

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, April 25, 2016 at 3:00 p.m.
Place: San Mateo City Hall
330 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo, California
Conference Room C (across from Council Chambers)

PLEASE CALL Jeff Lacap (650-599-1455) 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 March 28, 2016 meeting. | Action (Garbarino) | Pages 1 - 4 |
| 3. | Review and recommend approval of the Proposed One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Framework. | Action (Higaki) | Pages 5 – 10 |
| 4. | Review and recommend approval of the Measure M 5-Year Implementation Plan (Fiscal Year 2017- 2021). | Action (Hoang) | Pages 11 – 21 |
| 5. | Review and recommend approval of the project list for funding under the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for FY 2016/2017 and FY 2017/2018. | Action (Madalena) | Pages 22 - 26 |
| 6. | Receive information on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan development. | Information (Hoang) | Pages 27 - 49 |
| 7. | Receive information on the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 3. | Information (Yu) | Pages 50 - 51 |
| 8. | Executive Director Report. | Information (Wong) | No Materials |
| 9. | Member comments and announcements. | Information (Garbarino) | |
| 10. | Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date:
May 23, 2016 | Action (Garbarino) | |

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*

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 Mima Guilles at 650 599-
1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.*

Other enclosures/Correspondence - None

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

**MINUTES
MEETING OF March 28, 2016**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Garbarino 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. Issues from the February and March 2016 C/CAG Board meeting.

C/CAG Staff Jean Higaki provided updates on items that were previously brought to the CMEQ committee and been brought to the Board meeting thereafter.

3. Approval of minutes of January 25, 2016 meeting.

Motion: To approve the Minutes of the January 25, 2015 meeting, Keener/ O'Neill. O'Connell, Garbarino, Lee, Koelling, Scanlon, and Kim approve. Bonilla, Beach, Lewis, and Roberts abstain.

4. Receive a presentation on BAAQMD Funding for Plug-in Electric Vehicles (Information).

BAAQMD Staff Karen Schkolnick presented information on funding opportunities for Plug-in Electric Vehicle (PEV) from the BAAQMD including PEV Rebate programs for public agencies, Heavy-Duty Zero-Emission Vehicle (ZEV) and other resources available to public agencies.

Committee members had questions regarding battery life and disposal of PEV batteries. There were also questions about 3rd party smartphone applications for real time updates about charging stations. BAAQMD does not keep an official database of existing charging stations nor has an official smartphone application. Approximately \$12.5 million in regional funding is available for infrastructure projects under the Charge Program.

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

C/CAG Staff Jean Higaki presented that Caltrans has changed the pilot ramp metering project into a statewide research based project and therefore canceled the implementation project in San Mateo County. They will, however, continue to gather ramp data in the County.

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

C/CAG Staff John Hoang presented the proposed revised list of projects for the FY16/17 TFCA funds which includes Commute.org funding and SamTrans BART Shuttles. New proposed projects include SamTrans San Carlos Shuttle, SamTrans Bike Racks, and Smart Corridor Expansion.

The proposed Alternative Fuel Vehicles program was removed from the project list because there is a similar program offered at the regional (nine Bay Area counties) level by BAAQMD. Commute.org would receive the same amount of funding from the last cycle. The BART shuttle allocation amount was reduced so that the project could meet the cost-effectiveness criteria.

The proposed SamTrans San Carlos Shuttle would serve neighborhoods, shopping centers, and three schools that currently lack transit service. The proposed SamTrans Bike Racks on Buses Project would purchase new racks that would accommodate three bicycles instead of two bicycles. Member Lewis had a question about what would happen to the old bicycle racks that would be replaced.

Motion: To recommend approval of the Fiscal Year 2015/16 TFCA County projects, Keener/Scanlon. Lewis, O’Connell, Beach, Roberts, O’Neill, Garbarino, Lee, Bonilla, and Koelling approve. Kim recuse.

7. Review and provide comments on the proposed Measure M 5-Year Implementation Plan (Fiscal Year 2017-2021) Framework (Information).

C/CAG Staff John Hoang presented information on the proposed framework for the Measure M – 5-Year Implementation Plan indicating that the allocations remain the same from the original 5-Year Plan except that the Transit Operations/Senior Mobility be reduced from 22% to 20% because those senior mobility pilot projects did not come to fruition during 2011-2016 therefore funds in this category was directed only to RediWheels and senior mobility planning efforts.

Another allocation revision proposed is the Intelligent Transportation System/Smart Corridor to be increased from 10% to 12%. Additional funds will also be used to implement the next phase of the project and maintenance activities.

C/CAG Executive Director Sandy Wong read an email from Member Stone on his behalf: “I wanted to make sure I indicated my strong opposition to any reduction in Measure M funds for SamTrans paratransit and senior service. As you know, ridership in these areas is increasing. Cutting funding that helps out most vulnerable community members is not only bad policy, but I also suspect that the community would be outraged.” Members asked staff to gather more information from SamTrans about their plans for senior mobility and paratransit when this item is presented for recommendation at a future meeting.

8. Executive Director Report (Information).

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, provided the following update:

1. C/CAG Retreat is scheduled for April 14, 2016.
2. US-101 Carpool/Express Lane Project – a group comprised of San Mateo County Transit Authority, Caltrans, and C/CAG is currently working on a project charter and identifying each agency’s role in the project. A near term project milestone will be the environmental document for the project.
3. Smart Corridor – the construction work is nearly complete. San Mateo County Public Works is the contract manager on behalf of C/CAG and is currently working through claims dispute resolution.
4. STIP Update – MTC is responsible for creating a regional package for the Bay Area and recently approved a delay in \$71 million dollars’ worth of projects in response to the CTC and the cuts made in the STIP. The 92/101 Project was one of the projects that was put in delay.

9. Member comments and announcements (Information).

Member Roberts informed the Committee that the County has a contract with a billboard company that will evaluate county owned properties along US-101 for potential billboard locations. She informed the Committee that recent studies show that billboards cause driver distractions.

10. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.

The meeting adjourned at 4:38 pm.

The next regular meeting was scheduled for April 25, 2016.

2016 C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee Attendance Report													
Agency	Representative	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Alicia Aguirre	•											
City of Belmont	Charles Stone	•											
Town of Atherton	Elizabeth Lewis			•									
City of San Bruno	Irene O'Connell	•		•									
City of Burlingame	Emily Beach	(n/a)		•									
Environmental Community	Lennie Roberts			•									
City of Pacifica	Mike O'Neill	•		•									
City of South San Francisco	Richard Garbarino	•		•									
Public	Steve Dworetzky	• (3:18pm)											
City of Millbrae	Wayne Lee			•									
City of San Mateo	Rick Bonilla			•									
City of Pacifica	John Keener	•		•									
Agencies with Transportation Interests	Adina Levin	•											
Business Community	Linda Koelling	•		•									
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)	Liz Scanlon	•		•									
San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)	Doug Kim	•		•									

Staff and guests in attendance for March 28, 2016 meeting:
Sandy Wong, John Hoang, Jean Higaki, Eliza Yu - C/CAG Staff

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 25, 2016

To: C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ)

From: Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director

Subject: Review and recommend approval of the Proposed One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Framework

(For further information, contact Jean Higaki at 650-599-1462 or jhigaki@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) review and recommend approval of the of the Proposed One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Framework.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Federal funds allocated by MTC via OBAG 2 include Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds.

BACKGROUND

On November 18, 2015, MTC and ABAG adopted Resolution 4202 outlining and approving the OBAG 2 Grant Program. OBAG 2 is composed of two fund sources, Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and covers (five years) FY 2017/18 through FY 2021/22. General highlights of the adopted OBAG 2 program and jurisdictional eligibility requirements are attached.

MTC OBAG 2 policy allows CMAs the flexibility to invest in various transportation categories, such as Local Streets and Roads Preservation, Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements, Transportation for Livable Communities, Planning, and outreach activities. Below is the proposed funding and framework for the following programs:

Local Street and Roads (LSR) Maintenance and Rehabilitation

It is proposed to direct \$11,068,000 towards the Local Streets and Roads Preservation Program for the preservation of local streets and roads on the federal-aid system.

In 2006 Local Streets and Roads was subject to a competitive call for projects. In 2010 funding was allocated on a formula basis utilizing a combination of estimated funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) stimulus and estimates from the future funding cycle. This process also facilitated a State-Local Partnership Program (SLPP) fund exchange which enabled smaller projects to proceed under a state only process.

Under OBAG 2 the proposal is to direct \$11,068,000 towards the Local Streets and Roads program. MTC has a minimum grant size of \$250,000 however there is provision that “*CMA may program grant amounts no less than \$100,000 for any project, provided that the overall average of all grant amounts within their County CMA Program meets the county minimum grant amount threshold.*” In using a distribution formula, based 50% on population and 50% on lane miles, the Town of Colma would not meet MTC’s minimum grant requirement of \$100,000.

Utilizing the \$100,000 provision, the current proposal is to allocate funding under a formula basis with the exception to augment the Town of Colma by \$68,000 to meet the minimum \$100,000. See the attached proposed funding scenario. Because the federal aid process has costly and time consuming administrative process, C/CAG staff urges those jurisdictions with grants under \$250,000 to consider directing their share towards non-infrastructure projects. Other suggestions would be to perform joint projects with neighboring jurisdictions or using funds in combination with other federal aid project grants.

Local Streets and Roads Preservation Program project sponsors will need to fulfill a few more requirements such as having a current Pavement Management Program certification and participation in the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS).

Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program

It is proposed to direct \$5,421,000 for competition in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program to fund a wide range of bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

Improvements are intended to address air pollution reduction and support bicycle/ pedestrian commuter needs. Projects should not serve exclusively recreational trips. Improvements could include Class I, II and III bicycle facilities; cycle tracks; bicycle education, outreach, sharing and parking; sidewalks, ramps, pathways and pedestrian bridges; user safety and supporting facilities; and traffic signal actuation. Bicycle and pedestrian projects may be located on or off the federal-aid highway system.

C/CAG staff will develop applications, screening requirements, and scoring criteria for this program in the next few months. The C/CAG BPAC will score projects for the Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements Program and make a final recommendation to the C/CAG Board.

Transportation for Livable Communities

It is proposed to direct \$5,421,000 for competition in the Transportation for Livable Communities Program to fund a wide range improvements and facilities that support and promote alternative transportation modes rather than the single-occupant automobile.

