



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, May 18, 2020

**Time:** 3:00 p.m.

On March 17, 2020, the Governor issued Executive Order N-29-20 suspending certain provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act in order to allow for local legislative bodies to conduct their meetings telephonically or by other electronic means. Pursuant to the Shelter in-Place Orders issued by the San Mateo County Health Officer and the Governor, and the CDC’s social distancing guidelines, which discourage large public gatherings, C/CAG meetings will be conducted via remote conferencing. Members of the public may observe or participate in the meeting remotely via one of the options below.

**Join Zoom Meeting:**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87112562804?pwd=WGxHOXRbZlZUxtYmEwRFp5TFE4QT09>

**Meeting ID: 871 1256 2804**

**Password: 039150**

**Join by Phone: +1-669-900-6833**

**Meeting ID: 871 1256 2804**

**Password: 039150**

Persons who wish to address the C/CAG CMEQ Committee on an item to be considered at this meeting, or on items not on this agenda, are asked to submit written comments to [jlacap@smcgov.org](mailto:jlacap@smcgov.org). Spoken public comments will also be accepted during the meeting through Zoom. Please see instructions for written and spoken public comments at the end of this agenda.

- 
- |   |                                     |              |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the agenda  | Presentations are limited to 3 mins | No Materials |
| 2. Issues from the May 2020 C/CAG Board meeting:<br><br>• Staff will provide an update at the meeting   | Information (Lacap)                 | No Materials |
| 3. Approval of minutes of April 27, 2020 meeting  | Action (Garbarino)                  | Page 1 - 4   |
| 4. Review Economic Stimulus Staff report and receive update on Economic Stimulus Activities.  | Information (Charpentier)           | Page 5 - 11  |
| 5. Review and recommend approval C/CAG distribution policy for Fiscal Year 2020 -21 State Transit Assistance (STA) Population- Based funds among the STA-eligible transit operators and funds that will be spent benefiting Communities of Concern for the subsequent fiscal year | Action (Charpentier)                | Page 12 – 22 |



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

- |  |                         |              |
|--|-------------------------|--------------|
| 6. Executive Director Report.  | Information (Wong)      | No Materials |
| 7. Member comments and announcements.  | Information (Garbarino) | No Materials |
| 8. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date:<br><b>June 29, 2020</b> | Action (Garbarino)      | No Materials |

**PUBLIC NOTICING:** All notices of C/CAG regular Board meetings, standing committee meetings, and special meetings will be posted at the San Mateo County Transit District Office, 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA, and on C/CAG’s website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>.

**PUBLIC RECORDS:** Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular Board meeting, standing committee meeting, or special meeting are available for public inspection. Those public records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to a regular Board meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the Board. The Board has designated the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), located at 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, for the purpose of making public records available for inspection. Such public records are also available on C/CAG’s website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>. Please note that C/CAG’s office is temporarily closed to the public; please contact Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406 to arrange for inspection of public records.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION DURING VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETINGS:** Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services to participate in this meeting should contact Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

Written comments should be emailed in advance of the meeting. Please read the following instructions carefully:

1. Your written comment should be emailed to [jlacap@smcgov.org](mailto:jlacap@smcgov.org).
2. Your email should include the specific agenda item on which you are commenting or note that your comment concerns an item that is not on the agenda.
3. Members of the public are limited to one comment per agenda item.
4. The length of the emailed comment should be commensurate with the two minutes customarily allowed for verbal comments, which is approximately 250-300 words.
5. If your emailed comment is received at least 2 hours prior to the meeting, it will be provided to the C/CAG CMEQ Committee members, made publicly available on the C/CAG website along with the agenda, and read aloud by C/CAG staff during the meeting. We cannot guarantee that emails received less than 2 hours before the meeting will be read during the meeting, but such emails will be included in the administrative record of the meeting.

Spoken comments will be accepted during the meeting through Zoom. Please read the following instructions carefully:

1. The C/CAG Board meeting may be accessed through Zoom at the online location indicated at the top of this agenda.
2. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting using an internet browser. If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, Safari 7+. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer.
3. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by your name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.
4. When C/CAG staff or CMEQ Chair call for the item on which you wish to speak, click on “raise hand.” Staff will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called on to speak.
5. When called, please limit your remarks to the time allotted.

If you have any questions about this agenda, please contact C/CAG staff: Jeff Lacap 650-599-1455 or [jlacap@smcgov.org](mailto:jlacap@smcgov.org)

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

**MINUTES  
MEETING OF April 27, 2020**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Garbarino at 3:05 p.m. via Zoom Videoconference. Attendance sheet is attached.

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

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Staff, provided videoconferencing procedures to the committee members and staff in attendance. Roll call for attendance was taken.

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

None.

**3. Issues from the April 2020 C/CAG Board meeting. (Information)**

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Staff, noted the agenda listed the status of items recently addressed by the C/CAG Board, and offered to respond to any questions.

**4. Approval of minutes of the February 24, 2020 meeting. (Action)**

*Motion – Committee member Lee/ 2<sup>nd</sup> Committee member Bonilla: To approve the minutes of the January 27, 2020 CMEQ meeting. Motion passed (10-0). (Member Levin joined the meeting after this item)*

**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 2020/2021 and FY 2021/2022. (Action)**

Susy Kalkin, C/CAG staff, presented the results of the Call for Projects for the current cycle of the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program. The \$10 million in funding for the two-year program is provided by C/CAG Congestion Relief Plan Program funds, which provides \$1,000,000 (\$500,000 for FY 20/21 and \$500,000 for FY 21/22), and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Measure A Program funds, which provide approximately \$9 million for the two-year funding cycle.

Applications were received from 8 sponsors for 34 different shuttles. Thirty of the proposed shuttles met the program requirements and are under consideration for funding. The total eligible sponsor request is for approximately \$11 million, exceeding the \$10 million in funds available for the program.

