



Shared mobility services planned for 2024 in San Mateo County

Published: 12/19/2022

Contact: Sean Charpentier, (415) 370-2174

Redwood City -- The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) adopted the San Mateo County Shared Micromobility Feasibility Study and Implementation Plan (Plan) at its December Board of Directors meeting. This Plan establishes the framework to allow C/CAG and our local partners to continue building an equitable and sustainable transportation option for the future.

Micromobility refers to services such as bikeshare and scooter-share, where users are able to check out various small and light-weight vehicles for short term use through a self-service rental portal. It has been envisioned as one of the tools to address first and last mile challenges, bridging the transportation gap between home and transit stations, and from transit stations to places of employment. Other benefits of micromobility includes reducing short distance vehicle trips and increasing transportation access.

Through C/CAG's effort to study the feasibility of a shared micromobility in San Mateo County, it was found that a multi-jurisdictional pilot program would be most efficient. Such program aims to reduce management and procurement burdens on individual jurisdictions, and creates a program that is best positioned to achieve the program goals of replacing motor vehicle trips, creating seamless travel options that integrate with transit, enhancing accessible mobility options and supporting economic development. "This program will help reduce vehicle miles traveled and reduce our carbon footprint by providing access to another transportation option for short-trips and connecting people to transit stations," said Davina Hurt, C/CAG Chair and the Vice Mayor of the City of Belmont.

The Plan also recommended offering electric assisted bicycles (e-bikes) in the shared mobility program, with an option for individual jurisdictions to add e-scooters and manual bicycles to the fleet. The two locations recommended for a pilot program are Daly City, Broadmoor, and Colma; and Redwood City and North Fair Oaks. This selection is based on their proximity to high frequency transit locations, and the ability to serve a large population in an equity priority community with limited access to vehicles and high reliance on transit.

"The Plan has a strong emphasis on equity as well as a goal to make the program seamless to ensure it is accessible to everyone in the County," said Ricardo Ortiz, C/CAG Vice Chair and the Mayor of the City of Burlingame.

In 2023, C/CAG will be implementing the Plan by establishing the governance committee, adopting committee bylaws, entering into a joint agreement between all participants, securing funding to launch pilot program, and then releasing procurement documents to select operator. C/CAG hopes to launch the shared micromobility pilot program in 2024.

The full Plan can be viewed here: <https://ccag.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/6.2-A3-Micromobility-Final-Plan.pdf> and more information on the program can be found on the C/CAG website at <https://ccag.ca.gov/programs/transportation-programs/shared-mobility/>.

About C/CAG: C/CAG works on issues that affect the quality of life in general; transportation, air quality, stormwater runoff, airport/land use compatibility planning, hazardous waste, climate planning, energy and water resource strategies, and solid waste and recycling. C/CAG operates as a Joint Powers Authority and has membership that includes each of the 20 cities and the County in San Mateo County.



December 7, 2022

Tony Tavares
 Director
 California Department of Transportation
 P.O. Box 942873
 Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Draft Revision to Caltrans Deputy Directive On Managed Lane Facilities (DD-43-R2)

Dear Director Tavares:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft revision to Caltrans Deputy Directive on Managed Lanes (DD-43-R2). Caltrans and Bay Area agencies have a long history of working in partnership and through CTOC to plan, deliver and operate managed lanes as they have evolved from the pilots first authorized in legislation to more mainstream methods to improve freeway operations, address carpool lane degradation, and promote carpooling and express buses. Collaboration will remain critical to collectively fund and deliver the promise of a seamless, regional express lane network that additionally reduces greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. As such, Bay Area agencies are eager to provide input to a statewide discussion to develop state policies that will frame this work. We are particularly appreciative of the efforts by Dina El-Tawansy and Joe Rouse to initiate discussion with us on this topic in August 2022 and again in November.

We support several aspects of the draft revision and look forward to collaborating with Caltrans on further policy development and implementation in these areas. Specifically,

1. GHG reduction: We agree managed lanes have an important role and support the intent to explain how managed lanes policies will reinforce this goal.
2. Conversion of general purpose lanes: We are glad to see support by the State for conversion to tolled managed lanes when appropriate, and we appreciate the discussion that has been initiated in the Statewide Pricing Group about how this may be “feasible and legally permitted” as noted in the draft DD-43-R2.
3. Non-tolled managed lanes: We are pleased to see this revision recognizes other managed lanes such as part-time use and bus lanes; since this is a newer area, we request Caltrans engage with agencies at an early stage in developing more specific and detailed policies that may live outside DD-43-R2, such as the current TBOS guidelines.
4. Equity: We thank Caltrans for elevating this important consideration, where Bay Area toll agencies have been at the forefront. We have performed equity analyses, are actively pursuing programs and intend to conduct equity analyses in the future. DD-43-R2 should describe the goals of an equity analysis and leave specifics of how equity is defined and measured to the operators, as this is a field that is evolving.
5. Operating rules: We agree that managed lanes operators should consult with Caltrans; however, policy must recognize State statute grants decision authority to operators.

The draft revision does, however, raise several areas of concern related to tolled managed lanes and our ability to continue to partner effectively with the State to operate existing lanes, meet existing

Director Tavares
December 7, 2022
Page 2

commitments and complete a regional network that serves express buses, addresses equity and reduces GHG emissions. These are summarized briefly below with more detailed concerns listed as an attachment to this letter.

