

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*

1:15 p.m., Thursday, April 21, 2016
San Mateo County Transit District Office¹
1250 San Carlos Avenue, 2nd Floor Auditorium
San Carlos, California

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) AGENDA

- | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations are customarily limited to 3 minutes). | Porter/Hurley | No materials |
| 2. Issues from the last C/CAG Board meetings (Retreat in April): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• None | | No materials |
| 3. Approval of the minutes from March 17, 2016 | Hoang | Page 1-4 |
| 4. Receive a presentation on the County Aerial Imagery (Information) | Thames
(SM Co) | No materials |
| 5. Review and recommend approval of the Proposed One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Framework (Action) | Higaki | Page 5-10 |
| 6. Review and recommend approval of the Measure M 5-Year Implementation Plan (Fiscal Year 2016/17- 2020/21) (Action) | Hoang | Page 11-21 |
| 7. 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 | Page 22-26 |
| 8. Receive information on the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 3 (Information) | Yu | Page 27-28 |
| 9. Regional Project and Funding Information (Information) | Higaki | No materials |
| 10. Executive Director Report | Wong | No materials |
| 11. Member Reports | All | |

¹ For public transit access use SamTrans Bus lines 260, 295, 390, 391, KX or take CalTrain to the San Carlos Station and walk two blocks up San Carlos Avenue. Driving directions: From Route 101 take the Holly Street (west) exit. Two blocks past El Camino Real go left on Walnut. The entrance to the parking lot is at the end of the block on the left, immediately before the ramp that goes under the building. Enter the parking lot by driving between the buildings and making a left into the elevated lot. Follow the signs up to the levels for public parking.

2016 TAC Roster and Attendance				
No.	Member	Agency	Jan	Mar
1	Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering		x
2	Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	x	x
3	Afshin Oskoui	Belmont Engineering	x	x
4	Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering		x
5	Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x	x
6	Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning		
7	Sandy Wong	C/CAG		x
8	Brad Donohue	Colma Engineering	x	
9	John Fuller	Daly City Engineering		x
10	Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x	
11	Jeff Moneda	Foster City Engineering	x	x
12	Paul Willis	Hillsborough Engineering	x	x
13	Justin Murphy	Menlo Park Engineering	x	x
14	Peter Vorametsanti	Millbrae Engineering	x	
15	Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering	x	
16	Jessica Manzi	Redwood City Engineering	x	x
17	Jimmy Tan	San Bruno Engineering	x	x
18	Jay Walter	San Carlos Engineering	x	x
19	Brad Underwood	San Mateo Engineering	x	x
20	Brian McMinn	South San Francisco Engineering	x	x
21	Billy Gross	South San Francisco Planning	x	x
22	Kevin Mulder	MTC	n/a	x
23		Caltrans		

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

March 17, 2016
MINUTES

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

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

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None.

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

Approved.

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

Approved.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discussions and comments were as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

10. Regional Project and Funding Information

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

11. Executive Director Report

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

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

12. Member Reports

None.

Meeting adjourned.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 21, 2016

To: C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC)

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@smc.gov)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMP TAC 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, 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 target the September BPAC meeting and October board meeting to 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.

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 21, 2016
To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
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 TAC 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 CMP TAC and Congestion Management and Environmental Quality

(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 21, 2016

To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

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 Program TAC 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 21, 2016

To: C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMPTAC)

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 CMP TAC will receive information on the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 3 Application and Scoring Criteria.

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. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) will issue a statewide call for projects and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) will administer a regional call for projects for the Bay Area.

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.

DISCUSSION

On March 30, 2016, the Call for Projects was issued concurrently for both the statewide and regional program where CTC released the Final Draft of the ATP Cycle 3 Guidelines, Application and Draft 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 favors 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 was a reoccurring issue and have now 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

- ATP Cycle 3 Final Draft Application, ATP Cycle 3 Draft Scoring Criteria, MTC's Regional ATP Guidelines documents can be downloaded from following link:

<http://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Attachment-to-Item-8-ATP.pdf>