

**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 APRIL 5, 2016**

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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** J. Londer, D. Lujan, P. Rosenblatt, L. Simonson

**STAFF PRESENT:** J. Averill, S. Bhatnagar, A. Chan, T. Dubost, J. Hurley, J. Slavitt

Chair Barbara Arietta called the meeting to order at 4:36 p.m. and Jeanette Ward led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 1, 2016 MEETING MINUTES**

Motion/Second: Hedges/Bautista

Ayes: Bautista, Hedges, O'Neill, Shaine, Ward, Warhurst, Young, Arietta

Absent: Fox, Londer, Lujan, Rosenblatt, Scruggs, Simonson

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**ITEMS FOR REVIEW – MARCH 3, 2016 TA BOARD MEETING**

**Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for February 2016 (TA Item 4b)**

Motion/Second: Shaine/Bautista

Ayes: Bautista, Hedges, O'Neill, Shaine, Ward, Warhurst, Young, Arietta

Absent: Fox, Londer, Lujan, Rosenblatt, Scruggs, Simonson

John Fox and Shaunda Scruggs arrived at 4:39 p.m.

**Update on State and Federal Legislative Program (TA Item 10c)**

Shweta Bhatnagar, Acting Manager, Government Affairs, gave the following update:

State

- On February 18, the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) released its draft 2016 Business Plan. The CHSRA has presented its plan to the Assembly Transportation Committee, the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee, and will give a presentation to the Assembly Budget Committee tomorrow. Jim Hartnett, TA Executive Director, participated in those hearings and discussed the status of the Caltrain Electrification Project and the need for the State to provide their share of funding for the project. The public comment period on the Draft Plan closes on April 18th. The CHSRA is required to prepare, publish, adopt, and submit an updated Business Plan to the Legislature by May 1.
- On March 10, the United States Department of Transportation announced procedures that would allow States to redistribute nearly \$2 billion in previously

appropriated earmark money that has been sitting unused for years. The Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 appropriations legislation included language that transfers unused earmarks that are at least 10 years old and for which less than 10 percent of the funding has been obligated to State transportation departments for new projects. Funding must be used for projects within 50 miles of the location of the original intended use. For California, there could be nearly \$150 million available through this process. Caltrans intends to set up a working group later this month to decide how funds should be repurposed within each region.

#### Federal

- Last month the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) administrator Therese McMillan announced she would be leaving the FTA and joining the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority as the head of planning. The current Special Advisor Carolyn Flowers will be taking Ms. McMillan's place at the FTA for the balance of the Obama Administration. Prior to joining the FTA, Ms. Flowers was the CEO for the Charlotte Area Transit System.
- Staff attended the American Public Transportation Association's annual Legislative Conference in Washington, DC last month. Director Karyl Matsumoto also attended. Much was learned about the new Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act and its associated rulemaking and implementation process. Staff also met with staff from Senator Dianne Feinstein's and Congressman Mike Honda's offices, as well as with Congresswomen Anna Eshoo and Jackie Speier. At those meetings staff asked them to support the TIGER grant application for the Willow Road/Highway 101 Interchange Project. Staff also thanked them for supporting the president's budget request to include the Caltrain Electrification Project in the Core Capacity Program and asked them to continue to advocate including the project in the final budget.

#### **Receive and File Measure A Program Status Report (TA Item 4c)**

Motion/Second: Bautista/Ward

Ayes: Bautista, Fox, Hedges, O'Neill, Scruggs, Shaine, Ward, Warhurst, Young, Arietta

Absent: Londer, Lujan, Rosenblatt, Simonson

#### **San Mateo County Shuttle Program Draft Funding Recommendations (TA Item 10a)**

Joel Slavit, Manager, Programming and Monitoring, presented:

- San Mateo County Shuttle Program Overview
  - San Mateo County Shuttle Program is a Joint TA/C/CAG Call for Projects (CFP)
    - TA Measure A Local Shuttle Program
    - C/CAG Local Transportation Services Program
  - Purpose:
    - Provide matching funding for the operation of local shuttle service
    - Shuttles are to provide access to regional transit and/or meet local mobility needs
- Process
  - TA Strategic Plan calls for
    - Funding considerations to be made through a CFP

- Project Review Committee assembled to evaluate applications
- Projects reviewed based on a set of evaluation criteria
- Funding recommendations anchored to the evaluation criteria
- Funding and Evaluation
  - Joint CFP issued on December 14, 2015 and closed on February 12, 2016
    - Covers Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 and FY2018
    - Up to \$9 million from TA Measure A
    - Up to \$1 million from C/CAG
    - Up to \$10 million total funds available
  - 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
- Project proposals
  - 40 shuttles proposed, 11 sponsors
  - 39 applications to be considered
    - One sponsor has requested a deferral
  - Up to \$10 million available, \$9.28 million requested
- Project Proposals: Sponsors
  1. Commute.org: 10 shuttles, \$2.863 million
  2. JPB: 14 shuttles, \$2.913 million
  3. Menlo Park: four shuttles, \$1.264 million
  4. Daly City: one shuttle, \$104,000
  5. Millbrae: one shuttle, \$197,000
  6. SamTrans: three shuttles, \$492,000
  7. San Carlos:
    - San Carlos: one shuttle, \$198,000
    - SamTrans/San Carlos: one shuttle, \$163,000
  8. SamTrans/San Mateo: one shuttle, \$219,000
  9. San Mateo Community College District: one shuttle, \$203,000
  10. San Mateo County: two shuttles, \$306,000
  11. South San Francisco: one shuttle, \$361,000
- Project Proposals: Public/Private Subsidy
  - Shuttles with private subsidy
    - Nine shuttles with no private subsidy
    - 31 shuttles with private subsidy
  - Degree of private subsidy
    - Four shuttles: greater than 50 percent private subsidy
    - Eight shuttles: less than 25 percent private subsidy
    - 19 shuttles: 25 to 50 percent private subsidy
- Project Proposals: Draft Recommendation (40 shuttles proposed)
  - 38 recommended for funding award
    - Existing shuttles requesting Measure A funding

1. JPB's Lincoln Centre commuter shuttle serving San Mateo/Foster City - \$181,100
2. Commute.org's Seaport Centre Caltrain commuter shuttle serving Redwood City - \$119,009
3. Commute.org's Bayshore Technology Park commuter shuttle serving Redwood Shores - \$123,104
4. JPB's Pacific Shores commuter shuttle serving Redwood City - \$232,600
5. JPB's Burlingame Bayside Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)/Caltrain commuter shuttle serving Burlingame - \$308,600
6. JPB's Mariners Island commuter shuttle serving San Mateo/Foster City - \$181,100
7. Daly City's Bayshore commuter/community shuttle serving Daly City - \$104,600
8. JPB's Twin Dolphin commuter shuttle serving Redwood Shores - \$190,400
9. Commute.org's Brisbane/Crocker Park BART/Caltrain commuter shuttle serving Brisbane/Daly City - \$555,000
10. JPB's Electronic Arts commuter shuttle serving Redwood Shores - \$150,000
11. Menlo Park's Marsh Road commuter shuttle serving Menlo Park - \$283,506
12. SamTrans's Sierra Point – Balboa Park BART commuter shuttle serving Brisbane - \$163,000
13. South San Francisco's South City community shuttle serving South San Francisco - \$360,507
14. Commute.org's Redwood City Midpoint Caltrain commuter shuttle serving Redwood City - \$182,143
15. SamTrans's Bayhill-San Bruno BART commuter shuttle serving San Bruno - \$179,000
16. SamTrans's Seton Medical-BART Daly City commuter shuttle serving Daly City - \$150,000
17. Commute.org's North Foster City commuter shuttle serving Foster City - \$315,274
18. JPB's Broadway/Millbrae commuter shuttle serving Burlingame - \$213,800
19. Commute.org's North Burlingame commuter shuttle serving Burlingame - \$124,562
20. JPB's Clipper commuter shuttle serving Redwood Shores - \$185,200
21. JPB's Sierra Point Millbrae commuter shuttle serving South San Francisco/Brisbane - \$84,000
22. JPB's Bayshore/Brisbane Commute and Midday Senior commuter/community shuttle serving Brisbane/Daly City - \$384,600
23. JPB's Campus Drive Area commuter shuttle serving San Mateo - \$185,200