1. Timing: New and changed policies should not be applied until the draft DD-43-R2 is finalized through collaborative effort with all California toll operators. Until then, Caltrans should process project co-ops, O&M agreements and amendments to existing O&M agreements quickly based on policies in place. The need for project design and construction coops should not be used as leverage to introduce terms in agreements that go beyond statute, existing authorization, and other existing agreements.
2. Honor existing agreements for extensions / phased implementation of existing express lane corridors and authorized facilities: Perhaps in an effort to articulate a forward looking state policy on pricing more broadly, the draft DD-43-R2 does not clearly recognize the current policy context for existing operations and their planned extensions, Extensions/phases of corridors (such as US 101, I-580 and I-680, SR 85) and authorized facilities (such as the MTC, VTA and ACTC express lanes networks) should be “grandfathered” - not subject to new policy requirements. Financial and legal obligations often carry through to phases or extensions not yet delivered; care must be taken not to introduce risk to legal or financial obligations to the larger enterprise/corridor or inconsistencies that will be confusing and difficult to administer.
3. Clarity vis a vis decision authority | consistency with statute: DD-43-R2 identifies operational and financial policies Caltrans would like to see implemented on managed lanes, with an emphasis on express lanes. However, statute gives considerable decision-making authority (such as business rules and use of remaining revenue) to the operators. DD-43-R2 should be much clearer about when operators have decision making authority and more careful about the use of “shall” to avoid conflict with statutory and other existing requirements. More generally, DD-43-R2 should use consistent terminology and accurately reference applicable statute(s). This is not simple - several sections of the SHC 149 (149.5, 149.6 and 149.7 for Bay Area lanes) outline roles, responsibilities and policies; however, it is important to avoid confusion as the districts implement the Caltrans policy.
4. Lease Agreements: We would like to better understand the reasons Caltrans wishes to move toward lease agreements. The proposal to move toward a lease agreement calls into question Caltrans’ intent to honor operators’ commitments to the operation, maintenance and rehabilitation of the lanes and to the use of future toll revenue toward transportation system improvements such as transit and system management. DD-43-R2 should recognize the validity of existing agreements and the need for mutual agreement between Caltrans and operators before changes are made. We are especially interested in the term of any agreements. A short term (such as 10 years) may make new facilities non-viable operationally or financially and delay buildout of the broader Bay Area Express Lanes Network putting at risk the State’s CAPTI and GHG strategy.

An underlying question worth further discussion is why Caltrans is seeking lease agreements with a fixed term and specifically whether or under what circumstances Caltrans envisions the State may play a different role (perhaps even as owner or operator) of facilities that exist today.

While not addressed explicitly in the draft policy, we would like to take this opportunity to recommend tolling agencies and Caltrans will need to work together to develop reasonable and feasible VMT

Director Tavares
December 7, 2022
Page 3

mitigation strategies. Revenues generated by managed lanes will in many cases not be sufficient to fund VMT mitigation measures on top of express lane operations, maintenance and rehabilitation – let alone the other uses of excess revenue contemplated in the draft DD-43-R2. We encourage continued discussion with tolling agencies about the approach, currently set forth in Caltrans guidelines, to analysis and mitigation requirements for high-occupancy toll lanes.


Many of us are active in CTOC and the Self Help Counties Coalition and note our comments here align with discussions in those statewide forums. We want to underscore support for discussions with CTOC, as the group that represents all existing California tolling agencies with existing contractual agreements with Caltrans. That may be supplemented by discussions with the Statewide Pricing Working Group. We respectfully request Caltrans clarify the point person in-charge of this effort at a statewide level and the steps Caltrans is taking to work with multiple groups and release a revised policy.


We individually and collectively value our ongoing partnerships with Caltrans. Accordingly, we and our staff are available to elaborate further on these comments and work constructively with your team.


Sincerely,


DocuSigned by:

1D1305B42F4441E...
Tess Lengyel, Executive Director
Alameda County Transportation Commission

DocuSigned by:

D896727CFC4F4F8...
April Chan, Executive Director
San Mateo Transportation Authority


DocuSigned by:

924A8C92DA0F469...
Sean Charpentier, Executive Director
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo

DocuSigned by:

D95D91CE6C8D48B...
Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Sonoma County Transportation Authority

DocuSigned by:

40E147986744470...
Timothy Haile, Executive Director
Contra Costa Transportation Authority

DocuSigned by:

5505C84BA7344A5...
Daryl Halls, Executive Director
Solano Transportation Authority


Therese W. McMillan, Executive Director
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Bay Area Infrastructure Financing Authority

DocuSigned by:

3BADE22182C0418...
Anne Richman, Executive Director
Transportation Authority of Marin

Director Tavares
December 7, 2022
Page 4

DocuSigned by:

Kate Miller

E283EE12A95245A...

