

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*

BOARD MEETING NOTICE

Meeting No. 244

- DATE:** Thursday, March 8, 2012
- TIME:** **6:30 P.M. Board Meeting**
- PLACE:** San Mateo County Transit District Office
1250 San Carlos Avenue, Second Floor Auditorium
San Carlos, CA
- PARKING:** Available adjacent to and behind building.
Please note the underground parking garage is no longer open.
- PUBLIC TRANSIT:** SamTrans Bus: Lines 261, 295, 297, 390, 391, 397, PX, KX.
CalTrain: San Carlos Station.
Trip Planner: <http://transit.511.org>

- 1.0 CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL
- 2.0 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
- 3.0 PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA
Note: Public comment is limited to two minutes per speaker.
- 4.0 PRESENTATIONS/ ANNOUNCEMENTS
- 4.1 Certificate of Appreciation to Rosanne Foust, C/CAG Board Member, for her years of
dedicated service and contributions to C/CAG. INFORMATION p. 1
- 4.2 Certificate of Appreciation to Sepi Richardson, C/CAG Board Member, for her years of
dedicated service and contributions to C/CAG INFORMATION p. 3

5.0 CONSENT AGENDA

Consent Agenda items are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless members of the Board, staff or public request specific items to be removed for separate action.

- 5.1 Approval of the Minutes of Regular Business Meeting No. 243 dated February 9, 2012. ACTION p. 5
- 5.2 Review and approval of the appointments of Councilmember Mark Olbert of San Carlos and Councilmember Andy Cohen of Menlo Park to the Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee. ACTION p. 11
- 5.3 Review and approval of Resolution 12-14 authorizing the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2012/2013 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Program Manager Fund for San Mateo County. ACTION p. 15
- 5.4 Review and approval of Resolution 12-15 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement between C/CAG and the County of San Mateo for construction contract advertisement, award, and administration of the Smart Corridors north and south segments project for an additional \$2,052,363 to a new total of \$8,402,363, for expanding the southerly project limit to Santa Clara County Line. ACTION p. 25

NOTE: All items on the Consent Agenda are approved/accepted by a majority vote. A request must be made at the beginning of the meeting to move any item from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

6.0 REGULAR AGENDA

- 6.1 Review and approval of C/CAG Legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update.
(A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified.) ACTION p. 33
- 6.2 Review and approval to the Pre-Tax Commuter Benefit Model Ordinance. ACTION p. 37
- 6.3 Review and approval of the Call for Projects for the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for Fiscal Year 2012/2013 & Fiscal Year 2013/2014. ACTION p. 43
- 6.4 Election of a C/CAG Chairperson and Two C/CAG Vice Chairpersons ACTION p. 67

7.0 COMMITTEE REPORTS

7.1 Committee Reports (oral reports).

7.2 Chairperson's Report

7.3 Boardmembers Report

8.0 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

9.0 COMMUNICATIONS - Information Only

9.1 Letter from Richard Napier, Executive Director C/CAG, to Andre Boutros, Chief Deputy Director, California Transportation Commission, dated 2/6/12. RE: Request for \$3.37 Million CMIA Savings for San Mateo County Smart Corridor. p. 75

9.2 Letter from Richard Napier, Executive Director C/CAG, to Heather Fargo, Executive Policy Officer, California Strategic Growth Council, dated 2/8/12. RE: Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Focus Area #2 Collaboration Requirement. p. 77

Copies of communications are included for C/CAG Board Members and Alternates only. To request a copy of the communications, contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406 or nblair@co.sanmateo.ca.us or download a copy from C/CAG's website – www.ccag.ca.gov.

10.0 ADJOURN

Next scheduled meeting: April 12, 2012 Regular Board Meeting.

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG Board and Committee meetings will be posted at San Mateo County Transit District Office, 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA.

PUBLIC RECORDS: Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular board meeting are available for public inspection. Those records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to the 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 those public records available for inspection. The documents are also available on the C/CAG Internet Website, at the link for agendas for upcoming meetings. The website is located at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>.

NOTE: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

If you have any questions about the C/CAG Board Agenda, please contact C/CAG Staff:

*Executive Director: Richard Napier 650 599-1420 Administrative Assistant:
Nancy Blair 650 599-1406*

FUTURE MEETINGS

March 8, 2012 Legislative Committee - SamTrans 2nd Floor Auditorium - 5:30 p.m.
March 8, 2012 C/CAG Board - SamTrans 2nd Floor Auditorium - 6:30 p.m.
March 20, 2012 NPDES Technical Advisory Committee - to be determined - 10:00 a.m.
March 9, 2012 Resource Management and Climate Protection Committee (RMCP)
March 15, 2012 CMP Technical Advisory Committee - SamTrans 2nd Floor Auditorium - 3:00 p.m.
Conference Room C - 7:00 p.m.
March 26, 2012 Administrators' Advisory Committee - 555 County Center, 5th Fl, Redwood City – Noon
March 26, 2012 CMEQ Committee - San Mateo City Hall - Conference Room C - 3:00 p.m.

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*

* * * * *

**A PRESENTATION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF
SAN MATEO COUNTY (C/CAG) EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO
ROSANNE FOUST
FOR HER DEDICATED SERVICE TO C/CAG**

* * * * *

Resolved, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), that,

Whereas, Rosanne Foust is a Council Member for the City of Redwood City since November 2003, and as Mayor from November 2007 through November 2009, and,

Whereas, Rosanne Foust served as the San Mateo County Transportation Authority's Representative on the C/CAG Board, and

Whereas, Rosanne Foust served on the C/CAG Compensation Committee, and

Whereas, Rosanne Foust served on the C/CAG Board of Directors, representing the City of Redwood City, from 2010 to 2011; and,

Now, therefore, the Board of Directors of C/CAG hereby resolves that C/CAG expresses its appreciation to Rosanne Foust for her many years of dedicated public service, and wishes her happiness and success in the future.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED THIS 8th DAY OF March, 2012.

ITEM 4.1

Bob Grassilli, Chair

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*

* * * * *

A PRESENTATION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY (C/CAG) EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO SEPI RICHARDSON FOR HER DEDICATED SERVICE TO C/CAG

* * * * *

Resolved, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), that,

Whereas, Sepi Richardson is a Council Member for the City of Brisbane beginning in 1995, and has served as Mayor, and,

Whereas, Sepi Richardson serves on the Congestion Management Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ), the C/CAG Legislative Committee, and on the C/CAG Finance Committee, and

Whereas, Sepi Richardson served on the C/CAG Board of Directors, representing the City of Brisbane as an Alternate from 2002 to 2005, and as a Representative from 2006 to 2012; and,

Now, therefore, the Board of Directors of C/CAG hereby resolves that C/CAG expresses its appreciation to Sepi Richardson for her many years of dedicated public service, and wishes her happiness and success in the future.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED THIS 8th DAY OF March, 2012.

ITEM 4.2

Bob Grassilli, Chair



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*

Meeting No. 243
February 9, 2012

1.0 CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Grassilli called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Roll Call was taken.

Jerry Carlson - Atherton
Sepi Richardson - Brisbane
Terry Nagel - Burlingame
Joseph Silva - Colma
David Canepa -Daly City
Carlos Romero - East Palo Alto (6:35)
Art Kiesel - Foster City
Naomi Patridge - Half Moon Bay
Tom Kasten - Hillsborough
Kirsten Keith - Menlo Park
Marge Colapietro - Millbrae
Mary Ann Nihart - Pacifica
Jeff Ira - Redwood City
Irene O'Connell -San Bruno
Bob Grassilli - San Carlos
Brandt Grotte - San Mateo
Don Horsley - San Mateo County
Karyl Matsumoto - South San Francisco, San Mateo County Transit District
Deborah Gordon - Woodside

Absent,
Belmont
Portola Valley

Others:
Richard Napier, Executive Director, C/CAG
Sandy Wong, Deputy Director, C/CAG
Inga Lintvedt, C/CAG Legal Counsel
Tom Madalena, C/CAG Staff
John Hoang, C/CAG Staff
Jean Higaki, C/CAG Staff
Kim Springer, San Mateo County
Joe La Mariana, San Mateo County
Susan Wright, San Mateo County
Corinne Goodrich, SamTrans

ITEM 5.1

Ronny Kraft, SamTrans
Jim Bigelow, Redwood City/San Mateo County Chamber, CMEQ Member
Onnalee Trapp, CMAQ Committee, League of Women Voters of San Mateo County
Jim Cogan, PG&E
Kristin Connelly, Bay Area Regional Coordinator, California Forward

4.0 PRESENTATIONS/ ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 4.1 Presentation from California Forward relative to their upcoming initiative on State Fiscal Reform.

Kristen Connelly made the presentation on behalf of California Forward. The Board had numerous questions with a concern raised that California Forward needs to work more closely with the Cities through the League of California Cities.

5.0 CONSENT AGENDA

Board Member O'Connell MOVED approval of Items 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4. Board Member Carlson SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 19-0.

- 5.1 Approval of the Minutes of Regular Business Meeting No. 242 dated January 12, 2012.
APPROVED
- 5.2 Update on the San Mateo County Energy Watch, Local Government Partnership with Pacific Gas and Electric Company.
INFORMATION
- 5.3 Review and approval of Resolution 12-08 Authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an agreement between C/CAG and the County of San Mateo, Department of Public Works, to Provide Staff Services for the Administration of the Climate Action Plan Template development in an Amount not to Exceed \$75,000 for Calendar Year 2012. APPROVED
- 5.4 Review and Approval of Resolution 12-09, Authorizing the C/CAG Executive Director to Submit a Grant Proposal to the Strategic Growth Council for the Sustainable Community Planning Grants and Incentives Program, Round 2 for an amount up to \$1,000,000.
APPROVED

6.0 REGULAR AGENDA

- 6.1 Review and approval of C/CAG Legislative policy, priorities, positions, and legislative update. (A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified.)
APPROVED

Language was changed to two of the C/CAG Legislative Policies for 2012.

Changed from:

- 4.3 Support modification or elimination of Proposition 26 requirements.

5.7 Support a dedicated funding source for Caltrain.

Changed to:

4.3 Support modification or elimination of Proposition 26 *two-thirds* requirements.

5.7 Support a dedicated funding source for *operating* Caltrain.

Board Member O'Connell MOVED to approve Item 6.1. Board Member Nihart SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 19-0.

6.2 Review and adoption of Resolution 12-10 authorizing a contract between the Board of Administration California Public Employees Retirement System (CALPERS) and the Board of Directors City/ County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG).
APPROVED

Board Member Richardson MOVED to approve Item 6.2. Board Member Grotte SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 19-0.

6.3 Update on the implementation of the San Mateo County Smart Corridor Project.
INFORMATION

6.4 Review and approval of Resolution 12-12 accepting the South San Francisco/ San Bruno Community-Based Transportation Plan contingent upon the inclusion of final comments from the Cities of South San Francisco and San Bruno.
APPROVED

Board Member Gordon MOVED to approve Item 6.4. Board Member O'Connell SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 19-0.

6.5 Review and approval of Resolution 12-13 to accept the "*Countywide Transportation Plan for Low Income Populations*". (Special voting procedures apply.)
APPROVED

Board Member Canepa MOVED approval of Item 6.5. Board Member Nagel SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 19-0.

A Super Majority Vote was taken by roll call. **MOTION CARRIED** 19-0. Results: 19 Agencies approving. This represents 90% of the Agencies representing 96% of the population.

6.6 Nominations for C/CAG Chair and Vice Chair (2) for the March Election of Officers.
APPROVED

Board Member Richardson nominated Board Member Romero for Chair.

Board Member Romero withdrew his name, saying it is typical for the Chair to serve two years and he would like to respect this.

Board Member Richardson withdrew her nomination.

Board Member Romero nominated Board Member Grassilli for Chair.

There were no other nominations for Chair.

Board Member Kasten nominated Board Member Romero for Vice Chair.

Board Member Richardson nominated Board Member Grotte for Vice Chair.

7.0 COMMITTEE REPORTS

7.1 Committee Reports (oral reports).

None.

