A G E N D A

COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
(Accessibility, Senior Services, and Community Issues)

San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building
Bacciocco Auditorium - Second Floor
1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 2010 – 2:00 p.m.

ACTION

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Approval of Minutes of Community Relations Committee Meeting of May 12, 2010

INFORMATIONAL

3. Accessibility Update – Bill Welch

4. Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update – Nancy Keegan


6. Performance Report – Shuttles

7. Multimodal Ridership Report – April 2010

Committee Members: Shirley Harris, Omar Ahmad, Jerry Deal

NOTE:
- This Committee meeting may be attended by Board Members who do not sit on this Committee. In the event that a quorum of the entire Board is present, this Committee shall act as a Committee of the Whole. In either case, any item acted upon by the Committee or the Committee of the Whole will require consideration and action by the full Board of Directors as a prerequisite to its legal enactment.
- All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
Committee Members Present:  S. Harris (Committee Chair), O. Ahmad, J. Deal

Other Board Members Present: M. Church, R. Guilbault (Chair), Z. Kersteen-Tucker, A. Lloyd, K. Matsumoto, A. Tissier


Committee Chair Shirley Harris called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Community Relations Committee (CRC) Meeting of April 14, 2010
The committee approved the minutes (Ahmad/Deal).

Designation of May as “Older Americans Month”
Committee Chair Harris said staff is asking the Board to adopt a proclamation designating May as “Older Americans Month.” The District is a leader in serving the senior citizens of San Mateo County.

Board Chair Rose Guilbault and Committee Chair Harris presented the proclamation to Denis O’Sullivan, Chair of the San Mateo County Commission on Aging.

Mr. O’Sullivan thanked the Board for the proclamation.

The committee (Ahmad/Lloyd) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the motion.

Student “Art Takes a Bus Ride” Contest
Marketing Manager Pat Boland announced the winners of the annual “Art Takes a Bus Ride” contest:

- Makena Pereira, 1st Grade, Central Elementary
- Aniket Hingnekar 1st Grade, Central Elementary
- Brandon Gee, 3rd Grade, Sandpiper Elementary
- Julia Everson, 3rd Grade, Roosevelt Elementary
- Maddie King, 4th Grade La Entrada Middle School
- Anita Lam, 5th Grade, Foster City Elementary

The Committee adjourned at 2:19 p.m. to view the wrapped bus with the winning artwork.

The Committee reconvened at 2:31 p.m.
Accessibility Update
Accessible Transit Services Manager Bill Welch said March was a great month for Redi-Wheels due to the change in the late cancellation policy. Staff is meeting with San Francisco International Airport staff tomorrow to see if an additional Redi-Wheels stop can be added.

Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update
PCC Chair Nancy Keegan reported:
- The PCC presented outgoing PCC Chair Kent Mickelson with a Certificate of Appreciation for his 14 years of service.
- A presentation was given by the local area Office of Emergency Services and Homeland Security on emergency preparedness for people with disabilities.

Director Karyl Matsumoto asked if the PCC notifies local agencies where there are homebound individuals in case of an emergency. General Manager/CEO Michael Scanlon said this is part of the county’s emergency support functions, but will have staff check.

Mr. Scanlon said staff and the Board would like to present a Certificate of Appreciation to Mr. Mickelson and asked Ms. Keegan to contact him to arrange it.

CAC Liaison Report
CAC Chair John Baker reported on the May meeting:
- Thanked the Board for the appointment of the new CAC members.
- Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing Rita Haskin gave a presentation on the Customer Survey Key Findings.
- A few member raised concerns that passengers are getting wet at the shelter on El Camino Real in San Carlos because there is no front panel and that there is wrong information posted at a bus stop in San Mateo.

Performance Report – Caltrain – 2010 Annual Passenger Counts
Deputy CEO Chuck Harvey provided the following information:
- Headcounts are taken on every weekday train and averaged over five weekdays.
- Average weekday ridership is down 6 percent for the first time in six years.
- Ridership increased at the San Francisco and Tamien stations and decreased at 27 stations.
- Santa Clara County has the highest decrease in ridership but generates the most riders.
- Gilroy ridership has decreased 27.6 percent since 2006.
- Average trip length increased from 22.3 miles to 23 miles.
- Average weekday bicycle ridership decreased 8.9 percent.
- Total weekend ridership increased 1.1 percent.

Public Comment
Ed DeLanoy, San Carlos, said Caltrain runs extra trains in the evening and they are empty. Staff should consider a train at midnight.

Multimodal Ridership Report – March 2010
Mr. Harvey said average weekday ridership for the month of March 2010 compared to March 2009 was as follows:
• Ridership for all modes was 91,139, a decrease of 6.1 percent.
• Bus ridership was 46,620, a decrease of 8.6 percent.
• Paratransit ridership was 1,117, a decrease of 1.9 percent.
• Caltrain ridership was 36,060, a decrease of 1.3 percent.
• Caltrain shuttle ridership was 5,465, a decrease of 13.7 percent.
• BART shuttle ridership was 1,877, a decrease of 7.8 percent.

Adjourned: 3:08 p.m.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: C. H. (Chuck) Harvey
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: ACCESSIBILITY REPORT

ACTION
This report is for information only. No policy action is required.

SIGNIFICANCE
Several groups advise SamTrans on accessible service issues. The Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) provides a forum for consumer input on paratransit issues. The Advocacy and Legislative Committee (AL-Com) is the advocacy arm of the PCC. The SamTrans Accessibility Advisory Committee (formerly the Americans with Disabilities Act Technical Advisory Committee or ATAC) is a SamTrans committee that advises on accessibility issues, particularly related to fixed-route service. Each group has requested that the Board be informed of the issues discussed at meetings.

The PCC meets monthly (except for August). The SamTrans Accessibility Advisory Committee (SAAC) meets every two months. The PCC Advocacy meetings are now being held on a quarterly basis.

The minutes from the April 13 PCC meeting and the March 18 SAAC meeting are attached.

Prepared by: Tina Dubost, Accessibility Coordinator 650-508-6247
Project Manager: Bill Welch, Manager, Accessible Transit Services 650-508-6475
ATTENDANCE
Members Present: Nancy Keegan, Vice Chair; Dale Edwards, AL-Com Chair; Myria Barnes-Jackson, DOR; Maureen Dunn, Senior Focus; Aki Eejima, Consumer; Diane Griffith, Consumer; Stephanie Hill, Consumer; Mike Levinson, Consumer; Benjamin McMullan, CID; Dan Mensing, Consumer; May Nichols, COA; Sammi Riley, Consumer; Bill Welch, SamTrans.

Absentees: Barbara Kalt, Rosener House; Michal Settles, Coastside; Craig McCulloh, Aging & Adult Services; Judy Garcia, Consumer; Joe Monsor, Caregiver.

Guests: Elly Colwell, SamTrans; Pat Dixon, COD, CAD; Tina Dubost, SamTrans; Linda Rhine, PCC Consultant, Nelson\Nygaard; Henry Silvas, SamTrans; Lynn Spicer, MV Transportation; Rose Berta, PCC Staff; Susan McCaman, San Bruno Senior Center; Marie Violet, Sequoia Health & Wellness Center.

(Total Attendance: 22) Quorum--Yes

WELCOME/INTRODUCTION
Nancy Keegan announced Kent’s resignation from the PCC. He will no longer serve as chair of the PCC. Nancy acknowledged his long-term commitment to the PCC and the paratransit community. Kent has given Linda his permission to share his email address for any members wishing to communicate directly with Kent. Kent will always remain a friend to the PCC. Linda thanked Nancy for stepping up to serve as Chair for the remainder of this year.

Nancy welcomed all to the April PCC meeting, as well as thanking two special guests for their attendance, Susan McCaman from San Bruno Senior Center, and Marie Violet from Sequoia Health & Wellness Center.

APPROVAL OF MARCH PCC MINUTES
Nancy asked for a vote of approval for the March minutes. Bill moved the minutes be approved and Dan seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by all with Stephanie abstaining because of her absence from the March meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. AL-COM REPORT
Dale Edwards, Chair, reported that the April 6th quarterly meeting included two guests—Kim Rothschild of SamTrans Government Affairs, and Marshall Loring of MTC. Kim gave an overview of the legislative issues affecting SamTrans; Marshall reported on the State bill on accessible housing and transportation. Bill and John are continuing their work on the SFO pick up sites. Dale and Sue Edwards, Diane Griffith, Dan Mensing, and Sammi Riley will be representing the PCC at the Fun, Health, & Safety Fair at the Serramonte Shopping Center this Saturday, April 17th. They will be doing outreach for the PCC. Nancy thanked Dale and the volunteers for their time and support of the PCC.
Dale gave a personal “thank you” to Barbara Kalt and Kent Mickelson for supporting his term as AL-Com Chair, and said he appreciates the trust all had in him in the last four years as Chair of the AL-Com. Dale also thanked everyone that supported him as AL-Com Chair. Nancy and all members thanked Dale for his excellent leadership.

**B. GRANT/BUDGET REVIEW**
No budget report. No new update on the 5310 application process.

**EDUCATION COMMITTEE**
Nancy reported on a productive meeting on March 23rd. The spring newsletter was distributed today, and will be distributed at the Health Fair this Saturday as well as the tote bags and brochures. The next upcoming fair is the Senior Showcase on May 15th and San Mateo County Fair in June. The committee is discussing scheduling the fairs based on PCC member availability and willingness to staff upcoming fairs.

There is a reconfiguration of the Education Committee meetings. The meetings will be quarterly and scheduled immediately after the monthly PCC meetings. The next meeting is Tuesday, June 8th, from 3:45-4:45 pm. There will not be a May meeting. March, June, September, and December are the months of the quarterly meetings to be held at the SamTrans Auditorium.

**D. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

The Nominating Committee was reconfigured. Barbara Kalt will remain as Committee Chair and May will also serve on the Committee. In Barbara’s absence, Nancy announced that nominations for next year’s officers will be pushed back one month. Nominations will be announced at the May meeting, and anyone with a nomination can contact Barbara. The voting will take place in June.

Linda gave the Consumer Corps report for the first quarter covering January through March. There were 200 reports, which is higher than usual. The feedback across the board is good. The ride times were within the acceptable range 92% of the time; telephone holds had an average time of 3.1 minutes; driver assistance was reported helpful; and the type of vehicles reported: 31% were picked up by a Redi-Wheels bus or large van, 45% by a Redi-Wheels minivan, 17% in a Redi-Wheels sedan, and 7% in a cab. Linda also gave an explanation of the Consumer Corps which represents riders’ trip experiences, and is a confirmation on the quality of service. The report also serves as a cross check with the formal statistics presented in SamTrans operational reports. Mike emphasized that Consumer Corps members’ reports are confidential, and Nancy noted that the report reflects a typical rider’s experience.

Linda mentioned that a current Consumer Corps member recently requested if supplemental questions could be included in the form. The Executive Committee will re-evaluate the form and may include questions relating to the new Late Cancel policy and other changes. Any proposed changes will be brought to the PCC for approval.

