

**CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)  
November 17, 2022  
MINUTES**

No.	Member	Agency	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov
1	Ann Stillman (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x
2	Heba El-Guindy*	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain									x	x
3	Robert Ovardia	Atherton Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
4	Peter Brown	Belmont Engineering	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x
5	Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x
6	Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x
7	Sean Charpentier	C/CAG	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
8	Brad Donohue	Colma Engineering	x			x	x	x	x	x		x
9	Richard Chiu	Daly City Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
10	Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
11	Humza Javed**	East Palo Alto Engineering										
11	Louis Sun	Foster City Engineering	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	
12	Maz Bozorginia	Half Moon Bay Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
13	Paul Willis	Hillsborough Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
14	Nikki Nagaya	Menlo Park Engineering			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
15	Sam Bautista**	Millbrae Engineering										x
16	Lisa Petersen	Pacifica Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
17	Jessica Manzi	Redwood City Engineering	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x
18	Matthew Lee	San Bruno Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
19	Steven Machida	San Carlos Engineering	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	x
20	Azalea Mitch	San Mateo Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
21	Eunejune Kim	South San Francisco Engineering	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	x
22	Billy Gross	South San Francisco Planning	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
23	Sean Rose	Woodside Engineering	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	x
24	James Choe	MTC	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x
25	Nidal Tuqan*	Caltrans										

\*appointed to the TAC at the September 2022 C/CAG Board Meeting

\*\*appointed to the TAC at the October 2022 C/CAG Board Meeting

The two hundred eighty-third (283<sup>rd</sup>) meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee took place on November 17, 2022 at 1:18 p.m.

TAC members attending are listed on the Roster and Attendance table on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Jeffrey Lacap, Kaki Cheung, Eva Gaye, Kim Wever, Van Ocampo – C/CAG; Patrick Gilster, Peter Skinner – SMCTA; Matt Petrofsky, Vanessa Castro – County of San Mateo; Drew and others not noted.

**1. Brief Overview of Teleconference Meeting Procedures**

C/CAG staff Kaki Cheung described how the Committee Meeting would run virtually.

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

There were no public comments regarding items not on the agenda.

**3. Issues from the November 2022 C/CAG Board meeting (Information)**

C/CAG staff Kaki Cheung shared the key items from the November meeting, as noted on the meeting agenda.

**4. Approval of minutes from the October 20, 2022 Meeting (Action)**

*Motion – To approve the minutes of the October 20, 2022 TAC meeting, Breault/Gross. Roll Call was taken. Murtuza, Donohue, Petersen and Choe abstained. All other members in attendance voted to approve. Motion passed 17-0-4.*

**5. Review and recommend Board approval of the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan (Action)**

C/CAG staff Kim Wever summarized the planning process of the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan. In addition, she shared the key comments received during public review. Staff is working with the Consultant to incorporate the comments in the Final Plan.

*Motion – To recommend Board approval of the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan, Murtuza/Machida. Roll Call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. Motion passed 20-0.*

**6. Review and recommend Board approval of the revised draft Committee Guidelines (Action)**

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier presented the updated draft Committee Guidelines. Key changes include the positions of Committee Chair and Vice-Chair to be open to any members, the composition of Committee membership to include representation from all San Mateo County jurisdictions, and the inclusion of two Planners.

Member Brown questioned if each jurisdiction should be limited to one vote since Planners will give certain cities two votes.

Committee Members discussed and generally supported having Planners as voting members given the advisory nature of the committee, and historically votes have not been divided to create a significant impact.

Member Gross suggested to increase the maximum number of Planners to three to enable representation from small, medium, and large cities.

*Motion – To recommend Board approval of the revised draft Committee Guidelines with the amendment of three planners, Gross/Murtuza. Roll call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. Motion passed 20-0.*

## **7. Review and provide input on the draft Scope of Work for the San Mateo Countywide Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP) (Information)**

C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap presented the draft Scope of Work for the San Mateo Countywide Local Roadway Safety Plan (LRSP). The completion of the LRSP will render jurisdictions in the County eligible for grant funding from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) OBAG 3 County & Local Program, and future funding for Caltrans Highway Safety Improvement Program.

