

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 17, 2008 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Place: **SanTrans 4th Floor Dining Room**
1250 San Carlos Ave, San Carlos, California

PLEASE CALL Nancy Blair (599-1406) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

- | | | | | |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. | Public Comment On Items Not On The Agenda | Presentations are limited to 3 mins | | 3:00 p.m.
10 mins. |
| 2. | Comments from the Chair | Information (O'Connell) | | 3:10 p.m.
5 mins |
| 3. | Minutes of October 27, 2008 meeting. | Action (O'Connell) | Pages 1 - 3 | 3:15 p.m.
5 mins. |
| 4. | Review and recommend approval of the Final San Mateo County Energy Strategy Report | Action (Springer) | Pages 4 - 18 | 3:20 p.m.
40 mins. |
| 5. | Review and comment on the program and performance measures for SB 348 - Reauthorized \$4 vehicle license fee on motor vehicles registered in San Mateo County. | Action (Hoang) | Pages 19 - 31 | 4:00 p.m.
20 mins. |
| 6. | Review and approval of the CMEQ 2009 meeting calendar. | Action (Napier) | Pages 32 | 4:20 p.m.
5 mins |
| 7. | Executive Director Report | Information (Napier) | Oral Presentation | 4:35 p.m.
5 mins |
| 8. | Member comments and announcements. | Information (O'Connell) | | 4:40 p.m.
10 mins. |
| 9. | Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date (December 15, 2008). | Action (O'Connell) | | 4:50 p.m. |

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.*

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*

Other enclosures/Correspondence - None

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

**MINUTES
MEETING OF OCTOBER 27, 2008**

At 3:01 p.m., the meeting was called to order by Chair O'Connell in Conference Room C at the City Hall of San Mateo.

Members Attending: Jim Bigelow, Judith Christensen, Sue Lempert, Arthur Lloyd, Karyl Matsumoto, Naomi Patridge, Barbara Pierce, Vice Chair Sepi Richardson, Lennie Roberts, Onnolee Trapp, Zoe Kersteen-Tucker, Daniel Quigg, and Steve Dworetzky.

Staff/Guests Attending: Sandy Wong, John Hoang, Jean Higaki, (C/CAG Staff), Pat Giorni (Burlingame resident), Richard Cook and Enrique Silvas (SamTrans), Pat Dixon (TA CAC), and Marian Lee (SamTrans/SMCTA).

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

Pat Giorni, a Burlingame resident, thanked the committee for their support regarding bicycle carrying capacity on CalTrain in its Bicycle Master Plan.

2. Minutes of July 28, 2008 meeting.

Motion: To approve the Minutes of the July 28, 2008 meeting. Pierce/Kersteen-Tucker. Approved unanimously.

3. Update on Measure A Strategic Plan (Information item).

Marian Lee-Skowronek of SamTrans presented the 2009-2033 Measure A Program Strategic Plan. She provided an overview on the key components of the Strategic Plan as well as the public outreach process used to develop the Strategic Plan. The 25-year Measure A program is expected to bring in \$3.7 billion dollars for the various transportation improvement categories, including Transit, Highways, Local Streets, Pedestrian/Bike, Grade Separation, and Alternative Congestion Relief. The Strategic Plan will be a living document and will be updated every 5 years. During the public outreach process, one of the overwhelming responses received from the public is "Customer Satisfaction". The TA Board is expected to adopt the Strategic Plan on December 4, 2008.

CMEQ members requested for a copy of the PowerPoint presentation. In addition, Member Lempert expressed concern about East Palo Alto's lack of staffing availability to pursue and compete for funding for projects that will benefit East Palo Alto.

4. Presentation on CO2 San Mateo County – including Energy Strategy and PG&E Local Government Partnership (information item).

Kim Springer of San Mateo County Public Works made a presentation on "CO2 San Mateo County – Climate Action Countywide". He also introduced his new staff, Alexis Petru. San Mateo County Public Works along with C/CAG in a partnership, have made much progress towards climate change. Together, they have received grant funds from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) as well as PG&E Local Government Partnership. These funds will provide energy efficiency improvements to municipal, commercial, residential sectors in San Mateo County. These

efforts will work towards the goals of energy demand reduction, water conservation, and collaboration between cities and utilities, as well as leadership from the top.

Member Kersteen-Tucker asked if SamTrans is eligible to participate in these programs.

With regard to the San Mateo County Energy Strategy report, member Pierce urged CMEQ members to bring it to the attention of their respective C/CAG Board members to urge city councils to adopt the San Mateo County Energy Strategy.

Member Trapp also suggested everyone to go see the new Portola Valley Town Center, a brand new facility that is environmentally sensitive.

5. Presentation of the Peninsula Gateway 2020 Corridor Study – Final Report and Action Plan (Information Item).

John Hoang presented the 2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor study. Phase 1 of the study has been completed and the Final Report is available and has been distributed to all members participated in the study. The purpose of the study is to identify short, medium, and long-term roadway improvement options for addressing traffic congestion and local community impacts due to regional traffic between US 101 and the Dumbarton Bridge. An Action Plan has been developed for stakeholders consideration. It includes near-term implementation projects as well as long-term solutions that require additional engineering analysis. Presentations of the Study and Action Plan are being made to the involved city councils in recent months.

Member Lempert stated that she hopes this study will lead to major improvement project(s) in the future, besides the minor and short-term “quick fixes”. One of the problems associated with such a project is that the time span is sometimes longer than the terms of elected officials. For example, Duane Bay was a strong supporter of this project but his term on the city council ended in the middle of the study. Member Roberts, also a participant in the study, stated that the lack of technical participation in this study from the City of East Palo Alto was also a challenge.

7. Recommendation of projects to be funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) under the Lifeline Transportation Program for a total of \$1,925,121.

This item was moved ahead of Item 6 at the request of member Kersteen-Tucker.

Jean Higaki presented the staff recommendation on the approval of projects to be funded by the Lifeline Transportation Program. Funding for this program comes from State Transit Assistance (STA), Prop 1B Transit Capital, and Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) funds. Each of these funding categories has its own restrictions on project eligibility. A call for projects was issue by C/CAG, resulting in four project applications. A selection committee reviewed the applications and recommended partially fund three of the four projects.

Member Lempert, also a Commissioner of the MTC, mentioned that others at the MTC have the misperception that San Mateo County is wealthy, as compared to other counties in the Bay Area. The Lifeline program funding is specifically directed toward low income communities. And San Mateo County share is calculated based on its share of low income communities.

Member Kersteen-Tucker expressed her support for the selected projects, and stated that the Fix Route 17 SamTrans project on the coast-side was developed based on a consorted effort by the community.

Motion: Recommend approval of projects to be funded by the MTC under the Lifeline Transportation Program for a total amount of \$1,925,121. Kersteen-Tucker/Richardson, approved, unanimously.

6. Update on the San Mateo County Smart Corridor Project (information).

Sandy Wong provide a verbal update on the San Mateo County Smart Corridor project. This project received \$10 million in State grant from the Transportation Bond Traffic Light Synchronization Program (TLSP), another \$10 million in County discretionary State Transportation Improvement funds, as well as local match from Measure A and C/CAG programs. A demonstration piece of the project, located in the City of San Mateo, is separated out and will be delivered early in order to meet the timeline requirement of the TLSP grant. C/CAG, along with its project partners including SMCTA and Caltrans, is seeking qualified consultants to manage the project and to assist in the technical aspects of the project. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is being review/approved by all involved agencies.

