### 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, January 26, 2015 at 3:00 p.m.Place:San Mateo City Hall330 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo, California<br/>Conference Room C (across from Council Chambers)

PLEASE CALL Wally Abrazaldo (599-1455) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND

1.	Public comment on items not on the agenda.	Presentations are limited to 3 mins	
2.	Approval of minutes of September 29, 2014 meeting.	Action (Garbarino)	Pages 1 - 4
3.	Review and approval of the 2015 CMEQ meeting calendar.	Action (Abrazaldo)	Page 5
4.	Review and recommend approval of the C/CAG Priority Development Area Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program list of projects	Action (Abrazaldo)	Pages 7 - 9
5.	Review and recommend approval of projects to be funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) under the Cycle 4 Lifeline Transportation Program for a total amount of \$4,414,272	Action (Higaki)	Pages 11 - 15
6.	Review and recommend approval of the Fiscal Year 2015/16 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Program Manager Fund for San Mateo County	Action (Hoang)	Page 17 - 19
7.	Review and recommend approval of the funding recommendation for the Bayshore Technology Park shuttle for FY 2014/2015 and FY 2015/2016 in an amount of \$94,182 in Measure A Transportation funds through the San Mateo County Shuttle Program Joint Call for Projects and of the agreement between C/CAG and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority in an amount not to exceed \$38,000	Action (Madalena)	Page 21 - 24
8.	Nominations and elections of CMEQ Chair and Vice Chair.	Action (Wong)	Page 25

#### 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

9.	Executive Director Report.	Information (Wong)
10.	Member comments and announcements.	Information (Garbarino)
11.	Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date: <b>February 23, 2015</b> .	Action (Garbarino)

- 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 MANAGEMENTAND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (CMEQ)

#### MINUTES MEETING OF September 29, 2014

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Pierce in Conference Room C at City Hall of San Mateo at 3:00 p.m. Attendance sheet is attached.

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

None.

#### 2. Approval of minutes of June 30, 2014 meeting.

Motion: To approve the Minutes of the June 30, 2014 meeting, Bigelow/O'Neill. Motion carried unanimously.

# **3.** Receive a presentation and update from the San Mateo County Energy Watch Program (Information).

Ms. Susan Wright, San Mateo County Energy Watch staff, provided an update on the San Mateo County Energy Watch (SMCEW) program. Her presentation highlighted the program's progress in several areas:

- **Support to public agencies for energy efficiency upgrades.** The program has helped 16 of the 21 jurisdictions in the county conduct energy efficiency audits for heating and cooling equipment. Additionally, the program has provided connections to PG&E rebates and facilitated streetlight projects in several local jurisdictions.
- **Support to schools for developing Proposition 39 expenditure plans.** The program is helping eight school districts in the county put together expenditure plans that list projects to improve energy efficiency and expand clean energy generation in schools. These plans are required to be eligible for Proposition 39 funds.
- **Support for Climate Action Plans.** The program has helped all 21 jurisdictions in the county develop Climate Action Plans. At present, all 21 jurisdictions have adopted or are currently working on a Climate Action Plan.
- **Support for greenhouse gas emission inventories.** The program has conducted countywide greenhouse gas emission inventories for energy use in years 2005 and 2010 and plans to conduct annual inventories in the future, contingent on available funding.
- **Public awareness and climate action plan implementation.** The program is starting a new countywide energy efficiency campaign to help meet long-term greenhouse gas emission reduction goals. Activities include outreaching to specific business segments, connecting cities to grant opportunities on alternative energy, collaborating with real estate professionals, and developing a zero net energy tool kit. In the future, the program may expand to also work on water-energy nexus projects.

CMEQ members asked several questions throughout Ms. Wright's presentation.

- Member Pierce asked about the criteria used to select the eight school districts that the program is supporting. Ms. Wright responded that the program identified school districts that faced bandwidth and expertise constraints and would need extra support to move forward.
- Member Aguirre asked how the progress of San Mateo County in reducing greenhouse gas emissions from 2005 to 2010 compares to that of other counties in the state. Ms. Wright responded that she did not have this data on hand and suggested that some of the reductions during this time period could be attributed to the downturn in the economy.
- Member Olbert asked about the availability of the countywide greenhouse gas inventory data on a per capita basis, suggesting that population growth would mask energy efficiency gains in reports that provide aggregate looks of the data. Member Pierce agreed and said that while new housing in the county necessarily entails more energy use, the new housing is much more energy efficient per capita. Ms. Wright responded that a per capita view of the data by city is available online on the SMCEW website.
- Member Lee asked about emissions credits available under the cap and trade program. Kim Springer, SMCEW staff, responded that staff could do some research on the cap and trade program and how to qualify for these credits.

#### 4. Review and recommend approval of the guidelines and application for the C/CAG Priority Development Area Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program (Action).

Wally Abrazaldo, C/CAG staff, presented the draft program guidelines and application for the proposed C/CAG Priority Development Area (PDA) Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program. This program would provide technical support to local jurisdictions to conduct parking-related planning projects consistent with the local vision for growth and development in PDAs in the county. Sources of funding for the program include local PDA planning funds that remain unawarded from the C/CAG PDA Planning Program and the C/CAG Congestion Relief Plan Fund.