**SAM TRANS/REDI-WHEELS REPORT**

**A. Operational Report**
Bill shared that John and Bill are still working on the SFO pick-up locations; the goal is to get locations that are convenient, safe and secure. Better signage is also in the works.
There was also much discussion at the AL-Com meeting on the concern from a Kaiser representative on dropping off clients at the wrong location. Due to six different Kaiser locations, customers sometimes reserve rides to the wrong drop off site. Bill explained that Redi-Wheels’ policy of not dropping off clients at secondary locations is due to the safety of customers and liability.

Bill reported that March was a banner month because Redi-Wheels had the highest productivity and good on-time performance in recent times. Trapeze software has helped in balancing on-time performance and productivity through improved scheduling of group trips and batching trips more efficiently. Tina recently attended a class on Trapeze and has learned more features it has to offer. Trapeze does automatic scheduling and can handle holidays more efficiently; a “stranded riders’ report” could also be helpful in case of emergency. Bill shared that the Brewster center will be expanding to accommodate increase in capacity and staff.

The CalACT spring conference is scheduled next week in San Francisco. Bill has a place on the panel for ADA Eligibility. SamTrans will be hosting approximately 30 people to visit the Eligibility Office and facility.

**B. Performance Summary**

Tina reported that February 2010 ridership is similar to February 2009. Total rides have increased by 1%. There were zero missed trips; productivity is up; complaints are down and compliments are up. Late cancels have increased due to the policy change. Lynn explained the definition of a late cancel. There was discussion on how the manifest is handled; details in the address sometimes get lost from reservations to the manifest. Lynn explained that the reservationist will read back the details in the address to the caller; and once the reservation is confirmed, the manifest is printed. Lynn will investigate and make sure the manifest includes the full address— letters and numbers included.

**C. Customer Comments**

Elly reported that the overall comments have decreased from January 2010 to February 2010. In the comments by category, policy related is up, while the service-related and compliments have decreased; the overall response time remains below the 7-day turnaround limit, thanks to Sophie and Lynn’s good efforts. In the comments by type, all remain the same except for customer error. Elly said that the errors are caused by errors in reserving rides. Bill mentioned that these are good statistics.

Stephanie shared that she was informed that the Hillsdale Mervyn’s bus stop is now renamed. Dan mentioned drop off points at Hillsdale Mall are Sears and SamTrans bus stop; he suggested riders specify which stop is preferred to the reservationist.

Aki asked how a rider could find out the status of their late cancels or no-shows. Bill said to call customer relations.

**D. Safety Report**

Lynn reported that RediCoast had no accidents this past month and one preventable accident for Redi-Wheels. There was a total of 219,000+ miles between accidents. Maureen asked how Spanish-speaking riders get their reservations completed. Lynn replied that they have several Spanish-speaking reservationists/dispatchers; it is difficult, but they are dealing with riders who speak a language other than English. The new Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system will be programmed in English and Spanish.
LIAISON REPORTS

A. MTC REPORT
Marshall could not be here today. Linda announced that Marshall was appointed to the new MTC Policy Committee.

B. AGENCY
Nancy gave the report for Barbara stating that they had two meetings: 1) site certifications, and 2) agency fare increase effective July 1, 2010 that had been postponed last year. Bill reported that Tina researched alternative methods for determining agency fares and has not yet been able to come up with an improvement on the current system. Fares cover a small portion of what it really cost to provide the service.

C. COASTSIDE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (CTC)
Dale announced that the Coastside meeting is scheduled for April 14, 2010 at 9:30 am, at Ted Adcott Senior Center.

D. EFFICIENCY REVIEW COMMITTEE (ERC)
Mike reported that the database of eligible riders has been cleaned up. They discussed the Late Cancel policy change; and so thus far, is looking good. Trends will be monitored and ERC will share with the full PCC the results on a regular basis. The Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system will be on the May SamTrans Board’s agenda for approval of the selected vendor. The IVR is scheduled to be in operation by early 2011.

E. COMMISSION ON AGING (COA) REPORT
May announced that the Commission on Aging (COA) is implementing changes to their representation. They are looking to select a new Vice Chair to replace Bob Collins, who recently passed away. COA is recruiting new members that reflect the community it serves. The agency would like to include members of the Hispanic community and professional members with an accounting or law background. Sammi, May and Nancy are encouraging seniors to fill out the 2010 Census and convincing them that there is no personal information being asked and everything is kept confidential.

COMMISSION ON DISABILITY (COD) REPORT
Pat Dixon mentioned the last meeting discussed the upcoming Art Fair and how to handle it given the difficult financial climate.

OTHER BUSINESS
Tina announced that the May PCC meeting will be held on the 4th floor in the Veranda Room. Signs will be posted and staff will guide members to the room.

Diane shared that she and John spoke about volunteering her time for training drivers on the awareness of service dogs.

An updated PCC roster list of members was distributed and should be kept confidential.

Dale gave a brief history of the PCC for the benefit of our guests at the meeting. He expressed his appreciation for all the people who work diligently on behalf of Redi-Wheels and RediCoast, from Bill Welch and SamTrans staff; John Murphy and Lynn Spicer of MV Transportation; to
Linda Rhine of Nelson\Nygaard and Rose Berta as well as all PCC members. The PCC represents over 7,000 riders with wonderful committed members on the PCC.

Ben recently contacted Joe Simitian’s office to follow up on Kent’s work on the idea of giving PCC first responder status in case of emergency. They are willing to work with us, and Ben will follow up with a report on this issue at the next AL-Com meeting in July. Henry noted that he was recently contacted by the Office of Emergency Services (OES).

Nancy thanked everyone for their attendance, input, and a good meeting.

**MEETING ADJOURNED:  3:30 pm and closed the meeting in Kent’s honor for his many years of service to the PCC.**
SAMTRANS ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY – March 18, 2010

SAMTRANS HEADQUARTERS BUILDING
1250 SAN CARLOS AVENUE, SAN CARLOS
GALLAGHER CONFERENCE ROOM, 3RD FLOOR
11:00 AM – 12:30 PM

PRESENT: Pat Dixon, Tom Collette, Jim Engvall, Alice McGrath, Jim Stinehoff
ABSENT: Alec Karp, Doris Maez

SAMTRANS STAFF: Paul Lee, Richard Lesser, Bill Welch

I. Approval of Minutes

Approved.

II. Fixed Route Bus and Caltrain

A. Updating of SAAC (formerly ATAC) By-Laws

The By-Laws were read around the table.

In the By-Laws document, “Coastside Opportunity Center” should be changed to its new name, “Coastside Hope”. Paul Lee asked whether the committee has a representative from Coastside Hope, as is indicated in the by-laws. He suggested talking to the Coastside Transportation Committee. Bill Welch concurred, asked whether it would be good to have a Coastside fixed-route user on the committee.

Tom Collette and Pat Dixon will bring up recruitment of new committee members at meetings of their other transportation committees. Jim Engvall suggested going through CID. Alice McGrath would like to get a committee member with a hearing impairment; she also asked whether SamTrans has a Facebook page. Jim Engvall said that Giaconda Egan might have an idea on recruiting someone with a hearing impairment. Bill Welch said that we might ask Rita Haskin if we could or should use bus cards to recruit for this committee, though it is not a board-appointed body like the CAC.

It was suggested that regular attendees Pat Dixon and Tom Collette be made official committee members.

Jim Steinhoff asked whether it is a requirement that committee members use public transit. He only uses his power chair to come to meetings, and doesn’t ride the bus much. Bill Welch replied that it is not currently a requirement, but believes that it is helpful for some of the members to use the service. Pat Dixon thinks it would limit membership – such as her own, since her back condition prevents her from riding the bus. She takes the information discussed in this committee back to the CAC committee.
Alice McGrath said that this goes back to the purpose of the committee – Is it only for fixed route users? Does a person have to be a regular rider to give meaningful input to the committee?

Tom Collette is attending with an eye to coordinating with the CAC committee on which he sits. He asked when a Caltrain Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting would take place. Richard Lesser is scheduling one soon.

The SamTrans Accessibility Advisory Committee currently has six members: Alec Karp (chair), Jim Engvall, Doris Maez, Alice McGrath, Kent Mickelson, Jim Stinehoff.

In the By-Laws section III – “Composition of the Committee”, Pat Dixon falls under four of the categories to have representation. Other members also could fit into more than one category. The categories are: senior citizens, people with physical disabilities, people with sensory impairments, wheelchair users, people with developmental disabilities, The SamTrans Citizens Advisory Committee, The Paratransit Coordinating Council and Coastsdie Hope.

Bill Welch asked if it makes sense to have all these categories and the general response was that it makes sense to include the five disabilities classifications in the committee composition. Alice McGrath noted that a blind traveler has a different perspective than a wheelchair user, though her awareness of different disability issues has been raised by being on this committee. She especially has learned a lot about wheelchair users’ experience through Jim Engvall and Jim Steinhoff’s committee participation.

It was suggested that the term for Chair and Vice Chair be changed from two years to one year to match the term for other members. It was agreed that flexibility on term limits for being on the committee was a good thing to keep experienced and contributing members. Bill Welch noted that it doesn’t say that someone cannot serve successive terms. Alice McGrath pointed out that while it is good to keep members, the committee could become stagnant without new members.

Under the “Absences” section of the By-Laws, email should be added as a means of letting staff know in advance of an excused absence from the Committee. Paul Lee suggested that we change “will be dismissed [for 3 unexcused absences] to “may be dismissed…” Jim Engvall also noted that absences related to a member’s disability are excused.

B. RTC Card to “go live” for Translink

Richard Lesser presented. RTC Cards currently have an RFD chip and Translink capability. We are now informing applicants of this functionality. It works on Caltrain, Muni, AC Transit, Golden Gate Transit, and BART, and SamTrans is scheduled to be revenue-ready for a “soft launch” of Translink on April 24th, dependant on equipment installation (antennas and other peripherals). The Eligible Discount Fare is automatically charged for RTC Translink users. The Caltrain “hard launch” is scheduled April 2nd. We will start to sell regular Translink cards here in addition to providing RTC cards. Translink is scheduled to change its name to “Clipper” on April 15th.
C. Affect of Service cuts and Fare Increases on Customers with Disabilities?

Alice McGrath stated that buses are now really crowded. Boarding and getting a seat is more difficult at any time of day, especially with a guide dog or service dog, and she often has to cajole passengers to relinquish a seat in the priority seating area, which she did not have to do when buses were less crowded. She does not encounter the same difficulties on VTA. She said that drivers should be aware that people with disabilities might need more help when buses are crowded.

Jim Engvall said that more articulated buses could help. On the more crowded buses, he has to ask people to move so that he can turn his wheelchair around to fit into the securement space. He said that some drivers seem to forget how to secure a wheelchair, attaching straps to his footrests and making other errors. Jim Stinehoff said that he sometimes has to request the lap and shoulder belts. Bill Welch asked to please let us know about these issues, so that we may counsel the drivers. Richard Lesser reminded all to give the bus number, route number, time, date, and badge number if possible when making a report.

VIII. Set Date for Next Meeting

The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday, May 20th.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: C. H. (Chuck) Harvey
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: SHUTTLES PERFORMANCE REPORT

ACTION
This report is for information only. No policy action is required.

