

# CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP) TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

March 17, 2016  
**MINUTES**

The meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices located at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Auditorium, San Carlos, CA. Co-chair Porter called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m. on Thursday, March 17, 2016.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Dave Bishop - Colma; Doug Kim – SamTrans; Jean Higaki, John Hoang, Eliza Yu – C/CAG; Ellen Barton – County of San Mateo, and other attendees not noted.

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

None.

**2. Issues from the last C/CAG Board meeting.**

Approved.

**3. Approval of the Minutes from January 21, 2016.**

Approved.

**4. Receive a presentation on the BAAQMD Alternative Fuel Grant Opportunities**

Ken Mak, BAAQMD staff, presented information on funding opportunities for Plug-in Electric Vehicle (PEV) from the BAAQMD including PEV Rebate programs for public agencies, Heavy-Duty Zero-Emission Vehicle (ZEV), and other resources available to public agencies. Comments and questions were as follows:

- Although the grants cover both cost of the charging station and associated installation costs, installation cost can be significantly more than the grant amounts due to cost associated with getting power to the stations and other factors. The Air District need to look at increasing the grant amounts to help agencies with deployment.
- ZEV usage among agencies has been low and the Air District is providing grants to encourage increased usage.
- Information on types of vehicle eligible to receive grants can be found at the PEV collaborative website. Previous year's rebate program has been undersubscribed so the Air District is looking for ways to improve the program.
- It was mentioned that agencies should consider providing for ADA when installing charging stations.

**5. Receive an update on the Highway 101 Pilot Ramp Metering Project, which is administered by Caltrans and UC Berkeley's PATH**

Eliza Yu presented that Caltrans has changed the project into a statewide research based project and therefore canceled the pilot project in San Mateo County. It was confirmed that there will not be a need for a task force.

**6. Review and recommend approval of the Fiscal Year 2016/17 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Projects**

John Hoang presented the proposed revised list of projects for the FY16/17 TFCA funds which includes 1) Commute.org - \$525,000 (no change), 2) SamTrans BART Shuttles \$109,000 (reduced based on latest cost effectiveness calculations), 3) SamTrans San Carlos Shuttle (New) - \$162,860, 4) SamTrans Bike Racks on Buses (New) - \$160,128; and 5) Smart Corridor Expansion (New) - \$267,012. The BART shuttle allocation amount was reduced so that the project could meet the cost-effectiveness criteria. With regards to the San Carlos Shuttle project, as a clarification, the project is still being evaluated for cost effectiveness and if it meets the requirements and receive TFCA funds, then the project would not need to receive Measure A funds.

- The San Carlos shuttle would receive a one-time TFCA grant this year. Doug Kim (SamTrans) clarified that if this project was fully funded by TFCA, there is no need to receive TA funds. Committee members noted that a new shuttle would take more than one year to build up ridership.
- Regarding performance criteria and shuttles, the pilot shuttle funded by funds will need to comply with cost-effectiveness criteria established by the Air District for the TFCA program.
- It was suggested that a call for projects should be implemented next year. In addition, there should be projects ready to receive unallocated funds. C/CAG should also consider taking advantage of the recent TA process for potential projects to be funded, if needed.

**7. Review and recommend approval of the Measure M 5-Year Implementation Plan (Fiscal Year 2016/17- 2020/21) Framework**

John Hoang presented information on the proposed framework for the Measure M – 5-Yr Implementation Plan indicating that the allocations remain the same from the original 5-Yr Plan except that the Transit Operations/Senior Mobility be reduced from 22% to 20% and that Intelligent Transportation System/Smart Corridor be increased from 10% to 12%. Co-chair Hurley indicated that further discussion will be taking place between C/CAG and SamTrans with regards to the Transit Operations/Senior Mobility program.

For Smart Corridor category, there was a request for clarification regarding responsibility for maintaining upgraded hardware/software (e.g., KITS) and associated field equipment. The maintenance responsibilities are described in the city-C/CAG MOUs; however, C/CAG staff will revisit the agreements and provide more clarity to the cities as far as responsibilities. Expansion of the Smart Corridor is expected to be underway within the next five years. For the current project, it is anticipated that the project will be completed and go live in the next few months. It was mentioned that there is also a need to optimize signal timing on non-Caltrans corridor.

