



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, June 25, 2018
Time: 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 Jeff Lacap (650-599-1455) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND

- | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the agenda. | Presentations are limited to 3 mins | |
| 2. Issues from the May and June 2018 C/CAG Board meeting: | Information (Lacap) | No Materials |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of the project list for funding under the Joint C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for FY 2018/2019 and FY 2019/2020 • Approval of projects funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) under the Cycle 5 Lifeline Transportation Program for a total amount of \$1,742,843 • Approval of the project list for on-call consultant services under the Grant Writing Technical Assistance Program (GW-TAP) for the Active Transportation Program Cycle 4 (ATP Cycle 4) | | |
| 3. Approval of minutes of April 30, 2018 meeting | Action (Garbarino) | Pages 1 – 4 |
| 4. Provide input on the framework for the update of the Land Use Impact Analysis Program and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Measures | Action (Muse) | Pages 5 - 18 |
| 5. Review and comment on Joint C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program Criteria | Information (Kalkin) | Pages 19 - 24 |
| 6. Receive information on U.S. 101 Managed Lanes Toll Operations | Information (Wong/Higaki) | No Materials |
| 7. Review and recommend approval of funding for the “Optimizing UrbanTraffic” in Menlo Park Pilot Project in the amount of \$236,700. | Action (Hoang) | Emailed & Handout |
| 8. Executive Director Report | Information (Wong) | No Materials |
| 9. Member comments and announcements | Information (Garbarino) | |
| 10. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date: August 27, 2018 | Action (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 Mima Guilles at 650 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.

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

**MINUTES
MEETING OF April 30, 2018**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Garbarino in Conference Room C at City Hall of San Mateo at 3:00 p.m. Attendance sheet is attached.

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None.

2. Issues from the March and April 2018 C/CAG Board meeting

C/CAG Staff Jeff Lacap provided updates on items that were previously brought to the CMEQ committee and been brought to the Board meeting thereafter.

3. Approval of minutes of February 26, 2018 meeting (Action)

Member O'Connell commented on Item #5, US 101 Managed Lane Toll Operator Options, that it will take a concentrated effort to come a consensus on selecting a toll operator.

Motion: To approve the minutes of the February 26, 2018 meeting, O'Connell/Lee. Motion passes unanimously.

4. Receive a presentation on the South San Francisco Downtown Parking Study (Information)

South San Francisco Public Works Administrator, Justin Lovell, presented on the South San Francisco Downtown Parking Study, which was funded by the C/CAG Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program. The program, established in 2014, provided consultant technical support to jurisdictions in San Mateo County to complete planning projects that facilitate the implementation of parking management strategies supportive of the vision for growth and development in PDAs. The City of South San Francisco proposed a study of the city's downtown parking district and was the first approved study from the program and was completed late 2016.

Committee members has questions about curbside management, a developer's role in parking management within the study area, the different types of developments in the area, the price of downtown parking permits, and future pricing strategies for parking.

5. Review and recommend approval of projects to be funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 5 for a total amount of \$1,742,843 (Action)

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG staff, presented the projects recommended for funding under the MTC Cycle 5 Lifeline Transportation Program. Funding for the program, which aims to fund various transportation projects to improve the mobility of low-income residents in the county, comes from two different sources: State Transit Assistance (STA) and Section 5307.

For this 5th Cycle, seven applications were received requesting STA and Section 5307 funding. STA funding was oversubscribed with \$1,703,452 being requested and approximately \$1,191,532 available. Section 5307 funding was oversubscribed with \$1,417,240 being requested and approximately \$551,311 available. The scoring panel ranked each project and recommended fully funding the top two ranked projects and partially funded the remaining projects except for projects submitted by the City of Menlo Park (Shoppers' Shuttle) and SamTrans (Operation of SFOX Route to SFO).

Committee members had questions about the sustainability of current shuttle programs, the types of projects eligible under the program, and the cost effectiveness of the proposed shuttle programs. Committee members also requested that staff, in the future, provide more accompanying data and other necessary information in staff reports when requesting the committee to review and recommend approval for items.

Motion: To recommend approval of projects to be funded by MTC Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 5 for a total of \$1,742,843, Bonilla/O'Connell, Garbarino, O'Neill, Lee, Beach, Keener, Lewis, and Masur approved. Powell and Koelling opposed.

6. Review and recommend approval of the project list for funding under the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for FY 2018/2019 and FY 2019/2020 (Action)

Susy Kalkin, C/CAG staff, presented the results of the Call for Projects for the current cycle of the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program. The \$10 million in funding for the two-year program is provided by C/CAG Congestion Relief Plan Program funds, which provides \$1,000,000 (\$500,000 for FY 18/19 and \$500,000 for FY 19/20), and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Measure A Program funds, which provide approximately \$9 million for the two-year funding cycle.

Applications were received from 9 sponsors for 38 different shuttles. Thirty-seven of the proposed shuttles met the program requirements and are under consideration for funding. The total eligible sponsor request is for approximately \$11.1 million, exceeding the \$10 million in funds available for the program. Because the program is oversubscribed, CMEQ members were also asked to consider and comment on potential benchmarks to be included in the next call for projects.

CMEQ members had clarifying questions on past projects funded through the program and the current scoring criteria. They requested that consideration of future scoring criteria be brought back for discussion at the next CMEQ meeting.

Motion: To recommend approval of the project list for funding under the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for FY 2018/2019 and FY 2019/2020, O'Connell/Lewis, Garbarino, O'Neill, Lee, Beach, Keener, Koelling, Masur, and Bonilla approved. Powell abstained.

7. Executive Director Report (Information).

C/CAG Executive Director Sandy Wong reported on the "Floods, Drought, Rising Seas, OH MY!" event hosted by C/CAG and the County of San Mateo. Sandy also reported on the C/CAG Countywide Water Coordination Committee.

Sandy announced the following upcoming events: C/CAG Lobby Day on May 2nd in Sacramento and the annual C/CAG Retreat on May 10th. Sandy concluded her report by announcing the US-101 Managed Lane project has been recommended to receive approximately \$200 million from the SB 1 Solutions for Congested Corridors program pending approval from the California Transportation Commission.

8. Member comments and announcements (Information).

Member Garbarino provided an update to the repeal efforts of SB 1.

9. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.

The meeting adjourned at 4:27 pm.