Member Ovadia inquired if grant funding will be limited to the projects listed in the LRSP. C/CAG staff Jeff will follow up on Member Ovadia's question.

Member Nagaya requested the addition of language translations for the engagement task.

Member Manzi stated that Redwood City recently adopted their LRSP and wants to make sure funding is not used for duplicate efforts. She also suggested focusing more on systemic safety measures instead of project specific recommendations.

Committee Members supported a Countywide consistent approach but agreed on minimizing duplication of efforts for jurisdictions with an existing LRSP. C/CAG staff Jeff confirmed that the Countywide LRSP will incorporate existing LRSPs and will not duplicate existing efforts.

Member Choe directed staff to leverage resources from MTC's Vision Zero Working Group.

Member Brown suggested to increase data analysis to the most recent 10-years since COVID may have altered the most recent data.

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

C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap highlighted the following items from his staff report: Inactive Projects list; PMP Certification Status; and other announcements and funding opportunities listed in the staff report. He also shared that CTC released project recommendations for the Statewide ATP Cycle 6. In the Statewide competitive programs, none of the projects submitted by San Mateo County were chosen for funding. C/CAG staff will work with MTC and CTC staff on how to better position our member agencies for success on the next cycle of the ATP Call for Projects.

Member Ovadia asked if there were any updates on the OBAG 3 funding. C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap responded that MTC is still evaluating all the grant applications and that C/CAG staff will be having initial conversations with MTC later this month.

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier shared the National Fish Passage Program funding opportunity for stream habitat fish rehabilitation and will have C/CAG staff share it to the Committee.

**9. Executive Director Report (Information)**

C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier announced that staff is preparing for in-person/hybrid Committee meetings starting in March. Staff is also looking at legislation for multijurisdictional bodies to meet remotely. Lastly, C/CAG Executive Director Sean thanked everyone for their hard work and wished everyone a Happy Thanksgiving.

**10. Member Reports (Information)**

There were no member reports.

**11. Adjournment**

Co-Chair Stillman adjourned the meeting at 2:21p.m.

## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** December 15, 2022

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

**From:** Susy Kalkin

**Subject:** Review and recommend approval of the Joint Call for Projects for the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for Fiscal Year 23/24 & Fiscal Year 24/25.

(For further information contact Susy Kalkin at [kkalkin@smcgov.org](mailto:kkalkin@smcgov.org))

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee review and recommend approval of the Joint Call for Projects for the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for Fiscal Year 23/24 & Fiscal Year 24/25.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

It is anticipated that an amount of approximately \$11,000,000 will be available for the FY 23/24 & FY 24/25 funding cycle.

### **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Funding to support the shuttle programs will be derived from the Congestion Relief Plan adopted by C/CAG and is anticipated to include \$1,000,000 in funding (\$500,000 for FY 23/24 and \$500,000 for FY 24/25). Additionally, the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) anticipates allocating approximately \$10,000,000 in Measure A Sales Tax funds for the two-year funding cycle. The C/CAG funding will be predicated on the C/CAG Board of Directors approving shuttle funding in the amount of \$500,000 for each fiscal year through the budget adoption process.

### **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

For the upcoming San Mateo County Shuttle Program, C/CAG will again partner with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority to issue a joint call for projects (CFP) for FY 23/24 and FY 24/25. The combined program is designed to utilize one call for projects process. Applicants will have to prepare one single application, and a scoring committee will rank the projects for funding. Once the proposed projects have been scored, they will be brought to each respective Board of Directors for the funding allocation.

The result of this process will be a single prioritized list of projects to be funded by each agency. Staff from each agency will be responsible for administering their agency's funding agreements with the shuttle program project sponsors.

### **Program Overview**

The funding for this CFP is intended to start new local transportation services, augment existing services, or continue projects previously funded by the Shuttle Program. Shuttles funded through this program must be open to the general public, and must conform to all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations.