7.2 Chairperson's Report

Thanked the Board for their continued outstanding attendance.

7.3 Board Members Report

Board Member Richardson announced the City of Brisbane has changed the committee assignments, and she will no longer be Brisbane's Representative to the CCAG Board. She will serve as an Alternate. Councilmember Clarke Conway will be Brisbane's Representative to the C/CAG Board.

Chair Grassilli thanked Board Member Richardson for her years of service to the C/CAG Board of Directors.

Board Member Carlson said he attended the Palo Alto Rail Committee meeting, and the Committee voted to support Senate Bill 985, a High Speed Rail bill submitted by Senator LaMalfa. If approved, it would cut off any further sale of High Speed Rail bonds, and would mandate that the proceeds from any sales-to-date be used to retire the old debt.

Board Member Nihart said the City of Pacifica is looking at their options, and is considering to outsource the Police Department.

8.0 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The first SCS RHNA PAC meeting is scheduled for February 23.

C/CAG's Executive Director and Deputy Director attended the January California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting, and brought back \$7,500,000 for the Smart Corridor Project. The C/CAG Deputy Director is working on obtaining another \$3,700,000 for the Smart Corridor Project.

Regarding the SCS RHNA PAC meeting, Board Member Kasten pointed out that at least two cities have significant problems with errors in the numbers that came from ABAG, and are in the process of responding back to point out those errors. Board Member Kasten asked if

ABAG was going to respond prior to the February 23rd meeting, as it may have an impact on the overall numbers.

The Executive Director responded that the numbers are not ready, and that the meeting on the 23rd will be dealing with broad policies. Issues with the detailed numbers will be worked out as part of the Sub-region process.

9.0 COMMUNICATIONS - Information Only

Copies of communications are included for C/CAG Board Members and Alternates only. To request a copy of the communications, contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406 or nblair@co.sanmateo.ca.us or download a copy from C/CAG's website – www.ccag.ca.gov.

- 9.1 Letter from Richard Napier, Executive Director C/CAG, to Mr. Ezra Rapport, Executive Director, Association of Bay Area Governments, dated 1/23/12. Subject: Support for Association of Bay Area Governments application for Proposition 84 Planning and Monitoring Grant – Bay Area Green Infrastructure Master Planning Project:
- 9.2 Letter Bob Grassilli, C/CAG Chair, to All Councilpersons of San Mateo County Cities and members of the Board of Supervisors, dated 1/23/12. Subject: Vacancy on the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ).

10.0 ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: March 8, 2012
To: City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors
From: Richard Napier, Executive Director
Subject: Review and approval of the appointments of Councilmember Mark A. Olbert of San Carlos and Councilmember Andy Cohen of Menlo Park to the Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

(For further information or questions contact Sandy Wong at 599-1409)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board review and approve the appointments of Councilmember Mark A. Olbert of San Carlos and Councilmember Andy Cohen of Menlo Part to fill vacant elected seats in the Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Currently, there are two vacant elected seats on the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) committee, vacated by former Councilmembers Linda Koelling of Foster City and Daniel Quigg of Millbrae. Recruitment letters were sent to all elected officials in San Mateo County. Letters of interest were received from Councilmembers Mark Olbert and Andy Cohen.

The CMEQ committee provides advice and recommendations to the full C/CAG Board on all matters relating to transportation planning, congestion management, and selection of projects for state and federal funding. The Committee also has the specific responsibility for the development and updating of the Congestion Management Program and the Countywide Transportation Plan.

ATTACHMENTS

- Roster for the CMEQ Committee
- Letter from Councilmember Mark Olbert
- Email from Councilmember Andy Cohen

CMEQ ROSTER (Jan. 2012)

Chair - Barbara Pierce
Vice Chair - Richard Garbarino
Staff Support: Sandy Wong (slwong@co.sanmateo.ca.us)
(650) 599-1409

Name	Representing
Jim Bigelow	Business Community
Zoe Kersteen-Tucker	San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)
Arthur Lloyd	Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (CalTrain)
Lennie Roberts	Environmental Community
Onnolee Trapp	Agencies with Transportation Interests
Steve Dworetzky	Public Member
Sepi Richardson	City of Brisbane
Naomi Patridge	City of Half Moon Bay
Gina Papan	City of Millbrae
Barbara Pierce	City of Redwood City
Irene O'Connell	City of San Bruno
Rich Garbarino	City of South San Francisco
Kevin Mullin	MTC
Nadia Holober	City of Millbrae



February 25, 2012

Sandy Wong
Congestion Management & Environmental Quality Committee
555 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

76 Bayview Drive
San Carlos, CA 94070

t: 650/596-3460
c: 650/868-3367

mark@arcabama.com

Dear Sandy,

I am writing to express my interest in being considered as a candidate to fill the open position on the Congestion Management & Environmental Quality Committee. I am a recently-elected member of the San Carlos City Council with a strong interest in the environment and transportation/congestion issues.

Prior to being elected to the San Carlos City Council last November I served as an elected trustee of the San Carlos Elementary District Board of Trustees for ten years, from November 2001 through December, 2011.

My private sector business experience was in financial analysis and management. In the course of my 20+ year business career I served as the chief financial officer of a public biotech company and the chief financial officer of a venture-backed startup biotech company.

If you need any additional information about my interest and background please don't hesitate to contact me.

I hope I'll have an opportunity to serve the broader community as a member of the Committee.

Very Truly Yours,

Mark A. Olbert
Member of the San Carlos City Council

From: "Andy Cohen" <andymcohen@gmail.com>
To: "slwong@co.sanmateo.ca.us" <slwong@co.sanmateo.ca.us>
Date: 2/26/2012 6:21 PM
Subject: CMEQ committee opening

Sandy,

Please accept this email as my expression of my interest in serving as a member of the CMEQ committee.

As a member of Menlo Park City Council for the past 8 years, and a member of the C/CAG Legislative Committee for the past 3 years, I have been interested in transportation and quality of life issues of all county residents and specifically all Menlo Park residents. I have had a long term interest in housing issues in the county and my city, and the South County region for many years, having served as Executive Director of Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto for one year during my tenure as council member in Menlo Park. CLSEPA serves the entire county and beyond in matters of essential concern to the minority community of San Mateo County.

Thanks for your consideration of my wishes to serve in this new capacity.

andy Cohen

Sent from my iPad

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: March 8, 2012

To: Board of Directors

From: Richard Napier, Executive Director

Subject: Review and approval of Resolution 12-14 authorizing the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2012/2013 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Program Manager Fund for San Mateo County.

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Directors approve Resolution 12-14 authorizing the adoption of the Fiscal Year 2012/2013 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Program Manager Fund for San Mateo County.

FISCAL IMPACT

The allocation of TFCA funds for Fiscal Year 2012/2013 is expected to be approximately \$1,037,781 of which \$47,781 (approx. 5%) will be allocated to administration. It is recommended that the remaining funds (\$990,000) be distributed based on the policies adopted in past years by C/CAG. The following table shows how the funds would be distributed based on these policies. The funding provided in these categories for the past three years is also shown.

<i>CATEGORY</i>		<i>2009/2010</i>	<i>2010/2011</i>	<i>2011/2012</i>	<i>2012/2013</i>
Employer Based Shuttle Projects	SamTrans	\$570,000	\$536,000	\$527,000	\$554,400
Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program (Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance)		\$449,000	\$421,000	\$414,000	\$435,600
Administration		\$51,722	\$47,153	\$46,566	\$47,781
Totals		\$1,070,722	\$1,004,153	\$987,566	\$1,037,781

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is authorized under Health and Safety code Section 44223 and 44225 to levy a fee on motor vehicles. Funds generated by the fee are referred to as the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funds and are used to implement projects to reduce air pollution from motor vehicles. Health and Safety Code Section 44241(d) stipulates that forty percent (40%) of funds generated within a county where the fee is in effect shall be allocated by the BAAQMD to one or more public agencies designated to receive the funds, and for San Mateo County, C/CAG has been designated as the overall Program Manager to receive the funds.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

As the Program Manager for the TFCA funds, C/CAG has allocated these funds to fund projects in San Mateo County operated by SamTrans and the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance (Alliance) for the last five fiscal years. The methodology used is that SamTrans receives an allocation equal to 56% of the funds available to projects and the Alliance receives 44% of the funds available to projects. It is being recommended that the same methodology be used for the FY 2012/2013 TFCA Program allocation.

C/CAG has supported the SamTrans Shuttle Program by providing TFCA funds for the BART shuttles which provide peak commute period shuttle service from BART stations to employment sites in San Mateo County. Please see the attached project information form for more detail about the SamTrans BART shuttles.

C/CAG has supported the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance (Alliance) with their Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program. This program provides incentives to reduce single occupant vehicle trips as well as shuttle program management. The Alliance offers carpool incentives, vanpool incentives, school pool incentives and a "Try transit Program". The Alliance also manages shuttles on behalf of member cities. Please see the attached project information form for more information on the Alliance Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program.

Both of these projects have been evaluated using the cost-effective worksheet provided by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and are below the threshold of \$90,000 per ton for the reduction of particulate matter.

- It is recommended that the SamTrans Shuttle Program receive an allocation of \$554,400 for its current shuttle program. This funding recommendation shall be contingent upon SamTrans submitting an acceptable work plan for use of the funds.
- It is recommended that Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance receive an allocation of \$435,600 in TFCA funds and receive \$510,000 from the Congestion Relief Plan for a total allocation of \$945,600 for the Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program. The funds allocated for the Alliance are subject to the submission of an acceptable work plan for use of the funds.

The following are the C/CAG Board policies that will continue to be in effect for the Fiscal Year 2012/2013 Program.

Overall Policies:

- Cost Effectiveness, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), will be used as initial screening criteria for all projects. Projects must show a cost effectiveness of less than \$90,000 per ton of reduced emissions based upon the TFCA funds allocated in order to be considered.

Shuttle Projects:

- Shuttle projects are defined as the provision of local feeder bus or shuttle service to rail and ferry stations and airports.
- All shuttles must be timed to meet the rail or ferry lines being served.
- C/CAG encourages the use of electric and other clean fuel vehicles for shuttles.
- Beginning with the 2003-04 TFCA funding cycle, all vehicles used in any shuttle/feeder bus service must meet the applicable California Air Resources Board (CARB) particulate matter standards for public transit fleets. This requirement has been made by the BAAQMD and is applicable to the projects funded by the Congestion Management Agencies.

If the recommendations are accepted, the following is a summary of the C/CAG TFCA Program for Fiscal Year 2012/2013:

Project	Recommendations
Administration	\$47,781
SamTrans	\$554,400
Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance	\$435,600
Total funds obligated	\$1,037,781
Total funds anticipated	\$1,037,781
Balance	\$0

ATTACHMENTS

- Project Information Form – Alliance (12SM01)
- Project Information Form – SamTrans (12SM02)
- Resolution 12-14

SAN MATEO COUNTY PROJECT INFORMATION

- A. Project Number: 12SM01
- B. Project Title: Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program
- C. TFCA Program Manager Funds Allocated: \$ 435,600
- D. TFCA Regional Funds Awarded (if applicable): \$ _____
- E. Total TFCA Funds Allocated (sum of C and D): \$ 435,600
- F. Total Project Cost: \$ TBD
Indicate the TFCA dollars allocated (C, D and E) and total project cost (D). Data from Line E (Total TFCA Funds) should be used to calculate C-E.

G. Project Description:

The Alliance provides Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs in San Mateo County as part of a region wide network of TDM services provided in collaboration and partnership with the Regional Rideshare Program, 511 Contra Costa, and Solano Napa Commuter Information to encourage use of transportation alternatives such as carpools, vanpools and transit. Efforts are targeted primarily at commute trips.