The next regular meeting was scheduled for May 21, 2018

| 2018 C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee Attendance Report | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----|-----|---------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Agency | Representative | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sept | Oct | Nov | Dec |
| Metropolitan Transportation Commission | Alicia Aguirre | x | | | | | | | | | | | |
| City of Redwood City | Shelly Masur | x | | x | x | | | | | | | | |
| Town of Atherton | Elizabeth Lewis | | | x | x | | | | | | | | |
| City of San Bruno | Irene O'Connell | x | | x | x | | | | | | | | |
| City of Burlingame | Emily Beach | x | | x | x | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Community | Lennie Roberts | x | | x | | | | | | | | | |
| City of Pacifica | Mike O'Neill | x | | x | x | | | | | | | | |
| City of South San Francisco | Richard Garbarino | | | x | x | | | | | | | | |
| Public | Josh Powell | x | | | x | | | | | | | | |
| City of Millbrae | Wayne Lee | | | x | x | | | | | | | | |
| City of San Mateo | Rick Bonilla | x | | x | x | | | | | | | | |
| City of Pacifica | John Keener | x | | x | x | | | | | | | | |
| Agencies with Transportation Interests | Adina Levin | x | | x (3:19pm) | | | | | | | | | |
| Business Community | Linda Koelling | x | | x | x | | | | | | | | |
| Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain) | Dave Pine | | | NA | NA | | | | | | | | |
| San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) | Pete Ratto | x | | x (3:20pm) | x | | | | | | | | |

Staff and guests in attendance for the April 30, 2018 CMEQ Meeting:

Sandy Wong, Jean Higaki, Jeff Lacap, Susy Kalkin - C/CAG Staff
 Joel Slavitt - SMCTA

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: June 21, 2018

To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

From: Sara Muse

Subject: Provide input on the framework for the update of the Land Use Impact Analysis Program and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Measures

(For further information or questions, contact Sara Muse at 650-599-1460)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ Committee provide input on the framework for the update of the Land Use Impact Analysis Program and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Measures.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A.

BACKGROUND

The Land Use Impact Analysis Program Policy was adopted in 2000 (updated in FY 2004/05) and is included in Appendix I of the 2017 Congestion Management Program (CMP). The policy, attached, provides guidelines for analyzing the impact of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions in San Mateo County. The purpose of the policy is to preserve acceptable performance on the CMP network, and to establish community standards for consistent system-wide transportation review. The policy is implemented during the environmental review process and applies to developments that generate more than 100 peak hour trips on the CMP roadway network. Developers can either reduce the scope of their project, build adequate roadway and/or transit improvements, contribute to a special fund for improvements, or require the developer and all subsequent tenants to implement TDM programs to mitigate new peak hour trips.

Staff plans to update the existing Land Use Impact Analysis Program to reflect current TDM best practices, provide updated performance targets, and standardize an annual survey, monitoring and reporting requirements. There are many changes that have occurred since the policy was adopted in 2000, including car-share, ride-hailing, bike share systems, increased complexity in work schedules, and more.

Land Use Impact Analysis Program Update Framework

The objective of the Land Use Impact Analysis Program update is to develop a TDM Plan for San Mateo County that identifies TDM strategies and programs that increase the efficiency of the transportation system through alternative modes of travel. The update will, in part, focus on aligning the framework with goals laid out in the CMP.

The proposed framework for updating the program includes the following:

1. **Best Practices Review** – Examine current state of TDM planning and implementation in the region, identify best practices and opportunities for improvement and expansion of TDM programs at the county and community levels, and build an understanding of the impacts and opportunities provided by new mobility and technology innovations.
2. **Established Approach** – Prepare an approach to update/revise the Policy, which may include but is not limited to, updated goals and objectives, performance targets, revised point system, trip reduction, or mode-shift targets.
3. **Stakeholder Meetings** – Hold 2-3 stakeholder meetings over the course of the project to review and provide feedback on the program update. The composition of the stakeholder group is currently being developed.
4. **Program Update** – Based on established approach and feedback from stakeholders, update the Land Use Impact Analysis Program to possibly include update goals and objectives, defined performance targets, and practical monitoring and reporting requirements, including standardized annual surveys.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Land Use Impact Analysis Program, CMP Appendix I

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE LAND USE COMPONENT OF THE CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

All land use changes or new developments that require a negative declaration or an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and that are projected to generate a net (subtracting existing uses that are currently active) 100 or more trips per hour at any time during the a.m. or p.m. peak hour period, must be reported to C/CAG within ten days of completion of the initial study prepared under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Peak period includes 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. **Peak hour is defined as the hour when heaviest daily traffic volume occurs and generally occurs during morning and afternoon commute times. Traffic counts are obtained during AM and PM peak periods and the volume from the heaviest hour of AM or PM traffic is used to define peak hour for those time periods. The highest number of net trips resulting from AM or PM peak hour will be used. Net trips are calculated by subtracting trips for existing uses from those generated by the new project.** Although projects that generate less than 100 peak hour trips are not subject to these guidelines, local jurisdictions are strongly encouraged to apply them to all projects, particularly where the jurisdiction has determined that the impacts of the project will have an adverse effect on traffic in that jurisdiction.

These guidelines are not intended to establish a Countywide **threshold** of significance of 100 peak hour trips for CEQA purposes. The determination of what level of traffic results in a significant impact is left in the first instance to the local jurisdiction. These guidelines do contemplate, however, that all trips resulting from projects that are reviewed by C/CAG and fall under these guidelines will be mitigated, whether or not it rises to a level of significance under CEQA.

Local jurisdictions must ensure that the developer and/or tenants will reduce the demand for all new peak hour trips (including the first 100 trips) projected to be generated by the development. The local jurisdiction can select one or more of the options that follow or may propose other methods for mitigating the trips. It is up to the local jurisdiction working together with the project sponsor to choose the method(s) that will be compatible with the intended purpose of the project and the community that it will serve. The options identified in these guidelines are not intended to limit choices. Local jurisdictions are encouraged to be creative in developing options that meet local needs while accomplishing the goal of mitigating new peak hour trips. The additional measures that are not specifically included in these guidelines should be offered for review by C/CAG staff in advance of approving the project. Appeals to the decisions by C/CAG staff will be taken to the full C/CAG Board for consideration.

The Congestion Management Program roadway network includes all state highways and selected principal arterials. When considering land use projects, local jurisdictions may either require that mitigation for impacts to the Congestion Management Program roadway network be finally determined and imposed as a condition of approval of the project, or may conditionally approve such project, conditioned on compliance with the requirements to mitigate the impacts to the Congestion Management Program roadway network. In those instances where conditional approval is given, a building permit may not be issued for the project until the required mitigation is determined and subsequently imposed on the project.

