

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)  
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (TA)**

1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos CA 94070  
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor

**MINUTES OF DECEMBER 1, 2015**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** B. Arietta (Chair), J. Fox, R. Hedges, R. Hees, J. Londer, D. Lujan, O. O'Neill, P. Rosenblatt, S. Scruggs, L. Shaine, L. Simonson, J. Ward, W. Warhurst, P. Young

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** D. Bautista

**STAFF PRESENT:** J. Averill, S. Bhatnagar, A. Chan, C. Harvey, S. Gaffney, J. Hurley, J. Slavitt

Chair Barbara Arietta called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m. and Rich Hedges led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 3, 2015 MEETING MINUTES**

Motion/Second: Londer/Hedges

Ayes: Fox, Hedges, Londer, Lujan, Rosenblatt, Scruggs, Simonson, Ward, Warhurst, Young, Arietta

Absent: Bautista, Hees, O'Neill, Shaine

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**ITEMS FOR REVIEW – DECEMBER 3, 2015 TA BOARD MEETING**

**Authorize Amendment of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 Budget by \$5 Million and Programming and Allocation of \$6.2 Million of Measure A Grade Separation Funding for the City of San Mateo for the Design of the 25th Avenue Grade Separation Project (TA Item 10a)**

April Chan, Chief Officer, Planning, Grants, and the Transportation Authority, said this is to complete the final design of the 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue Grade Separation Project in San Mateo. At their November 16 meeting, the San Mateo City Council committed to provide \$5 million in matching funds.

Randy Hees and Olma O'Neill arrived at 4:36 p.m.

Ms. Chan said last month the CAC asked about the prioritization of grade separation projects in San Mateo County. Cities that are interested in submitting requests for State funding through Public Utilities Commission Section 190 have to submit grade crossing information to get ranked by the State. The 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue Grade Crossing was ranked seven out of 56, and the crossing over Broadway was ranked 15. Caltrain also conducts a hazard analysis of all its crossings.

Mr. Hedges said the two most dangerous crossings are Broadway Avenue and 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue because of the short distance from the cross streets. A lot of drivers misjudge the space. The city of San Mateo is bringing a lot of money to the project.

Brad Underwood, Public Works Director, City of San Mateo, said \$6 million is being provided from Bay Meadows Project, which is from impact fees.

Laurie Simonson asked if the California High-speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) will be contributing funds. Ms. Chan said the city of San Mateo is working on asking the CHSRA to bring a little over \$80 million.

Motion/Second: Hees/Hedges

Ayes: Hedges, Hees, Londer, Lujan, O'Neill, Rosenblatt, Scruggs, Simonson, Ward,  
Warhurst, Young, Arietta

Absent: Bautista, Shaine

Abstain: Fox

### **Program Report: Transit – Shuttles (TA Item 11a)**

Joel Slavit, Manager, Programming and Monitoring, presented:

- New Measure A Local Shuttle Program
  - Shuttles: 4 percent of Measure A Program
  - Provides matching funds for operation of local shuttle service
  - Minimum 25 percent match required
- Measure A Allocations to Date
  - FY2011 and FY2012: \$2.772 million
  - FY2013 and FY2014: \$4.72 million
  - FY2015 and FY2016: \$5.805 million
- Funding Sources
  - 29 shuttles allocated Measure A funds for operation in FY2015 and FY2016
    - \$5.8 million in Measure A funds (56 percent)
    - \$4.6 million in matching funds (44 percent)
- FY2015 and FY2016 Shuttle Types
  - Commuter: 24
  - Community-serving: 3
  - Combination: 2

Larry Shaine arrived at 4:50 p.m.

- Measure A Funded Shuttles
  - Maps showing the location of all Measure A-funded shuttles in operation during FY2015 were shown
- FY2015 Performance
  - 28 different operating shuttles
  - Sponsor progress reports on ridership, total operating cost, and total service hours
  - Program performance on ridership, cost/passenger, passengers/service hour

- FY2015 Monthly Ridership
  - Average monthly ridership hovered between 70,000 and 80,000 riders per month
  - Total ridership for the year was 891,000 riders
- FY2015 Operating Cost/Passenger
  - Commuter shuttles: \$5.72
  - Community serving and combination shuttles: \$12.48
- FY2015 Passengers/Service Hour
  - Commuter shuttles: 17.7
  - Community serving and combination shuttles: 6.9
- Related Activities
  - Staff proposing a refinements to upcoming funding calls to better promote cost-effective service
  - Joint TA/City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) Call for Projects (CFP) to be released December 2015

Phil Rosenblatt asked what extent employers who are being serviced by the shuttles are contributing to the cost. Mr. Slavitt said it varies for the individual shuttle. They do provide a fairly healthy contribution. Some are very high. Genentech provides 100 percent and some others provide quite a bit more than 25 percent.