Project sponsor will use TFCA funds to complete specific activities as described below:

- Employer Based Shuttle Program Development and Management: a) continue to provide safe and reliable employer based shuttle services between employment sites and Caltrain and BART stations; b) continue to work with existing and potential new employer consortiums to attract and retain additional ridership; c) maximize satisfaction of employer representatives in shuttle consortiums and their employees; d) provide employer based shuttle services that are financially sustainable in a cost effective manner that do not duplicate existing fixed route services.
- Employer Outreach: The Alliance conducts marketing and outreach to employer work sites in San Mateo County providing commuter benefits consulting services to encourage employers to provide alternative commute benefits or programs to their employees.
- Non-Employer Commuter Outreach: The Alliance also reaches commuters directly as opposed to through their employers. Non-employer commuter outreach includes residential and community marketing.
- Incentive Programs:
 - The Alliance provides a “New Carpooler Commuter Incentive.” Drive-alone commuters, who live in, work in and/or commute through San Mateo County and who switch to carpooling to work at least 2 days per week for eight consecutive weeks are eligible to receive a financial incentive of a \$60 gas card per participant.

- The Alliance provides a “New Vanpooler Rider Incentive.” Drive-alone commuters, who live in, work in and/or commute through San Mateo County and who switch to vanpooling to work are eligible to receive a financial incentive of \$100 per month maximum for three months after the first three months of participating in a vanpool as a passenger.
- The Alliance provides a “Vanpool Driver Incentive.” Drivers of vanpools originating in or destined for San Mateo County who keep their vanpools operating for six months as the driver are eligible to receive a financial incentive of \$500.00 per driver.
- The Alliance provides a “Try Transit Program.” Drive-alone commuters, who live in, work in and/or commute through San Mateo County can try transit for free by utilizing free transit tickets provided by transit agencies in San Mateo County and neighboring partner agencies in surrounding counties. This is a trial program, one time only.
- The Alliance provides a “Carpool to School Incentive.” Parents who live and/or drive their children to school in San Mateo County and who switch to driving a “school pool” at least 2 days per week for at least 8 weeks are eligible to receive a financial incentive of a \$20.00 gas card per parent.
- Guaranteed Ride Home Program: The Alliance provides a “Guaranteed Ride Home Program,” to any commuter (whose employer signs on to the program) to San Mateo County who carpools, vanpools, or takes transit to work. The Alliance provides for 75% of the cost of a taxi or a 24-hour rental car in case of emergency during the work day. The participating employer pays the other 25% of the cost of the ride.
- Website: The Alliance has a website, www.commute.org that provides information about all transportation alternatives in San Mateo County, and provides links to the websites of our partner agencies and other Bay Area transportation providers.
- Phone: The Alliance provides general information about transportation alternatives to driving alone, including HOV and Park-and-Ride facility information to callers who call (650) 588-8170.

H. Final Report Content: Final Report form and final Cost Effectiveness Worksheet

Form 1 – Ridesharing, Shuttles, Transit Information, Rail/Bus Integration, Smart Growth, and Traffic Calming Projects. (Includes Transit Bus Signal Priority.)

I. Attach a completed Cost-effectiveness Worksheet and any other information used to evaluate the proposed project.

PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Number: 12SM02

B. Project Title: SamTrans Shuttle Program
Provide a concise, descriptive title for the project (e.g., "Elm Ave. Signal Interconnect" or "Purchase Ten Gasoline-Electric Hybrid Light-Duty Vehicles").

C. TFCA Program Manager Funds Allocated: \$554,400

D. TFCA Regional Funds Awarded (if applicable): \$56,583

E. Total TFCA Funds Allocated (sum of C and D): \$610,983

F. Total Project Cost: \$2,530,190
Indicate the TFCA dollars allocated (C, D and E) and total project cost (D). Data from Line E (Total TFCA Funds) should be used to calculate C-E.

G. Project Description:

Project sponsor will use TFCA funds to operate shuttles to connect BART stations to the employers in San Mateo County. This project supports the SamTrans Shuttle Bus Program, a peak commute period shuttle bus service from BART stations to major employment sites in San Mateo County. These employment sites are not served conveniently by existing transit service. The SamTrans Shuttle Bus Program includes eight (8) previously approved shuttle routes that are currently operating as part of the SamTrans Shuttle Bus Program. Most shuttles operate about eight trips a day. BART stations served include Balboa Park, Glen Park, South San Francisco, San Bruno, and Millbrae.

<u>Shuttle Name</u>	<u>Service Area</u>	<u>BART Station</u>
Bayhill	San Bruno	San Bruno
Crocker Park	Brisbane	Balboa Park
Gateway	South San Francisco	Millbrae
Gateway Express	South San Francisco	Glen Park
Oyster Point	South San Francisco	South San Francisco
Seton	Daly City	Daly City
Sierra Point	Brisbane	Balboa Park
Utah Grand	South San Francisco	South San Francisco

This service allows about 1964 (FY10-11) riders a day to take public transportation to about 150 companies. Since the average car driver lives 26.1 miles from the station this removes about 27,000 miles of trips a day from Bay Area freeways. All shuttle vehicles operated with TFCA funds meet the California Air Resources Board (CARB) particulate matter standards for public transit fleets.

H. Final Report Content: Final Report form and final Cost Effectiveness Worksheet

- *Form for Ridesharing, Shuttles, Transit Information, Rail/Bus Integration, Smart Growth, and Traffic Calming Projects. (Includes Transit Bus Signal Priority.)*

I. Attach a completed Cost-effectiveness Worksheet and any other information used to evaluate the proposed project.

See cost effectiveness worksheet.

J. Comments (if any):

See cost effectiveness worksheet.

RESOLUTION 12-14

**A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO
COUNTY AUTHORIZING THE ADOPTION OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2012/2013
EXPENDITURE PLAN FOR THE TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR CLEAN AIR
(TFCA) COUNTY PROGRAM MANAGER FUND FOR SAN MATEO COUNTY**

WHEREAS, the City/County Association of Governments has been designated the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Manager for San Mateo County; and,

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments has approved certain projects and programs for funding through San Mateo County's 40 percent local share of Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) revenues; and,

WHEREAS, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District has estimated the Fiscal Year 2012/2013 TFCA funding for San Mateo County to be \$1,007,664; and,

WHEREAS, the City/County Association of Governments will act as the Program Manager for \$990,000 of TFCA funded projects; and,

WHEREAS, the projects included in this expenditure plan are the most appropriate and cost-effective strategies currently available within the County for reducing motor vehicle emissions. All proposed expenditures will be consistent with the *Clean Air Plan* and Section 44241(b) of the California Health and Safety Code; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County that the C/CAG Staff is authorized to submit the Fiscal Year 2012/2013 Expenditure Plan for the TFCA County Program Manager Fund for San Mateo County to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED THIS 8th DAY OF MARCH 2012.

Bob Grassilli, C/CAG Chair

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: March 8, 2012

To: City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors

From: Richard Napier, Executive Director

Subject: Review and approval of Resolution 12-15 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement between C/CAG and the County of San Mateo for construction contract advertisement, award and administration of the Smart Corridor north and south segments project for an additional \$2,052,363 to a new total of \$8,402,363 for expanding the southerly project limits to the Santa Clara County Line
(For further information or questions contact Parviz Mokhtari at (408) 425-2433)

RECOMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board review and approve Resolution 12-15 authorizing the C/CAG chair to execute Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement between C/CAG and the County of San Mateo for construction contract advertisement, award and administration of the Smart Corridor north and south segments project for an additional \$2,052,363 to a new total of \$8,402,363 for expanding the southerly project limits to the Santa Clara County Line.

FISCAL IMPACT

The estimated construction cost of this project, including 10% contingency, is \$7,452,363. In addition, the County's estimate the contract administration fee is \$950,000 for total project cost of \$8,402,363. California Transportation Commission (CTC) has previously approved and allocated \$5,270,000 of State funds. Staff's request for additional \$3.7M is pending CTC action in the Spring of 2012.

BACKGROUND

The C/CAG Board at the regular meeting of June 10, 2010 approved an agreement between C/CAG and the County of San Mateo for construction administration of the Smart Corridor from Whipple Avenue in Redwood City to San Bruno Avenue for a total of \$6,350,000. Due to issues regarding the State budget, construction of the project was delayed. In June 2011 the Board authorized staff to proceed with the design of Segment 3 of the Smart Corridor (Whipple Avenue to Santa Clara County line). The design of Segment 3 has been completed and has been added to the previously approved project. Therefore; due to the extension of the limits of the project, the cost of the project and the duration of construction have been increased.

ATTACHMENT

Resolution 12-15
Amendment No. 1

ITEM 5.4

RESOLUTION 12-15

* * * * *

**A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY (C/CAG) AUTHORIZING THE CHAIR TO
EXECUTE AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN
C/CAG AND THE COUNTY OF THE SAN MATEO, FOR
CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT, ADVERTISEMENT, AWARD, AND
ADMINISTRATION OF THE SMART CORRIDOR NORTH AND SOUTH
SEGMENTS PROJECT**

* * * * *

RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), that

WHEREAS, C/CAG Board at the meeting of June 10, 2010 approved an Agreement between C/CAG and the County of San Mateo for construction and contract administration of Smart Corridor from Whipple Avenue to San Bruno Avenue for total amount of \$6,350,000; and

WHEREAS, C/CAG authorized staff to expand the project limit to the Santa Clara County Line; and

WHEREAS, the expansion of the Project limits affects the C/CAG programmed dollars for the construction phase, services to be provided by the County, and anticipated duration of the Project; and

WHEREAS, Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement is necessary because the southerly project limits have been extended whereby increasing the construction cost from \$5,700,000 to \$7,452,363; the construction duration has been increased; and the estimated cost for the County's services has been increased from \$650,000 to \$950,000.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County that the Chair is authorized to execute Amendment No. 1 to the Agreement between C/CAG and the County of San Mateo for construction contract, advertisement, award and administration of the Smart Corridor north and south segments project for an additional \$2,052,363 to a new total of \$8,402,363 for expanding the southerly project limits to the Santa Clara County Line. Final Amendment No. 1 is subject to approval by C/CAG legal counsel.

PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED THIS 8TH DAY OF MARCH 2012.

Bob Grassilli, Chair

**AMENDMENT NO. ONE
TO AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO
COUNTY AND THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, FOR CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT
ADVERTISEMENT, AWARD, AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE SMART
CORRIDORS NORTH AND SOUTH SEGMENTS PROJECT IN SAN MATEO
COUNTY**

THIS AMENDMENT NO. ONE to that certain Agreement, dated August 24, 2010, by and between the City/County Association of Governments, hereinafter called (C/CAG) and the County of San Mateo, acting through its Department of Public Works, (COUNTY), and, is entered into this _____ day of March, 2012.

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, an amendment to the Agreement is necessary due to an expansion of the project limits for the Smart Corridors North and South Segments project (Project); and

WHEREAS, the expansion of the Project limits affects the C/CAG programmed dollars for the construction phase, services to be provided by the County, and anticipated duration of the Project.

NOW, THEREFORE, for the consideration and upon the terms and conditions hereinafter specified, the Parties agree to amend the Agreement and Exhibits as follows:

1. C/CAG has programmed \$7,452,363 for the construction phase of the Project.
2. Provision 3, Funding and Method of Payment, of the Agreement:
Section 3a shall be modified such that C/CAG will compensate County in an amount not to exceed \$950,000.

Section 3b shall be modified such that C/CAG agrees to fully compensate COUNTY for construction costs for the Project , up to a maximum of \$7,452,363, including contingencies. COUNTY shall not be obligated to fund construction costs in excess of \$7,452,363.

3. The Project limits described in Exhibit A shall be replaced with the following description:

“Project local streets are located within the cities of San Bruno, Millbrae, Burlingame, San Mateo, Belmont, San Carlos, Redwood City, Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, and Town of Atherton, unincorporated County of San Mateo areas (Belmont and North Fair Oaks), and within State right-of-way on El Camino Real (SR 82). The Project is divided into the following two segments:

- North Segment: is from San Bruno Avenue to East Poplar Avenue, including San Bruno Avenue, Millbrae Avenue, Broadway Avenue, Peninsula Avenue, Poplar Avenue, Old Bayshore Road, Airport Boulevard, Rollins Road and California Drive.
- South Segment: is from East Poplar Avenue to Willow Road, including 3rd Avenue, 4th Avenue, Ralston Avenue, Harbor Boulevard, Holly Street, Brittan Avenue, Whipple Avenue, Delaware Street and Industrial Way, Old County Road, Veterans Boulevard, Middlefield Road, 5th Avenue, Jefferson Avenue, Marsh Road, Ravenswood Avenue and Willow Road.”

