



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

Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Date: Monday April 27, 2026</p> <p>Time: 3:00 p.m.</p> <p>Location: San Mateo City Hall Conference Room C 300 W. 20TH Ave San Mateo, CA 94403</p> <p>Remote: 555 W. Las Positas Blvd, 1 West Hospitalist Team Room 3 Pleasanton, CA 94588</p> | <p>Join by Zoom Webinar: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85493793604?pwd=tcr1SSJW6SCeNds111hiVaamiTfO1.1</p> <p>Join By Phone: +1 669 900 6833</p> <p>Zoom Webinar ID: 854 9379 3604</p> <p>Passcode: 223427</p> |
|--|---|

*****HYBRID MEETING - IN-PERSON AND BY VIDEOCONFERENCE*****

This meeting of the C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee will be held in person and by teleconference. Members of the public will be able to participate in the meeting remotely via the Zoom platform or in person at the location above. For information regarding how to participate in the meeting, either in person or remotely, please refer to the instructions at the end of the agenda.

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. Call to Order/Roll Call | Action (Papan) | No Materials |
| 2. Public comment on items not on the agenda. | Presentations are limited to 3 mins. | No Materials |
| 3. Issues from the April 9, 2026 C/CAG Board meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approval of proposed framework for MTC One Bay Area Cycle 4 County and Local Program. • Approval of submitting grant application for the Safety Applications for Every Traveler (SAFE-T) project. | Information (Lacap) | No Materials |
| 4. Approval of minutes of March 30, 2026 CMEQ Meeting. | Action (Papan) | Pages 1-5 |
| 5. Review and recommend approval of the C/CAG distribution policy for the Fiscal Year 2026-2027 State Transit Assistance (STA) Population-Based funds, including maintaining the established 37% and 63% split between paratransit services and the Lifeline Transportation Program. | Action (Lacap) | Pages 6-17 |



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

- | | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|--------------|
| 6. | Appoint two CMEQ Committee members to serve on the evaluation panel for the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 4 County & Local Program. | Action (Lacap) | Pages 18-20 |
| 7. | Receive a presentation on the FY 24-25 Safe Routes to School Annual Report. | Information (Gaye) | Pages 21-22 |
| 8. | Executive Director Report | Information (Cheung) | No Materials |
| 9. | Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date: May 18, 206 | Papan | No Materials |

PUBLIC NOTICING: All notices of C/CAG regular Board meetings, standing committee meetings, and special meetings will be posted at the San Mateo County Court Yard, 555 County Center, Redwood City, 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 Board 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 Board meeting are available for public inspection at the same time they are distributed to all members, or a majority of the members, of the Board. The Board 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 Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406 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 Mima Guilles at (650) 599-1406, 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 jlacap@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 CMEQ Committee members, 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 read during the meeting, but such emails will be included in the administrative record of the meeting.

Spoken comments will be accepted during the meeting in person and through Zoom. Public comments will

555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, California 94063

<http://www.ccag.ca.gov>



*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*

be taken first by speakers in person, followed by via Zoom. Please read the following instructions carefully:

In-person participation:

If you wish to speak to the C/CAG CMEQ, please fill out a speaker's slip placed by the entrance of the meeting room. If you have anything that you wish distributed to the Committee and included in the official record, please hand it to the C/CAG staff who will distribute the information to the Committee members and staff.

Remote Participation:

1. The C/CAG CMEQ 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 CMEQ Chair 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: Jeff Lacap, jlacap@smcgov.org

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

**MINUTES
MEETING OF MARCH 30, 2026**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Papan at 3:00 p.m. at San Mateo City Hall. Roll call for attendance was taken. Attendance sheet is attached.

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Meeting called to order at 3:00 pm by Chair Papan. Quorum was not met

2. Public comment on items not on the agenda

No public comment

3. Issues from March 12, 2025 C/CAG Board meeting. (Information)

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Program Director, noted that the C/CAG Board received updates on the following items:

- Approval of Fiscal Year 2026/27 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Act fund
- Execution of contract with Fehr & Peers for the San Mateo Countywide Safe Streets for All Supplemental Planning Project.
- Receipt of C/CAG Title VI Implementation Plan.

Member Brown asked how C/CAG plans to monitor e-bicycle usage and what steps the county will take to educate the public on proper operation. He emphasized the importance of providing education before individuals begin using e-bikes. Jeff responded that the forthcoming E-Bike white paper will include policy recommendations and ordinance templates to help local jurisdictions adopt e-bike regulations. He added that staff plan to present the report to the committee.

Member Fromson noted that Caltrain is updating its onboard rules, particularly in response to the growing presence of larger e-bikes. She explained that there is ongoing discussion about what should and should not be allowed, as well as how policies may vary by time of day. Given the strong engagement from the biking community, she added that there will be a public process over the next few months for those who wish to provide input.