Project improvements are intended to support community based transportation projects that reduces air pollution in downtown areas, commercial cores, high-density neighborhoods, and transit corridors. A wide range of improvements include but are not limited to transit station improvements (plazas, station access, pocket parks, and bicycle parking), Bicycle and pedestrian “complete street” improvements, and multi-modal streetscape improvements. Projects must be able to support alternative transportation modes (no landscape only projects).

C/CAG staff will develop applications, screening requirements, and scoring criteria for this program in the next few months. It is proposed that the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) scoring

panel, composed of staff from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, San Mateo County Transit District, and C/CAG will perform the initial scoring of projects in the TLC Program. The TLC scoring panel's recommendations will be forwarded to the TAC and CMEQ for final recommendation to the C/CAG Board.

Safe Routes to School (SRTS)

It is proposed to direct \$2,394,000 towards the Safe Routes to School Program. In previous cycles Safe Routes to School was a separate program from OBAG 1 and funding was directed entirely to the County Office of Education (COE) for administration. C/CAG also directed approximately \$1.2 million in Measure M funding to augment COE's implementation of the SRTS program focused on non-infrastructure projects and consisting of education and outreach to schools throughout the County.

For OBAG 2 it is proposed that SRTS program funds be directed to COE to continue their program but also to facilitate and develop infrastructure project proposals in coordination with city staff. However, the next 5 year Measure M portion of the SRTS funds will focus on infrastructure projects to be integrated with C/CAG vehicle license fee (VLF) storm water funds.

The redirecting Measure M funding towards infrastructure projects would remove funding barriers associated with integrating programs and eliminate the need to follow the Federal Aid process. A call for infrastructure projects will be developed and introduced after adoption of the Measure M expenditure plan.

Planning and Outreach

Consistent with OBAG 1 it is proposed to direct \$4,650,000 towards the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Planning and Outreach.

CMA planning and outreach program provides staff support at the county level for programming, monitoring and outreach activities delegated by MTC to the CMAs. These include but are not limited to development of the RTP/ SCS, development of PDA Growth strategies, Congestion Management Plan (CMP) updates, Countywide Transportation Planning, developing calls for projects, assistance with the programming and delivery of federal aid projects. It is proposed to keep consistent funding levels for Planning and Outreach from the last cycle as well as account for a 2.5 % augmentation per year which is consistent with previous STP/ CMAQ cycles of funding. This would result in \$4.65 mil for five fiscal years 2017/2018 through 2021/2022.

Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) Program

It is proposed to direct \$892,000 to the County in the Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) program, per state statute.

Under OBAG 1, the Safe Routes to School and the Federal-Aid Secondary (rural roads) programs were provided to San Mateo County outside of the OBAG umbrella. MTC has shifted these programs under the OBAG 2 process.

California statute provides minimum levels to counties for the maintenance of rural county roads under the FAS program. Guaranteed minimum FAS funding amounts are determined by California's Federal-Aid Secondary Highway Act (California Code 2200-2214), therefore it is proposed to program \$892,000 to the County for a rural county road maintenance project. FAS funding is not subject to the minimum PDA investment requirement.

Public Outreach

C/CAG will be expected to inform stakeholders and the public about the opportunities for public comment on project ideas and to “assist” community –based organizations, communities of concern, and any other underserved community interested in having project submitted for funding.

To comply with outreach requirements, C/CAG plans on utilizing committee and board meetings to allow for public input. C/CAG will host public workshops regarding funding opportunities and to solicit project ideas, to adhere to MTC outreach policy. Staff also intends to perform additional outreach in the form of informational mailings to community based organizations.

As C/CAG is not a potential project sponsor, staff may need to direct/ refer any public entities, with project ideas, to partner with a local jurisdiction (Cities/ County).

Flexibility to reprogram funds

Although project sponsors are always encouraged to propose larger projects (over match) and develop “alternative bid items” occasionally un-obligated funds are left on the table by jurisdictions due to non-eligible work items or cost savings. This ultimately results in funds being lost from the County. It is proposed that C/CAG staff be given the authority to move unobligated and cost saving funds between projects in order to avoid the loss of transportation funding from the County.

The proposed OBAG 2 framework proposal was presented to the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC) on April 21, 2016. Staff will present the CMP TAC recommendation at the CMEQ meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

1. OBAG 2 Eligibility and Requirements
2. Proposed funding scenario for Local Streets and Roads Preservation Program

OBAG 2 Eligibility and Requirements

Highlights of the MTC OBAG 2 adopted proposal:

- OBAG 2 allows CMAs the flexibility to invest in various transportation categories, such as Local Streets and Roads Preservation, Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements, Transportation for Livable Communities, Planning, and outreach activities.
- During OBAG 1 the Safe Routes to School and the Federal-Aid Secondary (rural roads) programs were provided to San Mateo County outside of the OBAG umbrella. MTC has shifted these programs under the OBAG 2 process.
- For San Mateo County, 70% of all funds must be spent in Priority Development Areas (PDAs), however Safe Routes to School is not subject to the PDA spending requirement.
- Projects can count towards a PDA if it connects or provides proximate access to a PDA. The definition of “proximate access to a PDA” will be proposed as a separate item.
- Pedestrian and bike project eligibility will be expanded to not be limited to the regional bike network.
- Minimum OBAG 2 grant size for this county is \$250,000. All project funds must be rounded to the thousands for programming.
- Each jurisdiction must identify and maintain a single point of contact for the implementation of all FHWA projects from inception to project close-out.
- Per MTC Resolution No. 3036 Request for obligation deadlines are November 1 of the prior program year in order to obligate funds by January 31 of the program year (e.g. if program year is 2018 delivery deadline is November 1, 2017.)

Eligibility Requirements

In order to be eligible for any funding related to the OBAG 2 funding, a jurisdiction must comply with the following requirements:

Complete Street Requirements - Jurisdictions that have not updated their circulation element after 2010 to meet the State’s Complete Streets Act requirements will need to adopt a complete streets resolution per the MTC model used for OBAG 1, if they have not already done so.

Housing Element Requirement - Agencies must have housing elements adopted by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HDC) by May 31, 2015. Agencies must continue to submit the annual housing Element Report to HCD to remain eligible for funding.

Anti-Displacement Requirement - MTC has directed their staff to develop anti-displacement policy recommendation and return to the commission in spring 2016 with a recommendation.

As of February 2016, all jurisdictions in San Mateo County are in compliance with the Complete Streets and Housing Element requirements.

**San Mateo C/CAG
OBAG 2 Local Streets and Roads Formula Distribution Proposal**

**\$11,000,000 in LSR
\$11,000,000**

(Distribution based 50% on population and 50% on road miles)

CITY / COUNTY	ROAD MILES	% OF MILES	POPULATION DOF	% OF POPULATION	% OF TOTAL ALLOCATION	Hypothetical Formula (round to 1,000)	Proposed Distribution (Rounded to 1,000)
Atherton	50.99	3.07%	6,935	0.92%	2.00%	\$220,000	\$220,000
Belmont	64.17	3.86%	26,748	3.55%	3.71%	\$408,000	\$408,000
Brisbane	26.20	1.58%	4,541	0.60%	1.09%	\$120,000	\$120,000
Burlingame	84.60	5.09%	29,890	3.97%	4.53%	\$499,000	\$499,000
Colma	6.52	0.39%	1,480	0.20%	0.29%	\$32,000	\$100,000
Daly City	112.11	6.75%	105,810	14.05%	10.40%	\$1,144,000	\$1,144,000
East Palo Alto	45.49	2.74%	29,137	3.87%	3.30%	\$363,000	\$363,000
Foster City	44.78	2.70%	32,390	4.30%	3.50%	\$385,000	\$385,000
Half Moon Bay	26.73	1.61%	12,051	1.60%	1.60%	\$177,000	\$177,000
Hillsborough	82.48	4.97%	11,420	1.52%	3.24%	\$357,000	\$357,000
Menlo Park	97.34	5.86%	33,273	4.42%	5.14%	\$565,000	\$565,000
Millbrae	51.52	3.10%	22,898	3.04%	3.07%	\$338,000	\$338,000
Pacifica	91.90	5.53%	38,551	5.12%	5.33%	\$586,000	\$586,000
Portola Valley	43.07	2.59%	4,527	0.60%	1.60%	\$176,000	\$176,000
Redwood City	153.22	9.23%	81,838	10.87%	10.05%	\$1,105,000	\$1,105,000
San Bruno	79.38	4.78%	44,409	5.90%	5.34%	\$587,000	\$587,000
San Carlos	86.78	5.23%	29,449	3.91%	4.57%	\$503,000	\$503,000
San Mateo	196.22	11.82%	101,429	13.47%	12.64%	\$1,391,000	\$1,391,000
South San Francisco	124.83	7.52%	66,193	8.79%	8.15%	\$897,000	\$897,000
Woodside	51.56	3.11%	5,539	0.74%	1.92%	\$211,000	\$211,000
SM County (Urban)	140.58	8.47%	64,615	8.58%	8.52%	\$936,000	\$936,000
Total	1,660.47	100.00%	753,123	100.00%	100.00%	\$11,000,000	\$11,068,000

Sources:

- Road Miles Information:
<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hpms/datalibrary.php>
- Population Information:
<http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-1/view.php>

**Highly encourage small jurisdictions to merge projects
Encourage merging into any competitive call application (B/P or TLC)**

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 25, 2016
To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee
From: John Hoang
Subject: Review and recommend approval of the Measure M 5-Year Implementation Plan (Fiscal Year 2017-2021)

(For further information or response to questions, contact John Hoang at 650-363-4105)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ Committee review and recommend approval of the Measure M 5-Year Implementation Plan (Fiscal Year 2017-2021).

FISCAL IMPACT

Approximately \$6.7 million annually (\$33.5 million over 5 years)

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Measure M - \$10 Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF)

BACKGROUND

The C/CAG sponsored Measure M; approved by the voters of San Mateo County in 2010, impose an annual fee of ten dollars (\$10) on motor vehicles registered in San Mateo County for transportation-related traffic congestion and water pollution mitigation programs. It was estimated that Measure M would generate approximately \$6.7 million annually and \$167 million total over the 25-year period between May 2011 and May 2036. Per the Expenditure Plan, 50% of the net proceeds will be allocated to cities/County for local streets and roads and 50% will be used for Countywide Transportation Programs such as transit operations/senior mobility, intelligent transportation system (ITS)/Smart Corridors, safe routes to school (SRTS), and stormwater pollution prevention.