SIGNIFICANCE
This presentation is part of this fiscal year’s series of detailed performance reports presented to the Board. Each of the District’s four transportation modes – SamTrans motor bus, ADA Paratransit, Caltrain and Shuttles – are featured individually each month. This month features a report on the Shuttles service.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
This is the third Shuttles report to be presented this fiscal year. Staff will report on the business partners, program size, funding partnerships, and ridership.

This month’s presentation will be presented via PowerPoint. A handout will be provided at the meeting.

Prepared by: Donald G. Esse, Senior Operations Financial Analyst 650-508-6329
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: C.H. (Chuck) Harvey
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: MULTIMODAL RIDERSHIP REPORT—APRIL 2010

ACTION
This report is for information only. No action is required.

SIGNIFICANCE
Table “A” summarizes the average weekday ridership (AWR) statistics for all modes of transportation for which SamTrans is responsible. Chart “A” compares AWR for Fiscal Year 2008, FY2009, FY2010 and year-to-date comparisons of FY2009 vs. FY2010.

Table “A” also provides the average weekday ridership of the BART SFO Extension as a separate line.

MONTHLY RIDERSHIP HIGHLIGHTS—APRIL 2010 COMPARED TO APRIL 2009

All Modes – AWR of 91,435, a decrease of 6.3 percent.

Bus – AWR of 44,950, a decrease of 8.6 percent. Heavy rain impacts ridership. April 2010 was wet with 2.75 inches, 1.57 inches above normal. April 2009 had 0.27 inches of rain, .91 inches below normal.

Paratransit - AWR of 1,109, a decrease of 1.6 percent.

Caltrain - AWR of 38,060, a decrease of 2.7 percent.

Caltrain Shuttles - AWR of 5,516, a decrease of 8.8 percent. Stanford Marguerite shuttles continue its transition to fully automated counting and change management. All other shuttles rolled up into this category are down approximately 16 percent.

BART Shuttles - AWR of 1,800, a decrease of 11.9 percent.
SamTrans Activities and Promotions:

The SamTrans Marketing Department continues to implement a number of programs and activities to attract customers. The activities for the month included:

- **Earth Day** – More than 4,600 customers were greeted by SamTrans and Peninsula Congestion Relief Alliance staffs as the two agencies partnered to celebrate the 40th anniversary of Earth Day. The “Go Green Team” distributed “thanks for being green” wallets at key SamTrans transit hubs, including Colma BART, Hillsdale Shopping Center, the Redwood City transit center and multiple locations between the Linda Mar Park and Ride and downtown Half Moon Bay. Staff wore green shirts and smiles as they thanked customers for supporting public transit and helping to reduce emissions.

- **Transit Benefits** – The financial incentive for using transit has become more attractive since the implementation of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 increased the allowance by nearly 100 percent. A new program sponsored by the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance provides fresh incentive for San Mateo County employers to get started – cash awards of up to $1,000 to defray some of the initial costs, as well as assistance in learning how to set up a program. To get the word out about the potential tax savings and the Alliance's program, SamTrans partnered with the organization to inform people about it and to promote public transit ridership. The educational component of the campaign included a news release and mention in the Alliance Earth Day promotion, which gave qualified commuters the opportunity to receive a $10 TransLink card.

- **Vendor Expansion** – SamTrans added a vendor to the pass sales network of businesses within the SamTrans service area. Sales packets were mailed to 55 businesses that were determined to be good prospects and a follow-up call was made to gauge interest in joining the team of more than 70 SamTrans pass sales outlets. The packets were sent to areas considered to be underserved by the current network of vendors and included a SamTrans System Map, Facts and Figure brochure, Information Guide and information about how to join the SamTrans sales network. A new vendor, California Check Cashing, joined the network in San Mateo.

Prepared by: James De Hart, Senior Planner 650-508-6227
Patrick Boland, Manager, Marketing 650-508-6245
### Table A
Average Weekday Ridership

#### April 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2008</th>
<th>FY2009</th>
<th>FY2010^</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus +</td>
<td>49,430</td>
<td>49,200</td>
<td>44,950</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain # +</td>
<td>39,940</td>
<td>39,120</td>
<td>38,060</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttle #</td>
<td>6,201</td>
<td>6,045</td>
<td>5,516</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttle</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>2,043</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>98,938</td>
<td>97,535</td>
<td>91,435</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART (Extension Only)*</td>
<td>32,948</td>
<td>36,057</td>
<td>35,165</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>131,886</td>
<td>133,592</td>
<td>126,600</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2008</th>
<th>FY2009</th>
<th>FY2010^</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus +</td>
<td>48,140</td>
<td>50,600</td>
<td>46,770</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain # +</td>
<td>36,820</td>
<td>40,090</td>
<td>37,310</td>
<td>-6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttle #</td>
<td>5,303</td>
<td>6,206</td>
<td>5,583</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttle</td>
<td>2,011</td>
<td>2,057</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>93,384</td>
<td>100,099</td>
<td>92,650</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART (Extension Only)*</td>
<td>33,648</td>
<td>37,556</td>
<td>35,704</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>127,032</td>
<td>137,655</td>
<td>128,354</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# System
* Extension Only (No Daly City)
+ Rounded to nearest tens
^ Service cuts/reduced (12/09)

### Chart A
Average Weekday Ridership
ACTION

1. Approval of Minutes of Finance Committee Meeting of May 12, 2010
2. Approval of Revenues and Expenses for April 2010
3. Adoption of Fiscal Year 2011 Operating Budget in the Amount of $131,810,465
4. Adoption of Fiscal Year 2011 Capital Budget in the Amount of $8,624,325
5. Authorize Approval of Bid Documents and Execution of Documents for Fuel Hedging Program
6. Authorize the Execution of the Memorandum of Understanding with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for the Operations and Maintenance of the ClipperSM Fare Collection System
7. Authorize Revisions to the Settlement Authority Policy for General Liability Claims
8. Authorize Revisions to the Settlement Authority Policy for Employment Claims

CONTRACTS

9. Authorize Rejection of Low Monetary Bid from Granite Construction Company as Non-Responsive and Award of Contract to Interstate Grading and Paving, Inc. for Pico Boulevard Paving Improvements for a Total Amount of $86,910
10. Authorize Award of Contract to The Cities Group for Provision of Workers Compensation Program Administration Services for a Fixed Price of $878,000 for a Five Year Term
11. Authorize Rejection of all Bids for Providing Electrical Maintenance Services and On-call Emergency Repairs and Authorization to Resolicit Bids

Committee Members: Mark Church, Shirley Harris, Art Lloyd

NOTE:

- This Committee meeting may be attended by Board Members who do not sit on this Committee. In the event that a quorum of the entire Board is present, this Committee shall act as a Committee of the Whole. In either case, any item acted upon by the Committee or the Committee of the Whole will require consideration and action by the full Board of Directors as a prerequisite to its legal enactment.
- All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
Committee Members Present: M. Church (Committee Chair), S. Harris, A. Lloyd

Other Board Members Present, Constituting Committee of the Whole: O. Ahmad, J. Deal, R. Guilbault, Z. Kersteen-Tucker, K. Matsumoto, A. Tissier


Committee Chair Mark Church called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Finance Committee Meeting of April 14, 2010
The committee approved the minutes (Lloyd/Harris).

Approval of Revenues and Expenses for March 2010
Deputy CEO Gigi Harrington said revenues are under budget by $7 million. There is $5 million in savings on the expense side. Last week fuel was $2.28 per gallon and $2.05 per gallon year-to-date. The fuel hedge was tripped in April and a payment of $24,539 was received from the bank.

The committee (Tissier/Lloyd) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the report.

Approval of the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Overall Goal of Zero Percent for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Funds for Fiscal Years (FY) 2011-2013
DBE Officer Raymond Lee said staff is asking that the Committee recommend a 0 percent DBE goal for Federal FY2011-2013. This goal is recommended because currently only one project has been identified that is federally-assisted and it is a contract for the South Base bus washer replacement where there is no DBE availability. There were no federally-assisted projects identified for the FY2012-2013 period and if there are projects identified the goal will be amended. Staff assures the Board they will continue to look for opportunities. Mr. Lee said, for the current fiscal year, the overall goal is 6 percent and as of March 2010 it is 5.3 percent. Public input is an important part of the DBE program so the DBE Review Committee proposes the committee recommend the publication of the proposed goal. If no public comments are received within 45 days, staff asks the Board to authorize the General Manager/CEO to adopt the 0 percent goal.

Director Shirley Harris asked if this was the first year there was a 0 percent goal. Mr. Lee said that is correct and also it is the first time a goal is being submitted on a three year basis. The United States Department of Transportation amended the regulations to make it three year which
is a bit more of a challenge. General Manager/CEO Michael Scanlon said this goal reflects current financial issues and no capital projects being done.

The committee (Deal/Tissier) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the motion.

Authorize Submittal of Grant Applications and the Execution of Standard Agreements with Caltrans Pertaining to FTA Section 5311 Funds for FY2009 and 2010 in the Amount of $208,994

The committee (Tissier/Kersteen-Tucker) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the motion.

Acceptance of the Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review and Outlook for the Quarter Ended March 31, 2010

Bill Osher of CSI Capital Management said the markets are more fragile now than they have been in the past. The portfolio is designed for safety and there is nothing going on in the market today that is causing any concern. The biggest negative is interest rates might not be rising as fast as they otherwise would be in an improving economic environment. Mr. Osher said employment is starting to grow again. The unemployment rate hasn’t dropped yet because there are more people going back into the labor force. Small business confidence is starting to rise again. This is good news because small businesses are the driver of employment in the country and with employment comes spending and with spending comes sales tax revenue dollars.

Director Karyl Matsumoto asked about growth in small businesses. Mr. Osher said there is more job growth in small businesses than large business. Employment growth is tracking more than 4 percent this quarter.

Committee Chair Church asked if the recent downturn is more of a correction in equity markets. Mr. Osher said equity markets were at bottom and have risen over 80 percent. There were a lot of people ready to pull the trigger and take some money off the table at any sign of a correction. Greece was the trigger that caused the correction and this is a wake-up call for governments around the globe to have more fiscal policy responsibility.

Public Comment

Ed DeLanoy, San Carlos, said he read the biographies of the candidates for San Mateo County Treasurer and he is appalled because no one speaks to the issue of cost containment and losses.

The committee (Harris/Deal) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the motion.

Director Adrienne Tissier recommended approval of the following items.

1. Authorize Execution of Purchase Orders Over $100,000 for Technology Related Products and Services to Vendors Under Cooperative Purchasing Agreements for FY2011 for anAggregate Not-to-Exceed Amount of $900,000
2. Authorize Execution of Purchase Orders Over $100,000 for Information Technology License Renewals, Maintenance Services and Professional Services for FY2011 for an Aggregate Not-to-Exceed Amount of $850,000

3. Authorize the Purchase of Seven Ford Focus Automobiles Through the State of California Contract for a Total Estimated Cost of $104,248

4. Authorize the Purchase of Four Hybrid Ford Escape Vehicles Through the State of California Contract for a Total Estimated Cost of $125,035

5. Authorize Award of Contract to Office Max, Inc. for Purchase and Delivery of General Office Supplies and Related Items for a Total Estimated Cost of $325,000 for Five Years

6. Authorize Award of Contract to Ontira Communications, Inc. for Provision of an Interactive Voice Response System and Maintenance and Support Services for a Fixed Price of $167,622

7. Rejection of the Single Bid Received from National Transit Interiors, Inc. for the Provision of Automotive and Bus Upholstery Repair Services

The committee (Tissier/Lloyd) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the motion.

