

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*

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) AGENDA

Date: Thursday, March 18, 2021

Time: 1:15 P.M.

On March 17, 2020, the Governor issued Executive Order N-29-20 suspending certain provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act in order to allow for local legislative bodies to conduct their meetings telephonically or by other electronic means. Pursuant to the Shelter-in-Place Orders issued by the San Mateo County Health Officer and the Governor, and the CDC's social distancing guidelines, which discourage large public gatherings, C/CAG meetings will be conducted via remote conferencing. Members of the public may observe or participate in the meeting remotely via one of the options below.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85680429257?pwd=SG5wR1NxYlkyMUttMktlb0Zlc1l3QT09>

Meeting ID: 856 8042 9257

Passcode: 618842

Join by Phone: (669) 900-6833

Meeting ID: 856 8042 9257

Passcode: 618842

Persons who wish to address the C/CAG TAC on an item to be considered at this meeting, or on items not on this agenda, are asked to submit written comments to kcheung1@smcgov.org. Spoken public comments will also be accepted during the meeting through Zoom. Please see instructions for written and spoken public comments at the end of this agenda.

-
- | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------|
| 1. Brief Overview of Teleconference Meeting Procedure | Cheung | No materials |
| 2. Public comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations are customarily limited to 2 minutes). | Porter/Hurley | No materials |
| 3. Issues from the last C/CAG Board meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Received presentation on the Equity Program Alternatives for the San Mateo County Highway 101 Express Lane project.○ Approved the most recent population data released by the State Department of Finance on May 1, 2020.○ Authorized C/CAG Chair to sign a Letter of Interest nominating 15 projects for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick Strike Program. | Cheung | No materials |
| 4. Approval of the minutes from February 18, 2021 | Cheung | Page 1-5 |
| 5. Receive an update and provide input on the San Mateo County Transportation Authority Short Range Highway Plan (SRHP) and Capital | Cheung/Gilster | Page 6-7 |

Improvement Program (CIP). (Information)

6.	Review and recommend approval of projects to be funded under the C/CAG Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 6 for a total amount of \$1,748,570. (Action)	Lacap	Page 8-11
7..	Receive information and provide input on the cost benefit analysis of the draft San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) Update. (Information)	Hiatt	Page 12-13
8..	Receive an update and provide input on the countywide subscription of StreetLight Data service. (Information)	Hiatt	Page 14-15
9..	Regional Funding and Project Information	Lacap	Page 16-22
10.	Executive Director Report	Wong	No materials
11.	Member Reports	All	

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG regular TAC meetings, standing committee meetings, and special meetings will be posted at the San Mateo County Transit District Office, 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA, and on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>.

PUBLIC RECORDS: Public records that relate to any item on the open session agenda for a regular TAC meeting, standing committee meeting, or special meeting are available for public inspection. Those public records that are distributed less than 72 hours prior to a regular TAC meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the TAC. The TAC has designated the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), located at 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, for the purpose of making public records available for inspection. Such public records are also available on C/CAG's website at: <http://www.ccag.ca.gov>. Please note that C/CAG's office is temporarily closed to the public; please contact Kaki Cheung at (650) 363-4105 to arrange for inspection of public records.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION DURING VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETINGS: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services to participate in this meeting should contact Kaki Cheung at (650) 363-4105, five working days prior to the meeting date.

Written comments should be emailed in advance of the meeting. Please read the following instructions carefully:

1. Your written comment should be emailed to kcheung1@smcgov.org.
2. Your email should include the specific agenda item on which you are commenting or note that your comment concerns an item that is not on the agenda.
3. Members of the public are limited to one comment per agenda item.
4. The length of the emailed comment should be commensurate with the two minutes customarily allowed for verbal comments, which is approximately 250-300 words.
5. If your emailed comment is received at least 2 hours prior to the meeting, it will be provided to the C/CAG TAC members and made publicly available on the C/CAG website along with the agenda. We cannot guarantee that emails received less than 2 hours before the meeting will be made publicly available on the C/CAG website prior to the meeting, but such emails will be included in the administrative record of the meeting.

Spoken comments will be accepted during the meeting through Zoom. Please read the following instructions carefully:

1. The C/CAG TAC meeting may be accessed through Zoom at the online location indicated at the top of this agenda.

2. You may download the Zoom client or connect to the meeting using an internet browser. If using your browser, make sure you are using a current, up-to-date browser: Chrome 30+, Firefox 27+, Microsoft Edge 12+, Safari 7+. Certain functionality may be disabled in older browsers including Internet Explorer.
3. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by your name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak.
4. When C/CAG Staff or Co-Chairs call for the item on which you wish to speak, click on “raise hand.” Staff will activate and unmute speakers in turn. Speakers will be notified shortly before they are called on to speak.
5. When called, please limit your remarks to the time allotted.

If you have any questions about this agenda, please contact C/CAG staff:

Program Director: Kaki Cheung (650) 363-4105 kcheung1@smcgov.org

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

February 18, 2021

MINUTES

No.	Member	Agency	Jan	Feb
1	Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	x	
2	Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	x	x
3	Robert Ovadia	Atherton Engineering	x	x
4	Peter Brown	Belmont Engineering	x	x
5	Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering	x	x
6	Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x	x
7	Sandy Wong	C/CAG	x	x
8	Brad Donohue	Colma Engineering	x	
9	Richard Chiu	Daly City Engineering	x	x
10	Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x	x
11	Dante Hall*	Foster City Engineering		
12	Paul Willis	Hillsborough Engineering	x	x
13	Maz Bozorginia	Half Moon Bay Engineering	x	x
14	Nikki Nagaya	Menlo Park Engineering	x	x
15	Andrew Yang	Millbrae Engineering	x	x
16	Lisa Petersen	Pacifica Engineering	x	x
17	Jessica Manzi	Redwood City Engineering	x	x
18	Jimmy Tan	San Bruno Engineering	x	x
19	Steven Machida	San Carlos Engineering	x	x
20	Azalea Mitch	San Mateo Engineering	x	x
21	Eunejune Kim	South San Francisco Engineering	x	x
22	Billy Gross	South San Francisco Planning	x	x
23	Sean Rose	Woodside Engineering	x	x
24	James Choe	MTC	x	x

*appointed to the TAC at the February C/CAG Board Meeting

The two hundred sixty-seventh (267th) meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee took place on February 18, 2021 at 1:17 p.m.