Mike Swire C/CAG BPAC member, noted that many of the current issues stem from e-motorcycles rather than e-bikes. He pointed out that much of the pending legislation at both the state and local levels do not fully address this distinction. However, he added that existing laws already prohibit riding these vehicles on public streets, which is a positive. He cautioned against creating a patchwork of county rules that could later be overridden by new state regulations, leading to

confusion. He emphasized that this is an evolving issue and should be approached thoughtfully and strategically.

4. Approval of minutes of February 23, 2026 Meeting (Action)

Committee could not vote on this action as quorum was not met.

5. Receive a presentation on the update of the San Mateo Countywide Equity Focus Areas.

C/CAG Program Director Jeff Lacap provided an introduction of the San Mateo Countywide Equity Focus Areas and introduced Katherine Turner from Fehr & Peers to present on the item.

Member Brown asked whether differences in age specifically seniors and minors, were considered as part of the equity criteria. Katherine responded that areas with high concentrations of seniors and individuals under 18 were evaluated. However, because these populations are distributed broadly across the county, age was not used as a distinguishing factor in the Equity Focus Areas (EFA) analysis.

Member Miles-Holland asked whether in combining multiple maps, the project team conducted a thorough review to ensure no areas were inadvertently excluded. She noted that while many new areas appear to have been added, she expressed concern that some communities previously included on earlier maps might not be reflected in the current version. She asked for clarification on the process used. Katherine responded that the project team reviewed the number of block groups included in prior equity analyses to ensure continuity and overlap. For any area that appeared to have been removed, the team conducted additional review using updated demographic data and sources. She explained that any changes in inclusion were attributable to shifts in geography or demographic trends that justified their exclusion under the updated criteria.

Chair Papan asked why MTC does not include the identified Tier 1 and Tier 2 Equity Focus Areas in its Equity Priority Communities criteria. C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier explained that MTC uses a significantly lower income threshold of approximately 20% of Area Median Income (AMI) whereas C/CAG's EFA framework also accounts for residents who are managing but still experiencing financial strain. He noted that while C/CAG incorporates all MTC's EPCs, the reverse is not the case. Sean added that MTC plans to update its EPC criteria. Chair Papan emphasized that this update should occur as soon as possible, given the high cost of living.

Mike Swire stated that C/CAG, along with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, should carefully consider how transportation decisions affect equity priority communities. He pointed to two projects to widen Highway 101 one in North County near South San Francisco, and another in the San Mateo area which have drawn criticism. He explained that highway expansions often lead to increased traffic rather than long-term congestion relief. He also noted that many equity priority communities are located adjacent to the highway, where housing tends to be more affordable, but residents face higher exposure to air pollution. As a result, these communities experience elevated rates of asthma, adverse pregnancy outcomes, and heart conditions linked to poor air quality.

6. Review and recommend approval of the proposed process and framework for the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 (OBAG 4) County & Local Program and appoint two Committee members to the evaluation panel.

Jeff Lacap Program Director provided an update on the process and framework for the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 4 (OBAG 4) County & Local Program.

Chair Papan asked what the PMP certification requirement for OBAG 4 funding entails. Jeff explained that project sponsors must maintain a pavement management database to track their Pavement Conditions Index (PCI), which is certified by MTC. Sean added that staff strictly enforces this requirement, noting that during the last round of OBAG funding, a project was deemed noncompliant and subsequently removed from consideration.

Chair Papan shared that she had been in communication with the City of Half Moon Bay, whose project was rejected by MTC due to noncompliance with its Housing Element. She noted that the city is currently working with the Department of Housing and Community Development to update its zoning.

Chair Papan also shared that MTC is seeking legislation to modify the requirements for Plan Bay Area to exclude CEQA requirement and refine air quality standards. She inquired if this legislation passes, what is the impact of the air quality benefits criteria on proposed project evaluations for OBAG 4? Sean responded that even if CEQA requirements for Plan Bay Area are reduced or removed, OBAG 4 project evaluations would still include the air quality benefits criteria, because it is fundamentally tied to federal funding rules and performance-based scoring not CEQA compliance.

Member Carter inquired whether the \$2.1 million of TFCA funding will be allocated towards bikeway and bike parking projects. Jeff responded that the TFCA funds there is benefit cost calculation that the Air Quality District requires. Staff will ensure that proposed bike projects that meet the cost efficiency will be considered for TFCA funding.

Member Herhold noted that the Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) set aside for the OBAG 4 program included an augmentation of \$6.3 million on top of the \$4.6 million. She inquired whether this is in alignment with previous set-asides for C/CAG's budget? Sean responded that PPM is done in 4 years cycles, but staff costs have significantly increased which resulted in the need for an additional set aside.

The committee could not nominate two members to serve on the OBAG 4 evaluation committee as quorum was not met. Staff will bring the item back to the committee at the April 27th meeting.

7. Receive a presentation on San Mateo County population trends and Plan Bay Area 2050+ regional growth projections.

Jeff Lacap Program Director provided an update on San Mateo County population trends and Plan Bay Area 2050+ regional growth projections.

