

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

### AGENDA

#### Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

**Date:** Monday, January 27, 2014 at 3:00 p.m.  
**Place:** San Mateo City Hall  
330 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo, California  
Conference Room C (across from Council Chambers)

PLEASE CALL Sandy Wong (599-1409) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND

- |   |                                     |               |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the agenda  | Presentations are limited to 3 mins |               |
| 2. Approval of minutes of November 27, 2013 meeting.  | Action (Garbarino)                  | Pages 1 - 6   |
| 3. Update on potential Stormwater funding initiative.   | Information (Fabry)                 | Pages 7 - 13  |
| 4. Technology presentation – feasibility of digester gas to compressed natural gas (CNG) fuel.  | Information (San Mateo Rep)         | Oral          |
| 5. Informational update on the San Mateo County Energy Watch (SMCEW) Program.   | Information (Springer/Wright)       | Pages 15 - 16 |
| 6. Update on the highway improvement studies along US 101   | Information (Wong)                  | Pages 17 - 18 |
| 7. Recommend adoption of the Fiscal Year 2014/15 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Program Manager Fund for San Mateo County | Action (Hoang)                      | Pages 19 - 21 |
| 8. Nominations and elections of CMEQ Chair and Vice Chair.  | Action (Wong)                       | Page 23       |
| 9. Executive Director Report.   | Information (Wong)                  |               |
| 10. Member comments and announcements.  | Information (Garbarino)             |               |



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

**MINUTES  
MEETING OF November 25, 2013**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Garbarino in Conference Room C at City Hall of San Mateo at 3:02 pm. Attendance sheet is attached.

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

Chair Garbarino welcomed new CMEQ Committee Member Mike O'Neill from Pacifica.

**2. Approval of Minutes of October 28, 2013 meeting.**

*Motion: To approve the Minutes of the October 28, 2013 meeting, Pierce/Trapp. Motion carried unanimously.*

**3. Receive a presentation on the Economic & Housing Opportunities (ECHO) Assessment phase 2 Study.**

Sujata Srivastava of Strategic Economics, a consultant retained by SamTrans, provided a presentation on the Economic & Housing Opportunities (ECHO) Assessment Phase II study, which focused on removing barriers to implementing the vision of the Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI). The study was funded by a TIGER II grant and examined the challenges and contexts for development in four cities along the El Camino Real corridor: Daly City, South San Francisco, Belmont, and Mountain View. The study produced a guidebook of strategies for all cities on the corridor to use to address barriers to implementation.

Ms. Srivastava's presentation highlighted three key strategies:

- **Plan for vibrant activity nodes.** Given that supporting 43 miles of mixed-use along the corridor is likely not a viable strategy for development, the study recommended that cities concentrate activity and public resources in high intensity nodes and highlighted key considerations for identifying potential opportunity sites.
- **Align land use regulations with market and physical conditions.** The study recommended that cities set zoning, parking, and other regulations to enable new investment in the short-term and support a long-term vision of transformation. For example, the study suggested that cities adjust zoning to reduce on-site parking requirements or allow feasible building types.
- **Coordinate public and private investments.** The study recommended that cities target public improvements in key activity nodes rather than spread resources out throughout the corridor. Additionally, citing the projected increase in property values along the corridor of \$35 billion, the study recommended that cities consider new strategies for getting private development to contribute to public improvements, such as implementing assessment districts or impact fees.

Member Lewis asked about bicycles as a mode of transportation on El Camino Real and expressed concern about the speed of cars on the stretch of El Camino Real located in Atherton, where the road takes up three lanes in both directions. She mentioned that Atherton is in conversation with Caltrans about potentially replacing the outside lanes with bicycle paths. Ms. Srivastava responded that

although Strategic Economics does not serve as the transportation consultant for the GBI, she has heard several conversations about balancing the needs of different users on El Camino Real and suggested that the issue of making travel safer for bicycles and pedestrians varies across the corridor.

