

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, November 25, 2013 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 October 28, 2013 meeting. | Action (Garbarino) | Pages 1 - 4 |
| 3. | Receive a presentation on the Economic & Housing Opportunities (ECHO) Assessment phase 2 Study. | Information (Strategic Economics) | Oral |
| 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. | Action (Madalena) | Pages 5 - 13 |
| 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. | Action (Madalena) | Pages 14 - 28 |
| 6. | Receive an update on the potential stormwater funding initiative. | Information (Fabry) | Oral |
| 7. | Review and approval of CMEQ meeting Calendar for 2014. | Action (Wong) | Page 29 |
| 8. | Executive Director Report. | Information (Wong) | |
| 9. | Member comments and announcements. | Information (Garbarino) | |
| 10 | Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date: | Action | |

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*

January 27, 2014.

(Garbarino)

NOTE: **All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee.
Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.**

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

Other enclosures/Correspondence - None

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

**MINUTES
MEETING OF October 28, 2013**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Garbarino in Conference Room C at City Hall of San Mateo at 3:05 pm. Attendance sheet is attached.

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None.

2. Approval of Minutes of September 30, 2013 meeting.

*Motion: To approve the Minutes of the September 30, 2013 meeting, Bigelow/Dworetzky.
Motion carried unanimously.*

3. Recommend adoption of the Final 2013 Congestion Management Program (CMP) For San Mateo County.

John Hoang presented a summary of updates made to the 2013 CMP since the report was released for public review in September. He reported that staff took public comments into consideration and incorporated them into the Draft Final 2013CMP as feasible. John also followed-up on the CMEQ Committee's request that staff consider adding data on private buses/shuttles to the 2013 CMP. He reported that he called the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance (the Alliance) and several local cities, but found that most private companies are reluctant to make this information public.

Members Roberts and Bigelow suggested that city staff in Menlo Park are likely to have access to this information from Facebook, given that the company agreed to a 43% alternative mode share in its development agreement. According to Member Bigelow, Facebook has a trip monitoring system in place and is subject to a \$10,000 fine for each day that the alternative mode share is below the target percentage. He will follow-up with the company during the November 19 meeting of the Menlo Park Chamber of Commerce Transportation Committee.

Member Patridge requested that staff insert a footnote into the 2013 CMP indicating that there are several large companies in the county that have policies and services in place for trip reduction (such as private buses/shuttles) and that staff are in the process of gathering more information on ridership.

Member Pierce suggested that future updates of the CMP include performance measures showing the number of companies that provide bus/shuttle services for their employees, as this may be easier to collect than passenger data. She also suggested that the report track the number of bicycle lanes completed and other measures that capture how the transportation system in the county is becoming more multimodal.

Member Dworetzky offered to connect C/CAG staff with Gary Bauer of Bauer's Intelligent Transportation to help start a conversation around obtaining information on the ridership of private shuttles.

John Ford, the Executive Director of the Alliance and a member of the public attending the CMEQ Committee meeting, reported that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission will be surveying all companies in the county in two years as part of the monitoring that will be completed for SB 1339. This survey will provide information on the number of companies in the county that provide private bus/shuttle services for their employees.

Member Lentz asked why the percentage of county residents carpooling to work decreased from 13% in 2000 to 10% in 2012 according to the data reported in the CMP. John Hoang responded that the information is based on survey data collected by the U.S. Census Bureau and suggested that there could be a number of possible explanations. John Ford mentioned several, including the improving economy, decreases in gas prices, and increases in congestion (which may induce mode shifts away from carpool to transit). He also reported that the Alliance will be conducting a telephone survey of San Mateo County residents and commuters in 2014 and offered to share survey the results of this effort with C/CAG staff.

Member Roberts suggested that the CMEQ Committee establish an award for companies that do a great job on trip reduction to provide an incentive for companies to report data on their private buses/shuttles.

Motion: To recommend adoption of the Final 2013 Congestion Management Program with additional notes indicating that there are several companies in the county that offer private bus/shuttle services for their employees that result in the reduction of Drive Alone trips. In addition, staff will work to obtain information on the usage of these services in the coming years with support from the Alliance, Patridge/Pierce. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Receive a progress report on the San Mateo County Energy Watch 2013-14 Program (Information).

Kim Springer, San Mateo County staff member on contract with C/CAG, provided a detailed presentation on the San Mateo County Energy Watch Program, which is run through a local government partnership between PG&E and C/CAG. The presentation offered an overview of the energy efficiency services that the program provides and an update of the program's progress toward its goals during the 2010-2012 and 2013-2014 program cycles. Highlights include:

- The program beat its goals for peak kW and kWh savings during the 2010-2012 program cycle.
- Two new sectors—schools and farms—were added to the existing sectors that the program serves (public facilities, non-profits, and homes) during the 2013-2014 program cycle.
- Available data through July 2013 show that the program has not yet met its 2013-2014 goals for peak kW and kWh savings. However, part of this is because the California Public Utilities Commission took until June to determine the type of retrofits that would be eligible for receiving incentives. Despite this and other delays, trends in the data suggest that the program will meet or exceed its peak kW and kWh savings goals by the end of 2014.
- The program provided support to 14 local jurisdictions in the county through its Comprehensive Energy Recommendations efforts. As part of this work, program staff conduct no-cost audits to help cities find deeper energy savings than are projected in their planned capital investment packages. PG&E offers cities “on-bill” financing for projects, which provides loans of up to \$1 million at 0% financing for up to 10 years that are repaid through monthly bill payments. This financing scheme allows cities to make additional energy improvements without large outlays of cash.