The committee members had the following comments/questions:

- The effects of ridership due to COVID-19
- Whether the spending of funds can be delayed due to COVID-19

- Whether there will be a health and safety plan required for each shuttle in response to COVID-19
- A consideration of microtransit as an alternative to shuttles

*Motion – Committee member Papan/ 2nd Committee member Lee: To recommend approval of the project list for funding under the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for FY 2020/2021 and FY 2021/2022 with the condition that the project sponsor provide a safety and security plan for each recommended shuttle. Motion passed unanimously (11-0).*

**6. Review and recommend acceptance of Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Regional Fund and approval of local matching funds for the Rideshare to Transit Pilot in a total amount of \$579,000. (Action)**

Kim Wever, C/CAG Staff, presented on the Rideshare to Transit Pilot project, which reduces single-occupancy vehicle trips by providing incentives to San Mateo County residents for using rideshare services to take transit during peak commute periods. This pilot aims at providing solutions to the first-mile challenge between commuters’ homes and transit stations.

The committee members had the following comments/questions:

- The business practices of Transportation Network Companies (TNC’s) in the classification of its drivers as independent contractors to avoid providing employee benefits
- Consider delaying the launch date of the pilot due to COVID-19.
- Required health and safety plans from prospective vendors in response to COVID-19
- In short, this pilot program would not be duplicative of Commute.org’s programs

*Motion – Committee member Bonilla: To recommend acceptance of Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Regional Fund and approval of local matching funds for the Rideshare to Transit Pilot in a total amount of \$579,000 with the condition that the project utilizes vendors/partners that are in compliance with state labor laws as opposed to those that avoid providing employee benefits.*

*Member Beach amended the motion to reconsider the timing of the launch of pilot program in response to COVID-19. Member Bonilla accepted the amendment and Member Mates seconded. Papan, Beach, Roberts, Garbarino, Bonilla, Levin, Koelling, Mates, Alba approved. O’Neill opposed. Motion passes (9-1). (Member Lee left the meeting prior to the vote)*

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

Executive Director Sandy Wong introduced to the committee the new C/CAG Program Directors: Kaki Cheung and Sean Charpentier. Sandy ended her report by showing the ‘C/CAG COVID-19 Corner’ webpage on the C/CAG website providing links to each member agency’s respective COVID-19 webpage and a section providing any relevant highlights to which an agency would like to call attention to.

**8. Member comments and announcements (Information)**

Member Papan announced that MTC has suspended congestion pricing on tolls at bridge crossings excluding carpools and trucks. MTC has also distributed the first apportionment of the CARES Act to support transit agencies in the Bay Area, including BART, Caltrain, and SamTrans during this crisis. MTC will also be requiring transit agencies to submit health and safety plans and coordination plans with other transit agencies in order to receive the second apportionment of funds.

Chair Garbarino asked Member Bonilla to check if the council chambers at San Mateo City Hall will be available for the next CMEQ meeting.

**9. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date**

The meeting adjourned at 4:33 pm.

The next regular meeting was scheduled for May 18, 2020.

2020 C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee Attendance Report													
Name	Representing	Jan	Feb	Mar (Canceled)	Apr	May	Jun	Jul (No Mtg.)	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec (No Mtg.)
Gina Papan (MTC Commissioner)	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	X	X		X								
Shelly Masur (Redwood City Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X										
Emily Beach (Burlingame City Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X		X								
Lennie Roberts	Environmental Community	X			X								
Mike O'Neill (Pacifica City Council Member)	Elected Official	X			X								
Rich Garbarino (South San Francisco City Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X		X								
Wayne Lee (Millbrae City Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X		X								
Rick Bonilla (San Mateo City Council Member)	Elected Official	X			X								
Adina Levin	Agencies with Transportation Interests	X	X		X								
Linda Koelling	Business Community	X	X		X								
Peter Ratto	San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)	X	X		X								
Julia Mates (Belmont City Council Member)	Elected Official	X			X								
Public Member	Jessica Alba	N/A	X		X								
<i>Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)</i>	<i>Vacant</i>												
<i>Elected Official</i>	<i>Vacant</i>												
<i>Elected Official</i>	<i>Vacant</i>												

**Staff and guests in attendance for the April 27, 2020 Meeting**

Sandy Wong, Jeff Lacap, Sean Charpentier, Kim Wever, Kaki Cheung, Susy Kalkin - C/CAG Staff  
Peter Skinner - SamTrans

## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: May 18, 2020  
To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee  
From: Sean Charpentier, Program Director  
Subject: Review Economic Stimulus Staff report and receive update on Economic Stimulus Activities.

(For further information or questions, contact Sean Charpentier at 650-599-1462)

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Review Economic Stimulus Staff report and receive update on Economic Stimulus Activities.

### FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact associated with this item.

### BACKGROUND

The COVID-19 pandemic has imposed a severe social and economic cost on the Bay Area, the State, and the Nation. The Federal Government has passed three stimulus bills in response to the crisis. There is the possibility of additional stimulus legislation that might include a focus on jobs, infrastructure investment, and other activities related to economic recovery. Other County Transportation Agencies (also known as Congestion Management Agencies) throughout the Bay Area are beginning to identify potential projects that could be included in a potential stimulus package. As such, C/CAG staff is taking the initiative to compile projects in San Mateo County to be prepared. There is uncertainty about the form and details of the next stimulus legislation, such as the amount of funding, the project criteria, and how the funds would be distributed. It is highly likely that the criteria would include an emphasis on project readiness to accelerate investment and the creation of jobs.

Past economic stimulus efforts often focused on the immediate investment of funds for construction projects due to the large and diverse number of jobs created by construction projects. The 2009 ARRA had a goal of allocating 50% of the funds to projects that were under construction within 120 days.