### **Updated Guidelines and Evaluation Approach**

In September 2021, SamTrans and Caltrain adopted the [Peninsula Shuttle Study](#) (Study) that was conducted in coordination with the TA, C/CAG, and Commute.org to streamline the management and operations of the multi-agency Peninsula Shuttle Program. The primary focuses of the study were to modernize data management, enhance rider communication, and simplify core management roles. As part of the process, the Study recommended new General Guideline Requirements & Screening Criteria (Attachment 1) and Evaluation & Scoring Metrics (Attachment 2) for the TA and C/CAG to use as part of the CFP grant process. The new approach focuses on data-driven performance metrics and simplifies the application process for sponsors.

### **Match Requirement Changes Due to COVID-19 Pandemic**

Project sponsors must provide a minimum of match of 25% toward the total cost of the shuttle proposed for funding. In previous cycles, a 50% match was required for sponsors of existing shuttles that had failed to meet the "operating cost per passenger" benchmark during the prior cycle. However, given the COVID-19 pandemic and varying return to work practices in San Mateo County, it is recommended that this criterion not be assessed this cycle, but will be evaluated for the next FY 25/26 & FY 26/27 cycle. The source of matching funds is at the discretion of the project sponsor but cannot be C/CAG funds or San Mateo County Transportation Authority Measure A Local Shuttle Program funds.

### **Tentative Timeline for Project Review and Approval:**

- December 15, 2022 – CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Presentation
- January 3, 2023 – TA Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) Presentation
- January 5, 2023 – TA Board of Directors Presentation
- January 12, 2023 – C/CAG Board of Directors Presentation
- January 13, 2023 – Call for Projects Officially Released
- February 24, 2023 – Applications Due
- March & April 2023 – SamTrans Operations Planning Shuttle Network Concurrence & CFP Evaluation Committee Scoring Period

- May 2023 – Draft Recommendations Presentation to TA CAC & Board and C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) & TAC
- June 2023 – Final Shuttle Program Adoption by TA & C/CAG Boards

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. San Mateo County Shuttle Program - General Guideline Requirements and Screening Criteria
2. San Mateo County Shuttle Program - Evaluation and Scoring Metrics

**Exhibit A. General Guideline Requirements and Screening Criteria**

All proposed shuttle applications must meet all of the guideline requirements and screening criteria listed in the table below and include the appropriate attachments with the applications.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Eligibility</b>	
Project is located in San Mateo County	Shuttle serves residents or employers in San Mateo County
Applicant is an eligible agency	Applicants may include local jurisdiction or Commute.org; may also be partnered with other public, non-profit, or private entities to co-sponsor
Applicant provides a governing board resolution (Attachment 1)	Applicant provides a board resolution in support of the proposed shuttle service application which includes the following: service description and benefits, total project cost and matching funds provided, certifies non-supplantation of funds, and authorizes Sponsor's Chief Executive or City/Town Manager (or similar) to execute a funding agreement with the TA or C/CAG
<b>Need &amp; Service Principles</b>	
Shuttle provides coordinated first/last mile connection to a major transit station or regional bus route	Eligible services include Caltrain, BART, WETA, and regional bus routes (including SamTrans ECR, 292, 110, 17, and 294, as well as Dumbarton Express)
Shuttle is open to the public and serves a range of users	Shuttles do not limit public access. A single employer does not account for >75% of ridership based on survey data.
Shuttle vehicles are ADA-accessible and can accommodate bicycles	Shuttle provider opts into SamTrans shuttle contract or provides vehicle specifications and photos of independently-operated shuttle vehicles
<b>Operations &amp; Readiness</b>	
Applicant provides an operating plan and service map (Attachment 2)	Applicant provides operating plan summarizing proposed schedule, stops, and operator. Applicant provides photos of stops. Applicant agrees to notify the TA, C/CAG, and SamTrans in writing of service changes in advance of implementation or risk losing funding for periods where changes were implemented.
SamTrans Shuttle Network Concurrence Review	SamTrans Operations Planning will provide a concurrence review of all submitted applications to assess the entire network of shuttles. The review will assess overlap with existing and proposed bus/shuttle services and access for equity focus areas. Applicants agree to incorporate route or stop modifications recommendations, where feasible.
Monitoring and quarterly reporting	Applicant agrees provide AVL and APC data to SamTrans (either via their own system or one provided by SamTrans). Applicant agrees to provide quarterly files summarizing ridership by stop and by trip (in format specified by SamTrans), participation in annual survey by SamTrans, and preparation of quarterly financial/progress reports required by the TA or C/CAG. Applicant agrees to manage customer service and rider feedback with summaries provided in quarterly progress reports.
Funding plan	Minimum match of 25% is required. C/CAG and TA Measure A/W funds are not eligible as match except for Local Streets & Road funds. No increased match will be required this cycle for underperforming existing shuttles due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Funding plan may include costs directly tied to the shuttle service, such as leasing vehicles, operations, marketing and outreach, and staff time directly associated with shuttle administration are eligible. Vehicle purchase and overhead, indirect or other staff costs are not eligible.
<b>Customer Service/Information</b>	
Applicant provides a Marketing plan (Attachment 3)	Marketing plan identified to provide information and marketing materials to potential riders. Applicant will be responsible for providing SamTrans with a GTFS feed accompanied by a list and map of stops for use on the SamTrans website, app, and third-party trip planning and real-time tracking apps.
Provide signage at all stops	Applicant agrees to install signage at all stop locations.