- The RICAPS program provides climate action planning support to all local governments in San Mateo County. Topics covered at monthly working meetings with the cities includes: emissions inventories, climate action planning technical assistance, and implementation updates on various programs such as: bike share, climate adaption, Safe Routes to Schools, and updates to the Title 24 building code.
- The Title 24 building code, which has been updated in 2013, will become the new code on January 1, 2014. Depending on how cities have green building ordinances structured, this may cause the ordinance to be superseded by the new code. Enactment of a new ordinance may require filing of justification papers with the California Energy Commission. Cities are looking for guidance and support for this process.
- The program started a Large Residential Resource Conservation Collaborative (LR2C2) to help local jurisdictions with large residential sectors to reduce energy use in large homes. As part of this work, staff put together webinars, presentations, and classes for residents on topics such as plug-load and energy audits.
- The program benchmarked all K-12 public schools in San Mateo County and presented this information to school administrators, chief business officers, and facilities managers in early October. This work put schools in the county a step ahead of all other schools in the region because benchmarking is a key requirement for Proposition 39 funds, which are allocated to local education agencies to support energy efficiency and alternative energy projects.

Member Pierce commented that several local cities banded together to form the LR2C2 because incentives did not seem to be driving resident behavior and more work was needed to achieve energy savings from the residential sector.

CMEQ members commended Kim Springer and his staff for their hard work.

6. Executive Director Report.

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, reported back to the CMEQ committee regarding the kick-off event for the SamTrans technical assistance program for prospective shuttle sponsors, which the committee heard about during its September meeting from SamTrans staff member, Joel Slavit. Sandy reported that the event was well attended and discussed improvements in the process to apply for shuttle funds, including more standardized performance measures for different types of shuttles and revised procedures in requesting a letter of concurrence from SamTrans. Sandy also mentioned that \$7 million of funding would be available for new and existing shuttles and that staff would bring the C/CAG/SamTrans joint call for projects guidelines to the CMEQ Committee for review in the coming months.

7. Member comments and announcements.

Member Dworetzsky mentioned that he would follow-up with Gary Bauer and connect him with C/CAG staff.

8. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.

Meeting adjourned at 4:13 pm.

The next regular meeting was scheduled for November 25, 2013.

	CMEQ 2013 Attendance							
Name	Jan 28	Mar 28	Apr 29	May 20	Aug 26	Sept 30	Oct 28	
Arthur Lloyd	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	
Barbara Pierce	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	
Gina Papan	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	
Naomi Patridge	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	
Onnolee Trapp	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Richard Garbarino	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	
Steve Dworetzky					Yes	Yes	Yes	
Zoe Kersteen- Tucker			Yes		Yes		Yes	
Mark Olbert		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Cliff Lentz	NA	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	
Elizabeth Lewis	NA					Yes		
Alicia Aguirre	NA	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Yes	Yes		
				* corrected as of August 27.				
Staff/Guests in Attendance for October 28:								
Sandy Wong, Jean Higaki, John Hoang, Wally Abrazaldo - C/CAG Staff								
John Ford - Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance								
George Rodericks - Town of Atherton								
Kim Springer - San Mateo County Public Works								

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

DATE: November 25, 2013

TO: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

FROM: Tom Madalena

SUBJECT: 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

(For further information please contact Tom Madalena at 650-599-1460)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ Committee 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.

FISCAL IMPACT

This commitment is for up to \$1,991,000 in Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), previously known as the State Transportation Improvement Program-Transportation Enhancement (STIP-TE) funds prior to MAP-21, funds to fund the construction of one selected Complete Street project on El Camino Real/Mission Street.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) was authorized under Section 1122 of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), previously known as the State Transportation Improvement Program-Transportation Enhancement (STIP-TE) funds prior to MAP-21.

BACKGROUND/ DISCUSSION

At the June 9, 2011 C/CAG Board of Directors meeting the Board conceptually approved of investing up to \$2,000,000 in discretionary State Transportation Improvement Program-Transportation Enhancement (STIP-TE) funds for the construction of a Complete Street project on the El Camino Real/Mission Street. STIP-TE funds are now known as Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds. The C/CAG Board of Directors has been supportive of the Green Street program and this allowed for a project that would build upon that program by constructing a complete street project with green street design features.

As part of the C/CAG Board adoption of the OBAG Program at the May 9, 2013 C/CAG Board meeting the C/CAG Board reaffirmed its approval to allocate \$1,991,000 in STIP-TE funds towards a Complete Streets project to be selected amongst the Tiger II Complete Streets case

study projects. The overview of OBAG program, including the \$1,991,000 STIP-TE funds, was reviewed by the C/CAG Board on August 9, 2012.

C/CAG has been a partner with the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) on the Grand Boulevard Initiative in San Mateo County. SamTrans received a United States Department of Transportation Tiger II grant to pursue up to 4 Complete Streets Design Case Studies along the El Camino Real/Mission Street in San Mateo County. The Tiger II funds produced 4 preliminary design packages at approximately 40% design for Complete Streets projects on the El Camino Real/Mission Street. Daly City, San Bruno, San Carlos and South San Francisco were the cities that were part of the Tiger II Complete Streets design work. SamTrans also pursued and was successful in receiving a Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program (TCSP) grant to bring one of these preliminary design packages to 100% design.