CMEQ members from the northern part of San Mateo County were concern with geographic equity. The funded portion of the Smart Corridor is generally along the US 101 between I-380 and Redwood City. Members Matsumoto, Christensen, and Richardson stated that traffic congestion is also severe in north county, and requested Sandy to bring back a message to Richard Napier, CCAG Executive Director, to draw more attention on transportation issues and congestion problems in the north. Sandy mentioned that C/CAG has worked with Caltrans on turning on the metering lights along northbound I-280 between San Bruno and Daly City in October. In addition, the next auxiliary lanes along US 101 to be worked on will be the segments north of San Bruno Ave.

8. Executive Director Report.

Sandy Wong reported on behalf of Richard Napier and expressed appreciation for everyone's support in getting SB348 passed. It extended the \$4 vehicle license fee for San Mateo County for the Transportation Management & Storm Water Quality programs. 50% of the fee will go directly back to the cities and the county.

9. Member comments and announcements.

Member Patridge announced that she was very proud of the opening the Route 92 project.

10. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m. The next meeting was scheduled for November 17, 2008 due to Thanksgiving holiday. It will be held at the SamTrans Dinning room.

Member Bigelow suggested a presentation on the Dumbarton Rail project update at a future meeting.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: November 17, 2008
To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ)
From: Richard Napier and Kim Springer
Subject: Review and recommend approval of the Final San Mateo County Energy Strategy Report
(For further information, contact Richard Napier 650-599-1420, or Kim Springer at 599-1412)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ review and recommend approval of the Final San Mateo County Energy Strategy Report.

FISCAL IMPACT

Approval of the San Mateo County Energy Strategy Report will not have any fiscal impact to C/CAG. The cost to C/CAG for the editing and graphics for the report has been approximately \$9,000. Approximately \$4000 of additional funding will be required for printing.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funding for the report preparation comes from the County of San Mateo as well as C/CAG transportation funds.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

A complete draft copy of the Energy Strategy was sent to all City Managers and Mayors via mail and e-mail on September 18, 2008; Cities were invited to submit comments to the County for consideration until October 15, 2008. The County received comments from six cities. All comments were reviewed and evaluated, including those comments submitted after the October 15 deadline.

The County is incorporating many of the cities' comments into the draft version of the Energy Strategy. Comments ranged from positive feedback about how the Energy Strategy will support the cities' climate action efforts to corrections of some typos. Other comments requested or suggested additional information about specific actions to implement the Energy Strategy, such as case studies, program models, and sample policies, as well as more information about how to implement certain programs and certain technologies. C/CAG and the County plan to incorporate these requests for additional information in future versions of the Energy Strategy, and there is also the potential for C/CAG and the County to coordinate workshops that will provide this information.

The two main concerns raised in the comments that cities wanted to emphasize were 1: that the Energy Strategy would not create additional meetings for staff and 2: that cities would not have to implement every action proposed in the Strategy upon adoption.

To address these concerns, C/CAG and the County will reinforce the Energy Strategy's objective in a letter to the cities that will accompany the final Energy Strategy. The main objective of this effort is to

coordinate climate action efforts among cities in the county, and to reduce meetings, eliminate duplicative work, and save resources, money, and the environment. The County also changed the “actions” in the Strategy to “potential actions,” per the City of San Carlos’ suggestion, to clarify that these are suggested actions that may help a city reach the Energy Strategy’s goals. Some actions listed in the Strategy may not work for a particular city and are not required to be implemented, especially if they are in conflict with a city’s existing climate action plan.

The County submitted the Energy Strategy document’s edits to the graphic design company, and they are currently working on the final version of the document. Please refer to the enclosed List of Comments and Actions Taken to gain a better idea of the comments, suggestions, and concerns of those cities that commented.

ATTACHMENT

Draft San Mateo County Energy Strategy – List of Comments & Actions Taken

Draft San Mateo County Energy Strategy – List of Comments and Actions Taken

Comment	City	Action Taken
Positive feedback		
I found the report extremely thorough and comprehensive. It touches on virtually all the important aspects of energy conservation and climate change that we need to deal with.	Belmont	N/A
The report is a timely, pro-active and informative policy document.	Half Moon Bay	N/A
It's an excellent draft overall with interesting ideas and information. It did seem a little too vague in some areas, such as in describing its goals, but did provide good examples and references that will be useful in developing action plans.	Menlo Park	More details and information about goals, strategies, and actions will be provided in future versions.
The City of Menlo Park has already implemented (or is about to implement) many of the "easy" recommendations (e.g. facilities assessments, inventory of existing emissions, water conservation programs, etc.). Others, some of which are being included in the City's Climate Action Plan, are doable, particularly if C/CAG follows thru with hiring staff to support the effort.	Menlo Park	The County has hired a Resource Conservation Specialist II to work on behalf of C/CAG on the Energy Strategy programs.
The draft indicates that C/CAG hopes to present the strategy to city councils asking them to adopt the strategy, commit to collaboration with cities/County on it, and release PGE info in early 2009. Menlo Park's Climate Action Plan (CAP) is expected to roll out for public comment in January/February 2009. It could be mutually beneficial for these two actions to occur around the same time, although there are some potential conflicts.	Menlo Park	The Energy Strategy is meant to support cities' climate action efforts and not conflict with them. The Strategies' goals are consistent with current institutional thinking and state laws and shouldn't conflict with cities' climate action plans. Cities are not required to implement every action listed in the Strategy. To clarify this point, "Actions" were changed to "Potential Actions."
The report is very comprehensive and contains many good ideas and programs. There is a lot to be gained in working together as a county to ensure the long term supply of energy and water, in preserving our natural resources and reducing	Millbrae	N/A

greenhouse gas emissions.		
The content of the Energy Strategy document is very thorough. The strategies and actions are well thought out and appear to be feasible to implement, both from a city staff perspective and as an individual. Appendix D: Resources is very complete, well organized and easily accessible through the links on the PDF. It will be a valuable tool in carrying out the Energy Strategy.	Portola Valley	N/A
Concerns		
There are some conflicts between the Energy Strategy and Menlo Park's Climate Action Plan, particularly in the areas of green building ordinances, investing in additional staff for energy programs and partnering with PG&E. Those could make the process of either "adopting" or "accepting" the County strategy somewhat challenging for staff as we'll end up with the burden of trying to explain or resolve conflicts unless C/CAG is going to be willing to perform those analyses before presenting to our Council.	Menlo Park	The Energy Strategy is meant to support cities' climate action efforts and not conflict with them. The Strategies' goals are consistent with current institutional thinking and state laws and shouldn't conflict with cities' climate action plans. Cities are not required to implement every action listed in the Strategy. To clarify this point, "Actions" were changed to "Potential Actions."
Millbrae, like other cities, is pulled in many directions and is busy implementing day-to-day programs. Additional meetings and commitments may prove challenging depending on how the plan is implemented. The overall point is that we have many commitments and programs and any effort the Utilities & Sustainability Task Force can do to coordinate with existing entities and programs working in these areas to streamline activities the easier it will be for cities to participate. While many of the strategies make sense, there may be some that don't make sense for us for a number of reasons, including that we already have a similar program in place or do not have the funds or staff to fulfill the proposed strategy.	Millbrae	The Energy Strategy is meant to support and coordinate cities' climate action efforts, not create additional work or meetings. Also, cities are not required to implement every action listed in the Strategy. To clarify this point, "Actions" were changed to "Potential Actions."
Comments on collaborating with other organizations		
We would like C/CAG and RecycleWorks to consider a few things in moving ahead	Millbrae	The USTF worked with BAWSCA, Joint Venture