**Preliminary Fiscal Year 2011 Operating Budget**
Manager of Budgets Ladi Bhuller made the following report:
- Preliminary revenues are projected to increase $3 million to $130.9 million.
- Preliminary operating expenses are $128.3 million.
- District-operated bus expenses are expected to increase $1.9 million; contracted services are expected to decrease $300,000; Americans with Disabilities Act program is expected to increase $100,000 and multimodal transit program is expected to decrease $6.4 million.
- The projected deficit for FY2011 results in the use of $22.5 million in reserves.

Director Matsumoto asked what the percentage of wages and benefits is on the expense side. Ms. Bhuller said it is $55 million out of the total operating budget of $128 million.

**Public Comment**
Jerry Grace, San Lorenzo, asked if this financial problem is just happening now or did it happen in the past. Mr. Scanlon said everything has not been good and staff has been using one-time funds to balance the budget.

John Baker, South San Francisco, asked how much is remaining in reserves. Mr. Scanlon said there probably is enough for a couple more years.

**Preliminary Fiscal Year 2011 Capital Budget**
Manager of Budgets, Eva Goode made the following report:
• The total budget is $5.2 million.
• The FY2011 budget addresses the vision and focus areas outlined in the District’s Strategic Plan.
• Some of the projects include:
  o Revenue vehicle replacement and support to replace vehicles at the end of their useful lives and procure bus parts, engines and transmissions.
  o Replace and upgrade information technology equipment, servers and software applications to maintain connectivity of various departments and external communications.
  o Undertake a Comprehensive Operational Analysis to evaluate the District’s suite of transportation services.
  o Facility improvement and rehabilitation to maintain a safe and secure environment for transit operations.
  o Development of the District’s Sustainability Program.
• The majority of the funding will come from District sales tax.

Adjourned: 3:45 p.m.
FINANCE ITEM # 2
JUNE 9, 2010

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR THE PERIOD ENDING APRIL 30, 2010 AND SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend that the Board accept and enter into the record the Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the month of April 2010 and supplemental information.

SIGNIFICANCE
Revenues: Total Revenues (page 1, line 12) are $3,687,230 or 3.4 percent worse than revised budget. Passenger Fares (page 1, line 1) are worse than budget by $287,070 or 2.0 percent, TDA and STA Funds (page 1, line 2) are worse than budget by $80,467 or 0.4 percent, Operating Grants (page 1, line 4) are worse than budget by 2,508,478 or 48.9 percent, District ½ Cent Sales Tax (page 1, line 8) is worse than budget by $629,407 or 1.3 percent and Investment Interest (page 1, line 9) is worse than budget by $255,798 or 5.2 percent.

Expenses: Total Expenses (page 4, line 75) are $3,045,725 or 2.8 percent better than budget. Within Total Expenses, Total Motor Bus (page 3, line 48) is better than budget by $2,515,221 or 3.2 percent, Total ADA Programs (page 4, line 57) are better than budget by $512,981 or 4.5 percent and Total Multimodal (page 4, line 73) is better than budget by $17,523 or 0.1 percent.

Budget Amendments: The budget amendments adopted by the Board at the April 14 Board meeting have been reflected in this Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the month of April 2010.

Prepared by: Rima Lobo, Manager, Financial Services 650-508-6274
Jeannie Chen, Senior Accountant 650-508-6259
## Statement of Revenues and Expenses

### Summary of Revenues and Expenses

**Fiscal Year 2010**

**April 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>SOURCES OF FUNDS</th>
<th>USES OF FUNDS</th>
<th>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT) FOR PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Revenue Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Interest, Rent &amp; Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - Operating Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Revenue Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Motor Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. A. Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - Other Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Uses of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - Operating Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Uses of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass through to Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer Out to Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal Agent Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Transfer Interest Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - Other Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Uses of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenues - All Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve Programmed for Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - Other Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- **Note A**: The Revised Budget includes the year end rollover of existing capital projects.

## Summary

**% OF YEAR ELAPSED**: 83.3%

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>SOURCES OF FUNDS</th>
<th>USES OF FUNDS</th>
<th>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT) FOR PERIOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Revenue Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Interest, Rent &amp; Other Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - Operating Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Revenue Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District Motor Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. D. A. Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - Other Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Uses of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - Operating Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Uses of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass through to Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer Out to Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiscal Agent Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Transfer Interest Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - Other Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Uses of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenues - All Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve Programmed for Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal - Other Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table Notes

- **% OF YEAR ELAPSED** provides a general measure for evaluating overall progress against the annual budget. When comparing it to the amounts shown in the "% REV BUDGET" column, please note that individual line items reflect variations due to seasonal activities during the year.

- **Note A**: The Revised Budget includes the year end rollover of existing capital projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>REVISED ACTUAL</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING REVENUES - MOTOR BUS</td>
<td>TOTAL MOTOR BUS FARES</td>
<td>1,391,613</td>
<td>13,921,536</td>
<td>13,623,146</td>
<td>13,880,000</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUND</td>
<td>2,055,253</td>
<td>25,059,260</td>
<td>20,552,535</td>
<td>20,552,535</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>45,252</td>
<td>2,163,754</td>
<td>181,007</td>
<td>226,258</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING GRANTS</td>
<td>Planning Assistance Grant</td>
<td>1,332,141</td>
<td>1,047,041</td>
<td>2,585,568</td>
<td>4,463,390</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT 1/2 CENT SALES TAX</td>
<td>General Operating Asst.</td>
<td>2,893,571</td>
<td>32,301,625</td>
<td>30,794,117</td>
<td>31,364,164</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT INTEREST INCOME</td>
<td>Investment Interest Income</td>
<td>26,771</td>
<td>837,947</td>
<td>86,108</td>
<td>67,088</td>
<td>128.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REVENUE SOURCES</td>
<td>Overnight Deposits Interest Income</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>193,916</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN DISABILITIES ACT</td>
<td>Passenger Fares Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>56,321</td>
<td>509,062</td>
<td>568,951</td>
<td>599,167</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIMODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS</td>
<td>Sales Tax - District ADA Programs</td>
<td>109,124</td>
<td>7,147,467</td>
<td>3,511,210</td>
<td>3,511,210</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>TOTAL MOTOR BUS</td>
<td>11,604,765</td>
<td>79,704,074</td>
<td>76,700,898</td>
<td>79,242,815</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% OF YEAR ELAPSED provides a general measure for evaluating overall progress against the annual budget. When comparing it to the amounts shown in the "% REV BUDGET" column, please note that individual line items reflect variations due to seasonal activities during the year.
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## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### OPERATING EXPENSES
#### FISCAL YEAR 2010
#### APRIL 2010

### % OF YEAR ELAPSED: 83.3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT ACTUAL</td>
<td>PRIOR ACTUAL</td>
<td>CURRENT ACTUAL</td>
<td>REVISED ACTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% REV BUDGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OPERATED BUSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>4,105,523</td>
<td>45,206,648</td>
<td>43,889,362</td>
<td>44,056,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Board of Directors</td>
<td>4,548</td>
<td>41,901</td>
<td>45,721</td>
<td>44,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Contracted Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>26,102</td>
<td>455,449</td>
<td>480,497</td>
<td>524,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Property Maintenance</td>
<td>78,765</td>
<td>856,077</td>
<td>835,437</td>
<td>1,196,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Professional Services</td>
<td>305,272</td>
<td>2,284,976</td>
<td>1,765,672</td>
<td>2,546,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Technical Services</td>
<td>278,172</td>
<td>2,523,938</td>
<td>2,952,072</td>
<td>3,057,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Other Services</td>
<td>26,749</td>
<td>329,158</td>
<td>278,771</td>
<td>347,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Materials &amp; Supply:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Bus Parts &amp; Materials</td>
<td>121,229</td>
<td>1,748,466</td>
<td>1,538,305</td>
<td>1,609,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Uniforms &amp; Driver Expense</td>
<td>14,468</td>
<td>345,520</td>
<td>259,971</td>
<td>324,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Timetables &amp; Tickets</td>
<td>42,084</td>
<td>147,415</td>
<td>160,732</td>
<td>181,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Office Supplies / Printing</td>
<td>21,253</td>
<td>242,201</td>
<td>184,856</td>
<td>255,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Other Materials &amp; Supply</td>
<td>14,219</td>
<td>141,720</td>
<td>121,067</td>
<td>144,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Utilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Telephone</td>
<td>28,796</td>
<td>375,371</td>
<td>313,301</td>
<td>330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Other Utilities</td>
<td>72,826</td>
<td>783,464</td>
<td>790,806</td>
<td>830,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Insurance Costs</td>
<td>231,194</td>
<td>2,279,124</td>
<td>1,906,133</td>
<td>1,909,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Workers’ Compensation</td>
<td>262,183</td>
<td>2,534,995</td>
<td>2,620,484</td>
<td>2,643,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Taxes &amp; License Fees</td>
<td>38,068</td>
<td>343,667</td>
<td>333,137</td>
<td>379,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Fixed Route Accessibility</td>
<td>83,687</td>
<td>839,014</td>
<td>823,668</td>
<td>817,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Leases &amp; Rental</td>
<td>8,332</td>
<td>87,540</td>
<td>86,672</td>
<td>94,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Promotional &amp; Legal Advertising</td>
<td>13,315</td>
<td>169,697</td>
<td>157,661</td>
<td>279,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Seminar &amp; Training</td>
<td>12,366</td>
<td>152,332</td>
<td>82,874</td>
<td>142,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Business Travel &amp; Meeting</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>29,269</td>
<td>18,079</td>
<td>25,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Dues &amp; Membership</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>74,564</td>
<td>34,705</td>
<td>42,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Postage &amp; Other</td>
<td>3,843</td>
<td>47,758</td>
<td>48,759</td>
<td>79,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Total District Operated Buses</td>
<td>6,134,906</td>
<td>66,149,192</td>
<td>63,162,330</td>
<td>65,306,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84,938,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 CONTRACTED BUS SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Contracted Urban Bus Service</td>
<td>1,157,731</td>
<td>11,891,209</td>
<td>11,899,210</td>
<td>12,137,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Other Related Costs</td>
<td>24,419</td>
<td>262,628</td>
<td>287,030</td>
<td>268,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Insurance Costs</td>
<td>54,849</td>
<td>571,404</td>
<td>545,202</td>
<td>545,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Coastside Services</td>
<td>54,724</td>
<td>498,578</td>
<td>504,401</td>
<td>527,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Redi Coast Non-ADA</td>
<td>17,297</td>
<td>167,937</td>
<td>162,030</td>
<td>218,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Other Related Costs</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>17,668</td>
<td>14,121</td>
<td>51,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 La Honda - Pescadero</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>37,800</td>
<td>43,438</td>
<td>43,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 SamCoast - Pescadero</td>
<td>10,244</td>
<td>103,612</td>
<td>105,414</td>
<td>130,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Other Related Cost - SamCoast</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>4,046</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>11,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Total Contracted Bus Service</td>
<td>1,325,220</td>
<td>13,554,882</td>
<td>13,565,264</td>
<td>13,935,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 TOTAL MOTOR BUS</td>
<td>7,460,126</td>
<td>79,704,074</td>
<td>76,727,594</td>
<td>79,242,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102,143,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% OF YEAR ELAPSED provides a general measure for evaluating overall progress against the annual budget. When comparing it to the amounts shown in the "% REV BUDGET" column, please note that individual line items reflect variations due to seasonal activities during the year.
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### OPERATING EXPENSES
#### FISCAL YEAR 2010
##### APRIL 2010