### ANALYSIS

Staff will provide an update on this topic. Attachment 1 is the C/CAG Board Staff report on this topic from May 14, 2020.

### ATTACHMENTS

1. C/CAG Staff Report May 14, 2020

## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: May 14, 2020

To: City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Board of Directors

From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director

Subject: Receive information on the preparation of a draft list of projects for potential Economic Stimulus legislation and provide input.

(For further information or questions, contact Sean Charpentier at 650-599-1462)

---

### RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board discuss the draft list of projects for potential Economic Stimulus legislation. This item is for information only.

### FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact associated with this item.

### BACKGROUND

The COVID-19 pandemic has imposed a severe social and economic cost on the Bay Area, the State, and the Nation. The Federal Government has passed three stimulus bills in response to the crisis. The transportation components of the bills have included funds for transit operators. There is the possibility of additional stimulus legislation that might include a focus on jobs, infrastructure investment, and other activities related to economic recovery. Other County Transportation Agencies (also known as Congestion Management Agencies) throughout the Bay Area are beginning to identify potential projects that could be included in a potential stimulus package. As such, C/CAG staff is taking the initiative to compile projects in San Mateo County to be prepared. This effort is beyond that which is currently taking place at MTC to support transit operators under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act. In April, the MTC programmed the first round of funding for transit operators, including Caltrain and Samtrans.

There is uncertainty about the form and details of the next stimulus legislation, such as the amount of funding, the project criteria, and how the funds would be distributed. It is highly likely that the criteria would include an emphasis on project readiness to accelerate investment and the creation of jobs. Past economic stimulus efforts often focused on the immediate investment of funds for construction projects due to the large and diverse number of jobs created by construction projects. The 2009 ARRA had a goal of allocating 50% of the funds to projects that were under construction within 120 days.

### ANALYSIS

The challenge is to prepare a realistic list that reflects the significant need for investment in transportation projects within San Mateo County, and that includes projects that meet the guidelines of the legislation



and can be constructed. There are currently no draft guidelines for an infrastructure stimulus package.

Staff have prepared draft project lists with four categories of projects that are in the planning and design process. The list does not include projects that are conceptual phase. As the guidelines for an economic stimulus legislation are currently unknown, the project list will be refined to include projects that meet the objectives.

The projects and programs are consistent with the C/CAG mission and existing activities and generally of Countywide significance. Staff proposed the following four categories of potential projects.

1. Countywide Roadway/Bike/Pedestrian Projects: These are projects that are generally included in existing planning and program documents such as the Plan Bay Area 2050 project list (PBA 2050) recently approved by the C/CAG Board, and STIP or other programming documents. The PBA 2050 is a 30-year planning document that includes projects that are ready to start construction and many projects that are at the conceptual phase. The PBA 2050 list was the starting point for projects that could be eligible for the first draft. Due to the anticipated project readiness threshold, many projects in the PBA 2050 that are further out in the conceptual stage are not included in the draft list. See Attachment 1.
2. Pavement management funds that would be allocated to jurisdictions within the County. Pavement management investments help local jurisdictions to maintain their Pavement Condition Index, can be quickly implemented, generate local jobs, and improve facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians. As a placeholder, staff recommend \$22 million, which is equal to the 2019 San Mateo County total allocation of SB1 Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA).
3. Other Bicycle and Pedestrian Eligible Projects: These are a variety of projects throughout the County. These are based on a preliminary list that will be refined. See Attachment 2.
4. Regional Flood Control/Water Quality Improvement where C/CAG was involved. See Attachment 3.

Staff have identified the stage of the project based on where it is in the project development process. The list includes projects that are at the design or planning stage.

1. Design: Generally, projects that have completed the environmental review and are in advanced stages of project design.
2. Planning: Projects that were working on securing environmental review and preliminary engineering.

The criteria for project readiness often include having environmental approval, design documents, and right of way certification. In general, projects that are in the design stage are closer to initiating construction and will likely score more highly on the project readiness scale.

There are approximately 36 total projects that cost \$1.5 billion and that require at least \$1.1 billion in additional funding to deliver.

Table 1: Estimated Total Project Costs (millions)

	<b>Total Project Costs</b>	<b>Estimated Funding Required</b>
Countywide Roadway/Bike/Ped Projects	\$1,451	\$1,093
Other Bike/Ped Projects	\$24	\$13
Regional Flood Control/Water Quality Improvement	\$13	\$5
Countywide Pavement Management	\$22	\$22
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,511</b>	<b>\$1,133</b>

The number of projects on the list will decrease as the project readiness status is refined and when specific legislative criteria are released. The budget amounts are primarily from the PBA 2050 and information from project sponsors. The amounts are subject to change because the PBA 2050 financial estimates were provided before the severe economic impact of the COVID 19 crisis.

Other key considerations are ensuring that there is regional equity within the County, and that projects that are recommended for funding will be fully funded and able to meet project readiness requirements. Also, it is expected that as the stimulus legislation progresses, local jurisdictions will submit their separate lists.