<p>with their plan. For one, Millbrae is a member of the California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC) and BAWSCA, and as a member of these organizations we are obligated to implement various water conservation programs and Best Management Practices (BMPs). You may be aware that BAWSCA is developing a regional water conservation plan that will include additional programs and water use projections. Your coordination with BAWSCA should eliminate program duplication. If you haven't already, you may also find it helpful to review CUWCC's BMP's and which cities and water agencies in the County are members. The other organization we're working with is the Joint Venture Climate Task Force which is noted in the report. Various programs are being considered and others are underway that will help with the strategies listed in the report.</p>		<p>Silicon Valley/Sustainable Silicon Valley, and Sustainable San Mateo on the draft Energy Strategy and will continue to consult with these organizations going forward.</p>
Corrections/typos		
<p><u>Page 30:</u> The State's landscape water conservation ordinance goes into effect in 2010, not 2020. This is also listed elsewhere in the report.</p>	<p>Millbrae</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p>
<p><u>Appendix A, page 50:</u> For staff contact, please note the correct spelling: Shelly Reider. Another correction is that Millbrae signed both the ICLEI pledge and the Mayor's Agreement for climate protection. There should not be parentheses for ICLEI's membership. Also, please note that solar permit fees are based on the valuation of the system purchased. Not everyone is charged the same.</p>	<p>Millbrae</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p>
<p>Page 50: Change "Mayor's Agreement" to "City Climate Letter". Change Foster City and San Carlos to "Yes"</p>	<p>San Carlos</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p>
<p>Page 50: San Carlos and all of the San Mateo County cities participating in the ICLEI/Joint Venture GHG Inventory project are ICLEI members.</p>	<p>San Carlos</p>	<p>Updated list.</p>
<p>For Belmont, the staff contact should be</p>	<p>Belmont</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p>

Karl Mittelstadt. We are a member of ICLEI. We are a member of SSV.		
Information (actions, strategies, etc.) to add to Energy Strategy:		
It would be helpful if the report provided some insight into how small cities can implement the larger, more complex goals, such as retrofitting all government facilities, eliminating/discounting permit & license fees for green projects and businesses, developing an Energy Element for the General Plan, etc.	Menlo Park	Next version. C/CAG will also consider coordinating workshops on these topics.
Providing model program ideas, rate structure models and samples ordinances in the report would be helpful.	Millbrae	Next version. City can also contact city in case study to obtain ordinance, rates, etc.
Once the report is finalized, it would be helpful to have a chart that outlines the strategies and goals with a timeline. It would also be good to eventually complement this effort with a strategy that includes two important areas that tie into water and energy: waste management/recycling and transportation.	Millbrae	Next version to have timelines and potentially information about solid waste and transportation. Timelines were not included in this report because C/CAG wanted cities to adopt goals first, and then agree on timelines. Solid waste and transportation were not included in the Strategy because they were not in USTF's scope.
Hopefully the next report will provide more details about implementation of the goals, strategies and actions outlined in the report by the local agencies. Local agencies should include the cities and the county to promote energy efficient building codes, sewer treatment agencies for promoting use of reclaimed water, water distribution agencies to coordinate use of reclaimed and potable water, PG&E Company to coordinate electric and natural gas conservation etc.	Half Moon Bay	Some of this information is included in the current report; more details to be in next version.
Need to clarify that the "San Mateo County" goals include all residents, businesses and agencies in San Mateo County rather than just the County Government alone.	San Carlos	"San Mateo County" refers to county's cities, residents, and businesses; "County of San Mateo" refers to County government.
Executive Summary, Pg. 6: Need more information on what an "energy efficiency implementation action plan" is, who will fund it, resources to develop, etc.	San Carlos	Incorporated.

Executive Summary, Pg. 6: Under Green Building Standards and Ordinances, also note recent State action to adopt a Green Building Code at the State level which will be enforced by all cities starting in 2009 (voluntary code) and in 2011 (mandatory code).	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Executive Summary, Pg. 8: Add mention of passage of AB 2466 – enabling cities and counties to use excess energy generated at one site towards the energy bill/use of another site.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Executive Summary, Pg. 9: Add comment that changes to Business License Taxes may require voter approval under Prop 218 before they can be changed.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Executive Summary, Pg. 9: Clarify membership of “Energy Task Force”. Also discuss what agency (C/CAG?) is investing in additional staff.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Executive Summary, Pg. 9: Change “Partner with businesses...” to “Partner with residents, businesses....”	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Page 3, Guiding Principles: Who will “enforce regulations” in cities where water and electricity are not city utilities? Describe “environmental justice impacts” and how they will be taken into account.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Page 4 – Next Steps: How does a “Government Baseline Audit of energy usage” differ from the GHG inventories being done by agencies working with ICLEI and Joint Venture Silicon Valley?	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Pg. 4 - Section 1: Background, Heading: Report and Next Steps, 2nd list of bullets, 2 nd bullet: Should indicate that the first steps of the implementation plan are described in Section 7: Next Steps.	Portola Valley	The purpose of this section is to obtain support from cities for goals and have them commit to these initial steps, not detail the first steps of Strategy implementation.
Pg. 4 - Section 1: Background, Heading: Report and Next Steps, 2nd list of bullets: It would also be helpful to add a section under the bullet “Complete a Government Baseline Audit of energy usage” (or in a separate intro as suggested above) on how the county plans to implement the plan;	Portola Valley	See above.

specifically, that the county plans to “organize meetings for information sharing and a quarterly workshop event on topics timely to progress towards the goals in the Energy Strategy” (p. 48). Otherwise, one finds oneself wondering how the actions are going to come to fruition.		
Pg. 7 - Heading: Impact, Title should be expanded—impact of what? The Energy Action Plan, the regulatory framework, policy?	Portola Valley	We wanted to keep the headings short; this is impact of all the issues discussed prior to this section.
Pg. 7 - Heading: Impact, Title 24, should be expanded to say the Title 24 Energy Code or Title 24 should be referred to and included in the index.	Portola Valley	Incorporated.
Page 10 – Potential Actions: Under “Net Metering”, add mention of passage of AB 2466 – enabling cities and counties to use excess energy generated at one site towards the energy bill/use of another site.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Page 13: How does the goal of 5.2 MGD relate to total current usage as a percentage?	San Carlos	Percentage will be different for each city, based on city’s current water usage rates.
Page 14: This section should also mention the energy generation occurring at the SBSA wastewater treatment plant in Redwood Shores owned by Redwood City, San Carlos, Belmont and West Bay Sanitary.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Page 15: Clarify that the County is planning to offer incentives, rebates and tax credits.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Pg. 17 – Section 4: Indicate the entity responsible for the goals.	Portola Valley	Next version.
Pg. 19 - Section 5: Strategies, It would be helpful to have the responsible party linked to the strategy (city, county, or other entity).	Portola Valley	Next version.
Page 21: Note that 28 agencies in Silicon Valley, of which ___ from San Mateo County are already working on this effort.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Energy Strategy section of the report addresses the strategy for conserving electric energy. This section should be expanded to discuss conservation of natural gas use for building heating and industrial/commercial purposes. The cities	Half Moon Bay	Information on green building codes and new technologies included in the current Strategy. The County held a workshop on developing green building codes in October 2008. Also, the next