In general, CMEQ members responded positively to the draft guidelines. A few questions and comments were offered to refine the guidelines and application:

- Member Olbert asked why C/CAG would propose to take on the responsibility of administering consultant contracts rather than simply passing on the funds to project sponsors. Wally responded that few project sponsors would want to go through the administrative burden of following Caltrans processes and procedures in accessing and using the funds, which are federal funds, for relatively small planning projects.
- Member Olbert suggested that more points be provided to applicants that demonstrate a commitment to implementing the results of their planning projects.
- Ellen Barton, C/CAG staff, suggested that additional consideration be provided to projects that incorporate plans for active transportation elements and transportation demand management strategies. Member Pierce agreed and said that project sponsors should strive to incorporate and address additional mobility options in their projects.
- Member O'Connell suggested that some of the 15 points provided to applicants for demonstrating support be reallocated to other scoring criteria, such as incorporating innovative elements and demonstrating a commitment to implementation.
- Member Pierce asked if capital money would follow the planning money that has been made available by the region. Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, said that there is potential for additional funding and made reference to funding programs administered by the Strategic Growth Council at the state level.

Wally stated that staff would incorporate the comments provided by the Committee and update the program guidelines and application prior to bringing them to the Board for review and approval.

Motion: To recommend approval of establishing a PDA Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program in an amount of \$342,000 for Fiscal Years 2013-2014 to 2015-2016 as part of the Local PDA Planning Program, O'Connell/Lee. Motion carried unanimously.

#### 5. Update of the San Mateo County US 101 Ramp Metering Implementation between State Route (SR) 92 and the San Francisco/San Mateo County Line (Information).

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, provided an update on the ramp metering project on US 101. She stated that this phase of the project would complete ramp metering on US 101 from county line to county line. C/CAG is working with staff from the various jurisdictions along US 101 to establish metering rate plans, which will set the timing of the meters. If all goes well, the northbound meters will be turned on sometime in November, and the southbound meters will be turned on in early 2015.

Committee members asked how metering rates are established and calibrated. Sandy provided a brief explanation of the iterative modeling process that helps to establish initial rates and the field tests that Caltrans conducts to recalibrate the rates if needed. The metering rates are reviewed by a technical committee made up of city staff before they are implemented.

#### 6. Executive Director Report (Information).

Sandy provided updates on a few items:

- Governor Brown signed AB 2170, sponsored by Assemblymember Kevin Mullin, into law. The legislation clarified that joint powers agencies in the state have the same taxation authority as their member agencies. This law allows C/CAG to move forward with a stormwater funding initiative in the future.
- The C/CAG Board approved a rain barrel rebate program, which will provide a \$50 rebate to county residents to purchase and install a rain barrel. C/CAG is partnering with the Bay Area Water Supply & Conservation Agency on this program.
- The California Transportation Commission recently held a meeting dedicated to road usage charges. Sandy explained that this is a new trend in transportation finance due to the decline in gas tax revenues associated with increased vehicle fuel efficiency and alternative fuels.

#### 7. Member comments and announcements (Information).

Meeting adjourned at 4:15 pm.

The next regular meeting was scheduled for October 27, 2014.

Agency	Representative	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Metropolitan Transportation C	Alicia Aguirre	Х	Х		Х		Х			Х			
Peninsula Corridor Joint Pow	Arthur Lloyd	х	Х										
City of Redwood City	Barbara Pierce	х	Х		Х		Х			Х			
Town of Atherton	Elizabeth Lewis	х			Х					Х			
City of San Bruno	Irene O'Connell	х					Х			Х			
Business Community	Jim Bigelow	х	Х		Х		Х			Х			
Environmental Community	Lennie Roberts		Х		Х		Х						
City of San Carlos	Mark Olbert	х	Х		Х					Х			
City of Pacifica	Mike O'Neill		Х		Х		Х			Х			
City of Half Moon Bay	Naomi Patridge	х	Х		Х		Х			Х			
Agencies with Transportation	Onnolee Trapp		Х		Х		Х			Х			
City of South San Francisco	Richard Garbarino	х	Х		Х		Х						
Public	Steve Dworetzky	х	Х		Х		Х			Х			
San Mateo County Transit Di	Zoe Kersteen-Tucker				Х		Х			Х			
City of Belmont	Charles Stone	N/A	N/A				Х						
City of Millbrae	Wayne Lee	N/A	N/A		N/A		Х			Х			

2014 C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee Attendance Report

#### Staff and guests in attendance for September 29:

Wally Abrazaldo, Ellen Barton, Jean Higaki, Sandy Wong - C/CAG Staff

Eddie Ashley, Jacki Falconio, Kim Springer, Susan Wright - San Mateo County Energy Watch

Date:	January 26, 2015			
То:	Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee			
From:	Wally Abrazaldo, Transportation Programs Specialist			
Subject:	Review and approval of the 2015 CMEQ meeting calendar.			
(For further information or response to questions, contact Wally Abrazaldo at 650-599-1455)				

#### RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ committee review and approve the regular meeting calendar for 2015.

#### FISCAL IMPACT None

## SOURCE OF FUNDS

#### N/A

#### BACKGROUND

The proposed meeting calendar for 2015 is as follows:

Congestion Management & Environmental Quality
Mondays 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
January 26
February 23
March 30
April 27
May 18 (May 25 is Memorial Day)
June 29
July – No meeting
August 31
September 28
October 26
November 30
December – No meeting

All meetings are scheduled for the last Monday of the month except for May 18<sup>th</sup>. Also, following the CMEQ committee's decision for past years, staff recommend to not schedule meetings for the months of July and December.