Staff will work with project sponsors to refine and update the list to reflect the current status of the projects and which projects are construction ready. The goal is to prepare a realistic list that reflects the significant need for investment in C/CAG projects, but is also composed of projects that meet the guidelines of the legislation and can be fully funded and constructed. This is the beginning of the process. C/CAG will present this item to the TAC, CMEQ, and return to the Board with an update at the June meeting.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Countywide Roadway Bike/Ped Projects
2. Other Bike/Pedestrian projects
3. Regional Flood Control/Water Quality Improvement Projects

Attachment 1: DRAFT Countywide Roadway/Bike/Ped Projects

#	Title	Sponsor	Total (YOES)	Estimated Gap \$	Phase
1	Route 101/Holly St Interchange Access Improvements	San Carlos	\$36	\$14	Design Phase
2	Improve U.S. 101/Woodside Road interchange	Redwood City	\$236	\$175	Design Phase
3	Route 1 Improvements in Half Moon Bay	Half Moon Bay	\$19	\$9	Design Phase
4	US 101/University Ave. Interchange Improvements	East Palo Alto	\$15	\$11	Design Phase
5	Smart Corridor Projects (SSF and Northern Cities Smart Corridor Project (Brisbane, Daly City, Colma))	CCAG	\$20	\$4	Design Phase
6	Highway 1 Gray Whale Cove Access Improvements		\$2	\$1	Design Phase
<b>Design Phase Subtotal</b>			<b>\$328</b>	<b>\$214</b>	
7	Hwy 1 / Manor Drive Overcrossing Improvement	Pacifica	\$25	\$24	Planning Phase
8	Implementation of managed lanes on U.S. 101 from I-380 to San Francisco County line (updated description)	San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (CCAG)	\$418	\$205	Planning Phase
9	Improve operations at U.S. 101 near Route 92 - Phase 1: Area Improvements	San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (CCAG)	\$26	\$25	Planning Phase
10	Improve operations at U.S. 101 near Route 92 - Phase 2: Direct Connector	San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (CCAG)	\$248	\$243	Planning Phase
11	US 101 Produce Avenue Interchange	South San Francisco	\$159	\$146	Planning Phase
12	U.S. 101 Interchange at Peninsula Avenue	San Mateo (City)	\$91	\$86	Planning Phase
13	Improve access to and from the west side of Dumbarton Bridge on Route 84 connecting to U.S. 101 per Gateway 2020 Study and Dumbarton Corridor Transportation Studies - Phased	San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (CCAG)	\$60	\$60	Planning and Implementation Phase
14	Hwy 1 operational & safety improvements in County Midcoast (acceleration/deceleration lanes; turn lanes; bike lanes; pedestrian crossings; and trails)	San Mateo County	\$9	\$6	Planning Phase
16	Reconstruct U.S. 101/Sierra Point Parkway interchange (includes extension of Lagoon Way to U.S. 101)	Brisbane	\$21	\$21	Planning Phase
17	I-280 improvements near D Street exit	Daly City	\$1	\$1	Planning Phase
18	Widen Millbrae Avenue between Rollins Road and U.S. 101 southbound on-ramp and resurface intersection of Millbrae Avenue and Rollins Road	Millbrae	\$16	\$16	Planning Phase
19	Construct a 6-lane arterial from Geneva Avenue/Bayshore Boulevard intersection to U.S. 101/Candlestick Point interchange - Environmental phase	Brisbane	\$19	\$19	Planning Phase
20	Extend Blomquist Street over Redwood Creek to East Bayshore and Bair Island Road	Redwood City	\$31	\$27	Planning Phase
<b>Planning Phase Subtotal</b>			<b>\$1,124</b>	<b>\$879</b>	
<b>TOTAL</b>					
			<b>Total (YOES)</b>	<b>Estimated Gap \$</b>	
			\$328	\$214	
			\$1,124	\$879	
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$1,451</b>	<b>\$1,093</b>	

