No.	Member	Agency	Jan	Feb	Apr	Jun	Sep
		2018 TAC Roster and Attendance					
1	Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering		x	x	x	x
2	Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	x	x	x	x	x
3	Robert Ovadia	Atherton Engineering	n/a	n/a	x	x	x
4	Afshin Oskoui	Belmont Engineering	x	x	x		x
5	Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering				x	x
6	Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering		x	x		x
7	Sandy Wong	C/CAG		x		x	x
8	Brad Donohue	Colma Engineering	x	x	x		x
9	John Fuller	Daly City Engineering		x	x	x	x
10	Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x	x	x	x	x
11	Norm Dorais	Foster City Engineering	n/a	n/a	n/a		x
12	Paul Willis	Hillsborough Engineering	x	x	x	x	x
13	Maz Bozorginia	Half Moon Bay Engineering	n/a	n/a	x	x	x
14	Justin Murphy	Menlo Park Engineering		x	x		x
15	Khee Lim	Milllbrae Engineering	x		x	x	x
16	Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering	x	x	x	x	x
17	Jessica Manzi	Redwood City Engineering	x	x	x	x	x
18	Jimmy Tan	San Bruno Engineering	x		x	x	x
19	Steven Machida	San Carlos Engineering	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x
20	Brad Underwood	San Mateo Engineering			x	x	x
21	Eunejune Kim	South San Francisco Engineering	x	x			x
22	Billy Gross	South San Francisco Planning	x	x		x	x
23	Sean Rose	Woodside Engineering	x	x		x	x

The two hundred forty sixth (246th) meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices located at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, 2nd Floor Auditorium, San Carlos, CA. Vice Chair Porter called the meeting to order on Thursday, September 20, 2018.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: John Ford, Kim Comstock – Commute.org; Betty Seto – DNV-GL; Richard Chiu – Daly City; Jose Iglesias, Jennifer Thompson – Sustainable Silicon Valley; Jean Higaki, John Hoang, Sara Muse, Jeff Lacap -C/CAG; and other attendees not signed in.

1. **Public comment on items not on the agenda.**
   None.

2. **Issues from the last C/CAG Board meeting.**
   None.

3. **Approval of the Minutes from June 21, 2018.**
   Approved.

4. **Receive information on the Carpool Incentive Program**
   John Hoang and Sara Muse presented on the recently completed pilot carpool incentive program including resulting performance measurements such as number of users, number of carpool trips, total new users, CO2 saved, and average driver miles per trip. The presentation also included observed trends in origins and destinations, and origination of trips from other counties. The resulting pilot project was considered successful and lessons learned suggests that having the ability to adjust the program would have been helpful in testing out different scenarios as well as the ability to obtain additional data points for performance analysis.

   Response and comments as follows. Once the program ended, we stopped receiving data post project therefore are unable to continue to monitor the carpools after incentive ended. Clarifications were made that although there is a high number of registered users, the number of unique matched users is much smaller. With regards to one-way trips takes a trip back, we can't verify exactly if matched users in morning trips are the same matched user in the afternoon trips.

5. **Review and recommend approval of Carpool Incentive Program 2.0**
   John Ford, Executive Director of Commute.org and Kim Comstock, Programs Manager, presented on the proposed new Carpool Incentive Program 2.0, partnering with C/CAG, to deploy a rewards-based carpooling program utilizing Commute.org's STAR platform and allowing users of various apps to participate. The reward includes up to $100 in e-gift cards earned in $25 increments for each 10 days of carpooling and also includes mid-week power carpool challenges. This program will provide access to additional data points for performance analyses.

Comments and questions were as follows:
- Depending on the apps used, actual carpool trips can be validated.
- Request staff to evaluate program and report back project status in six months
- How do capture how many people are in the car/How do you know if there is another person in the car for a carpool. Based on information reported by rider/driver and the honor system.
- Can we identify if there was another person in the vehicle? Maybe
- Consider peak periods maximum points.
- Target outreach to areas not currently served well by transit (e.g., Coastside, Fremont to Foster City trips)
- Try to identify types of users through the surveys (e.g., by income)
- Is funding for program used elsewhere or could funding be used on something else? Yes.
- How did we focus incentives more on Tuesday – Thursday? Those are the days with peak congestion.
- The key is to incentive peak period trips and not just for carpooling trips with friends late at night
- Are we losing marketing that Scoop and Waze would have done to increase activity? No.
- Is lesson learned to be applied to this 2.0 program? Yes.

6. **Receive a presentation on the Transportation Climate Plan**
Betty Seto from DNV-GL, presented on the draft Transportation Climate Plan that identify how the SMCTP 2040 supports state climate targets for 2030 and beyond. The Plan is part of the Countywide Sustainability and Climate Planning effort undertaken by cities and emphasize how cities can support implementation of C/CAG programs. The Plan focus on SMCTP 3040 strategies for Vehicle Mile Traveled (VMT) reduction and identifies next steps.

Comments were as follows:
- Categories seem off, bikes category should include scooters (public comment)
- There needs to be a regional approach and public outreach for incentivizing Electric Vehicles that includes SamTrans, Caltrain, and BART to be able to move the needle
- Public participation should include larger employers such as Google, Facebook, communities, and public members
- Consider re-wording to emphasize VMT reductions – what are targets for different VMT sectors?
- We need to consider other actions, not just rely solely on implementing electric vehicles
- Include more on autonomous vehicles.
- Factor time required to turnover vehicle stock and factor into analysis. Also consider adoption curve.
- Does implementation include aggressive targets per city for EV infrastructure?
- Would be good to understand how much impact we're having with different strategies
- How is the C/CAG TDM model being calibrated against the transportation network?

7. **Receive information on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update**
Sara Muse presented on the upcoming effort to update the Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, previously adopted in 2011. Elements considered in the update include existing conditions analysis, development strategies, inventory of facilities and programs, and identifying innovative solutions. Updating the plan is anticipated to take one year.

Comment and input were as follows:

- Prioritize gaps for bikes/peds compared to counts
- Consider return on investment with completed projects (recreational vs. commuting)
- Consider GHG reduction, 1st and last mile connections
- Use best management practices
- Focus on project that address connectivity issues rather than on high priority projects only
- Consider how to encourage biking and its health implications.

8. Regional Project and Funding Information

Jeff Lacap presented information on the FHWA Policy for Inactive Projects, PMP Certification, and other Federal Aid Announcements pertaining to the MTC obligation plan for FY18-19, DBE Contract goals, SB 1 Local Streets and Roads Funding Program report, and SB 1 Workshop and planning grants as well as Prop 6.

9. Executive Director Report

Not noted.

10. Member Reports

Not noted.

Meeting adjourned.