TAC members attending are listed on the Roster and Attendance table on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Mikaela Hiatt, Kaki Cheung, Jeffrey Lacap, Sean Charpentier, Kim Wever, Van Ocampo – C/CAG; Peter Skinner and Patrick Gilster – SMCTA; Julia Wean – Steer; Sue-Ellen Atkinson – City of San Mateo; Gwendolyn White and others not noted.

1. Brief Overview of Teleconference Meeting Procedures.

C/CAG staff Kaki Cheung described how the Committee Meeting would run virtually.

2. Public Comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations are customarily limited to 2 minutes).

There were no public comments regarding items not on the Agenda.

3. Issues from the last C/CAG Board Meetings.

C/CAG staff Kaki Cheung described the items of interest listed from the last C/CAG Board meeting.

4. Approval of Minutes from January 21, 2021.

Member Ovadia requested a correction to Item 8 of the January meeting minutes, his recommendation was to install rapid flashing beacons, and not rapid buses.

Member Breault moved to approve the minutes as revised, Member Ovadia seconded the motion. Roll Call was taken. All members in attendance voted to approve. Motion passed.

5. Receive an update on the current efforts to develop the five-year Measure M Strategic Plan, covering Fiscal Years 2021/22 to 2025/26. (Information)

C/CAG staff Kim Wever introduced Julia Wean of Steer, who would present on goals and objectives of the Local Streets and Roads program in Measure M. Julia explained that the Local Streets and Roads program aims to improve and maintain local facilities through congestion management and stormwater pollution prevention activities. Julia described the logic framework used to help with goal setting and development of strategic recommendations. Performance measures will be added to evaluate the program.

Member Ovadia asked if road condition would be included. Julia responded that the two areas stated in the goal were the primary targets, but the project team can evaluate the more granular elements throughout project development.

Member Petersen asked if the reporting structure would be similar to the reporting structure in SB 1. Julia Wean responded that the reporting structure would be less formal and would include a form to be completed at the beginning of each year, describing the expectations and targets for the local jurisdiction that year.

Member Murtuza asked if the forms will be modified for the cities to report where and how these funds were used, as they will be a portion of the work and not all of the work. Julia Wean

responded that the process would be similar to the current reporting process to C/CAG, which a city only reports the actions that were conducted using Measure M funding. Member Murtuza commented he felt that there is not currently a breakdown of the specificities of the expenditures in reporting to C/CAG, and it may be difficult to integrate and track.

Member Rose expressed appreciation for an online form and the simple reporting process to date. He also asked if jurisdictions will still be able to select which program (paving, sweeping, etc.) they use Measure M funds for. Julia Wean commented that would be the case, but this list of eligible activities would be expanded to integrate innovative transportation practices. She also commented that the main change would be standardizing units of measurement for the program, such as everyone reports street sweeping in miles rather than square feet.

Member Rose asked if the amounts prescribed would change. Julia Wean responded the project team did not expect the amounts to change significantly. Member Rose asked if funding trash management would be a qualifying expense continually, or just one time. Kim Wever responded that the funding source Member Rose referenced was AB 1546, which was a one-time item. If an activity is related to stormwater/MRP activities, then it would be eligible for Measure M Local Streets and Roads funding.

Member Ovadia expressed concerns about the reporting requirements, and how that may deter jurisdictions from spending on activities that are more difficult to track.

Member Brown commented that online reporting would be easier but was unsure about the benefit of conveying the work plan at the beginning of the fiscal year and reporting it after, compared to simply reporting the tasks that are completed at the end of the year.

Member Chiu commented that currently many cities use the funds predominantly for street sweeping and paving. He was unsure if a long list of eligible expenditures would be beneficial. Julia Wean responded that she agreed those activities are more common amongst the jurisdictions, but there are other agencies who use the list of eligible expenditures more broadly. It is important to C/CAG for partners to demonstrate the progress made using Measure M funds in a holistic manner.

Co-Chair Hurley commented that the quality of street sweeping may not be consistent with the quantity of street sweeping completed, due to vehicles parked on the roads. Julia Wean responded that C/CAG is not currently tracking street sweeping qualitatively, but may potentially consider exploring this as an option. Julia cautioned that this may be difficult for the local jurisdictions to track.

6. Receive an update on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick Strike Program development and provide input to the C/CAG nomination process (Action)

C/CAG Staff Sean Charpentier introduced the item and provided updates on the program since the last Technical Advisory Committee meeting in January 2021. Sean stated that the Call for Project nominations had been extended through 2/18 at 5 PM. As of the TAC meeting, C/CAG had received 8 projects, with a request of \$6,794,086. Sean stated that staff plans to update the list on Friday and present the recommended projects to the Congestion Management

Environmental Quality (CMEQ) committee and Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC).

Member Hurley asked if the action was to clarify the process for recommending a project. Sean Charpentier stated that the initial intent was a formal recommendation to the C/CAG Board, but given the revised timeframe for project submittal, the action at this meeting is to recommend the project selection process.

Member Breault asked the reason for introducing the criteria of giving priority for projects that had submitted previous funding applications. Sean Charpentier responded that the previous Committee report stated that recommendation. Sandy Wong added that at the request of the Committee at the January 2021 meeting, C/CAG staff agreed to accept projects that were not part of the previous calls. Projects would be ranked based on merit. In the event that two projects have similar merits, the project that submitted application to a previous call for project would be ranked higher.

Member Murtuza commented every project should be weighted equally, regardless of former submission, given there may be new projects in consideration for quick build.

Member Manzi commented that while she agreed that projects should be evaluated based on criteria from MTC, she felt that the “tie-breaker” solution C/CAG staff were proposing is appropriate.

Member Chiu commented that his understanding for the reason of incorporating previously applied projects was due to time constraints.

Member Manzi moved to approve the project evaluation process and Member Murtuza seconded.

Staff clarified that all projects would be evaluated based on their merits, and the tie-breaker would be used for projects that previously applied.