Meetings begin at 3:00 p.m. and end at 5:00 p.m. and are typically held in Conference Room C, San Mateo City Hall, with occasional alternative locations to be announced.

**ATTACHMENTS** None.

Date:	January 26, 2015
To:	Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee
From:	Wally Abrazaldo, Transportation Programs Specialist
Subject:	Review and recommend approval of the C/CAG Priority Development Area Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program list of projects
(For further	information or response to questions, contact Wally Abrazaldo at 650-599-1455)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG CMEQ review and recommend approval of the C/CAG Priority Development Area (PDA) Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program list of projects.

#### FISCAL IMPACT

The list of projects recommended by the scoring panel accounts for \$97,000 of the \$342,000 that the C/CAG Board of Directors directed toward the C/CAG PDA Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program.

#### SOURCE OF FUNDS

The C/CAG PDA Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program is funded by a combination of Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds and local Congestion Relief Plan funds.

#### BACKGROUND

In October 2014, the C/CAG Board of Directors approved the establishment of a PDA Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program with \$302,000 in funds that remained from the C/CAG PDA Planning Program and \$40,000 in local matching funds from the C/CAG Congestion Relief Plan Fund. The aim of the program is to provide consultant technical support to jurisdictions in San Mateo County to complete planning projects that facilitate the implementation of parking management strategies supportive of the vision for growth and development in PDAs. Potential activities include the preparation of parking management plans, zoning code updates, technical studies and analyses, and parking policy implementation plans.

C/CAG issued a call for projects for the program on October 10, 2014, and applications were due on December 1, 2014. Two application workshops were held on October 28, 2014 and November 7, 2014. Staff received two applications from the City of San Carlos and the City of South San Francisco, totaling \$157,000 in technical assistance requested. The City of San Carlos proposed a study to assist in establishing a residential permit parking program, and the City of South San Francisco proposed a study of the city's downtown parking district.

A scoring panel made up of staff from C/CAG, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, SamTrans, and the City of San Mateo reviewed and scored the two applications in late December.

After a review of the two applications, the project submitted by the City of South San Francisco was recommended for technical assistance under the program. Members of the scoring panel expressed several concerns about the application from the City of San Carlos, including a lack of budget information and a need to consider alternative parking management strategies to address the described problem. The scoring panel recommended that these concerns be communicated to the City of San Carlos to allow staff to submit another application if desired.

Staff will move forward and develop an on-call list of qualified consultants to provide technical assistance to projects awarded through the program. Projects will be issued to qualified consultants on a task order basis. Given that the program is undersubscribed, the technical assistance available under the program will be readvertised, and jurisdictions in the county may continue to submit applications to C/CAG until program funding is depleted. If the scoring panel recommendation is approved by the C/CAG Board of Directors, a total of \$245,000 will remain available under the program.

The C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed and recommended approval of the project list during its meeting on January 15, 2015.

#### ATTACHMENTS

• C/CAG PDA Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program Recommended Project List

#### C/CAG PDA Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program Recommended Project List

Jurisdiction	Project	Amount of Technical Assistance Requested	Scoring Panel Recommendation	Notes/ Comments
City of San Carlos	Residential Permit Parking Program for the Railroad Corridor PDA and Environs, Including the Greater East San Carlos Neighborhoods	\$60,000	\$0	<ul> <li>Need additional budget information</li> <li>Consider alternative parking management strategies in study</li> <li>Demonstrate additional support</li> </ul>
City of South San Francisco <b>Total</b>	City of South San Francisco Downtown Parking District Study	\$97,000 <b>\$157,000</b>	\$97,000 <b>\$97,000</b>	

Date:	January 26, 2015
To:	C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ)
From:	Jean Higaki, Transportation System Coordinator
Subject:	Review and recommend approval of projects to be funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) under the Cycle 4 Lifeline Transportation Program for a total amount of \$4,414,272
(For furt	her information or response to questions, contact Jean Higaki at 650-599-1462)

#### RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ review and recommend approval of the projects to be funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) under the Cycle 4 Lifeline Transportation Program for a total amount of \$4,414,272.

#### FISCAL IMPACT

\$2,469,130 in State Transit Assistance (STA), \$1,230,533 in Proposition 1B Funds, and \$714,609 in Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC (5307)) funds, for a total of \$4,414,272.

#### SOURCE OF FUNDS

The State and Federal funding sources include State Transit Assistance (STA), Proposition 1B Funds (Prop 1B), and Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) 5307 funds.

#### BACKGROUND

The Lifeline Transportation Program is a Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) program that C/CAG administers for San Mateo County. The purpose of the program is to fund projects, identified through the community-based transportation planning (CBTP) process, which improves the mobility of low-income residents. A call for projects was issued on October 24, 2014 and applications were due on December 5, 2014.

Per MTC guidelines, Proposition 1B funds will be issued directly to transit agencies. C/CAG concurrence is required to ensure the transit proposed project is consistent with the Lifeline Program objectives. JARC funds were open to competition only to transit agencies, due to the rigorous reporting requirements and the inability of passing through funds by a recognized transit agency. STA funds were open to public agencies and non-profits who obtained written concurrence from a recognized transit agency willing to pass through funds.