SamTrans, in partnership with C/CAG, issued a Notice for Participation for the Complete Streets project case study selection. The notice was issued on September 16, 2013 with applications being due on October 31, 2013. The notice was made available for the four case study cites to apply to bring their Complete Streets projects to final design with the TCSP grant funds and for the TAP funding for construction. The complete street projects were required to incorporate green street design features to be supportive of the Green Street program. San Bruno, San Carlos and South San Francisco applied for the TCSP and TAP funding through this process.

A review panel to evaluate and score the Complete Streets case study applications was convened on November 6, 2013. This panel consisted of staff from SamTrans, Caltrans, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and C/CAG. The panel scored and ranked the projects and the South San Francisco Complete Streets project was recommended for funding by the evaluation panel.

ATTACHMENTS

- Notice of Participation for the Transportation, Community, and System Preservation (TCSP) Complete Streets and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Project



Grand Boulevard Initiative Complete Streets Program

**Transportation, Community, and System Preservation (TCSP) Complete Streets and
Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Project
Notice for Participation**

10/02/2013

Amendment #1: The application due date has been extended to Thursday, October 31st at 5pm.

This notice is being distributed to the four TIGER II Complete Streets Project case study cities on behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County and the San Mateo County Transit District.

The Transportation, Community, and System Preservation (TCSP) and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Complete Streets Project is sponsored by the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo (C/CAG) and the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) under the Grand Boulevard Initiative in San Mateo County. The Project will fund the final design and construction of one of the four TIGER II Complete Streets case study segments on State Route 82 (El Camino Real/Mission Street). The constructed project will serve as a model for the Grand Boulevard Initiative, helping to realize the Grand Boulevard Initiative Vision and provide an example for other jurisdictions in the region and across the nation.

In June 2011, the C/CAG Board of Directors conceptually approved the commitment of \$1,991,000 in discretionary TAP funds (previously known as the State Transportation Improvement Program-Transportation Enhancement (STIP-TE) funds prior to MAP-21) to construct a Complete Streets project on the El Camino Real/Mission Street corridor. Use of the construction funding is contingent upon a Caltrans-approved Complete Streets project design which incorporates Sustainable/Green Streets infrastructure, such as rain gardens/vegetated curb extensions, canopy trees, and other stormwater management features.

In 2011, SamTrans secured final design funding for one of the four TIGER II Complete Streets case studies through the Federal Highway Administration’s TCSP grant program. The TCSP grant funds will be used to fill the gap between the TIGER II case study preliminary engineering designs and the use of C/CAG’s TAP construction funding.

A summary of the Project background and detailed description of the TCSP and TAP Complete Streets Project and available funding are provided below.

Grand Boulevard Initiative Complete Streets Program Background

The Grand Boulevard Initiative Complete Streets Program builds upon the streetscape design guidelines in the Grand Boulevard Initiative Multimodal Transportation Corridor Plan (2010). The Corridor Plan explores the potential for multimodal transportation design options along the El

Grand Boulevard Initiative Complete Streets Program

Camino Real corridor. The Corridor Plan's Street Design Guidelines, Street Design Prototypes, and a Caltrans Design Guideline Matrix provide a collection of strategies and design typologies to implement the Grand Boulevard Initiative Vision within the context of a State highway and in a manner that best suits the needs and desires of local jurisdictions. The overall purpose of the Grand Boulevard Initiative Complete Streets Program is to develop the El Camino Real corridor as a multimodal boulevard that is safe and efficient for all users (pedestrians, bicycles, transit, and automobiles for people of all ages and abilities).

TIGER II Complete Streets Project

In 2010, SamTrans was awarded a U.S. Department of Transportation/Federal Transit Administration TIGER II Planning Grant on behalf of the Grand Boulevard Initiative, which included funding for four Complete Streets case studies on the El Camino Real corridor in San Mateo County. The TIGER II Complete Streets Project is a partnership of SamTrans and C/CAG, with participation from and coordination with the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Caltrans.

The TIGER II Complete Streets Project funds the preliminary design of four innovative Complete Streets case study segments in Daly City, South San Francisco, San Bruno, and San Carlos. The projects were selected upon award of the grant through a competitive application process. Each design goes beyond the typical Complete Streets paradigm – each segment incorporates green infrastructure, such as vegetated curb extensions and medians, pervious paving, and canopy trees.

These segments will be the models for future corridor improvements and are intended for replication in the region, state, and across the nation. The case studies document a collaborative process to bring a Complete Street concept to preliminary design and provide a resource for other communities along the El Camino Real corridor and elsewhere in the State as they address the challenges of transforming auto-dominated urban arterial highways into balanced multimodal facilities.

The Daly City, South San Francisco, and San Bruno TIGER II case study designs are being taken to a 25% design level under the TIGER II Complete Streets Project. As required by the Caltrans, a Project Study Report/Project Development Study (PSR/PDS) is being prepared. The Final PSR/PDS and 25% design level will allow the Daly City, South San Francisco, and San Bruno case studies to proceed to the engineering, environmental studies, and final design phases with consensus and support from Caltrans on the preliminary design.