Roll call was taken. Member Choe voted to abstain. Other Members in attendance voted to approve. Motion passed.

7. Regional Project and Funding Information

C/CAG staff Jeff Lacap provided the Committee with an updated Caltrans inactive projects list, requesting members continue to invoice regularly to Caltrans. He also shared the CMP certification form. Further, Jeff Lacap provided results of the statewide ATP Cycle 5 recommendations. San Mateo County projects were not recommended for funding in the statewide call, but the regional recommendation is expected to be released in April or May of 2021. A variety of trainings opportunities were listed in the staff report, including the resident engineers training and local streets and roads training provided by FHWA.

Co-Chair Hurley asked how many applications were submitted to ATP Cycle 5. Jeff Lacap, with assistance from C/CAG staff, Mikaela Hiatt, responded that approximately eight projects in San Mateo County responded to the statewide ATP call for projects. Co-Chair Hurley asked if these projects were likely to also apply for the regional pot of funding. C/CAG staff Mikaela Hiatt and Jeff Lacap confirmed that yes, it is likely.

10. Executive Director Report

C/CAG Executive Director Sandy Wong announced that the federal government had released plans for stimulus package, which included transportation fund in an amount of \$900,000,000 for the state of California in response to COVID-19. Sandy stated that it was unclear at the time how the funded would be distributed.

11. Member Reports

Member Murtuza inquired about the recruitment process to fill Sandy Wong's position as Executive Director of C/CAG. Sandy Wong responded that the C/CAG Chair has set up a search committee actively working on the recruitment. The recruitment announcement is likely to be released in early March.

C/CAG staff, Mikaela Hiatt, requested StreetLight users to complete the user survey. Survey results will be presented at the March Committee meeting. Mikaela also informed Committee members that the San Mateo Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update was available for public review, and comments are due on March 10th, 2021.

Meeting adjourned at 2:27 PM.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: March 18, 2021

To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee

From: Kaki Cheung, Program Director

Subject: Receive an update and provide input on the San Mateo County Transportation Authority Short Range Highway Plan (SRHP) and Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

(For further information, contact Patrick Gilster at gilsterp@samtrans.com)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) receives an update and provides input on the current efforts to develop the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) SRHP and CIP.

FISCAL IMPACT

The cost to prepare the SRHP and CIP update is \$375,000.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

This project is funded using available interest from the sales tax collected as part of Measure A, commonly referred to as TA oversight funds.

BACKGROUND

The TA's Measure A half-cent sales tax for transportation programs and projects was reauthorized in 2004 for a period of 25 years by the voters of San Mateo County. Measure A took effect on January 1, 2009 and expires December 31, 2033. Twenty seven and one half percent of Measure A is dedicated to the highway program.

On November 6, 2018, the voters of San Mateo County approved Measure W, a new 30-year half-cent sales tax for transportation programs and projects that took effect July 1, 2019 and expires June 30, 2049. Twenty two and one half percent of Measure W is dedicated to highway congestion improvements.

In accordance with the recommendations set forth in the TA's Strategic Plan 2020-2024, staff with consultant assistance, is preparing a 10-year SRHP for 2020 – 2030 which includes a CIP to support future investment decisions for the Measure A Highway & Measure W Countywide Highway Congestion Relief Plan.

The SRHP is assessing highway program needs over the next ten years. This study and the resultant CIP are considering both committed projects as well as potential new projects. New projects are being identified through either the project inventory process with input from local sponsors or through the gap analysis assessment which highlights locations where existing safety or congestion needs are not currently be addressed by inventoried projects.

To aid in the development of the plan, staff is working with the TA Board Ad-Hoc Committee, and is receiving input from the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), as well as from outreach with all potential sponsor agencies.

This study will develop both a policy framework for making investment decisions, and a funding strategy for the highway program. Key policy decisions that are being addressed in the SRHP include: defining projects of countywide significance, determining the role of the TA on local and countywide projects, identifying a potential set aside for projects of countywide significance, and recommending a methodology for including potential projects identified in the gap analysis.

A PowerPoint Presentation will provide additional details on the development of the SHRP. The TA will send out the draft version of the SRHP and CIP for review by TAC members following the meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

- Draft Short Range Highway Plan (SRHP) and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) (will be available online at <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/congestion-management-program-technical-advisory-committee/>)
- PowerPoint Presentation (will be available online at <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/congestion-management-program-technical-advisory-committee/>)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: March 18, 2021

To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee

From: Jeff Lacap, Associate Transportation Systems Coordinator

Subject: Review and recommend approval of projects to be funded under the C/CAG Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 6 for a total amount of \$1,748,570

(For further information or questions, contact Jeff Lacap at jlacap@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMP TAC review and recommend approval of the projects to be funded under the C/CAG Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 6 for a total amount of \$1,748,570.

FISCAL IMPACT

This program will fund projects totaling \$1,748,570 in State Transit Assistance (STA) funds

SOURCE OF FUNDS

\$1,748,570 in State Transit Assistance (STA) funds

BACKGROUND**State Transit Assistance (STA) County Block Grant Program**

In February 2018, MTC Resolution 4321 established the new State Transit Assistance (STA) County Block Grant Program policy whereby the nine Bay Area County Transportation Agencies (CTA's), also known as Congestion Management Agencies, would determine how to invest the Population-Based STA funds in public transit services and lifeline transportation services. Under the STA Block Grant Program, C/CAG would be solely responsible for determining the distribution policy among STA-eligible transit operators and funds that will be spent benefiting Communities of Concern each fiscal year.

In the past, the MTC Resolution 3837 governed the State Transit Assistance (STA) Population-Based fund distribution policy. Under resolution 3837, funding was distributed by MTC to fund 1) Bay Area Northern County small transit operators, 2) Regional Paratransit, 3) the Lifeline Transportation Program, and 4) MTC regional coordination programs. Paratransit and Lifeline Transportation Program funds were further distributed among the nine bay area counties. The guidelines for the regional Lifeline Transportation Program Cycles 1-5 were developed by MTC, but each CTA was responsible for administering the program.