Attachment 2: DRAFT Other Bike/Ped Projects

City/Route	Title	Description	Cost	Estimated \$ GAP	Phase
1 Brisbane	Alvarado to San Benito Walkway	The project will improve a section of the central Brisbane alley between Alvarado St and San Benito Rd which is currently a steep dirt trail with installation of a concrete stairway path and lighting bollards. A handrail will be installed on one side, and a crosswalk and signage will be added to aid pedestrians crossing the street.	\$325,000	\$325,000	Design
2 Foster City	O'Neill Slough Trail Gap Closure Project (a part of the City's larger CIP project – Levee Protection Planning and Improvements Project)	Construct the section of O'Neill Slough Trail at the Cities of Belmont/Foster City limit line to the Bay Trail in Foster City, which is currently a dirt trail with carpet remnants to address rutting. Project improvements include constructing a Class I bicycle and pedestrian facility along this section of the trail on top of a new bridge over the O'Neill Slough. The proposed project will provide a "missing link" and close the gap between the Cities of Belmont and Foster City.	\$1,032,000	\$516,000	Design
3 Menlo Park	Middle Ave Pedestrian/Bicycle Undercrossing	This project will comprise of constructing a tunnel under the Caltrain railroad tracks and concrete ramps to and from the tunnel, providing a grade separated crossing under the Caltrain Railway, from El Camino Real (State Route 92) at Middle Avenue to Alma Street to create a new Class I pedestrian and bicycle path between east and west parts of Menlo Park.	\$20,000,000	\$8,500,000	Design
4 Pacifica	Palmetto Ave – Esplanade Ave Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Project	Combination of Class II and Class III bicycling facilities along Palmetto Ave, West Avalon Drive, and Esplanade Ave; pedestrian improvements will also be installed such as curb ramps, high-visibility crosswalks, and installation of RRFBs	\$350,000	\$315,000	Design
5 Portola Valley	Pedestrian Safety Improvements - Various locations in the Town of Portola Valley	Upgrade existing crosswalk facilities with new striping and adding new crosswalk signage. 9 Locations: Alpine Rd/Portola Rd, Portola Rd/Farm Road, Portola Rd/Westridge, Alpine Rd/Corte Madera Rd, Alpine Rd/Westridge Dr., Portola Rd/Grove Dr., Portola Rd at 900 Portola, Portola Rd/Wyndham, Shawnee Pass/ Iroquois Tr.	\$55,000	\$55,000	Design
6 Redwood City	Roosevelt Traffic Calming Pilot project	City intends to implement the pilot phase of Roosevelt traffic calming project from El Camino Real to Alameda de las Pulgas (1.5 mile). Planning phase started in March 2019 and will be presented to the City Council in June 2019.	\$20,000	\$200,000	Design
7 Redwood City	Jefferson/Cleveland & Jefferson/Clinton intersections pedestrian safety improvement/SR25	Installing full signal and bike pockets at Cleveland intersection, installing HAWK at Clinton intersection.	\$250,000	\$250,000	Design
8 Redwood City	Hopkins Traffic Calming: Permanent project	The pilot project from El Camino Real to Alameda de las Pulgas was implemented in summer 2019 (More than 1 mile). City is seeking funding to make it permanent with some modifications to the current design.	\$400,000	\$400,000	Design
9 San Carlos	San Carlos Avenue Pedestrian Safety Improvement Project	Installation of sidewalk, curb, gutter, and curb ramps along San Carlos Avenue between Wellington and Beverly Drives; Traffic striping and pavement marking improvements.	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	Planning
10 San Bruno	Citywide Class III Bike Routes and Supporting Bike Facilities	The addition and enhancement of bike routes are proposed for corridors on lower speed and relatively less-trafficked routes that provide access through the City or connect to City destinations. Additional improvements would include high visibility shared lane markings, traffic diverters, speed feedback signs, and other traffic calming measures. The project would also add bicycle racks at key City facilities and a bicycle fix-it station at the BART station	\$300,000	\$270,000	Conceptual
11 San Bruno	Sidewalk Repair Project	The project includes sidewalk repairs and improvements to provide a safe and accessible public sidewalk. A sidewalk survey was completed in 2015-16 to identify sidewalk defects that are the City's or private property owners' responsibility to repair. Sidewalk locations scheduled for City repair each year are identified through the inventory assessment and by complaints received from residents. This project will replace sidewalk uplift caused by City's street trees and priority will be given to repair locations with the greatest sidewalk uplift.	\$500,000	\$450,000	Conceptual
12 San Bruno	ADA Curb Ramps	This project identifies and prioritizes areas requiring repair and installation of accessible curb ramp improvements, in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). The City's ADA Transition Plan includes a list of recommended locations to install curb ramps along bicycle facilities throughout the City, primarily in locations without an existing curb ramp of where the ramps do not meet federal ADA specifications.	\$1,000,000	\$900,000	Conceptual
13 San Bruno	RRFB at Various Locations	This project includes adding high-visibility pedestrian crosswalk markings, rectangular rapid flashing beacon, yield lines and warning signs across various intersection locations throughout the City. The project will install bulb-outs at select locations.	\$1,000,000	\$900,000	Conceptual
14 San Bruno	Sidewalk Installation on Sneath Lane	This project will close the sidewalk gap and install approximately 3,570 LF of sidewalk, curb and gutter along the cemetery on Sneath Lane. ADA accessible ramps will be installed at street crossings.	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	Conceptual
15 San Bruno	Pedestrian Scale and Streetlight Upgrades in Downtown San Bruno	This project will install pedestrian scale and street lighting along Downtown San Bruno on San Mateo Avenue between El Camino Real along the path of the "ECR" Samtrans bus service and Huntington Avenue where the Caltrain Station is located. Pedestrian scale lights along the sidewalk and improved street lighting will increase the visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists through Downtown.	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	Conceptual
San Carlos(1)	Holly/101 Pedestrian Overcrossing Project	New bicycle pedestrian dedicated bridge over Highway 101 near Holly Street.			Design
East Palo Alto (1)	University Ave./101 Overcrossing				Design
<b>(1) University Ave and Holly/101 are included in PBA Projects 17-06-0025 and 17-06-0017, respectively</b>					
			<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>Estimated \$ Gap</b>	
Design			\$22	\$11	
Planning			\$2	\$2	
Conceptual			\$9	\$9	
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$34</b>	<b>\$22</b>	

**Attachment 3: DRAFT Regional Flood Control/Water Quality Improvement Projects**

Regional Flood Control/Water Quality Improvement					
City/Route	Title	Description	Cost	Estimated \$ GAP	Phase
Atherton	Cartan Field Stormwater Capture Project	The project would install a stormwater capture facility at Cartan Field (30 Alejandra Avenue), in Atherton, CA. Additional drainage improvements along El Camino Real are also proposed. The stormwater capture facility would include a diversion structure within Atherton Channel to re-direct all dry-weather urban runoff and a portion of wet-weather runoff through a pre-treatment device before conveying the water into a buried multi-chambered storage facility with a storage capacity of up to nine (9) acre-feet. The water would be filtered to remove mercury and PCBs then discharged back into the channel. The final size of the underground storage facility will be determined based on available funding. The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the water capture facility at Cartan Field has been prepared, certified by the City Council and filed with eth County Recorder. Final design and permitting is scheduled to be completed in early 2021, with construction scheduled to begin in Spring/Sumer 2021.	\$13,000,000	\$5,000,000	Design
Design			\$13	\$5	
Planning			\$0	\$0	
Conceptual			0	0	
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$13</b>	<b>\$5</b>	

## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: May 18, 2020

To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

From: Sean Charpentier, Program Director

Subject: Review and recommend approval C/CAG distribution policy for Fiscal Year 2020-21 State Transit Assistance (STA) Population- Based funds among the STA-eligible transit operators and funds that will be spent benefiting Communities of Concern for the subsequent fiscal year.

(For further information or questions, contact Sean Charpentier at 650-599-1462)

---

### RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG CMEQ Committee recommend approval C/CAG distribution policy for Fiscal Year 2020-21 State Transit Assistance (STA) Population- Based funds among the STA-eligible transit operators and funds that will be spent benefiting Communities of Concern for the subsequent fiscal year.

