



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

Date: Monday August 31, 2026 Time: 3:00 p.m. Location: San Mateo City Hall Conference Room C 300 W. 20 TH Ave San Mateo, CA 94403	Join by Zoom Webinar: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89461896485?pwd=3smOqDn0qCKMZaZl4z0u71K7T3Hain.1 Join By Phone: +1 669 900 6833 Zoom Webinar ID: 894 6189 6485 Passcode: 360087
--	--

*****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 June 11 th C/CAG Board meeting: • Adoption of the C/CAG annual budget • Accepted the updated San Bruno/South San Francisco Community Based Transportation Plan.	Information (Lacap)	No Materials
4.	Approval of minutes of February 23 rd and March 27 th , 2026 CMEQ Meeting.	Action (Papan)	Pages 1-9
5.	Receive a presentation on the MTC Transit Priority Update.	Information (Lacap)	Pages 10-11
6.	Receive a presentation on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan update.	Information (Lacap)	Pages 12-14
7.	Receive information on the framework for the upcoming Lifeline Cycle 8 Call for Projects.	Information (Gaye)	Pages 15-19
8.	Executive Director Report	Information (Cheung)	No Materials
8.	Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date September 28, 2026	Papan	No Materials



*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*

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 Jeff Lacap at (650)-599-1455 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 Jeff Lacap at (650) 599-1455, 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 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

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*

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 FEBRUARY 23, 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 met with 8 voting members present. Member Hedges participated remotely via Brown Act but did not count towards quorum as his location was outside of the County jurisdiction. Member Dinan arrived after roll call.

2. Public comment on items not on the agenda

No public comment

3. Issues from February 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 the latest population data from Department of Finance for calculation of member contributions and administrative related items
- Receipt of executed contract with Transpo Group for professional services to prepare a \$6M BUILD application.
- Received presentation on the upcoming Cycle 4 of the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 4) County & Local Program, and the FY2026–2028 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program Calls for Projects

Chair Papan asked about the status of the latest population data. C/CAG Executive Director Sean Charpentier responded that population data is updated annually. He noted that the underlying planning document, Plan Bay Area, has revised its growth projections downward to reflect trends that have become more apparent since COVID.

Member Brown requested that staff provide an update on the trend line from the Department of Finance population data estimates.

4. Approval of minutes of January 26, 2026 Meeting (Action)

Motion to approve Minutes of the January 26, 2025 CMEQ Meeting. Holland/Hedges. Papan, Brown, Venkatesh, Jimenez, Miles-Holland, McCune, Dinan, Carter, Hedges. *Motion Passes 8-0 (by all members present)*

Member Dinan joined the meeting.

Member Papan requested that staff send a letter to Committee members who have missed three or more committee meetings.

5. Review and recommend approval of the Fiscal Year 2026/27 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Fund. (Action).

Matt Petrofsky, C/CAG staff presented on the Fiscal Year 2026/27 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Fund.

Chair Papan asked about the Commute.org–BART Shuttle project, which is recommended to receive \$60K in estimated TFCA funding. She noted that some stations may potentially close and asked whether that would affect the funding. Matt replied that if shuttle closures occur, routes would be adjusted accordingly. He added that while a few shuttles were discontinued last year, ridership on the remaining routes had increased.

Chair Papan asked whether TFCA funding has been used for Safe Routes to School projects. Sean responded that TFCA funding has been used only for eligible Safe Routes projects. Sean also added that staff are considering folding TFCA FYE27 funds into the OBAG 4 call for projects.

Member Brown asked what studies have been conducted to measure how much biking is used for commuting versus recreation purposes. He noted that, in Woodside, bicycle lanes appear to be used primarily for recreation rather than commuting and said this distinction should be measurable. Matt responded that he is not aware of any studies that directly address this question. However, he explained that decisions about infrastructure and its placement are guided by the TFCA program criteria, and that cost-effectiveness is calculated using ADT (average daily vehicle trips). While this is not a one-to-one comparison, ADT also does not distinguish between commuter or recreational driving travel. Sean added that when the C/CAG Bike and Pedestrian Plan is updated, a more detailed breakdown of these statistics can be provided. He also noted that bike lanes in hillside communities tend to be used more for recreation, whereas those in Bayside communities are more often used for commuting. Sean also added that Silicone Valley Bicycle Coalition typically conducts surveys to assess bicycle usage.