and county could adopt building standards which would promote gas conservation through higher insulation, building orientation and more efficient water/room heaters. This section should also include policies for promoting new technologies, solar, wind and bio energy.		version of the Strategy will have more information on policies to promote new technology.
Pg. 20 & on - Section 6: It would be helpful to have the responsible party linked to the recommended actions (city, county, or other entity).	Portola Valley	Next version.
Section 6, Energy: Should include an action and case study using energy efficiency retrofits to improve the stock of existing buildings—either mandatory at time of sale or voluntary.	Portola Valley	Next version.
The plan should evaluate the opportunity to obtain energy recovery by digesting food waste at wastewater plants. See attached research paper regarding the pilot program at East Bay Municipal Utility District.	San Carlos	Next version.
Page 23 – Ordinances: Note that the State has adopted a Green Building Code which will include voluntary standards in 2009 and mandatory compliance in 2011 which all cities and the county will be implementing.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Page 24: Note that citizen task forces can focus on work with residents while agency staff or interns can focus on work with the agency.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Page 24: In the Case Study on Energy Watch, is the 4 million kilowatt hours saved for agencies or is it a community wide figure?	San Carlos	Information already exists in Strategy.
Page 25 – Ordinances: Note that the State has adopted a Green Building Code which will include voluntary standards in 2009 and mandatory compliance in 2011 which all cities and the county will be implementing.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Pg. 27 - Include the "Berkeley Model" as an example for cities to consider that can establish assessment districts that will assist property owners in financing energy efficient programs on their property.	Belmont	Next version.

<p>Page 28 – Case Study: San Carlos installed a photovoltaic system at the City Corporation Yards and improved energy efficiency at City Hall to reduce operating and energy costs at both sites.</p>	<p>San Carlos</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p>
<p>Water Consumption section should explore ways to promote use of recycled water for landscape irrigation in highways and street medians, golf courses, commercial properties and ground water recharge. Cities and County could promote use of artificial turf on parks and large development projects.</p>	<p>Half Moon Bay</p>	<p>Some of this information is already included in the Strategy. More information will be included in future versions.</p>
<p>To achieve significant water conservation, the plan should address the market disincentives that are currently in place. For example, although the City of San Carlos has a significant potential source of recycled water available from the Redwood City pipeline that skirts the city limits along Skyway Drive, there is no market incentive to incur the significant capital costs needed to punch a purple pipe under the freeway and establish a distribution system to serve major water uses such as parks, schools, and industries. It typically costs more to operate a recycled water system (even if the capital costs are subsidized) than the revenues can generate, given that it must be priced below potable water. Also, the plan should recognize a paradox of the water business - that private water utilities such as California Water have little market incentive to undertake a costly conservation program. Full service cities and public water districts have a political incentive to undertake water conservation. Thus, there is typically a more aggressive water conservation program in such agencies. Yes, the PUC mandates water conservation for private water utilities. From where I sit, though, I see a lot of water waste and little public education or political involvement in areas served by private water utilities.</p>	<p>San Carlos</p>	<p>Next version.</p>
<p>Page 31 – Case Study: Redwood City now has 6 artificial turf athletic fields completed</p>	<p>San Carlos</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p>

and in use (Bechet Field at Red Morton Park, Griffin Field, Hoover Field 1, Hoover Field 2, McGarvey Field, Red Morton Park). Other examples include artificial turf fields in use at Menlo Atherton High School in Atherton, Carlmont High School in Belmont, Burlingame High School, Half Moon Bay High School, Canada College, Fair Oaks School and Sequoia High School in Redwood City, Skyline College in San Bruno, Hillsdale High School, San Mateo High School and the College of San Mateo in San Mateo, Orange Memorial Park in South San Francisco and Woodside High School.		
Page 34 – Proposed Intermediate Actions: Add mention of passage of AB 2466 – enabling cities and counties to use excess energy generated at one site towards the energy bill/use of another site.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Pg. 36 - Include a goal of identifying funding sources (state or federal) to provide the technical support and expertise cities will need as we move forward (many of the recommended actions in the report request that agencies hire additional staff and/or hire consultants to assist with the implementation of the various strategies; however, most agencies are not in the best financial condition for funding new programs or staff).	Belmont	Incorporated.
Collectively approach our legislators for assistance; it may be more successful than if we did it individually; collectively supporting legislation that helps us reach our goals.	Belmont	Incorporated.
Page 39 – Expertise: Note that in San Carlos, San Carlos Green works with San Carlos residents, the Chamber of Commerce Green Business Task Force works with San Carlos businesses and the City’s Staff works with City Government green projects in a multi-faceted approach.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Page 40 – Staffing: Clarify that the number of tasks listed here are likely to require more than 1 staff person to coordinate and	San Carlos	Incorporated.

carry out.		
Page 42 – Green Business Certification Program: Note that there is a cost to businesses to participate since they often have to buy new toilets, lighting and other items to meet program standards. Over time these energy saving changes often result in measurable reductions to the company’s bottom line operating costs.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Page 43: Action #4: Include that San Mateo County Environmental Health has initiated a take back program for compact fluorescent lights and has set up drop-off sites throughout the County and is looking for additional locations.	Millbrae	Incorporated.
Pg. 45 - Section 7: Next Steps: It would be helpful to have the responsible party linked to the milestones (city, county, or other entity).	Portola Valley	Next version.
Pg. 45 - Section 7: Next Steps: Some of the timelines on the milestones have passed or are coming up in December 2008, which will make cities who haven’t accomplished these tasks left behind. It would be helpful to reference a resource in the appendices for achieving the milestone.	Portola Valley	Incorporated.
Page 48 – Milestone 2: Add mention of passage of AB 2466 – enabling cities and counties to use excess energy generated at one site towards the energy bill/use of another site.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Page 49: Also note that the City Economic Development Managers who belong to SVEDA can also work on economic development aspects of Milestone 1.	San Carlos	Incorporated.
Page 49: A list of the City Staff Contact from all 20 cities in San Mateo County is available from Joint Venture: Silicon Valley.	San Carlos	Not necessary to incorporate – for County/C/CAG information only.
Appendix A: Status of City and County Efforts: Elected Contact: Maryann Derwin, Mayor, Staff Contact: Brandi de Garreaux, Sustainability and Resource Efficiency Coordinator.	Portola Valley	Incorporated.
Changes		
Locate the Table of Contents before the	Portola Valley	Executive Summary intended to

Executive Summary.		be a stand-alone document; left as-is.
Include a preface or intro before the Executive Summary that clearly explains the structure of the document and the plan for implementation.	Portola Valley	Decided to leave as-is; did not receive other similar feedback on this section.
The Executive Summary is difficult to understand without reading the Energy Strategy in its entirety. Perhaps it could be filled out a little (for example, an intro into the first section explaining what it is—background?). Overall, the formatting in the Executive Summary could be simplified to make it easier to read. It is very cluttered with so many different fonts in such a small amount of space.	Portola Valley	See above.
Start new main sections on a right page.	Portola Valley	Decided to leave as-is. Would increase the length of the document and use more paper.
List main sections at the top or the bottom of the page, so the reader knows where they are when navigating through the document.	Portola Valley	Incorporated.
Pg. 5 - Section 2: Context, Heading: Role of Energy, Paragraph 4, “San Mateo County has never had a power plant within its borders but all that will change when a new power plant opens at San Francisco International Airport.” According to the footnote, “The 49 megawatt facility is planned, but work has not begun and no opening date has been set.” This statement detracts from credibility of document. If possible, alarmist and misleading wording should be avoided.	Portola Valley	Incorporated.
Section 3: Findings, Headings in this section are not formatted consistently.	Portola Valley	Graphic designer to review headings.
Pg. 11 - Section 3, Heading: Energy and Climate, 3 rd paragraph, “...local government will soon be required to play an important role in helping the state meet the greenhouse gas reduction goals.” This sentence is vague and should indicate expectations and deadlines.	Portola Valley	Information already included in Strategy.
Pg. 13 - Section 3, Heading: Energy and Water, 2 nd paragraph from bottom, “The water rates charged by San Francisco to its	Portola Valley	Incorporated.