For this 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle, six applications were received requesting STA funding. STA funding was under subscribed with \$2,364,704 being requested and approximately \$2,469,130 available. No applications were received requesting JARC funds.

C/CAG staff organized a selection committee composed of Juda Tolmasoff from the County Legislative Office, Joel Slavit from San Mateo County Transit District, Jessica Osborne from the San Mateo County Health Systems, John Ford from the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance, and Wally Abrazaldo from C/CAG. This selection committee convened on December 18, 2014 to finalize scoring of the applications.

Under the program guidelines, C/CAG may elect to allocate some or all of their STA and/or JARC funds directly to transit operators for Lifeline transit operations within the county. Because the STA is undersubscribed, staff recommends that the remaining funds be directed towards the proposed lifeline transit operation projects (Route 17). There is a slight possibility that a small amount of additional STA funds may be made available to the lifeline program. Should that occurs, staff recommends directing those funds toward the same projects to be consistent with program guidelines.

Staff consulted with SamTrans and MTC staff regarding the remaining unsubscribed JARC 5307 funds. It is recommended to direct the funds to SamTrans for general bus procurement or a fixed route expansion, as the majority of SamTrans bus riders are low income.

The funding recommendation will be presented to the C/CAG Board for approval in February. Once approved, the recommendation will be sent to MTC for adoption in late April 2015.

For JARC funds, project sponsors will request funding directly from the Federal Transit Administration. For Prop 1B funds, transit agencies will request allocation to MTC for allocation by the state. For STA funds, pass through funding agreements will be executed between SamTrans and the project sponsor as required. As program administrator, C/CAG staff will be responsible for reviewing quarterly reports and will review STA invoices submitted by the project sponsors, prior to reimbursement by SamTrans.

#### ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Proposed Cycle 4 Lifeline Transportation Program
- 2. SamTrans Proposal for Prop 1B, JARC, and STA

## Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Funding Recommendation

Agency	Project	STA funds 95%	JARC funds (Transit)	Prop 1B (SamTrans)	Total \$ To Be Funded	Total \$ Requested	Comments/ Concerns
	San Mateo County Transportation Assistance for		, í	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Human Services Agency	Low-Income Residents-Cycle 4	\$350,000			\$350,000	\$350,000	
SamTrans	Operating Support for Fixed Route 17 Service	\$500,000			\$500,000	\$500,000	
Menlo Park	Menlo Park Midday Shuttle	\$354,100			\$354,100	\$354,100	
SamTrans	Operating Support for SamCoast Service	\$300,900	1		\$300,900	\$300,900	
Daly City	Daly City Bayshore Shuttle	\$559,704			\$559,704	\$559,704	
Outreach	Mobility Management/ Transportation Voucher Program	\$300,000			\$300,000	\$300,000	
SamTrans	Fixed Route Bus Procurement/ Expansion of Fixed Route 122		\$714,609		\$714,609		JARC recommendation in consultation with MTC and SamTrans staff.
SamTrans	Fixed Route Bus Procurement			\$1,230,533	\$1,230,533	\$1,230,533	Prop 1B to be allocated directly to transit operators, per MTC guidelines.
SamTrans*	Lifeline transit operations (to be directed towards Fixed Route 17 operations)				\$104,426		Unsuscribed STA. Per MTC guidelines, JARC and STA may be allocated directly to transit operators for lifeline transit operations and are not subject to competition.

Available Source \$	\$2,469,130	\$714,609	\$1,230,533	\$4,414,272	\$3,595,237
Sum of awarded funds	\$2,364,704	\$714,609	\$1,230,533	\$4,414,272	
Unsuscribed \$	\$104,426	\$0	\$0	\$0	

\* Should additional STA (5%) be made available it will be directed to SamTrans for lifeline transit operations.

January 15, 2015

Ms. Jean Higaki City/County Association of Governments County Office Building 555 County Center, Fifth Floor Redwood City, California 94063

Re: Lifeline Funding

Dear Ms. Higaki:

The San Mateo County Transit District (District) is requesting that the City/County Association of Governments provide a concurrence letter for the District's request to use \$1,230,533 in Prop 1B PTMISEA grant funds, \$714,609 in Federal Transit Administration Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) funds, and \$104,000 in State Transit Assistance (STA) funds from the Lifeline Program, to provide funding for the following projects:

samTrans

Funding	Project	Amount
Prop 1B PTMISEA	Replacement of the Articulated Bus Fleet	\$ 1,230,533
JARC	Replacement of the Articulated Bus Fleet	\$ 275,209
JARC	Expansion of Route 122 service	\$ 439,400
STA	Expanded Portion of Route 17 on the Coastside	\$ 104,000

#### **Replacement of the Articulated Bus Fleet**

The 2002 articulated buses currently in use operate in the urbanized portion of San Mateo County. The majority of SamTrans riders are low income and are dependent on public transportation to meet their daily transportation needs. The following are a few key demographic characteristics, based on the 2009 U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey and the 2009 SamTrans ridership survey, that demonstrate the low income make-up of SamTrans ridership:

- ➡ The mean household income of the average SamTrans bus rider is \$36,600 per year versus a mean countywide household income of \$117,895.
- Only 26 percent of all SamTrans riders own or have access to a car while just three percent of workers age 16 or over countywide do not have access to a personal vehicle.