Member Miles-Holland inquired if we track bike usage as it connects to public transit usage. Member Fromson responded that Caltrain reports on the number bikers using Caltrain and the percentage of ridership that take bikes onto the train and she would be happy to share that information.

Member Venkatesh asked whether the \$4 fee that funds the TFCA relates to VRF. Sean clarified that the funds are from Bay Area Air District and are not related.

Member Hedges shared that the percentage of bike share in Central Peninsula is about 1%. He stressed the importance of more protected bicycle infrastructure, especially for promoting safety near schools.

Member Jimenez asked about the availability of TFCA funds and whether Foster City would be eligible to apply for electrification projects. Sean responded that the TFCA program typically has about \$400K available for electrification projects after funding the Commute.org Shuttle program. He added that the \$420K may be combined with the *other projects to be determined (bikeway and bike parking specific)* \$1.7 million to support OBAG Active Transportation projects.

Motion to approve the Fiscal Year 2026/27 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Fund. Venkatesh/Jimenez. Papan, Brown, Venkatesh, Jimenez, Miles-Holland, McCune, Dinan, Carter, Hedges. Motion Passes 9-0.

6. Receive an update on Cycle 4 of the MTC One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 4) County & Local Program. (Information)

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Program Director presented on the MTC One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 4) County & Local Program.

Member Dinan asked whether evaluation panel members would need to recuse themselves when applying for the grant program. Jeff responded that the process is being modeled after the State's ATP program, where a subset of applications is assigned to each panel member, and efforts are made to avoid assigning reviewers applications from their own jurisdictions.

Chair Papan asked whether this portion of the OBAG funding is automatic. Sean responded that the County and Local Program distribution provided through funding targets, noting that MTC does not allow federal transportation funds to be sub-allocated by formula.

Committee members provided comments and questions only. No formal action was needed.

7. Executive Director Report (Information)

C/CAG Executive Director, Sean Charpentier provided the following updates for the 2026 look ahead:

- Coastal Resiliency earmark was included in the Omnibus budget that was approved, so \$1.2 to start emergency planning on the coast, thanks to Congressman Liccardo.
- The stormwater team received half a million dollars in Clean California grant to work on trash capture and trash and litter prevent pickup and prevention, primarily along the El Camino corridor with Climate-Resilient Communities and the San Jose Conservation Corps.
- Upcoming Grant Applications for Submission:
 - o \$6 M in Build Grant Application

- o \$2.3 M in Stormwater projects including construction of Fordham Avenue in East Palo Alto.
 - \$500K for two school greening projects in Daly City
 - \$1.5M to begin the green infrastructure planning and sustainable street planning on Grand Ave in South San Francisco
- \$1M One Watershed Strategic Plan, which is the next vision of green infrastructure projects, because we're working our way through the ones in the prior plan.
- \$3 million application to the state to help some of our member agencies clean up PCBs and meet that regulatory component of the regional permit.

8. Member comments and announcements (Information)

Chair Papan provided an update on MTC's upcoming Transit Oriented Communities meeting. They have an ad hoc committee providing two proposals for jurisdictions without their housing elements certified.

9. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for March 30, 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										
Tom McCune (Belmont City Council Member)	Elected Official	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											
Juslyn Manalo (Daly City Council Member)	Elected Official	AB 2449											
Pranita Venkatesh (San Carlos Council Member)	Elected Official		X										
Bob Nguyen (Millbrae Council Member)	Elected Official												
Vacant (Council Member)	Elected Official												
Gina Papan (MTC Commissioner)	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	X	X										
Mollie Carter	Environmental Community	X	X										
Richard Hedges	Public Member	X	Brown Act										
Vacant	Business Community												
Deborah Penrose	Agencies with Transportation Interests	AB 2449											
Peter Ratto	San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)	X	X										
Pamela Herhold	Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	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

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

**MINUTES
MEETING OF APRIL 27, 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 met at 3:20pm

2. Public comment on items not on the agenda

No public comment

3. Issues from April 9, 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 the proposed framework for the One Bay Area Grants Cycle 4 county and local program.
- Approval of a grant application submittal for the C/CAG Safety Applications for Every Traveler (SAFE-T) project.
- Christopher Sturken appointed to the CMEQ Committee

4. Approval of minutes of March 30, 2026 Meeting (Action)

Motion to approve Minutes of the March 30, 2026 CMEQ Meeting. Hedges/Venkatesh. Papan, Venkatesh, Jimenez, Miles-Holland, Carter, Penrose, Hedges and Sturken. Motion Passes 8-0

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.