Member Papan asked about the methodology for determining the projected \$35 billion increase in property values along the El Camino Real corridor by 2035. Ms. Srivastava responded that the estimate is based on household and employment projections from Plan Bay Area and C/CAG. She added that the values of new housing units and construction were applied to these projections to estimate the increase in assessed property values.

Member Pierce asked if other cities along the El Camino Real corridor that were not examined as part of the study would be able to use the findings of the study or if a consultant should be hired to better understand local conditions. Ms. Srivastava responded that the general principles of the study could be applied to most places along the corridor but that if a city wanted to determine the answers to specific questions, such as the amount of community benefits that would result from higher densities, hiring a consultant would be recommended.

**4. Review and recommend approval of the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding for the South San Francisco Grand Boulevard Complete Streets project in an amount of \$1,991,000.**

Tom Madalena, C/CAG staff, presented the South San Francisco Grand Boulevard Complete Streets project and discussed how it was selected and recommended for funding from the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). In June 2011, the C/CAG Board made a commitment to using up to \$2 million of State Transportation Improvement Program-Transportation Enhancement (STIP-TE) funds, which are now known as TAP funds under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act (MAP-21), towards a Complete Streets project on El Camino Real/Mission Street. The Board reaffirmed this commitment in May 2013 as part of adopting the OneBayAreaGrant Program and approved allocating \$1,991,000 in STIP-TE funds towards a Complete Streets project that would be selected amongst the four TIGER II Complete Streets case study projects in Daly City, San Bruno, San Carlos, and South San Francisco.

San Bruno, San Carlos, and South San Francisco applied for the TAP funds, which were supplemented by additional funding that SamTrans received through a Transportation, Community, and Systems Preservation Program (TCSP) grant, to bring their preliminary Complete Streets project design packages completed under TIGER II from 40% design to 100% design. Tom described that the three projects were evaluated by a review panel based on their readiness, availability of match, incorporation of green street design elements, level of utility conflicts, and transferability to other jurisdictions, among other evaluation measures. Based on these criteria, the South San Francisco project was recommended for funding.

According to Tom, the South San Francisco project includes wider sidewalks, improved transit stops, 105 new trees, frontage planting, and tree wells as well as pervious medians, sidewalks, and if approved by Caltrans, pervious paving for curbside parking along El Camino Real.

Member Dworetzky asked about the location of the project. C/CAG staff responded that the project is located just north of Westborough Boulevard on El Camino Real.

*Motion: To recommend approval of the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funding for the South San Francisco Grand Boulevard Complete Streets project in an amount of \$1,991,000, Pierce/Lewis. Motion carried unanimously.*

**5. Review and recommend approval of the Call for Projects for the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for Fiscal Year 2014/2015 & Fiscal Year 2015/2016.**

Tom Madalena, C/CAG staff, presented the Call for Projects for the second cycle of the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program. The \$7 million in funding for the two-year program is provided by C/CAG Congestion Relief Plan Program funds, which provide \$500,000 per fiscal year, and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Measure A Program funds, which provide approximately \$3 million per fiscal year. According to Tom, the Call for Projects and scoring criteria are very similar to those used during the last cycle, and only a few changes were made to make the application more straightforward and adjust performance measures for inflation.

Tom reported that this item was presented to the C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) last week, where a discussion ensued regarding the eligibility of shuttle projects that serve school children. According to Tom, these types of projects are not precluded by the shuttle program application guidelines, but project sponsors that propose to provide service to school children may subject themselves to additional state and federal regulations, specifically as they relate to safety around transporting school children. Tom cited a legal determination a few years back that was received by the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance that said if a shuttle route serving a school was open to the public, circuitous, and stopped at a number of destinations in addition to the school, these additional regulations would not apply.

According to Tom, the Transportation Authority is now seeking an opinion from its legal counsel as to whether or not its funds can be used for school service. The C/CAG TAC recommended approval of the Call for Projects with additional language stating that shuttles that primarily serve school children would be eligible for funding pending the decision from the Transportation Authority's legal counsel.