Some of the choices for local jurisdictions include:

1. Reduce the scope of the project so that it will generate less than 100 net peak hour trips.
2. Build adequate roadway and/or transit improvements so that the added peak hour trips will have no measurable impact on the Congestion Management Program roadway network.
3. If a local jurisdiction currently collects traffic mitigation fees, any portion of the fees that are used to mitigate the impacts of the project's traffic on the Congestion Management Program roadway network will count as a credit toward the reduction in the demand for trips required under the Congestion Management Program. The developer may also contribute a one-time only payment of \$20,000 per peak hour trip (including the first 100 trips) to a special fund for the implementation of appropriate transportation demand management system measures at that development. These funds will be used to implement transportation demand management programs that serve the development making the contribution.
4. Require the developer and all subsequent tenants to implement Transportation Demand Management programs that have the capacity to fully reduce the demand for new peak hour trips. The developer/tenants will not be held responsible for the extent to which these programs are actually used. **The developer shall pay for a monitoring program for the first three years of the development. The purpose of the monitoring program is to assess the compliance of the project with the final TDM plan.** The following is a list of acceptable programs and the equivalent number of trips that will be credited as reduced. Programs can be mixed and matched so long as the total mitigated trips is equal to or greater than the new peak hour trips generated by the project. These programs, once implemented, must be on going for the occupied life of the development. Programs may be substituted with prior approval of C/CAG, so long as the number of **mitigated trips** is not **reduced**. Additional measures may be proposed to C/CAG for consideration. Also there may be special circumstances that warrant a different amount of credit for certain measures. For example, a developer may elect to contract with the Alliance or another provider of TDM services to meet this requirement. These situations can also be submitted to C/CAG in advance for consideration. It is up to each local jurisdiction to use its best judgment to determine the extent to which certain measures are "reasonable and effective." For example, there will be a point where additional showers will not result in more people riding bicycles or walking to work.
5. Adopt Congestion Management Program guidelines for projects within its jurisdiction and submit those guidelines for approval by C/CAG. The local jurisdiction would then apply these guidelines to the appropriate level of project and provide an annual report describing affected projects and guidelines applied. C/CAG would review the jurisdiction's efforts on an annual basis and could require amendments to the jurisdiction's guidelines if the jurisdiction's guidelines were not meeting Congestion Management Program goals.

6. Adopt the C/CAG guidelines for application to the appropriate level of project in the jurisdiction, and submit an annual report describing affected projects and guidelines applied. C/CAG would review the jurisdiction's efforts on an annual basis and could require amendments to the jurisdiction's guidelines if the jurisdiction's guidelines were not meeting Congestion Management Program goals.
7. Negotiate with C/CAG staff for other acceptable ways to mitigate the trips for specific developments on a case-by-case basis.
8. **C/CAG recognizes that for retail or special uses appropriate TDM measures may be difficult to implement. Please contact C/CAG to develop appropriate measures for these types of projects.**

Transportation

| <u>Demand Management Measure</u> | <u>Number of Trips Credited</u> | <u>Rationale</u> |
|--|---|---|
| Secure bicycle storage | One peak hour trip will be credited for every 3 new bike lockers/racks installed and maintained. Lockers/racks must be installed within 100 feet of the building. | Experience has shown that bicycle commuters will average using this mode one-third of the time, especially during warmer summer months. |
| Showers and changing rooms. | Ten peak hour trips will be credited for each new combination shower and changing room installed. An additional 5 peak hour trips will be credited when installed in combination with at least 5 bike lockers | 10 to 1 ratio based on cost to build and the likelihood that bicycle utilization will increase. |
| Operation of a dedicated shuttle service during the peak period to a rail station or an urban residential area. Alternatively the development could buy into a shuttle consortium. | One peak hour trip will be credited for each peak-hour round trip seat on the shuttle. Increases to two trips if a Guaranteed Ride Home Program is also in place. Five additional trips will be credited if the shuttle stops at a child-care facility enroute to/from the worksite. | Yields a one-to-one ratio (one seat in a shuttle equals one auto trip reduced); utilization increases when a guaranteed ride home program is also made available. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Charging employees for parking. | Two peak hour trips will be credited for each parking spot charged out at \$20 per month for one year. Money shall be used for TDM measures such as shuttles or subsidized transit tickets. | Yields a two-to-one ratio |
| Subsidizing transit tickets for employees. | One peak hour trip will be credited for each transit pass that is subsidized at least \$20 per month for one year. One additional trip will be credited if the subsidy is increased to \$75 for parents using transit to take a child to childcare enroute to work. | Yields a one-to-one ratio (one transit pass equals one auto trip reduced). |
| Subsidizing pedestrians/bicyclists who commute to work. | One peak hour trip will be credited for each employee that is subsidized at least \$20 per month for one year. | Yields a one-to-one ratio (One pedestrian/bicyclist equals one auto trip reduced). |
| Creation of preferential parking for carpoolers. | Two peak hour trips will be credited for each parking spot reserved. | Yields a two-to-one ratio (one reserved parking spot equals a minimum of two auto trips reduced). |
| Creation of preferential parking for vanpoolers. | Seven peak hour trips will be credited for each parking spot reserved. | Yields a seven-to-one ratio (one reserved parking spot equals a minimum of seven auto trips reduced). |
| Implementation of a vanpool program. | Seven peak hour trips will be credited for each vanpool arranged by a specific program operated at the site of the development. Increases to ten trips if a Guaranteed Ride Home Program is also in place. | The average van capacity is seven. |

Operation of a commute assistance center, offering on site, one stop shopping for transit and commute alternatives information, preferably staffed with a live person to assist building tenants with trip planning.

One peak hour trip will be credited for each feature added to the information center; and an additional one peak hour trip will be credited for each hour the center is staffed with a live person, up to 20 trips per each 200 tenants. Possible features may include:

- Transit information brochure rack
- Computer kiosk connected to Internet
- Telephone (with commute and transit information numbers)
- Desk and chairs (for personalized trip planning)
- On-site transit ticket sales
- Implementation of flexible work hour schedules that allow transit riders to be 15-30 minutes late or early (due to problems with transit or vanpool).
- Quarterly educational programs to support commute alternatives

This is based on staff's best estimate. Short of there being major disincentives to driving, having an on site TDM program offering commute assistance is fundamental to an effective TDM program.

Survey Employees to examine use and best practices.

Three peak hour trips will be credited for a survey developed to be administered twice yearly

This is based on staff's best estimate with the goal of finding best practices to achieve the mode shift goal.

Implementation of a parking cash out program.