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Program Director, provided an overview of the proposed distribution policy for Fiscal Year 2026-27 State Transit Assistance (STA) Population-Based funds, including maintaining the established 37% allocation for paratransit services and 63% allocation for the Lifeline Transportation Program. He noted that the proposal was presented to the CMP Technical Advisory Committee at their April 2026 meeting and that SamTrans did not support maintaining the existing funding split; however, no alternative distribution was proposed.

Jeff further explained that the San Mateo County Transportation Authority's (SMCTA) shuttle program evaluation is currently underway and that adjusting the STA funding split before the results are available would be premature. He also acknowledged concerns regarding increasing transit operating and capital costs, including bus stop improvements. Based on historical funding allocations, SamTrans receives approximately 60% of the total STA Population-Based funds through a combination of the paratransit allocation and competitive Lifeline Transportation Program awards. Jeff also highlighted that staff are exploring a streamlined renewal process for SamTrans Route 117 and SamCoast operational projects.

Member Hedges asked what portion of STA funding could be used for vehicle purchases. Jeff Lacap explained that MTC no longer provides the funding source that previously allowed vehicle purchases under the Lifeline program.

Member Miles-Holland inquired whether any additional routes should be considered for the streamlined renewal process. Jeff noted that Daly City and Menlo Park projects have received Lifeline funding since the program's inception. However, given the ongoing SMCTA shuttle program evaluation, staff recommend waiting until the study results are available before considering these projects for inclusion in the streamlined renewal process.

Member Venkatesh inquired about how the Lifeline Transportation Program operates. Jeff explained that C/CAG administers the program through a competitive Call for Projects process. To be eligible, projects must be identified through a Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) or a similar planning process that identifies the transportation needs of disadvantaged communities. C/CAG solicits applications, evaluates and ranks eligible projects, and awards funding based on the results of the competitive evaluation process.

Chair Papan noted that CalEPA is in the process of redefining disadvantaged communities and inquired how the changes could affect MTC Equity Priority Community (EPC) designations in San Mateo County and the Lifeline Transportation Program. Chair Papan urged C/CAG to submit a letter to the Bay Area Caucus advocating for San Mateo County to retain its existing EPC designations. Jeff responded that MTC will be initiating its EPC refresh. He noted that any resulting changes could affect eligibility in future Lifeline Transportation Program cycles but would not affect the program's upcoming funding cycle.

Member Sturken requested additional information regarding the scoring criteria and process used to determine Lifeline Transportation Program funding awards. Jeff Lacap explained that applications are evaluated based on several factors, including the demonstrated need and benefits of the proposed project, the population and communities served, and whether the project is identified in a Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) or similar planning document. For capital projects, C/CAG also evaluates the proposed project schedule and readiness to ensure the project can be delivered in accordance with the program's timely use of funds requirements.

Motion to approve 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.

Hedges/ Venkatesh. Papan, Venkatesh, Jimenez, Miles-Holland, Carter, Penrose, Hedges and Sturken. Motion Passes 8-0

Member Manalo joined the meeting virtually and noted she was in route.

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

Jeff Lacap, C/CAG Program Director, provided an overview of the OBAG 4 schedule and requested that the committee appoint two members to serve on the evaluation panel.

Member Hedges, Sturken and Manalo volunteered to serve on the OBAG 4 evaluation panel.

Motion to appoint Rich Hedges and Christopher Sturken to serve on the evaluation panel for the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 4 County & Local Program. Jimenez/ Miles-Holland. Papan, Venkatesh, Jimenez, Miles-Holland, Carter, Penrose, and Sturken. Motion Passes 7-0-1. Hedges Abstained.

7. Receive a presentation on the FY 24-25 Safe Routes to School Annual Report.

Eva Gaye, C/CAG staff introduced Theresa Vallez- Kelly SRTS Coordinator from County Office of Education to give an overview of the FY24-25 SRTS Annual Report.

8. Executive Director Report (Information)

Kaki Cheung, C/CAG Acting Executive Director, noted that Sean Charpentier's last day was April 24th. She thanked

9. Member comments and announcements (Information)

10. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date

The meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for May 18, 2026 at San Mateo City Hall, Conference Room C.