Member Kersteen-Tucker asked whether funding was available only for new projects, or if existing projects were also eligible. Tom responded that funding is offered on a competitive basis and that both new and existing shuttles are eligible. He added that while all projects compete against one another, there are slightly different application questions for new and existing shuttles (i.e. new shuttles will not be asked to provide any performance information).

Member Kersteen-Tucker asked a follow-up question about how underperforming shuttle programs are provided with additional assistance. Tom responded that while C/CAG staff do not provide additional assistance to these programs, project sponsors are encouraged to obtain additional support from SamTrans and the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance. Additionally, he mentioned that program funds could be used to fund marketing efforts that could help increase ridership.

Member Lentz asked about the typical timeframe for making changes to an existing shuttle service. Tom suggested that the timeframe could vary based on existing community processes for planning shuttles. He said that tweaking an existing shuttle may not be as complicated as planning for new service, which could take over a year because of the time needed for community meetings and local working group sessions.

Member Papan asked about the \$100,000 that the Transportation Authority set aside for the technical assistance workshop and the technical assistance to shuttle project sponsors. Tom responded that he was not aware of the amount of money spent on the workshop or providing technical assistance to cities, as the money is not under C/CAG control. He believes that most of the \$100,000 will not be drawn down unless the cities tap into the technical assistance provided by SamTrans and the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance.

Member Olbert asked why congestion relief was not included as a factor in the need criteria section of the program application. Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, suggested that certain effectiveness measures, such as shuttle ridership, may provide some information on congestion relief. Member Roberts added that congestion relief is likely covered by an effectiveness criterion that asks applicants to describe the extent to which their proposed shuttles reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trips and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

***Motion: To recommend approval of the Call for Projects for the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for Fiscal Year 2014/2015 & Fiscal Year 2015/2016 with the amendment that congestion relief be included as an element under the need criterion, Olbert/Pierce. Motion carried unanimously.***

***Motion: To recommend that the CMEQ committee be informed as to how the \$100,000 in Transportation Authority funding for technical assistance to shuttle project sponsors was spent, Olbert/Papan. Motion carried unanimously.***

## **6. Receive an update on the potential stormwater funding initiative.**

Matt Fabry, C/CAG staff, provided an update on the initiative for C/CAG and its member agencies to raise funds to comply with regional stormwater permit mandates. He reported that because C/CAG was unsuccessful in its efforts to obtain enabling legislation during the recent legislative session, staff have more time for this work and are considering a revised approach, which will require approval from the C/CAG Board, as staff are proposing to access funds that were originally allocated to later phases of the project.

Matt explained that the improved approach is guided by the experiences of Contra Costa County, Los Angeles County, and the Santa Clara Valley Water District in seeking authority to put forth special taxes or property related fees. The experiences of these jurisdictions suggest that C/CAG could benefit from a stronger community engagement process. Thus, the revised approach involves staff meeting with municipalities in early 2014 to better understand local needs and concerns and to identify key community stakeholders. Another component of the approach is the development of a communications tool based on the findings of the planned public opinion research to communicate how funds will be spent and provide the public an opportunity to provide input.

Matt also described C/CAG's revised legislative approach, which is to seek the authority for C/CAG to develop and approve a countywide water pollution prevention plan for which the agency has the ability to impose a plan implementation fee, which can take the form of a special tax or property related fee. If the legislation passes and an urgency clause is successfully attached, C/CAG could move forward with a funding initiative as early as mid-2014.

Member Papan asked about the information that C/CAG currently has on cities' needs and concerns. Matt responded that a preliminary analysis has been conducted, but that C/CAG has not received much feedback from cities on the findings of this analysis.

Member Olbert asked about what would happen if C/CAG were not successful in obtaining legislation to move forward with a funding initiative. Matt responded that the plan may be for the County or local cities to consider their own funding initiatives, but added local jurisdictions have not expressed interest in doing this at this time.

Member Lentz asked about the average tax or fee that homeowners would have to pay under the funding initiative. Matt responded that amount would be in the range of \$17 to \$35 per single-family home. He added that this could potentially raise \$12 million in funding.