As the County Transportation Agency, C/CAG coordinates with STA-eligible transit operators and develops the STA Population-Based distribution policy within San Mateo county to fund

Paratransit service and the Lifeline Transportation Program. SamTrans is the only STA eligible transit operator in San Mateo County. Beginning in Fiscal Year 2018-2019, C/CAG and SamTrans staff have coordinated and developed an annual STA Population-Based distribution policy. In May 2020, the C/CAG Board approved Resolution 20-37 which adopted the distribution policy for Fiscal Year 2020-21 STA Population-Based funds.

Along with the previous STA Block Grant Program distributions from Fiscal Years 2018-19 and 2019-20, C/CAG has accumulated approximately \$3,399,304 in STA funds available for the Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 6 beginning in Fiscal Year 2021-22. Per STA Block Grant guidelines, any remaining balances from each annual STA fund allocation is rolled over to the next fiscal year for San Mateo County. Any unallocated funds will stay in San Mateo County.

Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP)

Lifeline Transportation Program projects are related to the Community Based Transportation Plans (CBTP). CBTPs are based in Communities of Concern. There are currently 4 CBTPs in San Mateo County (San Bruno/South San Francisco; North Central San Mateo, Bayshore, and East Palo Alto).

The CBTP are based on grass roots input, and the perspectives of residents and community organizers. Each CBTP will establish solutions to transportation gaps identified during diverse outreach campaigns and coordination with local community groups. The CBTP's include a series of transportation solutions designed to benefit low-income residents, the disabled, senior citizens, those without vehicles and other disadvantaged communities.

C/CAG is currently updating the CBTPs for Daly City and Southeast San Mateo County, but the update has been delayed by the COVID-19 crisis. C/CAG had originally planned to complete the update of the CBTPs in 2020 and then issue the Cycle 6 Call for projects. However, the COVID-19 crisis has delayed the update of the CBTPs due to the challenges of creating meaningful public engagement and input during the pandemic.

However, C/CAG decided to proceed with the Cycle 6 Call for projects in late 2020 to provide the opportunity for existing Lifeline projects, such as community shuttle operations and other transit services, to apply and to see if there were additional projects/programs that were responding to the needs created by the COVID-19 crisis.

C/CAG Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 6 Call for Projects

As the County Transportation Agency (CTA) for San Mateo County, C/CAG administers the Lifeline Transportation Program. The purpose of the program is to fund projects, identified through the aforementioned CBTPs, which improves the mobility of low-income residents, or through other relevant planning efforts in other low-income areas. The C/CAG CMP TAC reviewed the Lifeline call for projects in November 2020 and the C/CAG Board of Directors authorized the call for projects at its December 2020 meeting. A call for projects was issued on December 11, 2020 and applications were due on February 19, 2021.

Per program guidelines, funds are open to public agencies and non-profits who obtained written concurrence and a pass-through funding agreement from a recognized transit agency willing to pass through funds.

C/CAG staff organized a selection panel composed of Juda Tolmasoff from the Office of San Mateo County Supervisor Carole Groom, John Ford from Commute.org, Richard Hedges from the MTC Policy Advisory Council, and Susy Kalkin from C/CAG. This selection panel convened on March 8, 2021 to finalize scoring and ranking of the applications.

The selection panel recommended to fully fund the following projects eligible for STA funding:

- Daly City Bayshore Shuttle (Project Sponsor: City of Daly City)
- Operating Support for Expanded Route 17 Service (Project Sponsor: SamTrans)
- Operating Support for SamCoast Service (Project Sponsor: SamTrans)
- Get Around! Senior Transportation Program (Project Sponsor: City of San Mateo)
- Menlo Park Shuttle Program (Project Sponsor: City of Menlo Park)
- Free South City Shuttle Outreach Enhancements Project (Project Sponsor: City of South San Francisco)

For this 6th Cycle, funding requests were undersubscribed with \$1,748,570 being requested and approximately \$3,399,304 available. The remaining funds will be rolled over and stay within San Mateo County. C/CAG staff proposes that the remaining funds be directed towards administering a mid-cycle call for projects upon completion of the updates of two Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTP's) in Southeast San Mateo County and Daly City currently underway and tentatively scheduled for completion next year. In the meantime, staff has started to engage with community stakeholders to better understand the needs of specific targeted communities that would benefit from the Lifeline Transportation Program.

This funding recommendation will also be presented to the CMEQ committee in March and the C/CAG Board for approval in April. For STA funds, pass through funding agreements will be executed between SamTrans and the project sponsor as required. As program administrator, C/CAG staff will be responsible for reviewing quarterly reports and will review STA invoices submitted by the project sponsors, prior to reimbursement by SamTrans.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed Cycle 6 Lifeline Transportation Program Project List

Proposed Cycle 6 Lifeline Transportation Program Project List

Rank	Project Sponsor	Project	Project Description	Total Requested Amount	Total Recommended Amount
1	Daly City	Daly City Bayshore Shuttle	Provide a circulator shuttle service connecting the Bayshore neighborhood in Daly City with transit and important destinations in the western portion of Daly City.	\$ 294,750	\$ 294,750
2	SamTrans	Operating Support for Expanded Route 17 Service	Operation of existing Lifeline funded expanded fixed route bus service for SamTrans Route 17 on the Coastsides of San Mateo County.	\$ 374,000	\$ 374,000
3	SamTrans	Operating Support for SamCoast Service	This project will continue funding the operation of SamCoast, a general public demand response system on the Coastsides of San Mateo County centered in Pescadero, serving a low-income population, including migrant farm workers.	\$ 179,820	\$ 179,820
4	San Mateo (City)	Get Around! Senior Transportation Program	The Get Around! Program is an existing, successful City of San Mateo program providing seniors safe and affordable on-demand access to transportation.	\$ 320,000	\$ 320,000
5	Menlo Park	Menlo Park Shuttle Program	Shuttle provide the Belle Haven community and other neighborhoods with reliable, free local transit since 1998.	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
6	South San Francisco	Free South City Shuttle Outreach Enhancements Project	Enhanced outreach efforts of the Free South City Shuttle Program to better reach and advise the residents of South San Francisco of its service, with the goal of the program's expansion in the near future due to higher demand and increased ridership.	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000

Available Lifeline Cycle 6 STA Funds	\$3,399,304
Total Recommended Amount for Lifeline Cycle 6	\$1,748,570
Unsubscribed Amount	\$1,650,734

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: March 18, 2021

To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee

From: Mikaela Hiatt, Transportation Programs Specialist

Subject: Receive information and provide input on the cost benefit analysis of the draft San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) Update

(For further information, contact Mikaela Hiatt at mhiatt@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Technical Advisory Committee receive information and provide input on the cost benefit analysis of the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) Update.

