next meeting. Richard has since presented this item to the Redwood City council and provided more clarifying information. Member Matsumoto stated that her city manager has informed her while the CRP can leverage other funds, it's reasonable for a 4-year term and have the opportunity to come back in 4 years to reassess the situation. She can only vote for a 4-year term. Member Pierce thanked Richard for coming to Redwood City council to explain the differences between options and mentioned that they will support the higher amount.

Motion: Recommend approval of the Congestion Relief Plan reauthorization, Bigelow/Trapp, unanimous.

6. Update on the Transportation Infrastructure Bond (information).

Sandy Wong reported that C/CAG submitted 5 projects for funding for the \$4.5 billion Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) of the Transportation Bond (Prop 1B). On Jan. 16, 2007, Caltrans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) submitted candidate projects to the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Statewide, a total of \$11 billion

request was submitted to the CTC. Two of the San Mateo county projects were included in the Caltrans and MTC submittals. The CTC will take action at its Feb. 28, 2007 meeting to award funding to projects. Staff has met with all five State legislators for San Mateo County and solicited their support. A joint letter was sent by all five state legislative delegations to the CTC supporting the San Mateo County projects.

Member Lempert stated that the meetings at the MTC regional level went pretty well even though it's about money. The problem was everyone wanted to ask for more money than that is available. Richard has spent a lot of time on it. C/CAG member O'Mahony and member Lempert have sent individual letters to support these projects. Richard Napier stated that he and Sandy have spent a lot of time on this issue, and that only projects that are highly competitive were submitted. He also thanked member Lempert and her colleagues at MTC for their help. It remains to be seen as to how this will unfold at the CTC level.

7. Recommendation on approval of the revised Scoring Criteria for the local streets and road pavement program (Project Evaluation and Selection Process).

John Hoang reported that at the end of the last Local Street and Road funding cycle, CMEQ and the C/CAG Board requested for a reevaluate the scoring process. A subcommittee of the TAC was formed to address this need. Member Larson stated that she would like the committee to seriously consider before putting much money in sealing projects because sealing of pavement is just a cosmetic fix. Member Bigelow stated that he was at the TAC meeting and observed overwhelming support by TAC members in this recommended scoring process. CMEQ members asked staff to provide explanation in acronyms. Member Lempert asked about East Palo Alto's ability to compete for funding. Richard Napier stated that C/CAG staff recognize the staffing level issue at East Palo Alto and spends a lot of time helping the city in order to make sure they don't lose money. Member Lempert suggested that maybe city council should be made aware of any problems there might be. Member Richardson asked about the frequency of Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) update. John responded that it varies from city to city and frequency could range from every year up to five years, or as needed. Also, AADT would probably not fluctuate much with 2-3 years. John will follow up on the frequency of AADT update by jurisdictions.

Motion: Recommend approval of the revised scoring criteria for the local streets and road pavement program, direct staff to report back on frequency of updating AADT information by jurisdictions. Bigelow/Richardson, Unanimous.

8. Comment on the Regional Housing Needs Analysis (information).

Richard Napier introduced this item by stating that the agreement to conduct a housing needs study was made two years ago. This is not a nexus study, but rather, it provides broad range of data regarding housing need and supply. Tom Madelena introduced Mr. Teifion Rice-Evans, Project Manager from Economic & Planning Systems, who gave a very detail presentation on the Study. Mr. Rice-Evans pointed out this study compared housing need with supply. Assumptions were based on MTC/ABAG projections. Findings indicated a broad distribution of housing needs across all income levels. Since San Mateo County does not have large areas of vacant land to build on, big imbalance between need and supply is projected in the future.

Comments from CMEQ included:

- Build not only units, but the right units for the right people.
- There is a mapping mistake on page 6 of the report which left out East Palo Alto.
- When presenting numbers that represent the future, should always state that it's a projection.
- Use the same color to represent the same thing on different charts.
- There is no need to advocate for high end housing, but the lower end.
- We need a plan to bridge the housing gap.
- We must address housing and transportation together.
- The topic of Transit Oriented Development (TOD) is missing.
- Show more statistics such as household and income for each jurisdiction.
- Show actual housing production numbers in the past 10 years.

Duane Bay, Director of San Mateo County Housing Department, commented that the housing elements for the 20 cities are about 80% similar to one another. He further noted that the ABAG projections are at a "big picture" level, but they are less accurate when zoomed into more detailed levels.

Richard Napier stated that this item will go to the technical and policy committees of Regional Housing Needs Analysis (RHNA). He also asked the CMEQ to recommend C/CAG Board to direct staff to distribute this Draft Report for comments.

Motion: Recommend distribution of the Draft San Mateo County Housing Needs Study with the corrections of color unification and addition of 10 years production data, Bigelow/Pierce, unanimous.

9. Member comments and announcements.

Member Bigelow suggested inviting the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) to a future meeting to present an update on the Dumbarton Rail Corridor project.

Sandy Wong provided an update on the ramp metering on highway 101 status.

Member Trapp mentioned that she attended the League of City conference and was proud to see the San Mateo County poster there.

10. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.

At 4:55 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.