The articulated bus fleet has reached the end of its useful life and without replacement, reliable bus service to the County's most at-risk populations will be in jeopardy.

#### BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2015

SHIRLEY HARRIS, CHAIR ZOE KERSTEEN-TUCKER, VICE CHAIR JEFF GEE CAROLE GROOM ROSE GUILBAULT KARYL MATSUMOTO CHARLES STONE ADRIENNE TISSIER

MICHAEL J. SCANLON GENERAL MANAGER/CEO

#### **Expansion of Route 122 service**

Route 122 provides trips for customers between San Mateo County and the Stonestown Shopping Center. Currently, the service ends before the Center closes, so Center employees cannot ride public transit home after work. JARC funds will be used to expand Route 122 service so that service is available for Center workers to return home after work and provide additional trips for customers. SamTrans will add approximately 5.4 hours to daily weekday and Saturday service and 1.1 hours for Sunday service.

#### Expanded Portion of Route 17 on the Coastside

SamTrans has been awarded \$500,000 in STA funds from the Lifeline Program to help fund the expanded portion of Route 17 on the Coastside of San Mateo County. Increasing the request by \$104,000 in STA funds to the previous award of \$500,000 for this project will total \$604,000, still below the maximum share of 80%.

We are confident the above projects will help us sustain quality bus service to our low income residents. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely, April Chan

Executive Officer, Planning and Development

Date:	January 26, 2015
To:	Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee
From:	John Hoang
Subject:	Review and recommend approval of the Fiscal Year 2015/16 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Program Manager Fund for San Mateo County
(For furthe	er information or questions contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

#### RECOMMENDATION

That the that the CMEQ Committee review and recommend approval of the Fiscal Year 2015/16 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Program Manager Fund for San Mateo County.

#### FISCAL IMPACT

\$1,128,240.41 (Admin. - \$54,940.41; Projects - \$1,073,300)

#### 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 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 BAAQMD 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

C/CAG, as the Program Manager for the TFCA funds, has allocated the TFCA funds for projects operated by SamTrans and the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance (Commute.org) for the past several years. Funds provided to SamTrans help fund the SamTrans Shuttle Program for the BART shuttles which provide peak commute period shuttle service from BART stations to employment sites in San Mateo County. Funds provided to Commute.org help fund the Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program, which is a program that provides incentives to reduce single occupant vehicle trips as well as shuttle program management and includes carpool incentives, vanpool incentives, school pool incentives and a "Try Transit Program". Commute.org also manages shuttles on behalf of member cities.

The following program guidelines would continue to be in effect for the Fiscal Year 2015/16 Program.

**Overall Programs:** 

- Cost Effectiveness, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), will be used as 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.
- 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.

The estimated administration budget is \$54,940.41 (approx. 5%) with the remaining \$1,073,300 proposed to be distributed to SamTrans and Commute.org. Similar to the previous seven program TFCA funding cycles, it is recommended that 56% of the available project funds is provided to SamTrans and 44% of the funds provided to Commute.org for the FY 2015/16 TFCA Program allocation.

It is recommended that the SamTrans Shuttle Program receive an allocation of \$601,000 (56% of available funds) for its current shuttle program. This funding recommendation shall be contingent upon SamTrans submitting an acceptable work plan for use of the funds.

It is also recommended that the Commute.org receive an allocation of \$472,300 (44% of available funds). The funds allocated for Commute.org will be subjected to the submission of an acceptable work plan for use of the funds. These funds will be combined with C/CAG Congestion Relief Plan funds for the Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program.

Administration	\$54,940.41
SamTrans	\$601,000
Commute.org	\$472,300
Total funds obligated	\$1,128,240.41
Total funds anticipated	\$1,128,240.41
Balance	\$0

A summary of the recommended C/CAG TFCA Program for Fiscal Year 2015/16 is shown below:

TFCA funding distribution for the past three years are as follows:

Agency	Project	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15
C/CAG	Administration	\$47,781	\$52,526	\$53,337
SamTrans	Employer Based Shuttle Projects	\$554,400	\$566,000	\$582,000
Commute.org	Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program	\$435,600	\$445,000	\$457,500
	Totals	\$1,037,781	\$1,063,526	\$1,092,837

#### ATTACHMENTS

None

**Date:** January 26, 2015

To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

From: Tom Madalena

Subject: Review and recommend approval of the funding recommendation for the Bayshore Technology Park shuttle for FY 2014/2015 and FY 2015/2016 in an amount of \$94,182 in Measure A Transportation funds through the San Mateo County Shuttle Program Joint Call for Projects and of the agreement between C/CAG and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority in an amount not to exceed \$38,000

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

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the CMEQ Committee review and recommend approval of the funding recommendation for the Bayshore Technology Park shuttle for FY 2014/2015 and FY 2015/2016 in an amount of \$94,182 in Measure A Transportation funds through the San Mateo County Shuttle Program Joint Call for Projects and of the agreement between C/CAG and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority in an amount not to exceed \$38,000.

#### FISCAL IMPACT

C/CAG will enter into a funding agreement with the TA to share in the cost of the shuttle for a total cost to C/CAG of \$38,000.