### FISCAL IMPACT

This program is estimated to have \$2,391,124 in Population-Based State Transit Assistance (STA) for San Mateo County for Fiscal Year 2020-21.

### SOURCE OF FUNDS

\$2,391,124 in Population- Based State Transit Assistance (STA) for Fiscal Year 2020-21.

### BACKGROUND

Based on the proposed FY 20-21 State Budget, the Bay Area would receive approximately \$185 million in Revenue-Based and \$67 million in Population based STA funds. The state allocates Revenue-Based STA to transit operators based on their revenue as defined by PUC 99314 (b). The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) receives a share of the Population- Based STA based on a population formula.

In the past, the MTC Resolution 3837 governed the State Transit Assistance (STA) Population- Based fund distribution policy. Under Resolution 3837, funding was distributed to fund northern county small transit operators, Regional Paratransit, the Lifeline Transportation Program, and MTC regional coordination programs. Paratransit and Lifeline Transportation Program funds were further distributed among the nine bay area counties.

MTC assigned STA funds to each county and then split each county's share to fund a) Paratransit service and b) to fund the Lifeline Transportation Program. MTC often added a

small amount of other funds to the Lifeline Transportation Program funds but a significant portion of the funds for every cycle came from the STA Population- Based funds.

Since 2006, C/CAG has been delegated by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to administer the Lifeline Transportation Program for San Mateo County. The purpose of the Lifeline Program is to fund projects, identified through the community-based transportation planning (CBTP) process, which improves the mobility of low-income residents.

On February 28, 2018, under MTC Resolution 4321, MTC established the new STA County Block Grant Program policy whereby the nine Bay Area Congestion Transportation Agencies (CTA) would determine how to invest the population-based STA funds in public transit services and lifeline transportation services. MTC developed a formula distribution to each county that factors STA eligible small transit operators, regional paratransit, and the lifeline transportation program.

As the CTA, C/CAG coordinates with STA-eligible transit operators and develops the STA Population-Based distribution policy within San Mateo. SamTrans is the only STA-eligible operator in San Mateo county. In past cycles, under MTC, the split averaged 37% for paratransit and 63% for the Lifeline program. C/CAG set aside its share of FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20 funds for a Lifeline Call for Projects in 2020.

#### Fiscal Year 2020-21

For Fiscal Year 2020-21, the County share of population-based STA funds is estimated to be \$2,391,124. In past cycles, under MTC, the split averaged 37% for paratransit and 63% for the Lifeline program. C/CAG staff is proposing to continue the historical 37% for paratransit and 63% for Lifeline division for FY 2020-21. This would result in approximately \$884,716 for paratransit and \$1,506,408 for the Lifeline Transportation Program.

It is important to note that STA fund estimate was released in February 2020, but due to COVID-19 crisis, actual revenues might be significantly lower for FY 2020-21.

C/CAG staff is the early stages of developing a call for projects for the Lifeline Transportation Program using the accumulated funds from FY 2018-19 and FY 2019-20, scheduled for later this summer. The COVID-19 crisis might create increased demand for Lifeline programs. Staff proposes retaining the C/CAG FY 2020-21 Lifeline portion for eligible Lifeline programs that may exceed the available funds from Fiscal Years 2018-2020, or other STA eligible Lifeline programs or projects that respond to the COVID-19 crisis.

This proposal will be presented to the C/CAG TAC on May 21, 2019 and the C/CAG Board on June 11, 2020

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. MTC Resolution No. 4321

Date: February 28, 2018  
W.I.: 1511  
Referred By: PAC  
Revised: 02/27/19-C

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 4321, Revised

This resolution establishes a policy for the programming and allocation of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds and State of Good Repair Program funds, made available under the provisions of Public Utilities Code Sections 99312.1, 99313, and 99314.

This resolution supersedes Resolution No. 3837.

This resolution was revised on February 27, 2019 to update the STA Population-Based County Block Grant performance measure requirements for small and medium sized transit operators as well as to make adjustments to the State of Good Repair (SGR) Program Revenue-Based program policies to reflect updated Caltrans SGR Program guidelines.

Further discussion of this action is contained in the Executive Director's Memorandum to the Programming and Allocations Committee dated January 3, 2018 and the MTC Programming and Allocations Committee Summary Sheets dated February 14, 2018 and February 13, 2019.



Date: February 28, 2018  
W.I.: 1511  
Referred By: PAC

Re: Adoption of MTC's State Transit Assistance (STA) and State of Good Repair Program Programming and Allocation Policy.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 4321

WHEREAS, State Transit Assistance (STA) funds are to be used to enhance public transportation service, including community transit service, and to meet high priority regional transportation needs; and

WHEREAS, Senate Bill (SB) 1 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017), known as the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, establishes the State of Good Repair Program (SGR Program); and

WHEREAS, both STA and SGR Program funds are distributed by the State Controller's Office pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 99313 and 99314, a Population-Based and Revenue-Based program, respectively; and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the San Francisco Bay Area, is responsible for the allocation of STA and SGR Program funds available to eligible claimants in this region; and

WHEREAS, MTC adopted an STA Allocation Policy in Resolution No. 3837 in 2008; and

WHEREAS, SB 1 significantly increased the amount of funding to the STA program and established the SGR Program; and


WHEREAS, in order to align the allocation of STA and SGR Program funding with the Bay Area's most pressing transportation needs; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that MTC adopts its State Transit Assistance and State of Good Repair Program Programming and Allocation Policy described in Attachment A, attached hereto and incorporated by reference, for guidance to eligible claimants in the preparation of their

applications for STA and SGR Program funds and to staff for reviewing such applications; and  
be it further

RESOLVED, that the prior policy governing allocation of State Transit Assistance Funds  
contained in Resolution No. 3837 is superseded by this resolution.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jake Mackenzie, Chair

The above resolution was entered  
into by the Metropolitan Transportation  
Commission at a regular meeting of  
the Commission held in San Francisco,  
California, on February 28, 2018.