4. Exhibit C "SMCo Smart Corridors Project. Construction Management Estimated Charges" to the Agreement is replaced in its entirety with the attached Exhibit C containing the revised Not to Exceed Construction Management Charges of \$950,000.

5. All Other Terms and Conditions of the Agreement Dated the 24th day of August 2010, between the County and C/CAG Shall Remain in Full Force and Effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto, by their duly authorized representatives, have affixed their hands.

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

By: _____
Bob Grassilli, C/CAG Chair

By: _____
President
Board of Supervisors
County of San Mateo

Date: _____

Date: _____

ATTEST:

By: _____
John L. Maltbie, Acting Clerk of Said Board

Approved as to form:

C/CAG Legal Counsel

County Legal Counsel

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: March 8, 2012

To: City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors

From: Richard Napier, Executive Director

Subject: Review and approval of C/CAG Legislative policies, priorities, positions, and legislative update
(A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified)

(For further information or questions contact Richard Napier at 599-1420)

INFORMATION

The C/CAG Legislative Committee meeting was canceled in February. A copy of the State Legislative Update – February is attached for information.

ATTACHMENT

- State Legislative Update - February

(3)

(4)

(5)



ADVOCATION



SHAW/YODER/ANTWIH, *inc.*
LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY • ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT

February 28, 2012

TO: Board Members, City/County Association of Governments, San Mateo County
FROM: Advocation, Inc. – Shaw / Yoder / Antwih, Inc.

RE: STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE-FEBRUARY

On January 5, Governor Brown released his FY 2012-13 State Budget. He emphasizes that significant progress in trimming down the state's chronic budget deficit has been made by comparing a \$26.6 billion shortfall in FY 2011-12 and \$20 billion structural deficit to a \$9.2 billion gap in FY 2012-13 with future structural shortfalls of \$5 billion from the \$89 billion spending plan. The \$9.2 billion deficit is an 18-month forecast which includes a current year gap (FY 11-12) of \$4.1 billion. Unlike last year, the Governor has not called for a Special Session to address the deficit. Therefore, budget subcommittees are not expected to meet until later this Spring. The following is a summary of other topics of interest.

On February 27, the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) issued its report on the 2012-13 State Budget. According to the LAO, while the economic outlook has improved somewhat since our last forecast in November, data received after that forecast concerning 2010 tax payments by Californians and soft personal income tax (PIT) estimated payments in December and January have weakened some parts of our office's near-term revenue forecast. In January, we noted that our November General Fund revenue forecast was \$6.8 billion lower than the administration's in 2011-12 and 2012-13 combined (including our lower estimates of revenue from the Governor's proposed tax initiative). Now, LAO's updated revenue forecast—including similar federal tax policy assumptions as the administration's, an updated estimate of revenues from the Governor's initiative, and an initial estimate of revenues due to the possible Facebook stock offering—is \$6.5 billion lower than the administration's in 2011-12 and 2012-13 combined. If the Facebook-related revenues were omitted from this new forecast, General Fund revenues would be about \$8.5 billion lower than the administration's over this period—worse than the \$6.8 billion difference identified in January—due mainly to the negative revenue data received over the last three months.

Redevelopment

The month of January represented the last month of existence for local Redevelopment Agencies (RDAs). The 2010 law eliminating the agencies, crafted as part of last year's budget package, takes effect on February 1. While some lawmakers have voiced support for reviving the agencies' main functions in new forms, a workable solution has not emerged since the state Supreme Court struck down the Legislature's first attempt at creating a successor to RDAs. A push to delay the dissolution date until April 15 has failed to gain traction in the Legislature. Senate President pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg is authoring **SB 654** in order to allow local governments to keep and use redevelopment money earmarked for affordable housing projects. The bill, which had an urgency clause, failed to receive a 2/3 vote and was moved on the Senate Floor on a majority vote. Affordable housing advocates are working with the pro Tempore to try and gather votes to pass the bill as an urgency item. Assembly Speaker John Pérez has introduced **AB 1585** as a placeholder to consider providing a tool to help stimulate local economies.

High-Speed Rail

The High-Speed Rail Authority is expected to release its revised Business Plan in late March. Major revisions are expected from the original plan which was released on November 5th and calls for a \$98.5 billion investment to build the high-speed train network. It is our understanding that the new plan will recommend making substantial investments in the Peninsula as well as Southern California in order to modernize the existing infrastructure of the bookends to the system and prepare for linkage to a high-speed rail system in the future.

As a result, Caltrain is in position to receive as much as \$1 billion in Proposition 1A funding to use with local match dollars (\$1.428 billion total) to electrify its system along its existing right-of-way, implement positive train control, and purchase new rail cars. The improvements would be completed by 2019, a full 12 years before high-speed rail service is being contemplated in the area. Electrification will allow for member agencies to reduce their operating costs in half while increasing service from 45,000 to 70,000 riders per day.

Key Bills

1. **AB 2291 (Gordon)** is a spot bill that has been introduced as a vehicle for CCAG's extension of its current \$4 vehicle license fee for program for the management of traffic congestion and storm water pollution. The last extension, which was provided in SB 348 (Simitian) Chapter 377, Statutes of 2008, is set to expire on January 1, 2013.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: March 8, 2012
To: City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors
From: Richard Napier, Executive Director
Subject: Review and approval of the Pre-Tax Commuter Benefit Model Ordinance
(For further information contact Sandy Wong at 599-1409)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board review and recommend approval of the Pre-Tax Commuter Benefit Model Ordinance.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Commuter Benefits, born from the Clean Air Act of 1990, is part of a federally-enabled program governed by section tax code 132(f) of the tax code. The net result of this benefit is a reduction in commuting costs for employees and payroll taxes for employers. In February 2009, the transit benefit pre-tax "cap" was increased as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) to \$230 per month. However, pending Congress action, the \$230 benefit cap may be extended, or become permanent, or revert back to \$125 per month. Employees can use the pre-tax wages to purchase transit passes or vanpool rides. The public policy benefits of a Pre-Tax Commuter Benefits Ordinance include potential vehicle trip reduction during peak commuter periods, provision of more affordable travel choices, resulting in greater use of public transit as a commuter alternative, and potential reduction in energy consumption and air emissions during peak commuter periods.

On May 12, 2011 the C/CAG Board directed staff to work with the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance to conduct outreach efforts regarding a prospective Pre-Tax Commuter Benefits Ordinance requiring employers to offer a pre-tax commuter benefits program to encourage employees to use public transit or vanpools. Since then, CMEQ committee member Jim Bigelow and former Executive Director of the Alliance, Christine Maley-Grubl, along with Stuart Baker of Commuter Checks, conducted extensive outreach to local business groups to inform them about pre-tax commuter benefits programs and to receive input. The results were encouraging. The C/CAG Board also received an update on this effort at the September 8, 2011 meeting.

Based on the positive feedback from the business community, and recognizing the potential for carbon emissions reductions based on a proactive program that provides tax benefit for both employers and employees, a Draft Pre-Tax Commuter Benefit Model Ordinance was developed and presented to the CMEQ committee for review and comments at the September 26, 2011

ITEM 6.2.

meeting. The CMEQ committee made revisions to the Draft Model Ordinance and requested a second round of outreach to the business communities. Results were reported back to the CMEQ committee on February 27, 2012. The CMEQ committee reviewed and recommended approval of the Final Pre-Tax Commuter Benefit Model Ordinance. The model ordinance covers employers with 100 or more employees in San Mateo County.

If approved by the C/CAG Board, this model ordinance would be transmitted to each local jurisdiction in San Mateo County with a recommendation of adoption by the jurisdiction. Having a model ordinance for all cities and the County to use will provide consistency on implementation across jurisdictions.

ATTACHMENT

Final Pre-Tax Commuter Benefit Model Ordinance

1 [Commuter Benefits]

2

3 **Ordinance adding Section ____ of the _____ Code to require City of _____**
4 **employers to offer commuter benefits to encourage employees to use public transit or**
5 **van pools;**

6 Be it ordained by the People of the City of _____:

7 Section 1. Findings. The City Council hereby finds and declares:

8 (a) _____ is committed to protecting the public health, safety, welfare
9 and environment. Air pollution is one of the major public health threats in _____ and
10 contributes to asthma and other respiratory diseases. Encouraging commuters to use public
11 transit and vanpools to reach their place of employment will reduce air pollution from private
12 cars.

13 (b) Existing Federal Tax law, Internal Revenue Code section 132(f) allows
14 employers and employees to reduce the cost of public transit by enabling employers to deduct
15 employer-provided transit benefits as business expenses, or by allowing employees to elect to
16 purchase qualifying transit passes or vanpool rides with pre-tax dollars.

17 (c) The County of San Mateo currently partially subsidizes its 5,300 employees to
18 purchase qualifying transit passes and van pool transit through an Internal Revenue Code
19 section 132(f) qualified Transit Benefit Program.

20 (d) The Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance will assist employers in
21 offering commuter benefits through education and information provided through phone
22 consultation or onsite outreach, and other technical assistance.

23 (e) Commuter benefits programs will help the City of _____ achieve its goal to
24 reduce greenhouse gas emissions within the city to 1990 levels by the year 2020 per State
25 Assembly Bill 32.

[Type text]

SEC. ____ . COMMUTER BENEFITS PROGRAM

(a) Definitions.

Whenever used in this Section, the following terms shall have the meanings set forth below.

"Alternative Commute Mode" shall mean public transit (bus, train, ferry, etc), vanpool, carpool (Including "casual carpool"), bicycling, and walking.

"Covered Employee" shall mean any person who is on their respective employer's payroll. Employee shall further be defined as any person who is entitled to payment of a minimum wage from an employer under the California minimum wage law, as provided under Section 1197 of the California Labor Code and wage orders published by the California Industrial Welfare Commission.

"Covered Employer" shall mean any person, as defined in Section 18 of the California Labor Code, including corporate officers or executives, who directly or indirectly, or through an agent any other person, employs or exercises control over the wages, hours or working conditions of one hundred (100) or more employees who work at or out of a location within the City of _____, including those who perform work outside the geographic boundaries of the City of _____ but within the County of San Mateo. [While there is no requirement for employers with fewer than 100 employees, these employers are encouraged to participate in the program. All the educational and outreach support services from the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance are available to employers of any size.]

"Transit Pass" shall mean any pass, debit card, transit smart card (e.g., Clipper Card), voucher or similar item entitling a person to transportation on public transit, including but not limited to, travel by bus, light rail or train by Muni, BART, Caltrain, or SamTrans.

"Vanpool" shall mean any highway vehicle:

[Type text]

- (1) the seating capacity of which is at least 6 adults (not including the driver), and
- (2) at least 80% of the mileage use of which can reasonably be expected to be-

(A) for the purpose of transporting employees in connection with travel between their residences and their place of employment, and

(B) on trips during which the number of employees transported for such purposes is at least ½ of the seating capacity of such vehicle (not including the driver).

(b) Transportation Benefit Program

No later than 90 days after the effective date of this Ordinance, all Covered Employers shall provide at least one of the following transportation benefit programs:

(1) A Pre-Tax Election: A program, consistent with Section 132 of Title 26, United States Code, that offers employees the option to elect to exclude from taxable wages and compensation, employee commuting costs incurred through the use of public transportation or vanpools, up to maximum level allowed by federal tax law, 26 U.S.C. 132 (f)(2), which presently is two hundred and thirty dollars per month (\$230);

(2) Employer Paid Benefit: A program whereby the Covered Employer supplies a transit pass or reimbursement for equivalent vanpool charges at least equal in value to the purchase price of a monthly SamTrans bus pass, which presently is \$64, for the public transit system requested by the employee; or to reimburse vanpool charges; or

(3) Transportation furnished by the employer at no cost to the employee in a vanpool or bus, shuttle or similar multi-passenger vehicle operated by or for the employer.