**Exhibit B. Evaluation and Scoring Metrics**

Table B.1 below summarizes the application metrics and questions along with the associated possible points. Table B.2 summarizes the weightings based on whether an application is a previously funded existing shuttle from FY 2023 or is a newly proposed service.

**Table B.1 Application Metrics and Scoring Rubric**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Methodology Notes</b>
<b>Goal 1: Equity</b>				
1.1 - Serves residents in a SamTrans Equity Zone	Shuttle serves residents in an Equity Zone as identified by Reimagine SamTrans	0 - No 1 - Yes	Coverage of proposed routes, populated by TA Staff	Route design reflects intent to connect residents of a Community of Concern to regional transit
1.2 - Serves lower income riders	Percent of riders potentially qualifying for very low-income housing assistance	1 - 0% to 19% 2 - 20% to 39% 3 - 40% to 59% 4 - 60% to 79% 5 - 80% to 100%	Based on results of 2022 Shuttle Annual Survey, populated by TA staff	Based on annual survey data and County of San Mateo very low-income housing assistance limits (by household size and income)
1.3 - Assessment of equity need	Staff review of how the proposed shuttle would serve low-income communities, communities of color, seniors, or other vulnerable populations.	Scores of 1 to 5 based on quintiles of staff rankings	Written response by applicant	Based on applicant's description as well as assessment of local context. Consider how reliant riders are on the shuttle and how the shuttle serves key destinations for underserved populations.
<b>Goal 2: First/Last Mile Need</b>				
2.1 Overlaps with existing bus and shuttle services	Staff review of proposed shuttle relative to existing bus or shuttle service in the proposed service area	0 - Serves similar geographic area; similar span of service/headways; similar connections 1 - Serves similar geographic area but more or substantially different service (e.g. more frequent peak period service) 2 - Does not serve similar geographic area & provides new or substantially different service	Based on SamTrans Shuttle Network Concurrence Review of proposed route, populated by SamTrans staff	Geographic area defined as 1/4 mile walksheds from stops. Consider overlap with both public and private services and whether any services already have tapped into the market

Criteria	Description	Points Possible	Responsibility	Methodology Notes
2.2 - Leverages matching funds	1 point for meeting the minimum match amount; 1 point for each additional match tier	1 - 25% match to 29% 2 - 30% to 34% 3 - 35% to 39% 4 - 40% to 44% 5 - 45% to 49% 6 - 50% to 54% 7 - 55% to 59% 8 - 60% to 64% 9 - 65% to 70% 10- >70%	Funding plan provided by applicant	Match subject to change based on program funding availability
2.3 - Assessment of first/last mile need	Staff review of how the proposed shuttle would address first/last mile gaps between regional transit and employment centers, residential areas, and/or activity centers	Scores of 1 to 5 based on quintiles of staff rankings	Written response by applicant	Based on applicant's description as well as assessment of local context. Consider how critical the service is for first/last mile connections to regional transit and whether other options are available.
<b>Goal 3: Ridership</b>				
3.1 - Daily ridership	Based on ridership data from the previous six months for existing shuttles For new shuttles, ridership potential should be qualitatively evaluated by the reviewer based on application materials, and may be assigned a ranking in comparison to a shuttle with comparable characteristics	Scores of 1 to 5 based on quintiles of applications received	Based on results of 2022 Shuttle Annual Survey, populated by TA staff	For new shuttles, comparable characteristics include: subsidized transit fares; number/density of people and jobs served; duplication with other services; serving commuter and community markets; etc.
3.2 - Productivity	Passengers per revenue hour, based on ridership and service data from the previous six months	Scores of 1 to 5 based on quintiles of applications received	Based on results of 2022 Shuttle Annual Survey, populated by TA staff	New shuttles should estimate productivity using estimated daily ridership & revenue hours
3.3 - Cost efficiency	Net subsidy per passenger for TA-C/CAG funds, based on data from previous six months. Calculation excludes matching funds.	Scores of 1 to 5 based on quintiles of applications received	Based on results of 2022 Shuttle Annual Survey, populated by TA staff	New shuttles should estimate productivity using estimated daily ridership & cost