Shaunda Scruggs asked if Genentech provides ridership data. Mr. Slavitt said they have no obligation to provide it, but he will check if the data is available.

Ms. Scruggs asked if non-Genentech employees take the Genentech shuttles. Mr. Slavitt said the shuttles that receive Measure A funding are open to the public.

Mr. Shaine asked if all the shuttles are operated and owned by Commute.org and how Commute.org is compensated. Mr. Slavitt said Commute.org gets funding from the Measure A Shuttle Program as well as from participating employers, transit management associations and business parks. Some shuttles are managed by the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB), and some by Commute.org. For some community serving shuttles, like the one in Pacifica, the city manages day-to-day operations but it ties into a SamTrans or JPB contract for the service. East Palo Alto works with the city of Palo Alto to contract with a vendor to run their shuttle. Each relationship is slightly different. There are not more than eight different sponsors and the bulk of the program is run by Commute.org and the JPB.

Mr. Hedges asked if the Norfolk combination shuttle has improved. Mr. Slavitt said no, and employers do not contribute.

Mr. Hees said some of the shuttles are getting 30 and 40 passengers per hour, which are incredible numbers. He asked at what point a shuttle should become a SamTrans route. He said when there are 40 passengers per hour it might be time to transition. Mr. Slavitt said a SamTrans bus route typically has stops every quarter- to half-mile. The purpose of some of these commuter shuttles is to get from Point A to Point B as fast as possible, and they don't make many stops. Turning it into a fixed-route bus trip might change the purpose.

Mr. Rosenblatt asked what the difference is between shuttles and paratransit. He said there is a Redi-Coast program on the Coastside, but there is no shuttle program.

Mr. Hurley said for paratransit there are criteria that riders have to be able to meet to use that service. That service does not have a fixed route; they are on a needs basis.

Mr. Slavit said if a shuttle is desired on the Coastside, a sponsor would need to respond to the CFP and put in a proposal.

John Fox said it might be a good idea for a future agenda to have a discussion about the extent to which shuttles compete or siphon ridership away from SamTrans and the relationship between SamTrans service to shuttle service. Mr. Hurley said shuttles are within the purview of the TA and fixed-route service is outside the TA's purview but SamTrans does review candidate shuttles for redundancy. It might also have to do with cost, and sometimes it is cheaper to provide service with a shuttle than a fixed-route bus service.

Mr. Hedges said there are different business models for shuttles and fixed-route service. Shuttles only run during peak-time, and they usually go directly to employers. Changing the business model will drive riders away.

### **Joint TA and City/County Association of Governments San Mateo County Shuttle Program CFP (TA Item 11b)**

Mr. Slavit presented:

- Program Overview
  - Joint CFP with the TA and C/CAG
  - Program purpose: provide matching funding for the operation of local shuttle services
  - Eligible costs include operations, marketing and administration of shuttles
- Eligibility Requirements
  - Sponsor must be a public agency
  - Services county residents and employees
  - Provides access to regional transit and/or meets local mobility needs
  - Open to public and Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant
  - Funds are to supplement, not supplant, other funding sources
  - SamTrans concurrence letter
  - Governing board resolution
- Process: Funding and Evaluation
  - Joint CFP to be issued December 14, 2015
    - Covers FY2017 and FY2018
    - Up to \$9 million from TA Measure A
    - Up to \$1 million from C/CAG
  - Minimum 25 percent match required
  - One application process, one staff evaluation panel
- Evaluation Criteria
  - Need and Readiness: 50 percent new shuttles, 40 percent existing shuttles
  - Effectiveness: 15 percent new shuttles, 25 percent existing shuttles
  - Funding Leverage: 20 percent new and existing shuttles