**8. Review and recommend approval of the Proposed One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Framework**

Jean Higaki presented the proposed framework for OBAG 2 indicating the following proposed funding: LSR - \$10M; Bike/Ped - \$5.955M (competitive); TLC - \$5.955M (competitive); SRTS - \$2.394M (; Planning/Outreach - \$4.650M; FAS - \$892K

Discussions and comments were as follows:

- All \$2.394M for SRTS will be for non-infrastructure projects.

- The proposed allocation of \$10M to LSR was based on the availability of STP/CMAQ funds as well as trying to maintain a similar ratio between LSR, Bike/Ped and TLC as in OBAG1, which was more restrictive. For OBAG2, staff can look at adding more funds to LSR since we are not bound by available STP/CMAQ funds.
- The proposed scenario of having six jurisdictions compete against each other for \$851,000 will result in three cities potentially receiving no funding.
- Consider working with MTC to change the \$250,000 minimum requirement; add another \$649,000 to LSR so that each city receives at least \$250,000; or revisit the formula so that each agency receives a minimum of \$250,000; or reduce amount across the board to achieve a minimum \$250,000 for each jurisdiction. The current proposal is not equitable and needs to be modified so that each city receives some funds.
- Recommendation to reallocated \$324,500 each from Bike/Ped and TLC towards LSR, enabling the six jurisdiction to receive a minimum \$250,000
- Most LSR project involves pavement and striping therefore there are dual purposes that benefits both for LSR and bikes. Cities are already required to do complete streets.
- Clarification was made that PMP and HPMS requirements are not part of C/CAG's requirements.
- For OBAG2, there will be one call for projects.
- Reiteration of adding \$649,000 to the LSR formula distribution from funds reallocated from Bike/Ped and TLC program and looking at utilizing the maximum amount of STP funds available.
- Staff indicated that there is up to \$1M (including the \$649,000) that could be moved to LSR.
- It was suggested that staff come up with other options and formula and consider reallocation more funds from other programs.
- A point was made that providing for a minimum amount of \$250,000 to smaller cities is unfair since larger cities have more roads. Based on number of miles within a city, the smaller cities may in effect, receive four times the money per mile of road than a large city.
- It would be good to have a bigger funding picture to know all funding sources available for local streets and roads.
- The County rural roads are taken care of with other funds.
- Efforts were made to seek out larger sized projects that cover multiple cities but there were no projects identified.
- The Bike/Ped program was undersubscribed last time and funds were shifted to TLC.
- Staff will discuss with MTC again to see if there can be a waiver for the minimum project amount less of than \$250,000.

Committee members, with one dissention, directed staff as follows: Based on the suggestions provided, rework the distribution formula and come back to the TAC with recommendations for 1) adding \$649K to LSR and provide for a minimum \$250,000 for each city, or 2) adding \$1M to LSR and allow for a minimum of less than \$250,000 to each city.

## **9. Receive information regarding the Caltrans' Project Study Report-Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) Work Plan**

Eliza Yu handed out the Caltrans' PID Work Plan Template and requested updated information from jurisdictions that meets the following criteria: project located on the state highway system, project cost is over \$1M, and project is controversial in nature. Cities should send information to Eliza.

## **10. Regional Project and Funding Information**

Jean Higaki presented information pertaining to Federal funding, project delivery, and pertinent regional policies that may affect local agencies. Information included the inactive list of projects (handouts), regional pavement needs report, obligation plan for FY16/17, Caltrans District 4 bike plan request for information, and release of the ATP grant.

### **11. Executive Director Report**

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, provided an update on the Highway 101 Express Lane project. Co-chair Hurley added that the traffic studies are underway and there is an integrated team overseeing the implementation. The environmental documents should take 24 months to complete. The private sector is looking to add money to the PAED phase.

Comments included concerns about traffic impacts to local roads in general. Notice will be issued once the environmental document process begins.

### **12. Member Reports**

None.

Meeting adjourned.