Name	Representing	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May (No Mtg)	Jun (No Mtg)	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		X								
Stacy Miles Holland (Atherton Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X	R	X								
Juslyn Manalo (Daly City Council Member)	Elected Official	AB 2449		R	R								
Pranita Venkatesh (San Carlos Council Member)	Elected Official	X	X	X	X								
Bob Nguyen (Millbrae Council Member)	Elected Official			X									
Christopher Sturken (Council Member)	Elected Official				Brown Act								
Gina Papan (MTC Commissioner)	Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)	X	X	X	X								
Mollie Carter	Environmental Community	X	X	X	X								
Richard Hedges	Public Member	X	Brown Act	Brown Act	X								
Vacant	Business Community												
Deborah Penrose	Agencies with Transportation Interests	AB 2449			X								
Peter Ratto	San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)	X	X	X	X								
Pamela Herhold	Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)	X		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: Kaki Cheung, Jeff Lacap

Online: Eva Gaye, Theresa Vallez-Kelly (SMCOE)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 31, 2026

To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee

From: Jeff Lacap, Program Director

Subject: Receive a presentation on the MTC Transit Priority Update.

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee receive a presentation on the MTC Transit Priority Update.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no financial impact related to this item.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

BACKGROUND

In 2021, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adopted the Bay Area Transit Transformation Action Plan, a strategic framework aimed at enhancing the customer experience and improving the efficiency of transit operations across the region. A key priority of the Action Plan is to improve bus speed and reliability through regional coordination and local implementation.

1. *Transit Priority Policy for Roadways (TPPR)*: Adopted by the Commission in January 2026 (MTC Resolution No. 4739), the TPPR is the region's official transit priority policy. It is implemented through the existing MTC Complete Streets Checklist and applies to roadway projects that receive MTC discretionary funding or seek MTC endorsement.
2. *Conduct a Regional Transit Assessment (RTA) and Develop a Transit Priority Network (TPN)*: MTC is also conducting a Regional Transit Assessment, which includes a Corridor Assessment to identify where bus service improvements are most needed. This work will inform the development of the Transit Priority Network (TPN), a designated network of corridors where transit will be prioritized based on data-driven thresholds (e.g., buses per hour, passenger volumes) and stakeholder engagement.

The draft TPN defines a regional network of key transit roadways. On these roadways, projects should consider best-practice transit-supportive design elements (not only mitigating project impacts to transit, but also striving to improve transit), and transit-supportive investments should be prioritized for funding. Once the TPN is adopted, these considerations will apply to projects on the network under the TPPR.

MTC staff, in conjunction with a technical advisory committee comprised of transit agency, city, county transportation agency, and Caltrans staff, developed the draft TPN. The network was designed to form a coherent regional system, drawing on factors such as ridership, service frequency, local plans and policies, and regional growth geographies (including Equity Priority Communities), and informed by stakeholder input. MTC released the draft TPN in summer 2026 and anticipates adopting a final network in winter 2027.

Feedback on the draft TPN can be submitted through MTC's public comment webform, and questions may be directed to transitpriority@bayareametro.gov.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The MTC Transit Priority Network advances equitable access by prioritizing transit-supportive design and investment on key transit roadways, improving transit travel times and reliability for the communities that most depend on transit. Equity Priority Communities (EPCs) were among the factors considered in developing the network.

ATTACHMENTS

1. MTC Transit Priority Update Presentation (The attachment is available on the C/CAG website. See "Additional Agenda Materials" for the relevant Committee meeting at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/congestion-management-and-environmental-quality-committee/>)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 31, 2026

To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

From: Jeff Lacap, Program Director

Subject: Receive a presentation on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan update.

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee receive a presentation on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP).

FISCAL IMPACT

This presentation is information only, and has no fiscal impact associated with this action. The cost to update the Plan is \$399,992.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Per Resolution 24-59, C/CAG entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) to collectively participate in funding the cost to complete the upcoming update of the CTP in San Mateo County. The total cost of this effort is to be split 50/50 between C/CAG and SMCTA. C/CAG share of funding will come from the C/CAG Congestion Relief Fund.