### % OF YEAR ELAPSED:

- **83.3%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>REVISED</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>APPROVED</th>
<th>REVISED</th>
<th>% REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT PROGRAMS</td>
<td>475,060</td>
<td>5,011,946</td>
<td>4,738,093</td>
<td>4,762,208</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>6,638,319</td>
<td>5,771,819</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled/Redi-Wheel</td>
<td>160,685</td>
<td>1,973,102</td>
<td>1,795,601</td>
<td>2,075,999</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>2,586,793</td>
<td>2,398,133</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>ADA Sedan Service</td>
<td>237,370</td>
<td>2,145,758</td>
<td>2,237,907</td>
<td>2,324,600</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>2,338,640</td>
<td>2,938,140</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>ADA Accessibility Support</td>
<td>82,742</td>
<td>780,101</td>
<td>639,848</td>
<td>649,580</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>787,840</td>
<td>779,800</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Coastside ADA Support</td>
<td>89,636</td>
<td>935,562</td>
<td>948,688</td>
<td>1,059,950</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>1,215,320</td>
<td>1,272,450</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>32,729</td>
<td>403,458</td>
<td>429,160</td>
<td>422,160</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>TOTAL ADA PROGRAMS</td>
<td>1,078,222</td>
<td>11,249,925</td>
<td>10,788,516</td>
<td>11,301,497</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>14,081,912</td>
<td>13,675,342</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>MULTIMODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Peninsula Rail Service</td>
<td>1,239,703</td>
<td>14,041,884</td>
<td>14,041,884</td>
<td>14,041,884</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Total Caltrain Service</td>
<td>1,239,703</td>
<td>14,041,884</td>
<td>14,041,884</td>
<td>14,041,884</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>OTHER SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Dumbarton Express Service</td>
<td>10,632</td>
<td>128,946</td>
<td>104,546</td>
<td>105,095</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>126,070</td>
<td>125,950</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>SamTrans Shuttle Service</td>
<td>312,094</td>
<td>1,708,805</td>
<td>1,960,298</td>
<td>1,888,100</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>1,902,905</td>
<td>2,266,625</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>SM/Caltrain Shuttles</td>
<td>160,909</td>
<td>1,351,785</td>
<td>1,300,188</td>
<td>1,344,175</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>1,457,005</td>
<td>1,976,530</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Maintenance Multimodal Facilities</td>
<td>10,788</td>
<td>116,079</td>
<td>117,398</td>
<td>162,583</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>195,100</td>
<td>195,100</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Total Other Support</td>
<td>494,423</td>
<td>3,305,615</td>
<td>3,482,430</td>
<td>3,499,953</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>3,681,080</td>
<td>4,564,205</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>TOTAL MULTI-MODAL PROGRAM</td>
<td>1,734,126</td>
<td>17,347,499</td>
<td>17,524,314</td>
<td>17,541,837</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>20,202,370</td>
<td>21,085,495</td>
<td>83.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>10,272,474</td>
<td>108,301,498</td>
<td>105,040,424</td>
<td>108,086,149</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>136,427,741</td>
<td>131,981,432</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% OF YEAR ELAPSED" provides a general measure for evaluating overall progress against the annual budget. When comparing it to the amounts shown in the "% REV BUDGET" column, please note that individual line items reflect variations due to seasonal activities during the year.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
MOTOR BUS MONTHLY EXPENSES - BUDGET VS ACTUAL
FISCAL YEAR 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTHLY EXPENSES</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>8,473,981</td>
<td>8,493,157</td>
<td>8,547,372</td>
<td>8,448,278</td>
<td>8,564,955</td>
<td>8,359,492</td>
<td>7,546,657</td>
<td>8,278,129</td>
<td>6,047,526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>7,995,340</td>
<td>7,681,837</td>
<td>7,717,629</td>
<td>7,771,470</td>
<td>7,862,993</td>
<td>7,643,740</td>
<td>7,313,072</td>
<td>6,901,766</td>
<td>8,379,621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance %</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
<td>8.23%</td>
<td>8.05%</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUMULATIVE EXPENSES</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>7,995,340</td>
<td>15,677,177</td>
<td>23,394,806</td>
<td>31,166,276</td>
<td>39,029,269</td>
<td>46,673,009</td>
<td>53,986,081</td>
<td>60,887,847</td>
<td>69,267,468</td>
<td>76,727,594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance %</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
<td>8.23%</td>
<td>8.05%</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
<td>5.37%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monthly Expenses - Budget vs Actual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>3,181,130</td>
<td>1,536,627</td>
<td>1,536,275</td>
<td>1,576,276</td>
<td>1,546,277</td>
<td>1,546,276</td>
<td>1,845,483</td>
<td>1,650,334</td>
<td>1,547,223</td>
<td>1,575,936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3,183,019</td>
<td>1,526,868</td>
<td>1,524,459</td>
<td>1,695,052</td>
<td>1,536,284</td>
<td>1,537,516</td>
<td>1,715,713</td>
<td>1,529,884</td>
<td>1,541,393</td>
<td>1,734,126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cumulative Expenses - Budget vs Actual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>3,181,130</td>
<td>4,717,757</td>
<td>6,254,032</td>
<td>7,830,308</td>
<td>9,376,585</td>
<td>10,922,861</td>
<td>12,768,344</td>
<td>14,418,678</td>
<td>15,965,901</td>
<td>17,541,837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3,183,019</td>
<td>4,709,887</td>
<td>6,234,346</td>
<td>7,929,398</td>
<td>9,465,682</td>
<td>11,003,198</td>
<td>12,718,911</td>
<td>14,248,795</td>
<td>15,790,188</td>
<td>17,524,314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variance - F(U)</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>7,870</td>
<td>19,686</td>
<td>99,090</td>
<td>89,097</td>
<td>80,337</td>
<td>49,433</td>
<td>169,883</td>
<td>175,713</td>
<td>17,523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>-0.06%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>-1.27%</td>
<td>-0.95%</td>
<td>-0.74%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**MULTIMODAL MONTHLY EXPENSES - BUDGET VS ACTUAL**

**FISCAL YEAR 2010**

---

**Statement of Revenues and Expenses**

**Page 7 of 9**
### SOURCES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Passenger Fares</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,014,802</td>
<td>Local TDA and STA Funds</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Pass through to Other Agencies</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,238,192</td>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$260,956</td>
<td>Measure A &amp; AB34 Funds</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,216,300</td>
<td>District 1/2-Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Pass through to Other Agencies</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,238,192</td>
<td>Operating Grant</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,148,340</td>
<td>District 1/2-Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,973,621</td>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$210,245</td>
<td>Total Sources of Funds</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### USES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$427,530</td>
<td>District Motor Bus</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Pass through to Other Agencies</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$427,530</td>
<td>Land Transfer Interest Expense</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$427,530</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATING REVENUES - MOTOR BUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Motor Bus Fares</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,814,062</td>
<td>Local TDA Transit Fund</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,238,192</td>
<td>Operating Grant</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,148,340</td>
<td>District 1/2-Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$427,530</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AMERICAN DISABILITIES ACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$200,740</td>
<td>Local TDA 4.5 Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$289,392</td>
<td>Sales Tax - Paratransit District</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$86,652</td>
<td>Measure A Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$88,652</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MULTI-MODAL PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$177,304</td>
<td>Sales Tax - Caltrain</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(177,304)</td>
<td>Transfer from TA for Caltrain</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATING EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$298,971</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$378,960</td>
<td>Fuel and Lubricants</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$152,085</td>
<td>Taxes and License Fees</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,544</td>
<td>Postage and Other</td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29 Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$427,530</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board Resolution No. 2010-29Authorizing to decrease the FY2010 Operating Budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUDGET TRANSFERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$35,850</td>
<td>Page 3, Line 7 - Professional Services</td>
<td>Budget transfer from Professional Services to Wages &amp; Benefits to fund operating grant previously budgeted under consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>Page 4, Line 52 - Other Related Costs</td>
<td>Budget transfer to reclassify budget savings from Redi-Wheels Other Related Costs to ADA Sedan Service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$47,850</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Justification:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$47,850</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Justification:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Budget</td>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td>Over/(Under) Budget/Projection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2009:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>16,383,000</td>
<td>1st Quarter 17,259,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>17,387,000</td>
<td>2nd Quarter 15,980,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>15,217,000</td>
<td>3rd Quarter 12,936,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>16,383,000</td>
<td>4th Quarter 13,839,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2009 Total</td>
<td>65,370,000</td>
<td>FY2009 Total 60,015,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 09</td>
<td>4,260,000</td>
<td>Sep. 09 4,205,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 09</td>
<td>4,260,000</td>
<td>Oct. 09 4,342,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 09</td>
<td>5,721,000</td>
<td>Nov. 09 4,673,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>1,314,000</td>
<td>Dec. 09 1,332,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Months Total</td>
<td>15,555,000</td>
<td>14,554,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 09</td>
<td>4,560,000</td>
<td>Dec. 09 4,193,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 09</td>
<td>4,560,000</td>
<td>Jan. 10 4,353,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 09</td>
<td>5,967,000</td>
<td>Feb. 10 5,591,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>1,405,000</td>
<td>Mar. 10 1,101,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months Total</td>
<td>32,047,000</td>
<td>29,795,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 10</td>
<td>3,970,000</td>
<td>Mar. 10 3,353,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 10</td>
<td>3,970,000</td>
<td>Apr. 10 3,533,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 10</td>
<td>3,041,440</td>
<td>May 10 1,416,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>1,325,000</td>
<td>Jun. 10 944,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Months Total</td>
<td>44,353,440</td>
<td>36,682,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>4,224,600</td>
<td>Jun. 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10</td>
<td>4,224,600</td>
<td>Jul. 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 10</td>
<td>5,632,700</td>
<td>Aug. 10 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>1,564,660</td>
<td>Sep. 10 944,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010 Total</td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
<td>FY2010 Total 36,682,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>14,554,695</td>
<td>14,554,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>15,240,785</td>
<td>15,240,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>13,613,850</td>
<td>13,613,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>5,060,857</td>
<td>5,060,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTD Actual Per Statement of Revenues &amp; Expenses</td>
<td>48,470,186</td>
<td>(1) Accrued</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINANCE ITEM # 3  
JUNE 9, 2010

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT  
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon  
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington  
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: PROPOSED FY2011 OPERATING BUDGET

ACTION

Staff proposes that the Committee recommend Board approval of the FY2011 Proposed Operating Budget (Attachment “A”).