(c). Administration and Compliance

(1) The Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance shall alert employers that fall under the category of Covered Employer, that they will need to offer this program per their cities' ordinance code.

[Type text]

(2) The Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance shall maintain an education and advice program to assist employers with meeting the requirements of the Commuter Benefits Program. The Alliance will also outline other commuter support options such as the Guaranteed Ride Home Program and the Shuttle Bus service.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

_____, City Attorney

By: _____

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: March 8, 2012
To: Board of Directors
From: Richard Napier, Executive Director
Subject: Review and approval of the Call for Projects for the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for Fiscal Year 2012/2013 & Fiscal Year 2013/2014

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Board of Directors review and approve the Call for Projects for the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for Fiscal Year 2012/2013 & Fiscal Year 2013/2014.

FISCAL IMPACT

For the FY 12/13 & FY 13/14 funding cycle there will be approximately \$7,000,000 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 12/13 and \$500,000 for FY 13/14). The San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) Measure A Program will provide approximately \$6,000,000 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 budget adoption process.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The C/CAG Shuttle Program was developed out of the Congestion Relief Plan in 2002. In connection with the Congestion Management Program, individual cities do not have to prepare deficiency plans on a biannual basis, instead C/CAG took on the responsibility by setting up the Congestion Relief Plan. One of the measures in the Congestion Relief Plan is the local shuttle program. The objective of the Congestion Relief Plan is to absolve cities from the responsibility of preparing a deficiency plan.

Initially conceived as a demonstration project to improve the mobility of residents in San Mateo County, the program has evolved into a robust network of shuttles that provide congestion relief by connecting employment centers to transit stations throughout San Mateo County. The local shuttle programs include community routes as well that provide mobility for residents within communities during both day and evening.

ITEM 6.3

Responding to the desire and need for a more streamlined San Mateo County shuttle program, C/CAG staff worked with TA staff to develop a combined process. These efforts were called out specifically in the recently drafted Shuttle Business Practices Guidebook. Staff developed a "one call" funding program that enables applicants to apply to one program utilizing one application and scoring criteria for both C/CAG and TA funding sources. The combined program is designed to utilize one call for projects, one application, and one scoring committee. The funding cycle as developed is a two-year cycle and includes FY 12/13 and FY 13/14. Both agencies will be utilizing one methodology by which to score projects. There will be ongoing performance measures that will be the same for both agencies. Once proposed projects have been scored they will be brought to each respective Board of Directors for the funding allocation from the respective agency. Staff will work to try to issue only one source of funds (C/CAG or TA) for each project.

All applications will go through one application process. The result of this process will be one prioritized list of projects to be funded. The scoring committee will then create two separate lists of projects which will go to each agency for funding. This means there will be one prioritized project list that will be broken down into two lists that will have the projects to be funded by each agency. After the funding allocations are made by each Board of Directors, staff from each agency will be responsible for administering their agency's funding agreements with the shuttle program project sponsors. Essentially there is one call for projects and application process, but once the funding allocations are made project sponsors will then be working with staff from the agency that provides the funding.

The major changes are the lower match requirement for project applicants as well as the funding cycle going from a one-year funding cycle to a two-year funding cycle. The minimum match is now being proposed to be twenty five percent (25%) of the total project cost. This represents a significant reduction from the existing match requirement of fifty percent (50%) of total project cost as is currently required under the existing C/CAG shuttle program. This change to 25% is still under discussion with the Transportation Authority staff and may be revised before the call for projects is issued. Project applicants now include local jurisdictions and/or public agencies. Renewal projects will be evaluated in part based on the proposed baseline thresholds for operating cost per passenger and boardings per service hour. For operating cost per passenger, the thresholds are \$7 per passenger for commuter shuttles, \$9 per passenger for community shuttles and \$16 per passenger for door-to-door shuttles. For boardings per service hour, the thresholds are 15 boardings per service hour for commuter shuttles, 10 boardings per service hour for community shuttles and 2 boardings per service hour for door-to-door shuttles. These thresholds are likely to be reviewed and modified in the future.

Proposed Timeline for the San Mateo County Shuttle Program for FY 12/13 & FY 13/14:

- February 16, 2012 – Technical Advisory Committee Call for Projects Review
- February 27, 2012 – Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Call for Projects Review
- March 8, 2012 – C/CAG Board of Directors Call for Projects Review and Approval

- March 9, 2012 – Issue Call for Projects for FY 12/13 & FY 13/14 San Mateo County Shuttle Program
- March 21, 2012 – Application Workshop at SamTrans offices
- April 16, 2012 – Shuttle Program Applications Due
- April 16-27, 2012 – Convene Shuttle Program Evaluation Committee
- May 17, 2012 – Technical Advisory Committee Recommended Project List Review
- May 21, 2012 – Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee Project List Review
- June 5, 2012 – TA Citizens Advisory Committee Project List Review
- June 7, 2012 Transportation Authority Board of Directors Project List Review and Approval
- June 14, 2012 – C/CAG Board of Directors Project List Review and Approval

ATTACHMENTS

- San Mateo County Shuttle Program Call for Projects FY 2012/2013 & 2013/2014

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY



TO: City/County Managers
Public Works Directors

FROM: Tom Madalena, C/CAG
Celia Chung, SMCTA

DATE: March 9, 2012

RE: **Call for Projects: San Mateo County Shuttle Program FY 2012/2013 & FY 2013/2014**

This memo transmits the guidelines and criteria for the San Mateo County Shuttle Program for FY 2012/2013 & FY 2013/2014, a combination of the C/CAG Local Transportation Services Program under the Countywide Congestion Relief Plan and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) Measure A Sales Tax Program. This combined funding program offers \$7,000,000 available on a competitive basis for a two-year funding cycle. Eligible applicants in San Mateo County can apply for funding to establish local shuttle services that are designed to assist residents and employees to travel within San Mateo County or to connect with a regional transportation service (major SamTrans routes, Caltrain, BART, ferries). Eligible applicants include local jurisdictions and/or public agencies within San Mateo County. Projects that are coordinated among multiple jurisdictions are encouraged. The funding for this Call for Projects is to start new local transportation services, augment existing services, or continue projects previously funded under the Congestion Relief Plan and/or the Measure A Sales Tax Local Shuttle Program. Shuttles funded through this program must be open to the general public.

In order to qualify for funding, the project sponsor must provide a minimum of 25% of the total cost of the program. The source of matching funds is at the discretion of the project sponsor, although matching funds must not be C/CAG funds or San Mateo County Transportation Authority Measure A Local Shuttle Program funds. Direct costs for operations, marketing and administration of shuttles are eligible.

Local jurisdictions and/or public agencies must be the applicant for the funds; however they may use other entities such as SamTrans, the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance (Alliance) or others to manage and/or operate the service. Employers and private entities are not eligible to apply directly, however they may partner with a local jurisdiction or public agency which would be the applicant. A letter of concurrence/sponsorship from SamTrans is required to confirm that the shuttle route(s) shall not duplicate SamTrans fixed-route service. Please contact Marisa Espinosa, Manager of Planning and Research <espinosam@samtrans.com> or (650) 508-6226 no later than **April 2, 2012** to request the letter of concurrence/sponsorship.

Applications may be emailed to tmadalena@co.sanmateo.ca.us or mailed to:

Tom Madalena
C/CAG
555 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

The application deadline is 5:00 p.m. Monday April 16, 2012. An application workshop will be held 1:30 p.m. Wednesday March 21, 2012. The applications must include the information listed below and must be completed with the attached Microsoft Word and Excel application forms. Projects (both new and renewal) may be considered for reduced funding in the event that there are insufficient funds to fully fund the requested amount. C/CAG and the TA intend to program funds such that each shuttle program funded through this funding cycle will only receive one funding source.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR APPLICATIONS FOR EXISTING PROJECTS

A. Service Performance (maximum of 25 points)

Provide the following data for the past 12 months of service based on the definitions provided.

1. Operating cost per passenger for prior 12 months (up to 13 points).

This measure is calculated by dividing all operating costs by total passengers. Operating costs include contract costs (if applicable), maintenance, insurance, fuel and administrative costs to the service. Benchmarks that the projects will be evaluated against are \$7/passenger for commuter shuttles, \$9/passenger for community shuttles and \$16/passenger for door-to-door shuttles.

2. Passengers per vehicle hour of service for prior 12 months (up to 12 points).

Passengers per vehicle hour of service is calculated by dividing the total number of passengers by the total number of vehicle service hours. Benchmarks that the projects will be evaluated against are 15 passengers per vehicle hour of service for commuter shuttles, 10 passengers per vehicle hour of service for community shuttles and 2 passengers per vehicle hour of service for door-to-door shuttles.

B. Budget (up to 9 points)

Show:

1. Contractor cost (e.g. operator/vendor)
2. Administrative costs (e.g. staff oversight)
3. Other direct costs (e.g. marketing)
4. Total operating cost
5. Notes/exceptions (e.g. if there are projected differences between the first and second years' costs)

C. Service Plan (10 points)

1. Describe how the service was delivered for the prior 12 months and any proposed changes for the new funding period, including:
 - a. Service area (show routes, if applicable, and destinations served)
 - b. List specific rail stations, major SamTrans route or ferries served by the shuttle
 - c. Schedule (days, times, frequency) - Show coordination with scheduled transit service. Also describe whether the shuttle is a community shuttle, commuter shuttle or door-to-door shuttle.
 - d. Marketing (outreach, advertising, signage, schedules, etc.)
 - e. Service provider

- f. Administration and oversight plan/roles
- g. Co-sponsor/stakeholders (roles/responsibilities)
- h. Monitoring plan (service quality performance data, complaints/complements, surveys)
- i. Ridership characteristics, e.g. commuters, employees, seniors, students, etc.
- j. Any differences/changes to existing service for the funding period, compared to the prior 12 months

D. Matching funds (25 points)

- 1. List amounts and sources of matching funds

E. Partnership (2 points)

- 1. How much private sector funding will be contributed towards this shuttle?

F. Public Input/Support (up to 2 points)

- 1. Endorsement of shuttle by the governing board/city council of the sponsor/applicant
- 2. Letters of support from co-sponsors, partners, stakeholders, etc.

G. Need (up to 25 points)

Describe how the shuttle will

- 1. Provide service to low-income, transit dependent, seniors, disabled or other special-needs populations
- 2. Provide transportation to needed services for the above populations
- 3. Provide service to underserved/previously underserved areas
- 4. Multi-jurisdictional coordinated service (if applicable)

H. Sustainability (up to 2 points)

- 1. Does the shuttle accommodate bicycles?
- 2. Will clean-fuel vehicles be deployed for shuttle service?

I. Bonus Points (5 points)

Describe how this shuttle will impact, effect or comply with:

- 1. Increases in fixed route ridership
- 2. Safety
- 3. Single-Occupant Vehicle (SOV) Vehicle-Miles-Traveled (VMT) Reduction
- 4. Leveraging/sharing resources
- 5. Proposed shuttle is included in adopted local, special area, county or regional plan
- 6. Preserves open space and natural habitat
- 7. Reduces emissions/improves air quality

8. Improves transit access to Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
9. Supports job and housing growth

J. Minimum Requirements

Each shuttle project must meet the following minimum requirements in order to be considered for funding.

1. Letter of concurrence/sponsorship from SamTrans. This means confirmation in writing by SamTrans that the shuttle routes shall not duplicate SamTrans fixed-route service. Please contact Marisa Espinosa, Manager of Planning and Research <espinosam@samtrans.com> or (650) 508-6226 no later than **April 2, 2012** to obtain the letter of concurrence/sponsorship.
2. Any changes to the proposed service prior to implementation or during the funding period must be approved by the funding agency (C/CAG or TA) with the concurrence of SamTrans.
3. Service schedules must be designed to ensure timed transfers between routes and with regional carriers such as SamTrans, Caltrain, BART, and ferries.
4. To qualify for funding, a project must have a minimum overall score of 50 points in order to be considered.
5. Non-supplantation of funds certification. This certifies that the grant funding will not replace existing funds for the project.
6. Shuttle must be open to the general public.
7. Shuttle must be ADA-compliant.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR APPLICATIONS FOR NEW PROJECTS

A. Projected Ridership and Performance (up to 10 points)

Project the following data based on the definitions provided. Explain the methodology for your projection of the number of passengers for each proposed route. State assumptions and document justification where possible.