#### SOURCE OF FUNDS

The recommended source of funds for the Bayshore Technology Park shuttle is the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) Measure A Program and up to \$38,000 in C/CAG Congestion Relief Program funds.

The overall funding for the San Mateo County Shuttle Program for FY 2014/2015 and FY 2015/2064 is as follows.

	SMCTA	C/CAG
Total available	\$6,000,000	\$1,000,000
Previously allocated	\$5,711,414	\$923,266

Funding to support the shuttle programs will be derived from the Congestion Relief Plan adopted by C/CAG and includes \$1,000,000 in funding (\$500,000 for FY 14/15 and \$500,000 for FY

15/16). The SMCTA Measure A Program will provide approximately \$6,000,000 for the twoyear funding cycle.

#### **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

At the May 8, 2014 Board of Directors meeting the Board approved the shuttle funding allocation for the San Mateo County Shuttle Program for FY 14/15 and FY 15/16. At the time of the May Board meeting the Bayshore Technology Park Shuttle was deferred for funding at the request of the project sponsor, the Alliance, so that they could work out service overlaps with the Joint Powers Board (JPB) Caltrain Bridgepark Shuttle.

The Alliance submitted a revised application and staff from both the TA and C/CAG have determined that the Bayshore Technology Park shuttle is now eligible for funding. The revised application has been recommended for approval by the Shuttle Evaluation Panel. The revised application now includes a service plan that was developed in coordination with JPB operation staff which resulted in modifications to both shuttle routes.

This shuttle will be funded directly by the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA). The SMCTA Board of Directors approved funding the Bayshore Technology Park Shuttle on January 8, 2015. In order to keep the funding split equitable between the two agencies, the intent is to have the TA fund the shuttle project sponsor and for C/CAG and the TA to enter in a funding agreement in which C/CAG will reimburse the TA in an amount not to exceed \$38,000.

This item will be presented to the C/CAG Board of Directors at the February 12, 2015 Board meeting for review and approval.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Exhibit A- San Mateo County Shuttle Program Funding Recommendation FY 2014/2015 & FY 2015/2016
- Exhibit B San Mateo County Shuttle Program Performance

#### Exhibit A - San Mateo County Shuttle Program Funding Recommendation FY 2014/2015 & FY 2015/2016

Sponsor	Shuttle Name	Primary Service Area	New or Existing	Service Type	Total Cost	Requested Allocation	Proposed Fund Source	Total Matching Funds	Percent Matching Funds	Private Sector Match
Alliance	North Foster City	Foster City	Existing	Commuter	\$429,318	\$160.994	Measure A	\$268,324	63%	yes, 25%
Alliance	South San Francisco BART	South San Francisco	Existing	Commuter	\$897,991	1 /	Measure A	\$673,493	75%	yes, 32%
Alliance	Seaport Centre Caltrain	Redwood City	Existing	Commuter	\$227,896		Measure A	\$113,948	50%	yes, 50%
Alliance	North Burlingame	Burlingame	Existing	Commuter	\$244,355		Measure A	\$122.178		yes, 50%
Alliance	Brisbane/Crocker Park BART/Caltrain	Brisbane	Existing	Commuter/ Community	\$775,335	\$465,201	Measure A	\$310,134	40%	yes, 20%
Alliance	Redwood City Midpoint Caltrain	Redwood City	Existing	Commuter	\$232,547	\$174,410	Measure A	\$58,137	25%	yes, 25%
Alliance	Centennial Towers	South San Francisco	Existing	Commuter	\$232,548	. ,	Measure A	\$116,274	50%	yes, 50%
Alliance	South San Francisco Caltrain	South San Francisco	Existing	Commuter	\$511,604		Measure A	\$127,901	25%	yes, 25%
Alliance	South San Francisco Ferry	South San Francisco	Existing	Commuter	\$429,319		Measure A	\$150,262	35%	yes, 10%
Alliance	Bayshore Technology Park	Redwood Shores	New	Commuter	\$188,363	. ,	Measure A / C/CAG	\$94,182	50%	yes, 50%
East Palo Alto	East Palo Alto Caltrain	East Palo Alto	New	Commuter/ Community	\$662,760		Measure A	\$173,492	26%	no
Foster City	Foster City Mid-day	Foster City	New	Community	\$380,000	\$285,000	Measure A	\$95,000	25%	no
JPB	Sierra Point	South San Francisco	Existing	Commuter	\$309,000	\$46,300	Measure A	\$262,700	85%	yes, 68%
JPB	Genentech/Gateway - Main	South San Francisco	Existing	Commuter	\$510,800	\$92,000	Measure A	\$418,800	82%	yes, 82%
JPB	Bayside/Burlingame	Burlingame	Existing	Commuter	\$218,700	\$131,200	Measure A	\$87,500	40%	yes, 25%
JPB	Lincoln Centre	San Mateo/Foster City	Existing	Commuter	\$293,000	\$175,800	Measure A	\$117,200	40%	yes, 25%
JPB	Mariners Island	San Mateo/Foster City	Existing	Commuter	\$293,000	\$175,800	Measure A	\$117,200	40%	yes, 25%
JPB	Pacific Shores	Redwood City	Existing	Commuter	\$376,800	\$226,100	Measure A	\$150,700	40%	yes, 25%
JPB	Bridge Park	Redwood Shores	Existing	Commuter	\$293,000	\$175,800	Measure A	\$117,200	40%	yes, 25%
JPB	Broadway/Millbrae	Burlingame	Existing	Commuter	\$264,400	\$198,400	Measure A	\$66,000	25%	no
JPB	Electronic Arts	Redwood Shores	Existing	Commuter	\$309,900	\$124,000	Measure A	\$185,900	60%	yes, 50%
JPB	Campus Drive	San Mateo	Existing	Commuter	\$237,000	\$142,200	Measure A	\$94,800	40%	yes, 25%
JPB	Oracle	Redwood Shores	Existing	Commuter	\$376,800	\$226,100	Measure A	\$150,700	40%	yes, 25%
JPB	Clipper	Redwood Shores	Existing	Commuter	\$246,100	\$147,700	Measure A	\$98,400	40%	yes, 25%
JPB	Belmont/Hillsdale	Belmont	Existing	Commuter	\$218,700	\$164,100	Measure A	\$54,600	25%	no
JPB	Bayshore/Brisbane	Brisbane/Daly City	Existing	Commuter/ Community	\$455,600	\$341,700	Measure A	\$113,900	25%	no
JPB	Norfolk	San Mateo	Existing	Commuter	\$237,000	\$142,200	Measure A	\$94,800	40%	yes, 25%
Menlo Park	Willow Road	Menlo Park	Existing	Commuter	\$339,505	\$254,112	C/CAG	\$85,393	25%	yes, 4%
Menlo Park	Marsh Road	Menlo Park	Existing	Commuter	\$330,846	\$248,001	C/CAG	\$82,845	25%	yes, 4%
Menlo Park	Mid-day	Menlo Park	Existing	Community	\$448,875	\$337,313	C/CAG	\$111,562	25%	yes, 8%
Menlo Park	Shoppers	Menlo Park	Existing	Community	\$111,795	\$83,840	C/CAG	\$27,955	25%	yes, 10%
Pacifica	Pacifica Weekend Community	Pacifica	Existing	Community	\$140,600	\$105,450	Measure A	\$35,150	25%	yes, 11%
South San Francisco	South San Francisco East-West Community	South San Francisco	New	Commuter/ Community	\$376,045	\$282,034	Measure A	\$94,011	25%	no