**7. Review and approval of the CMEQ meeting Calendar for 2014.**

*Motion: To approve the CMEQ meeting calendar for 2014, Olbert/Lentz. Motion carried unanimously.*

**8. Executive Director Report.**

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, reported that C/CAG Board Vice Chair Mary Ann Nihart will act as Chair until the Board holds new elections in March 2014. The current Board Chair, Brandt Grotte, decided not run for reelection to the San Mateo City Council.

Sandy also reminded the committee that the CMEQ Committee holds annual elections for the Chair and Vice Chair positions during its January meeting.

**7. Member comments and announcements.**

Member Olbert discussed the presentation provided by PG&E at the last C/CAG Board meeting as well as the interchange between PG&E staff and various C/CAG Board members.

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

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

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

	<b>CMEQ 2013 Attendance</b>							
<b>Name</b>	<b>Jan 28</b>	<b>Mar 28</b>	<b>Apr 29</b>	<b>May 20</b>	<b>Aug 26</b>	<b>Sept 30</b>	<b>Oct 28</b>	<b>25-Nov</b>
Arthur Lloyd	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	
Barbara Pierce	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
Gina Papan	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes		Yes
Irene O'Connell		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes		
Jim Bigelow	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Lennie Roberts	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Naomi Patridge	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
Onnolee Trapp	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes
Richard Garbarino	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Steve Dworetzky					Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Zoe Kersteen- Tucker			Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes
Mark Olbert		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
Cliff Lentz	NA	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Elizabeth Lewis	NA					Yes		Yes
Alicia Aguirre	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Yes	Yes		
Mike O'Neill								Yes
				* corrected as of August 27.				
<b>Staff/Guests in Attendance for November 25:</b>								
Sandy Wong, Jean Higaki, Tom Madalena, Wally Abrazaldo, Matt Fabry - C/CAG Staff								
Ronny Kraft - SamTrans								
Sujata Srivastava, Michelle Fong - Strategic Economics								

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** January 27, 2014  
**To:** Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee  
**From:** Matt Fabry, Water Pollution Prevention Program Coordinator  
**Subject:** Update on Potential Stormwater Funding Initiative

(For further information or questions contact Matthew Fabry at 650 599-1419)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Receive an informational update on the potential countywide stormwater funding initiative.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

### Enabling Legislation

Assembly Member Kevin Mullin, at C/CAG's request, introduced legislation in the current session that would enable C/CAG, as a joint powers agency, to pursue a countywide special tax or property-related fee to fund stormwater pollution prevention programs (AB 418, attached). The bill passed out of the Senate Governance and Finance Committee on January 15 on a 5-1 vote. The bill includes an urgency clause that will allow it to go into effect immediately upon signature by the governor, but requires 2/3 approval in both houses. The next step is a vote on the floor of the Senate, likely by the end of the month. Support letters are needed and a template has been provided to cities for their use.

### Funding Needs Analysis

EOA, Inc. (a sub-consultant on C/CAG's funding initiative consultant team) completed a preliminary draft Funding Needs Analysis report that was provided to C/CAG's Stormwater Committee members in October for review and comment, and is now preparing a revised draft that should go out to member agencies by the end of the month. This report details, by jurisdiction, existing costs for compliance, anticipated future costs, and existing sources of dedicated revenue. Staff plans to bring this revised draft to the Stormwater Committee for discussion at its February 20 meeting.

### Community Outreach/Engagement and Action Plan Development

At its December meeting, the C/CAG Board authorized early use of contract funds slated for later phases of the consultant team's scope of work in order to begin developing an Action Plan and initiating community engagement efforts. The Action Plan would be created as a "Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Plan" that details how revenue from a successful initiative would be utilized, and translate into plain language activities mandated under the Municipal Regional Permit as a means of communicating more effectively with the general public. The Action Plan would be adopted by the C/CAG Board in advance of proceeding with either a special tax or property-related fee initiative process.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Assembly Bill 418