Member Brown inquired why PBA 2050+ has no influence on the Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND) for RHNA cycles. Chair Papan responded that the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is responsible for Regional Housing Needs Determination.

Chair Papan noted that Plan Bay Area 2050+ (PBA 2050) is highly visionary. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) had originally projected significantly higher growth, without fully accounting for recent population declines. Recognizing this, they have since revised some of those projections to be more realistic, as the earlier assumptions were not feasible to achieve. While PBA 2050+ remains ambitious, adjustments were necessary to better align expectations with current conditions. State agencies such as the Department of Finance and the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) set key population and housing targets, including the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). Because these agencies have used differing projections, there should be a focus on better aligning their projections. The goal is to ensure that the housing targets ultimately assigned to local jurisdictions through the RHNA cycles are more grounded and achievable.

8. Executive Director Report (Information)

C/CAG Executive Director, Sean Charpentier provided the following updates:

No updates. Sean noted that this was his last CMEQ meeting serving in the role as Executive Director.

Member comments and announcements (Information)

9. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date

The meeting adjourned at 4:19 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for April 27, 2026 at San Mateo City Hall, Conference Room C.

| Name | Representing | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul (No Mtg) | Aug | Sept | Oct | Nov | Dec |
|---|--|------------|-----------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----------------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Dick Brown (Woodside Town Council Member) | Elected Official | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Tom McCune (Belmont City Council Member) | Elected Official | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Mark Dinan (East Palo Alto Council Member) | Elected Official | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Stacy Jimenez (Foster City Council Member) | Elected Official | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Stacy Miles Holland (Atherton Council Member) | Elected Official | X | X | R | | | | | | | | | |
| Juslyn Manalo (Daly City Council Member) | Elected Official | AB 2449 | | R | | | | | | | | | |
| Pranita Venkatesh (San Carlos Council Member) | Elected Official | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Bob Nguyen (Millbrae Council Member) | Elected Official | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Vacant (Council Member) | Elected Official | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gina Papan (MTC Commissioner) | Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Mollie Carter | Environmental Community | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Richard Hedges | Public Member | X | Brown Act | Brown Act | | | | | | | | | |
| Vacant | Business Community | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deborah Penrose | Agencies with Transportation Interests | AB 2449 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Peter Ratto | San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Pamela Herhold | Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) | X | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Casey Fromson | Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain) | X | | X | | | | | | | | | |

R - Remote attendance

Blank- Absent

Brown Act - Remote attendance via Publicly Accessible Teleconference Location

X - In person attendance

AB 2449 – Remote attendance via AB 2449

In-Person: Sean Charpentier, Eva Gaye, Jeff Lacap

Online: Mike Swire (BPAC); Taylor Adams, Katherine Turner (Fehr & Peers)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 27, 2026

To: C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

From: Jeff Lacap, Program Director

Subject: Review and recommend approval of the C/CAG distribution policy for the Fiscal Year 2026-2027 State Transit Assistance (STA) Population-Based funds, including maintaining the established 37% and 63% split between paratransit services and the Lifeline Transportation Program.

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee review and recommend approval of the C/CAG distribution policy for the Fiscal Year 2026-2027 State Transit Assistance (STA) Population-Based funds, including maintaining the established 37% and 63% split between paratransit services and the Lifeline Transportation Program.

FISCAL IMPACT

Based on the latest STA fund estimate published in February 2026, an estimated amount of \$2,466,306 is available in the Population-Based State Transit Assistance (STA) program for San Mateo County in Fiscal Year 2026-2027.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The State Transit Assistance (STA) Program funds are derived from a sales tax on diesel fuel. The funding for the program is split between a Revenue Based Program, which is distributed to transit operators by MTC. The Population-Based Program is distributed to the Bay Area based on the 19% share of the state's population. In Fiscal Year 2026-2027, San Mateo County will receive approximately \$2,466,306 in Population- Based State Transit Assistance (STA) funding, based on the current STA Fund Estimate.

BACKGROUND

According to the proposed Fiscal Year 2026-2027 State Budget, the Bay Area would receive \$70 million in Population based STA funds. The state allocates Revenue-Based STA to transit operators based on their revenue, as defined by PUC 99314 (b). The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) receives a share of the Population-Based STA money under a population formula.

In the past, MTC Resolution 3837 governed the State Transit Assistance (STA) Population- Based fund distribution policy. Under Resolution 3837, funding was distributed to fund northern county small transit operators, Regional Paratransit, the Lifeline Transportation Program, and MTC regional coordination programs. Paratransit and Lifeline Transportation Program funds were further distributed among the nine bay area counties.

The purpose of the Lifeline Program is to fund projects, identified through the community-based transportation planning (CBTP) process. The process aims to improve the mobility of residents within Equity Priority Communities. Identified by MTC, Equity Priority Communities are census tracts that have a significant concentration of underserved populations, such as households with low incomes and people of color.