Criteria	Description	Points Possible	Responsibility	Methodology Notes
3.4 - VMT reduction	Shuttles reduce vehicle miles traveled	Scores of 1 to 5 based on quintiles of applications received	Based on results of 2022 Shuttle Annual Survey, populated by TA staff	<p>VMT Prevented = [% of Riders Shifted from Driving] * [Average Length of Home-to-Work Journey by Home Zip Code] * [Average Daily Ridership]</p> <p>[% of Riders Shifted from Driving] = Based on annual rider survey results, what percentage of riders report that they would commute entirely by car if the shuttle did not exist</p> <p>New shuttles estimated based on comparable ridership, mode shift, and trip length estimates</p>
3.5 - Assessment of ridership growth potential	Staff review of a shuttle's potential to grow ridership.	Scores of 1 to 5 based on quintiles of staff rankings	Written response by applicant	Based on applicant's description as well as assessment of local context. Assessment should focus on whether the shuttle serves an area with significant development activity and whether it has demonstrated a sustained ridership growth trend. May also consider whether major changes to shuttle planning or TDM programs have the potential to affect ridership, such as increased GoPass participation and other transit subsidies by nearby employers, expansion of frequency or service hours, and adjustments to route to serve bidirectional markets of residents and employees.
<b>Bonus Points</b>				
B.1 - Clean-fuel vehicles	Shuttle does not use diesel, gasoline, or natural gas	0 - No 1 - Yes	Written response by applicant	Based on applicant's description of shuttle vehicles
B-2 - Off-peak service	Shuttle provides off-peak service (i.e., midday)	0 - No 1 - Yes	Written response by applicant	Shuttle schedule includes off-peak service (e.g. greater than 8 hours of service per day, outside of peak periods from 6am-10am and 3pm-7pm)

Criteria	Description	Points Possible	Responsibility	Methodology Notes
B-3 - Sidewalk connectivity	Most shuttle stops are provided on-street/in public right-of-way connected to sidewalks	0 - <60% of stops located on-street with sidewalk access 1 - 60-79% of stops located on-street with sidewalk access 2 - >80% of stops located on-street with sidewalk access	Photos of individual stops and sidewalk access provided by applicant	Shuttle stops located on public streets connected to sidewalks are more accessible and attract a wider range of riders. Applicants should provide a map with proposed stop locations annotated. This rating should exclude the stop at the Caltrain/BART/ferry/regional bus transfer.
B-4 - Private sector match	Shuttle includes matching funds from the private sector	0 - No 1 - Yes	Funding plan provided by applicant	Private sector match may include direct contribution of matching funds or pass-through from city fees

Table B.2 Weightings for Existing and New Shuttles

Criteria	Max Raw Points from Table B.1	Adjusted Weighting for Existing Shuttles	Adjusted Weighting for New Shuttles
1.1 - Serves residents in a SamTrans Equity Zone	1	10	15
1.2 - Serves lower income riders	5	10	0
1.3 - Assessment of equity need	5	5	10
2.1 - Overlaps with existing bus/shuttle services	2	10	10
2.2 - Leverages matching funds	10	10	10
2.3 - Assessment of first/last mile need	5	5	5
3.1 - Daily ridership	5	10	10
3.2 - Productivity	5	10	10
3.3 - Cost Efficiency	5	10	10
3.4 - VMT Reduction	5	10	10
3.5 - Assessment of ridership growth potential	5	10	10
B.1 - Clean-fuel vehicles	1	1	1
B.2 - Off-peak service	1	4	4
B.3 - Private sector match	1	1	1
B.4 - Sidewalk connectivity	2	4	4
<b>Total Possible</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>110</b>