24. JPB's Oracle commuter shuttle serving Redwood Shores - \$260,000
  25. Commute.org's South San Francisco BART commuter shuttle serving South San Francisco - \$641,742
  26. Commute.org's South San Francisco Caltrain commuter shuttle serving South San Francisco - \$399,459
  27. JPB's Belmont/Hillsdale commuter shuttle serving Belmont - \$185,200
  28. Commute.org's South San Francisco Centennial Tower commuter shuttle serving South San Francisco - \$118,544
  29. Commute.org's South San Francisco Ferry commuter shuttle serving South San Francisco - \$284,546
  30. Menlo Park's Shoppers community shuttle serving Menlo Park - \$59,485
  31. JPB's Norfolk Area commuter shuttle serving San Mateo - \$170,900
- Existing shuttles requesting C/CAG funding
    32. Menlo Park's Willow Road commuter shuttle serving Menlo Park - \$190,071
    33. Menlo Park's Mid-day community shuttle serving Menlo Park - \$731,457
  - New shuttles requesting Measure A funding
    34. San Mateo Community College District's Skyline College Express commuter shuttle serving San Bruno - \$202,703
    35. San Carlos's San Carlos Commuter commuter shuttle serving San Carlos - \$198,245
    36. SamTrans/San Mateo's Connect San Mateo community shuttle serving San Mateo - \$218,750
    37. SamTrans/San Carlos's San Carlos Community community shuttle serving San Carlos - \$162,860
    38. San Mateo County's County Parks Explorer community shuttle serving East Palo Alto/East Menlo Park/North Fair Oaks - \$201,056
  - One deferred funding recommendation
    39. San Mateo County's Coastside Beach community shuttle serving Half Moon Bay/unincorporated county - \$105,000 – being revised. When the shuttle is ready to proceed, staff will re-evaluate it and bring forward a recommendation to the Board.
  - One shuttle not recommended for funding
    40. Millbrae's new Millbrae Shuttle Service community shuttle serving Millbrae - \$197,250 – runs along the El Camino Real and has extensive overlap with and duplicates SamTrans bus service.
- Up to \$10 million available
  - \$9.28 million requested, \$8.98 million recommended for award
    - \$8.06 million from Measure A
    - \$0.92 million from C/CAG

- Schedule
  - April 2016: Informational item to the CAC and Board on draft program of projects list, and presentation to the C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee and Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee
  - May 2016: TA and C/CAG boards requested to approve proposed program of projects
  - May 2016 – June 2016: TA and C/CAG enter into funding agreements with project sponsors
- Future Funding Calls
  - Shuttle calls to become more competitive, less funding may be available for the next CFP
  - Consideration of increased match requirement for existing shuttles that do not meet the operating cost/passenger benchmark
    - Match requirement based on FY2017 performance, effective for funding cycle covering FY2019 and FY2020

Ms. Ward asked how to follow the progress of the deferred Coastside shuttle. Mr. Slavitt said the Midcoast Community Council would be the appropriate place to go.

Larry Shaine said the evaluation committee includes someone from Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit). He asked what their involvement is. Mr. Slavitt said panelists from this agency as well as from external agencies were included. The members from AC Transit and from Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District were former employees of SamTrans.

Mr. Shaine said Menlo Park has historically been independent and asked if Menlo Park needs more funding and if this is the start of a trend. Mr. Slavitt said the TA has not historically funded them, C/CAG has.