One peak hour trip will be credited for each parking spot where the employee is offered a cash payment in return for not using parking at the employment site.

Yields a one-to-one ratio (one cashed out parking spot equals one auto trip reduced).

Implementation of ramp metering.

Three hundred peak hour trips will be credited if the local jurisdiction in cooperation with CalTrans, installs and turns on ramp metering lights during the peak hours at the highway entrance ramp closest to the development.

This is a very difficult and costly measure to implement and the reward must be significant.

Installation of high bandwidth connections in employees' homes to the Internet to facilitate home telecommuting

One peak hour trip will be credited for every three connections installed. This measure is not available as credit for a residential development.

Yields a one-to-**three** ratio.

Installation of video conferencing centers that are available for use by the tenants of the facility.

Five peak hour trips will be credited for a center installed at the facility.

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Implementation of a compressed workweek program.

One peak hour trip will be credited for every 5 employees that are offered the opportunity to work four compressed days per week.

The workweek will be compressed into 4 days; therefore the individual will not be commuting on the 5th day.

**Flextime:
Implementation of an alternate hours workweek program.**

One peak hour trip will be credited for each employee that is offered the opportunity to work staggered work hours. Those hours can be a set shift set by the employer or can be individually determined by the employee.

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Provision of assistance to employees so they can live close to work.

If an employer develops and offers a program to help employees find acceptable residences within five miles of the employment site, a credit of one trip will be given for each slot in the program.

This assumes that a five-mile trip will generally not involve travel on the freeways.

Implementation of a program that gives preference to hiring local residents at the new development site.

One peak hour trip will be credited for each employment opportunity reserved for employees recruited and hired from within five miles of the employment site.

This assumes that a five-mile trip will generally not involve travel on the freeways.

Provision of on-site amenities/accommodations that encourage people to stay on site during the workday, making it easier for workers to leave their automobiles at home.

Five peak hour trips will be credited for each feature added to the job site. Possible features may include:

- banking
- grocery shopping
- clothes cleaning
- exercise facilities
- child care center

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Provide use of motor vehicles to employees who use alternate commute methods so they can have access to vehicles during breaks for personal use.

Five peak hour trips will be credited for each vehicle provided.

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Provide use of bicycles to employees who use alternate commute methods so they can have access to bicycles during breaks for personal use.

One peak hour trip will be credited for every four bicycles provided.

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Provision of child care services as a part of the development

One trip will be credited for every two child care slots at the job site. This amount increases to one trip for each slot if the child care service accepts multiple age groups (infants=0-2yrs, preschool=3&4 yrs, school-age=5 to 13 yrs).

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Developer/property owner may join an employer group to expand available child care within 5 miles of the job site or may provide this service independently

One trip will be credited for each new child care center slot created either directly by an employer group, by the developer/property owner, or by an outside provider if an agreement has been developed with the developer/property owner that makes the child care accessible to the workers at the development.

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Join the Alliance's guaranteed ride home program.

Two peak hour trips will be credited for every 2 slots purchased in the program.

Experience shows that when a Guaranteed Ride Home Program is added to a TDM program, average ridership increases by about 50%.

Combine any ten of these elements and receive an additional credit for five peak hour trips.

Five peak hour trips will be credited.

Experience has shown that offering multiple and complementary TDM components can magnify the impact of the overall program.

Work with the Alliance to develop/implement a Transportation Action Plan.

Ten peak hour trips will be credited.

This is based on staff's best estimate.

The developer can provide a cash legacy after the development is complete and designate an entity to implement any (or more than one) of the previous measures before day one of occupancy.

Peak hour trip reduction credits will accrue as if the developer was directly implementing the items.

Credits accrue depending on what the funds are used for.

Encourage infill development.

Two percent of all peak hour trips will be credited for each infill development.

Generally acceptable TDM practices (based on research of TDM practices around the nation and reported on the Internet).

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Encourage shared parking. | Five peak hour trips will be credited for an agreement with an existing development to share existing parking. | Generally acceptable TDM practices (based on research of TDM practices around the nation and reported on the Internet). |
| Participate in/create/sponsor a Transportation Management Association. | Five peak hour trips will be credited. | Generally acceptable TDM practices (based on research of TDM practices around the nation and reported on the Internet). |
| Coordinate Transportation Demand Management programs with existing developments/employers. | Five peak hour trips will be credited. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| For employers with multiple job sites, institute a proximate commuting program that allows employees at one location to transfer/trade with employees in another location that is closer to their home. | One peak hour trip will be credited for each opportunity created. | Yields a one-to-one ratio. |
| Pay for parking at park and ride lots or transit stations. | One peak hour trip will be credited for each spot purchased. | Yields a one-to-one ratio. |

Additional Measures for Residential Developments

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Develop schools, convenience shopping, recreation facilities, and child care centers in new subdivisions. | Five peak hour trips will be credited for each facility included. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Provision of child care services at the residential development and/or at a nearby transit center | One trip will be credited for every two child care slots at the development/transit center. This amount increases to one trip for each slot if the child care service accepts multiple age groups (infants, preschool, school-age). | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Make roads and streets more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. | Five peak hour trips will be credited for each facility included. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Revise zoning to limit undesirable impacts (noise, smells, and traffic) instead of limiting broad categories of activities. | Five peak hour trips will be credited. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Create connections for non-motorized travel, such as trails that link dead-end streets. | Five peak hour trips will be credited for each connection make. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Create alternative transportation modes for travel within the development and to downtown areas - bicycles, scooters, electric carts, wagons, shuttles, etc. | One peak hour trip will be credited for each on-going opportunity created (i.e. five bicycles/scooters/wagons = five trips, two-seat carts = two trips, seven passenger shuttle = seven trips). | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Design streets/roads that encourage pedestrian and bicycle access and discourage automobile access. | Five trips will be credited for each design element. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Install and maintain | Five trips will be credited for each | This is based on staff's best |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| alternative transportation kiosks. | kiosk. | estimate. |
| Install/maintain safety and security systems for pedestrians and bicyclists. | Five trips will be credited for each measure implemented. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Implement jitneys/vanpools from residential areas to downtowns and transit centers. | One trip will be credited for each seat created. | Yields a one-to-one ratio. |
| Locate residential development within one-third mile of a fixed rail passenger station. | All trips from a residential development within one-third mile of a fixed rail passenger station will be considered credited due to the location of the development. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |

The local jurisdiction must also agree to maintain data available for monitoring by C/CAG, that supports the on-going compliance with the agreed to trip reduction measures.