Kate Miller, Executive Director
Napa County Transportation Authority

DocuSigned by:

Casey Emoto

5794C57A77364E4

Casey Emoto, Chief Engineering and
Program Delivery Officer,
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

DocuSigned by:

Tilly Chang

FFD2528AB88FE49B

Tilly Chang, Executive Director
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

CC: Dina El-Tawansy, Director, Caltrans District 4
Joe Rouse, Acting Chief of Staff, Caltrans Traffic Operations
Andrew Quinn, Assistant Deputy Director, Roadway Pricing
Shahrazad Amiri, Chair, California Toll Operators Coalition

Attachment



RA COSTA
transportation
authority



Attachment

Bay Area Transportation Agencies' Detailed Comments on Draft DD-43-R2, December 7, 2022

Policies as Applied to Tolloed Lanes: Clearly define the scope of the policy, including roles and responsibilities and applicability to existing, new, and expansions of express lanes. Clarify timing and process for review. Clarify if Caltrans seeks to approve any of these plans/documents.

a) General

- The DD should acknowledge facilities that have been authorized often include collections of projects (e.g., multiple corridors or multi-phased projects) intended to work as a whole. Bay Area phased corridors include I-680 in Alameda County and Contra Costa County, I-580 in Alameda County, US 101 in San Mateo County, and US 101 and SR-85 in Santa Clara County among others. MTC's express lane network (authorized by CTC) and VTA's and ACTC's networks (authorized by legislation) and the SM 101 corridor have numerous unbuilt segments that are part of a single enterprise.
- Add a clearer declaration in the introductory paragraph that the rights and responsibilities of operators and Caltrans are defined in statute, existing CTC authorizations, and existing cooperative agreements to make clear that policy recommendations in this draft directive that conflict or exceed what is currently authorized are aspirations but not requirements. Care should be taken to limit the use of "shall" except in cases that apply to all projects, existing and new; or to more clearly qualify with each use of "shall" that already authorized segments are excluded. In addition to cleaning up the policy as much as possible, we recommend adding the qualifying phrase "unless state laws dictate otherwise." While in some locations the draft DD-43-R2 acknowledges statute or federal requirements may dictate policies, use of words like "shall" on p2 makes it unclear to staff tasked with developing and administering agreements what protected rights managed lanes operators may have.

b) Lease Agreements and Operating Agreements (p2-4):

- It is unclear why the draft DD-43-R2 highlights the use of a lease term, what "other appropriate mechanism" might be, whether there is an intention to apply a lease term on existing facilities and when a new requirement would go into effect. Imposing lease terms on existing facilities that are authorized (whether for existing or future projects within the facility) may have severe consequences to legal and financial obligations of operators. Uncertainty about what may happen at the end of the lease period creates significant risk for operators and could dissuade investment of local revenue. It may be useful to highlight the risk Caltrans is trying to manage and mitigate.
- The requirement that the operating agreement between the managed lanes operator and Caltrans include an outline of how toll revenues are to be used is both unnecessary and premature. SHC 149.5, 149.6 (and 149.7 already outline the process by which such plan is to be developed. This seems to undermine the authority vested in an operator's board to make these determinations. Because financing agreements are often not finalized until after an operating agreement is complete, the details of what may be required pursuant to the financing terms and conditions will not be known in time to inform this process.
- More clarity is needed regarding financial responsibility for civil assets at the point of transfer to operators, particularly for conversion projects where assets such as pavement may not be new and may require near-term rehabilitation. The most appropriate arrangement for rehabilitation

Attachment | Page 2

Bay Area Transportation Agencies' Detailed Comments on Draft DD-43-R2, December 7, 2022

- or replacement of such assets would be for the operator to assume a share of cost proportionate to the amount of time the lanes have been tolled over the asset's lifecycle.
- Lease and/or operating agreements should clearly define operator and Caltrans roles through the project lifecycle so that project-specific agreements for corridor improvements, maintenance and rehabilitation can appropriately allocate risk and responsibilities as related to funding, sponsorship and implementation.
- c) Business Rules and Operating Policies (p2 & 4):
- P2 states "Caltrans shall determine how managed lanes will be implemented, the operational strategies used on managed lanes, and any changes to those strategies, except as noted in this Directive." While these responsibilities should be vested in Caltrans when they take on the risk, both liability and financial, to implement managed lanes, this language directly conflicts with the responsibilities reserved for operating agencies when undertaking these projects under SHC 149.5, 149.6 and 149.7. Without direct control over these dynamics, including the setting of tolls, collection and operational dynamics, a sponsoring agency could be subject to added risk for not meeting financial and legal obligations.
 - Provisions that undercut authority of the operating agency to set and modify business rules and to include lease terms may severely limit debt financing options and may discourage completion of the Bay Area's managed lanes. (Such provisions put at risk the operators' ability to pay back any existing loans or debt and clearly should not apply in such cases.) Clarify that Caltrans review does not mean Caltrans approval is required (for existing and new lanes alike). Language on p4 providing Caltrans review of any changes to business rules is concerning for similar reasons and may also conflict with statute. Rating agencies will have issues with the potential for these rules to be subject to additional review not under the control of the sponsoring agency. SHC 149.7 vests the sponsoring agency with the responsibility for "establishing, collecting and administering tolls" without additional oversight or review. Instead, any shared concerns or statewide operational discussions are best served via CTOC, which was established just for this purpose.
 - We suggest a conversation with operators to understand what business rules Caltrans is interested in being made aware of, and to the degree there is agreement, for operators to make available to Caltrans these business rules
 - Establish timelines for any Caltrans reviews so operators can efficiently navigate board approval processes.
 - It is worth clarifying that variable tolls include tolls set by a dynamic pricing algorithm as well as time-of-day pricing and that the toll setting authority rests with the operating agency. Caltrans has at times asserted that time-of-day pricing is not permitted.
- d) Use of Revenue, Expenditure Plans and Excess Revenue (p3-4):
- For every express lane in operation, financing requirements and/or statute already dictates how the use of excess revenue is to be determined and what are eligible uses. Recommend the DD clarify that the restrictions in this paragraph that exceed statutory requirements on use of excess revenue apply only to toll facilities implemented by Caltrans. For other facilities, these are desirable and may be conveyed as part of the consultation process but are ultimately decisions of the operating agency's board.
 - The DD should use terms clearly defined in state statute and include the appropriate references to statute. SHC 149.7 defines "remaining revenue" and "expenditure plan" but not "excess revenue." However, not all authorizing statutes include these terms. For example, SHC 149.5 uses "net revenue."