Ms. Scruggs asked if all shuttles are listed on commute.org or only the ones sponsored by commute.org. Mr. Slavitt said commute.org has their shuttles and some JPB shuttles. Between commute.org and the Caltrain website, most shuttles will be picked up. Staff encourages all sponsors to get their information on Google transit.

Chair Arietta asked if all the shuttle information could be on the TA website. Mr. Slavitt said that is something to consider.

Mr. Fox asked if there is any way to evaluate which shuttle routes might make sense to shift to a fixed-route SamTrans service. There must be some argument to use SamTrans versus shuttles, perhaps depending on a per mile basis or labor pool basis. He asked if there is a review process. Mr. Slavitt said the SamTrans Mobility Management Plan looked at poor performing bus routes to find better ways to provide service. Two or three of the proposed shuttles are to replace poor performing bus routes.

Mr. Fox asked if the shuttle costs are less than SamTrans costs. Mr. Slavitt said SamTrans has looked at it and there are efficiencies to be gained.

Mr. Hedges said businesses have money in some shuttles to get their people back and forth. He said he thinks riders would go back to automobiles if the shuttles were turned into SamTrans bus routes. It is a good idea to have AC Transit involved because of their connections with many of the shuttles. He said Google has shuttle information.

Chair Arietta asked what happened to the Pacifica shuttle that goes up to Devil's Slide. Mr. Slavitt said Pacifica decided not to put up any match and chose not to continue its existing shuttle because it was falling far short of its benchmarks.

Chair Arietta asked if a SamTrans bus serves that area. Mr. Slavitt said yes.

Mr. Shaine asked if there is any requirement for the equipment to be environmentally clean. Mr. Slavitt said the TA encourages it but it is not a requirement. When the program becomes oversubscribed it will be more important. More points are awarded for a clean-fuel vehicle.

Paul Young asked where to find out more information about the specifics of the Skyline College shuttle. Mr. Slavitt said he can talk about it off line.

Joe Hurley, Director, TA Program, said shuttles are afforded a certain level of agility that the fixed-route bus services don't have, such as schedule adjustments and route adjustments.

### **Program Report: Paratransit Program (TA Item 10b)**

Tina Dubost, Manager, Accessible Transit Services, presented:

- Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Paratransit
  - Passed in 1990
  - Full accessibility on all fixed-route buses (lifts/ramps)
  - Complimentary paratransit service for those unable to ride fixed-route transit
  - ADA Paratransit characteristics/requirements:
    - Service must be provided within three-fourths-mile zone of fixed-route service
    - Service day/time parallel to fixed-route service
    - Shared ride
    - Advance reservation
    - Zero denial for service
- SamTrans Paratransit Service
  - Provides equal opportunity for mobility to people with disabilities who cannot use conventional fixed-route transit
  - Commitment to paratransit pre-dates ADA
  - Provides service beyond what is required by ADA
  - Demand for ADA service has grown dramatically
  - Federal mandate
- Paratransit Registrants – up to approximately 8,400
- Paratransit Customers
  - 63 percent are 70 years or older
  - 21 percent are non-ambulatory