MTC assigned STA funds to each county and then split each county's share to fund a) Paratransit service and b) to fund the Lifeline Transportation Program. MTC often added a small amount of other funds to the Lifeline Transportation Program funds, but a significant portion of the funds for every cycle came from the STA Population-Based funds.

Since 2006, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) delegated the responsibility of administering the Lifeline Transportation Program to C/CAG. In 2018, under MTC Resolution 4321, MTC established a new STA County Block Grant Program policy, whereby the nine Bay Area Congestion Transportation Agencies (CTA) are granted discretion to determine county level distribution of STA Population Based funds between eligible uses.

As the CTA, C/CAG coordinates with STA-eligible transit operators and develops the STA Population-Based distribution policy within San Mateo County. SamTrans is currently an STA-eligible operator in San Mateo County. In past cycles, under MTC, the split averaged 37% for paratransit and 63% for the Lifeline program. C/CAG has continued to set aside its share of STA funding for a Lifeline Transportation Program Call for Projects.

C/CAG staff recommends maintaining the historical 37%/63% split between paratransit services and the Lifeline Transportation Program. Maintaining the established distribution provides consistency and predictability, offering stability for both transit operators and community-based programs, and supporting effective planning and program delivery. The proposed split aligns with the intent of the MTC STA County Block Grant Program, which was designed to provide counties with flexibility to balance investments between paratransit services and equity-focused mobility programs. Furthermore, this approach allows C/CAG to directly funds projects identified through the Community-Based Transportation Planning (CBTP) process and advances mobility improvements in Equity Priority Communities.

Fiscal Year 2026-2027

For Fiscal Year 2026-2027, the County share of population-based STA funds is estimated to be \$2,466,306 per the Governor's budget. This estimate may change depending on the actual STA revenue generated.

To maintain consistency with prior funding cycles, C/CAG staff is proposing to continue the historical breakdown of 37% for paratransit and 63% for the Lifeline programs in Fiscal Year 2026-27. This would result in approximately \$912,533.22 for paratransit and \$1,553,772 for the next cycle of the Lifeline Transportation Program, slated to begin in Winter 2027.

C/CAG uses the 63% in STA funds for discretionary calls for projects for Lifeline programs and projects. Historically, C/CAG has funded two SamTrans lifeline routes through the discretionary Lifeline call: SamCoast and Route 117. Staff plan to streamline the application process for these routes on a bi-annual renewal process, given that SamTrans serves as a pass-through agency for STA funds.

Staff will return this summer with a streamlined renewal option for these routes/programs to minimize the cost and administrative burden of SamTrans submitting repeat applications for current routes.

Recommendation

At the C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting on April 16, 2026, staff presented the proposed FY 2026-2027 STA distribution policy recommending maintaining the established 37%/63% split between paratransit and Lifeline programs. During the discussion, a TAC member representing both the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) and SamTrans noted that SamTrans does not support the staff recommendation. However, no specific alternative distribution methodology was proposed. SamTrans staff were not present to further articulate their position.

Concerns raised on behalf of SamTrans included evolving post pandemic travel patterns, the increasing cost of transit operations, capital needs including bus stop upgrades, and the assertion that SamTrans riders are largely low income and align with Lifeline program objectives.

Staff acknowledges these considerations. However, staff continues to recommend maintaining the existing 37%/63% split at this time for several reasons.

First, while the formula allocates 37% of STA funds to paratransit, historical funding outcomes indicate that SamTrans receives a significantly larger share of total STA funding when accounting for both the formulaic paratransit allocation and competitive Lifeline awards. Across recent funding cycles, SamTrans has received approximately 60% or more of total STA funds, reflecting that the current framework already directs a majority of resources towards transit services.

Second, the Lifeline program is intended to fund a broad range of mobility solutions that address gaps not served by traditional fixed-route transit, including first- and last-mile connections, community shuttles, and targeted investments in Equity Priority Communities. Maintaining the current Lifeline share preserves funding capacity for jurisdictions to implement locally responsive and equity-driven programs. Reducing the Lifeline share would constrain these efforts and disproportionately impact smaller jurisdictions and community-based services.

Finally, several significant developments may affect future funding needs and policy considerations. These include the potential adoption of the SB 63 Connect Bay Area local expenditure plan, which could provide substantial new revenue for SamTrans, as well as the ongoing SMCTA shuttle evaluation

study assessing changing mobility patterns and service demands. Given these pending factors, adjusting the funding split at this time would be premature.

The TAC ultimately voted to approve the staff recommendation to maintain the 37%/63% split, with two abstentions and one objection. The TAC also recommended that this item be brought back for further discussion with SamTrans staff at a future meeting.

Based on these considerations, C/CAG staff recommends that the C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee recommend approval of the Fiscal Year 2026-2027 State Transit Assistance (STA) distribution policy, maintaining the existing 37%/63% split.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

STA Population-Based funds are allocated to the Lifeline Transportation Program, which is administered by C/CAG. This program supports projects identified through the Community-Based Transportation Planning (CBTP) process, which aims to improve mobility for residents in Equity Priority Communities (EPCs). Designated by MTC, EPCs are census tracts with a high concentration of underserved populations, including low-income households and people of color.