In March 2011, the C/CAG Board approved the initial 5-Year Implementation Plan for FY 2011-2016. The Plan, which was amended in May 2012, provided an estimate of funds that would be allocated to jurisdictions for local streets and roads as well as established allocation percentages for administration and the countywide transportation programs. The allocations for the Countywide Transportation Programs were originally derived based on anticipated needs and estimated implementation cost to fund each respective programs and projects, annually and over the 5-Year implementation period. It was intended that the Countywide Transportation Programs be re-evaluated at the end of five (5) to determine whether the initial funding level (allocations) was adequate or whether adjustments are needed based on the actual expenditures incurred over the 5-Year period.

At the March 2016 meetings, the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee

(CMP TAC) and CMEQ Committee received the proposed FY 2017-2021 framework, which included modified allocations to the Countywide Transportation Programs consisting of a reduction of 2% (\$130,000) from the Transit Operations/Senior Transportation category and converse increase of 2% to the ITS/Smart Corridor category with the SRTS and stormwater pollution prevention allocations remaining the same at 6% and 12% respectively. The purpose of the proposed change was to address the need to increase funds for the expansion of the Smart Corridor project as well as implementation of other ITS related projects. Furthermore, funding from the Transit Operations/Senior Transportation category primarily goes towards funding RediWheels, which is a \$15M annual program that also receives significant funding from other multiple sources.

The CMP TAC commented on the Smart Corridor and ITS and requested for clarification on Smart Corridor maintenance responsibilities and timeframe for expansion. Several members of the CMEQ Committee was concerned with reducing funding for the Transit Operations/Senior Transportation and requested staff to look at other options. After further discussions with SamTrans staff, additional information on the Transit Operations/Senior Transportation will be provided to C/CAG. Therefore, C/CAG staff recommends keeping the Countywide Transportation Programs allocations the same and making no changes at this time.

Analysis and proposal for the FY 2017-2021 Implementation Plan is as follows:

- Administration: Currently, for budgeting purposes, 5% is taken off the top before allocations are made to the Local Streets and Roads and the Countywide Programs. For the new Plan going forward, administration allocation, maximum of 5%, will be made at the beginning of each C/CAG budget fiscal year to minimize the accumulation of unspent funds so that funds can be redistributed to the programs more effectively.
- Local Streets and Roads (50% of net revenue): Funds for local streets and roads are allocated biennially to jurisdictions to reimburse expenditures related to traffic congestion management or stormwater pollution prevention related activities. The allocation formula is based on 50% population and 50% road miles for each jurisdiction, modified for a minimum guaranteed amount of \$75,000 per jurisdiction.
- Transit Operations/Senior Mobility: Recommend no change in allocation at this time since any changes to the RediWheels program will require much more analysis. Funds will continue to be provided to the SamTrans for paratransit (disabled and senior) service including Senior Mobility programs. This fund supplements other funds SamTrans receives. The RediWheels program is a fixed-route paratransit service for persons with disabilities who cannot independently use regular SamTrans bus service. The Senior Mobility Program provides services to promote community shuttles, and provide rides through a network of coordinated transportation providers.
- ITS/Smart Corridor: Recommend no change in allocation. Funds in this category have been primarily used for design and construction of the Smart Corridor project. This fund was used to leverage other funds for the Smart Corridor, such as TLSP and STIP. The current project, which is almost complete, is located from I-380 to the Santa Clara County line and includes local arterials connecting US 101 and SR 82 (El Camino Real). With the first phase of the Smart Corridor is near completion, some of the funds will be budgeted for Smart Corridor maintenance activities. Funds will be used to implement the next phase of the project with the expansion to other cities and corridors, as needed, to deploy ITS elements including signage and close circuit cameras, and upgrading signal systems in cities as needed. Funds will also be made available for other arterial

management related projects to be defined.

- **SRTS:** Recommend no change in allocation. Currently, the funds are used as matching funds to the Safe Routes to School federal funds that C/CAG receives from the region. The majority of the allocation has been spent on non-infrastructure projects such as outreach, education, encouragement, and evaluation. For the new Plan, it is proposed that the funds be used more to focus on infrastructure improvements related to enhancing safety and accessibility for school children walking or biking to and from schools. Typical projects may include crosswalks, sidewalk, signals, signage, and other to be identified by the cities in coordinate with school sites. It is proposed that this fund be closely coordinated with the unspent AB1546 Countywide NPDES funds and be used for integrated safe routes to school and stormwater pollution prevention types of projects.
- **NPDES/MRP:** Recommend no change in allocation. Funds in this category National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)/ Municipal Regional Permit (MRP) are designated for pollution mitigation programs and projects, as allowed under Measure M’s authorizing legislation, Government Code Section 65089.20. The funds are used for countywide compliance activities through C/CAG’s Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program, primarily for technical consultant costs for regulatory compliance support programs.

The assumption for the FY 2017-2021 Implementation Plan estimates that revenue will remain at \$6.7 million annually, although actual revenue will vary yearly. The proposed allocation scenario is shown below:

Category / Programs	FY 2011-2016 Allocation	Proposed FY 2017-2021		
		Allocation	Annual Revenue (Million)	5-Year Revenue (Million)
• Program Administration	Up to 5%	Up to 5%	\$0.34	\$1.70
• Local Streets and Roads	50% of net revenue	50% of net revenue	\$3.18	\$15.90
• Transit Operations and/or Senior Transportation*	22%	22%	\$1.40	\$7.0
• Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and Smart Corridors*	10%	10%	\$0.64	\$3.18
• Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS)*	6%	6%	\$0.38	\$1.90
• National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)/ Municipal Regional Permit (MRP)*	12%	12%	\$0.76	\$3.82
		Total	\$6.70	\$33.50

* Countywide Transportation Programs (50% of net revenue)

ATTACHMENTS

- Draft Measure M Implementation Plan (FY 2017–2021)

Measure M Implementation Plan (draft)

FY 2017-2021

April 2016



PURPOSE OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Measure M Implementation Plan describes the various programs identified in the Expenditure Plan in more detail and established percentages of funds allocated to each of the Countywide Transportation Programs. The Implementation Plan also identifies specific projects and programs under each category that would be eligible to receive funds along with identifying the targeted performance measures for each activity. The Implementation Plan, which requires adoption by the C/CAG Board, is developed at the onset of the 25-Year Measure M Program and is updated every 5 years. This Implementation Plan covers the period from FY 2017 to FY 2021.

COLLECTION OF THE FEE

The \$10 Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) will be collected for a period of 25 years, beginning on May 2, 2011 and ending on May 1, 2036. Beginning approximately July 2011 and every month thereafter for the duration of the fee, the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) will issue C/CAG a monthly check for revenues collected from the prior month. The estimated revenue is \$6.7 million annually and \$33.5 million over the initial 5-year implementation period. This amount takes into consideration the DMV's administrative fee charge of approximately \$0.005 (one-half of a cent) for each check issued to C/CAG.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY (FY 2017 - 2021)

As indicated in the approved Measure M Expenditure Plan up to 5% of the proceeds is allocated for administration with 50% of the net revenue allocated to the Local Streets and Roads category and 50% of the net revenue allocated to the Countywide Transportation Programs which includes the following programs: Transit Operations and/or Senior Transportation, Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and Smart Corridors, Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS), and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Municipal Regional Permit.

The FY 2017–2021 Implementation Strategy is as follows:

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION (Up to 5%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Allocation of funds to be taken off the top.▪ A portion of the funds will be used for routine program administration activities.▪ Any unused administration funds would be redistributed to the Local Streets and Roads and/or Countywide Program categories as appropriate.

LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS (50% of Net Revenue)

- Allocations to local jurisdictions (20 cities and the County) for congestion mitigation and stormwater pollution mitigation programs.
- Allocation to be on a cost reimbursement basis utilizing a distribution formula consisting of 50% population and 50% road miles for each jurisdiction modified for a minimum guaranteed amount of \$75,000 for each jurisdiction. (Exhibit A)
- Allocations will be made two times a year, at a minimum every 6 months.
- Jurisdictions have the flexibility on use of the funds between the categories and projects; therefore, there are no requirements to split the funds evenly between the categories.
- Measure M should not be used to supplant existing city general funds.

Category	Programs/Projects Description	Performance Measure
Traffic Congestion Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local Shuttles/transportation ▪ Road resurfacing/reconstruction ▪ Deployment of local Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) ▪ Roadway operations (e.g., restriping, signal timing / coordination, signage) ▪ Replacement and/or upgrading of traffic signal hardware and/or software 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of passengers transported ▪ Miles/fraction of miles of roads improved ▪ Number of ITS components installed/ implemented ▪ Miles/fraction of miles of roads improved ▪ Number of units replaced and/or upgraded
Stormwater Pollution Prevention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Street Sweeping ▪ Roadway storm inlet cleaning ▪ Street side runoff treatment ▪ Auto repair shop inspections ▪ Managing runoff from street/parking lot ▪ Small capital projects such as vehicle related runoff management/controls ▪ Capital purchases for motor vehicle related runoff management/controls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Miles of streets swept ▪ Number of storm inlets cleaned ▪ Square feet of surfaces managed ▪ Number of auto repair shops inspected ▪ Square feet of surfaces managed annually ▪ Number of projects implemented ▪ Number of pieces of equipment purchased and installed

LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS (Continue)		
Category	Programs/Projects Description	Performance Measure
Stormwater Pollution Prevention (Cont'd)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional used oil drop off locations ▪ Motor vehicle fluid recycling programs ▪ Installation of new pervious surface median strips in roadways ▪ Municipal Regional Permit Compliance Activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of locations implemented/ operated; oil quantity collected ▪ Number of programs implemented/ operated; fluid quantity collected ▪ Square footage of new pervious surface median strips installed ▪ Identification of permit provision(s) and compliance activities performed

COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS (50% of Net Revenue)

- Allocations for the four (4) Countywide Programs are as follows:
 - Transit Operations and/or Senior Transportation - 22%
 - Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and Smart Corridors - 10%
 - Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) Infrastructure - 6%
 - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Municipal Regional Permit (MRP) for administration and projects - 12%
- Allocation to be on a cost reimbursement basis.
- Up to a maximum of 4% may be transferred between the ITS/Smart Corridors, SR2S, and NPDES/MRP within the 5-year period taking into consideration actual expenditures, unused allocations, program shortfalls, and program needs.
- The ITS and NPDES projects to be selected by a competitive “call for project” process.
- The Transit Operations and/or Senior Transportation programs to be sponsored by SamTrans or Caltrain. Proposed projects to be submitted to C/CAG annually for approval.
- The SRTS Infrastructure Program to be administered by the C/CAG. Funds will also be provided to County Office of Education (COE) as match for non-infrastructure projects.
- The ITS/Smart Corridors and NPDES/MRP Programs to be administered by C/CAG