**C/CAG AGENDA REPORT**

**Date:** December 15, 2022

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

**From:** Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

**Subject:** Review and recommend Board approval of the revised Committee Guidelines to include two Co-Chairs.

(For further information contact Sean Charpentier at [scharpentier@smcgov.org](mailto:scharpentier@smcgov.org))

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Technical Advisory Committee reviews and recommends Board approval of the revised Committee Guidelines to include two Co-Chairs.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

There is no fiscal impact related to this item.

**SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Not applicable.

**BACKGROUND**

Staff has brought the topic of Committee guideline revisions for discussion at its September and November meetings. At the Committee's November meeting, the Committee approved a revised set of draft Guidelines that included:

- The positions of Committee Chair and Vice-Chair are open to any members, and election shall take place every two years.
- The composition of Committee membership is expanded to include representation from all San Mateo County jurisdictions. Additional seats for the City of East Palo Alto and Town of Portola Valley have been created.
- The Committee will include a total of three Planners to be appointed for a two-year term. C/CAG will seek to provide a balance of representations among small, medium, and large cities. C/CAG would reach out to members' Planning Directors or Community Development Directors, seeking letters of interests. The C/CAG Board will then consider and appoint the candidates.

In order to provide additional flexibility, enable more opportunities to run meetings as a Chair, and distribute the workload, staff is proposing to revise the chairmanship from a Chair and Vice Chair structure to a two person Co-Chair partnership. Staff is seeking feedback from the Committee on this proposed update, and requests Committee approval of the revised Guidelines included as

Attachment 1. The specific change is highlighted for easy reference.

**ATTACHMENT**

1. Draft Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC) Guidelines Updated December 2022 (redlined)

## Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC)

### Guidelines

Established 11/24/09

Revised 12/15/2022

### Mission

The CMP TAC is a staff committee composed of engineers and planners who provide technical expertise and professional recommendations to the CMEQ Committee and C/CAG Board regarding transportation and air quality issues, the Congestion Management Program, and the Countywide Transportation Plan.

### Membership

The CMP TAC was originally established to include representatives from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) (1), the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) (1), San Francisco International Airport (SFIA) (1), the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) (1 with 1 alternate), the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) (2), San Mateo County Government (3), the Central County Cities (2), the North County Cities (2), the South County Cities (2), the Cities at large (1), and Caltrans (3). A total of 19 members.

The current composition of the Technical Advisory Committee includes ~~up to twenty~~ twelve city engineers and two planners, one county engineer, ~~one county planner~~, one representative each from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Caltrans, SamTrans/the Transportation Authority/the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB/Caltrain), and ~~C/CAG/the Congestion Management Program~~.

~~There are currently a total of 25 positions including 15 engineers and 4 planners from the local jurisdictions in addition to representatives from Caltrans, SamTrans, Peninsula Corridor JPB, SMCTA, MTC, and C/CAG.~~

- ~~• 25 members on average~~
- ~~• The CMP TAC is currently composed of 24 members made up of engineers representing SMCTA, Peninsula Corridor JPB (Caltrain), Caltrans, MTC, C/CAG, and the cities and County~~
- ~~• 16 jurisdictions (15 cities and the County) are represented~~
- ~~• Burlingame, San Mateo, Daly City, and the County have 2 representatives each (engineer and planner)~~
- ~~• 5 cities NOT represented: Hillsborough, San Bruno, Portola Valley, Half Moon Bay, and East Palo Alto~~
- ~~• The total number of members fluctuates with the highest of 27 in 2005 and lowest of 20 in 2000 with 20. The current number of members is 24.~~

### Term Limits

- There are no term limits for the CMP TAC. Members can remain on the TAC indefinitely or until the member voluntarily relieve him/or herself of the membership.
- Membership of Planners
  - The CMP TAC may include a total of three planners.
  - There are no term limits, but Planners will be appointed every two years.
  - C/CAG will issue a call for applicants every two years. Interested planners shall submit letters of interest to the C/CAG Board, who will make the appointment.
  - C/CAG shall strive to include Planners that represent small, medium, and large cities.