- 19 percent have cognitive disabilities
- 11 percent have visual disabilities
- 22 percent receive fare assistance
- All Redi-Wheels and RediCoast users must be certified as eligible for ADA Paratransit
- SamTrans utilizes a third-party functional assessment process to determine eligibility
- Paratransit Customer Trips
  - 10 percent go to dialysis centers
  - 15 percent go to adult day care centers
  - Other key destinations include doctor appointments, county services, hospitals, senior centers, colleges, senior housing, and shopping
- Program Costs
  - Average cost per trip is up approximately 3.2 percent per year
  - FY2015
    - Total costs = \$15,387
    - Total trips = 329,040
    - Average cost per trip = \$46.76
    - Farebox ratio = 5.1 percent
- How Service is Funded
  - TA Paratransit funding
    - Original Measure A
      - \$25 million fund established permanent source, use proceeds from investment to fund service
    - New Measure A
      - 4 percent of Measure, approximately \$2.9 million per year designated to meet the special mobility needs of county residents through paratransit and other accessible services
- Paratransit Funding Sources (FY2016 Budget - \$16.7 million)
  - San Mateo County: \$5 million
  - District sales tax: \$4 million
  - TA: \$3.1 million
  - Transportation Development Act Funds: \$1.8 million
  - Measure M (motor vehicle registration fee): \$1.4 million
  - Passenger fares: \$800,000
  - State Transit Assistance: \$400,000
  - Interest (Paratransit Trust Fund): \$300,000
- Operating Statistics
  - Redi-Wheels and RediCoast are delivered by a contractor with program oversight by SamTrans staff
    - First Transit is the contractor for Redi-Wheels
    - MV Transit is the contractor for RediCoast
  - SamTrans owns and maintains a fleet of vehicles for these services (53 cutaway buses and 24 minivans)
  - Contractor supplements District fleet with sedans and contracted taxis to meet peak demand



- Redi-Wheels Operation Center
  - Brewster facility and equipment owned and maintained by SamTrans
- Redi-Wheels Average Weekday Ridership
  - Graph was shown illustrating significant growth in ridership
- On-time performance (OTP)
  - Meeting standards of 90 percent
- Customer satisfaction
  - Standard is no more than 2.5 complaints per thousand trips, and both services are doing considerably better than that
- Redi-Wheels trip denials
  - In compliance with the requirement to provide 100 percent of service requests
- Summary
  - Ridership is increasing
  - County demographics pointing towards continued higher demand in the future
  - Service quality is high
    - Very low complaint rate
    - OTP rate above 90 percent goal
  - Paratransit service is a Federal mandate and contributes to SamTrans structural deficit
  - SamTrans continues to monitor costs and provide high-quality ADA service

Mr. Hedges said the Grand Jury did an investigation on Redi-Wheels and were very complimentary of the service. He asked for information about volunteering for the travel training. Ms. Dubost said there is a Senior Mobility Plan and the idea is to catch seniors before they need paratransit to encourage them to try SamTrans fixed-route service. The idea is for them to use SamTrans buses instead of paratransit, which is more efficient for SamTrans because the cost per rider for bus service is much less, and it improves the quality of life for many people. Staff is looking for travel ambassadors if people are interested in teaching people how to use the bus.

Ms. Bautista asked if the operating budget will be aligning with the expected increase in ridership. Ms. Dubost said because SamTrans cannot deny trips she expects the budget will go up. Staff will do what they can to limit the service only to those who truly need it. Ridership and costs will continue to go up.

Ms. Bautista asked what kind of training is involved in the event of emergencies. Ms. Dubost said the driver would pull over, call the dispatcher and call for an ambulance. Drivers have first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation training.

Mr. Shaine asked if service is provided outside the county to medical facilities such as Stanford Hospital. Ms. Dubost service is provided to areas that are within three-fourths of a mile of SamTrans service areas, which includes Stanford Hospital. By exception, the service also goes to the Palo Alto Veterans Administration Hospital because it is an important destination, as well as medical centers within the county and parts of San Francisco such as St. Luke's and San Francisco General.

Mr. Shaine said the certification program is good for free rides on fixed-route buses. Ms. Dubost said that is true and it is a way to encourage customers to take SamTrans whenever possible.

Olma O'Neill asked if staff works with any other agencies to transfer certification from their agency to SamTrans. Ms. Dubost said everyone has to go through the SamTrans certification process at least once and it is good for three years.

Ms. Scruggs asked if there have ever been programs that build in education about other programs and services while customers are on paratransit vehicles. Ms. Dubost said that has not been tried. She does give the eligibility staff copies of the Help at Home guide to hand out, but there is no formal process.