- Clarify the statements on how Caltrans advocates that remaining revenue be spent. It states first that "any excess toll revenues" shall be used to enhance or improve public transit. Then lists other uses: "programs that ... enhance a managed lanes system," which may include investments not focused on transit and "maintenance and operation of adjacent general purpose lanes." The DD should recognize operating agencies have the authority to direct remaining revenue to other priority improvements, including safety and operational improvements to the express lanes and mainline in the corridor.
 - The DD should reflect statutory provisions such as limiting use of excess or remaining revenue to the corridor in which it was generated. The language that excess toll revenue should be used for transit in "and near the corridor" may conflict with statutory language restricting use of remaining revenue to the corridor in which it was generated. The text should say remaining revenue may be used for O&M of GP lanes in the corridor in which the revenues were generated and that it shall not replace state funds spent on O&M more broadly (so that state funds cannot be shifted from one corridor to another).
 - The statement that Caltrans may request excess toll revenue in proportion to state resources should provide clarity on what Caltrans is seeking--revenue in perpetuity or simply as a reimbursement. The DD should acknowledge existing statute limits the use of excess revenue to the corridor from which it was generated, and the authority for determining the use of excess revenue is granted to the operating agency. The DD should also clarify what state resources it has in mind (e.g., SB1, STIP, ITIP) and provide a policy basis. This policy will have implications on the type of conditions that will be established by loan financiers. Finally, this is another instance where it would be extremely awkward and disruptive to apply a new policy to an existing facility or corridor.
 - To the extent operators have responsibilities for improving the express lanes, the policy should allow for a broader look at the operators' investment, including a range of discretionary sources other than excess revenue (e.g., tax revenue and federal funds).
 - DD should allow the operating agency to determine the term of the Expenditure Plan.
 - Define "general purpose lane additions." Are these different from "expansions"?
- e) Equity Analysis (p3):
- We agree with the need to consider equity in tolling; however, while the DD does not define what an equity analysis is, it is definitive about mitigation of "any negative equity impacts." We recommend softening the requirement to "considering equity" while this scope is undefined and working with operators to develop a common understanding on desired approach and outcomes, who/how to assess when considerations have been met, and how to apply when an agency has an existing equity program.
 - Equity impacts are not fully understood before a project is started; the understanding is an evolving and iterative process. We agree that equity should be re-evaluated and adjusted and suggest more emphasis on this point than on requiring a list of strategies be incorporated in the operating agreement.
- f) Annual reports and audits (p2):
- Define the reports to be included in an operating agreement on p2. Are these separate from annual financial audits that agencies already perform? What are the standards for performance monitoring? This section should relate to statutory requirements.

Applicability to Non-Tolled Managed Lanes

- a) Requirements for agreements and reports seem based on tolled managed lanes and don't necessarily make sense for other types of managed lanes (Bus on Shoulder and Part-time Use Lanes). Consider a table to clarify what requirements apply to each type of managed lane
- b) These lanes should not require operating agreements or leases since they are typically owned and operated by Caltrans. Specifically, does Caltrans envision that Caltrans, BATA, TAM and CCTA would develop an operating or maintenance agreement for the Richmond San Rafael Part Time Use Lane at the end of the pilot?
- c) If projects are operated by Caltrans, Caltrans should be responsible for any annual audits or reports. The language on p.2 may contradict the draft Bus on Shoulder guidelines.
- d) The directive states costs for design and construction of managed lanes should be covered through coops. For these non-revenue generating projects, Caltrans costs should be addressed as they would be for any other roadway projects.

Maintenance

- a) DD is largely silent on Caltrans' responsibilities for civil maintenance of these facilities. In many existing Operations and Maintenance Agreements Caltrans is responsible for performing civil roadway maintenance, reimbursed by the toll operators.
- b) Recommend identifying (possibly under Deputy District Director, Traffic Operations) a responsibility to emphasize and coordinate the protection of managed lanes infrastructure (communications, tolling and ITS equipment) during maintenance, design and construction by Caltrans and contractors.



COVER LETTER

November 29, 2022

Mitch Weiss, Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street MS-52
P. O. Box 942873
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Weiss,

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) and the Town of Colma (Town), we are pleased to submit herewith a 2022 Local Partnership Program (LPP) Competitive grant application for the Hillside Boulevard Improvement Project, Phase II (Project) from Serramonte Boulevard to Lawndale Boulevard in Colma.

The C/CAG, as an eligible applicant for LPP funding, is nominating the Project on behalf of the Town for the 2022 Local Partnership Competitive Program. The Town is the lead agency implementing the Project and will be responsible for providing all matching funds as well as meeting all applicable laws and regulations. The C/CAG (Nominating Agency) and the Town of Colma (Implementing Agency) have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding documenting this relationship, which is included as an attachment to the grant application.