### Co-Chairs

- The two Co-Chairs for the CMP TAC are appointed by Committee members at a CMP TAC Meeting every two years.
- There are no term limits.
- The role of the Co-Chairs are to manage the Committee meetings by calling the meeting to order, leading the Committee through the agenda topics, monitoring meeting discussion to ensure all discussion remains on topic, and leading the motion and approval of all action items.
- Co-Chairs will rotate every other meeting. A Co-Chair may chair consecutive meetings if the other Co-Chair is unavailable to attend.

### **Selection Process**

- To fill the vacant engineering positions, jurisdictions shall submit a nomination letter from the City/Town/County Manager to the C/CAG Executive Director. staff solicits individuals from C/CAG member agencies who have expressed interest in being on the TAC and requested that a letter of interest be submitted to C/CAG for considerations. Staff would focus on the cities' Public Works Directors/City Engineers that are not currently represented on the Committee. For backfilling a vacant "Planner" position, staff will contact the Planning Directors.
- Interested individuals are then asked to submit a letter of interest and request from the City Manager. Based on the number of vacancies and responses received, the C/CAG Executive Director makes the recommendation for the appointment of new member(s) to backfill the vacancies. If there is more interest than positions available, the Director has the discretion to expand the number of members to maintain a representational and diverse committee.
- The C/CAG's Board of Directors then approve the nomination at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting.

### 2022 Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee Roster

<u>Agency</u>	<u>Representative</u>
<u>San Mateo County Engineering</u>	<u>Ann Stillman</u>
<u>SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain</u>	<u>Heba El-Guindy</u>
<u>Atherton Engineering</u>	<u>Robert Ovadia</u>
<u>Belmont Engineering</u>	<u>Peter Brown</u>
<u>Brisbane Engineering</u>	<u>Randy Breault</u>
<u>Burlingame Engineering</u>	<u>Syed Murtuza</u>
<u>C/CAG</u>	<u>Sean Charpentier</u>
<u>Colma Engineering</u>	<u>Brad Donohue</u>
<u>Daly City Engineering</u>	<u>Richard Chiu</u>
<u>Daly City Planning</u>	<u>Tatum Mothershead</u>
<u>East Palo Alto Engineering</u>	<u>Humza Javed</u>
<u>Foster City Engineering</u>	<u>Louis Sun</u>
<u>Half Moon Bay Engineering</u>	<u>Maziar Bozorginia</u>
<u>Hillsborough Engineering</u>	<u>Paul Willis</u>
<u>Menlo Park Engineering</u>	<u>Nikki Nagaya</u>
<u>Millbrae Engineering</u>	<u>Sam Bautista</u>
<u>Pacifica Engineering</u>	<u>Lisa Petersen</u>
<u>Portola Valley Engineering</u>	<u>Vacant</u>
<u>Redwood City Engineering</u>	<u>Jessica Manzi</u>



<u>San Bruno Engineering</u>	<u>Matthew Lee</u>
<u>San Carlos Engineering</u>	<u>Steven Machida</u>
<u>San Mateo Engineering</u>	<u>Azalea Mitch</u>
<u>South San Francisco Engineering</u>	<u>Eunejune Kim</u>
<u>South San Francisco Planning</u>	<u>Billy Gross</u>
<u>Woodside Engineering</u>	<u>Sean Rose</u>
<u>MTC</u>	<u>James Choe</u>
<u>Caltrans</u>	<u>Nidal Tuqan</u>