1. Total passengers
2. Shuttle vehicle hours of service to be provided
3. Total operating costs. Include contract costs (if applicable), maintenance, insurance, fuel and administrative costs to the service. Operating costs and passenger data should be provided separately for each route.

B. Budget (up to 9 points)

1. Contractor cost (e.g. operator/vendor)
2. Administrative costs (e.g. staff oversight)
3. Other direct costs (e.g. marketing)
4. Total operating cost
5. Notes/exceptions (e.g. if there are projected differences between the first and second years' costs)

C. Service Plan (up to 25 points)

1. Describe how the service will be delivered for the first 12 months of service including:
 - a. Service area (show routes, and destinations served. Attach maps if available)
 - b. List specific rail stations, major SamTrans routes or ferries served by the shuttle
 - c. Schedule (days, times, frequency) Show coordination with scheduled transit service. Also describe whether the shuttle is a community shuttle, commuter shuttle or door-to-door shuttle as well as the size and number of vehicles to be used.
 - d. Marketing (outreach, advertising, signage, schedules, etc.)
 - e. Service provider
 - f. Administration and oversight plan/roles
 - g. Monitoring Plan (service quality, performance data, complaints/complements, surveys)
 - h. Co-sponsors/stakeholders (roles/responsibilities)
 - i. Ridership characteristics, e.g. commuters, employees, seniors, students, etc.
 - j. Proposed shuttle is consistent with policy documents (adopted)

D. Matching funds (up to 25 points)

1. List amounts and sources of local match funding

E. Partnership (up to 2 points)

1. How much private sector funding will be contributed towards this shuttle?

F. Public input/Support (up to 2 points)

1. Endorsement of shuttle by the governing board/city council of the sponsor/applicant
2. Letters of support from co-sponsors, partners, stakeholders, etc.
3. Shuttle results from a public planning process

G. Need (up to 25 points)

Describe how the shuttle will:

1. Provide service to low-income, transit dependent, seniors, disabled or other special-needs populations
2. Provide transportation to needed services for the above populations
3. Provide service to underserved/previously underserved areas
4. Multi-jurisdictional coordinated service

H. Sustainability (up to 2 points)

1. Does the shuttle accommodate bicycles?
2. Will clean-fuel vehicles be deployed for shuttle service?

I. Bonus Points (5 points)

Describe how this shuttle will impact, effect or comply with:

1. Increases in fixed route ridership
2. Safety
3. Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV) Vehicle-Miles-Traveled (VMT) Reduction
4. Leveraging/sharing resources
5. Proposed shuttle is included in adopted local, special area, county or regional plan
6. Preserves open space and natural habitat
7. Reduces emissions/improves air quality
8. Improves transit access to Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
9. Supports job and housing growth

J. Minimum Requirements

Each shuttle project must meet the following minimum requirements in order to be considered for funding.

1. Letter of concurrence/sponsorship from SamTrans. This means confirmation in writing by SamTrans that the shuttle routes shall not duplicate SamTrans service. Please contact Marisa Espinosa, Manager of Planning and Research <espinosam@samtrans.com> or (650) 508-6226 no later than **April 2, 2012** to obtain the letter of concurrence/sponsorship.
2. Any change to the proposed service prior to implementation or during the funding period must be approved by the funding agency (C/CAG or TA) with the concurrence of SamTrans.
3. Service schedules must be designed to ensure timed transfers between routes and with regional carriers such as SamTrans, CalTrain, BART, and ferries.
4. To qualify for funding a project must have a minimum overall score of 50 points in order to be considered.
5. Non-supplantation of funds certification. This certifies that the grant funding will not replace existing funds for the project.
6. Shuttle must be open to the general public.
7. Shuttle must be ADA-compliant.

EVALUATION PROCESS (dates are subject to change)

An evaluation panel will review the applications and develop recommendations for publication by May 4, 2012. These recommendations will be presented to the C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on May 17, 2012. The TAC recommendation will go to the C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) on May 21, 2012. The recommendations will also go to the TA Citizens Advisory Committee on June 5, 2012. The C/CAG Board of Directors and TA Board of Directors will each develop a program of projects after consideration of the recommendations provided by the TAC and CMEQ on June 14, 2012 and June 7, 2012 respectively.

Attachments:

- San Mateo County Shuttle Program Application FY 12/13 & 13/14 for Existing Shuttles
- San Mateo County Shuttle Program Application FY 12/13 & 13/14 for New Shuttles
- San Mateo County Shuttle Program Criteria
- Non-supplantation of funds certification

Call for Projects
San Mateo County Shuttle Program FY 2012/2013 & FY 2013/2014

Application Form for Existing Shuttles

Sponsoring agency:

Contact person:

Phone:

Email:

Shuttle Name	Amount of Funding Requested
	\$

Minimum Requirements:

Yes No

- Project is located within San Mateo County
- Project is a shuttle service that meets local mobility needs and/or provides access to regional transit
- Funding is for shuttle operations open to the general public
- Shuttles must be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
- A funding match of at least 25% will be provided
- A Non-Supplantation Certificate is attached
- A letter of concurrence/sponsorship from SamTrans is attached*

* Please contact Marisa Espinosa, Manager of Planning and Research [(650)-508-6226, espinosam@samtrans.com], no later than April 2, 2012 to request the letter of concurrence/sponsorship.

If you have answered “no” to any of the above minimum requirements, please review the project guidelines and contact Tom Madalena [(650) 599-1460, tmadalena@co.sanmateo.ca.us] or Celia Chung [(650) 508-6466, chungc@samtrans.com] with any questions.

Attachments

List all attachments here:

- A letter of concurrence/sponsorship from SamTrans (*Minimum requirement*)
- A Non-Supplantation Certificate (*Minimum requirement*)
- Service Maps (*C1a*)
- Governing Board Endorsement (*E1*)
- Support letters (*E2*)
-
-
-
-

APPLICATION FOR EXISTING PROJECTS

Table 1

Contractor Cost			
In House Cost			
Fuel			
Insurance			
Administrative Costs (e.g. Personnel expenses)			
Other Direct Costs (e.g. Printing marketing materials, promotions, etc.)			
Total Operating Costs	\$0	\$0	\$0

Operating Data	For 12 Months Prior
Vehicle Hours of Service	
Revenue Vehicle Miles	
Total Passengers	

Performance Indicators ¹	For 12 Months Prior	
Operating Cost/Passenger	#DIV/0!	= Total Operating Cost/Total Passengers
Passengers/Revenue Hour	#DIV/0!	= Total Passengers / Vehicle Hours of Service

A. Service Performance (up to 25 points)

(Use Table 1 to provide calculation information for questions 1 and 2)

1. Operating cost per passenger for prior 12 months (up to 13 points); and
2. Passengers per vehicle hour of service for prior 12 months (up to 12 points).

B. Budget (up to 9 points)

(Use Table 1 to provide information for questions 1, 2, 3, and 4)

1. Contractor cost (e.g. operator/vendor)
2. Administrative costs (e.g. staff oversight)
3. Other direct costs (e.g. marketing)
4. Total operating cost
5. Notes/exceptions (e.g. if there are projected differences between the first and second years' costs)

C. Service Plan (up to 10 points)

1 Benchmarks for existing shuttles

Shuttle service	Operating Cost/ passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour
Commuter	\$7	15
Community or Combination	\$9	10
Door to Door	\$15	2

1. Describe how the service was delivered for the prior 12 months and any proposed changes for the new funding period, including:
 - a. Service area (route description, destinations served)
(Attach maps)
 - b. List specific rail stations, major SamTrans route or ferries served by the shuttle
 - c. Schedule (Days, times, frequency) Show coordination with scheduled transit service. Also describe whether the shuttle is a community shuttle, commuter shuttle or door-to-door shuttle as well as the size and number of vehicles to be used.
 - d. Marketing (outreach, advertising, signage, schedules, etc.)
 - e. Service provider
 - f. Administration and oversight plan/roles
 - g. Co-sponsor/stakeholders (roles/responsibilities)
 - h. Monitoring plan (service quality performance data, complaints/complements, surveys)
 - i. Ridership characteristics (commuters, employees, seniors, students, etc.)
 - j. Any differences/changes to existing service for the funding period, compared to the prior 12 months

D. Matching Funds (up to 25 points)

1. List amounts and sources of matching funds

Table 2

Source of Funding	Amount	Percentage
Matching Funds <i>(list sources)</i>		
<i>Subtotal Matching Funds</i>	\$0.00	#DIV/0!
TA or C/CAG Funding request for FY13 & FY14		#DIV/0!
Total Funding	\$0.00	#DIV/0!

E. Partnership (up to 2 points)

1. How much private sector funding will be contributed towards this shuttle? \$ _____

F. Public Input/Support (up to 2 points)

1. Endorsement of shuttle by the governing board/city council of the sponsor/applicant
(Attach evidence of endorsement)
2. Letters of support from co-sponsors, partners, stakeholders, etc.
(Attach letters)

G. Need (up to 25 points)

Describe how the shuttle will:

1. Provide service to low-income, transit dependent, seniors, disabled or other special-needs populations
2. Provide transportation to needed services for the above populations
3. Provide service to underserved/previously underserved areas
4. Multi-jurisdictional coordinated service (if applicable)

H. Sustainability (up to 2 points)

1. Does the shuttle accommodate bicycles?
2. Will clean-fuel vehicles be deployed for shuttle service? (describe)

I. Bonus Points (up to 5 points)

Describe how this shuttle will impact, effect or comply with:

1. Increases in fixed route ridership
2. Safety
3. Single Occupant Vehicle (SOV) Vehicle-Miles-Traveled (VMT) Reduction
4. Leveraging/sharing resources
5. Proposed shuttle is included in adopted local, special area, county or regional plan
6. Preserves open space and natural habitat
7. Reduces emissions/improves air quality
8. Improves transit access to Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
9. Supports job and housing growth

**Call for Projects
 San Mateo County Shuttle Program FY 2012/2013 & FY 2013/2014**

Application Form for New Shuttles

Sponsoring agency:

Contact person:

Phone:

Email:

Shuttle Name	Amount of Funding Requested
	\$

Minimum Requirements:

Yes No

- Project is located within San Mateo County
- Project is a shuttle service that meets local mobility needs and/or provides access to regional transit
- Funding is for shuttle operations open to the general public
- Shuttles must be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)
- A funding match of at least 25% will be provided
- A Non-Supplantation Certificate is attached
- A letter of concurrence/sponsorship from SamTrans is attached*

* Please contact Marisa Espinosa, Manager of Planning and Research [(650)-508-6226, espinosam@samtrans.com], no later than April 2, 2012 to request the letter of concurrence/sponsorship.

If you have answered “no” to any of the above minimum requirements, please review the project guidelines and contact Tom Madalena [(650) 599-1460, tmadalena@co.sanmateo.ca.us] or Celia Chung [(650) 508-6466, chungc@samtrans.com] with any questions.

Attachments

List all attachments here:

- A letter of concurrence/sponsorship from SamTrans (*Minimum requirement*)
- A Non-Supplantation Certificate (*Minimum requirement*)
- Service Maps (*C1a*)
- Governing Board Endorsement (*E1*)
- Support letters (*E2*)
-
-
-
-

APPLICATIONS FOR NEW PROJECTS

Table 1

Projected Operating Costs	FY13 Projection	FY14 Projection
Contractor Cost		
In House Cost		
Fuel		
Insurance		
Administrative Costs (e.g. Personnel expenses)		
Other Direct Costs (e.g. Printing marketing materials, promotions, etc.)		
Total Operating Costs	\$0	\$0

Projected Operating Data	FY13 Projection	FY14 Projection
Vehicle Hours of Service		
Revenue Vehicle Miles		
Total Passengers		

Performance Indicators	FY13 Projected Average	FY14 Projected Average
Operating Cost/Passenger	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Passengers/Revenue Hour	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

A. Projected Ridership and Performance For Each Fiscal Year (up to 10 points)
(Use Table 1 to provide calculation information for questions 1, 2, and 3. State assumptions and document justification where possible.)