FISCAL IMPACT

This presentation has no fiscal impact. The cost to update the CBPP is \$221,492.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

- TDA Article 3 funds
 - Local Transportation (LTF), derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected statewide
 - State Transit Association (STA) fund, derived from the statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel
- Measure A Transportation Sales Tax (San Mateo County Transportation Authority)
- C/CAG Local Transportation Funds

BACKGROUND

The San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (CBPP) is currently undergoing an update. C/CAG has retained Toole Design Group as the consultant to lead the project. Following the last meeting with the Committee on January 21, 2021, the team finalized comments on the prioritized project list, developed the draft Cost Benefit Analysis of the CBPP projects, and released the Draft CBPP for Public Review on February 10, 2021.

The team worked with the local jurisdiction staff to review and finalize the list of recommended prioritized projects in San Mateo County. With input from the Committee at its January 2021 meeting, C/CAG and Toole developed and finalized the cost benefit analysis for the list of prioritized projects along the Countywide Backbone Network. The Cost Benefit Analysis is the final step in the prioritization process, using the cost assumptions and the prioritization ranking provided to and confirmed by local jurisdiction staff during the review process. Cost assumptions for each project are

normalized on a per mile basis to ensure fair comparison. Priority ranking is used to guide and determine a project's level of benefits. Project benefit and cost are then separated into high, medium, and low categories.

At the March 18th meeting, C/CAG staff will present initial results of the cost benefit analysis. Staff will focus on the high benefit projects in each of the high, medium and low-cost bins. Staff requests that the Committee members review the analysis and provide comments and directions. Final input on the analysis are due to C/CAG staff by March 25th, 2021.

The Draft CBPP was released for public review on February 10th. The public comment period concluded on March 10th, and C/CAG staff received a total of 16 sets of comments by the deadline, not including online comments. Once local jurisdiction staff and the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee provide feedback on the cost benefit analysis, the project team will review and incorporate input accordingly. Staff will bring the item back to the Committee at the April 15th meeting for further action. The C/CAG Board is expected to adopt the Plan at its May meeting.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft Cost Benefit Analysis – High Benefit Project List (will be available online at <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/congestion-management-program-technical-advisory-committee>)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: March 18, 2021

To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee

From: Mikaela Hiatt, Transportation Programs Specialist

Subject: Receive an update and provide input on the countywide subscription of StreetLight Data service

(For further information or questions, contact Mikaela Hiatt at mhiatt@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Technical Advisory Committee receive an update and provide input on the countywide subscription of StreetLight Data service.

FISCAL IMPACT

The cost to subscribe StreetLight Data service during the first year is \$275,000, which was funded with a combination of the following:

- \$50,000 from C/CAG
- \$50,000 from SMCTA; and
- \$175,000 in aggregate amount from 13 Participating Member Agencies

The annual subscription cost for the second and third year is \$363,000.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

- SMCTA Measure A Funds
- C/CAG Measure M (\$10 Vehicle Registration Fee)
- Member Agency Funds

BACKGROUND

At the April 2020 C/CAG Board meeting, the C/CAG Board approved a joint countywide subscription service to the StreetLight Data platform. Participants of the program included 12 cities, the County of San Mateo, C/CAG and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority. The user group decided to activate the subscription on September 1, 2020. The StreetLight team subsequently provided group training to the users and assisted local agencies on an individual basis. As of March 11, 2021, 465 total analyses have been conducted, including vehicle miles traveled and origin and destination studies. Currently, there are 40 active users on the StreetLight Data platform.

C/CAG staff recently conducted a survey of users on the platform. Of the 9 responses received, survey respondents conveyed that StreetLight Data was a useful tool and in general, expressed interests to continue the subscription for a second year. Users also indicated that they would like more personalized

trainings and assistance with performing analyses. The StreetLight Data customer support team has since set up office hours, providing more opportunities to work with users on a more individual basis.

Per the agreement with StreetLight Data, the cost of the subscription is set to increase from the Year 1 cost of \$275,000 to \$363,000 for Years 2 and 3. This new rate would begin on September 1, 2021, one year following the service activation date. The subscription fees are calculated based on population sizes. Table 1 below shows the actual Year 1 (2020) cost, and the new rates for Year 2 (2021), assuming the same level of participations from the cities and partner:

Table 1

Jurisdiction Size	Actual 2020 Subscription Cost	Estimated 2021 Subscription Cost*
TA	\$50,000	\$50,000
C/CAG	\$50,000	\$50,000
Large Cities (>60k pop.)	\$20,600	\$30,900
Medium Cities (15k-60k pop.)	\$12,900	\$19,300
Small Cities (<15k pop.)	\$5,100	\$7,700

*assumes same level of participation as Year 1 of the subscription

The estimated subscription cost for year 2021 in Table 1 above would decrease should more cities elect to subscribe to the service. The deadline to confirm participation for year 2 of the service is April 8th, 2021.

At the March 18th TAC meeting, C/CAG staff will present the results of the survey and provide preliminary information on usage of the platform. Staff would like to gauge interests from Committee members on the desire to subscribe to StreetLight Data for future years.

ATTACHMENT

None.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: March 18, 2021

To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee

From: Jeff Lacap, Associate Transportation Systems Coordinator

Subject: Regional Project and Funding Information

(For further information, contact Jeff Lacap at jlacap@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG TAC receive information on regional project and funding information.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A.

BACKGROUND

C/CAG staff routinely attends meetings hosted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and receives information distributed from MTC pertaining to federal funding, project delivery, and other regional policies that may affect local agencies. Attached to this report includes relevant information from MTC.