<p>wholesale water agencies will triple in the next several years...” The word will should be changed to “are expected to” and a source should be included to support the projections.</p>		
<p>Page 17 – Potential Goal – 25% Reduction: What are the steps and cost to achieve this goal?</p>	<p>San Carlos</p>	<p>Cannot change “goals” to “potential goals;” the point of the Strategy is for cities to agree on common goals that are based on current institutional thinking and laws. Steps to achieve goals are the actions and strategies listed in the other sections of the report. Cost issues are addressed elsewhere in the report; the point of the Strategy is to foster countywide collaboration to reduce cost and eliminate duplication.</p>
<p>Pg. 20 - Headings should say “Potential Actions” rather than “Actions” since it is not clear what the cost, staffing & budget impacts of these actions are. In today’s economic times, some agencies may be unable to carry out all of the proposed “actions.”</p>	<p>San Carlos</p>	<p>Incorporated. These are suggested actions, and cities are not required to implement every action upon adopting the Energy Strategy.</p>
<p>Pg. 20 - Section 6, It would help to remove the bullets on the case studies as they are hard to visually differentiate from the actions.</p>	<p>Portola Valley</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p>
<p>Pg. 21 - Section 6, Heading: Energy, 2nd paragraph from bottom, “The Bay Area Quality Management District is sponsoring free workshops...” This information is dated--can’t locate the workshops on the BAAQMD site.</p>	<p>Portola Valley</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p>
<p>Pg. 21 - Section 6, Heading: Energy, 2nd paragraph from bottom, “...in a format consistent with the one used in the Air District workshops.” What is this format? Are these workshops still offered? Would it make more sense to recommend using the format distributed by CARB in their Local Government Operations Protocol (developed by CARB, ICLEI and the</p>	<p>Portola Valley</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p>

California Climate Action Registry), as this format will be used in the eventual mandatory reporting for AB 32?		
Pg. 25 - Section 6, Heading: Energy, “Case Study: San Francisco plans to adopt a mandatory green building ordinance...” Should update this bullet to indicate that San Francisco has adopted the ordinance.	Portola Valley	Incorporated.
Page 27: Under Case Study, note that in San Carlos, a Community Solar Discount Program in 2007 with Solar City, 18 households installed 83 kW of capacity, generating 1,678,000 pounds of carbon offset over the next 30 years. Mountain View can be dropped since it is not in San Mateo County.	San Carlos	Incorporated
Pg. 34 - Heading: Collaboration, last paragraph: Example is given for cities working together based on the ratio of residential to commercial accounts. This groups cities with very different constituencies in partnerships (i.e. East Palo Alto and Hillsborough). A more helpful example would be to group cities by their residential electricity use/natural gas use.	Portola Valley	More analysis will be provided in future versions.
Pg. 35 - Heading: Collaboration, chart: unable to differentiate the colors when it is printed in black and white.	Portola Valley	Incorporated.
Pg. 45 - Section 7: Next Steps: Section 7 should be moved to the beginning of the document (to frame the effort) or the plan for collaboration and San Mateo County’s role should be mentioned in a new intro section or the existing background section.	Portola Valley	Decided to leave as-is.
Appendices, Reports: Page numbers on the report, “Largest Commercial Energy Users...” should be at the top of the page to not interfere with the numbering of the Energy Strategy.	Portola Valley	To incorporate if feasible for graphic designer.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: November 17, 2008

To: Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

From: Richard Napier, C/CAG Executive Director

Subject: Review and comment on the program and performance measures of SB 348 – Reauthorization of \$4 vehicle license fee on motor vehicles registered in San Mateo County

(For further information contact Richard Napier at 599-1420 or John Hoang at 363-4105)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ review and comment on the program and performance measures of SB 348 – Reauthorization of \$4 vehicle license fee on motor vehicles registered in San Mateo County

FISCAL IMPACT

The expected annual revenue from the continuation of the Vehicle License Fees (VLF), through the approval of Senate Bill 348 (SB 348), is approximately \$2,700,000. This value is derived from revenue received from the Assembly Bill 1546 (AB1546) Program between FY 06 and FY 08. The total cost of the recommended programs will be based on annual revenues received.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funds are collected from the Vehicle License Fees (VLF) through the Senate Bill 348 (SB 348). Funding to support these programs will be derived from the imposition of a \$4.00 fee effective January 1, 2009 and continue to January 1, 2013. The imposition of this fee was authorized by the amended California Government Code Section 65089.11 et. seq.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

AB 1546

Assemblymember Simitian introduced Assembly Bill 1546 (AB1546) on behalf of C/CAG in 2003. This bill was adopted by the Legislature on August 18, 2004, and signed into law by the Governor on September 29, 2004. It took effect on January 1, 2005 as Chapter 2.65 (commencing with Section 65089.11) to Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code and Section 9250.5 of the Vehicle Code, relating to local government.

AB 1546 imposed an annual fee of up to four dollars (\$4) on motor vehicles registered in San Mateo County to fund traffic congestion management and stormwater pollution prevention programs. The collection of the fees began on July 1, 2005 and through January 1, 2009. Fifty percent of the revenue is allocated to individual jurisdictions within San Mateo County and fifty percent is allocated to C/CAG for Countywide projects (25% for traffic congestion management

and 25% for stormwater pollution prevention).

Approximately \$8 M was received between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2008. Under the budget and program adopted by the Board, 50% (\$4 M) was allocated to local jurisdictions. The remaining 50% funded countywide programs such as development of the alternative fuel and shuttle program utilizing hydrogen technology, installation and upgrading of intelligent transportation system (ITS) infrastructure to improve traffic movements, development and implementation of traffic incident management strategies, and the development of a sustainable, green streets and parking lot program.

SB 348

Senate Bill 348 (SB 348), sponsored by Senator Simitian, allowed the C/CAG Board to reauthorize an annual fee of up to \$4 on vehicles registered in San Mateo County for a period of four years until January 1, 2013, unless reauthorized by the Legislature and Governor. The bill was adopted by the Legislature and signed by the Governor on September 27, 2008.