Category	Programs/Projects Description	Performance Measure
Transit Operations and/or Senior Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SamTrans Paratransit operations and maintenance (Caltrain projects are also eligible) ▪ Senior Mobility Management projects that complement paratransit (e.g., Mobility Ambassadors, Van Sharing) ▪ Senior Mobility Education (e.g. Senior Mobility Guide, Website Management) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operating costs and fare revenue; Usage; Operating Efficiency; Reliability and Safety; Customer satisfaction; Cost effectiveness ▪ Hours of service per month; number of trips per month; and number of individuals who ride in a given month ▪ Frequency of in-person presentations; number of individuals participated; increased activity on web page

COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS (Continue)		
Category	Programs/Projects Description	Performance Measure
ITS and Smart Corridors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Deployment of projects having regional and countywide significance ▪ Maintenance and operations of the Smart Corridors specific equipment located within the San Mateo County jurisdictions' right-of-way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of ITS components installed and implemented ▪ Number of instances and duration that the equipment (directional signs, CCTV, communications, power supply line and equipment) is inoperable; Operability and activation of equipment
SRTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ San Mateo County SRTS Program includes infrastructure and non-infrastructure (education, outreach, encouragement, and evaluation activities) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of schools participating in the Program; Number of projects (infrastructure and non-infrastructure) implemented

COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS (Continue)

Category	Programs/Projects Description	Performance Measure
NPDES and MRP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Street and Road Repair and Maintenance ▪ Green Street projects ▪ Control mobile sources ▪ Public outreach events ▪ Trash load reduction and hot spot cleanup ▪ Vehicle brake pad pollution impacts ▪ Municipal Regional Permit Compliance Activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of guidance documents developed; area/length of roadways managed ▪ Number of projects completed, area of impervious surface managed with low impact development measures ▪ Number of guidance documents developed, outreach events or materials distributed, or mobile source properly managed ▪ Number of materials/events developed, distributed, and/or attended; Number of people contacted ▪ Number of guidance documents developed; quantity of area addressed by trash management measures; amount of trash loading reduced/prevented through implementation of management measures ▪ Number of guidance documents developed and/or quantity of pollutants addressed by management measures ▪ Identification of permit provision(s) and compliance activities performed

EXHIBIT A

The table below provides an estimated distribution for the Local Streets and Roads allocation based a formula consisting of 50% population and 50% road miles for each jurisdiction modified for a minimum guaranteed amount of \$75,000 for each jurisdiction.

Jurisdiction	Before Applying Minimum \$75K		After Applying Minimum \$75K		
	% of Total Allocation	Estimated Annual Revenue	% of Total Allocation	Estimated Net Annual Revenue	Estimated Net 5-Year Revenue
Atherton	1.85%	\$58,721	2.35%	\$75,000	\$375,000
Belmont	3.52%	\$111,963	3.30%	\$104,950	\$524,750
Brisbane	1.00%	\$31,802	2.35%	\$75,000	\$375,000
Burlingame	4.29%	\$136,601	3.92%	\$124,650	\$623,250
Colma	0.29%	\$9,176	2.35%	\$75,000	\$375,000
Daly City	10.07%	\$320,340	9.71%	\$309,000	\$1,545,000
East Palo Alto	3.16%	\$100,447	2.99%	\$95,300	\$476,500
Foster City	3.37%	\$107,320	3.13%	\$99,750	\$498,750
Half Moon Bay	1.53%	\$48,793	2.35%	\$75,000	\$375,000
Hillsborough	2.99%	\$95,157	2.80%	\$89,000	\$445,000
Menlo Park	4.84%	\$154,118	4.49%	\$143,000	\$715,000
Millbrae	2.93%	\$93,313	2.71%	\$86,400	\$432,000
Pacifica	5.06%	\$160,949	4.82%	\$153,500	\$767,500
Portola Valley	1.47%	\$46,721	2.35%	\$75,000	\$375,000
Redwood City	9.59%	\$305,118	8.96%	\$285,350	\$1,426,750
San Bruno	5.09%	\$161,990	4.69%	\$149,100	\$745,500
San Carlos	4.31%	\$137,043	3.98%	\$126,750	\$633,750
San Mateo	12.06%	\$383,667	11.00%	\$350,000	\$1,750,000
South San Francisco	7.79%	\$247,868	7.13%	\$226,800	\$1,134,000
Woodside	1.78%	\$56,636	2.35%	\$75,000	\$375,000
San Mateo County	13.03%	\$414,759	12.22%	\$388,950	\$1,944,750
Total	100%	\$3,182,500	100.00%	\$3,182,500	\$15,912,500

Notes:

1. Population totals are updated based on the State of California Department of Finance estimates (2015)
2. Figures may be slightly off due to rounding off errors.
3. Assumes constant annual revenue over the 5-year Implementation Plan period.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 25, 2016

To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee

From: Tom Madalena

Subject: Review and recommend approval of the project list for funding under the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for FY 2016/2017 and FY 2017/2018

(For further information or response to questions, contact Tom Madalena at 650-599-1460)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee review and recommend approval of the project list for funding under the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for FY 2016/2017 and FY 2017/2018.

FISCAL IMPACT

For the FY 16/17 and FY 17/18 funding cycle there is up to \$10,000,000 available.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

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 16/17 and \$500,000 for FY 17/18). The San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) Measure A Program will provide approximately \$9,000,000 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 annual budget adoption process.

BACKGROUND

For the FY 16/17 & FY 17/18 cycle the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) and C/CAG created a call for projects that combines two years of funding for shuttles in an amount up to \$10,000,000 from both agencies. Staff issued the call for projects on December 14, 2015 and applications were due on February 12, 2016. C/CAG and TA staff held an application workshop on December 15, 2016 to answer questions about the program and to guide project sponsors through the application process. Staff received applications from 11 sponsors which encompass 40 separate shuttles. The total amount requested was approximately \$9,300,000.

Staff convened a Shuttle Evaluation Panel on March 17, 2016 to evaluate and score the shuttle program applications. The panel consisted of staff from the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), the TA, Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit), Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz Metro) and C/CAG. The panel developed a recommended list of projects for funding which is presented in Attachment A. The Coastside Beach Shuttle is being deferred due to a request from the sponsor, the County of San Mateo, so that they can better coordinate the route and schedule with existing transit service and the community. The Millbrae Shuttle was not recommended

for funding by the Shuttle Evaluation Panel due to significant overlap with SamTrans bus service and not meeting the minimum program requirements.

Upcoming Milestones	Date
C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee	April 21, 2016
C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee	April 25, 2016
TA Citizen Advisory Committee	May 3, 2016
TA Board Action	May 5, 2016
C/CAG Board Action	May 12, 2016

ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment A – Recommendations for FY 2016/2017 & FY 2017/2018 Funding for San Mateo County Shuttle Program



**FY2017 and FY2018 San Mateo County Shuttle Program
Draft Recommended Project List for Award**

Attachment A

Rank	Score	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	Notes
1	77	JPB	Lincoln Centre	San Mateo/Foster City	Existing	Commuter	\$278,600	\$181,100	Measure A	\$97,500	35%	yes, 25%	
2	76	Commute.org	Seaport Centre Caltrain	Redwood City	Existing	Commuter	\$238,018	\$119,009	Measure A	\$119,009	50%	yes, 50%	
3	75	Commute.org	Bayshore Technology Park	Redwood Shores	Existing	Commuter	\$246,208	\$123,104	Measure A	\$123,104	50%	yes, 50%	
4	75	JPB	Pacific Shores	Redwood City	Existing	Commuter	\$357,900	\$232,600	Measure A	\$125,300	35%	yes, 25%	
5	74	JPB	Burlingame Bayside BART/Caltrain	Burlingame	Existing	Commuter	\$474,500	\$308,600	Measure A	\$165,900	35%	yes, 25%	
6	73	JPB	Mariners Island	San Mateo/Foster City	Existing	Commuter	\$278,600	\$181,100	Measure A	\$97,500	35%	yes, 25%	
7	72	Daly City	Bayshore	Daly City	Existing	Commuter/ Community	\$523,000	\$104,600	Measure A	\$418,400	80%	no	
8	72	JPB	Twin Dolphin	Redwood Shores	Existing	Commuter	\$265,800	\$190,400	Measure A	\$75,400	28%	yes, 25%	
9	72	Menlo Park	Willow Road	Menlo Park	Existing	Commuter	\$253,429	\$190,071	C/CAG	\$63,358	25%	yes, 15%	
10	71	Commute.org	Brisbane/Crocker Park BART/Caltrain	Brisbane/Daly City	Existing	Commuter	\$786,665	\$555,000	Measure A	\$231,665	29%	yes, 25%	
11	71	JPB	Electronic Arts (EA)	Redwood Shores	Existing	Commuter	\$380,200	\$150,000	Measure A	\$230,200	61%	yes, 61%	
12	71	Menlo Park	Marsh Road	Menlo Park	Existing	Commuter	\$378,008	\$283,506	Measure A	\$94,502	25%	yes, 24%	
13	71	SamTrans	Sierra Point - Balboa Park BART	Brisbane	Existing	Commuter	\$505,600	\$163,000	Measure A	\$342,600	68%	yes, 62%	existing shuttle, new to San Mateo County Shuttle Program
14	71	South San Francisco	South City	South San Francisco	Existing	Community	\$487,343	\$360,507	Measure A	\$126,836	26%	yes, 1%	
15	70	Commute.org	Redwood City Midpoint Caltrain	Redwood City	Existing	Commuter	\$242,857	\$182,143	Measure A	\$60,714	25%	yes, 25%	
16	70	SamTrans	Bayhill - San Bruno BART	San Bruno	Existing	Commuter	\$238,600	\$179,000	Measure A	\$59,600	25%	yes, 18%	existing shuttle, new to San Mateo County Shuttle Program
17	70	SamTrans	Seton Medical - BART Daly City	Daly City	Existing	Commuter	\$218,800	\$150,000	Measure A	\$68,800	31%	yes, 31%	existing shuttle, new to San Mateo County Shuttle Program
18	70	San Mateo Community College District	Skyline College Express	San Bruno	New	Commuter	\$449,436	\$202,703	Measure A	\$246,733	55%	no	new express shuttle from Daly City BART to Skyline Community College
19	69	Commute.org	North Foster City	Foster City	Existing	Commuter	\$467,032	\$315,274	Measure A	\$151,758	32%	yes, 25%	
20	69	JPB	Broadway/Millbrae	Burlingame	Existing	Commuter	\$284,900	\$213,800	Measure A	\$71,100	25%	no	
21	67	Commute.org	North Burlingame	Burlingame	Existing	Commuter	\$249,126	\$124,562	Measure A	\$124,563	50%	yes, 50%	
22	66	JPB	Clipper	Redwood Shores	Existing	Commuter	\$246,900	\$185,200	Measure A	\$61,700	25%	yes, 25%	
23	66	JPB	Sierra Point Millbrae	South San Francisco/ Brisbane	Existing	Commuter	\$294,200	\$84,000	Measure A	\$210,200	71%	yes, 66%	
24	62	JPB	Bayshore/Brisbane Commute & Midday Senior	Brisbane/Daly City	Existing	Commuter/ Community	\$512,700	\$384,600	Measure A	\$128,100	25%	no	
25	62	JPB	Campus Drive Area	San Mateo	Existing	Commuter	\$246,900	\$185,200	Measure A	\$61,700	25%	yes, 25%	
26	62	JPB	Oracle	Redwood Shores	Existing	Commuter	\$570,200	\$260,000	Measure A	\$310,200	54%	yes, 53%	
27	61	San Carlos	San Carlos Commuter	San Carlos	New	Commuter	\$264,326	\$198,245	Measure A	\$66,082	25%	yes, TBD	new shuttle, participating employers to be determined
28	59	Commute.org	South San Francisco BART	South San Francisco	Existing	Commuter	\$915,656	\$641,742	Measure A	\$273,914	30%	yes, 25%	
29	59	Commute.org	South San Francisco Caltrain	South San Francisco	Existing	Commuter	\$532,612	\$399,459	Measure A	\$133,153	25%	yes, 25%	