FHWA Policy for Inactive Projects

Caltrans requires administering agencies to submit invoices at least once every 6 months from the time of obligation (E-76 authorization). The current inactive list is attached (Attachment 1). Project sponsors are requested to visit the Caltrans site regularly for updated project status at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/local-assistance/projects/inactive-projects>

Please continue to send in your invoices in a timely matter to Caltrans or let them know of any unanticipated delays to your project. Obligated funds should be able to be spent and invoiced for reimbursement within 6 months. Projects not ready to be encumbered or awarded within 6 months should not be obligated.

Pavement Management Program (PMP) Certification

The current PMP certification status listing is attached (Attachment 2). Jurisdictions without a current PMP certification are not eligible to receive regional funds for local streets rehabilitation and will have

projects removed from MTC's obligation plans until their PMP certification is in good standing. Contact Christina Hohorst, PTAP Manager, at (415) 778-5269 or chohorst@mtc.ca.gov if you need to update your certification.

Miscellaneous MTC/CTC/Caltrans Federal Aid Announcements

Lapsed Project End Dates

Please review the Caltrans Project End Date (PED) lookahead report attached (Attachment 3) and work with Caltrans Local Assistance to take appropriate action.

Any work done on projects past the PED is not eligible for reimbursement. PEDs should be extended prior to the expiration of the current PED. If a PED is extended after its lapse, then the work done during the lapsed period is not reimbursable. PEDs must be extended through an E-76 modification. Please plan on the E-76 approval process to take at least 4 weeks.

Caltrans Division of Local Assistance (DLA), Office of Project Implementation provides guidance and support to local agencies in managing the Federal-aid projects. The Project End Date (PED), analogous to the previously used Agreement End Date (AED), is the date that an agency estimates to identify the end of a project phase's Period of Performance (end of Federally participating work). It is defined as the date after which no additional federally participating costs may be incurred for an authorized phase of work.

The look ahead report attached lists projects with (i) expired PED, (ii) PED to expire within the next three months, (iii) PED to expire within the next 6 months and (iv) PED to expire in more than 6 months but with lapses in the past. The purpose of this list is to alert local agencies of expired or expiring PEDs, so they can initiate PED extension requests where necessary and/or contact DLAEs for further assistance. Projects with final invoices submitted do not require a PED extension.

Mini Roundabout Training

Join Caltrans on March 30, 2021 to learn more about mini roundabouts, a low-cost alternative to traditional roundabouts.

Register for the webinar now: [https://csus.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZwKf-uhrDwrHdYv2uJe6OoeRAKpB1h-oKgk](https://csus.zoom.us/j/91612920000)

2021 CTC Local Streets and Roads Funding Program

In preparation for the annual project list submission to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) Local Streets and Roads Program, funding estimates for FY2021-22 Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account for San Mateo County is attached to this report (Attachment 4)

Project lists for FY2021-22 are due to CTC by July 1, 2021. For more information, please visit the CTC website:

<https://catc.ca.gov/programs/sb1/local-streets-roads-program>

Federal Aid Training Series: Getting Your Federal Aid Started and Environmental Requirements

The “Getting Your Federal Aid Started” online course will be held on April 14-15 and will provide an overview of key requirements and responsibilities to be carried out by local agencies using federal funds for project delivery.

The “Environmental Requirements” online course will be held on May 11-12 and will focus on the rules that must be followed to comply with requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other Federal Environmental Laws for local agency federal-aid transportation projects 'off' the State Highway System (SHS). Completion of “Getting Your Federal-Aid Project Started” is recommended before taking this course.

Register for both courses here: <http://californialtap.org/index.cfm?pid=1077>

Caltrans 2021 Publications Update

Caltrans Division of Local Assistance has released the 2021 Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) and 2021 updates to the Local Assistance Program Guidelines (LAPG). All changes have been documented in Local Programs Procedures 20-01 (LPP 20-01) and can be viewed [here](https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/local-assistance/documents/lpp/lpp20-01.pdf):
<https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/local-assistance/documents/lpp/lpp20-01.pdf>

ATTACHMENTS

1. Caltrans Inactive Project List for San Mateo County as of March 8, 2021
2. MTC’s PMP Certification Status of Agencies within San Mateo County as of March 11, 2021
3. Caltrans Lapsed Project End Dates Lookahead Report
4. FY2021-22 Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account Revenue Estimate

Updated on 03/08/ Projects > \$50k

Project Number	Status	Agency Action Required	State Project No	Project Prefix	District	County	Agency	Project Description	Latest Date	Earliest Authorization Date	Latest Payment Date	Last Action Date	Months of No Activity	Program Codes	Total Cost Amount	Obligations Amount	Expenditure Amount	Unexpended Balance
5299013	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately. Provide status to DLAE/ submit inactive justification form.	415000126	STPL	04	SM	Millbrae	MILLBRAE DOWNTOWN AND EL CAMINO REAL CORRIDOR, MILLBRAE PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA SPECIFIC PLAN	01/24/2020	02/06/2015	01/24/2020	01/24/2020	12	M23E	\$650,000.00	\$500,000.00	\$347,858.47	\$152,141.53
5935079	Inactive	Invoice overdue. Contact DLAE.	418000322	BPMP	04	SM	San Mateo County	CLOVERDALE ROAD OVER BUTANO CREEK, NORTH OF BUTANO PARK ROAD (BR NO 35C0041) SCOUR COUNTERMEASURES AND TREAT DECK WITH METHACRYLATE (TC)	04/02/2020	11/07/2018	04/02/2020	04/02/2020	9	Z233	\$150,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$52,871.62	\$97,128.38
5102049	Future	Invoice returned to agency. Contact DLAE.	417000373	BRLS	04	SM	San Mateo	BERMUDA DRIVE OVER FIESTA CHANNEL (BR # 35C0077) BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	09/03/2020	06/09/2018	09/03/2020	09/03/2020	4	Z001	\$534,414.00	\$473,117.00	\$45,925.65	\$427,191.35
5935075	Future	Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	417000250	ATPLNI	04	SM	San Mateo County	SAN MATEO COUNTY: COUNTYWIDE INCLUDING THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS. PROMOTE SAFE AND ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION TO AND FROM SCHOOL	07/21/2020	06/15/2017	07/21/2020	07/21/2020	6	Z301	\$4,036,000.00	\$900,000.00	\$530,267.29	\$369,732.71
5177030	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	413000001	BRLS	04	SM	South San Francisco	SAN BRUNO CANAL BRIDGE AT SOUTH AIRPORT BOULEVARD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	09/22/2020	12/13/2012	09/22/2020	09/22/2020	4	M240,Z001	\$7,153,750.00	\$6,333,214.00	\$6,273,956.89	\$59,257.11