1. Total passengers
2. Vehicle hours of service to be provided.
3. Total Operating Costs

Assumptions:

B. Budget (up to 9 points)
(Use the Table 1 to provide calculation information for questions 1, 2, 3 and 4)

1. Contractor cost (e.g. operator/vendor)
2. Administrative costs (e.g. staff oversight)
3. Other direct costs (e.g. marketing)
4. Total operating cost
5. Notes/exceptions (e.g. if there are projected differences between the first and second years' costs)

C. Service Plan (up to 25 points)

1. Describe how the service will be delivered for the first 12 months of service including:
 - a. Service area (route description, destinations served)
(Attach maps)
 - b. List specific rail stations, major SamTrans routes or ferries served by the shuttle
 - c. Schedule (Days, times, frequency) Show coordination with scheduled transit service. Also describe whether the shuttle is a community shuttle, commuter shuttle or door-to-door shuttle as well as the size and number of vehicles to be used.
 - d. Marketing (outreach, advertising, signage, schedules, etc.)
 - e. Service provider
 - f. Administration and oversight plan/roles
 - g. Monitoring Plan (service quality, performance data, complaints/complements, surveys)
 - h. Co-sponsors/stakeholders (roles/responsibilities)
 - i. Proposed shuttle is consistent with policy documents (adopted)
 - j. Ridership characteristics (commuters, employees, seniors, students, etc.)

D. Matching Funds (up to 25 points)

1. List amounts and sources of matching funds
(Use Table 2 to answer question 1)

Table 2

Source of Funding	Amount	Percentage
Matching Funds <i>(list sources)</i>		
<i>Subtotal Matching Funds</i>	\$0.00	#DIV/0!
TA or C/CAG Funding request for FY13 & FY14		#DIV/0!
Total Funding	\$0.00	#DIV/0!

E. Partnership (up to 2 points)

1. How much private sector funding will be contributed towards this shuttle? \$ _____

F. Public input/Support (up to 2 points)

1. Endorsement of shuttle by the governing board/city council of the sponsor/applicant
(Attach evidence of endorsement)
2. Letters of support from co-sponsors, partners, stakeholders, etc.
(Attach letters)
3. Shuttle results from a public planning process (describe)

G. Need (up to 25 points)

Describe how the shuttle will:

1. Provide service to low-income, transit dependent, seniors, disabled or other special-needs populations
2. Provide transportation to needed services for the above populations
3. Provide service to underserved/previously underserved areas
4. Multi-jurisdictional coordinated service (if applicable)

H. Sustainability (up to 2 points)

1. Does the shuttle accommodate bicycles?
2. Will clean-fuel vehicles be deployed for shuttle service? (describe)

I. Bonus Points (up to 5 points)

Describe how this shuttle will impact, effect or comply with:

1. Increases in fixed route ridership
2. Safety
3. Single Occupant Vehicles (SOV) Vehicle-Miles-Traveled (VMT) Reduction
4. Leveraging/sharing resources
5. Proposed shuttle is included in adopted local, special area, county or regional plan
6. Preserves open space and natural habitat
7. Reduces emissions/improves air quality
8. Improves transit access to Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
9. Supports job and housing growth

San Mateo County Shuttle Program Criteria

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA		San Mateo County Shuttle Call For Projects FY 12/13 & 13/14	
Minimum Local Match	25%		
Local Match Limitations	C/CAG or Measure A Shuttle funds cannot be used as the local match for either funding agency. Measure A Local Streets/Transportation Funds may be used.		
Program Purpose	- Provide local shuttle services for residents and employees to travel within or to connect with regional transportation/transit service within San Mateo County.		
Eligible Applicants	Local jurisdictions and/or public agencies are eligible applicants for the funds, however they must obtain a letter of concurrence/sponsorship from SamTrans. They may partner with other public, non-profit or private entities to co-sponsor shuttles. Grant applicants may also contract with other public, non-profit or private entities to manage and/or operate the shuttle service.		
Eligible Costs	Costs directly tied to the shuttle service, such as operations, marketing and outreach, and staff time directly associated with shuttle administration are eligible. Overhead, indirect or other staff costs are not eligible. Staff costs are limited to a maximum of 5% of the grant amount.		
Minimum Requirements/Screen	Project is located in San Mateo County Project is a shuttle service that meets local mobility needs and/or provides access to regional transit. Funding is for operations open to the general public Shuttles must be compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act(ADA). Non-Supplantation Certification: Funding request does not substitute for existing funds. Letter of concurrence/sponsorship from SamTrans		
Other Requirements	- Any change to the proposed service prior to implementation or during the funding period must be approved by the funding agency (TA or C/CAG) with the concurrence of SamTrans.		
SCREENING CRITERIA		EXISTING SHUTTLES	NEW SHUTTLES
Non-Supplantation Certification	Funding request does not substitute for existing funds.	Yes/No	Yes/No
Letter of Concurrence/sponsorship	a. If there are proposed route and/or schedule changes to shuttle service, applicant shall provide a letter of concurrence/no prejudice from SamTrans regarding the proposed changes. OR b. For existing services that have not previously received funding from the TA or C/CAG, evidence of coordination with SamTrans, i.e., letter of concurrence/no prejudice from SamTrans that proposed shuttle routes does not duplicate SamTrans fixed route service, is required.		Evidence of coordination with SamTrans, i.e., letter of concurrence/no prejudice from SamTrans that proposed shuttle routes does not duplicate SamTrans fixed route service, is required.
SCORING CRITERIA		EXISTING SHUTTLES	NEW SHUTTLES
		Maximum Points	Maximum Points
Effectiveness (Service Performance)	Annual average operating cost per passenger for the prior 12 months - up to 23 points Annual average passengers per revenue vehicle hour of service for the prior 12 months - up to 12 points	25	Projected ridership, operating costs, and revenue vehicle hours of shuttle service to be provided in the first and second years of shuttle service. State assumptions and document justification where possible.
Readiness (Budget)	Budget line items a. Contractor (operator/vendor) cost b. Administrative (Staff oversight) c. Other direct costs (e.g. marketing) d. Total operating cost e. Notes/exceptions (e.g. if there are projected differences between	9	Budget line items a. Contractor (operator/vendor) cost b. Administrative (Staff oversight) c. Other direct costs (e.g. marketing) d. Total operating cost e. Notes/exceptions (e.g. if there are projected differences between
Readiness (Service Plan)	Describe how the shuttle service will be delivered for the 2-year funding period including: a. Service area (routes/maps, destinations served) b. Specific rail stations, ferry or major SamTrans transit centers served c. Schedule (days, times, frequency) - show coordination with scheduled transit service d. Marketing Plan/activities (advertising, outreach, signage, etc.) e. Administration and oversight (whom?) f. Monitoring/Evaluation Plan/activities (performance data, complaints/compliments, surveys) g. Co-sponsors/stakeholders (roles?) h. Ridership characteristics: e.g. commuter/ employees, seniors, students, etc. i. Any significant changes to existing service	10	Describe how the shuttle service will be delivered for the 2-year funding period including: a. Service area (routes/maps, destinations served) b. Specific rail stations, ferry or major SamTrans transit centers served c. Schedule (days, times, frequency) - show coordination with scheduled transit service d. Marketing Plan/activities (advertising, outreach, signage, etc.) e. Administration and oversight (whom?) f. Monitoring/Evaluation Plan/activities (performance data, complaints/compliments, surveys) g. Co-sponsors/stakeholders (roles?) h. Ridership characteristics: e.g. commuter/ employees, seniors, students, etc. i. Proposed service is consistent with adopted policy documents
Readiness (Local Match)	Percentage of local match contribution 0 to < 25% - 0 points 25 to < 50% - up to 20 points 50 to < 75% - up to 23 points 75 to < 99% - up to 25 points	25	Percentage of local match contribution 0 to < 25% - 0 points 25 to < 50% - up to 20 points 50 to < 75% - up to 23 points 75 to < 99% - up to 25 points
Readiness (Funding)	Partnership: Recipient of private sector funding	2	Partnership: Recipient of private sector funding
Readiness (Public Input/Support)	Endorsed by the governing board/city council of the sponsor/applicant Letters of support from stakeholders, etc.	2	Endorsed by the governing board/city council of the sponsor/applicant Letters of support from stakeholders, etc. Shuttle results from a public planning process
Need	Provides service to low income, transit dependent, seniors, disabled or other special-needs populations Provides transportation to needed services for any of the aforementioned populations Provides service to underserved/previously unserved areas Multi-jurisdictional coordinated service	25	Provides service to low income, transit dependent, seniors, disabled or other special-needs populations Provides transportation to needed services for any of the aforementioned populations Provides service to underserved/previously unserved areas Multi-jurisdictional coordinated service
Sustainability	Shuttle accommodates bicycles Use of clean-fuel vehicle for shuttle service	1 1	Shuttle accommodates bicycles Use of clean-fuel vehicle for shuttle service
Maximum Point Total		100	Maximum Point Total
MISCELLANEOUS		EXISTING SHUTTLES	NEW SHUTTLES
		Bonus Points	Bonus Points
Effectiveness	Service results in an increase to fixed route transit ridership Safety SOV VMT reduction Leveraging/sharing resources (peak and off-peak service)	2	Service results in an increase to fixed route transit ridership Safety SOV VMT reduction Leveraging/sharing resources (peak and off-peak service)
Policy Consistency	Proposed shuttle is included in an adopted local, special area, county or regional plan (e.g. community-based transportation plan, general plan, Grand Blvd. Initiative, MTC Priority Development Area, etc.)	1	Proposed shuttle is included in an adopted local, special area, county or regional plan (e.g. community-based transportation plan, general plan, Grand Blvd. Initiative, MTC Priority Development Area, etc.)
Sustainability	Preserves open space and natural habitat Reduces emissions/Improves air quality Improves transit access to Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Supports jobs and housing growth	2	Preserves open space and natural habitat Reduces emissions/Improves air quality Improves transit access to Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Supports jobs and housing growth

**San Mateo Fiscal Years 2013 and/or 2014
San Mateo County
Shuttle Program**

Non-Supplantation of Funds Certification

This certification, which is a required component of the project initiator's grant application, affirms that San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) Measure A Local Shuttle Program and/or City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) Local Transportation Services Program funds will be used to supplement (add to) existing funds, and will not supplant (replace) existing funds that have been appropriated for the same purpose. Potential supplantation will be examined in the application review as well as in the pre-award review and post award monitoring.

Funding may be suspended or terminated for filing a false certification in this application or other reports or documents as part of this program.

Certification Statement:

I certify that any funds awarded under the FY2013 and/or FY2014 TA Measure A Local Shuttle Program and/or C/CAG Local Transportation Services Program will be used to supplement existing funds for program activities, and will not replace (supplant) existing funds or resources.

Project Name: _____

Project Applicant: _____

PRINT NAME

TITLE*

SIGNATURE

DATE

* This certification shall be signed by the Executive Director, Chief Executive Officer, President or other such top-ranking official of the Project Applicant's organization.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

DATE: March 8, 2012
TO: C/CAG Board of Directors
FROM: Richard Napier, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Election of a C/CAG Chairperson and Two C/CAG Vice Chairpersons
(For further information please contact Richard Napier at (650) 599-1420)

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Board elect a Chairperson and two Vice Chairpersons. The vote can be by acclamation or a written ballot depending on the preference of the Board.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The C/CAG By-Laws, as amended on June 10, 2004, provides for the nomination of officers at the regular February Board meeting and the election of officers shall occur at the regular March Board meeting. This change was to allow time for the candidates to provide the Board Members with background information to assist them in casting their votes.