This report is submitted for informational purposes only. No policy action is requested at this time.

SIGNIFICANCE

At the May Board meeting, staff presented a preliminary operating budget with a deficit of $22.5 million. One time funds have been used to reduce the deficit to $20.0 million. These one-time sources are not sustainable. The SamTrans Financial Capacity Board Sub-committee along with staff are continuing to examine the long term financial issues.

The FY2011 Operating Budget totals $128.3 million $131.8 million, as shown in Attachment A, Total Uses of Funds (page 1, line 24). The proposed budget is projected to decrease by $5.8 million or 4.3 percent $2.3 million or 1.7 percent from the FY2010 revised budget of $134.1 million.

Sources of Funds

Total sources of funds are projected to be $130.9 million $136.9 million (page 1, line 14 15), for an increase of $3.0 million or 2.4 percent $9.0 million or 7.1 percent as detailed below.

Passenger Fares (page 1, line 1), from both Motor Bus and ADA services, are projected at $17.2 million in FY2011, a decrease of $0.2 million or 1.3 percent from the FY2010 revised budget.

- Motor Bus Fares are projected to decrease by $0.3 million, or 1.8 percent, from FY2010 revised budget to reflect current economic trends. The San Mateo County Transit District (District) continues to see a drop in passenger fare receipts despite fare increases implemented in FY2010 for fixed routes fares. Ridership is down due to the higher unemployment rate in San Mateo County and an increase in the use of discount fare media.
• Redi-Wheels Fares are projected to increase by $0.1 million, or 11.2 percent over the FY2010 revised budget primarily due to a Redi-Wheels fare increase planned due to take effect July 1, 2010.

Local/State/Federal (page 1, lines 2, 4, 5 & 6) funds of $47.1 million $50.3 million reflect a projected increase of $5.1 million or 12.0 percent $8.3 million or 19.8 percent over the FY2010 revised budget of $42.0 million. The increase is mainly due to the availability of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds for FY2011 in the amount of $4.8 million and lifeline funds in the amount of $0.8 million. The reinstatement of STA funds is offset by a decrease in Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds of $1.2 million or 4.7 percent decrease from the FY2010 revised budget. Operating Grants are increasing by $1.5 million or 22.6 percent $3.9 million or 58.6 percent over the FY2010 revised budget mostly due to $4.0 million in one-time funds. The receipt of the $4.0 million in one time funds resulted from the retirement of 10 buses from its fleet in light of a 7.5% service reduction implemented in December, 2009.

Pass through to Other Agencies (page 1, line 3), is $1.0 million, a projected decrease of $1.0 million or 49.7 percent from the FY2010 revised budget. This change reflects a decrease in funding received for the Advanced Zero-Emission Bus (ZEB) Demonstration Program pass through to AC Transit in FY2010. The FY2011 corresponding pass through expenditure can be found under Uses of Funds (page 1, line 22).

District ½ Cent Sales Tax (page 1, line 9) receipts of $60.0 million are projected to remain constant in FY2011, a reflection of the uncertainty in the current economic climate.

Investment Interest (page 1, line 10) of $0.6 million reflects a projected decrease of $0.1 million or 16.0 percent from the FY2010 revised budget of $0.7 million. This is due to a decrease in the balance in the investment portfolio as a result of the use of reserves to balance the FY2010 budget and a decrease in interest rate projections.

Other Interest, Rent & Other Income (page 1, line 11) of $5.1 million reflects a projected decrease of $0.7 million or 12.8 percent compared to the FY2010 revised budget. The decrease is mostly due to the result of one time professional engineering services contract reimbursement received in FY2010 from Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB). The corresponding expenses are reduced in Uses of Funds – District Motor Bus (page 1, line 18).

Other Sources (page 1, line 12) of $2.8 million reflects additional savings from FY2010.

Uses of Funds

Operating Costs (page 1, line 23 24) of $128.3 million $131.8 million are projected to decrease by $5.8 million or 4.3 percent $2.3 million or 1.7 percent from the FY2010 revised budget of $134.0 million. The decrease is mostly due to a reduction in SamTrans’ contribution to Caltrain.

Sales Tax Allocation - Capital Programs (page 1, line 2928) is projected to be $4.2 million, a projected increase of $0.6 million or 16.5 percent compared to the FY2010 revised budget.

Motor Bus Highlights

Total Motor Bus Expense (page 1, line 18) of $98.8 million $98.2 million, reflects a projected increase of $1.6 million or 1.6 percent $1.0 million or 1.0 percent over the FY2010 revised budget of $97.2 million. Critical Motor Bus elements include:
• **Wages and Benefits** (page 3, line 1) which are projected to **increase** $1.5 million or 2.7 percent, **$0.9 million or 1.6 percent** as a result of projected increases in Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) contract commitments and corresponding benefits.

• **Fuel & Lubricants** (page 3, line 11) are projected to **increase** $0.5 million or 9.0 percent, due to a projected increase in the cost of diesel fuel. The FY2011 budgeted price for diesel fuel is $3.00 per gallon compared to the projected price of $2.53 per gallon projected in the FY2010 revised budget. Staff has implemented a fuel hedging program in accordance with the adopted fuel hedging policy as a means of reducing volatility and uncertainty in the fuel budget.

• **Contracted Bus Service** (page 3, line 43) is projected to **decrease** $0.3 million or 1.6 percent, primarily due to service cuts implemented on December 20, 2009.

**Paratransit Highlights**

The FY2011 budget for ADA programs (page 1, line 19) of $13.8 million is a projected **increase** of $0.1 million or 0.7 percent over the FY2010 revised budget mainly due to the need for additional funding for the C.A.R.E. Evaluators eligibility certification contract.

**Caltrain Service**

In FY2011, the District’s proposed member agency share for Caltrain Service (page 1, line 20), is **$10.7 million** $14.7 million. This amount represents the District’s contribution as one of the three member agencies that support Caltrain operations. This is projected to **decrease** $5.9 million or 35.5 percent **$1.8 million or 11.0 percent** from FY2010 revised budget of $16.5 million. The JPB partners continue to experience reduction in their traditional sources of revenues largely attributable to the ongoing global recession. The District has been funding the operating budget with significant amount of reserves which is not a financially sustainable practice, and as a result, SamTrans is initiating a decrease in its contribution to the JPB. It is expected that other JPB member agencies’ shares will be reduced proportionately. In FY2011, $4.8 million of the San Mateo’s Caltrain share is funded by the FY2011 Measure A funds via the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, and $4.0 million will be funded as a result of the infusion of one time funds, as discussed in the operating grants section. This will allow the District to provide a total of $14.7 million to Caltrain.

**Other Multi-Modal Programs**

In FY2011, support to various shuttle programs (including Dumbarton Express, SamTrans and Caltrain Shuttles and the multimodal maintenance facility) is projected to **decrease** $0.5 million or 10.5 percent from the FY2010 revised budget (page 1, line 21), primarily due to the reduction in costs for the East Palo Alto JARC shuttle.

**Pass through to Other Agencies**

A projected **decrease** of $1.0 million or 49.7 percent from the FY2010 revised budget is related to the corresponding decrease in revenue under the **Sources of funds** (page 1, line 3).

**Land Transfer Interest Expense**

The FY2011 budget includes $0.1 million (page 1, line 23) in interest expense which represents the District’s interest payment to the TA on a promissory note of $4.3 million for four acres of property acquired from the TA which is located in San Carlos along the Caltrain right of way. The agreement allows the District to pay for the purchase price over time, and before December 1, 2033, subject to the payment of annual interest at the current rate of return earned by the TA on its investment portfolio until the principal is paid in full.
BACKGROUND
The District’s proposed FY2011 budget is consistent with the District’s Strategic Plan. The proposed budget lays out expenses consistent with the strategic plan’s vision and goals related to the District’s six focus areas: Financial Integrity, Multimodal Services, Transportation and Land Use, Customers, Business Practices, and Employees. The proposed budget provides for the continuation of safe, reliable and high-quality services to SamTrans customers, while promoting employee excellence in a very challenging economic environment.

Changes from the staff report distributed on May 12th are presented in bold, blue font.