City County Association of Governments Congestion Mangement Program 2017 Update

Land Use Impact Analysis Program Compliance

| Jurisdiction | Project | Measures Taken | C/CAG Compliance |
|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
| San Bruno | Administration Building for the San Francisco Police Credit Union (SFPCU) | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | TDM Plan approved by C/CAG |
| City of San Carlos | Office Projects | TDM plan incorporated into Neg Dec | TDM Plan approved by C/CAG |
| City of South San Francisco | 1440 San Mateo Avenue | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | None - Project does not generate 100+ trips in the am or pm peak hours |
| City of Menlo Park | 650 Live Oak LLC | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | None - Project does not generate 100+ trips in the am or pm peak hours |
| DOH | Veterans Village | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | None - Project does not generate 100+ trips in the am or pm peak hours |
| City of Burlingame | Douglas Avenue MF Development | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | None - Project does not generate 100+ trips in the am or pm peak hours |
| City of Millbrae | Serra Station | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | TDM Plan approved by C/CAG |
| City of Belmont | 4 Lot Subdivision Project | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | None - Project does not generate 100+ trips in the am or pm peak hours |
| East Palo Alto | Ocford Day Academy Project | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | None - Project does not generate 100+ trips in the am or pm peak hours |

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: June 25, 2018
To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee
From: Susy Kalkin
Subject: Review and comment on Joint C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program Criteria

(For further information or response to questions, contact Susy Kalkin 650 599-1467)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMEQ Committee review and provide input on the Joint C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program Criteria.

BACKGROUND

At the April CMEQ meeting, the Committee discussed the results of the Call for Projects for the current cycle of the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program. The \$10 million in funding for the two-year program is provided by C/CAG Congestion Relief Plan Program funds, which provides \$1,000,000 (\$500,000 for FY 18/19 and \$500,000 for FY 19/20), and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Measure A Program funds, which provide approximately \$9 million for the two-year funding cycle.

Applications were received for 37 shuttles, totaling approximately \$11.1 million, and exceeding the \$10 million in funds available for the program. Because the program is oversubscribed, CMEQ members were also asked to consider and comment on potential changes to the program criteria to be considered in the next call for projects. After some discussion, it was determined that additional information was needed and staff was directed to bring the matter back for discussion at the next available CMEQ meeting.

DISCUSSION

As shown on the attached “San Mateo County Shuttle Program Criteria” sheet, detailed criteria have been developed over the years to evaluate the merits of the individual projects. Also attached is a copy of both the recently approved Shuttle Program funding for FY 18/19 & 19/20 and the performance metrics for FY 16/17 for those shuttles, as requested by CMEQ at the April meeting.

Similar scoring criteria have been used over the past few cycles, with the following principal changes in this round:

- 1) Updated benchmarks for operating cost per passenger to reflect increases in CPI.
- 2) Increased match for underperforming shuttles – In place of the standard requirement that a project sponsor provide 25% in matching funds, a 50% match was required for sponsors of existing shuttles that have failed to meet the applicable “operating cost per passenger” benchmark by 50% or more after two full years of operation.

- 3) Detailed marketing plan required as part of the application.
- 4) Quarterly progress reports must identify marketing efforts undertaken during the reporting period, and, if benchmarks are not being met, sponsor must indicate additional marketing or operational efforts to be undertaken to address deficiencies.

Although the next Call for Projects is not proposed for another two years, there are a few observations/options that are offered for the Committee's preliminary discussion. With the demand for funding increasing, it is likely that the next funding call will be more competitive, and with that there is concern that some of the existing shuttles that are funded at this time could be at risk of losing their service if sufficient funds are not available. And while overall funding is certainly a critical component of the program, an equally important issue is maximizing the efficiency of the shuttle operations. As has been pointed out, it is not necessary for all the money to be expended if the proposed projects are not performing sufficiently well. And, as noted above, the objectives of the increased match, the marketing plan and the adjustments to the quarterly progress reports that have been instituted for this CFP are all directed at improved operations and accountability.

The following are some additional options for discussion that might be considered in order to better manage and maximize available funding for both commuter and community serving needs:

- Require commuter shuttles with access to private employer contributions to pay more than a minimum 25% match to allow the available public funding to go further.
Many commuter shuttles already exceed this match, and this program is a public subsidy that is a direct benefit to the employers that are generating the need to reduce SOV trips.
- Disqualify from consideration a shuttle that misses the Operating Cost per Passenger benchmark by 50% after two consecutive two-year funding cycles.
Some of the commuter shuttles have missed the benchmark by more than 50% for the last 2-year cycle, so in accordance with the current criteria they were required to increase their matching funds contribution to 50% minimum.
- Set aside a minimum amount of funding for shuttles serving transit dependent populations.
While the benchmarks are more relaxed for community serving shuttles, which often serve the needs of transit dependent populations, and while there are a few community shuttles that perform as well or better than some commuter shuttles, others struggle to meet the established benchmarks.

The existing criteria used for scoring have been developed over time and have worked successfully over the years. However, since this is the first time the program has been oversubscribed there may be additional criteria that merit consideration to maximize the effectiveness of the program, so initial input from the Committee is requested at this time. Because the San Mateo County Shuttle Program is a joint effort of both C/CAG and the TA, staff from both agencies will continue to work together to incorporate feedback from both bodies for any future Call for Projects.

ATTACHMENTS

1. San Mateo County Shuttle Program Criteria FY 18/19 & 19/20
2. San Mateo County Shuttle Program Approved Funding Recommendations for FY 18/19 & 19/20
3. Shuttle Program Performance Metrics FY 16/17