ATTACHMENT

1. MTC Resolution No. 4321

Date: February 28, 2018
W.I.: 1511
Referred By: PAC
Revised: 02/27/19-C
02/23/22-C

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 4321, Revised

This resolution establishes a policy for the programming and allocation of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds and State of Good Repair Program funds, made available under the provisions of Public Utilities Code Sections 99312.1, 99313, and 99314.

This resolution supersedes Resolution No. 3837.

This resolution was revised on February 27, 2019 to update the STA Population-Based County Block Grant performance measure requirements for small and medium sized transit operators as well as to make adjustments to the State of Good Repair (SGR) Program Revenue-Based program policies to reflect updated Caltrans SGR Program guidelines.

This resolution was revised on February 23, 2022 to suspend the County Block Grant program for FY 2022-23 to implement the American Rescue Plan funding exchange.

Further discussion of this action is contained in the Executive Director's Memorandum to the Programming and Allocations Committee dated January 3, 2018 and the MTC Programming and Allocations Committee Summary Sheets dated February 14, 2018, February 13, 2019 and February 9, 2022.

Date: February 28, 2018
W.I.: 1511
Referred By: PAC

Re: Adoption of MTC's State Transit Assistance (STA) and State of Good Repair Program Programming and Allocation Policy.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 4321

WHEREAS, State Transit Assistance (STA) funds are to be used to enhance public transportation service, including community transit service, and to meet high priority regional transportation needs; and

WHEREAS, Senate Bill (SB) 1 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017), known as the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, establishes the State of Good Repair Program (SGR Program); and

WHEREAS, both STA and SGR Program funds are distributed by the State Controller's Office pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 99313 and 99314, a Population-Based and Revenue-Based program, respectively; and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the San Francisco Bay Area, is responsible for the allocation of STA and SGR Program funds available to eligible claimants in this region; and

WHEREAS, MTC adopted an STA Allocation Policy in Resolution No. 3837 in 2008; and

WHEREAS, SB 1 significantly increased the amount of funding to the STA program and established the SGR Program; and


WHEREAS, in order to align the allocation of STA and SGR Program funding with the Bay Area's most pressing transportation needs; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that MTC adopts its State Transit Assistance and State of Good Repair Program Programming and Allocation Policy described in Attachment A, attached hereto and incorporated by reference, for guidance to eligible claimants in the preparation of their

applications for STA and SGR Program funds and to staff for reviewing such applications; and
be it further

RESOLVED, that the prior policy governing allocation of State Transit Assistance Funds
contained in Resolution No. 3837 is superseded by this resolution.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION



Jake Mackenzie, Chair

The above resolution was entered
into by the Metropolitan Transportation
Commission at a regular meeting of
the Commission held in San Francisco,
California, on February 28, 2018.

Date: February 28, 2018
W.I.: 1511
Referred By: PAC
Revised: 02/27/19-C
02/23/22-C

Attachment A
Resolution No. 4321
Page 1 of 5

**STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE AND STATE OF GOOD REPAIR PROGRAM
PROGRAMMING AND ALLOCATION POLICY
Exhibit 1**

This policy affects all allocations by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) of STA and SGR Program funds, made available under the provisions of Public Utilities Code Sections 99312.1, 99313 and 99314 and relevant subsections.

I. STA Population-Based Funds (PUC Code 99313) Including Interest Earnings

1. STA Population-Based County Block Grant

Commencing with Fiscal Year 2018-19 70% of the STA Population-Based funds and interest is reserved for programming to STA-eligible operators by Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) in each of the nine Bay Area counties as part of a STA Population-Based County Block Grant (County Block Grant). The County Block Grant will allow each county to determine how best to invest in transit operating needs, including providing lifeline transit services. The funds reserved for the County Block Grant shall be distributed amongst the nine counties according to the percentages shown in Table 1. Each county's share in Table 1 was calculated based on the county's share of STA funds from the Resolution 3837 formula, totaled across all categories (Northern Counties/Small Operators Program, Regional Paratransit Program, and the Lifeline Transportation Program).

Table 1. Distribution of STA Population-Based County Block Grant, by County

| | |
|---------------|--------|
| Alameda | 17.68% |
| Contra Costa | 22.18% |
| Marin | 5.71% |
| Napa | 3.49% |
| San Francisco | 8.46% |
| San Mateo | 5.06% |
| Santa Clara | 14.09% |
| Solano | 10.50% |
| Sonoma | 12.83% |

Within Alameda and Contra Costa Counties a minimum amount of County Block Grant funds shall be programmed amongst the transit operators detailed in Table 2.