Similar to AB 1546, in order to impose the fee, the C/CAG Board must hold a public hearing to adopt a program and budget for the management of traffic congestion and stormwater pollution within San Mateo County, and adopt performance measures for those programs. Proceeds from the fee must only be used for programs that bear a relationship or benefit to the motor vehicles that will pay the fee. This includes motor vehicle congestion and stormwater pollution prevention programs that directly address the negative impacts on creeks, streams, bays, and the ocean caused by motor vehicles and the infrastructure supporting motor vehicle travel. The C/CAG Board, by a two-thirds vote, would reauthorize the fee. The C/CAG Board will be voting to reauthorize the \$4 fee at the November 13, 2008 Board Meeting. The results will be presented at the CMEQ meeting.

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE FOUR DOLLAR (\$4.00) FEE

The fee revenue must not exceed the cost of the service, including reasonable administrative expenses, and it must be used to pay only for services for which the fee is charged. C/CAG Staff has analyzed the past and anticipated costs associated with the implementation of the programs listed in the attachment to Resolution 08-55 and has concluded that these costs will far exceed the revenues anticipated to be realized through the imposition of the \$4.00 fee. Below is the Justification for the fee. This provides the overall basis and analysis. Staff identified both the need and the program planned for the fee.

- Motor Vehicle Related Program Needs - The need is \$528,213,811 with local roads maintenance and \$33,231,003 without, versus \$10,800,000 in revenue from the fee.
- The proposed budget is \$10,800,000 over the term, which utilizes all the revenue (\$10,800,000) from the fee.
- Program Administration – Limited by statute to no more than 5% of the proceeds of the fee provided to C/CAG. Any unexpended funds in this category will be divided among the program categories.
- Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) setup costs – This amount is a one-time cost to program computers and establish procedures for the collection of the fee. The amount is based on an estimate provided by the DMV. Any unexpended funds in this category will be divided among the program categories. It should be less than \$25,000.
- Local Congestion Management Programs – Based on a recent analysis of the need for San Mateo County local streets and roads maintenance and improvements, there will be a

- cumulative funding shortfall of \$494,982,808 over the next 25 years.
- Clean fuel shuttle program – The annual cost of implementing existing shuttle programs averages \$100,000 per shuttle. The cost of a clean fuel shuttle program will require additional expense.
- Deployment of Intelligent Transportation System Countywide Plan – The C/CAG Board has adopted a Countywide Intelligent Transportation System Plan. Based on the program elements included in this Plan, the cost of full implementation is anticipated to exceed ten million dollars. The funding proceeds from this fee will be used as matching funds to hopefully attract other funding sources. This will also provide a source of funds to support the San Mateo County Smart Corridor Project that is underway.
- Local Motor Vehicle Related Stormwater Pollution Prevention Programs - The estimates are based on the actual City/ County cost for Street Sweeping, Storm Drain Inlet Cleaning, and Shop Inspections. The Capital Project investment is an estimate assuming \$50,000 each for 20 cities and the County.
- Countywide Motor Vehicle Related Stormwater Pollution Prevention Programs - The Recycling, BMP, and Training Implementation are based on C/CAG Staff estimates. The Hydrology Modification Plan is a quote with an analysis identifying the motor vehicle related portion that is 65% of the total plan. The Hydrology Modification Plan Implementation is interpolated from the actual costs for Santa Clara County.

Therefore, the \$4.00 fee is justified on the following basis:

- 1- The unmet need for the programs to be funded far exceeds the revenue raised by the fee.
- 2- The cost of the planned programs for the term of the fee is the same or greater than the revenue raised by the fee.
- 3- These or similar programs will be supplemented by other revenue such as local, State, and Federal transportation funds in order to try to meet the need.
- 4- Depending on the cost of the individual programs and revenue available additional motor vehicle related services could be provided.
- 5- All the revenue from the fee will be used for eligible programs to address the large need.

NEXUS OF THIS PROGRAM TO THE FEE

The programs to be funded with the proceeds from the fee must have a relationship or benefit to the motor vehicles that are paying the fee.

As it relates to the congestion management component of the program, motor vehicles are the clear and direct cause of traffic congestion on the roadways. The programs to be implemented with the proceeds from the fee will include improvements to the roadway system that facilitate the flow of traffic and reduce travel times, improve the conditions and maintenance of roadways to have the added benefit of reducing the wear and tear on vehicles, improve the performance and efficiency of roadways through deployment of new technologies, and through improvements to public transit to provide alternatives to driving single occupant vehicles.

The stormwater pollution prevention component of the program is designed to curb one of the primary sources of pollutants in the Ocean, the Bay and other San Mateo County waterways, which are the fluids, emissions, and residue from the wearing of parts on motor vehicles. These materials are deposited on impervious surfaces throughout the County and are washed into the

waterways by storms. This has been documented by the California State Water Resources Control Board (Resolution No. 2003-009, Monitoring List 2002), the San Mateo Countywide Clean Water program in a 1999 study, the Santa Clara Valley Nonpoint Source Program (Source Identification and Control Report), and by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The programs to be implemented with the SB 348 fee will directly address the negative impacts of these materials produced by motor vehicles on waterways, and also to address the pollution created by the infrastructure supporting motor vehicle travel. Therefore the fee paid by the owners of motor vehicles will be used to mitigate the water pollution created by the vehicles that are assessed the fee.

Under both of these program elements, the motor vehicles and operators are directly responsible for the problems created; and the fee is being assessed to these same entities in order to develop and implement the solutions to these same problems.

PROGRAM FUND DISTRIBUTION

The established program will allocate the net proceeds equally towards the traffic congestion management and stormwater pollution prevention categories. The program will distribute the funding within the above mentioned categories for projects that focuses on the local jurisdictions including the 20 cities and the County as well as projects with countywide significance. The program allocations are summarized as follows:

- 25% are committed to the cities and County for local traffic congestion management programs.
- 25% are programmed by C/CAG for Countywide traffic congestion management programs including the implementation of a demonstration alternate fuel program and the deployment of Intelligent Transportation Systems
- 25% are committed to the cities and County for local programs that address the negative impact on creeks, streams, bays, and the ocean caused by motor vehicles and the infrastructure supporting motor vehicle travel.
- 25% are programmed by C/CAG for Countywide programs that address the negative impact on creeks, streams, bays, and the ocean caused by motor vehicles and the infrastructure supporting motor vehicle travel.

PROGRAM AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The attachment to this report summarizes the allowable uses of the anticipated revenues for each year of the program. These program categories and performance measures are currently in place and are recommended to continue. The C/CAG Board will conduct an annual review of the programs for each of the subsequent years that the program is in effect.

Under the allowable programs identified attachment, the cities and the County will receive significant financial relief for the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Program (NPDES) and transportation programs that they are currently supporting. Many of these programs are unfunded mandates. The program has been defined such that cities and the County will be able to qualify for its full allocation of funds under both the NPDES and transportation categories.

The specific programs and performance measures will be presented to the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), NPDES TAC, and the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee for updating, as appropriate.

BENEFIT TO THE CITIES AND THE COUNTY

Through the program proposed for the implementation of the fee, the County and all 20 Cities will each receive a proportional share of 50% of the proceeds from the adoption of this fee (minus administrative costs for C/CAG and the Department of Motor Vehicles). These allocations will be used to directly offset existing costs for the implementation of transportation and stormwater pollution prevention programs at the local level to address the negative impacts of motor vehicles. Only those costs that bear a direct relationship or benefit to the motor vehicles paying the fee are eligible for the use of these fees. The remaining 50% of the fees collected will be for Countywide programs and services related to motor vehicles. The Countywide program will also be beneficial to the Cities/County.