San Mateo County Shuttle Program Criteria

| Eligibility Criteria | | San Mateo County Shuttle Program Call for Projects FY 18/19 & FY 19/20 | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Minimum Local Match | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 25% funding match for: 1) existing shuttles that do not exceed the applicable operating cost/passenger benchmark by more than 50% and 2) all new shuttles and existing shuttles that have been in operation for less than two years ¹ - 50% funding match for existing shuttles in operation for 2 years or more that fail to meet the applicable operating cost per passenger benchmark by 50% or more based on FY16/17 performance data. (More recent performance data covering a full 12 months may be applied if available at the time the application is submitted.) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Local Match | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Measure A Local Streets and Transportation funds may be used. - C/CAG or Measure A funds from programs other than Local Streets and Transportation cannot be used as the local match for either funding agency. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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. | | Funding request does not substitute for existing funds. | | | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Technical Assistance | Sponsors of new as well as existing shuttles that have not met the established cost/passenger and passengers/service hour benchmarks, from FY 16/17, are required to consult with SamTrans operations planning staff for community serving shuttles and Commute.org for commuter shuttles prior to the submission of a funding application for guidance on how to best provide cost effective service to meet the identified need. If SamTrans and/or Commute.org apply as sponsors to receive funding from the San Mateo County Shuttle program, they must document the actions that will be taken to improve performance for any of their existing shuttles that do not meet the applicable cost/passenger and passengers/service hour benchmarks. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 congestion relief in San Mateo County -Provides transportation services to special populations (e.g. low income/transit dependent, seniors, disabled, other) and connects to the services used by these 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"> a. Service area (routes/maps, destinations served) b. Specific rail stations, ferry or major SamTrans transit centers served c. Schedule (days, times, frequency) - show coordination with scheduled transit service d. Marketing plan/activities (advertising, outreach, signage, etc.) e. Service Provider f. Administration and oversight (whom?) g. Monitoring/evaluation plan/activities (performance data, complaints/compliments, surveys) h. Co-sponsors/stakeholders (roles?) i. Ridership characteristics: e.g. commuter/ employees, seniors, students, etc j. Any significant changes to existing service k. Incorporation of any changes to the service plan as a result of the required technical assistance consultation with SamTrans operations planning or Commute.org staff for existing underperforming shuttles <p>Solid funding plan with budgeted line items for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Contractor (operator/vendor) cost. (inc. fuel surcharge if applicable) b. Administrative (Staff oversight) c. Other direct costs (e.g. marketing) d. Total operating cost e. Notes/exceptions (e.g. if there are projected differences between 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 congestion relief in San Mateo County -Provides transportation services to special populations (e.g. low income/transit dependent, seniors, disabled, other) and connects to the services used by these 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"> a. Service area (routes/maps, destinations served) b. Service plan development c. Specific rail stations, ferry or major SamTrans transit centers served d. Schedule (days, times, frequency) - show coordination with scheduled transit service e. Marketing plan/activities (advertising, outreach, signage, etc.) f. Service Provider g. Administration and oversight (whom?) h. Monitoring/evaluation plan/activities (performance data, complaints/compliments, surveys) i. Co-sponsors/stakeholders (roles?) j. Ridership characteristics: e.g. commuter/ employees, seniors, students, etc k. Planning process for shuttles, including actions taken as a result of the required technical assistance consultation with SamTrans operations planning or Commute.org staff for new shuttles <p>Solid funding plan with budgeted line items for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Contractor (operator/vendor) cost (inc. fuel surcharge if applicable) b. Administrative (Staff oversight) c. Other direct costs (e.g. marketing) d. Total operating cost e. Notes/exceptions (e.g. if there are projected differences between 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), state assumptions and methodology used for any calculations | | <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), state assumptions and methodology used for any calculations | | | | | | | | |
| Funding Leverage – 20 points | <p>Percentage of matching funds contribution:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;"><u>Shuttles w/ min. 25% match reqmt.</u></td> <td style="width: 50%;"><u>Shuttles w/ min. 50% match reqmt.</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>25 to < 50% - 5 to 10 points</td> <td>50 to < 75% - 5 to 15 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50 to < 75% - 10 to 15 points</td> <td>75 to < 99% - 15 to 18 points</td> </tr> <tr> <td>75 to < 99% - 15 to 18 points</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p>Private sector funding proposed (supports less public subsidy) – 2 points</p> | | <u>Shuttles w/ min. 25% match reqmt.</u> | <u>Shuttles w/ min. 50% match reqmt.</u> | 25 to < 50% - 5 to 10 points | 50 to < 75% - 5 to 15 points | 50 to < 75% - 10 to 15 points | 75 to < 99% - 15 to 18 points | 75 to < 99% - 15 to 18 points | | <p>Percentage of matching funds contribution:</p> <p>25 to < 50% - up to 10 points 50 to < 75% - up to 15 points 75 to < 99% - up to 18 points Private sector funding proposed (supports less public subsidy) – 2 points</p> |
| <u>Shuttles w/ min. 25% match reqmt.</u> | <u>Shuttles w/ min. 50% match reqmt.</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 to < 50% - 5 to 10 points | 50 to < 75% - 5 to 15 points | | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 to < 75% - 10 to 15 points | 75 to < 99% - 15 to 18 points | | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 to < 99% - 15 to 18 points | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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 | | <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 | | | | | | | | |
| | Maximum Point Total - 100 | | Maximum Point Total - 100 | | | | | | | | |

¹ See Tables 1 & 2, next page, for details on Shuttle Operation Benchmarks and parameters for 50% match

Table 1 – FY 2018/19 & 2019/20 Shuttle Operation Benchmarks

| Shuttle Type | Op. Cost/Passenger FY18/19 & 19/20 | Passengers Per Service Hour FY18/19 & 19/20 (Current CFP) |
|--------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Commuter | \$8/passenger | 15 |
| Community | \$10/passenger | 10 |
| Door to Door | \$20/passenger | 2 |

Table 2 - The following table shows how the 50% match would be applied for shuttles that fail to meet the applicable operating cost per passenger benchmark by 50% or more after 2 full years of operation:

| Shuttle Type | Op. Cost/Passenger FY18/19 & 19/20 (Current CFP) | Benchmark missed by 50% or more |
|--------------|--|---------------------------------|
| Commuter | \$8/passenger | ≥\$12/passenger |
| Community | \$10/passenger | ≥\$15/passenger |
| Door to Door | \$20/passenger | ≥\$30/passenger |

San Mateo County Shuttle Program - Approved Funding Recommendations for FY2019 and FY2020