TA Measure A Local Shuttle Program Allocation: C/CAG Local Transportation Services Shuttle Program Allocation:

Total TA-C/CAG Shuttle Funding Allocation:

Total Funding Available for FY2015 & 2016 shuttle Call for Projects:

\$5,805,596 \$923,266 \$6,728,862 \$7,000,000

#### Exhibit B - San Mateo County Shuttle Program Performance

				FY2014	FY2014 Performance Metrics						
Sponsor	<u>Shuttle Name</u>	Primary Service Area	Sevice Type	Total Operating Costs	SMC Shuttle Program Funds Expended	Total Matching Funds Expended	Percent Matching Funds	Total Passengers	Op. Cost∕ Passenger	SMC Shuttle Program Cost/ Passenger	Passengers/ Service Hr
1 Burlingame	North Burlingame Shuttle	Burlingame	commuter	\$114,414	\$57,207	\$57,207	50%	15,275	\$7.49	\$3.75	8.77
2 East Palo Alto	Community #1 (Caltrain) <sup>2</sup>	East Palo Alto	community	\$141,501	\$86,999	\$54,501	39%	33,069	\$4.28	\$2.63	18.45
3 East Palo Alto	Community #3 (Midtown) <sup>1</sup>	East Palo Alto	community	\$47,258	\$27,423	\$19,835	42%	4,765	\$9.92	\$5.76	9.40
4 East Palo Alto	Community #4 (Redwood City) <sup>1</sup>	East Palo Alto	community	\$76,665	\$49,351	\$27,315	36%	4,110	\$18.65	\$12.01	4.28
<sup>5</sup> Daly City	Daly City Bayshore Circulator <sup>1</sup>	Daly City	commuter/ community	\$79,069	\$15,814	\$63,255	80%	4,524	\$17.48	\$3.50	3.64
6 Pacifica	Weekend Community Shuttle	Pacifica	community	\$59,134	\$44,351	\$14,784	25%	2,819	\$20.98	\$15.73	6.53
7 Alliance	Brisbane Crocker Park Shuttle	Brisbane	commuter	\$255,585	\$102,234	\$153,351	60%	91,526	\$2.79	\$1.12	19.19
8 Alliance	Seaport Centre Shuttle	Redwood City	commuter	\$111,479	\$55,740	\$55,740	50%	25,984	\$4.29	\$2.15	16.72
9 Alliance	South SF BART Shuttle	South San Francisco	commuter	\$437,166	\$113,883	\$323,284	74%	47,791	\$9.15	\$2.38	7.53
10 Alliance	South SF Caltrain Shuttle	South San Francisco	commuter	\$249,384	\$187.038	\$62,346	25%	28,412	\$8.78	\$6.58	7.85
11 Alliance	South SF Centennial Tower	South San Francisco	commuter	\$112,347	\$56,173	\$56,173	50%	8,633	\$13.01	\$6.51	5.22
12 Alliance	South SF Ferry Terminal	South San Francisco	commuter	\$176,757	\$114,892	\$61,865	35%	14,259	\$12.40	\$8.06	5.54
- / Indinoo			commuter/	\$1707707	¢111/072	\$01,000	0070	11/207	\$12110	\$0.00	0.01
<sup>13</sup> JPB	Bayshore/Brisbane	Brisbane/Daly City	community	\$200,831	\$148,298	\$52,533	26%	27,404	\$7.33	\$5.41	7.91
14 JPB	Belmont/Hillsdale	Belmont	commuter	\$92,351	\$68,116	\$24,235	26%	17,622	\$5.24	\$3.87	12.75
15 JPB	Broadway/Millbrae	Burlingame	commuter	\$119,036	\$87,686	\$31,350	26%	47,958	\$2.48	\$1.83	27.67
16 JPB	Burlingame Bayside	Burlingame	commuter	\$93,439	\$30,979	\$62,460	67%	50,518	\$1.85	\$0.61	34.98
17 JPB	Campus (Hillsdale)	San Mateo	commuter	\$104,459	\$54,664	\$49,795	48%	23,079	\$4.53	\$2.37	15.04
18 JPB	East Palo Alto Community #2	East Palo Alto	commuter	\$131,573	\$95,912	\$35,660	27%	48,844	\$2.69	\$1.96	25.27
19 JPB	Fashion Island (EA)	Redwood Shores	commuter	\$129,442	\$28,295	\$101,147	78%	39,849	\$3.63	\$0.71	29.21