The San Carlos TIGER II case study is being taken to a 65% design level through the Caltrans Permit Engineering Evaluation Report (PEER) process. A Draft PEER has been submitted to Caltrans for review and comment. A Design Exception Fact Sheet is being prepared for the San Carlos case study as part of the PEER and will provide guidance to the Daly City, South San Francisco, and San Bruno case studies as they each incorporate similar design elements and will require similar design exceptions. The Draft PEER and 65% design plans will allow the San Carlos case study to move to the final design phase (preparation of the Final PEER), with approval from Caltrans.

TAP Funding for Construction

As stated above, on June 9, 2011, the C/CAG Board of Directors conceptually approved the commitment of \$1,991,000 in discretionary TAP funding toward construction of a Complete Streets project in the El Camino Real/Mission Street corridor. The Complete Streets project must

Grand Boulevard Initiative Complete Streets Program

incorporate Sustainable/Green Streets elements to be eligible for the construction funding. Upon selection of a project with completion of 100% design, the C/CAG Board of Directors will be asked to formally approve the construction funding. The TAP construction funding must be obligated for construction and the city must be ready to go out to bid for construction by January 2016.

TCSP and TAP Complete Streets Project

The TCSP and TAP Complete Streets Project will build upon the TIGER II Complete Streets Project under the Grand Boulevard Initiative Complete Streets Program. The TCSP funding will bring one of the four TIGER II case studies to 100% final design. C/CAG's \$1,991,000 in TAP funding for construction will be awarded to that final design case study. The Project will result in an exemplary segment for the Grand Boulevard Initiative, bringing the Grand Boulevard Initiative Vision to a reality.

The total amount of final design grant funding for the project is \$365,232. As noted in the Complete Streets Project Summary and Preliminary List of Draft Selection Criteria sent to each case study city representative on June 21, 2013, a local match of \$91,308 (20% match) is required to be eligible for the TCSP funding. The city will be required to provide the \$91,308 local match using non-federal funds.

The total amount of construction grant funding is \$1,991,000 million. The TAP funding also requires a non-federal cash local match. The TAP matching requirements are in progress under MAP-21 legislation and it is our understanding that a 20% non-federal match is required. This may be reduced, pending final legislation. Assuming a 20% match requirement, a local match of \$498,000 is required to be eligible for C/CAG's TAP construction funding. The city will be required to provide the \$498,000 local match using non-federal funds.

The table below summarizes the TCSP and TAP Complete Streets Project funding:

Funding Source	Total
Final Design Funding	
TCSP Grant (80%)	\$365,232
Non-Federal Local Cash Match (20%)	\$91,308
<i>Total Design Funding</i>	<i>\$456,540</i>
Construction Funding	
C/CAG TAP Funding (80%)	\$1,991,000
Non-Federal Local Cash Match (20%)	\$498,000
<i>Total Construction Funding</i>	<i>\$2,489,000</i>
Total Available Funding	\$2,945,540

The TCSP and TAP funding is available until January 2016. The final design funding must be spent by January 2016 and the TAP construction funding must be obligated for construction by January 2016. The project also must be included on the January 2016 California Transportation Commission (CTC) agenda for approval.

Grand Boulevard Initiative Complete Streets Program

Case Study Segment Design and Construction Phasing

As the construction cost of each TIGER II case study segment exceeds the available funding for construction, each case study segment will need to be broken down into smaller segments to fit the funding that is available under this TCSP and TAP Complete Streets Project. The city will need to identify a prioritized segment of the full TIGER II case study segment. The construction cost of the city's prioritized portion of the case study segment must not exceed \$2,489,000 (approximately 1-2 blocks in length), unless additional construction funds from the city (or other secured funding sources) will be allocated to the project.

Caltrans has agreed to this approach of segmenting the TIGER II case studies to fit future funding opportunities, rather than having to construct the complete TIGER II case study segment in full at one time. In order to meet the Caltrans Project Initiation Document requirements, the prioritized portions of the TIGER II case study segments cannot exceed a maximum of \$3 million in total construction costs.

For the Daly City, South San Francisco, and San Bruno case studies, the proposed prioritized portions of the TIGER II case study segments would be required to go through Caltrans' Permit Engineering Evaluation Report (PEER) process for project approval, which combines Caltrans' Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA&ED) phase and the Project Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) phase. The PS&E phase is the final phase prior to project construction.

As a Draft PEER is being prepared for the San Carlos case study under the TIGER II grant, San Carlos' proposed prioritized segment would move directly into the Final PEER stage for Project Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) phase for final design.

Application Process and Requirements

The TIGER II case study cities are invited to submit applications for a prioritized portion of their full TIGER II case study segment. The cities are asked to address the following general application requirements and selection criteria. Responses will be used to determine the final design case study.

The selection panel will consist of representatives from C/CAG, SamTrans, US EPA, and Caltrans.

Please provide the following general application requirements and answer the following questions in a separate document, not to exceed 5 pages. You may provide as many attachments as you see fit.

General Application Requirements

1. City Name
2. Contact Information (Name, Title, Phone Number, E-mail)
3. Define the full TIGER II case study segment boundaries.
4. Define the boundaries of the prioritized portion within the TIGER II case study segment and the rationale for selecting this portion.
5. Provide a construction cost estimate for the prioritized portion of the case study segment.
6. Provide a schedule of major project milestones. (Note: Final design must be completed by January 2016 and the TAP construction funding must be obligated by that same date.)
7. Provide the City's written commitment to incorporating, operating, and maintaining the Sustainable/Green Streets infrastructure within the selected portion. The city selected for the

Grand Boulevard Initiative Complete Streets Program

TCSP and TAP Complete Streets Project funding will be required to provide a City Resolution formalizing this commitment prior to project programming.