FY2017 and FY2018 San Mateo County Shuttle Program
Draft Recommended Project List for Award

Rank	Score	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	Notes
30	58	JPB	Belmont/Hillsdale	Belmont	Existing	Commuter	\$246,900	\$185,200	Measure A	\$61,700	25%	no	



FY2017 and FY2018 San Mateo County Shuttle Program Draft Recommended Project List for Award

Rank	Score	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	Notes
31	57	SamTrans/ San Mateo	Connect San Mateo	San Mateo	New	Community	\$437,500	\$218,750	Measure A	\$218,750	50%	yes, 18%	new shuttle serving downtown San Mateo area
32	56	Commute.org	South San Francisco Centennial Towers	South San Francisco	Existing	Commuter	\$237,088	\$118,544	Measure A	\$118,544	50%	yes, 50%	
33	56	SamTrans/ San Carlos	San Carlos Community	San Carlos	New	Community	\$325,720	\$162,860	Measure A	\$162,860	50%	yes, 28%	new shuttle serving students in San Carlos hills
34	55	San Mateo County	County Parks Explorer	East Palo Alto/East Menlo Park/North Fair Oaks	New	Community	\$301,320	\$201,056	Measure A	\$100,264	33%	yes, 16%	new weekend-only shuttle service to Edgewood and Wunderlich County Parks
35	54	Commute.org	South San Francisco Ferry	South San Francisco	Existing	Commuter	\$437,764	\$284,546	Measure A	\$153,218	35%	yes, 10%	
36	54	Menlo Park	Mid-day	Menlo Park	Existing	Community	\$975,277	\$731,457	C/CAG	\$243,820	25%	no	existing shuttle adding new service to West Menlo Park
37	52	Menlo Park	Shoppers	Menlo Park	Existing	Community	\$79,313	\$59,485	Measure A	\$19,828	25%	no	door to door service
38	51	JPB	Norfolk Area	San Mateo	Existing	Commuter	\$227,800	\$170,900	Measure A	\$56,900	25%	yes, 25%	
39	8	Millbrae	Millbrae Shuttle Service	Millbrae	New	Community	\$526,000	\$197,250		\$65,750	13%	no	<i>not recommended for funding, major duplication with SamTrans bus service/ no concurrence letter, didn't obtain required technical assistance & didn't provide minimum 25% match</i>
Subtotals:							\$14,982,798	\$9,178,573	\$0	\$5,541,225	37%		

TA Measure A Local Shuttle Program Allocation: \$8,059,795
C/CAG Local Transportation Services Shuttle Program Allocation: \$921,528
Total TA-C/CAG Shuttle Funding Allocation: \$8,981,323
Total Funding Available for FY2015 & 2016 Shuttle Call for Projects: \$10,000,000

Funding Recommendation To Be Determined

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	Notes
San Mateo County	Coastside Beach	Half Moon Bay/ Unincorporated County	New	Community	\$140,000	\$105,000		\$35,000	25%	no	sponsor has requested deferral to further coordinate service plan with the community

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 25, 2016
To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee
From: John Hoang
Subject: Receive information on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan development
(For further information or response to questions, contact John Hoang at 650-363-4105)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ Committee receives information on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan development.

FISCAL IMPACT

\$185,000

SOURCE OF FUNDS

C/CAG Transportation Fund; Transportation Authority (TA); SamTrans

BACKGROUND

In 1988, the State legislature passed Assembly Bill 3705 (Eastin), authorizing Bay Area counties to develop Countywide Transportation Plans (CTPs) on a voluntary basis. The provisions in AB 3705 are codified in Section 66531 of the California Government Code, and were modified by the passage of AB 1619 (Lee) (Statutes of 1994, Chapter 25). Among other things, the law suggested content to be included in the CTPs, and, if a county chooses to prepare one, the relationship between the CTP and the RTP/SCS, and between the CTP and Congestion Management Programs (CMPs).

The law also directs MTC to “develop guidelines to be used in the preparation of county transportation plans.” In September 2014, MTC adopted its new Guidelines for Countywide Transportation Plans. It was MTC’s first updated Guidelines since year 2000.

CTPs are intended to establish a county’s long-range transportation vision, goals and priorities. The long-range transportation planning context is important given the complexity of the transportation system.

Upon the passage of State legislation mentioned above, and after several years of undertaking, C/CAG adopted its first Countywide Transportation Plan in 2001. Ten years later, C/CAG staff, in cooperation with a Working Group consisted of several city planners and other key stakeholders, prepared an incomplete yet substantially drafted CTP. Due to the departure of the lead C/CAG staff responsible for the project, the CTP update was put on-hold. Subsequently, in late 2012, C/CAG retained DKS Associates with the intension to complete the CTP update. Due to limited budget in the DKS contract, DKS was able use the materials previously prepared by C/CAG staff and created a Draft CTP.

However, that Draft CTP has not gone through the requisite outreach to ascertain all stakeholders and the public's viewpoints were reflected.

In February 2016, C/CAG executed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with project partners San Mateo County Transportation Authority and SamTrans to complete the new San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan. DKS has been retained to complete the CTP. A Project Team, comprised of key staff from C/CAG, TA, SamTrans, and Caltrain, was established to provide overall guidance and direction to the consultant towards the development of the CTP. In addition to the Project Team, a Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) would also be established. It was determined that the CMEQ Committee, with its diverse representation of elected officials and public members representing business, environmental, and transportation interests, would assume the role of the PAC.

As part of this initial PAC meeting, staff will be presenting the draft CTP visions, goals, and policies for the following categories: Land Use & Transportation, Roadway System, Bicycles, Pedestrians, Public Transportation, Transportation System Management, Transportation Demand Management, Parking, Modal Connectivity, Goods Movement, and Finance.

ATTACHMENTS

1. San Mateo Countywide Plan – Vision/Goals/Policy (Draft)

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION LINKAGE

1 LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION LINKAGE VISION, GOAL, AND POLICIES

Vision

A San Mateo County that is safe and convenient for all people on foot, by bicycle, via public transportation, and with an automobile to places people wish to go.

Goal

Integrate transportation and land use plans and decisions in support of a more livable and sustainable San Mateo County through a Countywide Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Policies

Integrate Land Use and Transportation Planning

- Integrate land use and transportation planning efforts where feasible at the local, county, and regional levels.
- Strengthen the pedestrian, bicycle, and shuttle bus circulation links among land uses, particularly within transit-orient development (TOD) areas.

Concentrate Development

- Concentrate new development in urban areas within the County of San Mateo's urban/rural boundary, particularly those designated as "Priority Development Areas".
- Promote higher density residential, employment, and mixed-use development near transit stations and along major bus transit corridors throughout the County to create pre-conditions for improved linkages between land use and transportation alternatives to the solo occupant automobile.
- Support the redevelopment of cities along the Caltrain and BART systems as a balanced mix of retail, office, and residential centers at intensities adequate to support transit service that is competitive with the private car.
- Emphasize transportation demand management (TDM) in planning for more concentrated development.

Enhance Rural Communities

- Ensure that rural San Mateo County has safe, convenient transportation links to activity centers and services.
- Protect Priority Conservation Areas from growth-inducing transportation projects.

Housing Supply

- Promote the development of a range of housing types along a spectrum of prices within the County, especially near transit stations and along major bus transit corridors.

LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION LINKAGE

- Support creation of “complete communities” for San Mateo County’s diverse population that contain an array of housing types affordable at different income levels and a range of community services.

Development Standards

- Give priority to development that encourages transit use, walking, and bicycling.
- Minimize motor vehicle traffic generated by new development, both within and adjacent to San Mateo County when the traffic impacts of such development spill out onto the San Mateo County highway network.
- Encourage the adoption of Smart Codes, Form-Based Codes and other enhancements in the development review and entitlement process to foster more walkable, bicycle-friendly, and transit-oriented land development patterns.
- Foster “universal design” in housing and transportation facilities so that access to both is readily available to all who work and or live in San Mateo County. This is especially critical as the population of San Mateo County ages.

Parking Management

- Consider adoption of parking reforms including parking maxima instead of minima, “unbundling” parking costs from the cost of housing and commercial space, and “shared” parking.
- Support comprehensive parking management plans and programs to optimize all parking resources.