Project Number	Status	Agency Action Required	State Project No	Project Prefix	District	County	Agency	Project Description	Latest Date	Earliest Authorization Date	Latest Payment Date	Last Action Date	Months of No Activity	Program Codes	Total Cost Amount	Obligations Amount	Expenditure Amount	Unexpended Balance
5438015	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately. Provide status to DLAE.	414000191	HPLUL	04	SM	East Palo Alto	UNIVERSITY OVERCROSSING US 101 BIKE PED PATH	10/25/2019	11/27/2013	10/25/2019	10/25/2019	15	LY20,HY20	\$950,000.00	\$760,000.00	\$739,979.07	\$20,020.93
5029032	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately. Provide status to DLAE.	414000103	BPMP	04	SM	Redwood City	MAIN ST, VETERANS BLVD, AND MAPLE ST OVER REDWOOD CREEK BRIDGE PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	08/28/2019	03/21/2014	08/28/2019	08/28/2019	17	M240	\$26,250.00	\$23,239.00	\$4,519.81	\$18,719.19
5333014	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	412000122	BHLS	04	SM	Woodside	KINGS MOUNTAIN RD OVER WEST UNION CREEK, 0.05 MI EAST OF TRIPP RD, BRIDGE REHABILITATION	07/07/2020	03/16/2012	07/07/2020	07/07/2020	6	L1CE	\$135,090.00	\$119,595.00	\$98,399.16	\$21,195.84
5935064	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	413000030	BPMP	04	SM	San Mateo County	VARIOUS BRIDGES IN SAN MATEO COUNTY: 35C0186, 35C0056, 35C0054, 35C0052, 35C0064, 35C0119, 35C0187, 35C0119, 35C0053 BRIDGE PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	08/19/2020	08/10/2018	08/19/2020	08/19/2020	5	Z001,1180	\$119,000.00	\$105,351.00	\$94,179.87	\$11,171.13
5333013	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	412000121	BHLS	04	SM	Woodside	MOUNTAIN HOME RD OVER BEAR CREEK, 0.3 MI SOUTH OF SR 84, BRIDGE REHABILITATION	07/07/2020	03/16/2012	07/07/2020	07/07/2020	6	L1CE	\$107,428.00	\$95,106.00	\$93,266.37	\$1,839.63

PMP_Certification_Status_Listing

PMP Certification
March 11, 2021

Expired
Expiring within 60 days
Certified

* "Last Major Inspection" is the basis for certification and is indicative of the date the field inspection was completed.

County	Jurisdiction	Last Major Inspection*	Certified	P-TAP Cycle	Certification Expiration Date
San Mateo	Atherton	8/13/2018	Pending	21	4/30/2021
San Mateo	Belmont	8/30/2019	Yes	22	9/1/2021
San Mateo	Brisbane	8/11/2018	Pending	21	4/30/2021
San Mateo	Burlingame	9/1/2018	Pending	21	4/30/2021
San Mateo	Colma	6/13/2019	Yes	20	7/1/2021
San Mateo	Daly City	10/1/2019	Yes	20	11/1/2021
San Mateo	East Palo Alto	12/19/2018	Pending	21	4/30/2021
San Mateo	Foster City	2/28/2018	Pending	21	4/30/2021
San Mateo	Half Moon Bay	11/11/2019	Yes	22	12/1/2021
San Mateo	Hillsborough	10/2/2018	Pending	21	4/30/2021
San Mateo	Menlo Park	11/12/2018	Pending	21	4/30/2021
San Mateo	Millbrae	8/31/2017	Pending	21	4/30/2021
San Mateo	Pacifica	8/20/2018	Pending	21	4/30/2021
San Mateo	Portola Valley	9/1/2018	Pending	21	4/30/2021
San Mateo	Redwood City	11/14/2018	Pending	22	4/30/2022
San Mateo	San Bruno	8/3/2019	Yes	22	9/1/2021
San Mateo	San Carlos	10/7/2019	Yes	20	11/1/2021
San Mateo	San Mateo County	7/31/2019	Yes	20	8/1/2021
San Mateo	San Mateo	11/30/2017	Pending	21	4/30/2021
San Mateo	South San Francisco	2/23/2020	Yes	20	3/1/2022
San Mateo	Woodside	11/15/2018	Pending	21	4/30/2021

(*) Indicates One-Year Extension. Note: PTAP awardees are ineligible for a one-year extension during the cycle awarded.

(^) Indicates previous P-TAP awardee, but hasn't fulfilled requirement; must submit certification prior to updating to current P-TAP award status.

Note: Updated report is posted monthly to:

http://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/PMP_Certification_Status_Listing.xlsx

Legend:	PED- lapse as of 2/02/2021
	PED - 3 month look ahead to lapse
	PED- 6 month look ahead to lapse
	PED- 6 month + (With Previous PED lapses)