8. Confirm the City's ability to provide the required local matching funds and define the source of funding (non-federal).
9. Address the selection criteria questions/considerations listed below.

Criteria for Selection of Final Design Case Study

A. Level of readiness of jurisdiction to utilize Complete Streets design

- What is the level of readiness of the City to support the Complete Streets final design and construction (i.e., policies, plans, visions in place to make use of the design)?
- Is the City Council and/or other city commission in support of complete streets improvements on El Camino Real/Mission Street? The city selected for the TCSP and TAP Complete Streets Project funding will be required to provide a City Resolution in support of the Complete Streets Project prior to project programming.
- What actions have been (or will be) taken to present the case study design to the City Council and/or other city commissions?
- What is the level of anticipated community, business, and political support?
- Who will manage the project for the City?

B. Availability of local match

- A minimum local cash match of \$91,308 (non-federal) is required for the TCSP final design funding, totaling 20% of the total final design budget.
- A minimum local cash match of \$498,000 (non-federal) is required for the TAP construction funding, totaling 20% of the total construction budget.
- What are the total contributions that the city will contribute as a local match to final design and construction? The city selected for the TCSP and TAP Complete Streets Project funding will be required to enter into a Funding Agreement with C/CAG and SamTrans prior to project programming.
- What is the source of the non-federal match contribution?

C. Incorporation of Complete Streets design elements

- Does the case study address exemplary Complete Streets design elements (i.e., pedestrian improvements, bicycle improvements, transit improvements)?
- Please provide a written commitment to incorporate, operate, and maintain the Complete Streets features. The city selected for the TCSP and TAP Complete Streets Project funding will be required to provide a City Resolution formalizing this commitment prior to project programming.

D. Incorporation of Sustainable Streets (Green Streets) infrastructure

- The final design segment must include Sustainable/Green Streets infrastructure in order to be eligible for C/CAG's TAP funding for construction.
- Please provide a written commitment to incorporate, operate, and maintain the Sustainable/Green Streets features. The city selected for the TCSP and TAP Complete Streets Project funding will be required to provide a City Resolution formalizing this commitment prior to project programming.
- How does the city plan to fund ongoing maintenance of the sustainable street infrastructure?

Grand Boulevard Initiative Complete Streets Program

- How many new street trees would be planted in the project segment? What is the anticipated full-growth canopy coverage provided by these trees?
- As feasible, please quantify by square footage pre- and post-project impervious surface, permeable paving, and landscape-based stormwater treatment features, and indicate how much impervious surface will be treated/managed by either permeable pavement or landscape-based stormwater treatment facilities. Please describe how the project incorporates other exemplary Sustainable Streets elements, such as recycled materials, reflective surfaces, water- or energy-conserving features, etc.

E. Utility Conflicts

- Please identify any known utility conflicts in the project segment and whether utility relocations will be required during project construction. Please be as specific as possible (i.e., type of utility and provider, known location, and need for relocation).

F. Transferability to other jurisdictions

- Is the case study area a prime example of corridor conditions?
- Can the design be easily replicated along the corridor?
- Is the case study representative of common Complete Streets design opportunities in other communities in the corridor?

G. Surrounding environment (existing and planned)

- What types of existing development surround the case study area (i.e., transit centers, commercial uses, residential, etc.)?
- What types of uses (and intensity of uses) are planned for the case study area?

Submittal Instructions

Each city shall provide 6 identical hard copies and 1 electronic copy on CD to the address below no later than **5pm on Thursday, October 31, 2013**. The application package must be delivered by this date (not post-marked by this date).

Megan Wessel
San Mateo County Transit District
1250 San Carlos Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070

General Application Review and Selection Process

Case study applications are due no later than **5pm on Thursday, October 31, 2013**.

The TCSP and TAP Case Study Selection Committee will review the applications according to how well they meet the criteria described above and how representative they are of common complete streets design opportunities faced by other communities along the El Camino Real corridor.

The cities will be notified of the final selection in early November.

Grand Boulevard Initiative Complete Streets Program

Contact Information

Please contact Megan Wessel at 650-622-7815 or wesselm@samtrans.com with any questions.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: November 25, 2013
To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee
From: Tom Madalena
Subject: 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

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ Committee 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.

FISCAL IMPACT

For the FY 14/15 & FY 15/16 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 14/15 and \$500,000 for FY 15/16). 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

For the upcoming San Mateo County Shuttle Program, C/CAG will partner with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority to issue a joint call for projects. 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 14/15 and FY 15/16. Both agencies will be utilizing one methodology by which to score projects. 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. There will be ongoing progress reports required from project sponsors that will be the same for both agencies.

The minimum match is twenty five percent (25%) of the total project cost. Project applicants include local jurisdictions and/or public agencies. There will be a governing board resolution that confirms that the jurisdiction/agency approves of the application submittal and commits to providing the matching funds that must be submitted no later than March 7, 2014.