Quality Public Places and Spaces

- Foster exemplary public places and spaces as focal points for the social, economic, and recreational life of communities.

ROADWAY SYSTEM

2 ROADWAY SYSTEM VISION, GOAL, AND POLICIES

Vision

A roadway system that contributes to the socio-economic and environmental health of San Mateo County.

Goal

Enhance safety and efficiency on the countywide roadway network to foster comfortable, convenient, and multi-modal mobility.

Policies

Improve the efficiency of the existing roadway system in San Mateo County

- Increasing the connectivity of the roadway system to provide more direct routes between origins and destinations.
- Provide auxiliary lanes on freeways to separate local and through traffic.
- Develop a more complete system of HOV lanes to provide an incentive for ridesharing and to increase transit operating speeds.
- Provide grade separation with Caltrain.

Focus capacity increasing program on the most congested commute corridors

- Constructing key highway projects that remove or reduce bottlenecks in the most congested commute corridors.

Improve connections with regional transportation facilities

- Construct or improve roadways that connect major inter county highway facilities and transit stations.

Enhance safety for travel by motorized modes

- Identifying and eliminating roadway hazards.
- Improving the geometric design of roadways where current design is creating vehicle conflicts and crashes.
- Creating separate lanes or facilities for non-motorized modes.
- Providing grade separation for Caltrain.

Maintain the roadway system

- Maintaining an inventory of roadway facilities and maintenance needs.
- Providing adequate funding for roadway maintenance.

3 BICYCLES VISION, GOALS, AND POLICIES

Progress toward improvement of the cycling conditions in San Mateo County requires a planned approach. A broad vision and a more focused goal to accompany it are needed to keep on course. A set of policies represents the means to achieve the goal and bring the vision to life. Specific performance objectives, accompanied by a set of performance measures, are needed to chart the amount and pace of progress toward achievement of policies, goal, and vision.

Vision

A San Mateo County in which walking for active transportation and recreation is safe, comfortable, and convenient.

Goal

Promote safe, convenient, and comfortable pedestrian travel in support of healthy, active communities while reducing reliance on the automobile for short trips.

Policies

Investment

- Direct funds for bicycle improvements to local jurisdictions for the planning, design, construction and maintenance of bicycle facilities of countywide priority.

A Convenient Travel Option

- Continue to develop a safe, reliable, comprehensive, and convenient bikeway system competitive in door-to-door with the automobile for many short distance trips.

Integration with Public Transit

- Encourage local agencies and transit operators, such as SamTrans, Caltrain and BART, to work cooperatively to promote bicycling to transit by improving access to and through stations and stops, installing bicycle parking and maximizing opportunities for on-board bicycle access.

Encouragement, Education, and Incentives

- Work with local, county and regional agencies and organizations – including those with a focus on public health – to develop effective encouragement programs that promote bicycling as a safe, convenient and healthy mode of transportation.
- Provide funding for effective support programs and events that encourage bicycling among a broad range of potential users.
- Encourage local school districts to implement projects and activities that promote bicycling to school among students and staff.
- Promote integration of bicycle-related services and activities into broader countywide transportation demand management and commute alternative programs.
- Provide support for programs that educate drivers and bicyclists about their rights and responsibilities, as well as traffic education and safety programs for adults and youth.

Safety

- Promote collaboration among the Sheriff’s Office, local police departments and other county and local agencies to develop and administer effective safety, education and enforcement strategies related to bicycling.
- Provide support for programs that educate drivers and bicyclists about their rights and responsibilities, as well as traffic education and safety programs for adults and youth.
- Collect and analyze data on traffic collisions involving bicyclists and share this information with local agencies to assist them in identifying and remedying problem locations.

Complete Streets

- Comply with the complete streets policy requirements of Caltrans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission concerning safe and convenient access for bicyclists, and assist local implementing agencies in meeting their responsibilities under the policy.
- For transportation projects funded by county or regional agencies, require that local implementing agencies incorporate “complete streets” principles as appropriate; that they provide at least equivalently safe and convenient alternatives if they result in the degradation of bicycle access; and that they provide temporary accommodations for bicyclists during construction.
- Monitor countywide transportation projects to ensure that the needs of bicyclists are considered in programming, planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance, and encourage local agencies to do the same for their projects.
- Provide support to local agencies in adopting policies, guidelines and standards for complete streets and routine accommodation of bicyclists in all new transportation projects.
- Strongly encourage local agencies to adopt policies, guidelines, standards and regulations that result in truly bicycle-friendly land use developments, and provide them technical assistance and support in this area.

Traffic Calming

- Support efforts to calm motor vehicle traffic to enhance travel conditions for bicyclists.

Barriers to Bicycle Access and Circulation

- Reduce barriers to bicycle access and circulation, including those caused by gaps in the bicycle facilities network and the severance effect on bicycle travel due to rail lines, freeways, and major arterial streets.

Financing

- Promote cooperation among local agencies and with San Francisco and Santa Clara counties to pursue funding for multi-jurisdictional bicycle projects and implement bicycle projects in their capital improvement programs.

Bike Sharing

- Encourage efforts to establish bike-sharing programs in communities throughout the County.

Priorities

- When allocating funds, give relative funding priority to projects that address safety deficiencies for bicyclists, especially conflicts with motor vehicles.
- In developing a countywide system of bicycle facilities, place special attention on implementing or improving north-south routes and reducing barriers to east-west access.
- Encourage and collaborate with Caltrans and local agencies to implement countywide priority bicycle facilities within their jurisdiction. In particular, encourage Caltrans to provide safe bicycle crossings of state highways in San Mateo County and local agencies to include bicycle projects in their capital improvement programs.
- Promote cooperation among local agencies and with San Francisco and Santa Clara counties to pursue funding for multi-jurisdictional projects and implement bicycle facilities across jurisdictional lines.
- Provide funding for support facilities, including short- and long-term bicycle parking, a countywide bikeway signage scheme, locker rooms, showers and other amenities in public facilities for changing and storing clothes and equipment.
- Support completion of the San Mateo County portion of the Bay Trail.

On-Going Bicycle Planning Activities

- Encourage all local jurisdictions to develop comprehensive bicycle plans, and provide assistance and support in this area as appropriate.
- Encourage all local jurisdictions to designate bicycle coordinators and to establish local bicycle or bicycle/pedestrian advisory committees, or provide other meaningful opportunities for public input on issues related to non-motorized transportation.
- Involve the public and local agencies meaningfully in making decisions about the planning, design and funding of bicycle projects, and maintain an open and accessible process for providing input and influencing decisions.
- Update the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan every five years, particularly to incorporate needed changes to the list of proposed bicycle projects of countywide priority.
- Provide timely information to local jurisdictions on funding programs and sources not administered by C/CAG that may be used to implement bicycle facilities, and encourage them to submit applications for project funding.

4 PEDESTRIANS VISION, GOALS, AND POLICIES

Progress toward improvement of the pedestrian environment in San Mateo County requires a planned approach. An over-arching vision and a more specific goal to accompany it are needed to keep on course. A set of policies comprises the means to achieve the goal and realize the broad vision. Specific performance objectives and an associated set of performance measures are needed to chart the amount and pace of progress toward achievement of policies, goal, and vision.

Vision

A San Mateo County in which walking for both active transportation and recreation is safe, comfortable, and convenient.

Goal

Promote safe, convenient, and comfortable pedestrian travel in support of healthy, active communities while reducing reliance on the automobile for short trips.

Policies

Investment

- Direct funds for pedestrian improvements to local jurisdictions for the planning, design, construction and maintenance of pedestrian facilities of countywide priority.

Integration with Public Transit

- Encourage local agencies and transit operators, such as SamTrans, Caltrain and BART, to work cooperatively to promote walking to transit by improving access to and through stations and stops, installing adequate pedestrian seating, and ensuring opportunities for access by people with disabilities.

Encouragement, Education, and Incentives

- Work with local, county and regional agencies and organizations – including those with a focus on public health – to develop effective encouragement programs that promote walking as a safe, convenient and healthy mode of transportation.
- Provide funding for effective support programs and events that facilitate mobility among a broad range of potential users, including pedestrians and people with disabilities.
- Encourage local school districts to implement projects and activities that promote walking to school among students and staff.
- Promote integration of pedestrian-related services and activities into broader countywide transportation demand management and commute alternatives programs.
- Provide support for programs that educate drivers and pedestrians about their rights and responsibilities, as well as traffic education and safety programs for adults and youth.

PEDESTRIANS

Safety

- Promote collaboration among the Sheriff’s Office, local police departments and other county and local agencies to develop and administer effective safety, education and enforcement strategies related to pedestrians.
- Collect and analyze data on traffic collisions involving pedestrians and share this information with local agencies to assist them in identifying and remedying problem locations.

Complete Streets

- Comply with the complete streets policy requirements of Caltrans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission concerning safe and convenient access for pedestrians, and assist local implementing agencies in meeting their responsibilities under the policy.
- For transportation projects funded by county or regional agencies, require that local implementing agencies incorporate “complete streets” principles as appropriate; that they provide at least equivalently safe and convenient alternatives if they result in the degradation of pedestrian access; and that they provide temporary accommodations for pedestrians during construction.
- Monitor countywide transportation projects to ensure that the needs of pedestrians are considered in programming, planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance, and encourage local agencies to do the same for their projects.
- Provide support to local agencies in adopting policies, guidelines and standards for complete streets and routine accommodation of pedestrians in all new transportation projects.
- Strongly encourage local agencies to adopt policies, guidelines, standards and regulations that result in truly pedestrian-friendly land use developments, and provide them technical assistance and support in this area.

Traffic Calming

- In areas with high levels of pedestrian traffic, encourage cities to implement appropriate traffic calming measures to slow approaching car speeds and thus lengthen reaction time available to both drivers and pedestrians in the event of a potential conflict.

Barriers to Pedestrian Access and Circulation

- Reduce barriers to pedestrian access and circulation, including those caused by gaps in the pedestrian facilities network and the severance effect on pedestrian travel due to rail lines, freeways, and major arterial streets.

Financing

- Promote cooperation among local agencies and with San Francisco and Santa Clara counties to pursue funding for multi-jurisdictional pedestrian projects and implement pedestrian projects in their capital improvement programs.