- Policy Consistency and Sustainability: 15 percent new and existing shuttles
- Evaluation Criteria: Need and Readiness
  - Provides service to an area underserved by transit
  - Provides congestion relief
  - Provides service to special populations
  - Solid service plan
  - Solid funding plan
- Evaluation Criteria: Effectiveness
  - Annual operating cost per passenger for past 12 months for existing shuttles or projected if new shuttles
  - Annual passengers per service hour for past 12 months for existing shuttles or projected if new shuttles
  - Shuttle links with other fixed-route transit
  - Improves access from transit-oriented development to major activity centers
  - Reduces single-occupant vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled
- Evaluation Criteria: Funding Leverage
  - Up to 10 points for 25 to 50 percent match
  - Up to 15 points for 50 to 75 percent match
  - Up to 18 points for 75 to 100 percent match
  - Extra two points for private sector funding
- Evaluation Criteria: Policy Consistency and Sustainability
  - Shuttle is included in an adopted local, specific area, county or regional plan
  - Supports jobs and housing growth/economic development
  - Use of clean fuel vehicles for service
  - Accommodation for bicycles
  - Demonstration of cost savings
- Summary of Proposed Changes for this CFP
  - Required sponsor consultation with SamTrans prior to submittal of applications for new shuttles, as well as existing shuttles that don't meet the established benchmarks
- Changes for Consideration with Future CFPs
  - Propose increasing match requirement for existing shuttles that don't meet the operating cost per passenger benchmark, up to a maximum of 50 percent to help pay for costs above the benchmark
  - Match requirement based on FY2017 performance, effective for funding cycle covering FY2019 and FY2020
- Schedule
  - November 2015: presentation to C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee and Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee
  - December 2015: Presentation to TA CAC and TA and C/CAG boards
  - December 14, 2015: CFP released
  - December 15, 2015: CFP workshop
  - February 12, 2016: Application deadline
  - April 2016: Informational item to TA CAC and Board on draft program of projects, presentations to C/CAG committees
  - May 2016: TA and C/CAG boards approve proposed program of projects

Mr. Hees said he is pleased with the change requiring the increasing percentage of match. He asked what the consulting will do. Mr. Slavitt said if there is a new sponsor the consultation will give them technical assistance. For existing sponsors with poor performing routes, staff will sit with the sponsor and go over route modifications and other suggestions or options that will meet the need.

William Warhurst said the evaluation criteria of need and readiness are sharing the category, but the two ideas are independent and should not overlap. A project that is not needed should have its score dropped no matter how ready it is. Mr. Slavitt said for existing shuttles, 20 percent is for need and 20 percent is for readiness, and for existing shuttles, need is 25 percent and 25 percent is for readiness.

Ms. Simonson asked if there is ability to extend more time to pull things together for the bike and pedestrian CFP. Mr. Slavitt said all calls are given five to six weeks. If a sponsor does not know what they want to do, a few extra weeks is not going to help a lot. Sponsors have projects on their books that they haven't been able to fund and they are just waiting for funding to be available. The time is set to give enough time for sponsors to fill out the application. He said he will discuss this issue with Ms. Simonson after the meeting.

Ms. Scruggs asked at what point the TA will no longer fund a shuttle with low ridership instead of raising the match requirement. Mr. Slavitt said shuttles are required to get concurrence letters from SamTrans so there is no duplication of routes. If there is any duplication, the TA will not fund the shuttle. The TA has not historically turned down a shuttle based on how it thinks the shuttle will perform. Hopefully since sponsors are required to come in and work with SamTrans on the shuttle performance it won't be an issue.

Ms. Scruggs asked if the ridership falls and the TA tells the sponsor their match must be 40 percent, and then ridership falls again and the TA tells the sponsor their match must be 50 percent, at what point the TA stops providing funds. Mr. Slavitt said that is a good question and he will take it into consideration as future CFPs are structured.

Mr. Shaine asked how capital expenses fit in if there is a need for new buses or upgrades. Mr. Slavitt said per the Transportation Expenditure Plan, this program funds the operation of service. The procurement of vehicles is not eligible under this program, so sponsors contract with vendors for those elements.

Mr. Shaine asked where the money comes from to purchase new shuttles. Chuck Harvey, Deputy CEO, said shuttle services are bid through private operators, and those operators bid a cost per hour to operate a shuttle. That cost per hour includes providing a vehicle. The amortized cost of the vehicle is built into the hourly rate that is paid for the vehicle.

### **Update on State and Federal Legislative Program (TA Item 11c)**

Shweta Bhatnagar, Government Affairs Officer, said last month Congress passed another short-term surface transportation extension bill providing lawmakers another

two weeks to resolve critical differences between the House and Senate's multi-year transportation spending plans. The extension will continue Federal funding for surface transportation programs through December 4. The House and Senate have reached an agreement of a five-year, \$305 billion transportation bill, which will hopefully put an end to temporary extensions. This bill is expected to increase highway spending by \$2.1 billion above current levels in the first year, and by 2020 it will increase to \$6.1 billion. Spending on transit will go from the current \$8.6 billion to almost \$10.6 billion in 2020. The bill also includes nearly \$200 million for Positive Train Control projects and a \$295 million cap on liability claims faced by railroads. The House and Senate must still vote on the bill and passage is expected by December 4.

**Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for Fiscal Year Ending June 2015 (Unaudited) (TA Item 4b)**

Jeff Londer asked why Program Expenditures on line 13 are 50 percent higher than projected. Shannon Gaffney, Interim Treasury Manager, said program expenditures are done as pass-throughs as a percentage of the revenues that are received, and if revenues are higher than anticipated, expenditures are going to be higher than anticipated. Measure A revenues have exceeded expectations in the last several years.

Motion/Second: Hedges/Lujan

Ayes: Fox, Hedges, Hees, Londer, Lujan, O'Neill, Rosenblatt, Scruggs, Shaine, Simonson, Ward, Warhurst, Young, Arietta

Absent: Bautista

**Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for October 2015 (TA Item 4c)**

Motion/Second: Hedges/Lujan

Ayes: Fox, Hedges, Hees, Londer, Lujan, O'Neill, Rosenblatt, Scruggs, Shaine, Simonson, Ward, Warhurst, Young, Arietta

Absent: Bautista

**Approval of Minutes of November 5, 2015 (TA Item 4a)**

No discussion.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR – BARBARA ARIETTA**

Chair Arietta appointed Mr. Fox, Mr. Hedges, and Mr. Hees to the 2016 Officer Nominating Committee.

See attachment for Chair Arietta's complete report.

**REPORT FROM STAFF – JOE HURLEY**

Joe Hurley, Director, TA Program, said this CAC has done a lot of fine work over the year. There have been a number of allocations for highway and bike and pedestrian projects, and shuttles serving almost 900,000 people per year. The money from Measure A will improve the mobility for people who live and work in San Mateo County and makes the area a better place to live. He thanked the CAC members for their contributions.

**MEMBER COMMENTS/REQUESTS**

Mr. Londer thanked outgoing Board Director Terry Nagel for her hard work on the Board.

Daina Lujan said the Holiday Train is coming the weekend of December 5 and 6 and it accepts unwrapped toy donations.

Mr. Hedges said the Measure S tax measure passed by 70 percent in the city of San Mateo. The State distributes about 9 percent of State funding and the Federal government distributes about 18 percent of Federal funding for transportation, and the rest is from self-help money. San Mateo decided to help itself to about \$150 million over 30 years, which will repair streets and roads and help with the sewer plan.

**DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday, January 5, 2016 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070

Adjourned at 5:58 p.m.



Averill, Joshua

---

**From:** Barbara Arietta <barietta@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 26, 2015 3:32 PM  
**To:** Averill, Joshua  
**Subject:** \*\*\*\*\* TA CAC Chair's Report - December 1, 2015\*\*\*\*\*

### **2015-2016 CAC Officer 's Election**

This year, in following the same method of selection as the Executive Board employs for selection of its own leadership, CAC members Richard Hedges, Randy Hees and John Fox have been appointed to the Nominating Committee for the recommendation of next year's CAC leadership. After gathering information from the CAC members through our CAC secretary, Josh Averill, they will make their decisions and report their recommendations to the CAC at it's January meeting, whereupon a vote will be taken by the CAC for the 2015-2016 committee leadership.

### **FACEBOOK CONTRIBUTES \$1 MILLION FOR TRANSPORTATION STUDY**

San Mateo County Supervisor Warren Slocum recently announced that the business community is very concerned about the growing traffic problems on the Peninsula, especially the 101 congestion and its impact on their ability to recruit and retain employees. Although an earlier effort to create the Dumbarton Spur, a connection between Caltrain in Redwood City/North Fair Oaks area with the Dumbarton Bridge and adjacent communities in Menlo Park and East Palo Alto, was "put on hold" this past May, apparently renewed interest is brewing.

A great big thanks should be extended to Facebook, whose headquarters are located in Menlo Park, for recently making a generous contribution of \$1M to our San Mateo County Transit District for a transportation study of the entire corridor, including a rail bridge, bus, light rail, ferry service and even "gondolas" as one report described it.

All options will be considered along with availability of potential sources of funding.

### **CALTRAIN FORUM**

There will be a Forum on Thursday evening, December 3rd, on Caltrain capacity and 101 congestion relief at the Redwood City Library starting at 6:30pm. It is open to all citizens and will cover such issues as caltrain electrification, grade separations and how San Mateo County can help pay for capacity increases.

Respectfully submitted,

**BARBARA ARIETTA**  
Chair, San Mateo County Transportation Authority CAC