Prepared by: Ladi Bhuller, Manager, Budgets  650.508.7755
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>FY2009 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY2010 ADOPTE</th>
<th>FY2010 REVISED</th>
<th>FY2011 PROPOSED</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY11 PROPOSED</td>
<td>FY10 REVISED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOURCES OF FUNDS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Passenger Fares</td>
<td>17,324,303</td>
<td>18,975,000</td>
<td>17,375,000</td>
<td>17,157,400</td>
<td>(217,600)</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Local TDA and STA Funds</td>
<td>32,145,337</td>
<td>29,975,899</td>
<td>26,443,922</td>
<td>30,860,639</td>
<td>4,416,717</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Pass through to Other Agencies</td>
<td>175,365</td>
<td>97,334</td>
<td>1,939,661</td>
<td>975,293</td>
<td>(964,368)</td>
<td>-49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Operating Grants</td>
<td>6,537,337</td>
<td>4,429,071</td>
<td>6,676,263</td>
<td>10,577,283</td>
<td>3,910,020</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Measure A</td>
<td>4,260,958</td>
<td>8,897,724</td>
<td>8,311,768</td>
<td>8,298,888</td>
<td>(32,880)</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 AB434 Funds</td>
<td>630,968</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>570,000</td>
<td>536,000</td>
<td>(34,000)</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Operating Revenues</td>
<td>61,074,269</td>
<td>62,975,020</td>
<td>61,327,614</td>
<td>68,405,500</td>
<td>7,077,880</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td>60,015,455</td>
<td>62,216,300</td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Investment Interest</td>
<td>642,507</td>
<td>671,920</td>
<td>564,170</td>
<td>107,750</td>
<td>-16.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Other Interest, Rent &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>6,021,682</td>
<td>5,105,649</td>
<td>5,832,029</td>
<td>5,082,780</td>
<td>-12.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Other Sources</td>
<td>630,968</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>570,000</td>
<td>536,000</td>
<td>(34,000)</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Other Revenues</td>
<td>66,679,644</td>
<td>67,993,869</td>
<td>66,503,949</td>
<td>68,458,023</td>
<td>1,954,074</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sources of Funds</td>
<td>127,753,913</td>
<td>130,968,889</td>
<td>127,831,563</td>
<td>136,863,523</td>
<td>9,031,960</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USES OF FUNDS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Motor Bus</td>
<td>95,292,707</td>
<td>102,143,459</td>
<td>97,220,595</td>
<td>98,189,247</td>
<td>968,652</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D.A. Programs</td>
<td>13,614,337</td>
<td>14,081,912</td>
<td>13,675,342</td>
<td>13,773,432</td>
<td>98,088</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multi-Modal Programs</td>
<td>4,365,227</td>
<td>3,681,080</td>
<td>4,564,205</td>
<td>4,084,270</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass through to Other Agencies</td>
<td>175,365</td>
<td>97,334</td>
<td>1,939,661</td>
<td>975,293</td>
<td>(964,368)</td>
<td>-49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Transfer Interest Expense</td>
<td>156,659</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>62,285</td>
<td>-43.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses of Funds</td>
<td>130,125,584</td>
<td>136,525,075</td>
<td>134,063,378</td>
<td>131,810,465</td>
<td>(2,252,913)</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OPERATING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</td>
<td>(2,371,671)</td>
<td>(5,556,178)</td>
<td>(5,053,061)</td>
<td>11,284,876</td>
<td>-181.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Allocation - Capital Programs</td>
<td>11,030,751</td>
<td>3,585,803</td>
<td>3,585,803</td>
<td>4,176,971</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE OF RESERVES</td>
<td>(13,402,422)</td>
<td>(9,141,981)</td>
<td>(9,817,618)</td>
<td>876,090</td>
<td>-108.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE OF RESERVES FOR DEBT SERVICE</td>
<td>(19,134,109)</td>
<td>(19,231,942)</td>
<td>(19,231,942)</td>
<td>(20,873,523)</td>
<td>(1,641,581)</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBT SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Interest</td>
<td>4,482,910</td>
<td>5,245,900</td>
<td>5,245,900</td>
<td>3,605,840</td>
<td>(1,640,060)</td>
<td>-31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sources of Funds</td>
<td>4,482,910</td>
<td>5,245,900</td>
<td>5,245,900</td>
<td>3,605,840</td>
<td>(1,640,060)</td>
<td>-31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USES OF FUNDS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>23,537,804</td>
<td>24,450,342</td>
<td>24,450,342</td>
<td>24,451,963</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Agent Fees</td>
<td>79,215</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses of Funds</td>
<td>23,617,019</td>
<td>24,477,842</td>
<td>24,477,842</td>
<td>24,479,363</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL USES OF RESERVES</td>
<td>(32,536,530)</td>
<td>(28,373,923)</td>
<td>(29,049,560)</td>
<td>(19,997,433)</td>
<td>9,052,127</td>
<td>-31.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
#### FY2011 PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING REVENUES - MOTOR BUS:</th>
<th>FY2009 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY2010 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY2010 REVISED</th>
<th>FY2011 PROPOSED</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MOTOR BUS FARES</td>
<td>16,706,381</td>
<td>18,256,000</td>
<td>16,656,000</td>
<td>16,358,000</td>
<td>(298,000)</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL (TDA) TRANSIT FUND:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Operating Assistance</td>
<td>28,857,479</td>
<td>28,477,104</td>
<td>24,663,042</td>
<td>23,503,880</td>
<td>(1,159,162)</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STA Base</td>
<td>1,467,632</td>
<td>271,510</td>
<td>5,111,071</td>
<td>5,239,561</td>
<td>1929.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATING GRANTS:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>5,479,312</td>
<td>3,376,430</td>
<td>5,356,077</td>
<td>4,026,459</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT 1/2 CENT SALES TAX:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Operating Assistance</td>
<td>36,858,909</td>
<td>47,141,215</td>
<td>45,288,150</td>
<td>39,859,672</td>
<td>(6,307,576)</td>
<td>-13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVESTMENT INTEREST INCOME:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment Interest Income</td>
<td>498,541</td>
<td>140,670</td>
<td>140,670</td>
<td>86,830</td>
<td>(53,840)</td>
<td>-38.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER REVENUE SOURCES:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>1,028,370</td>
<td>1,041,900</td>
<td>1,047,940</td>
<td>6,040</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMERICAN DISABILITIES ACT:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares-Redi Wheels</td>
<td>617,923</td>
<td>719,000</td>
<td>719,000</td>
<td>799,400</td>
<td>80,400</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MULTI-MODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Caltrain</td>
<td>14,378,772</td>
<td>15,128,552</td>
<td>17,129,503</td>
<td>18,093,552</td>
<td>960,000</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| TOTAL REVENUES                 | 129,493,495 | 136,427,741    | 131,981,432    | 130,755,172    | (1,226,260) | -0.9%          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT OPERATED BUSES</th>
<th>FY2009 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY2010 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY2010 REVISED</th>
<th>FY2011 PROPOSED</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wages and Benefits</strong></td>
<td>54,670,026</td>
<td>56,034,282</td>
<td>53,545,216</td>
<td>54,414,983</td>
<td>869,767</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>50,898</td>
<td>51,910</td>
<td>662,910</td>
<td>930,600</td>
<td>267,690</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>585,703</td>
<td>1,434,000</td>
<td>1,434,000</td>
<td>1,282,500</td>
<td>(151,500)</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>3,246,103</td>
<td>2,980,66</td>
<td>3,167,88</td>
<td>2,955,181</td>
<td>(132,684)</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>3,333,997</td>
<td>3,676,639</td>
<td>3,777,593</td>
<td>3,907,744</td>
<td>130,205</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>377,234</td>
<td>450,246</td>
<td>450,246</td>
<td>362,927</td>
<td>(87,322)</td>
<td>-19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTRACTED BUS SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Urban Bus Service</td>
<td>14,204,824</td>
<td>15,073,092</td>
<td>14,605,502</td>
<td>14,488,202</td>
<td>(117,300)</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>295,500</td>
<td>334,465</td>
<td>323,285</td>
<td>310,800</td>
<td>(12,485)</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastside Services</td>
<td>597,999</td>
<td>633,590</td>
<td>633,590</td>
<td>568,256</td>
<td>(65,334)</td>
<td>-10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redi Coast Non-ADA</td>
<td>196,893</td>
<td>261,980</td>
<td>261,980</td>
<td>222,860</td>
<td>(39,120)</td>
<td>-14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>18,464</td>
<td>64,250</td>
<td>64,250</td>
<td>61,410</td>
<td>(2,840)</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Honda Pescadero</td>
<td>49,350</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcoast - Pescadero</td>
<td>123,678</td>
<td>116,170</td>
<td>156,170</td>
<td>141,662</td>
<td>(14,508)</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs-SamCoast</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>13,940</td>
<td>13,780</td>
<td>13,780</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contracted Bus Service</strong></td>
<td>16,146,209</td>
<td>17,204,987</td>
<td>16,763,217</td>
<td>16,494,890</td>
<td>(268,327)</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MOTOR BUS</strong></td>
<td>95,292,707</td>
<td>102,143,459</td>
<td>97,220,595</td>
<td>98,189,247</td>
<td>968,652</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### FY2011 PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET

#### FY11 PROPOSED
Compared to FY10 REVISED BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2009 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY2010 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY2010 REVISED</th>
<th>FY2011 PROPOSED</th>
<th>Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Disability Act Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Elderly &amp; Disabled/Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>6,016,496</td>
<td>6,638,319</td>
<td>5,771,819</td>
<td>6,769,180</td>
<td>997,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Other Related Costs</td>
<td>2,420,784</td>
<td>2,586,793</td>
<td>2,557,633</td>
<td>2,527,380</td>
<td>(30,253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 ADA Sedan Service</td>
<td>2,625,697</td>
<td>2,338,640</td>
<td>2,778,640</td>
<td>1,781,024</td>
<td>(997,616)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 ADA Accessibility Support</td>
<td>919,841</td>
<td>787,840</td>
<td>779,800</td>
<td>880,120</td>
<td>100,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Coastside Support</td>
<td>1,116,519</td>
<td>1,215,320</td>
<td>1,272,450</td>
<td>1,300,720</td>
<td>28,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Insurance Costs</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ADA Programs</strong></td>
<td>13,614,337</td>
<td>14,081,912</td>
<td>13,675,342</td>
<td>13,773,430</td>
<td>98,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-Modal Transit Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 Caltrain Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 Peninsula Rail Service</td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>14,707,870</td>
<td>(1,813,415)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Caltrain Service</strong></td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>14,707,870</td>
<td>(1,813,415)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 Dumbarton Express Service</td>
<td>155,265</td>
<td>126,070</td>
<td>125,950</td>
<td>126,150</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 SamTrans Shuttle</td>
<td>2,141,440</td>
<td>1,902,905</td>
<td>2,266,625</td>
<td>2,251,360</td>
<td>(15,265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 SM/Caltrain Shuttle</td>
<td>1,912,887</td>
<td>1,457,005</td>
<td>1,976,530</td>
<td>1,515,010</td>
<td>(461,520)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 Maintenance Multimodal Fac</td>
<td>155,635</td>
<td>195,100</td>
<td>195,100</td>
<td>192,100</td>
<td>(3,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Support</strong></td>
<td>4,365,227</td>
<td>3,681,080</td>
<td>4,564,205</td>
<td>4,084,620</td>
<td>(479,585)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Multi-Modal Programs</strong></td>
<td>20,866,517</td>
<td>20,202,370</td>
<td>21,085,495</td>
<td>18,792,495</td>
<td>(2,293,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>129,793,560</td>
<td>136,427,741</td>
<td>131,981,432</td>
<td>130,755,172</td>
<td>(1,226,260)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO. 2010 -  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
* * *  
ADOPTION OF AN OPERATING BUDGET IN  
THE AMOUNT OF $131,810,465 FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011  

WHEREAS, Section 103141(b) of the California Public Utilities Code requires the Board of Directors to adopt an annual budget for the District; and  

WHEREAS, the adoption of an operating budget is necessary for obtaining both Federal and State funds to support the District's transit improvement program; and  

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO has prepared and presented to the Board of Directors a proposed final operating budget for Fiscal Year 2011 in the amount of $131,810,465 that sets forth projected revenues and expenses associated with the District's operating and maintenance program.  

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District adopts the Fiscal Year 2011 Operating Budget, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Attachment “A”; and  

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager/CEO is directed to submit this budget to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, together with a copy of this resolution at the earliest practical date; and  

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of June 2010, by the following vote:  
AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  

___________________________________  
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District  

ATTEST:  

___________________________  
District Secretary
FINANCE ITEM # 4
JUNE 9, 2010

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2011 CAPITAL BUDGET

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend Board approval of the Fiscal Year 2011 (FY2011) Capital Budget in the amount of $8,624,325.

SIGNIFICANCE
At the May 12, 2010 Finance Committee meeting, staff presented the proposed FY2011 Capital Budget as an informational item. Since the May meeting, staff has added three items to the Capital Budget: Transit Fleet Vehicle 2010 California Air Resources Board (CARB) Regulation upgrade, PeopleSoft Upgrade and appropriation authority for third party projects. Funding for these items will not require additional District sales tax funds, as further discussed below.

In light of the current fiscal climate, the FY2011 Capital Budget contains only those projects necessary and essential to sustain the District’s existing service and infrastructure network, without comprising the District’s need to comply with legal mandates and to plan for visions set forth in the District’s adopted Strategic Plan. The FY2011 Capital Budget contains the following major elements:

- **Revenue Vehicles and Support Equipment Replacement** – Includes the replacement of a paratransit revenue vehicle sub-fleet: 10 El Dorado cutaway vehicles. These vehicles have reached the end of their useful lives. Also included is the retrofit of up to 32 Transit Fleet Vehicles to bring them into compliance with CARB regulations. Funding for this work will come from prior year grant savings. This category also includes the annual procurement of bus parts, engines and transmissions, and replacement of maintenance support equipment and service support vehicles. The amount budgeted for this category totals $2,846,216.