Table 2. Alameda and Contra Costa County Small Operator Minimum

| County | Minimum % of Block Grant to be Allocated Annually Amongst Eligible Small Operators | Eligible Small Operators |
|---------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Alameda County | 24% | LAVTA and Union City Transit |
| Contra Costa County | 60% | CCCTA, ECCTA, WestCAT |

The following program conditions apply to the County Block Grant:

- **Reporting:** Each CMA must submit to MTC by May 1st of each year, a report including the following information about the previous, completed, fiscal year: 1) the county’s programming distribution of STA Population-Based funds amongst STA-eligible operators and; 2) the estimated amount of STA Population-Based funding that will be spent within or benefiting Communities of Concern.
- **Fund Swaps:** Each CMA is required to seek approval from MTC before requesting that a STA-eligible operator recipient of STA Population-Based funds perform a fund swap involving STA Population-Based funds. The CMA must notify all STA-eligible operators within their county of the request to swap funds before seeking approval from MTC.
- **Coordinated Claim/Submission Deadline:** Each CMA must play a coordinating role in the development of STA Population-Based claims from STA-eligible operators within their county. Each CMA must also submit to MTC by May 1st of each year a governing board-approved resolution listing the distribution policy for STA Population-Based funds amongst the STA-eligible operators for the subsequent fiscal year. Operators will continue to submit their own claims, if desired.
- **Performance Measures:** All small and medium sized operators shall be required to maintain operating costs (cost per service hour, cost per passenger, or cost per passenger mile) at least twenty (20) percent below the annual average operating cost of the seven operators included in the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP). Operating costs for small and medium sized operators shall be calculated for each mode (bus, rail, ferry, etc.) and benchmarked against the comparable modal average for the operators included in the TSP. In addition, annual year-over-year increases in operating costs for each small and medium sized operator shall be no greater than five (5) percent per year. If an operator is unable to meet the above requirements they may submit an appeal/justification to MTC explaining the circumstances that prevented achievement of the targets. Beginning in Fiscal Year 2023-24 MTC may link existing and new operating and capital funds administered by MTC to progress towards achieving the performance target.
- **Operator Consolidation Planning Efforts:** In the Northern Counties (Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma) as an alternative to meeting TSP performance requirements, counties and transit operators may develop a plan to consolidate into a single county operator.
- **Mobility Management:** In the five other counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara) each county must establish or enhance mobility management programs to help provide equitable and effective access to transportation.

The STA County Block Grant program is suspended for fiscal year 2022-23. Funds that would normally flow into the STA County Block Grant program will instead be programmed directly by the Commission to transit operators to implement the American Rescue Plan funding exchange as a part of MTC Resolution 4481, Revised.

2. *MTC Regional Program*

Commencing with Fiscal Year 2018-19 30% of the STA Population-Based funds and interest is reserved for projects and programs that improve regional coordination, including but not limited to:

- Clipper®
- 511
- Transit connectivity

In addition, a portion of the Regional Program funding (approximately \$8 million in the first year based on the estimated Senate Bill 1 increment for Fiscal Year 2018-19) will be used to pay for the administrative costs and to help offset transit fare revenue loss for a regional means-based fare program.

MTC will develop an annual MTC Regional Coordination program. All final programming will be reviewed and approved by the MTC Programming and Allocations Committee (PAC).

3. *Transit Emergency Service Contingency Fund*

The Transit Emergency Service Contingency Fund shall be used to provide assistance for an emergency response to a qualifying incident or event, under specific circumstances as described in MTC Resolution No. 4171.

The fund shall not exceed a total balance of \$1 million of STA Population-Based funds. In any individual fiscal year no more than \$333,333 of STA Populated-Based funds and interest shall be apportioned to the fund. Interest accrued to the fund shall not count towards the \$1 million total balance limit and interest can continue to accrue once the fund has reached \$1 million. Beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16, \$333,333 in STA Population-Based funds, taken “off the top” from estimated STA Population-Based revenues for the fiscal year, will be apportioned to the fund. Apportionments will continue in subsequent fiscal years until the fund reaches a total of \$1 million. In future years should the balance of the fund fall below \$1 million, funds shall be apportioned in the next fiscal year to restore the full balance of the fund, subject to the annual apportionment limit.

II. STA Revenue-Based Funds (PUC Code 99314)

Funds apportioned to the region based on revenues generated by the transit operators will be allocated to each STA-eligible operator for the support of fixed route and paratransit operations, for inter-operator coordination, including the cost of interoperator transfers,

joint fare subsidies, integrated fares etc., and for capital projects consistent with the adopted long-range plan.

III. SGR Program Population-Based Funds (PUC Code 99312.1, distributed via PUC 99313)

MTC will develop an annual investment program for SGR Program Population-Based Funds through the annual Fund Estimate. All final programming will be reviewed and approved by the MTC Programming and Allocations Committee (PAC) and will be consistent with the below priorities. All proposed programming actions will be submitted to Caltrans for approval, consistent with SGR Program Guidelines.

1. Priority 1: Clipper® 2.0

Invest in the development and deployment of the Bay Area's next generation transit fare payment system, Clipper® 2.0.