Proposed Timeline for the San Mateo County Shuttle Program for FY 14/15 & FY 15/16:

- November 21, 2013 – Technical Advisory Committee Call for Projects Review
- November 25, 2013 – Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee Call for Projects Review
- December 12, 2013 – C/CAG Board of Directors Call for Projects Review and Approval
- January 13, 2014 – Issue Call for Projects for FY 14/15 & FY 15/16 San Mateo County Shuttle Program
- January 21, 2014 – Application Workshop at SamTrans offices
- February 14, 2014 – Shuttle Program Applications Due
- February 24-28, 2014 – Convene Shuttle Program Evaluation Committee
- March 20, 2014 – Technical Advisory Committee Recommended Project List Review
- March 31, 2014 – Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee Project List Review
- May 1, 2014 Transportation Authority Board of Directors Project List Final Review and Approval
- May 8, 2014 – C/CAG Board of Directors Project List Review and Approval

ATTACHMENTS

- San Mateo County Shuttle Program Call for Projects FY 2014/2015 & 2015/2016

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY



TO: City/County Managers
Public Works Directors

FROM: Tom Madalena, C/CAG
Joel Slavitt, SMCTA

DATE: January 13, 2014

RE: **Call for Projects: San Mateo County Shuttle Program FY 2014/2015 & FY 2015/2016**

This memo transmits the guidelines and criteria for the San Mateo County Shuttle Program for FY 2014/2015 & FY 2015/2016, 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. Shuttle projects must conform to all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations.

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 Michael

Eshleman, Operations Planning [(650)-508-6227, eshlemanm@samtrans.com], no later than **January 31, 2014** to request the letter of concurrence/sponsorship.

Submit seven (7) hard copies and one (1) electronic copy of the application. Applications may be emailed to tmadalena@smcgov.org and mailed to:

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

The application deadline is 5:00 p.m. Friday February 14, 2014. An application workshop will be held 1:30 p.m. Tuesday January 21, 2014 in the 2nd Floor Auditorium of the SamTrans office in San Carlos. Governing Board Resolution must be submitted no later than March 7, 2014. The applications must include the information listed below and must be completed with the attached Microsoft Word application forms. Projects (both new and existing) 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.

EVALUATION PROCESS (dates are subject to change)

An evaluation panel will review the applications and develop recommendations for publication by March 1, 2014. These recommendations will be presented to the C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on March 20, 2014. The TAC recommendation will go to the C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) on March 31, 2014. 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 May 8, 2014 and May 1, 2014 respectively.

Attachments:

- San Mateo County Shuttle Program Application FY 14/15 & 15/16 for Existing Shuttles
- San Mateo County Shuttle Program Application FY 14/15 & 15/16 for New Shuttles
- San Mateo County Shuttle Program Criteria
- Non-supplantation of funds certification

San Mateo County Shuttle Program FY 2014/2015 & FY 2015/2016

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 Michael Eshleman, Operations Planning [(650)-508-6227, eshlemanm@samtrans.com], no later than January 31, 2014 to request the letter of concurrence/sponsorship.
- A governing board resolution in support of the proposed shuttle is required. If the applicant is not able to obtain a governing board resolution prior to the February 14, 2014 application submission deadline, the application will be accepted on an interim basis with an endorsement letter from the applicant's City manager or Executive officer. An adopted governing board resolution must be obtained no later than March 7, 2014.

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@smcgov.org] or Joel Slavit [(650) 508-6476, slavitj@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*) Other specify here _____

APPLICATION FOR EXISTING PROJECTS

A. Need (up to 20 points)

Describe how the shuttle will:

1. Provide service in/to an area underserved by other public transit
2. Provide transportation to low-income, transit dependent, seniors, disabled or other special-needs populations
3. Provides transportation to the services used by the special demographic groups from Item A.2 above.

Letters of support from co-sponsors, partners, stakeholders, etc. (*List agencies/organizations and attach letters*)

B. Readiness (Up to 20 points)

1. Service Plan - Describe how the service was delivered for the prior 12 months and any proposed changes for the new two year 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
- k. If the shuttle under-performed the benchmarks listed in Table 1 below, did the sponsor utilize the Technical Assistance Program (TAP) offered by SamTrans and the Alliance?

Table 1 - Benchmarks for existing shuttles

Shuttle service	Operating Cost/ passenger	Passengers/ Service Hour
Commuter	\$7	15
Community or Combination	\$9	10
Door to Door	\$16	2

2. Funding Plan with Budgeted Line Items (*use Table 2 below*):

Table 2

Budget Line Item	For Prior 12 Months	FY 15 Budget	FY 16 Budget	Total Budget FY 15 & 16
a. Contractor cost (e.g. operator/vendor)				
b. Fuel				
c. Insurance				
d. Administrative costs (e.g. staff oversight)				
e. Other direct costs (e.g. marketing)				
f. Total Operating Cost				

- g. Notes/exceptions (e.g. if there are projected differences between the first and second years' costs)

C. Effectiveness (up to 25 points)

1. Service Performance

Operating cost per passenger and passengers per service hour for prior 12 months
(Use Table 3 below)

Table 3

Operating Data		For Prior 12 Months
Vehicle Hours of Service		
Service Vehicle Miles		
Total Passengers		
Performance Indicators		For Prior 12 Months
Operating Cost/Passenger ¹		
Passengers/Service Hour ²		

Footnotes

1. Total Operating Cost/Total Passengers
2. Total Passengers/Vehicle Hours of Service

2. What other transit services does this shuttle connect with (*if bus, identify the route*)?
3. Does the shuttle provide connections between transit oriented development and major activity centers?
4. Describe the extent that this shuttle reduces Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trips and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). *Provide justification/methodology for the reduction in the number of SOV trips and VMT.*

D. Funding Leverage (up to 20 points)

1. List amounts and sources of matching funds

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 FY15 & FY16		#DIV/0!
Total Funding	\$0.00	#DIV/0!