PEDESTRIANS

Priorities

- When allocating funds, give relative funding priority to projects that address safety deficiencies for pedestrians and people with disabilities, especially conflicts with motor vehicles.
- In developing a countywide system of pedestrian facilities, place special attention on implementing or improving north-south routes and reducing barriers to east-west access.
- Encourage and collaborate with Caltrans and local agencies to implement countywide priority pedestrian facilities within their jurisdiction. In particular, encourage Caltrans to provide safe pedestrian crossings of state highways in San Mateo County and local agencies to include pedestrian projects in their capital improvement programs.
- Promote cooperation among local agencies and with San Francisco and Santa Clara counties to pursue funding for multi-jurisdictional projects and implement pedestrian facilities across jurisdictional lines.
- Provide funding for support facilities, including locker rooms, showers and other amenities in public facilities for changing and storing clothes, and devices for improving accessibility for people with disabilities.

Land Use and Urban Design

- Encourage cities to promote land use patterns and developments that make walking a viable and inviting mode of transportation.
- Facilitate appropriate mixed use and transit-oriented development.
- Locate walkable destinations such as parks and markets within and near residential areas.
- Design residential and commercial districts with human-scaled, interesting buildings, low traffic speeds, landscaping, and pedestrian amenities such as benches.
- Encourage cities to place jobs in locations that stimulate walking. Evaluate and update land use designations to promote job growth within walking distance of transit stations and multi-family housing.
- Encourage sidewalks in industrial districts and office parks.

Parking Lots

- Encourage cities to locate parking lots behind businesses, rather than at the street front. Design parking lots with safe, attractive, and clearly marked pedestrian routes.

On-Going Pedestrian Planning Activities

- Encourage all local jurisdictions to develop comprehensive pedestrian plans, and provide assistance and support in this area as appropriate.
- Encourage all local jurisdictions to designate pedestrian coordinators and to establish local pedestrian or bicycle/pedestrian advisory committees or provide other meaningful opportunities for public input on issues related to non-motorized transportation.

PEDESTRIANS

- Involve the public and local agencies meaningfully in making decisions about the planning, designing and funding of pedestrian projects, and maintain an open and accessible process for providing input and influencing decisions.
- Update the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan every five years, particularly to incorporate needed changes to the list of proposed pedestrian projects of countywide priority.
- Provide timely information to local jurisdictions on funding programs and sources not administered by C/CAG that may be used to implement pedestrian facilities, and encourage them to submit applications for project funding.

5 PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION VISION, GOALS, AND POLICIES

There needs to be a structured approach to making the public transit system in San Mateo County as effective and efficient as possible. This in turn requires a comprehensive Vision accompanied by a more explicit goal and set of policies by which to achieve the goal. These policies are operationalized through a set of Performance Objectives. Progress toward achievement of these Objectives is charted through Performance Measures. BART, SamTrans and Caltrain have each developed Strategic Plans and will be updating their respective plans over time. These Strategic Plans outline the goals, policies and objectives for their systems as well as performance metrics. C/CAG's Vision, Goal, Policies and Objectives for public transit listed here are consistent with those of the Strategic Plans of BART, SamTrans, and Caltrain. Each organization is responsible for developing its policies related to these principles. Performance Measures that can be useful in tracking progress toward meeting the Objectives or in defining needs and gaps in transit serve in future planning and programming efforts are provided in **Appendix A**.

Vision

A public transportation system in San Mateo County that provides essential mobility for all, offers a competitive alternative to the automobile, and contributes to environmental and socio-economic well-being.

Goal

Develop and maintain a seamless, safe and convenient public transportation system in San Mateo County focused on the customer.

Policies

Develop Improved Service Efficiency and Cost-effectiveness to Increase the Utility of Public Transportation

- Continue to tailor public transportation service in response to the needs of the traveling public.
- Avoid or minimize transit service duplication within target markets of the San Mateo County public transportation system.
- Reduce where possible conflicts between modes or services that are resulting in congestion and higher operating costs.
- Identify ways to reduce operating cost through the application of new or different technologies for propulsion, communication, system operation and management.
- Explore ways to emphasize the role of transit hubs of regional importance to improve service coordination.

Enhance Access to Public Transit

- Work cooperatively with local law enforcement agencies to improve the safety of passengers while on public transportation vehicles and while getting to and from the service.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION VISION, GOALS, AND POLICIES

- Examine ways to cost-effectively improve the east-west connectivity of public transportation services.
- Continue to research the needs of special populations, including seniors, persons with disabilities, low income transit dependents and those for whom English is a second language and explore ways to meet their needs.
- Continue to explore and evaluate amenities to enhance the transit experience and reduce travel times.
- Advocate for funding opportunities to create a more stable, predictable financial base for public transportation in San Mateo County.

Encourage a Customer-friendly Public Transportation System that is Logical, Intuitive, and Easy to Use

- Continue to explore ways to improve the coordination and interface of transit services, schedules, and information among multiple providers within San Mateo County with the goal of developing a seamless network for the user.
- Continue to explore ways to provide easily understood bus and train service information at transit stations and other stops to reduce customer anxiety about accessing transit service.

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT VISION, GOAL, AND POLICIES

6 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT VISION, GOAL, AND POLICIES

Improved transportation systems management in San Mateo County requires a strategic approach. A broad vision and a more specific goal to accompany it are needed for guidance set of policies comprise the means to achieve the goal and realize the broad vision. Specific performance objectives and an associated set of performance measures are needed to chart the amount and pace of progress toward achievement of policies, goal, and vision.

Vision

A San Mateo County in which the transportation system is efficient, cost-effective, and environmentally responsible.

Goal

Manage travel efficiently through supply-side measures, including low-cost traffic operations improvements and use of electronics that reduce or eliminate the need for increases in physical capacity.

Policies

Increase Efficiency on Existing Facilities Before Adding New Capacity

- Invest in enhanced traffic signal system capabilities, provision of center left turn pockets, improved incident detection and management, and similar traffic management measures to reduce vehicle delay on San Mateo County roadways before investment in new through lane capacity.

Deploy Advanced Information and Communications Technology to Manage and Reduce Vehicular Travel

- Continue investment in initiatives such as the Smart Corridor project and public transit traveler information systems that disseminate information about real time travel conditions and options to San Mateo County travelers as well as enhance roadway efficiency.

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT VISION, GOAL, AND POLICIES

7 TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT VISION, GOAL, AND POLICIES

Success in managing transportation demand in San Mateo County requires a strategic approach. This begins with a clear, broad vision. A more defined goal to achieve the vision helps bring focus. Policies comprise the means to attain the goal and bring the vision to life. Specific performance objectives and an associated set of performance measures are the navigational tools used to monitor progress toward realization of policies, goal, and vision.

Vision

A San Mateo County in which reliance on solo occupant motor vehicle travel is minimized.

Goal

Reduce and manage travel efficiently through demand-side measures, including land use planning and transportation demand management efforts at work sites.

Policies

Focus on Reducing the Need to Travel and the Distance of Travel

- Encourage telecommute programs, satellite work centers, teleconferences, and other substitute for travel within San Mateo County.

Involve Private and Public Sector Employers in Efforts to Reduce the Amount of Vehicular Travel

- Support reduction of solo occupant vehicle use through employer-based commute alternatives incentive programs in San Mateo County. Include employee transportation coordinators and transportation management associations (TMAs) as key components of this effort.

Improve Access to Destinations by Means of Non-Motorized Modes and Local Shuttles to Reduce the Need to Travel by Private Vehicle

- Promote transit-oriented development, traditional neighborhood design, improved bicycle, pedestrian and local transit connections to activity centers and similar efforts to reduce the need to travel by private motor vehicle to, from, and among destinations within San Mateo County.

8 PARKING VISION, GOAL, AND POLICIES

Optimizing the San Mateo County parking system in San Mateo County communities needs to take place in a planned, structured way. A broad vision and a more explicit goal to accompany it are needed to help chart progress. A set of policies constitute the means to achieve the goal and realize the broad vision. Specific performance objectives and an associated set of performance measures indicate how much progress is being made in attaining the policies, goal, and vision.

Vision

Parking in San Mateo County that is a “right-sized” balance of supply and demand, supportive of Smart Growth and Transit Oriented Development strategies, intuitive to use, and environmentally responsible

Goal

Encourage innovations in parking policy and programs, including incentives for reduced parking requirements, and a comprehensive approach to parking management, in furtherance of countywide transportation system goals

Policies

Support Reduction of Parking Supply

- Encourage adoption of parking reforms including parking maxima instead of minima, and “unbundling” parking costs from the cost of housing and commercial space.
- Support comprehensive parking management programs to optimize all parking resources, off-street and on-street.
- Use technology to minimize the land area needed for parking.

Facilitate Shared Parking Arrangements to Increase the Efficiency of Parking Provision and Reduce the Costs of Parking Provision.

- Advocate shared parking arrangements when and where feasible.

Encourage Implementation of “Green” Parking Lot Initiatives That Serve to Reduce Storm Water Runoff.

- Promote the San Mateo County “Green Streets and Parking Lots Program” approach of using swales, permeable pavements, “rain gardens”, and landscaping to capture storm water runoff, enhance aesthetics, and mitigate the urban and suburban “heat island” effect.

Foster Emplacement of Solar Panels on Parking Lots and Structures to Conserve Energy.

- Encourage projects like the County of San Mateo “Solar Genesis” project to create new sources of renewable energy above parking structures and parking lots, increasing the utility of these facilities without hampering their parking function.

PARKING VISION, GOAL, AND POLICIES

Promote Installation of “Smart” Parking Meters and Real-Time Parking Information Dissemination in San Mateo County Public Parking Facilities.

- Foster implementation of “smart” meter projects similar to the initiative in Redwood City to increase parking customer convenience and create opportunities for demand-responsive pricing for on-street and off-street public parking facilities.

Ensure Adequate Wayfinding to Parking Facilities in San Mateo County.

- Promote implementation of programs to enhance public information about parking availability, thus decreasing the amount of traffic congestion caused by motorists searching for parking and increasing the convenience of parking customers.

Encourage Placement of Parking Facilities in Locations That Do Not Disrupt Pedestrian Travel or Create a Hazard for Pedestrians

- Discourage location of parking structure and lot entrances on streets that have or are planned to have a substantial flow of pedestrian traffic in order to minimize a potential safety hazard for pedestrians, increase parker convenience, and avoid creating “dead” spaces on shopping streets.

Promote Adequate, Secure, and Safe Bicycle Parking at San Mateo County Shops, Store, and Offices.

- Ensure that clean, energy-efficient, and healthful transportation by bicycle is not frustrated by lack of safe, secure parking at the destination end of the cycling trip.