AMENDED IN SENATE JANUARY 6, 2014  
AMENDED IN SENATE SEPTEMBER 5, 2013  
AMENDED IN SENATE AUGUST 12, 2013  
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 15, 2013  
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2013–14 REGULAR SESSION

**ASSEMBLY BILL**

**No. 418**

---

---

**Introduced by Assembly Members Mullin and Eggman**

February 15, 2013

---

---

~~An act relating to electric vehicles, and making an appropriation therefor, to add the heading of Article 1 (commencing with Section 65089.11) to Chapter 2.65 of, and to add Article 2 (commencing with Section 65089.50) to Chapter 2.65 of, Division 1 of Title 7 of, the Government Code, relating to local government, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.~~

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 418, as amended, Mullin. ~~Electric vehicles.~~ *Local government: special tax, assessment, or property-related fee.*

*Existing law, until January 1, 2013, authorized the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County to impose a fee of up to \$4 on motor vehicles registered within San Mateo County for a program for the management of traffic congestion and stormwater pollution within that county.*

*This bill would authorize the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, in accordance with specified provisions of the California Constitution, to impose a parcel tax or a property-related*

*fee for the purpose of implementing stormwater management programs, as prescribed.*

*This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute.*

~~Existing law establishes the Air Quality Improvement Program that is administered by the State Air Resources Board for the purposes of funding projects related to, among other things, reduction of criteria air pollutants and improvement of air quality. Existing law requires, until January 1, 2016, that a portion of the registration fees for motor vehicles and vessels be deposited into the Air Quality Improvement Fund and, upon appropriation, be expended for the implementation of the program. Pursuant to the Air Quality Improvement Program, the state board has established the Clean Vehicle Rebate Project to promote the production and use of zero-emission vehicles and the Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project to provide vouchers to help California fleets to purchase hybrid and zero-emission trucks and buses.~~

~~Existing law establishes the Vehicle Inspection and Repair Fund, which serves as a repository for fees collected by the Department of Consumer Affairs pursuant to the Automotive Repair Act.~~

~~This bill would require the Controller, upon the order of the Director of Finance, to transfer, as a loan, \$30,000,000 from the Vehicle Inspection and Repair Fund to the Air Quality Improvement Fund. The bill would appropriate to the state board \$30,000,000 from the Air Quality Improvement Fund for the Clean Vehicle Rebate Project and the Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project, thereby making an appropriation.~~

~~Vote: majority  $\frac{2}{3}$ . Appropriation: *yes/no*. Fiscal committee: *yes/no*. State-mandated local program: *no*.~~

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

- 1 *SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the*
- 2 *following:*
- 3 *(a) The County of San Mateo and each of the 20 incorporated*
- 4 *cities within this county have joined together to form the*
- 5 *21-member City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo*
- 6 *County, a joint powers agency that addresses issues of countywide*
- 7 *significance, including water pollution prevention programs.*
- 8 *(b) Each of the 21-member agencies of the City/County*
- 9 *Association of Governments of San Mateo County is mandated to*

1 *comply with municipal stormwater permit requirements issued by*  
2 *the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.*

3 *(c) The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo*  
4 *County helps coordinate municipal stormwater permit compliance*  
5 *activities among its member agencies and, in cases where*  
6 *compliance activities are more effectively implemented at a*  
7 *countywide level, does so on their behalf as directed by its member*  
8 *agencies.*

9 *(d) The addition of Section 65089.50 to the Government Code*  
10 *will better enable the City/County Association of Governments of*  
11 *San Mateo County to do, among other things, all of the following:*

12 *(1) In conjunction with its member agencies, protect the natural*  
13 *resources within the County of San Mateo and restore and enhance*  
14 *the environment, including the long-term protection of the waters*  
15 *of local creeks, the San Francisco Bay, and the coastline along*  
16 *the Pacific Ocean.*

17 *(2) Develop and adopt a countywide stormwater management*  
18 *program designed to coordinate, fund, and implement water*  
19 *pollution prevention programs within the County of San Mateo,*  
20 *by the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo*  
21 *County or its member agencies.*