The total estimated construction cost for the Project is \$9,100,000. This grant application requests \$4,550,000 in LPP funding for the construction of this Project. The Town is providing a one-to-one match of \$4,550,000 from the General Funds.

This letter serves to affirm that the funds received by the Town through this grant program will be used to supplement existing funds and will not supplant funds for this project. The Town also commits to requesting approval of a resolution supporting the application for Hillside Boulevard Improvement project, Phase II at the October 26, 2022, City Council meeting and affirms that costs are adequate for the proposed project.

Colma is a small town with a large impact on San Mateo County's transportation system, due to its major thoroughfares, auto dealership row, high-quality transit, and commercial centers. The Hillside Boulevard Improvements will enhance mobility and connectivity for those who choose

to walk and bike through this portion of the Town's business district. The project also centers on safety for all modes of transportation, enabling pedestrians and bicyclists to traverse safely across the street and managing vehicle speeds to help reduce the risk of fatal or serious injuries.

We hope this application will meet your requirements. If you need any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact the Town's City Manager, Brian Dossey at bdossey@colma.ca.gov or call (650) 997-8300. If you have any questions for the C/CAG regarding the nomination of the Project, please contact Jeff Lacap at jlacap@smcgov.org

Sincerely,

City/County Association of Governments
of San Mateo County (C/CAG)

Town of Colma



Sean Charpentier, Executive Director

Brian Dossey, City Manager

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

11/17/22

Mitch Weiss, Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Executive Director Weiss:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), I write in support of the San Mateo County Transit District's (SamTrans) Emission Zero Project, SamTrans effort to transition its diesel bus fleet to meet the goal of a 100% zero emission fleet by 2034 - six years ahead of the state mandated deadline.

C/CAG is the County Transportation Agency (CTA) and is also the designated Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for San Mateo County. C/CAG represents all of San Mateo County's 764,442 residents through its 21-member Board of Directors that includes a seat for every jurisdiction in San Mateo County. C/CAG's goal is to improve mobility, the environment, equity, and the economy. C/CAG also deals with issues that affect the quality of life, air quality, stormwater runoff, hazardous waste, solid waste and recycling, and land use near airports.

As part of SamTrans' Emission Zero, this project will construct the electric charging infrastructure needed to allow deployment of the zero emission fleet. Grant funding will help procure electric charging equipment and construct critical infrastructure at SamTrans' South Base Maintenance Facility (South Base) in San Carlos, California. The proposed project will allow SamTrans to deploy its near-term battery electric buses (BEB) fleet of 37 BEBs and new connections from the fully implemented *Reimagine SamTrans* approved plan which expands bus routes and increases ridership, better integrate services, and improves safety throughout the entire SamTrans bus network.

SamTrans' current average weekday ridership of 26,000 reflects a significant ridership recovery rate when compared to 2019 ridership. Nearly 90 percent of SamTrans' riders are low-income, transit dependent customers with limited to zero access to a car, making SamTrans bus service a vital transportation resource. The project will enable the deployment of BEBs from South Base for new and existing and routes aimed at serving historically underserved and low-income communities like East Palo Alto. New services such as Route EPX is planned to begin operating in 2023, providing a new connection between the cities of East Palo Alto, Redwood City, SFO and San Bruno BART using zero emission bus technology.

The *Emission Zero Project* represents SamTrans' commitment to providing access to sustainable public transit services for riders in San Mateo County, improve service reliability to critical destinations, improving air quality throughout the entire Bay Area, and promoting increased ridership.

For these reasons, we encourage your support of the SamTrans grant application. Feel free to contact me at scharpentier@smcgov.org if you have questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "San Chavante". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

C/CAG, Executive Director

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

October 25, 2022

Mr. Mitch Weiss
Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: US 101/ SR 92 Area Improvements and Multimodal Project - SCCP Cycle 3

Dear Mr. Weiss:

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) strongly supports the request of Caltrans for Senate Bill (SB) 1 Solutions for Congestion Corridor (SCCP) Program Cycle 3 funding in connection with the US 101/ SR 92 Area Improvements and Multimodal Project (Project). C/CAG is a co-sponsor of the Project together with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA), while the cities of San Mateo and Foster City as well as the San Mateo County Transit District (Samtrans), and Caltrans District 4 are major stakeholders.

This Project consists of three major components: highway interchange improvements, a Complete Street Class IV Separated Bikeway, and an Express Bus Mobility Hub at the existing Caltrans Park and Ride Lot which will help ease congestion, improve bike and pedestrian access and safety, and provide commute alternatives near the US 101/SR 92 interchange.