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

E. Policy Consistency & Sustainability – (up to 15 points)

1. Proposed shuttle is included in adopted local, special area, county or regional plan (*list plans*)
2. Describe how the shuttle service supports job and housing growth/economic development.
3. Will clean-fuel vehicles be deployed for shuttle service? (*describe*)
4. Does the shuttle accommodate bicycles?
5. Are there any costs savings demonstrated through sharing of resources (e.g. shuttle operator provides reduced rates if used for both peak and off-peak service)

San Mateo County Shuttle Program FY 2014/2015 & FY 2015/2016

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 Michael Eshleman, Operations Planning [(650)-508-6227, eshlemanm@samtrans.com], no later than January 31, 2014 to request the letter of concurrence/sponsorship.
- A governing board resolution in support of the proposed shuttle is required. If the applicant is not able to obtain a governing board resolution prior to the February 14, 2014 application submission deadline, the application will be accepted on an interim basis with an endorsement letter from the applicant's City manager or Executive officer. An adopted governing board resolution must be obtained no later than March 7, 2014.

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@smcgov.org] or Joel Slavit [(650) 508-6476, slavitj@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

A. Need (up to 25 points)

Describe how the shuttle will:

1. Provide service in/to an area underserved by other public transit
2. Provide transportation to low-income, transit dependent, seniors, disabled or other special-needs populations
3. Provides transportation to the services used by the special demographic groups from Item A.2 above.

Letters of support from co-sponsors, partners, stakeholders, etc. (*List agencies/organizations and attach letters*)

B. Readiness (Up to 25 points)

1. Service Plan - Describe how the service will be delivered including:
 - a. Service area (route description, destinations served)
(*Attach maps*)
 - b. Describe your service plan development (planning process, public outreach, whether SamTrans/Alliance technical assistance was utilized, etc.)
 - c. List specific rail stations, major SamTrans route or ferries served by the shuttle
 - d. 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.
 - e. Marketing (outreach, advertising, signage, schedules, etc.)
 - f. Service provider
 - g. Administration and oversight plan/roles

- h. Co-sponsor/stakeholders (roles/responsibilities)
- i. Monitoring plan (service quality performance data, complaints/complements, surveys)
- j. Ridership characteristics (commuters, employees, seniors, students, etc.)
- k. Any differences/changes to existing service for the funding period, compared to the prior 12 months
- l. Planning process for shuttles (extent of public planning process, use of SamTrans and Alliance Technical Assistance Program)

C. Effectiveness (up to 15 points)

- 1. Projected ridership and performance for each fiscal year. *(Use Table 1 to provide calculation information for questions 1, 2 and 3. State assumptions and document justifications where possible.)*

Table 1

Projected Operating Costs	FY15 Projection	FY16 Projection
Contractor Cost		
Fuel		
Insurance		
Administrative Costs (e.g. Personnel expenses)		
Other Direct Costs (e.g. Printing marketing materials, promotions, etc.)		
Total Operating Costs		\$0

Projected Operating Data	FY15 Projection	FY16 Projection
Vehicle Hours of Service		
Service Vehicle Miles		
Total Passengers		

Performance Indicators	FY15 Projected Average	FY16 Projected Average
Operating Cost/Passenger	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Passengers/Service Hour	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

2. What other transit services does this shuttle connect with (*if bus, identify the route*)?
3. Does the shuttle provide connections between transit oriented development and major activity centers?
4. Describe the extent that this shuttle reduces Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trips and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). *Provide justification/methodology for the reduction in the number of SOV trips and VMT.*

D. Funding Leverage (up to 20 points)

1. List amounts and sources of matching funds

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 FY15 & FY16		#DIV/0!
Total Funding	\$0.00	#DIV/0!

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

E. Policy Consistency & Sustainability – (up to 15 points)

1. Proposed shuttle is included in adopted local, special area, county or regional plan (*list plans*)
2. Describe how the shuttle service supports job and housing growth/economic development.
3. Will clean-fuel vehicles be deployed for shuttle service? (*describe*)
4. Does the shuttle accommodate bicycles?
5. Are there any cost savings demonstrated through sharing of resources (e.g. shuttle operator provides reduced rates if used for both peak and off-peak service)