22 *(3) Impose, consistent with and pursuant to the California*  
23 *Constitution, a special tax or property-related fee within its*  
24 *boundaries to fund activities outlined in its joint powers agreement*  
25 *and consistent with municipal stormwater permit requirements*  
26 *mandated by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality*  
27 *Control Board.*

28 *SEC. 2. The heading of Article 1 (commencing with Section*  
29 *65089.11) is added to Chapter 2.65 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the*  
30 *Government Code, to read:*

31  
32 *Article 1. Traffic Congestion and Stormwater Pollution*  
33

34 *SEC. 3. Article 2 (commencing with Section 65089.50) is added*  
35 *to Chapter 2.65 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code,*  
36 *to read:*

1                    *Article 2. Stormwater Management*

2  
3        65089.50. (a) *The City/County Association of Governments*  
4 *of San Mateo County may impose either a special tax subject to*  
5 *the procedures and requirements set forth in subdivision (d) of*  
6 *Section 2 of Article XIII C of the California Constitution, or a*  
7 *property-related fee subject to the procedures and requirements*  
8 *set forth in subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) of Section 6 of Article XIII*  
9 *D of the California Constitution, for the purposes of implementing*  
10 *stormwater management programs consistent with the agencies'*  
11 *joint powers agreement.*

12        (b) *The special tax or property-related fee, at the option of the*  
13 *City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County,*  
14 *may be collected on the tax rolls of the county in the same manner,*  
15 *by the same persons, subject to the same penalties, and at the same*  
16 *time as, together with and not separate from, county ad valorem*  
17 *property taxes. In that event, from the amount collected pursuant*  
18 *to this paragraph, the county auditor may deduct that amount*  
19 *required to reimburse the county for its actual cost of collection.*

20        *SEC. 4. The Legislature finds and declares that, because of*  
21 *the unique circumstances applicable only to the City/County*  
22 *Association of Governments of San Mateo County an existing joint*  
23 *powers agency composed of the county and every city and town*  
24 *within the county that coordinates and provides stormwater permit*  
25 *compliance activities, a statute of general application cannot be*  
26 *enacted within the meaning of subdivision (b) of Section 16 of*  
27 *Article IV of the California Constitution. Therefore, this special*  
28 *statute is necessary.*

29        *SEC. 5. This act is an urgency statute necessary for the*  
30 *immediate preservation of the public peace, health, or safety within*  
31 *the meaning of Article IV of the Constitution and shall go into*  
32 *immediate effect. The facts constituting the necessity are:*

33        *In order to timely provide for the protection the water of local*  
34 *creeks, the San Francisco Bay, and the coastline for the use and*  
35 *enjoyment of the citizens of San Mateo and aquatic life, it is*  
36 *necessary that this act take effect immediately.*

37        ~~SECTION 1. (a) The sum of thirty million dollars~~  
38 ~~(\$30,000,000) is hereby appropriated from the Air Quality~~  
39 ~~Improvement Fund to the State Air Resources Board for the Clean~~  
40 ~~Vehicle Rebate Project and Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and~~

1 ~~Bus Voucher Incentive Project established pursuant to Article 3~~  
2 ~~(commencing with Section 44274) of Chapter 8.9 of Part 5 of~~  
3 ~~Division 26 of the Health and Safety Code.~~

4 ~~(b) Upon the order of the Director of Finance, the sum of thirty~~  
5 ~~million dollars (\$30,000,000) shall be transferred by the Controller,~~  
6 ~~as a loan from the Vehicle Inspection and Repair Fund to the Air~~  
7 ~~Quality Improvement Fund. No later than June 30, 2016, the loan~~  
8 ~~shall be repaid with interest at the rate earned by the Pooled Money~~  
9 ~~Investment Account at the time of the transfer.~~



# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** January 27, 2014  
**To:** Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee  
**From:** Kim Springer, Susan Wright, County Staff to C/CAG  
**Subject:** Informational update on San Mateo County Energy Watch Program initiatives  
(For further information contact Kim Springer at 650-599-1412 or Susan Wright at 650-599-1403.)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Receive an informational update on San Mateo County Energy Watch Program initiatives.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

\$840,000 for the 2013 and 2014 two-year program cycle.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

The primary funding source for the SMCEW program staff costs and expenses comes from the C/CAG – PG&E Local Government Partnership (LGP) agreement. Additional matching funds, specifically for transportation-related Climate Action Planning efforts, come from Congestion Relief Funds.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

San Mateo County Energy Watch is a local government partnership between C/CAG and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). This program is managed and staffed by RecycleWorks, a program of the County of San Mateo. This report provides updates to the information presented at the October CMEQ meeting.