Date: February 28, 2018  
W.I.: 1511  
Referred By: PAC  
Revised: 02/27/19-C

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 4321  
Page 1 of 6

**STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE AND STATE OF GOOD REPAIR PROGRAM  
PROGRAMMING AND ALLOCATION POLICY  
Exhibit 1**

This policy affects all allocations by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) of STA and SGR Program funds, made available under the provisions of Public Utilities Code Sections 99312.1, 99313 and 99314 and relevant subsections.

**I. STA Population-Based Funds (PUC Code 99313) Including Interest Earnings**

***1. STA Population-Based County Block Grant***

Commencing with Fiscal Year 2018-19 70% of the STA Population-Based funds and interest is reserved for programming to STA-eligible operators by Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) in each of the nine Bay Area counties as part of a STA Population-Based County Block Grant (County Block Grant). The County Block Grant will allow each county to determine how best to invest in transit operating needs, including providing lifeline transit services. The funds reserved for the County Block Grant shall be distributed amongst the nine counties according to the percentages shown in Table 1. Each county's share in Table 1 was calculated based on the county's share of STA funds from the Resolution 3837 formula, totaled across all categories (Northern Counties/Small Operators Program, Regional Paratransit Program, and the Lifeline Transportation Program).

**Table 1. Distribution of STA Population-Based County Block Grant, by County**

Alameda	17.68%
Contra Costa	22.18%
Marin	5.71%
Napa	3.49%
San Francisco	8.46%
San Mateo	5.06%
Santa Clara	14.09%
Solano	10.50%
Sonoma	12.83%

Within Alameda and Contra Costa Counties a minimum amount of County Block Grant funds shall be programmed amongst the transit operators detailed in Table 2.

**Table 2. Alameda and Contra Costa County Small Operator Minimum**

County	Minimum % of Block Grant to be Allocated Annually Amongst Eligible Small Operators	Eligible Small Operators
Alameda County	24%	LAVTA and Union City Transit
Contra Costa County	60%	CCCTA, ECCTA, WestCAT

The following program conditions apply to the County Block Grant:

- **Reporting:** Each CMA must submit to MTC by May 1st of each year, a report including the following information about the previous, completed, fiscal year: 1) the county’s programming distribution of STA Population-Based funds amongst STA-eligible operators and; 2) the estimated amount of STA Population-Based funding that will be spent within or benefiting Communities of Concern.
- **Fund Swaps:** Each CMA is required to seek approval from MTC before requesting that a STA-eligible operator recipient of STA Population-Based funds perform a fund swap involving STA Population-Based funds. The CMA must notify all STA-eligible operators within their county of the request to swap funds before seeking approval from MTC.
- **Coordinated Claim/Submission Deadline:** Each CMA must play a coordinating role in the development of STA Population-Based claims from STA-eligible operators within their county. Each CMA must also submit to MTC by May 1st of each year a governing board-approved resolution listing the distribution policy for STA Population-Based funds amongst the STA-eligible operators for the subsequent fiscal year. Operators will continue to submit their own claims, if desired.
- **Performance Measures:** ~~[ORINGAL LANGUAGE] All small and medium sized operators shall meet Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) performance requirements similar to the large operators and achieve a 5% real reduction in cost per service hour, cost per passenger, or cost per passenger mile by Fiscal Year 2022-23. For operators that have already achieved a 5% real reduction in one of the above performance measures by FY 2017-18 no further reduction is required. Operators may substitute TSP performance measures for a similar local voter approved or CMA adopted performance measure, subject to MTC concurrence. Once the 5% reduction is achieved transit operators are expected to keep future cost increases to no higher than the San Francisco Area Consumer Price Index as defined by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Beginning in Fiscal Year 2023-24 MTC may link existing and new operating and capital funds administered by MTC to progress towards achieving the performance target. Staff will work with the small operators and CMAs to evaluate whether an alternate performance framework or metrics are more appropriate for the small operators. Staff will return within one year to report on whether to retain the current framework or adjust the performance requirements.~~  
 [PROPOSED REVISION LANGUAGE] *All small and medium sized operators shall be required to maintain operating costs (cost per service hour, cost per passenger, or cost per passenger mile) at least twenty (20) percent below the annual average operating cost of the seven operators included in the Transit Sustainability Project*

*(TSP). Operating costs for small and medium sized operators shall be calculated for each mode (bus, rail, ferry, etc.) and benchmarked against the comparable modal average for the operators included in the TSP. In addition, annual year-over-year increases in operating costs for each small and medium sized operator shall be no greater than five (5) percent per year. If an operator is unable to meet the above requirements they may submit an appeal/justification to MTC explaining the circumstances that prevented achievement of the targets. Beginning in Fiscal Year 2023-24 MTC may link existing and new operating and capital funds administered by MTC to progress towards achieving the performance target.*

- **Operator Consolidation Planning Efforts:** In the Northern Counties (Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma) as an alternative to meeting TSP performance requirements, counties and transit operators may develop a plan to consolidate into a single county operator.
- **Mobility Management:** In the five other counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara) each county must establish or enhance mobility management programs to help provide equitable and effective access to transportation.

## **2. *MTC Regional Program***

Commencing with Fiscal Year 2018-19 30% of the STA Population-Based funds and interest is reserved for projects and programs that improve regional coordination, including but not limited to:

- Clipper®
- 511
- Transit connectivity

In addition, a portion of the Regional Program funding (approximately \$8 million in the first year based on the estimated Senate Bill 1 increment for Fiscal Year 2018-19) will be used to pay for the administrative costs and to help offset transit fare revenue loss for a regional means-based fare program.