| Score | Sponsor | Shuttle Name | Primary Service Area | New or Existing | Service Type | Total Submitted Cost | Requested Funding | Total Matching Funds | Percent Matching Funds | Private Sector Match | Recommended Allocation | Fund Source |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| 84 | San Mateo Community College District | Skyline College Express | San Bruno | Existing | Commuter | \$597,222 | \$298,611 | \$298,611 | 50% | none | \$298,611 | Measure A |
| 83 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | Redwood City Midpoint Caltrain | Redwood City | Existing | Commuter | \$420,632 | \$270,796 | \$149,836 | 36% | 36% | \$257,999 | Measure A |
| 82 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | Seaport Centre Caltrain | Redwood City | Existing | Commuter | \$276,846 | \$138,423 | \$138,423 | 50% | 50% | \$131,908 | Measure A |
| 81 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | North Burlingame | Burlingame | Existing | Commuter | \$287,300 | \$143,650 | \$143,650 | 50% | 50% | \$136,886 | Measure A |
| 80 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | North Foster City | Foster City | Existing | Commuter | \$550,491 | \$336,868 | \$213,623 | 39% | 25% | \$320,920 | Measure A |
| 79 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | Bayshore Technology Park | Redwood Shores | Existing | Commuter | \$287,370 | \$143,685 | \$143,685 | 50% | 50% | \$136,919 | Measure A |
| 78 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | Brisbane/Crocker Park | Brisbane/Daly City | Existing | Commuter | \$838,354 | \$552,766 | \$285,588 | 34% | 25% | \$526,544 | Measure A |
| 78 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Burlingame Bayside BART/Caltrain | Burlingame | Existing | Commuter | \$456,300 | \$342,300 | \$114,000 | 25% | 24% | \$342,300 | Measure A |
| 78 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Pacific Shores | Redwood City | Existing | Commuter | \$674,100 | \$505,700 | \$168,400 | 25% | 24% | \$505,700 | Measure A |
| 78 | SamTrans | Sierra Point - Balboa Park BART | Brisbane | Existing | Commuter | \$615,200 | \$190,000 | \$425,200 | 69% | 69% | \$190,000 | Measure A |
| 77 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | South San Francisco BART | South San Francisco | Existing | Commuter | \$1,131,967 | \$756,975 | \$374,992 | 33% | 25% | \$721,030 | Measure A |
| 77 | South San Francisco | South City | South San Francisco | Existing | Community | \$1,115,300 | \$836,000 | \$279,000 | 25% | none | \$836,000 | Measure A |
| 76 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Broadway/Millbrae | Burlingame | Existing | Commuter | \$306,900 | \$230,200 | \$76,700 | 25% | none | \$230,200 | Measure A |
| 75 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Mariners Island | San Mateo/Foster City | Existing | Commuter | \$302,700 | \$227,100 | \$75,600 | 25% | 24% | \$227,100 | Measure A |
| 75 | Menlo Park | Willow Road | Menlo Park | Existing | Commuter | \$306,622 | \$229,967 | \$76,655 | 25% | 21% | \$229,967 | C/CAG |
| 74 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | South San Francisco Caltrain | South San Francisco | Existing | Commuter | \$586,574 | \$439,930 | \$146,644 | 25% | 25% | \$419,095 | Measure A |
| 74 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Lincoln Centre | San Mateo/Foster City | Existing | Commuter | \$298,300 | \$223,800 | \$74,500 | 25% | 24% | \$223,800 | Measure A |
| 74 | SamTrans | Bayhill - San Bruno BART | San Bruno | Existing | Commuter | \$237,600 | \$178,200 | \$59,400 | 25% | 25% | \$178,200 | Measure A |
| 73 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Electronic Arts (EA) | Redwood Shores | Existing | Commuter | \$508,000 | \$150,000 | \$358,000 | 70% | 70% | \$150,000 | Measure A |
| 72 | SamTrans | Seton Medical - BART Daly City | Daly City | Existing | Commuter | \$231,400 | \$150,000 | \$81,400 | 35% | 35% | \$150,000 | Measure A |
| 71 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | South San Francisco Ferry | South San Francisco | Existing | Commuter | \$456,112 | \$273,667 | \$182,445 | 40% | 15% | \$260,727 | Measure A |
| 71 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Bayshore/Brisbane Commute | Brisbane/Daly City | Existing | Commuter | \$225,000 | \$168,800 | \$56,200 | 25% | none | \$168,800 | Measure A |
| 71 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Oracle | Redwood Shores | Existing | Commuter | \$888,400 | \$160,000 | \$728,400 | 82% | 82% | \$160,000 | Measure A |
| 71 | Menlo Park | Marsh Road | Menlo Park | Existing | Commuter | \$552,480 | \$414,360 | \$138,120 | 25% | 12% | \$414,360 | Measure A |
| 71 | SamTrans | San Carlos Community | San Carlos | Existing | Community | \$338,126 | \$169,063 | \$169,063 | 50% | 50% | \$169,063 | Measure A |
| 70 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | Genesis Towers | South San Francisco | Existing | Commuter | \$270,830 | \$135,415 | \$135,415 | 50% | 50% | \$129,043 | Measure A |
| 70 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Campus Drive | San Mateo | Existing | Commuter | \$240,400 | \$180,400 | \$60,000 | 25% | 24% | \$180,400 | Measure A |
| 70 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Norfolk | San Mateo | Existing | Commuter | \$240,400 | \$180,400 | \$60,000 | 25% | 24% | \$180,400 | Measure A |
| 68 | Daly City | Daly City Bayshore | Daly City | Existing | Commuter/Community | \$545,000 | \$245,000 | \$300,000 | 55% | none | \$245,000 | Measure A |
| 68 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Sierra Point Millbrae | South San Francisco/ | Existing | Commuter | \$362,000 | \$100,000 | \$262,000 | 72% | 72% | \$100,000 | Measure A |
| 66 | San Carlos | San Carlos Commuter | San Carlos | Existing | Commuter | \$249,415 | \$187,061 | \$62,354 | 25% | 20% | \$187,061 | Measure A |
| 64 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Twin Dolphin | Redwood Shores | Existing | Commuter | \$592,500 | \$444,500 | \$148,000 | 25% | 24% | \$444,500 | Measure A |
| 63 | SamTrans | Bayshore Brisbane Senior | Brisbane/Daly City | Existing | Door to door | \$255,200 | \$191,400 | \$63,800 | 25% | none | \$191,400 | Measure A |
| 58 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Belmont/Hillsdale | Belmont | Existing | Commuter | \$242,500 | \$181,900 | \$60,600 | 25% | none | \$181,900 | Measure A |
| 58 | Menlo Park ⁽²⁾ | M1 Crosstown | Menlo Park | Existing | Community | \$1,167,708 | \$875,781 | \$291,927 | 25% | none | \$774,168 | C/CAG |
| 55 | SamTrans | SFOX | Millbrae | New | Commuter/Community | \$1,100,901 | \$825,676 | \$275,225 | 25% | none | not recommended | NA |
| 43 | Menlo Park | Shoppers | Menlo Park | Existing | Door to door | \$119,223 | \$59,612 | \$59,611 | 50% | none | not recommended | NA |
| NA | Burlingame | Burlingame East-West | Burlingame | New | Community | \$340,000 | \$255,000 | \$85,000 | 25% | none | not recommended | NA |
| Subtotals: | | | | | | \$18,215,373 | \$11,393,006 | \$6,822,067 | 37% | | \$10,000,000 | |