Eligibility Criteria		TA-C/CAG Joint Shuttle Program Call for Projects FY 15 & 16	
Minimum Local Match	- 25%		
Local Match	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Costs directly tied to the shuttle service, such as operations, marketing and outreach, and staff time directly associated with shuttle administration are eligible. - Leasing of vehicles is an eligible expense; vehicle purchase is not. - Overhead, indirect or other staff costs are not eligible. 		
Minimum Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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). 		
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.		NA
Letter of Concurrence/sponsorship	Evidence of coordination with SamTrans, through a letter of concurrence from SamTrans, that shuttle routes do not duplicate SamTrans fixed-route or other public shuttle service, is required. If there are proposed route and/or schedule changes to existing shuttle service, applicant shall provide a letter of concurrence from SamTrans regarding the proposed changes.		Evidence of coordination with SamTrans, through a letter of concurrence from SamTrans, that proposed shuttle routes does not duplicate SamTrans fixed route or other public shuttle service, is required.
Governing Board Resolution	A governing board resolution in support of the project is required. If the applicant is not able to obtain a governing board resolution prior to the February 14, 2014 application deadline, the application will be accepted on an interim basis with an endorsement letter from the applicant's City Manager or Executive Officer until an adopted governing board resolution can be obtained by March 7, 2014		
Scoring Criteria		Existing Shuttles	New Shuttles
Need & Readiness	<p><u>Need – 20 points</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides service to an area underserved by other public transit - Provides services to special populations (e.g. low income/transit dependent, seniors, disabled, other) - Provides transportation to the services used by special populations - Letters of support from stakeholders <p><u>Readiness – 20 points</u></p> <p>Solid service plan in place describing how the shuttle service will be delivered for the 2-year funding period including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Service area (routes/maps, destinations served) Specific rail stations, ferry or major SamTrans transit centers served Schedule (days, times, frequency) - show coordination with scheduled transit service Marketing plan/activities (advertising, outreach, signage, etc.) Service Provider Administration and oversight (whom?) Monitoring/evaluation plan/activities (performance data, complaints/compliments, surveys) Co-sponsors/stakeholders (roles?) Ridership characteristics: e.g. commuter/ employees, seniors, students, etc Any significant changes to existing service Did applicant use the Technical Assistance Program offered by SamTrans & the Alliance to improve underperforming routes? <p>Solid funding plan with budgeted line items for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Contractor (operator/vendor) cost Fuel Insurance Administrative (Staff oversight) Other direct costs (e.g. marketing) Total operating cost Notes/exceptions (e.g. if there are projected differences between the 1st and 2nd year costs) 		<p><u>Need – 25 points</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides service to an area underserved by other public transit - Provides services to special populations (e.g. low income/transit dependent, seniors, disabled, other) - Provides transportation to the services used by special populations - Letters of support from stakeholders <p><u>Readiness – 25 points</u></p> <p>Solid service plan in place describing how the shuttle service will be delivered for the 2-year funding period including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Service area (routes/maps, destinations served) Service plan development Specific rail stations, ferry or major SamTrans transit centers served Schedule (days, times, frequency) - show coordination with scheduled transit service Marketing plan/activities (advertising, outreach, signage, etc.) Service Provider Administration and oversight (whom?) Monitoring/evaluation plan/activities (performance data, complaints/compliments, surveys) Co-sponsors/stakeholders (roles?) Ridership characteristics: e.g. commuter/ employees, seniors, students, etc Any significant changes to existing service Planning process for shuttles (extent of public planning process, use of SamTrans & Alliance Technical Assistance Program) <p>Solid funding plan with budgeted line items for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Contractor (operator/vendor) cost Administrative (Staff oversight) Other direct costs (e.g. marketing) Total operating cost Notes/exceptions (e.g. if there are projected differences between the 1st and 2nd year costs)
Effectiveness	<p><u>Effectiveness – 25 points</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Annual average operating cost per passenger for the prior 12 months - Annual average passengers per revenue vehicle hour of service for the prior 12 months - Service links with other fixed route transit (more points for higher ridership routes) - Improves access from transit oriented development to major activity nodes - Reduces single occupant vehicle (SOV) trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) 		<p><u>Effectiveness - 15 points</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 - Proposed service links with other fixed route transit (more points for higher ridership routes) - Proposed service improves access from transit oriented development to major activity nodes - Proposed service reduces single occupant vehicle (SOV) trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT)
Funding Leverage – 20 points	<p>Percentage of matching funds contribution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25 to < 50% - up to 10 points 50 to < 75% - up to 15 points 75 to < 99% - up to 18 points <p>Private sector funding proposed (supports less public subsidy) – 2 points</p>		<p>Percentage of matching funds contribution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25 to < 50% - up to 10 points 50 to < 75% - up to 15 points 75 to < 99% - up to 18 points <p>Private sector funding proposed (supports less public subsidy) – 2 points</p>
Policy Consistency & Sustainability – 15 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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.) - Supports jobs and housing growth/economic development - Use of clean fuel vehicle(s) for service - Shuttle accommodates bicycles - Cost savings demonstrated through sharing of resources (shuttle operator provides reduced rates if service used for peak and off-peak service) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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.) - Supports jobs and housing growth/economic development - Use of clean fuel vehicle(s) for service - Shuttle accommodates bicycles - Cost savings demonstrated through sharing of resources (shuttle operator provides reduced rates if service used for peak and off-peak service)
	Maximum Point Total - 100		Maximum Point Total - 100

**San Mateo Fiscal Years 2015 and/or 2016
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 FY2015 and/or FY2016 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

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*

Date: November 25, 2013

To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

From: Sandy Wong

Subject: Review and approval of the 2014 CMEQ meeting Calendar

It is recommended that the CMEQ committee approve the regular meeting calendar for 2014 as follows:

Congestion Management & Environmental Quality
Mondays 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
January 27
February 24
March 31
April 28
May 19 (May 26 is Memorial Day)
June 30
July – No meeting
August 25
September 29
October 27
November 24
December - No meeting

All meetings are scheduled for the last Monday of the month except for May 19th. Also, following the CMEQ committee's decision for past years, staff recommend to not schedule meetings for the months of July and December.

Meetings begin at 3:00 p.m. and end at 5:00 p.m. and are typically held in Conference Room C, San Mateo City Hall, with occasional alternative locations to be announced.