The highway improvements at the US 101/SR 92 Interchange, and its vicinity, will improve traffic flow, reduce weaving conflicts thereby improving safety conditions, and improve local access to and from US 101. More specifically, the highway project will:

- 1) Widen the existing loop connector from westbound SR 92 to southbound US 101 to add a lane which will reduce the traffic queue on westbound SR 92.
- 2) Eliminate the inside lane merge between southbound US 101 connector ramp and eastbound SR 92 to eliminate the weaving movements and lengthen the merge between northbound and southbound US 101 to eastbound SR 92 connectors and eastbound SR 92 to increase safety by reducing merging conflicts.
- 3) Realign the Fashion Island Boulevard Exit from the southbound US 101 to eastbound SR 92 connector to the southbound US 101 to westbound SR 92 exit ramp to prevent drivers from illegally crossing the gore area when attempting to bypass the southbound US 101 to westbound SR 92 queue.
- 4) Widen and realign the northbound US 101 off-ramp at Hillsdale Boulevard to split the left turn and right turn lanes in order to increase storage while also preventing mainline spillback and extend the eastbound lanes on Hillsdale Boulevard through the intersection.
- 5) Realign and reconstruct bike and pedestrian facilities along East Hillsdale Boulevard to improve connections to the shopping centers at the ends of the overcrossing.

Additionally, this Project includes two signature multimodal components that will improve local access for people walking, cycling, and accessing transit.

- Multimodal Component #1 – Complete Street Class IV Separated Bikeway and Pedestrian Improvements: Construction of Class IV separated bike lanes on Fashion Island Boulevard and 19th Avenue. This will provide dedicated bicycle access under the US 101/SR 92 interchange while improving conditions at the on-/off-ramps, connecting San Mateo and Foster City to the Hayward Park Caltrain Station and to the recently ATP-funded Delaware Street separate bike lanes. In addition, enhancements to signage, pavement markings and accessibility will be provided to better accommodate pedestrian movements.
- Multimodal Component #2 – Express Bus Mobility Hub: Upgrades to the existing Caltrans-owned park and ride lot under the interchange on the west side of US 101. The Mobility Hub will serve as a new Express Bus stop for SamTrans express bus service to San Francisco and as a future layover/transfer location for El Camino Real routes. The upgrades will also include electric vehicle chargers, bike lockers, real-time transit information, pedestrian scale lighting, pedestrian accessibility upgrades, and a direct connection to the proposed separated bike lanes on Fashion Island Boulevard.

The Project is identified in the Plan Bay Area 2050 as RTP ID: 21-T06-027 and aligns with all the Transportation Strategies for Sustainable Connections to Opportunity. The Project will:

1. Maintain and optimize the existing transportation system - The US 101/SR 92 highway improvements were designed to optimize the existing infrastructure with the most cost-effective modifications to address a highway bottleneck and improve operational and safety conditions of the interchange. The project is listed as a “Major Interchange Improvement” on Map 4-1 in Plan Bay Area 2050.
2. Create healthy and safe streets - The Fashion Island Boulevard and 19th Avenue Class IV Separated Bikeway will provide a dedicated, safe place for people to cycle, scoot, and roll. Pedestrian benefits will also be included at intersections with improved pavement markings, modified signalizations, reduced crossing distances, and slowed turning movements of vehicles.
3. Build a next-generation transit network - The Express Bus Mobility Hub will provide a space for the future planned service to easily pick-up and drop-off regional travelers. The future planned US 101 Express Bus service is identified on as an “Express Bus Investment” on Map 4-4 in Plan Bay Area 2050 and will provide a connection with local routes serving El Camino Real. This is in addition to the coordinated multi-modal improvements within the lot, including the provision of bike parking, EV chargers, lighting, and improvements to bicycle and pedestrian access and connections through signage and marking.

Additionally, the Project is included in the current US 101 South Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan (CMCP), titled “Improve operations at US 101/SR 92 Interchange – Phase 1 Area Improvements.” and furthers all eight goals of the plan:

1. Provide a safe transportation system to all users within the Corridor – The project area experiences higher than the statewide average in vehicular collisions. Improvements includes adding capacity on ramps to reduce queuing and rear-end collisions and changing multiple ramp merge movements to reduce side swipe collisions. Class IV bikeways will provide a separated facility for people biking including protected intersections and signal modifications through the project area.
2. Reduce recurring freeway congestion and improve freeway efficiency in moving people – The project will reduce queuing at existing congestion areas by providing more efficient turn lanes to ramp connections to minimize delay and mainline spillback (no mainline capacity is proposed).
3. Improve trip reliability along the Corridor – The ramp modifications will reduce queuing and congestion at the interchange to promote travel time reductions. The ramps improvements will also facilitate access to the Park and Ride lot where future SamTrans Express Bus services along the US 101 corridor will connect to.

4. Support an accessible and interconnected multimodal transportation system within the Corridor – The Park and Ride lot improvements for the future SamTrans Express Bus service is the first step toward the creation of San Mateo County’s first Mobility Hub. The Class IV Separate Bikeway on Fashion Island Boulevard/19th Avenue will provide a critical connection to the Mobility Hub from the Hayward Park Caltrain Station at the west end of the project area to the City of Foster City at the east end.
5. Reduce pollutants and GHG emissions within the Project area – While the VMT impacts for the highway portion of the project are projected to be net neutral since they are primary circulation improvements. The Class IV Separated Bikeway and future Express Bus Service along with improved access and connectivity between the modes will reduce VMT along the corridor and in the Project area, as well as reduce GHG emissions.
6. Support economic prosperity – The interchange improvements will provide more efficient local access to jobs in the cities of San Mateo and Foster City while also improving regional access to jobs through San Mateo County.
7. Efficiently manage transportation assets within the Corridor to protect existing and future investments The project will build upon existing facilities while minimizing right-of-way impacts and enhancing access to surrounding communities.
8. Support efficient Land Use – The project will promote in-fill development and is located directly adjacent to a proposed transit-oriented redevelopment project of a 14.5 acre site in the City of San Mateo near the intersection of Concar Drive and Delaware Street. The development is located midpoint between the Hayward Park Caltrain Station and the proposed Mobility Hub on the Park and Ride lot.