2. Priority 2: Green Transit Capital Priorities

If not needed for Clipper® 2.0, program SGR Program Population-Based funds to the acquisition of zero emission buses (ZEB) by the Bay Area's transit operators. SGR Program funds are intended to pay for the cost increment of ZEBs over diesel or hybrid vehicles or for charging or hydrogen infrastructure to support ZEBs. MTC staff will work to secure a 1:1 match commitment from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to expand and accelerate the deployment of ZEBs in the region.

IV. SGR Program Revenue-Based Funds (PUC Code 99312.1, distributed via PUC 99314)

Funds apportioned to the region based on revenues generated by the transit operators will be allocated to each respective STA-eligible operator for state of good repair projects, preventative maintenance, and other projects approved by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as eligible for SGR Program expenditure. Starting with Fiscal Year 2019-20 operators must submit their proposed SGR Program Revenue-Based projects to MTC, consistent with Caltrans' proposed amendments to the SGR Program Guidelines for Fiscal Year 2019-20. Operators should submit their SGR Program Revenue-Based project list to MTC by May 15th of each year. MTC staff will compile SGR Program Revenue-Based projects from all operators across the region and submit to the Commission for approval before submitting the approved regional SGR Program Revenue-Based project list to Caltrans by September 1st of each year.

Transit operator's SGR Program Revenue-Based projects should be consistent with their agency's Transit Assessment Management (TAM) plan.

**State Transit Assistance (STA)
Rules and Regulations
for the MTC Region
Exhibit 2**

These Rules and Regulations cover the eligibility requirements and the rules for a full or partial allocation of these funds.

Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible for any STA funds in the MTC region, an operator must comply with all SB 602 fare and schedule coordination requirements for the fiscal year. The evaluation of operator's compliance with the SB 602 program is made annually.

An operator's requested STA allocation may also be partially or fully reduced if the operator did not make satisfactory progress in meeting its Productivity Improvement Program (PIP) and/or the Regional Coordination projects for which each operator is a participant.

SB 602 Requirements/California Government Code Section 66516

Fare coordination revenue-sharing agreements, must be fully executed by all participating operators and provisions of the agreement(s) must be in compliance with MTC rules and regulations.

MTC Res. 3866 (Transit Coordination Implementation Plan) documents coordination requirements for Bay Area transit operators to improve the transit customer experience when transferring between transit operators and in support of regional transit projects such as Clipper. If a transit operator fails to comply with the requirements of Res. 3866 or its successor, MTC may withhold, restrict or reprogram funds or allocations.

PIP Projects

PIP projects are a requirement of STA funding. Failure by operators to make a reasonable effort to implement their PIP projects may affect the allocation of these funds. Projects will be evaluated based on actual progress as compared to scheduled. STA funds may be reduced proportionate to the failure of the operator to implement the PIP project/s. Progress in meeting the milestones identified for a project may be used as the basis for assessing reasonable effort.

The amount withheld will be reviewed with the affected operator. Partial funds withheld may be held by MTC up to two years to allow an operator to comply with its PIP as required by statute.

After two years, funds withheld under this section may also be re-allocated to any eligible operator for purposes of improving coordination, according to the unfunded coordination projects in the Regional Coordination Plan (MTC Res. 3866 or its successor). MTC may also allocate these funds to any operator whose increase in total operating cost per revenue vehicle hour is less than the increase in the CPI.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 27, 2026

To: C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

From: Jeff Lacap, Program Director

Subject: Appoint two CMEQ Committee members to serve on the evaluation panel for the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 4 County & Local Program.

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee appoints two Committee members to serve on the evaluation panel for the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 4 County & Local Program.

FISCAL IMPACT

Other than staff time, there is no direct fiscal impact to C/CAG at this time. Upon C/CAG and MTC approval, the OBAG 4 County & Local Program funds will be allocated to project sponsors directly.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Federal funds are allocated by MTC via the OBAG 4 County & Local Program, including Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds.

BACKGROUND*One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) County & Local Program*

The One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program is the policy and programming framework for investing federal Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ), and other fund programs throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) established the OBAG program in 2013 to strengthen the connection between transportation investments and regional goals for focused growth in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Transit Oriented Communities (TOCs), places near public transit that are planned for new homes, jobs, and community amenities.

At the April 9, 2026 meeting, the C/CAG Board of Directors reviewed and approved the OBAG 4 County & Local Program guidelines, including the proposed funding set-asides, evaluation criteria, and call for projects process.

The upcoming call for project process will distribute approximately \$27.5M in competitive transportation funding within San Mateo County. This includes \$24.1M in One Bay Area Grant

(OBAG) Cycle 4 County & Local Program funding, \$1.3M in MTC Community Action Resource and Empowerment (CARE) - Community-Based Transportation Plan Project Development Technical Assistance (CBTP TA) funding, and \$2.1M of Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Fund.