Project Number	Prefix	District	County	Agency	RTPA	MPO	FADS Current SEQ #	FADS SEQ Status	PED Date	PED Expires (Months)	PED Status	PED Lapses	Lapse Occurrence(s)	Closure Milestone- Final Report in Progress	Closure Milestone (Internal)- Project Final	Closure Milestone (Internal)- FMIS Project	STATE PROJ NO	ALT STATE PROJ NO	RQST REASON	CT SUBMIT TO FHWA	FHWA APPROVAL DATES
5268(020)	STPL	04	San Mateo County	Belmont	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	MTC	1	Approv	12/01/18	-27	*Expired	SEQ# 1(12/1/2018 to Present)	1			ACTIVE	0415000290L-N		PRE	04/08/15	04/09/15
5102(049)	BRLS	04	San Mateo County	San Mateo	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	MTC	1	Approv	08/06/20	-6	*Expired	SEQ# 1(8/6/2020 to Present)	1			ACTIVE	0417000373L-N		PRE	06/01/18	06/09/18
5177(033)	CML	04	San Mateo County	South San Francisco	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	MTC	3	Approv	09/01/20	-5	*Expired	SEQ# 3(9/1/2020 to Present)	1			ACTIVE	0414000209L-N		OTH	08/31/18	09/12/18
5935(053)	BRLO	04	San Mateo County	San Mateo County	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	MTC	3	Approv	09/30/20	-4	*Expired	SEQ# 3(9/30/2020 to Present)	1			ACTIVE	0400021228L-N		CON	04/12/16	04/19/16
5935(069)	BPMP	04	San Mateo County	San Mateo County	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	MTC	1	Approv	09/30/20	-4	*Expired	SEQ# 1(9/30/2020 to Present)	1			ACTIVE	0414000091L-N		CON	04/21/17	04/26/17
5226(023)	CML	04	San Mateo County	San Bruno	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	MTC	1	Approv	11/01/20	-3	*Expired	SEQ# 1(11/1/2020 to Present)	1			ACTIVE	0419000066L-N		PRE	11/13/18	11/16/18
5935(079)	BRLO	04	San Mateo County	San Mateo County	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	MTC	2	Pend-FHWA	01/15/21	-1	*Expired	SEQ# 2(1/15/2021 to Present)	1			ACTIVE	0418000322L-N		OTH	12/04/18	
5171(024)	STPL	04	San Mateo County	Burlingame	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	MTC	1	Approv	06/01/21	4	< 6 mos					ACTIVE	0418000444L-N		CON	03/04/20	03/05/20
5029(036)	STPL	04	San Mateo County	Redwood City	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	MTC	1	Approv	06/30/21	5	< 6 mos					ACTIVE	0419000300L-N		CON	01/30/20	01/31/20
5171(023)	CML	04	San Mateo County	Burlingame	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	MTC	1	Approv	07/01/21	5	< 6 mos					ACTIVE	0418000443L-N		CON	06/23/20	06/24/20
5029(033)	STPL	04	San Mateo County	Redwood City	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	MTC	3	Approv	12/31/21	11	6 mos +	SEQ# 2(10/15/2017 to 9/11/2020)	1			ACTIVE	0414000186L-N		CON	09/08/20	09/11/20
5177(030)	BRLS	04	San Mateo County	South San Francisco	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	MTC	6	Pend-HQ	12/15/22	23	6 mos +	SEQ# 6(12/15/2020 to SEQ# 6 Approval)	1			ACTIVE	0413000001L-N		OTH		
5935(081)	STPL	04	San Mateo County	San Mateo County	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	MTC	2	Approv	09/01/23	31	6 mos +	SEQ# 1(10/31/2020 to 12/16/2020)	1			ACTIVE	0419000108L-N		CON	12/07/20	12/16/20

Local Streets and Roads - Projected Revenues

Estimated January 2021

	2020-21			2021-22		
	Hwy Users Tax Account	Road Mntnc Rehab Acct	TOTAL	Hwy Users Tax Account	Road Mntnc Rehab Acct	TOTAL
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY						
ARROYO GRANDE	429,760	319,015	748,775	472,157	349,381	821,538
ATASCADERO	726,805	542,607	1,269,412	798,916	594,256	1,393,173
EL PASO DE ROBLES	746,562	557,580	1,304,142	820,664	610,654	1,431,318
GROVER BEACH	326,488	241,510	567,997	358,584	264,498	623,082
MORRO BAY	253,627	186,294	439,921	278,385	204,027	482,412
PISMO BEACH	200,820	147,033	347,853	220,360	161,029	381,389
SAN LUIS OBISPO	1,112,937	835,228	1,948,164	1,223,937	914,731	2,138,667
County of San Luis Obispo	8,638,258	7,086,104	15,724,362	9,518,944	7,760,611	17,279,555
Total Cities & County: San Luis Obispo	12,435,257	9,915,370	22,350,627	13,691,947	10,859,187	24,551,134
SAN MATEO COUNTY						
ATHERTON	170,720	126,171	296,891	187,280	138,181	325,461
BELMONT	640,837	484,947	1,125,783	704,486	531,107	1,235,593
BRISBANE	114,562	83,715	198,278	125,550	91,684	217,234
BURLINGAME	713,708	541,037	1,254,745	784,719	592,536	1,377,255
COLMA	40,856	26,983	67,839	44,398	29,552	73,949
DALY CITY	2,544,824	1,947,389	4,492,213	2,800,419	2,132,756	4,933,174
EAST PALO ALTO	717,928	544,285	1,262,212	789,365	596,094	1,385,459
FOSTER CITY	791,982	601,285	1,393,266	870,900	658,519	1,529,419
HALF MOON BAY	300,653	225,413	526,066	330,239	246,869	577,108
HILLSBOROUGH	280,668	210,029	490,697	308,234	230,021	538,255
MENLO PARK	840,601	638,708	1,479,309	924,431	699,504	1,623,936
MILLBRAE	546,632	413,206	959,838	600,865	452,538	1,053,403
PACIFICA	907,467	690,175	1,597,643	998,053	755,871	1,753,924
PORTOLA VALLEY	113,820	83,144	196,965	124,733	91,059	215,792
REDWOOD CITY	1,990,445	1,522,601	3,513,046	2,190,286	1,667,533	3,857,820
SAN BRUNO	1,060,096	807,656	1,867,752	1,166,101	884,534	2,050,635
SAN CARLOS	703,205	532,952	1,236,157	773,155	583,683	1,356,838
SAN MATEO	2,439,284	1,866,154	4,305,439	2,684,217	2,043,788	4,728,005
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	1,567,522	1,197,073	2,764,595	1,724,638	1,311,019	3,035,657
WOODSIDE	136,985	100,205	237,191	150,137	109,743	259,881
County of San Mateo	14,295,160	9,761,638	24,056,798	15,723,297	10,690,822	26,414,119
Total Cities & County: San Mateo	30,917,955	22,404,765	53,322,720	34,005,503	24,537,414	58,542,917