Ms. Scruggs asked if SamTrans would be open to that type of education, such as allowing a nonprofit organization representative to ride along to provide education to customers. Ms. Dubost said she is not sure if that would be the best way to reach someone or if flyers would be better.

Mr. Warhurst said a problem could be when someone with a cognitive disability who should not be unsupervised is dropped off an hour early for work and has nowhere to go. He asked how that is handled. Ms. Dubost said some customers who have routine trips can get a subscription trip and that will give them a set pickup time. If the person should not be left alone, staff can put notes in the manifest that they are not to be left alone.

Mr. Warhurst said he knows someone who has the subscription trips and the drop off time can range as much as an hour before or after the set time. Ms. Dubost said there will be some variability but an hour seems like a lot. She said she will talk to Mr. Warhurst offline about this issue.

Chair Arietta asked if service is provided to people who live on the coast down the county where there is not SamTrans service. Ms. Dubost said there are a few parts of the county that do not get paratransit service, but there are very few people living there. There are a few people who are so far from the main routes that SamTrans is simply not able to provide service. In some cases even taxis won't provide service because the customer is so far away.

#### **Approval of Minutes of March 3, 2016 (TA Item 4a)**

No discussion.

#### **REPORT OF THE CHAIR – BARBARA ARIETTA**

See attachment for Chair Arietta's complete report.

#### **REPORT FROM STAFF – JOE HURLEY**

Mr. Hurley reported:

- There has been a series of meetings on the 101 Corridor looking at short-term and long-term mobility improvements. High-occupancy vehicle lanes and high-

occupancy toll managed lanes are being looked at. Traffic studies are underway to assess the performance of these different scenarios. As that information becomes clear and presentable, staff will come back to the CAC with the findings.

- Recruitment to fill six positions on the CAC began on April 4 and closes on May 6. Interviews will be scheduled for May 27. Appointments will be made at the June 2 Board meeting.

Chair Arietta said she read that drivers will be ticketed if they drive on Interstate 580 in the new commute lanes without a FasTrak Flex Tag. Mr. Hurley said the old transponders were fixed, and the new flex tag allows drivers to select if they have two or three people in the car, because they will be charged at different rates depending on the number of passengers. If the driver has a regular transponder without the flex, they will not get the credit for having three people in the vehicle.

Ms. Ward left at 5:51 p.m.

#### **MEMBER COMMENTS/REQUESTS**

Mr. Hedges said the State is sponsoring a volunteer program to see how well it would work to change from a gas tax to mileage-based fee. He said infrastructure has to be paid for. Bonding is so cheap that some infrastructure projects should be bonded in order to pay for them.

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

Tuesday, May 3, 2016 at 4:30 p.m. at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, San Carlos, CA 94070

Adjourned at 5:56 p.m.

**Averill, Joshua**

---

**From:** Barbara Arietta <barietta@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 17, 2016 4:20 PM  
**To:** Averill, Joshua  
**Subject:** \*\*\*\*\*CAC CHAIR'S REPORT 4/5/2016\*\*\*\*\*

#### **MTC HOSTS CALTRAIN ELECTRIFICATION MEETING**

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Director Steve Heminger announced that he hosted a meeting of officials from the High Speed Rail Authority and the Peninsula Joint Powers Board in March to discuss ways to close the funding shortfall for the Caltrain Electrification Project that is scheduled to begin construction later this year. According to Heminger, the meeting was quite productive and a follow-up session will be scheduled in the next several weeks.

#### **STATE FUNDING FOR LOCAL ROADS ALSO SLASHED**

The MTC has recently reported that The STIP is not the only victim of the recent cut in the state gas tax. Cities and counties saw state funding for local streets and roads cut by 25% in FY 2015-16, forcing deferred maintenance for many Bay Area communities whose roads are already in poor condition. The MTC also reports that it is strongly urging the Legislature to restore the rate to 18 cents per gallon, eliminate the price-based adjustment, and index it to the Consumer Price Index or the Construction Cost Index thereafter.

**Respectfully submitted,**

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