

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (TA)
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor

MINUTES OF JANUARY 3, 2012

MEMBERS PRESENT: B. Arietta (Chair), J. Bigelow, R. Hedges, R. Hees, E. Lasensky, J. Londer, D. Maez, D. Mensing, L. Shaine, L. Simonson, A. Vargas, J. Whittemore

MEMBERS ABSENT: J. Fox, B. Warhurst, G. Zimmerman

STAFF PRESENT: J. Ackemann, A. Chan, C. Chung, M. Espinosa, A. Hughes, J. Hurley, N. McKenna

Chair Barbara Arietta called the meeting to order at 4:32 p.m. and Jim Whittemore led the Pledge of Allegiance.

REPORT FROM THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE – ELECTION OF 2012 OFFICERS

Randy Hees said the nominating committee of Jim Bigelow and himself are recommending Ms. Arietta for chair and April Vargas for vice chair for 2012.

There were no other nominations from the floor.

A motion (Bigelow/Hees) to re-elect Ms. Arietta and Ms. Vargas to chair and vice chair, respectively, for 2012 was passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Whittemore said would like the email response from staff on his Brown Act question incorporated into the minutes.

Laurie Simonson asked that her name be corrected on page one. On page 2 of 5, the third bullet should say revised statutes not, statues. On page 3 of 5 the first sentence is missing a couple of words and should read “Chair Arietta asked what the technical findings that eliminated two sections were.” On page 4 of 5 under the update on State and Federal legislative programs the second sentence should read “now looking to be around \$327 million” not, “not looking to be around \$327 million.”

Doris Maez said on page 3 of 5 the fourth paragraph from bottom the first sentence should have a question mark. On page 5 of 5 under Elizabeth Lasensky’s committee comments the word is litter not liter.

Ms. Lasensky said on page 3 of 5 one of her points is missing and that is the tax payers of San Mateo County would not benefit from this proposed service that would only serve East Bay commuters.

A motion (Bigelow/Hees) to approve the amended November 29, 2011 minutes was passed.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

ITEMS FOR REVIEW – JANUARY 5, 2011 TA BOARD MEETING

Program Report: Transit: Shuttles (TA Item 13a)

Planner, Celia Chung reported on the upcoming Call for Projects (CFP):

- New Measure A program designates 4 percent to the Shuttle Program (Program) under the 30 percent transit category. The original Measure A had no dedicated funds to the Program.
- First CFP was done in calendar year 2010 and the TA allocated two years' worth of funding for Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 and FY2012. A total of \$4.5 million was available of which \$2.8 million was allocated. The City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) was given a pass-through amount of \$600,000 (\$300,000 each year) for their program which they fund through their local congestion relief program.
- Nineteen shuttles received funding from Measure A.
- The total operating cost for the 19 shuttles was \$4.3 million [sic]. The local shuttle sponsors were able to come up with an additional \$1.1 million [sic] in different funds to complete the overall total operating costs for the shuttles.
- There are 11 commuter shuttles and eight community or combination shuttles, 17 are fixed-route shuttles and two are on-demand shuttles.
- As a condition of receiving grant funding, sponsors are required to submit an annual report that includes operating costs, total ridership and total service hours data.
- Based on the data submitted, performance assessment on the operating cost per passenger and the boardings per service hour for each of the shuttles was conducted by staff.
- Total ridership for FY2011 was 438,270.
- The operating cost per passenger for the community shuttle was \$8.49 and the commuter was \$5.93.
- The boardings per hour for the community shuttles averaged 11 and for the commuter shuttles averaged 15.
- Next steps include performance monitoring, develop performance measures, market existing shuttles and expansion of new shuttles. These steps will be part of the Shuttle Business Practices implementation. A CFP is currently scheduled for early 2012 with Board allocation in June:

Mr. Hees said the two on-call shuttles seem to be targeted at seniors and are expensive. Is this diverting people from paratransit and how does cost compared for the two services. Director of Transportation Authority Program Joe Hurley said passengers have to go through a qualification process to be eligible for paratransit service. Manager, Planning and Research Marisa Espinosa said the cost for paratransit is \$40 per person and the senior shuttles are for those who are ambulatory.

Larry Shaine asked if existing shuttles funded by the TA need to reapply or are they grandfathered. Ms. Chung said in the 2010 CFP the grandfathered projects submitted an application, but were not evaluated like new shuttles. In the upcoming CFP, staff is going to have all shuttles submit applications and all will be evaluated on a level playing field.

Mr. Shaine asked if the cities will be notified that they need to reapply. Ms. Chung said there will be outreach to all the cities informing them of the process.

Mr. Shaine said on the cost per passenger where the fixed shuttles are charging a fee for the passengers, i.e. Foster City charges \$1 per ride, are the numbers net of that fee? Ms. Chung said Foster City started charging fares in FY 2012 and the numbers presented are for FY2011.