At the February 9, 2012 Board meeting, Bob Grassilli was nominated for Chair; and Carlos Romero and Brandt Grotte were nominated for the two Vice Chairs.

No additional nominations may be submitted at the March 8^h meeting. The Board can only accept additional nominees from the floor in the event there are not enough candidates for the available offices.

The voting shall be public. According to legal counsel, this can be done by hand or in writing as long as the Board member's name appears on the ballot and it becomes part of the official record. Written ballots will be available if the Board wants to use them.

ATTACHMENTS:

Background information for Bob Grassilli, Carlos Romero, and Brandt Grotte.

ITEM 6.4

Council Member Bob Grassilli



Councilmember Information

Term of Office: November, 2009 - November, 2013
Profession: Business Consultant

Email: bgrassilli@cityofsancarlos.org

Phone: (650) 802-4160

Biography

Bob Grassilli was elected to the San Carlos City Council on November 8, 2005 and again on November 3, 2009. Previously, he served on the San Carlos Planning Commission from 1994 to 2000, and on the Railroad Land Use Committee.

He earned his Master's of Business Administration in Finance from the University of California and a Bachelor's degree in Business from the University of San Francisco. He is a graduate of Serra High School.

Mr. Grassilli's priorities for San Carlos include: adopting a fiscally responsible municipal budget and ensuring that citizens receive the best fire protection services available.

Mr. Grassilli started his professional career in 1970 with Arthur Andersen, a large Certified Public Accounting firm and in 1977 worked for Sunstream Homes where he spent 27 years; the last 18 as Chief Financial Officer. He currently serves on the Board of Directors of Samaritan House as well as the Carl and Celia Berta Gellert Foundation.

Mr. Grassilli was born in San Francisco and moved to the Peninsula at age four. He has lived in San Carlos since 1983. He enjoys golf and travel, as well as volunteering for various charities on the Peninsula.

Council Committee Assignments

Each year, the Mayor assigns members of the City Council to serve on Citywide and Regional committees representing the City of San Carlos. Here are the committees that this Council Member serves on as a Committee Member and Alternate Committee Member.

Council Committee Member

- Capital Budget Subcommittee (Council Ad Hoc Committee)
- City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG)
- Council Finance Subcommittee (Council Ad Hoc Committee)
- Council of Cities
- Planning Commission (Council Liaison)
- San Mateo County Convention and Visitors Bureau
- South Bayside System Authority Board (SBSA)
- Wheeler Plaza Subcommittee (Council Ad Hoc Committee)

Alternate Council Committee Member

- Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)
- Belmont-San Carlos Fire Department Board
- C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC)
- C/CAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)
- Housing Endowment and Regional Trust (HEART)

63

Carlos Romero's Bio

Elected to the East Palo Alto City Council in 2008, Carlos Romero served as Mayor of East Palo Alto in 2011. Prior to being elected mayor, he was chair and vice chair of the East Palo Alto Redevelopment Agency, served on and chaired the city's Planning Commission for six years and was a member and chair of the East Palo Alto Rent Stabilization Board for four years. Currently Carlos chairs the city's Housing and Economic Development committees.

Regionally, Carlos is vice chair of City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) of San Mateo County, and vice chair of the multi-county Dumbarton Rail Policy Advisory committee comprised of Alameda and San Mateo counties. Carlos also serves as a board member of the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance comprised of 17 San Mateo County cities, and he is an alternate board member on the San Francisquito Creek Joint Powers Authority. He also served on the nine county Metropolitan Transportation Commission's advisory committees for three and one half years, and chaired its Equity Analysis subcommittee. He is an active participant in the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, participating in their Housing, Land Use and Transportation policy areas.

Professionally, Carlos is a housing development and land use consultant for non-profit and community based organizations. Over the past 20 years he has been involved in almost every aspect of developing and operating community housing and economic development organizations as a founder, board member, project manager, and executive director. Prior to consulting, he headed Mission Housing Development Corporation, a San Francisco community-based, affordable housing organization with an annual operating budget of \$6.5 million and a portfolio of over 1200 affordable units. During his tenure at Mission Housing, he was responsible for more than \$110 million dollars of housing and mixed-use development activity.

In addition to his affordable housing development skills, Carlos has extensive experience as a community organizer in low-income neighborhoods. He has worked on a multitude of grassroots organizing projects ranging from the incorporation of East Palo Alto, to citizenship and civic participation trainings for immigrants, to environmental justice campaigns. In 1988, he co-founded EPA CAN DO, a community-based housing and economic development organization that has developed over 330 affordable housing units in East Palo Alto. Carlos has served on several boards of directors of non-profit organizations in East Palo Alto over the last 25 years. Of particular note, he was the board chair of The East Palo Alto Community Law Project, a legal services organization in EPA that also served as Stanford Law School's clinical law program in public interest law.

Carlos did his undergraduate studies in international relations and economics at Stanford University, was a Fannie Mae Fellow at the Harvard's Kennedy School of Government in 2001, and in 2004/2005 was a Harvard Loeb Fellow at the Harvard Graduate School of Design during which he researched land use and transportation issues, national housing policy, and advanced real estate finance and capital markets.

Brandt Grotte

Brandt Grotte has been a resident of San Mateo since 1986. He grew up in a variety of towns in the U.S. and abroad while his father was in the Air Force, settling in San Jose where he attended Leland High School. After high school, he obtained his BA in Aquatic Biology from UC Santa Barbara in 1979, and subsequently a Masters Degree in Environmental Management from the University of San Francisco in 1996. Brandt is very happily married to Kathy and has two stepsons. He currently works in the electronics industry as the company's Global Environmental, Safety and Health Manager.

Grotte has been active in neighborhood issues since 1989 including as a founding member of the Shoreview-Parkside Neighborhood Association and a representative to San Mateo United Homeowners including multiple years as President of each association. Other activities in support of the City and its residents and businesses have included

- Membership on San Mateo's Citizens Committee on Social Service Providers
- The City's committee that developed Single-Family Residential Design Guidelines (for second story additions)
- Bay Meadows Foundation (philanthropic)
- The City's Street Tree Maintenance focus group
- San Mateo United Homeowners Subcommittee on the General Plan Update
- City of San Mateo, Citizens' Academy
- Chamber of Commerce's Leadership Program
- Chair, member and founding Councilmember of the Sustainability Advisory Committee
- Founding member of San Mateo FACT (Flood Assessment Correction Team) to remove many of our homes from the FEMA Flood Map
- City representative to the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG)
- City representative to the ALS/JPA (countywide ambulance services)
- Measure C campaign to improve Fire and Police stations
- Measure P to preserve height and density limits
- Implementing a Sustainability Plan and practices in our City to secure our long term future (now an appendix to the General Plan)
- Building a new Police Station that is seismically safe, sustainably green and demonstrates to our public safety workers that we value them
- City Council appointed lead on High Speed Rail – utilizing the opportunity to preserve and improve downtown San Mateo, electrify CalTrain and get safe grade separations for the streets in San Mateo
- Approved new Solar Panels on the Main Library which was determined LEED Gold in 2008
- Approved Bay Meadows Phase II which is now bringing good jobs to San Mateo, will provide a vibrant new Transit Oriented Development (TOD) neighborhood and significantly add 15+ acres to our system of parks
- Support for Downtown marketing efforts and the Chamber of Commerce EDGE program (to promote business conversation, employee training and business retention) that are helping to support our businesses in these challenging economic times
- Increased affordable housing requirement from 10 to 15% in new developments
- Approved the Hines and Station Park Green TOD developments which were approved with high green building requirements and development agreements that are business friendly and yet increase benefits to the adjacent neighborhoods

He is currently serving on the City Council as a Councilmember and was the 2009 Mayor. Grotte served on the Planning Commission of the City of San Mateo for 5 years including one year each as Vice-Chair and Chairperson. As a former Planning Commissioner, he demonstrated an open and responsive manner to all sides on any planning issue. This included listening, considering and then recommending solutions that balance the interests of all parties, and protect the character of San Mateo while allowing it to grow in a responsible and sustainable manner.

Professionally, Grotte has worked in the fields of aquaculture, facilities maintenance and for the past 29 years in the electronics field. His professional responsibilities include significant efforts in the areas of environmental management systems, risk management including fire protection, risk assessment, workers compensation, occupational health issues, quality management systems and building consensus between groups ranging from wage role employees to upper management.

Grotte's International experience has promoted his sensitivity to a variety of cultures and includes the challenges of achieving understanding across cultural boundaries. This is important when developing policies, obtaining consensus, implementing programs and interpreting needs all of which are important in the highly diverse City of San Mateo.

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*

February 6, 2012

Andre Boutros, Chief Deputy Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
(Via E-Mail)

Subject: Request for \$3.73 Million CMIA Savings for San Mateo County Smart Corridor

Dear Mr. Boutros,

The City/County Association of Government of San Mateo County (C/CAG) and Caltrans District 4 have formed a successful partnership in developing the San Mateo County Smart Corridor. We greatly appreciate the support from the California Transportation Commission (CTC) on this project, particularly its recent decision in programming the additional \$7.5 million TLSP funding for the expanded project scope for Segment 3 (El Camino Real).


I would like to take this opportunity to provide some additional clarification regarding our current request, through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), for an additional \$3.73 million CMIA Savings in order to fully build out the Smart Corridor.

1. The \$3.73 million and the \$7.5 million will go to two separate project contracts, both are for Segment 3.
2. We have also included a request for additional RIP fund as part of the 2012 STIP development in the event that the CMIA Savings does not come through. However, if we are granted the CMIA Savings, we will withdraw the STIP request.
3. The project we proposed to use the \$3.73 million CMIA Savings is ready to go. If the CTC approves the \$3.73 M request, we would request a simultaneous allocation at the March 2012 CTC meeting, and advertise in April 2012.
4. The Smart Corridor project is supported by the MTC and is ranked third on their priority list.

The Smart Corridor generally parallels the San Mateo US 101 corridor. The San Mateo US 101 has been awarded another CMIA grant for Auxiliary Lanes improvement. Segment 3 of the Smart Corridor extends the project from Whipple Ave to the Santa Clara County Line. It will complement the benefit of the original CMIA project. Your consideration of this request is appreciated.

If you need any further information, please contact me at (650) 599-1420 or Sandy Wong, C/CAG Deputy Director, at (650) 599-1409.

Sincerely,



Richard Napier, Executive Director

ITEM 9.1

chron

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

February 8, 2012

Heather Fargo
Executive Policy Officer
California Strategic Growth Council
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Focus Area #2 Collaboration Requirement

Dear Ms. Fargo,

Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) applying for planning grants under Focus Area #2 are required to demonstrate collaboration with local government partners by submitting letters of intent to participate in the proposed activities from these partners. In the San Francisco Bay Area, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the region's MPO submitting an application in partnership with the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the region's Council of Governments, and local governments with Priority Development Areas. Priority Development Areas (PDAs) are locally designated and regionally adopted areas for accommodating more housing near transit in the support of creating complete communities as part of FOCUS, the San Francisco Bay Area's regional blueprint plan. PDA jurisdictions have adopted resolutions to participate in the FOCUS program. Given their readiness and commitment to creating complete communities, PDAs will play an important role in implementing Senate Bill 375. Leveraging our diverse partnerships with local and regional interest groups will also support these efforts.

As the agencies charged with preparing and adopting a Sustainable Communities Strategy to implement Senate Bill 375 in this region, ABAG and MTC have proposed several elements that advance this work and would support the development of PDAs as complete communities. ABAG and MTC have already committed to supporting PDAs by prioritizing them in their capital, planning, and technical assistance funding programs. In the draft One Bay Area Grant proposal to support implementation of the SCS currently under development, PDAs could receive up to 70% of transportation dollars allocated to their county to support infill development and transportation improvements. State funding through this grant program would further advance implementation of sustainable communities planning goals.

Given that our jurisdiction's PDA will be supported by this proposal, we support it, and intend to participate in the proposed activities. If you have any questions regarding our PDA plans and participation, please contact me.

Regards,


Richard Napier
Executive Director

ITEM 9.2