ATTACHMENTS

- Programs and Performance Measures
- Executive Analysis (*as submitted to the State of California in January 2008*)

PROGRAMS AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The following table identifies the project types associated with traffic congestion management and stormwater pollution prevention programs including performance measures as applicable to the Local Cities/County and Countywide programs.

Traffic Congestion Management		
	<i>Projects</i>	<i>Performance Measure</i>
Local Cities and County	Local shuttles/transportation	Number of passengers transported.
	Road resurfacing/reconstruction	Miles/fraction of miles of roads improved.
	Deployment of Local Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	Number of ITS components installed/implemented.
	Roadway operations such as: Restriping, Signal timing, coordination, Signage	Miles/fraction of miles of roads improved.
	Replacement and/or upgrading of traffic signal hardware and/or software	Number of units replaced and/or upgraded.
	Countywide	Maintenance and operation of up to four hydrogen and/or other clean fuel shuttle vehicles and related fueling infrastructure
Deployment of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) projects having regional / Countywide significance		Number of ITS components installed / implemented.

Stormwater Pollution Prevention		
	<i>Projects</i>	<i>Performance Measure</i>
Local Cities and County	Street sweeping	Miles of streets swept an average of once a month.
	Roadway storm inlet cleaning	Number of storm inlets cleaned per year.
	Street side runoff treatment	Square feet of surfaces managed annually.
	Auto repair shop inspections	Number of auto repair shops inspected per year.
	Managing runoff from Street/Parking lot impervious surfaces	Square feet of surfaces managed annually.
	Small capital projects such as vehicle wash racks for public agencies that include pollution runoff controls	Number of projects implemented.

	Capital purchases for motor vehicle related runoff management and controls	Number of pieces of equipment purchased and installed.
	Additional used oil drop off locations	Number of locations implemented and operated, and quantity of oil collected.
	Motor vehicle fluid recycling programs	Number of programs implemented and operated, and quantity of fluids collected.
	Installation of new pervious surface medium strips in roadways	Square footage of new pervious surface medium strips installed.
Countywide	Pilot water studies	Number of studies completed
	Public outreach to auto repair shops	Number of shops contacted and information provided.
	Training and implementation of car wash Best Management Practices (BMPs)	Number of individuals trained
	NPDES consulting assistance on motor vehicle related issues	Person hours of consulting assistance.
	Brake pad partnership	Number of studies participated in.
	Partial funding for hydromodification plan	Percent implementation of the Plan
	Monitoring of motor vehicle related BMPs	Number of locations where BMPs were monitored annually
	Addressing stormwater pollution on the freeways and other State highways through installation of filtration systems	Number of filtration systems installed
	Countywide oil and other motor vehicle fluid recycling programs	Number of programs implemented and operated
	Countywide training on the prevention and control of water pollution attributable to motor vehicles	Number of individuals trained
	Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lot program.	Number of programs implemented

**SAN MATEO COUNTY DEDICATED
MOTOR VEHICLE FEE PILOT PROJECT
EXECUTIVE ANALYSIS**

Introduction

In 2004, AB 1546 was chaptered as California Government Code Section 65089.11 thru 65089.15 for a pilot project in San Mateo County. This allowed the City/ County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) to collect up to a four-dollar motor vehicle fee to fund programs that would address the impact of motor vehicles on transportation and the environment. The programs have a direct nexus between the fee and the motorists that pay the fee. It funds only programs that address the negative impact of motor vehicles on congestion and the environment. The Code specifically requires this direct nexus. The San Mateo County Programs meet the nexus requirement.

The pilot project has provided funding to the 20 cities and the County in San Mateo County to successfully implement a variety of local and regional programs to address traffic congestion and storm-water pollution issues. It has provided funding to meet unfunded mandates such as requirements to meet the Federal Clean Water Act. There are currently minimal funding sources to address the Clean Water Act and insufficient funding to address the traffic congestion problems.

The San Mateo County pilot project will sunset on 1/01/09 unless the term is extended. This analysis describes the accomplishments for the three years and the project's compliance with the California Government Code. This analysis shows that the pilot project has been successful and is a financial tool for the cities and County to address an unfunded mandate such as the Federal Clean Water Act. Therefore, the accomplishments of the past three years justify continuation of this pilot project as requested in SB 348 so that it can continue for another four years to 1/1/2013.

Detailed Pilot Project Description

The enclosed report describes the major programs of this pilot project all of which have a direct nexus to motor vehicles. The two primary categories are Traffic Congestion and Storm-water Pollution Prevention with each divided into Local and Countywide projects.

Traffic Congestion - Projects to improve the movement of traffic and/or to increase capacity on the roadway.

- Local shuttles/transportation including use of alternative fuels
- Road resurfacing/reconstruction
- Roadway operations such as re-striping, signal timing, coordination, signage, and replacement and/or upgrading of traffic signal hardware and/or software
- Deployment of Intelligent Transportation System projects having Local and Regional (Countywide) significance

Storm-water Pollution Prevention - Projects to minimize debris and pollutants in the storm-water system caused from the operations of motor vehicles. Projects must clearly bear a relationship or benefit to the motor vehicles that will pay the fee. They must address the negative impact on creeks, streams, bays, and the ocean caused by motor vehicles and the infrastructure supporting motor vehicle travel.

- Street sweeping and storm inlet cleaning
- Street side runoff treatment
- Auto repair shop inspections
- Managing runoff from street/parking lot surfaces

Each of the major programs is equally funded with revenues from the pilot project.

Accomplishments

The pilot project has implemented several major programs including the following:

Traffic Congestion Program - Roadway improvements, Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and incident management projects implemented or underway.

Storm-water Pollution Prevention Program - Roads swept, storm drains cleaned, rock swales installed and creation of a Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Program.

Alternative Fuel Program (Included in Traffic Congestion) - The hydrogen shuttle service deployed and has traveled over 1000 miles and transported over 800 passengers.

See the attached San Mateo County Pilot Program Accomplishments for detailed information and performance measures. It is noted that the quantities indicates totals for the program. The Pilot Project funded a portion of the total programs.

Benefits

The key benefit of the pilot project was to fund local and County jurisdictions to find innovative solutions to address the negative impact of motor vehicles on congestion and the environment. Other specific benefits include:

- **Local and Regional Benefit** - Provided funds to develop programs of both local and regional benefit to the county.
- **Unfunded Mandates** - Provides funds to meet unfunded mandates such as requirements to meet the Federal Clean Water Act.
- **Traffic Congestion** - Provided incentives to local jurisdictions to work together on regional signal timing projects that could not be done individually.
- **Storm-water Pollution** - Provided incentives to local jurisdictions to implement innovative programs such as the Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots demonstration projects that will enhance the visual aspects of public streets as well as control storm-water, traffic, and reduce water pollution.
- **Alternative Fuel** - Provides startup funds to explore the benefits of alternative fuels and its impact on clean air and water.

SAN MATEO COUNTY PILOT PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Traffic Congestion Program

- Performance measures includes the following accomplishments:
 - **130** miles of streets/roads resurface/reconstructed
 - **157** traffic signal retimed/replaced/upgraded
 - **17** miles of streets/roads re-striped
 - **111** miles of street signage improved
- Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)
 - **\$1,244,000** was distributed to 11 jurisdictions for a total of **78 projects** (62 signal controllers; 16 traffic video detection systems) to **improve inter-jurisdictional traffic management**. The projects were selected through a competitive process.
- Traffic Incident Management
 - Development of the draft **Incident Management - Alternative Route Plan** and **Infrastructure Improvement Plan** for deployment strategies for **Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)** elements are underway. Infrastructure improvements identified in the Plan has advanced into a **San Mateo County Smart Corridors** to deploy ITS equipment along designated local streets and state routes to manage traffic congestion and improve mobility.