Ms. Maez said the funding source numbers don't add up. Ms. Chung said the total funding number doesn't show the \$600,000 allocated to C/CAG.

Mr. Whittemore asked who receives the money collected from the two Foster City shuttles. Mr. Shaine said the city sells the passes and manages the money.

Mr. Whittemore asked how the shuttle program compares to Santa Clara County, both on adoption of the shuttles relative to the population of potential shuttle usage and the cost per person. Also are there comparisons done for any similar metro area that is not located in the Bay Area? Interim Executive Director Planning and Development Aidan Hughes said the exercise has not been done but can be.

Jim Bigelow asked if employers are paying a 25 percent match. Ms. Chung said it ranges across the board. In the previous CFP, staff set a 50 percent target for local match, which also included contributions from employers.

Chair Arietta asked when the information is being sent to city managers. Ms. Chung said it is part of the CFP and still being worked out.

Chair Arietta asked if the cities have to go get their own shuttle contractors. Ms. Chung said yes. The TA is just the funding source.

Chair Arietta asked how long the outreach process is. Ms. Chung said once the CFP letter goes out, the applications are due four weeks from that date.

Ms. Espinosa reported on the San Mateo County Shuttle Business Practices Guidebook:

- The purpose of the Guidebook is to identify key issues facing the Program. To develop best practice strategies to improve coordination in key areas of planning, funding, operations, administration and marketing/public administration.
- A task force was formed to develop the guidebook structure, content and recommendations.
- Agencies represented on the Task Force include the TA, San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance (Alliance) and C/CAG.
- Stakeholder interviews were conducted with employers, funders and operations and administrative staff.
- The process included identifying key issues, policy goals, strategies and strategy champions, barriers, prioritizing each strategy and development of the Draft Guidebook.
- The strategies are staff level work and are not an adopted policy by any of the represented agencies.
- Principal activities started in spring 2011 with stakeholder interviews and continued through November 2011 with the Draft Guidebook.
- Key issues under planning are:

- Shuttle planning is typically based on available funding, with a limited understanding of market potential.
- Improvement process for under-performing routes is not clearly defined.
- Robust employer participation in the shuttle program is limited.
- Key issues under funding are:
 - Process consists of multiple funding sources, calls and match requirements.
 - Reporting requirements differ by funding source, while no uniform performance monitoring process is applied across shuttle programs.
- Key issue under operations and administration was several entities perform similar operations, management, procurement and administrative roles.
- Key issues under marketing and public information are:
 - Provision of coordinated regional transportation information integrating shuttle information is limited.
 - Marketing budgets are constrained.
 - Shuttle vehicles, stations and marketing materials lack a consistent brand identify.
- All strategies will be advanced over time.
- To rank the strategies a four tier matrix was used.

Daniel Mensing asked if this information is all from scratch or used by others. Ms. Espinosa said this is a result of many meetings with the Task Force over the last nine months.

Mr. Mensing asked if the employers are one of the funders for the program. Ms. Espinosa said it depends on the shuttle and the employer.

Ms. Maez asked if this was entirely an in-house project or were samples from other agencies used. When is final adoption expected? Ms. Espinosa said there were some consultant services and a best practice analysis was done with other shuttle programs throughout the state. The San Mateo County Shuttle Program is very robust and very unique. Ms. Espinosa said staff is not asking the Board to adopt this Guidebook but will use this to help inform for the next CFP.

Mr. Shaine asked if there was any representation on the Task Force from riders, citizens or employers. Ms. Espinosa said not on the Task Force, but part of the stakeholder interviews, cities, employers and other project sponsors were interviewed that have contact with the different shuttles ridership.

Mr. Shaine said staff should consider talking to riders and asking them how the Program can be improved. Ms. Espinosa said staff has surveys the Alliance did. This work was not designed for a service plan but concepts and high level strategies.

Mr. Shaine asked if the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) was involved with the funding. Ms. Espinosa said MTC has not been involved. This is a countywide effort. MTC does not fund shuttle programs except for monies that come through the Bay Area Air Quality Management District where there is a small pot of funds that C/CAG maintains and uses for their CFP.

Mr. Hees said there are “strategies champions” on only a few pages of the presentation and various implementations disappear after a few pages. Is this information part of the next step component? Ms. Espinosa said that information will be in the document.

Mr. Hees said there are a few shuttles that stand out that are great successes and has staff studied why they are such a success compared to the other shuttles? Ms. Espinosa said staff has not looked in detail why that is. Staff is watching the Foster City shuttles because of the charge and what affect it has on ridership and also what affect it has on the local public transit route ridership.