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| OBAG 4 | \$ 24.1M |
| Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Fund | \$ 2.1M |
| MTC Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) Technical Assistance | \$ 1.3M |
| Total* | \$ 27.5M |

** Target for reference, actual awards subject to competitive project evaluation and selection*

Projects submitted through the Call for Projects will be evaluated and scored to develop a recommended program for C/CAG Board and Metropolitan Transportation Commission approval. To support this process, C/CAG will convene a seven-member evaluation panel consisting of staff and Committee representatives.

Panel members will:

- Review and score submitted applications based on adopted criteria
- Participate in panel discussions to develop funding recommendations
- Adhere to the established evaluation schedule (July–August 2026)

A more detailed timeline can be seen in the table below.

OBAG 4 County & Local Program – Proposed San Mateo County Timeline

| Tentative Dates | C/CAG Action |
|--------------------------|---|
| April 2026 | C/CAG Board approval of OBAG 4 Framework and Process |
| May 2026 | OBAG 4 County & Local Program Call for Projects Issued to Local Jurisdictions and Agencies |
| May – June 2026 | Call for Projects Application Period (approximately 45 days) |
| July – August 2026 | OBAG 4 screening, scoring, and development of project nominations for MTC C/CAG BPAC review of MTC Complete Streets Checklists for OBAG 4 nominated projects |
| September 2026 | Present recommendations to C/CAG Committees (CMP TAC, CMEQ, and BPAC) |
| October 2026 | Project nomination list approved by the C/CAG Board and submitted to MTC |
| November – December 2026 | MTC’s Project Evaluation Process |
| January 2027 | MTC Commission approval of County & Local program of projects |

Due to a lack of quorum at the March CMEQ Committee meeting, the committee was unable to complete this action. Staff requests that the CMEQ Committee appoint two members to serve on the evaluation panel at this meeting to ensure timely completion of the OBAG 4 evaluation process.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The OBAG program supports equity in San Mateo County by directing funding toward projects that improve access to safe, reliable, and sustainable transportation options for all communities, including historically underserved and disadvantaged populations. Through the county program, local jurisdictions can prioritize investments in a broad range of transportation projects.

ATTACHMENTS

None

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: April 27, 2026
To: Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee
From: Eva Gaye, Transportation Program Specialist
Subject: Receive a presentation on the FY 24-25 Safe Routes to School Annual Report.

(For further information, contact Eva Gaye at egaye@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee receive a presentation on the FY24-25 Safe Routes to School Annual Report.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The San Mateo County Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program for FY 2024-2025 was funded using a combination of federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funds from the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program and local Measure M funding, which is the \$10 vehicle registration fee levied in San Mateo County.

BACKGROUND

Since 2011, C/CAG has partnered with the San Mateo County Office of Education (SMCOE) to implement the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program. The program is guided by the nationally recognized Six E’s framework Education, Engagement, Encouragement, Evaluation, Engineering, and Equity which provides a comprehensive approach to promoting safe, active, and sustainable school transportation.

The program provided support to 128 schools across the County and organized various bike and pedestrian safety events which included Perfection on Wheels, Bike Mobile, Marine Science Institute, and Safe Moves which saw participation from elementary, middle and high school students across the county.

In addition, the SRTS program implemented the fourth cycle of the School Travel Fellowship Program during Fiscal Year 2024-2025, an innovative initiative designed to support municipalities in partnering with schools and community organizations to promote safe and accessible active transportation around school environments.

This cycle selected five teams from San Carlos, Millbrae, East Palo Alto, South San Francisco, and the County of San Mateo. Each team included school representatives, community partners, and city staff who collaborated on demonstration projects, quick-build interventions, and other innovative strategies to improve traffic safety in school areas. A standout example is the City of San Carlos team, which worked closely with multiple partners including the city, SamTrans, and three schools on a shared campus (Tierra Linda Middle School, Mariposa Upper School, and Charter Learning Center). Together, they relocated a bus stop that was no longer safely accommodating student demand. The team also partnered with the city to remove parking along Dartmouth Avenue near the schools and established a safer pedestrian walkway through the school parking lot, improving overall student access and safety.

Impact of SRTS Program

To evaluate the effectiveness of the SRTS Program, the County Office of Education conducted the [School Travel Tally Database](#), during FY 2024–2025, providing access to a comprehensive countywide dataset on school travel behavior. The database captures commuting patterns for students and their families and includes an interactive map that allows users to compare travel trends across school districts and examine individual school-level data in greater detail.

For FY 2024–2025, the data show that 17% of students walk to school, 5% use public transit, and 63% travel by private vehicle. These results remain consistent with those reported in FY 2023–2024.

Equity Impacts and Considerations

The San Mateo County Safe Routes to School Program’s commitment to equity extends to educational opportunities, outreach events, and partnerships to improve safety in priority schools. The program further prioritizes grant funding in schools that are in MTC Equity Priority Communities.

ATTACHMENTS

1. FY 2024-2025 Safe Routes to School Annual Report (*will be available online at: [Congestion Management and Environmental Quality | C/CAG](#)*)