In terms of project readiness, the highway component is currently in the Plans Specifications & Estimates (PS&E) phase and scheduled for construction next fiscal year, 2023/24. The multimodal components would be built following the highway improvements because the Park and Ride lot will be used as a staging area. Total construction cost for all Project components is estimated at \$47.7 million with \$7.7 million already secured through a combination of STIP, RM3 and local Measure A sales tax funds. We are seeking a \$40 million SCCP grant funds to fully fund the project and meet the planned construction schedule.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at scharpentier@smcgov.org if you have any questions or require additional information. Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,



Sean Charpentier
Executive Director – C/CAG

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

October 25, 2022

Mr. Mitch Weiss
Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, MS 52
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Support for US 101/Woodside Road Interchange and Port Access Project

Dear Mr. Weiss:

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) strongly supports the request of Caltrans and City of Redwood City for 2022 Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP) grant funds for the Right-of-Way Phase of the US 101/Woodside Road Interchange and Port Access. The Project will reconstruct the interchange to current structural and seismic standards and add several miles of new pedestrian and bicycle facilities. It will reduce congestion for Port and industry truck movements, reduce greenhouse gas emission, improve traffic circulation and access that minimizes community impacts, provide new pedestrian and bicycle facilities to the bayfront area, and increase overall vehicular and bicycle and pedestrian safety. The Project will not only provide huge improvements to the daily operations and cargo movements at the Port of Redwood City (Port), but also enhance access to and from US 101.

In terms of Project Readiness, the Project is ready to proceed with right of way acquisition, having completed 95% of Project Design and right of way and utility requirements cleared.

C/CAG applauds Caltrans and the City of Redwood City for sponsoring this regionally significant freight project and fully supports its application for TCEP funds. Please do not hesitate to contact me at scharpentier@smcgov.org if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,



Sean Charpentier
Executive Director – C/CAG

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*

October 12, 2022

To: press@VoteNoProp30.com

Subject: Position on 2022 California Proposition 30

To whom it may concern,

On September 15, 2022 the C/CAG Legislative Committee and the C/CAG Board of Directors reviewed and discussed the merits of California Proposition 30. A majority of the Committee and Board opposed the Proposition.

The arguments opposing the Proposition centered on four main concerns:

1. Prop 30 sets a bad precedent for future initiatives from and benefiting the private sector with taxpayer revenues, which is in alignment with the Governor's no position;
2. risk to funding for education in alignment with the California Teachers Association;
3. additional movement by community out of California due to higher taxes; and
4. the timing of the measure as it relates to the already large surplus of and extensive funding in the next budget already for transportation electrification and wildfire initiatives.

After discussion, the C/CAG Legislative Committee took a NO position through a roll call vote, referring its recommendation to the larger C/CAG Board of Directors. In turn the C/CAG Board of Directors discussed the Legislative Committee's position and also voted NO on California Proposition 30 through a roll call vote.

Therefore, C/CAG has taken a NO position on California Proposition 30.

Sincerely,



Sean Charpentier
C/CAG Executive Director

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

September 21, 2022

The Honorable Pete Buttigieg
Secretary
U.S. Department of Transportation
1200 New Jersey Avenue, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20590

Re: City of Burlingame – Broadway Grade Separation Project

Dear Secretary Buttigieg:

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County, I am writing to express our strong support for the City of Burlingame's grant application for the Broadway Grade Separation Project (Project). With over 10,000 at-grade railroad crossings throughout the State of California, the Broadway at-grade railroad crossing in Burlingame remains the top priority on the California Public Utilities Commission's Grade Separation Priority List. Final engineering design is now well underway, environmental clearance has been secured, and the Project is ready for construction.

Last year, a fatal accident at the crossing reminded us of just how dangerous the crossing remains. Unsafe situations arise at the crossing on a daily basis, and grade separation presents the best opportunity to solve the problem by completely and permanently separating the railroad from all vehicular and other traffic.

In addition to addressing the dangers associated with this crossing, the Project will improve traffic flow and the overall quality of life in and around the Project area. Broadway is the only gateway to Burlingame from U.S. 101, connecting the freeway to two vital business districts, numerous small and large businesses, and 11 San Francisco International Airport-serving hotels. Ninety-two Caltrain commuter trains pass through the Broadway at-grade railroad crossing daily. When trains cross Broadway, all other transportation comes to a halt, resulting in congestion, trip delays, air quality impacts, and impacts on local and regional businesses. The Project partners have committed significant resources to bring the Project to a "shovel-ready" state. With the support of the U.S. Department of Transportation, this new critical infrastructure will improve public safety, reduce traffic, facilitate active transportation modes, and invigorate the economic vitality of Burlingame and the region while allowing train service to increase and meet statewide and regional mobility needs.

Thank you for your consideration of this application. Feel free to contact me at scharpentier@smcgov.org if you have any questions about this application.