Encourage Development of Master Parking Management Plans for Downtowns and Other Activity Centers in San Mateo County

- Support local government efforts to prepare parking master plans that optimize parking capacity by managing parking demand and “right-sizing” parking capacity.

Reduce On-street Parking Along El Camino Real

- Preserve street capacity and reduce safety concerns associated with parking vehicles, especially in redeveloping areas.

9 MODAL CONNECTIVITY VISION, GOAL, AND POLICIES

Enhancing intermodal connections in San Mateo County requires a policy framework that includes an overall vision and a clear goal to guide policy development and implementation. A suite of policies should link directly back to the goal and vision. Performance objectives define policy aims and performance measures operationalize them so that progress in achieving the objectives can be measured.

Vision

Parking in San Mateo County that is a “right-sized” balance of supply and demand, supportive of seamless travel within San Mateo County.

Goal

Integrate the roadway, public transit, and non-motorized modes transportation networks to advance system efficiency, effectiveness, and convenience.

Policies

Promote Interagency Co-ordination in Planning, Design, and Operation of Services at Public Transit Stations in San Mateo County.

- Customers should be afforded as convenient and stress-free experience as feasible in assessing public transit services, including transfers from one mode and /or operator to another.

Enhance Dissemination of Information on Intermodal Travel Opportunities within and to/from San Mateo County.

- Provide timely information on connections between and among bus, rail, private automobile, and non-motorized modes of travel.
- Improve wayfinding to and service information dissemination at public transit station platforms through electronic changeable signage and more traditional static sign

Remove the Physical Barriers to Intermodal Travel, including Difficult Intersection Crossing Conditions Leading to San Mateo County Transit Stations and Stops

- Encourage clean, efficient intermodal travel by making access to public transit stations safe, convenient, and comfortable for pedestrians and bicyclists. Promote bicycle and pedestrian safety at intersections in the environs of public transit stations and stops.

Encourage Efficient Intermodal Transit Service Scheduling at Public Transit Stations and Other Transit Transfer Locations

- Decrease waiting time for public transit passengers and increase convenience of public transit travel through improved integration of bus and rail transit service schedules.

Consider Satellite Transit Transfer Hubs When and Where Feasible

- Transfer facilities in satellite locations for passenger interchange among line haul bus service routes, as well as between line haul transit services and community, as well as

MODAL CONNECTIVITY VISION, GOAL, AND POLICIES

employer shuttle buses may increase customer convenience while at the same time reduce congestion at major public transit hubs.

Ensure Adequate Bicycle Parking Conveniently Located at Public Transit Stations in San Mateo County

- Promote the clean, energy efficient access to public transit that the bicycle provides by making bicycle parking an important priority at San Mateo County transit stations and other stops.

Support “Right-sized” Auto Parking at San Mateo County Public Transit Stations Through Development of Transit Station Area Parking Management Plans

- Promote “right-sized” parking provision for private autos at transit stations so that there is sufficient parking for patrons. Station area parking management plans should include consideration of pricing policy for station parking facilities and either or both time zoning and nominal cost pricing for nearby on-street parking.

DRAFT

10 GOODS MOVEMENT VISION, GOAL, AND POLICIES

An overall policy framework is needed to encourage safer, more efficient, and cleaner freight movement in San Mateo County includes an over-arching vision and a compelling goal to guide policy development and implementation. A set of policies should connect directly back to the goal and vision. Performance objectives set forth policy aims concisely and performance measures operationalize them so that progress in attaining the objectives is measurable.

Vision

Goods movement that supports a sustainable San Mateo County.

Goal

Foster safe and efficient goods movement compatible with countywide economic development and environmental policies.

Policies

Enhance safety and capacity on truck routes within San Mateo County.

- Ensure adequate turning radii, lane widths, vertical and horizontal clearances, and operational improvements at freeway interchange bottlenecks on designated truck routes to promote safe, efficient goods movement.

Promote Use of Low and Zero Emissions Technologies for Truck Freight in San Mateo County.

- Support use of cleaner motive power in goods movement to protect the San Mateo County environment.

11 FINANCIAL VISION, GOAL, AND POLICIES

C/CAG will work with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA), The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to develop funding plans and priorities.

Vision

Sustainable funding sources to maintain, operate, optimize, and expand all modes of the transportation networks in San Mateo County.

Goal

Seek and protect transportation revenues to maintain existing transportation infrastructure and investments, and to improve all modes of transportation systems within San Mateo County in a balanced fashion.

Policies

Support the protection of the existing infrastructure.

- C/CAG supports a “fix-it-first” approach to transportation funding in general, due to the limited revenue dedicated to roadway rehabilitation. The maintenance and restoration of existing structures and facilities is a cost effective use of limited funds. For example, a city that spend \$1 on timely maintenance to keep a section of roadway in good condition can avoid spending \$5 to restore the same road that is allowed to deteriorate to the point where major rehabilitation is necessary. The “fix-it-first” approach also extends to support state funding for the SHOPP, which would help Caltrans maintain mobility throughout the state highway system.

Support increasing the operational efficiency of the existing transportation network.

- San Mateo County is built out especially along the El Camino Real and US 101 corridors. Given that most of the transportation corridor right of ways are built and cannot easily be expanded, it makes sense to seek to optimize the operational efficiency of the existing transportation network where appropriate. Examples of optimizing the existing system include but are not limited through the use of intelligent transportation systems (ITS), and ramp metering. Increasing the efficiency of the existing transit system should also be supported such as providing support for Caltrain enhancements as well as development of rapid transit corridors (e.g. preserve capacity on major arterial roadways to facilitate Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)).

Support a dedicated source of funds for Caltrain.

- Caltrain is managed through a joint powers agreement between transit agencies in San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and does not currently have a dedicated source of funds. Caltrain is unlike other bay area transit agencies that are funded with dedicated taxes, and must rely heavily on member agency contributions. Caltrain makes yearly funding request from its member agencies. Member agency contribution levels are not compulsory and tend to fluctuate with the economic

conditions of its member agencies. Caltrain needs a steady source of revenue for continued reliable operations.

Support expansion projects when and where it is appropriate.

- Certain appropriate expansion projects could greatly improve the operation efficiency of the overall system. There are also cases where expansion projects can show high user benefit in terms of travel time savings or safety improvements. Detailed traffic analysis would have to show that clear benefits can be gained where expansion projects are proposed. Example projects considered might be the reconfiguration of intersections and interchanges or the inclusion of high occupancy vehicle lanes (HOV) where it is warranted and appropriate.

Priority of the STIP towards State Highway Improvement Projects

- Total shortfalls for transit and roadway are fairly similar for San Mateo County, but the entire transit program is nearly twice the size of the roads program. As a relatively larger shortfall is projected on roads and highways, directing STIP funds towards roads and highways will address a small amount of the proportional shortfall.

Support a balanced integrated approach to finance a variety of transportation modes

- It is understood that there is no individual project that can solve the congestion within the county. Solutions have to come from a variety of projects ranging from technological solutions like ITS installations, operational infrastructure improvements such as reconfiguring intersections, transportation demand management (TDM), and alternative mode accommodations.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 25, 2016

To: C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ)

From: Eliza Yu, Transportation Programs Specialist

Subject: Receive information on the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 3

(For further information, contact Eliza Yu at 650-599-1453 or eyu@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ will receive information on the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 3.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Active Transportation Program (ATP) funds will be derived from: the Federal Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) (includes Safe Routes to Schools, and a portion (about 40%) of the Recreational Trails grant programs), State Highway Account funds, Bicycle Transportation Account, Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program, California's Safe Routes to Schools program and \$21 million of federal Highway Safety Improvement Program funds.

The total ATP Cycle 3 allocation statewide is estimated to be approximately \$230 million comprised of funds for two fiscal years: FY 19/20 and FY 20/21. The amount of the total program may increase depending on the effect of new federal transportation bill, called the Fixing American's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. Similar to previous ATP calls, 50% of the total funds are to be allocated through a statewide competitive call for projects, 40% are set aside for regional competitive calls for projects, and 10% are to be distributed to small urban and rural areas by a separate competitive call for projects.

BACKGROUND

The Active Transportation Program (ATP) was established by Senate Bill 99, Senate Bill 95 and Assembly Bill 101. ATP was signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown in September 2013. ATP rolls most of our state and federal funding sources set aside for trails, bicycling, and pedestrian related projects into one competitive grant fund, which totals approximately \$120 million annually. The creation of one larger program raises the profile of active transportation projects in the state, and streamlines the process for funding bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure by

reducing administrative costs. MTC is estimated to receive and allocate \$20.1 million in total for the regional ATP Cycle 3 Call for Projects.

DISCUSSION

On April 15, 2016, the ATP Call for Projects was issued concurrently for both the statewide and regional program where CTC released the Final Adopted ATP Cycle 3 Guidelines, Application and Evaluation Scoring Rubric. These documents have been attached to this agenda report for your reference.

San Mateo County has had difficulties in the past in receiving ATP grants in part due to the ATP program's previous scoring criteria that favored disadvantaged communities. Other jurisdictions have shared this issue and brought their concerns to MTC and CTC. Changes to the scoring allocation of points for projects benefiting disadvantaged communities have been a reoccurring issue and has since been revised.

State law requires at least 25 percent of ATP funds benefit disadvantaged communities. MTC defines these Communities of Concern as those large concentrations of:

- Minority residents
- Household incomes under 200 percent of the federal poverty level
- Limited English-proficient households
- Zero-vehicle households
- Seniors age 75 or older
- Residents with a disability
- Single-parent families
- Rent-burdened households

Another reoccurring issue that has been brought up to MTC is the local match requirement. MTC requires project sponsors seeking regional ATP grants to put up matching funds totaling at least 11.47 percent of the grant amount. The match requirement may be waived for projects that benefit low-income communities, communities of color, Safe Routes to School projects, or stand-alone non-infrastructure projects. The statewide ATP grant program currently does not require a local match to be eligible for the grant.

Applications at the statewide and regional level are both due on **June 15, 2016**.

ATTACHMENTS

1. CTC's ATP Cycle 3 Final Adopted Guidelines
2. CTC's ATP Cycle 3 Final Draft Application and Scoring Criteria
3. MTC's Regional ATP Cycle 3 Guidelines

The attachments can be downloaded from the following link:

<http://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/ATP-Attachment-April-2016-CMEQ.pdf>