MTC will develop an annual MTC Regional Coordination program. All final programming will be reviewed and approved by the MTC Programming and Allocations Committee (PAC).

## **3. *Transit Emergency Service Contingency Fund***

The Transit Emergency Service Contingency Fund shall be used to provide assistance for an emergency response to a qualifying incident or event, under specific circumstances as described in MTC Resolution No. 4171.

The fund shall not exceed a total balance of \$1 million of STA Population-Based funds. In any individual fiscal year no more than \$333,333 of STA Populated-Based funds and interest shall be apportioned to the fund. Interest accrued to the fund shall not count towards the \$1 million total balance limit and interest can continue to accrue once the fund

has reached \$1 million. Beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16, \$333,333 in STA Population-Based funds, taken “off the top” from estimated STA Population-Based revenues for the fiscal year, will be apportioned to the fund. Apportionments will continue in subsequent fiscal years until the fund reaches a total of \$1 million. In future years should the balance of the fund fall below \$1 million, funds shall be apportioned in the next fiscal year to restore the full balance of the fund, subject to the annual apportionment limit.

## **II. STA Revenue-Based Funds (PUC Code 99314)**

Funds apportioned to the region based on revenues generated by the transit operators will be allocated to each STA-eligible operator for the support of fixed route and paratransit operations, for inter-operator coordination, including the cost of interoperator transfers, joint fare subsidies, integrated fares etc., and for capital projects consistent with the adopted long-range plan.

## **III. SGR Program Population-Based Funds (PUC Code 99312.1, distributed via PUC 99313)**

MTC will develop an annual investment program for SGR Program Population-Based Funds through the annual Fund Estimate. All final programming will be reviewed and approved by the MTC Programming and Allocations Committee (PAC) and will be consistent with the below priorities. All proposed programming actions will be submitted to Caltrans for approval, consistent with SGR Program Guidelines.

### **1. Priority 1: Clipper® 2.0**

Invest in the development and deployment of the Bay Area’s next generation transit fare payment system, Clipper® 2.0.

### **2. Priority 2: Green Transit Capital Priorities**

If not needed for Clipper® 2.0, program SGR Program Population-Based funds to the acquisition of zero emission buses (ZEB) by the Bay Area’s transit operators. SGR Program funds are intended to pay for the cost increment of ZEBs over diesel or hybrid vehicles or for charging or hydrogen infrastructure to support ZEBs. MTC staff will work to secure a 1:1 match commitment from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to expand and accelerate the deployment of ZEBs in the region.

## **IV. SGR Program Revenue-Based Funds (PUC Code 99312.1, distributed via PUC 99314)**

~~[ORINGAL LANGUAGE] Funds apportioned to the region based on revenues generated by the transit operators will be allocated to each respective STA-eligible operator for state-of-good-repair projects, preventative maintenance, and other projects approved by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as eligible for SGR Program expenditure.~~

*[PROPOSED REVISION LANGUAGE] Funds apportioned to the region based on revenues generated by the transit operators will be allocated to each respective STA-eligible operator for state of good repair projects, preventative maintenance, and other projects approved by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as eligible for SGR Program expenditure. Starting with Fiscal Year 2019-20 operators must submit their proposed SGR Program Revenue-Based projects to MTC, consistent with Caltrans' proposed amendments to the SGR Program Guidelines for Fiscal Year 2019-20. Operators should submit their SGR Program Revenue-Based project list to MTC by May 15<sup>th</sup> of each year. MTC staff will compile SGR Program Revenue-Based projects from all operators across the region and submit to the Commission for approval before submitting the approved regional SGR Program Revenue-Based project list to Caltrans by September 1<sup>st</sup> of each year.*

Transit operator's SGR Program Revenue-Based projects should be consistent with their agency's Transit Assessment Management (TAM) plan.

**State Transit Assistance (STA)  
Rules and Regulations  
for the MTC Region  
Exhibit 2**

These Rules and Regulations cover the eligibility requirements and the rules for a full or partial allocation of these funds.

**Eligibility Requirements**

To be eligible for any STA funds in the MTC region, an operator must comply with all SB 602 fare and schedule coordination requirements for the fiscal year. The evaluation of operator's compliance with the SB 602 program is made annually.

An operator's requested STA allocation may also be partially or fully reduced if the operator did not make satisfactory progress in meeting its Productivity Improvement Program (PIP) and/or the Regional Coordination projects for which each operator is a participant.

***SB 602 Requirements/California Government Code Section 66516***

Fare coordination revenue-sharing agreements, must be fully executed by all participating operators and provisions of the agreement(s) must be in compliance with MTC rules and regulations.

MTC Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan) documents coordination requirements for Bay Area transit operators to improve the transit customer experience when transferring between transit operators and in support of regional transit projects such as Clipper. If a transit operator fails to comply with the requirements of Res. 3866 or its successor, MTC may withhold, restrict or reprogram funds or allocations.

***PIP Projects***

PIP projects are a requirement of STA funding. Failure by operators to make a reasonable effort to implement their PIP projects may affect the allocation of these funds. Projects will be evaluated based on actual progress as compared to scheduled. STA funds may be reduced proportionate to the failure of the operator to implement the PIP project/s. Progress in meeting the milestones identified for a project may be used as the basis for assessing reasonable effort.

The amount withheld will be reviewed with the affected operator. Partial funds withheld may be held by MTC up to two years to allow an operator to comply with its PIP as required by statute.

After two years, funds withheld under this section may also be re-allocated to any eligible operator for purposes of improving coordination, according to the unfunded coordination projects in the Regional Coordination Plan (MTC Res. 3866 or its successor). MTC may also allocate these funds to any operator whose increase in total operating cost per revenue vehicle hour is less than the increase in the CPI.