Mr. Bigelow asked if this information will be in the hands of businesses who are participating in the Program. Ms. Espinosa said that will be part of the next step of engaging employers more widely in some of the work and proposed strategies.

Mr. Bigelow asked if there is any scoring that goes with the applications. Ms. Espinosa said separate from this process is what happens with the CFP process. Ms. Chung said she will come back in a month to discuss the proposed CFP process.

Ms. Lasensky said none of these shuttles are regional so if a couple of cities proposed a joint project to combine shuttle service to make more connectivity would projects like that be scored higher? Ms. Espinosa said the current guidelines preclude that from happening and also have not seen that in the past. That idea may happen in the new round as different cities are looking for ways to pony up their local match requirement.

Ms. Lasensky asked if some of the regional interest was not in San Mateo County, but a border city, how would that work? Ms. Espinosa said that would have to be a policy call from the Board because if it is San Mateo County monies for San Mateo County shuttles then serving a city outside of the county may trigger some questions or concerns.

Mr. Whittemore asked who was the consultant and how long did they work on this project. Ms. Espinosa said Fehr and Peers was retained since last May.

Mr. Whittemore asked if there currently is a guidebook. Ms. Espinosa said no there is not. Mr. Whittemore said this book won't be in place in time for the CFP and thinks the book is too big and some of the goals are not goals. The goals need to be concrete to the issues identified.

Approval of Minutes (TA Item 6a)

No discussion

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for November 2011 (TA Item 6b)

Mr. Whittemore said last month there was an explanation of the grant proceeds number coming in, but doesn't understand why the \$2 million in the State Local Partnership Program funds is coming in pieces. Why wasn't it booked just once and shouldn't the money be there? Director of Budgets and Grants April Chan said the grant is on a reimbursement basis. The grant hasn't been received yet and we'll get it on a reimbursement basis.

Mr. Whittemore said the first United States security listed under United States Government Agencies was called, redeemed and matured as reflected in the report and wondered why it is still in the report. Manager of Treasury Lori Snow said bonds are reported as actual days.

Jeff Londer said on the graph that shows administrative expenses, the actual expense is much lower than the projections and wondered why. Ms. Chan said staff is recommending an amendment to the budget for administration expenses.

Ms. Maez said the current actual shows the TA is in the black, but the projection is the TA will be in the red and expect to be \$17 million short at end of the year. Ms. Chan said sales tax revenue is estimated for the year. There is actually a fairly healthy fund balance and using prior year fund balance to do projects because the TA has collected funding in years past. This year staff is projecting about \$70 million in revenue and programming expenditures of about \$87 million because staff is using prior year fund balance.

A motion (Hees/Bigelow) to support acceptance of the Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for November 2011 was approved.

Sam Trans Liaison Report – December 14, 2011 (TA Item 9)

No discussion

Authorize Amendment to Fiscal Year 2012 Budget by \$481,698 for a New Total of \$88,323,700 (TA Item 12a)

Mr. Hees asked if this item is just restating an increase in sales tax projections, a reduction in interest rate and then correcting those items that are based on income. Ms. Chan said yes.

Mr. Whittemore asked if anything else in the budget should have been rebaselined since this is being done. Ms. Chan said the budget team looked at everything and this was the only thing that needs to be done.

Mr. Shaine asked what the source of the positive field is based on when the budget was adopted. Ms. Chan said staff is looking at actual receipts and working with the County and believe these numbers are still pretty conservative.

A motion (Hedges/Bigelow) to support amendment of the Fiscal Year 2012 budget was approved.

Daniel Mensing left at 6:05 p.m.

Authorize Support for Re-assignment of Dumbarton Rail Regional Measure 2 Operating Funds to Support Dumbarton Bus Service (TA Item 12b)

Mr. Shaine asked when the current Environmental Impact Report will be completed.

Mr. Hughes said the 2013 date is the expected completion date, but will then need to wait for the record of decision.

Mr. Bigelow said every year since the passage of Regional Measure 2 (RM2), \$5.5 million dollars is being doled out to other qualifying regional projects beyond Dumbarton Rail. Last year the operating money went for the introduction of the Clipper Card in the Bay Area. By taking the \$5.5 million and focusing on the Dumbarton Corridor, the buses can be used to increase the patronage of the corridor and when the money is available to build or phase the project for rail then the money will be switched from the buses back to the rail. This is a rail operating subsidy and has nothing to do with the capital project cost.

Ms. Simonson asked what the definition of “in place” is as mentioned in the last paragraph of the staff report. What worst case scenario happens if the rail is never built? The resolution doesn’t seem to address that issue and leaves it open that the funding will continue for the shuttle bus. Mr. Hughes said the resolution supports reassignment of funds and in accordance with the processes the MTC had to go through to reassign the funds from rail operations to support bus operations and once the Dumbarton Rail Project is ready there will have to be another request for reassignment of funds from bus to rail.