TA Measure A Local Shuttle Program Allocation: \$8,995,865
C/CAG Local Transportation Services Shuttle Program Allocation: \$1,004,135
Total TA-C/CAG Shuttle Funding Allocation: \$10,000,000
Total Funding Available for FY2019 & FY2020 Shuttle Call for Projects: \$10,000,000
Total Sponsor Funding Requests: \$11,393,006

Footnotes:

- 1) The funding request for Commute.org's 10 shuttles include \$151,105 of administrative costs, which are not recommended for funding from the Measure A Shuttle Program. Commute.org has historically received Measure A support to help fund its administrative costs through annual allocations from the Alternative Congestion Relief (ACR) Program. Commute.org's proposed administrative costs to support their shuttle program will be considered as part of their annual ACR funding request.
- 2) The original proposal for the Menlo Park Crosstown Shuttle combines existing mid-day shuttle service, west of El Camino Real, with existing all-day service, east of El Camino Real, and expands existing west side service from mid-day to all-day service. The draft recommendation is to help underwrite a revised request from Menlo Park for the continuation of existing mid-day service, west of El Camino Real, and existing all-day service, east of El Camino Real. Total cost of the revised request is \$1,037,963.
- 3) The Burlingame East-West Community Shuttle did not meet the following program screening criteria: It didn't receive a Letter of Concurrence from SamTrans due to concerns regarding duplication of SamTrans fixed route service, and it didn't participate in the required shuttle technical assistance program, which is a requirement for all new shuttle sponsors.

San Mateo County Shuttle Program Performance Metrics FY 2016-17

| Score | Sponsor | Shuttle Name | Primary Service Area | Service Type | | Total Passengers | Operating Cost/ Passenger | Passengers/ Service Hour |
|-------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--|------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| 84 | San Mateo Community College District | Skyline College Express | San Bruno | Commuter | | 62,635 | \$4.28 | 28.5 |
| 83 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | Redwood City Midpoint Caltrain | Redwood City | Commuter | | 31,250 | \$3.51 | 20.5 |
| 82 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | Seaport Centre Caltrain | Redwood City | Commuter | | 33,574 | \$3.49 | 20.3 |
| 81 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | North Burlingame | Burlingame | Commuter | | 21,120 | \$5.78 | 12.2 |
| 80 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | North Foster City | Foster City | Commuter | | 65,798 | \$3.38 | 21.6 |
| 79 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | Bayshore Technology Park | Redwood Shores | Commuter | | 33,819 | \$3.48 | 20.5 |
| 78 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | Brisbane/Crocker Park | Brisbane/Daly City | Commuter | | 94,533 | \$3.84 | 20.0 |
| 78 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Burlingame Bayside BART/Caltrain | Burlingame | Commuter | | 51,695 | \$3.34 | 16.9 |
| 78 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Pacific Shores | Redwood City | Commuter | | 57,342 | \$2.99 | 23.6 |
| 78 | SamTrans | Sierra Point - Balboa Park BART | Brisbane | Commuter | | 50,333 | \$6.08 | 20.6 |
| 77 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | South San Francisco BART | South San Francisco | Commuter | | 85,672 | \$5.35 | 13.5 |
| 77 | South San Francisco | South City | South San Francisco | Community | | 63685 | 3.26 | 26.9 |
| 76 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Broadway/Millbrae | Burlingame | Commuter | | 49,451 | \$2.52 | 26.0 |
| 75 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Mariners Island | San Mateo/Foster City | Commuter | | 28,236 | \$4.46 | 14.9 |
| 75 | Menlo Park | Willow Road | Menlo Park | Commuter | | 19,409 | \$5.31 | 15.0 |
| 74 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | South San Francisco Caltrain | South San Francisco | Commuter | | 40,249 | \$6.65 | 10.9 |
| 74 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Lincoln Centre | San Mateo/Foster City | Commuter | | 31,347 | \$3.94 | 16.7 |
| 74 | SamTrans | Bayhill - San Bruno BART | San Bruno | Commuter | | 48,666 | \$2.44 | 29.9 |
| 73 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Electronic Arts (EA) | Redwood Shores | Commuter | | 19,305 | \$12.35 | 14.3 |
| 72 | SamTrans | Seton Medical - BART Daly City | Daly City | Commuter | | 35,650 | \$3.10 | 21.3 |
| 71 | Commute.org ⁽¹⁾ | South San Francisco Ferry | South San Francisco | Commuter | | 24,073 | \$8.68 | 8.2 |
| 71 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Bayshore/Brisbane Commute | Brisbane/Daly City | Commuter | | 19,358 | \$10.96 | 6.4 |
| 71 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Oracle | Redwood Shores | Commuter | | 27,875 | \$13.77 | 5.9 |
| 71 | Menlo Park | Marsh Road | Menlo Park | Commuter | | 25,797 | \$5.16 | 13.8 |
| 71 | SamTrans | San Carlos Community | San Carlos | Community | | 34,471 | \$6.90 | 39.6 |
| 70 | Commute.org | Genesis Towers | South San Francisco | Commuter | | 12,602 | \$9.20 | 7.8 |
| 70 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Campus Drive | San Mateo | Commuter | | 16,498 | \$7.00 | 8.9 |
| 70 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Norfolk | San Mateo | Commuter | | 11,151 | \$9.31 | 6.9 |
| 68 | Daly City | Daly City Bayshore | Daly City | Commuter/Community | | 20,463 | \$11.18 | 8.4 |
| 68 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Sierra Point Millbrae | South San Francisco/ | Commuter | | 14,707 | \$12.17 | 11.7 |
| 66 | San Carlos | San Carlos Commuter | San Carlos | Commuter | | 7,359 | \$12.76 | 6.0 |
| 64 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Twin Dolphin | Redwood Shores | Commuter | | 15,885 | \$9.41 | 8.0 |
| 63 | SamTrans | Bayshore Brisbane Senior | Brisbane/Daly City | Door to door | | 4,561 | \$24.40 | 2.9 |
| 58 | Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board | Belmont/Hillsdale | Belmont | Commuter | | 10,626 | \$9.54 | 7.5 |
| 58 | Menlo Park | M1 Crosstown | Menlo Park | Community | | 11,598 | \$24.17 | 3.0 |
| 55 | SamTrans | SFOX | Millbrae | Commuter/Community | | NA | NA | NA |
| 43 | Menlo Park | Shoppers | Menlo Park | Door to door | | 933 | \$51.59 | 1.5 |
| NA | Burlingame | Burlingame East-West | Burlingame | Community | | NA | NA | NA |

 Community Shuttles
 Door to Door Shuttles