### **Assistance for Public Schools**

In collaboration with the San Mateo County Office of Education (SMCOE), the SMCEW held a workshop on October 10, 2013 to deliver results of the energy benchmarking project and further educate district staff on the energy savings implementation process and the opportunity to access Prop 39 funding. Following the workshop, SMCEW and SMCOE have been meeting individually with school districts to strategize next steps for accessing no-cost auditing and technical assistance.

### **Real Estate Advisory Group Meeting**

SMCEW program funding provides for work on climate action planning, including assistance with implementation. To assist communities in reducing residential energy use, on February 3, 2014, SMCEW is hosting a Real Estate Advisory Group Meeting. At this interactive lunch meeting, SMCEW and a small group of city sustainability staff and real estate professionals will discuss how they can collaborate to drive demand for energy efficient homes.

### **Zero Net Energy (ZNE)**

SMCEW has been providing input to the California Public Utilities Commission's new Residential ZNE Action Plan. In particular, SMCEW is exploring the idea of developing a reach code to Zero Net Energy that cities could adopt as a measure in their climate action plans. Staff is exploring the feasibility of this approach.

### **Contracting for 2015 Program Year**

Discussions about the structure and content of the energy efficiency portfolio beyond the 2013-2014 program cycle started in late 2013 and are gaining momentum. The most likely scenario will be that the current cycle will be extended by a year (through 2015), to provide the time to set up a new ten-year rolling cycle from 2016-2026.

In particular, SMCEW staff is looking at expanding its work into the commercial sector, which PG&E supports. SMCEW would assist cities with regional outreach efforts to small and medium business customers. Staff would work alongside the PG&E sales organization to provide technical assistance including benchmarking services, (enabling businesses to comply with California's new benchmarking law, AB1103), and comprehensive recommendations for energy savings. Staff will coordinate with cities to identify target business sectors and coordinate like sectors countywide for greater efficiencies.

### **ATTACHMENT**

None

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** January 27, 2014  
**To:** Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee  
**From:** Sandy Wong  
**Subject:** Update on the highway improvement studies along US 101  
(For further information or questions contact Sandy Wong at 650-599-1409)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the CMEQ Committee receive an update on the highway improvement studies along US 101.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

None.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Not applicable.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

In May 2012, the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) issued a call for project for the Transportation Measure A Highway Program. The Measure A Highway Program focuses on removing bottlenecks in the most congested highway commute corridors, reducing congestion, and improving throughput along critical congested commute corridors. C/CAG was successful in obtaining funding commitments from SMCTA via the Highway Program call for projects for the following 4 studies along and near the US 101 corridor:

1. Project Study Report for US 101 HOV (carpool lanes) “Hybrid option” from Whipple Ave to I-380.
2. Project Study Report for US 101 Auxiliary Lanes from Oyster Point to San Francisco County Line.
3. Feasibility Study for Route 92/Delaware Street Interchange Area.
4. Feasibility Study for US 101/Route 92 Interchange Improvement.

A “Project Study Report” is the first required document for a highway improvement project per Caltrans procedures. It is a prerequisite to the environmental study phase of a highway project. Typically, a “Project Study Report” requires more in-depth technical analysis than a “feasibility study”.