Chair Arietta said MTC will consider this item at their January 25 meeting.

A motion (Bigelow/Hees) to support re-assignment of Dumbarton Rail Regional Measure 2 operating funds to support Dumbarton bus service was approved.

Update on State and Federal Legislative Program (TA Item 13b)

Government Affairs Officer Jayme Ackemann reported:

- As part of the tax extenders package there was the successful reauthorization of the payroll tax benefit. Unfortunately, as part of those tax extenders, lobbyists were also seeking the Commuter Check Benefit being extended and it wasn’t. Staff will continue to lobby at the local, State and Federal level to see that this is included in efforts going forward in early 2012.
- At the Federal level there are a couple of bills that staff will be supporting very actively and hoping they will be rolled into the SAFETEA-LU reauthorization efforts that will be under discussion over the next year. HR 3200 would allow for greater flexibility for transit districts to move Federal funding into their operating budget. This means that we would be able to allocate towards bus routes, rehiring bus operators and reactivating routes that may have been cut. The Senate also has a similar bill that would allow this increased flexibility. It doesn’t have a number yet, but staff will be following closely.
- At the State level there wasn’t a lot happening as a result of the holiday shutdown. Staff will be working very closely with our lobbyists to continue to protect the gas tax swap funding. There was an increment of that funding that went unprotected when the gas tax swap was made and that is critical money, about \$5-\$6 million to SamTrans if the governor were to take that unprotected increment and reallocate to the General Fund. Staff has been very successful thus far in protecting that money and preventing it from being reallocated, but as the budget cycle continues to play out over the coming months staff is concerned this money could be lost and that would be a big hit to the budget.
- Staff has completed a draft of the 2012 legislative program and will circulate to the CAC via email and seek comments and feedback on the draft legislative program before taking to the Board at the February meeting.

Mr. Bigelow said the Commuter Tax Benefit now provides up to \$230 for parking.

Ms. Ackemann said when the payroll tax extension benefit was passed it was on a two month extension so it will have to be revisited over the next few weeks in order to make it a full year extension. Staff is hoping the Commuter Tax Benefit will be rolled back into that as part of the consideration for the full year extension.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR – BARBARA ARIETTA

Chair Arietta reported:

- The MTC will hold a public hearing on the Dumbarton Rail Project on January 11.

- Attended SanTrans Service Plan workshop in South San Francisco and a three bus system scenario was presented.
- *San Jose Mercury News* recently reported on MTC's project performance assessment and there will be a public meeting on January 10 at 5:30 p.m. at Hiller Aviation in San Carlos.
- *San Jose Mercury News* also reported that High Speed Rail will not supply one million jobs, but only 60,000 each year.

REPORT FROM STAFF – JOE HURLEY

Manager, Real Estate and Property Development Brian Fitzpatrick said the TA Board allocated \$27 million to support the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA) project. In early 2010 the TJPA came to the TA and asked to use some of the money that was allocated to purchase a condominium at 580 Howard Street in San Francisco that is needed for the project. The TA came up with a plan that the money that was put forth to purchase this was securitized in case the project didn't move forward. The way the agreement works is as the TA funds the money to buy the unit, the property is transferred to TJPA, who owns the property then a trigger mechanism is set up in case the project doesn't move forward. If the project doesn't work the TA files a quit claim deed which puts in place a process for the TA to recover their investment in the property. A similar procedure was followed for 85 Natoma Street.

Mr. Whittemore said the building is gone and he was trying to track earlier private sales for this property. He said the San Francisco Board of Supervisors exercised eminent domain for the property, but the TA board was told they would try to avoid using eminent domain.

Mr. Shaine said there is an outstanding issue on the follow-up from the attorneys on the Brown Act and the quorum. Mr. Hurley said a quorum is defined as the majority of the filled positions.

COMMITTEE COMMENTS

Mr. Whittemore said he went and looked at the South San Francisco Ferry Terminal Project and the communication to the neighbors for San Bruno Grade Separation Project has been great.

Ms. Simonson said Caltrain was free and offered extra trains on New Year's Eve, but the news release on this information was pushed way down on the website and nearly impossible to find the information about the service.

Ms. Vargas said the Devils Slide Tunnel is going to open soon and there is some concern about facilities to allow pedestrians to cross when San Mateo County Parks takes over. It appears a discussion about a signalized traffic light for pedestrians would benefit the community. The design that Caltrans has for the signal light has not been approved yet. Mr. Hurley said the traffic light has to meet traffic warrants justify a signalized intersection. Ms. Vargas said there will be a public meeting on this issue.

Date and Time of Next Meeting

Tuesday, January 31, 2012 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070.

The meeting adjourned at 6:51 p.m.