<b>2009 TAC Roster and Attendance</b>	
<b>Member</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering
Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA
Duncan Jones	Atherton Engineering
Karen Borrmann	Belmont Engineering
Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering
Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering
Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning
Sandy Wong	C/CAG
Gene Gonzalo	Caltrans
Rick Mao	Colma Engineering
Robert Ovadia	Daly City Engineering
<del>Tatum Mothershead</del>	<del>Daly City Planning</del>
Ray Towne	Foster City Engineering
Chip Taylor	Menlo Park Engineering
Ron Popp	Millbrae Engineering
Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering
April Chan	Peninsula Corridor JPB
Peter Vorametsanti	Redwood City Engineering
Robert Weil	San Carlos Engineering
Larry Patterson	San Mateo Engineering
Bob Beyer	San Mateo Planning
Steve Monowitz	San Mateo County Planning
Dennis Chuck	So. San Francisco Engineering
Kenneth Folan	MTC
<b><i>Staff Support</i></b>	
John Hoang	C/CAG

## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: December 15, 2022

To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee

From: Kaki Cheung, Program Director

Subject: Review and approve the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee 2023 Meeting Calendar.

(For further information or questions, contact Kaki Cheung at [kcheung1@smcgov.org](mailto:kcheung1@smcgov.org))

---

### RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee reviews and approves the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee 2023 Meeting Calendar.

### BACKGROUND

The proposed schedule of Committee meetings in 2023 will be as follows:

- January 19, 2023
- February 16, 2023
- March 16, 2023
- April 20, 2023
- May 18, 2023
- June 15, 2023
- No meeting in July
- August 17, 2023
- September 21, 2023
- October 19, 2023
- November 16, 2023
- December 21, 2023
- January 18, 2024

The Committee meetings will be held on the third Thursday of the month at 1:15 PM. To be consistent with C/CAG Board meeting structure, there is not a meeting in the month of July. Committee meetings are currently held via Zoom Videoconference under AB 361. C/CAG staff is preparing to return to in-person committee meetings beginning in March 2023. In-person Committee meetings are typically held at the San Mateo County Transit District, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, 2nd Floor Auditorium, San Carlos, CA.

Staff proposes adding the January 2024 meeting in the event that the December 2023 meeting is canceled. Staff recommends that the Committee reviews and approves the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee 2023 Meeting Calendar.

**C/CAG AGENDA REPORT**

Date: December 15, 2022

To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee

From: Kaki Cheung, Program Director

Subject: Receive a presentation on City of Belmont's Ralston Ave. Adaptive Signalization System project

(For further information, contact Peter Brown at [pbrown@belmont.gov](mailto:pbrown@belmont.gov))

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the Committee receives a presentation on City of Belmont's Ralston Ave. Adaptive Signalization System project.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The total estimated project cost is \$255,000, with a funding contribution of \$230,000 from C/CAG's Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) grant. The City provided the remaining local match.

**SOURCE OF FUNDS**

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) 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 TFCA funds. These funds are used to implement projects that 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 BAAQMD to one or more public agencies designated to receive the funds. In San Mateo County, C/CAG is the TFCA grant Program Manager.

**BACKGROUND**

In October 2020, C/CAG awarded a total of \$759,000 in Fiscal Year 2021-2022 TFCA funds to one arterial traffic management project using advanced transportation technology; and four traffic calming projects (quick build bike/pedestrian projects). City of Belmont was awarded \$230,000 for the Ralston Ave. Adaptive Signalization System project. The project was recently completed.

This project proposed utilizing advanced adaptive traffic signalization technology along Ralston Avenue between State Route 82 and Interstate 280. The project aimed to reduce congestion for

## ITEM 8

motorists, and improve operations and safety for bicyclists and pedestrians at intersections. The project installed an adaptive traffic system to implement and enhance arterial Management at twelve (12) traffic signals along Ralston Avenue. With the various activity centers along the route, including schools, shopping centers, community centers and businesses, traffic demand can be highly variable. By implementing advanced adaptive signalization of all traffic signals in the corridor, the project helps to reduce travel time for motorists and improve operations of the entire corridor. The improved traffic flow will result in less idling at the intersections and reduced fuel consumption. It is estimated the project will lead to 549.75 tons of CO2 emission reductions. At the Committee's December meeting, the City of Belmont's Public Works Director, Peter Brown, will present on the project and share initial data and lessons learned.

C/CAG is excited for the project completion, and hopes to support more member agencies on leveraging technology to solve the County's congestion problems and advance our clean air goals.

### ATTACHMENT

None