The project concept for the US 101 HOV “Hybrid option” from Whipple to I-380 was developed through a Feasibility Study in partnership with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in the past two years. In 2011, an initial HOV analysis was done to evaluate two options to extend the carpool lanes to the north from where they currently terminate at Whipple Ave. That analysis evaluated two options: Option 1 was to add a new carpool lane by widening the freeway. Option 2 was to convert an existing mixed-flow lane to a carpool lane. The conclusion was that Option 1 would be very costly and would result in adverse right-of-way impacts, while Option 2, although low cost, would result in excessive travel time delay to the remaining mixed-flow lanes.

Consequently, MTC, C/CAG, and Caltrans directed the consultant to conduct a feasibility study to evaluate a “hybrid option”, which would utilize the existing pavement for a new carpool lane in some segments, and would add new pavement (widening) for a new carpool lane in other segments in order to provide continuous carpool lane from Whipple to I-380. That feasibility study concluded the “hybrid option” has overall positive benefits and merits continue study. Hence, a Project Study Report has been initiated.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

None.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** January 27, 2014  
**To:** Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee  
**From:** John Hoang  
**Subject:** Recommend adoption of the Fiscal Year 2014/15 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Program Manager Fund for San Mateo County.

(For further information or questions contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the CMEQ Committee recommends adoption of the Fiscal Year 2014/15 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Program Manager Fund for San Mateo County.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

\$1,092,837.33 (Admin. - \$53,337.33; Projects - \$1,039,500)

## **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**

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

Program”. The Alliance also manages shuttles on behalf of member cities.

The following program guidelines would continue to be in effect for the Fiscal Year 2014/15 Program.

Overall Programs:

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

Shuttle Projects:

- Shuttle projects are defined as the provision of local feeder bus or shuttle service to rail and ferry stations and airports.
- All shuttles must be timed to meet the rail or ferry lines being served.
- C/CAG encourages the use of electric and other clean fuel vehicles for shuttles.
- 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.

The estimated administration budget is \$53,337.33 (approx. 5%) with the remaining \$1,039,500 proposed to be distributed to SamTrans and Alliance. Similar to the previous seven program TFCA funding cycles, it is recommended that 56% of the available project funds is provided to SamTrans and 44% of the funds provided to the Alliance for the FY 2014/15 TFCA Program allocation.

It is recommended that the SamTrans Shuttle Program receive an allocation of \$582,000 (56% of available funds) for its current shuttle program. This funding recommendation shall be contingent upon SamTrans submitting an acceptable work plan for use of the funds.

It is also recommended that the Alliance receive an allocation of \$457,500 (44% of available funds). The funds allocated for the Alliance will be subjected to the submission of an acceptable work plan for use of the funds. These funds will be combined with C/CAG Congestion Relief Plan funds for the Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program.

A summary of the recommended C/CAG TFCA Program for Fiscal Year 2014/15 is summarized below:

Administration	\$53,337.33
SamTrans	\$582,000
Alliance	\$457,500
Total funds obligated	\$1,092,837.33
Total funds anticipated	\$1,092,837.33

Balance	\$0
---------	-----

TFCA funding distribution for the past three years are shown below:

<i>Agency</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>2011/12</i>	<i>2012/13</i>	<i>2013/14</i>
C/CAG	Administration	\$46,566	\$47,781	\$52,526
SamTrans	Employer Based Shuttle Projects	\$527,000	\$554,400	\$566,000
Alliance	Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program	\$414,000	\$435,600	\$445,000
Totals		\$987,566	\$1,037,781	\$1,063,526

**ATTACHMENTS**

None.



# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** January 27, 2014  
**To:** Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee  
**From:** Sandy Wong  
**Subject:** Nomination/Election of Chair and Vice Chair  
(For further information or questions contact Sandy Wong at 650-599-1409)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

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

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

None.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Not applicable.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Each year, the CMEQ Committee selects a Chair and a Vice Chair to lead the Committee for the year. Richard Garbarino currently serves as the Chair, and the Vice Chair position is currently vacant. Gina Papan previously served as the Vice Chair before terming out of her elected position on the Millbrae City Council at the end of 2013. Richard was elected Chair at the January 28, 2013 CMEQ meeting, and is eligible to continue in this capacity if elected by the Committee.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

None.