BACKGROUND

A Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) establishes a long-range vision and goals for the transportation system and recommends the project priorities and strategies to achieve them over time. Because the CTP is a primary input into the San Francisco Bay Area's Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS, or "Plan Bay Area") prepared by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), it plays a critical role in regional transportation and land use planning. MTC adopted the current plan, Plan Bay Area 2050, in 2021 and is now developing a limited and focused update, Plan Bay Area 2050+. The next major update is expected to begin in 2026 and be adopted in 2029, and MTC recommends that CTPs be completed by 2026 to inform the next regional transportation plan.

The last iteration, the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan 2040 (SMCTP 2040), was adopted by the C/CAG Board on February 9, 2017. Since then, substantial population and employment growth, completed transportation projects and planning efforts, pandemic-driven changes in commute patterns, and updated MTC guidelines and equity and climate policies have prompted this update.

C/CAG is updating the CTP for San Mateo County in collaboration with the San Mateo County

Transportation Authority (SMCTA). Beginning in November 2025, C/CAG and SMCTA staff entered the first phase of outreach, drawing on nearly five years of recent public engagement to shape and validate the draft vision and goals, and have presented to over 30 committees to date.

DRAFT CTP PROJECT LIST

A key component of the CTP update is the development of a transportation project list. The list has two parts: a list of regionally significant projects, referred to as Large Projects, and a separate list of transportation programs. Projects represent regionally significant infrastructure investments, operational changes, or policy actions that add, remove or alter transportation capacity or network elements, or otherwise materially change travel patterns across a large geographic area. Programmatic Funding Categories encompass smaller transportation efforts that are not regionally significant. These categories establish priorities for eligible project types while providing flexibility to respond to changing transportation needs. Most local jurisdiction projects are expected to fall under a Programmatic Funding Category rather than being listed individually.

The project list will also serve as a primary input into MTC's next major update to Plan Bay Area. To be included as a regionally significant project, a project must meet at least one of MTC's screening thresholds. These include, among others: expanding, extending, or reducing the lanes of the principal arterial system over a length greater than one-quarter mile; adding new or expanded access to the principal arterial system, such as new or modified interchanges; extending or expanding fixed guideway transit infrastructure; adding new or expanded transit stations, terminals, or parking facilities; expanding transit fleets or service levels; altering the cost to users of the transportation system, such as tolling, cordon pricing, or transit fares; or a total estimated cost (capital plus operating and maintenance) greater than \$250 million.

In July 2026, the project team began compiling a draft CTP Project List. This preliminary list draws from recently programmed projects, adopted call-for-projects awards, and priority projects identified in corridor and modal plans. Sources included San Mateo County's Plan Bay Area 2050+ transportation project list, the SMCTA Strategic Plan, and SMCTA US-101 corridor multimodal strategies.

The project team distributed agency-specific draft project list workbooks and requested that each agency provides input in three areas:

1. Confirm the existing Large Projects and provide the project information needed for future travel demand modeling;
2. Identify any additional Large Projects not currently captured; and
3. Identify up to five top priority projects, regardless of project size.

The project information collected from local agencies will be shared during the upcoming round of engagement with city councils this fall. With the collected data, the project team will work on assembling the final project list to be incorporated into the CTP. C/CAG staff requests that local jurisdiction continue to provide any relevant project information before September 4th, 2026.

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan is a countywide plan that advances equity by ensuring all residents in San Mateo County have access to safe and reliable modes of transportation by recommending transportation project priorities and strategies that will achieve the vision and goals over time.

ATTACHMENTS

1. San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan Update Presentation (The attachment is available on the C/CAG website. See “Additional Agenda Materials” for the relevant Committee meeting at: <https://ccag.ca.gov/committees/congestion-management-and-environmental-quality-committee/>)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 31, 2026

To: Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee

From: Eva Gaye, Transportation Program Specialist

Subject: Receive information on the framework for the upcoming Lifeline Cycle 8 Call for Projects.

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee receives information on the framework for the upcoming Lifeline Cycle 8 Call for Projects.

FISCAL IMPACT

Based on the latest STA fund estimate published in August 2026, an estimated amount of \$4.9M is available in the Population-Based State Transit Assistance (STA) program for San Mateo County in FY 26/27 through FY 27/28. Final grant amount will be provided at the September Committee meeting.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The State Transit Assistance (STA) Program funds are derived from a sales tax on diesel fuel. Program funding is split between a Revenue Based Program, which is distributed to transit operators by MTC, and the Population-Based Program, which is distributed to the Bay Area based on the 19% share of the state's population.