Storm-water Pollution Prevention Program

- Performance measures includes the following accomplishments:
 - **110,175** miles of streets/roads swept
 - **16,787** storm-drain inlets and catch basins inspected and cleaned
 - **600** feet of rock swales installed to check erosion
- Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Program
 - Development of Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots **Technical Design Guidebook** provides strategies for incorporating innovative storm-water treatment measures in streets and parking lot projects is ongoing.
 - “Call for Projects” to fund up to four small-scaled demonstration projects with a total program cost of approximately \$1,193,595. The projects will construct **green streets** and related roadside storm-water pollution prevention improvements. It is anticipated that the projects will begin in April 2008.
 - Funded up to \$250,000 for construction of **storm-water management measures** improvements at the Fitzgerald Marine Reserves.

Alternative Fuel Program (Included in Traffic Congestion)

- Leveraged funds to get a Hydrogen Shuttle awarded from SB 76.
- The **hydrogen shuttle service was deployed** on December 3, 2007 and is on a full morning schedule of four (4) round trips per day carrying over 7 passengers per trip. The shuttle has traveled over 1000 miles and transported over 800 passengers during first four weeks of operation.

Financial Overview for 1/1/05 thru 1/1/08

Description	Amount
Revenues	
Fees Collected	\$6,145,489
Expenditures	
DMV and C/CAG Admin costs	\$210,757
Programs	
Disbursements to date	\$2,434,628
Programmed	\$3,261,095
Total Expenditures	\$5,906,480
Un-programmed	\$239,009
TOTAL	\$6,145,489

Approximately 96 percent of the funds have been committed. Annual reports have been submitted each year since 2006, even though the law required only one report. In addition, an independent financial audit has also been completed for fiscal years 2005-06 and 2006-07. Results of the audits have shown that all funds have been properly accounted for with no findings.

Administration of the Project

In 2004, elected representatives from the twenty cities and the County of San Mateo voted unanimously to approve a resolution to adopt a fee and program as required by the California Government Code.

This project has met all California Government Code requirements including:

- A resolution for the fee and adoption of program and budget.
- Notification of a public meeting regarding the resolution. No public opposition.
- Approval of the resolution by a unanimous vote representing over 2/3 of the population.
- The filing of an annual report.
- An independent financial audit.

Please see the attached C/CAG Conformance to California Government Code for detailed information. The performance reports indicate that local and County jurisdictions are using the funds to remove debris from thousands of miles of roadways and hundreds of inlets and to improve miles of roadways, and scores of traffic signals. This results in significant congestion and environmental benefits. Many of these programs will not be able to continue unless the pilot project's term is extended beyond January 1, 2009.

For this reason, in 2007, elected representatives from these same jurisdictions supported SB 613 to extend the term of California Government Code 65089.11 thru 65089.15 another ten years to 1/1/2019. The justification was because it funds projects that benefit

**C/CAG Conformance to California Government Code Sections 65089.11 thru
65089.15 – San Mateo County \$4 Motor Vehicle Fee**

Code Requirements	Method of Compliance
Resolution for Fee	Newspaper Notice of Public Hearing held on December 9, 2005 Resolutions 04-37 and 04-38
Resolution for Program	December 9, 2005 Resolutions 04-37 and 04-38
Approval of Board representing 2/3 majority voters	17 Ayes representing population of 621,186 0 Nays 4 Absent representing population of 85,975
Start imposing fee no earlier than July 1, 2005	DMV issued renewal increases for vehicles registered after July 1, 2005
Termination on January 1, 2009 unless reauthorized by the Legislature.	Pending
Board finding of fact by 2/3 majority vote to approve imposing fees	By Resolution 05-08 on March 10, 2005
Congestion Management Program	By Resolution 05-08 on March 10, 2005
Storm-water Pollution Prevention Program	By Resolution 05-08 on March 10, 2005
5 percent of the fees for Admin	Actual fees = 3.4% (\$210,757 including DMV fees/\$6,145,489)
Specific program with budget and performance measures to be adopted at public hearing	By Resolution 05-08 on March 10, 2005
Review of independent audit performed at noticed public hearing	Board meeting scheduled for February 14, 2008 Annual Audits by Maze Associates for FY 2005-2006 completed September 2006 *FY 2006-2007 completed November 2007 * Exceeds requirements
Review of Report to Legislature by July 1, 2006 performed at noticed public hearing	Board meeting scheduled for February 14, 2008 Reports to Legislature sent on June 29, 2006, *June 29, 2007 *January 23, 2008 * Exceeds requirements

people that live, work and operate motor vehicles in San Mateo County. SB 613 passed the legislature and was sent to the Governor. However, the Governor chose to veto SB 613. In his veto message, the Governor stated that he would consider reauthorization of a four-year bill if the legislature deemed the first three years of the pilot project successful. Therefore, the purpose of this report is to explain, in detail, those accomplishments for the first three years of the program, the merit of extending the term by four years to 1/1/2013, and to address the requests in the Governor's veto message.

Next Steps

Submit the three-year report and Executive Analysis:

- Legislature
- Governor's Office

Meet all the requirements established in the Governor's SB 613 veto message:

- Report and evaluate the program after three years.
- Extension of California Government Code 65089.11 thru 65089.15 for four years.

Amend SB 348 to replace the current language with the revised language of SB 613 to extend the term four years to 1/1/2013:

- Meet the requirements of the Governor's veto message.
- Submit SB 348 to the Legislature and the Governor for approval.

Justification for approval of SB 348

- Meets all the requirements of the Governor's veto message of SB 613.
- Proven success for the past three years.
- Many of these Traffic Congestion and Storm-water Pollution Prevention programs will not have funding to continue unless the pilot project's term is extended beyond January 1, 2009.
- Provides limited funding for the unfunded federal and state mandates for storm-water pollution programs.
- Provides a tool for local governments to address the impact of motor vehicles.

Summary of Legislative History

Year	Description
2004	AB 1546 Chaptered - CGC 65089.11 thru 65089.15
1/1/2009	Termination date unless extended.
2007	SB 613 - Requested a 10-year extension that was vetoed by the Governor in preference for a shorter extension
2008	SB 348 - Bill with a four-year extension as requested by the Governor.

Contact: Richard Napier - Executive Director, C/CAG 1 650 599-1420

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 17, 2008
To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee
From: Sandy Wong
Subject: Review and approval of the 2009 CMEQ meeting Calendar

The schedule for regular meetings in 2009 will be as follows:

Congestion Management & Environmental Quality
Mondays 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
January 26
February 23
March 30
April 27
May 18 (move up due to Holiday)
June 29
July 27
August 31
September 28
October 26
November 23 (move up due to Holiday)
December 21 (move up due to Holiday)

All meetings are scheduled for the last Monday of the month except for May 18th, November 23rd, and December 21st. They are moved up one week due to holidays. The meetings begin at 3:00 p.m. and end at 5:00 p.m. and are held in Conference Room C, San Mateo City Hall.