20 JPB	Gateway/Genentech	South San Francisco	commuter	\$237,705	\$24,670	\$213,035	90%	34,628	\$6.86	\$0.71	15.09
21 JPB	Lincoln Centre	Foster City	commuter	\$128,550	\$58,125	\$70,425	55%	37,634	\$3.42	\$1.54	22.89
22 JPB	Mariners Island	San Mateo/Foster City	commuter	\$137,343	\$66,644	\$70,699	51%	38,777	\$3.54	\$1.72	21.57
23 JPB	Norfolk (Hayward Park)	San Mateo	commuter	\$102,646	\$52,350	\$50,297	49%	9,501	\$10.80	\$5.51	6.16
24 JPB	Oracle	Redwood Shores	commuter	\$173,016	\$90,312	\$82,703	48%	31,125	\$5.56	\$2.90	13.85
25 JPB	Pacific Shores	Redwood City	commuter	\$169,770	\$60,767	\$109,003	64%	67,146	\$2.53	\$0.90	31.48
26 JPB	Redwood Shores (Bridge Park)	Redwood Shores	commuter	\$128,615	\$43,681	\$84,934	66%	38,245	\$3.36	\$1.14	23.50
27 JPB	Redwood Shores (Clipper)	Redwood Shores	commuter	\$106,498	\$60,360	\$46,138	43%	23,663	\$4.50	\$2.55	15.13
28 JPB	Sierra Point	Brisbane/South San Francisco	commuter	\$147,135	\$19,680	\$127,455	87%	19,447	\$7.57	\$1.01	15.56
29 Menlo Park	Marsh	Menlo Park	commuter	\$147,061	\$116,178	\$30,883	21%	31,977	\$4.60	\$3.63	37.01
30 Menlo Park	Willow	Menlo Park	commuter	\$105,083	\$78,812	\$26,271	25%	24,334	\$4.32	\$3.24	45.91
31 Menlo Park	Midday	Menlo Park	community	\$171,750	\$112,205	\$59,545	35%	23,708	\$7.24	\$4.73	10.68
32 Menlo Park	Shoppers	Menlo Park	community	\$34,499	\$31,739	\$2,760	8%	2,401	\$14.37	\$13.22	23.09
33 Redwood City	Climate Best Express <sup>2</sup>	Redwood City	community	\$105,416	\$52,708	\$52,708	50%	6,065	\$17.38	\$8.69	3.87
34 Redwood City	Midpoint Caltrain Shuttle	Redwood City	commuter	\$100,179	\$60,108	\$40,072	40%	37,643	\$2.66	\$1.60	26.18
			Totals	\$4,727,153	\$2,353,394	\$2,373,760	50%	962,735			

Footnotes
1) All shuttles were in operation for the duration of Fiscal Year 2014 (from 7/1/13 through 6/30/14), with the following exceptions:
East Palo Alto #3 and #4 shuttles were discontinued by the sponsor at the end of February 2014.

Daly City Bayshore Circulator Shuttle service started 1/6/14

2) The Redwood City Climate Best Express and the East Palo Alto #1 Shuttles were discontinued by their sponsors at the end of Fiscal Year 2014.

Date:	January 26, 2015
To:	Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director

Subject: Nomination/Election of Chair and Vice Chair

(For further information or response to questions, contact Sandy Wong at 650-599-1409)

#### RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ Committee nominate and elect a Chair and a Vice Chair to serve for the year.

#### FISCAL IMPACT

None.

#### SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A.

#### BACKGROUND

Each year, the CMEQ Committee selects a Chair and a Vice Chair to lead the Committee for the year. Member Richard Garbarino currently serves as the Chair, and Member Barbara Pierce currently serves as the Vice Chair. Member Garbarino was elected Chair at the January 28, 2013 CMEQ meeting, and Member Pierce was elected Vice Chair at the January 27, 2014 CMEQ meeting. Both are eligible to continue serving in their respective roles if elected by the Committee.

#### ATTACHMENTS

None.