BACKGROUND

State Transit Assistance (STA) County Block Grant Program

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

As the County Transportation Agency (CTA), C/CAG coordinates with STA-eligible transit operators and develops the STA Population-Based distribution strategy. Beginning in Fiscal Year

2018-2019, C/CAG and SamTrans staff have coordinated and developed an annual STA Population-Based distribution policy. In past cycles, under the STA Block Grant Program, the split averaged 37% for paratransit and 63% for the Lifeline program. C/CAG will continue with this split for the FY 26/27 cycle and allocate its share towards the Lifeline Transportation Program. The distribution policy for the FY26/27 State Transit Assistance (STA) Population-Based funds was approved by the TAC at the April 16th meeting and the CMEQ Committee at its April 27th meeting, followed by C/CAG Board adoption at the May 14th meeting.

Lifeline Transportation Program

The purpose of the Lifeline Transportation Program is to fund transportation projects identified in, or derived from, Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) and other local planning efforts serving disadvantaged communities. MTC's Equity Priority Communities are areas with high concentrations of low-income and minority households and/or other populations that face transportation or economic barriers, such as people with disabilities, seniors, and cost-burdened renters.

San Mateo County currently has six CBTPs: Bayshore, East Palo Alto, North Central San Mateo, San Bruno/South San Francisco, Daly City, and Southeast San Mateo County. These plans identify transportation needs and solutions intended to benefit Equity Priority Communities. Projects identified in CBTPs will continue to receive priority consideration in Cycle 8.

Historical Allocation of Lifeline Program and Cycle 8 Need for Change

C/CAG has historically used a competitive Call for Projects process for the Lifeline Transportation Program. Since Cycle 2, SamTrans' Route 117 and SamCoast projects have received recurring Lifeline funding. Other locally sponsored operations projects have also received Lifeline funding over multiple cycles.

For Cycle 8, C/CAG proposes piloting a streamlined renewal process for established operations projects where a full competitive application would provide limited additional evaluative value. The purpose is to reduce repeated administrative review for stable, recurring services while preserving competition for new, expanded, materially changed, or otherwise uncertain projects.

The proposed streamlined process is project-based and is not intended to create a permanent entitlement for any sponsor or project. Funding would remain subject to continued Lifeline eligibility, available State Transit Assistance (STA) resources, staff review, committee consideration, and C/CAG Board approval.

Proposed C/CAG Lifeline Cycle 8 Framework

Cycle 8 would use a three-step funding structure: (1) determine whether an established operations project qualifies for streamlined renewal; (2) establish funding for qualifying streamlined projects using an objective historical baseline and funding safeguards; and (3) conduct a competitive Call for Projects process for all remaining Lifeline funds.

Step 1: Determine eligibility for streamlined renewal

For the Cycle 8 pilot, staff recommends that a project that is operational in nature be considered for streamlined renewal when it: (1) provides an established, ongoing transportation service; (2) has a demonstrated history of recurring Lifeline funding over multiple cycles (i.e., five or more cycles); (3) has a substantially stable scope and service model and is expected to continue operating during the Cycle 8 funding period; and (4) continues to meet Lifeline Program eligibility and performance requirements.

Based on these criteria, staff recommend that SamTrans' SamCoast and Route 117 qualify for streamlined renewal in Cycle 8. Both are established SamTrans operations projects with recurring Lifeline funding histories, stable service functions, and continued relevance to Lifeline-eligible communities.

C/CAG recognizes that other locally sponsored operations projects have also received Lifeline funding over multiple cycles. Some of these services are currently undergoing broader evaluation regarding service design, operating needs, funding availability, or long-term continuation. Because the streamlined process is intended for continuation of services with a sufficiently stable scope and funding need, staff recommends that those projects continue through the competitive process for Cycle 8. Eligibility for streamlined renewal may be reconsidered in a future cycle if service and funding conditions become sufficiently established.

A project would be required to use the competitive Call for Projects if its scope or service substantially changes; it no longer meets Lifeline Program requirements; its funding request cannot be supported by the established baseline and available STA resources; or staff determines that competitive review is necessary to protect programming integrity or equitable access to limited funds.

Step 2: Establish streamlined renewal funding

The preliminary Cycle 8 allocation for SamTrans Route 117 and SamCoast project will be calculated using each project's average annual C/CAG Lifeline award over the past three funding cycles, currently estimated at \$781,784. This methodology provides a predictable baseline based on actual C/CAG funding history rather than a new sponsor request.