Sincerely,



Sean Charpentier
Executive Director
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

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

September 16, 2022

EPA Region 9, Watersheds Office (WTR-3-2)
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Subject: Support for the City of San Bruno's Proposal for Advancing Design of the San Bruno Regional Stormwater Capture Project at I-280/I-380 under the San Francisco Bay Water Quality Improvement Fund Grant Program

Dear Ms. Valiela,

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), I am pleased to write in support of the regional stormwater capture project at the I-280/I-380 interchange (Project) being submitted under the San Francisco Bay Water Quality Improvement Fund Grant Program for 2022 by the City of San Bruno. C/CAG has been collaborating over the course of several years with the City of San Bruno on this stormwater capture project as part of our efforts to implement regional-scale, multi-jurisdictional, and multi-benefit solutions to stormwater management and water quality improvement in San Mateo County. C/CAG developed the initial project concept for this regional project in the San Mateo County Stormwater Resource Plan in 2017 and supported the City in securing additional funds (\$913,333) from a State General Fund Grant in 2019 to advance the project through preliminary studies and design. Most recently, C/CAG has secured a \$2.4M member-directed spending request through the support of Congresswoman Jackie Spierer's office. We strongly support planning and development of this Project as it will reduce non-point source pollution within the San Bruno Creek watershed, mediate runoff in the drainage area during large storms and help restore groundwater recharge levels, while minimizing environmental and site use impacts. The Project will also support C/CAG's efforts to establish a countywide Regional Collaborative Program to enable more cost-effective and sustainable strategies of stormwater management and to help address near and long-term water quality goals mandated by the Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit.

This Project is a central part of the proposed initial MOU-based phase of C/CAG's Regional Collaborative Program and we respectfully request your highest consideration of funding in support of advancing the Project through the next phase of environmental review and documentation.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration and please reach out to me directly at scharpentier@smcgov.org or (415) 370-2174 if you have any additional questions about our program's support of the proposed Project.

Sincerely,

Sean Charpentier
Executive Director
City/County Association of Governments, 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

September 15, 2022

The Honorable Pete Buttigieg
Secretary of the United States Department of Transportation
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Secretary Buttigieg:

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) supports the application of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) to the United States Department of Transportation's (USDOT) Safe Streets and Roads for All (SS4A) competitive grant program for BART to develop a Safety Action Plan (Project).

BART is seeking \$1 Million in SS4A All grant funding to fund BART's development of a system-wide Safety Action Plan. With 50 stations and 130 miles of track across five San Francisco Bay Area counties (Alameda, Contra Costa County, Santa Clara, San Mateo, and San Francisco), the BART system runs adjacent to many major roadways and highways, including I-80, I-580, I-880, Highway 101 and I-280. The Project will focus on reducing car fatalities on streets, roads and highways in corridors proximate to the BART system by investing in 1) first/last mile improvements to improve road safety near BART stations and 2) investments that promote and support mode shift from driving to transit and active transportation to reduce the number of cars on roadways.

The region has seen an increase of highway use throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. BART's Safety Action plan will identify high value investments to improve the safety of Bay Area roads and highways and will enable BART to seek funding for those investments. The project will fulfill the SS4A goals of reducing car fatalities on local roads and highways near BART rail lines and will also advance State priorities of delivering transportation projects that promote multi-modalism and reduce vehicle-miles traveled, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and increase equity and access to historically disadvantaged and neglected communities.

C/CAG would like to thank USDOT for its consideration of this Project.

Sincerely,

Sean Charpentier
Executive Director



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

August 25, 2022

Ocean Protection Council
715 P Street, 20th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Letter of Support for HighTide's *Statewide Socioeconomic Impact Assessment to Empower Equitable Sea Level Rise Adaptation* Proposal Under the Ocean Protection Council's Proposition 68 Climate Adaptation Grant Program

Dear Ms. McDougall and Ms. Williams,

On behalf of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) and its staff, I write to enthusiastically support HighTide's proposal to the Ocean Protection Council's Proposition 68 2022 Coastal Resilience solicitation for the *Statewide Socioeconomic Impact Assessment to Empower Equitable Sea Level Rise Adaptation* project. This proposal is in collaboration with our local partners, Climate Resilient Communities (CRC), an exemplary community-based organization and leader in the field of equitable climate resilience planning in San Mateo County.

This proposal expands on the work that CRC is conducting in San Mateo County with technical support from HighTide through the State Coastal Conservancy's Proposition 68 Climate Adaptation Grant Program. To support HighTide's proposed project under the Ocean Protection Council's grant, C/CAG would leverage existing data and planning documents to provide context and a robust set of resources for developing the proposed study to evaluate the water management benefits of rain gardens and rainwater harvesting cisterns on private properties at a countywide and statewide scale. C/CAG has a vested interest in continuing to advance multi-scale green infrastructure solutions throughout the county, and this project aligns with C/CAG's green infrastructure modeling, planning and pilot project implementation for water quality improvement, localized flood risk reduction and climate resiliency. This innovative work from CRC and HighTide has the potential to scale to other communities in the State of California to empower community-driven adaptation to sea level rise and coastal flooding.

We are also excited about the first phase of the project, the statewide socioeconomic impact analysis, which will provide a more sensitive assessment, using peer reviewed methods, of the vulnerability of communities throughout San Mateo County and the State than many current vulnerability indices are able to achieve.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this proposal, and please contact me directly at scharpentier@smcgov.org should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Sean Charpentier, Executive Director
City/County Association of Governments, San Mateo County