This streamlined approach would include the following funding safeguards:

- **Three-Year Baseline:** The initial allocation will be based on the average annual Lifeline award for the preceding three funding cycles.
- **No automatic cost escalation:** The streamlined allocation will not automatically increase solely because the sponsor's operating costs increase. Any adjustment other than an annual CPI increase would be subject to available STA resources and C/CAG's review and approval.
- **Available Funds Protection:** Streamlined allocations will be established only after considering the total amount of STA funds available for the Lifeline program.
- **Competitive Funding Protection:** Based on the current estimate of \$4.9 million in Cycle 8 Lifeline resources, the combined three-year-average baseline for SamCoast and Route 117 is

at \$ 781,784, which represents approximately 16% of the estimated \$4.9 million Lifeline allocation, preserving the majority (84%) for the competitive projects.

- No Automatic Expansion: The Cycle 8 pilot would apply only to Route 117 and SamCoast at this time. Adding other projects to the streamlined process in a future cycle would require further C/CAG policy consideration.
- C/CAG will establish performance requirements through the applicable funding agreement. Staff will monitor continued operation, service levels consistent with the approved scope, expenditure and reporting compliance, and continued service to Lifeline-eligible communities. Performance concerns may result in corrective action or a requirement to return to the competitive process in a subsequent cycle.

Step 3: Conduct a Competitive Call for Projects

After establishing eligible streamlined allocations, all remaining Lifeline funds will be available through the traditional competitive Call for Projects process. All projects that do not qualify for streamlined renewal, including new, expanded, materially changed, or otherwise uncertain operations projects, would compete for available funding.

Funding and Local Match Available

For the FY 2026/2027 Cycle 8, approximately \$4.9 million in State Transit Assistance (STA) funding is currently estimated to be available. Under the proposed framework, \$781,784 will be programmed for Route 117 and SamCoast, leaving approximately \$4.1million for the competitive process. Final funding amounts will remain subject to the County's actual STA revenues.

Proposed grant amount minimums and maximums would remain consistent with Cycle 7, with a CPI adjustment:

- \$55,000 to \$130,000 for transit-based educational and outreach projects
- \$110,000 to \$670,000 for shuttle and operation projects, transit or active transportation capital projects, transit pass programs, and fixed transit route services.

Cycle 8 would require a local match of 11.47% for projects located in MTC Equity Priority Communities and Tier 1 C/CAG Equity Focus Areas, 15% local match for Tier 2 Equity Focus Areas, and 20 % for other areas.

Pilot Evaluation and Future Cycles

Staff recommend treating the streamlined renewal process as a Cycle 8 pilot. Before developing the next Lifeline funding cycle, staff would evaluate the pilot, including its administrative benefits, project performance, effect on competitive funding availability, and whether objective eligibility criteria should be continued, modified, or potentially extended to other established operations projects.

Lifeline Cycle 8 Schedule

Staff presented the draft framework at the August 20th C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee meeting. Committee members expressed concern that expanding the streamlined process to additional operational projects could reduce the amount of funding available for projects competing through the competitive process.

The Committee also recommended that C/CAG coordinate with external partners to explore whether shuttle project sponsors could submit a consolidated application, seeking local match for the Transportation Authority's Shuttle Program. This approach could reduce the administrative burden on project sponsors while maintaining a competitive process for other projects. Staff will return to the committee next month to present the Lifeline Cycle 8 Guidelines. The detailed schedule for the Cycle 8 Call for Projects is provided below.

Milestone	Date
TAC Reviewed Lifeline Framework	August 20, 2026
CMEQ Review of Framework	August 31, 2026
TAC Approval of the Draft Guidelines	September 17, 2026
CMEQ Approval of the Draft Guidelines	September 28, 2026
Board Review of Final Guidelines	October 8, 2026
Call for Projects Issued	Week of October 12th
Applicant Workshop	Week of October 12, 2026
Public Workshop	Week of October 19, 2026
Applications Due	November 13, 2026
Selection Panel Review Applications	November 16 – December 14, 2026
C/CAG Committees Consider Recommendations	January 2027
C/CAG Board Considers Recommendations	February 11, 2027

**Schedule is estimated and subject to change*

EQUITY IMPACTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The Lifeline Transportation Program directly funds projects that are identified in Equity Priority Communities across the county.

ATTACHMENTS

N/A