- **Information Technology (IT) Software and Hardware Upgrade & Replacement** – Includes replacement and upgrade of Informational Technology equipment, servers and software applications necessary to maintain the connectivity of various departments and external communications. Also included is an additional $1 million for the re-design and upgrade of PeopleSoft Finance and Reporting systems to better match the application to the business needs of the District. The $1 million in funding will come from the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) and San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA)
through the indirect cost allocation accounts since PeopleSoft upgrades provide benefits to JPB and TA fund and project accounting. Finally, this category includes funding to replace the telephone infrastructure which is entering an end-of-life status for maintenance support. The amount budgeted for these IT-related projects totals $2,326,000

- **Development** – Includes funding to undertake a comprehensive operational analysis to assess how the District can restructure its suite of services and operations more effectively and efficiently. This category also includes program planning and management. The amount budgeted for these projects totals $1,000,000.

- **Facilities** – Includes rehabilitation and improvement projects to ensure that maintenance and administrative facilities are adequately maintained to support the District’s revenue service operations. Projects in this category include pavement rehabilitation, fire alarm system replacement, bus stop improvements and a sustainability program to help reduce the District’s carbon footprint. The amount budgeted for these projects totals $652,109.

- **Others** – Includes funding for any unforeseen and emergency capital expenditures during the fiscal year. Also included in this category is the appropriation authority for third party projects; this will provide budget authority to fund any agreements which may arise during the year that are made by the District with third parties. Funding for these agreements will be provided by the third parties. The amount budgeted for this category is $1,800,000.

**BUDGET IMPACT**

Of the $8,624,325 recommended for the FY2011 Capital Budget, the total amount of sales tax required is $4,176,971, which remains the same as reported at the May 12, 2010 Board meeting. Federal, State and Other fund sources make up the remaining amount of $4,447,354 to fully fund the FY2011 Capital Budget.

**BACKGROUND**

The District’s Capital Budget is developed on an annual basis. A comprehensive call for projects was issued District-wide. The capital projects submitted were reviewed and prioritized for consistency with District policy directives. Due to the need to constrain financial resources for capital improvements this year, the final recommendations reflect only the most essential projects that support existing District revenue service without compromising either safety or security. In addition, the program is developed to leverage as much external funding and grants as possible.

Among other factors, projects submitted this year were evaluated and prioritized based on maintenance and enhancement of existing transit operations relative to operational and legal requirements and mandates, along with opportunities for business process improvements.

Prepared by: Leslie Fong, Senior Budgets Analyst 650-508-6332
Éva Goode, Manager, Budgets 650-508-7914
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>Recommended FY2011 Budget</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>REVENUE VEHICLES REPLACEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Replacement (10) Paratransit Vans</td>
<td>Replace 10 2007 El Dorado Amerivans at the end of their useful lives.</td>
<td>603,500</td>
<td>$603,500</td>
<td>$403,930</td>
<td>$99,785</td>
<td>$99,785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$603,500</td>
<td>$403,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>REVENUE VEHICLE SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Parking Meters @ Millbrae Transit Center</td>
<td>Amortized annual capital cost for the installation of Parking Meters at the Millbrae Transit Center. This project was amortized over an 8-year period.</td>
<td>1,594,883</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>$244,883</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Major Bus Components</td>
<td>Annual funding for procurement of bus parts.</td>
<td>665,740</td>
<td>$665,740</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$665,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Maintenance Equipment</td>
<td>Replacement of maintenance support equipment at the end of their useful lives.</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$21,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Non-Revenue Service Support Vehicles</td>
<td>Replace 7 non-revenue service support vehicles that have reached their useful lives.</td>
<td>187,893</td>
<td>$187,893</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$93,947</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$93,947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>South Base Bus Washer</td>
<td>Replacement of South Base bus washer, equipment has reached the end of its useful life.</td>
<td>670,000</td>
<td>470,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Radio Backbone (RF Communications) Upgrade Study</td>
<td>Replacing the radio hardware, in accordance with Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulations, the current system will not be supported by Orbital due to FCC changes.</td>
<td>123,200</td>
<td>$123,200</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$123,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,242,716</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Technology Replacement &amp; Upgrade Program</td>
<td>Replace and upgrade Dell servers and out of warranty printers, copiers, fax machines and scanners. Warranty is expiring in FY2011.</td>
<td>728,000</td>
<td>$728,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$728,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Phone System Replacement</td>
<td>Replace the telephone infrastructure at the District that will be entering an end-of-life status for maintenance support.</td>
<td>636,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>$598,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$598,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>PeopleSoft Project Upgrade</td>
<td>Redesign and upgrade of PeopleSoft to better match the application to the business needs of the District.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>5,493,800</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,326,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Comprehensive Operational Analysis</td>
<td>Evaluate and restructure SamTrans services and operations to more efficiently and effectively serve the county's transit needs and meet regional transportation goals, within the constraints of the current financial and operating environment.</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>606,600</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$143,400</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>PROJECT TITLE</td>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>Total Estimated Project Cost</td>
<td>Previously Budgeted</td>
<td>Recommended FY2011 Budget</td>
<td>Remaining</td>
<td>FUNDING SOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Capital Program and Project Development</td>
<td>Capitalized funds for annual program development including but not limited to plans, budgets, programs, funding strategies, and preliminary engineering.</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Capital Program Management</td>
<td>Capitalized funds for program and project controls support, including monitoring project performance and delivery.</td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
<td>$ 350,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>$ 143,400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Operating Facility Pavement Rehab: NB &amp; SB Concrete Rehab</td>
<td>Rehab pavement at North and South Bases to bring the pavement to a state of good repair.</td>
<td>$ 153,200</td>
<td>$ 153,200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Fire Alarm System Upgrades at Central, North Base and South Base</td>
<td>Project will maintain and improve the District's infrastructure by replacing obsolete fire alarm systems with reliable equipment at Central, North Base and South Base. The alarm systems are at the end of their useful life.</td>
<td>$ 1,100,000</td>
<td>$ 997,175</td>
<td>$ 102,825</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>102,825 $</td>
<td>- $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Sustainable Program Development</td>
<td>Project will identify proposed actions to reduce the District's carbon footprint.</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Bus Stop Improvement Program</td>
<td>Project will upgrade and replace bus stop amenities and enhance bus stop site infrastructures in areas identified as Communities of Concern.</td>
<td>$ 246,084</td>
<td>$ 246,084</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>196,887 $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 652,109</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>Annual set-aside for unforeseen and emergency capital expenditures.</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Third Party Payments</td>
<td>To provide budget authority for 3rd party projects.</td>
<td>$ 1,550,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,800,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL FOR SAMTRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 8,624,325</td>
<td>$ 143,400</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>403,930 $</td>
<td>1,093,424 $</td>
<td>2,950,000 $</td>
<td>4,176,971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
A) Funding will come from prior year grant savings
RESOLUTION NO. 2010 –

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

***

ADOPTING FISCAL YEAR 2011 CAPITAL BUDGET IN THE AMOUNT OF
$8,624,325

WHEREAS, Section 103141(b) of the California Public Utilities Code requires the
Board of Directors to adopt an annual budget for the District; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of a Capital Budget is necessary for obtaining Federal, State
and other grant funds to support the District’s capital transit improvement program; and

WHEREAS, the annual Capital budget is developed based upon the ten-year capital
program previously adopted as part of the 2009 Short Range Transit Plan; and

WHEREAS, staff has prepared a proposed Capital Budget for Fiscal Year 2011 in the
total amount of $8,624,325; and

WHEREAS, the anticipated Federal and other grant programming anticipated for the
proposed Capital Budget for Fiscal Year 2011 is $4,447,354; and

WHEREAS, the local sales tax required for the proposed Capital budget for Fiscal Year
2011 is $4,176,971.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors of the San
Mateo County Transit District hereby adopts a Capital Budget in the amount of $8,624,325 for
Fiscal Year 2011, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein as Attachment A;
and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager/CEO is directed to submit this budget to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, together with a copy of this resolution at the earliest practicable date.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of June 2010, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

______________________________
District Secretary
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO, Finance and Administration

SUBJECT: APPROVE BID DOCUMENTS AND AUTHORIZE EXECUTION OF DOCUMENTS FOR FUEL HEDGING PROGRAM

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend that the Board:

1. Approve execution of the documents on file in substantially final form for a diesel fuel price cap in connection with the San Mateo County Transit District’s (District) fuel hedging program; and

2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO or the Deputy CEO, Finance and Administration to execute the International Swaps and Derivatives Association, Inc. (ISDA) Master Agreement, the Schedule to the ISDA Master Agreement, the Credit Support Annex and related diesel fuel price cap documents, including a Confirmation, with the winning bidder, and to pay the premium for the diesel fuel price cap.

SIGNIFICANCE
In accordance with the fuel hedging policy adopted by the Board in March by Resolution No. 2010-21 (the "Fuel Hedging Policy"), staff has been working together with the District’s financial advisor to determine the interest of qualified financial institutions in bidding on a diesel fuel price cap and to develop a bid package for the diesel fuel price cap. The documents included in the bid package are a Request for Commodity Price Caps, an ISDA Master Agreement (Master Agreement), a Schedule to the Master Agreement (Schedule) and a Credit Support Annex (CSA). The documents have been reviewed by Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP, special counsel to the District. The documents require Board approval prior to the bidding process and execution by the General Manager/CEO or Deputy CEO, Finance and Administration. In addition to the documents included in the bid package, a Confirmation setting forth the pricing and other economic terms will be drafted and executed after the winning bid is selected.
The Master Agreement provides the terms and conditions governing the District’s relationship with the winning bidder. The Master Agreement is a form document of the International Swaps and Derivatives Association, Inc., and may apply to numerous types of hedging transactions, including fuel price caps, interest rate swaps and currency transactions. The Master Agreement documents the relationship between contracting parties and provides for greater legal certainty in the dealings of the parties. The Master Agreement contains provisions relating to the obligations of each party, representations, events of default and termination, early termination procedures and other matters. The Schedule modifies the Master Agreement to reflect the commercial understandings of the parties with respect to the contemplated transactions between them.

The CSA accompanies the Master Agreement and Schedule. The CSA provides protection to the District while the diesel fuel price cap remains in effect in the event that the rating of the winning bidder falls below A3/A-/A- by Moody’s, Standard & Poor’s or Fitch, as applicable. In the event of such a downgrade if the price cap has value to the District at the time, then the winning bidder (hereinafter sometimes referred to as the “counterparty”) must post collateral on a daily basis to secure its performance. As a condition for bidding, the counterparty must be rated in the “Aa” or “AA” category by at least one national rating agency at the time of bidding.

Based on preliminary discussions with eligible bidders by the District’s financial advisors, two firms, Barclays Capital (Barclays) and Deutsche Bank (DB), have expressed their intention to bid. DB was the winning bidder for the price cap which is in place through June 30, 2010 and has agreed to bid based on the documents approved by the Board in 2009. Barclays has agreed to bid using the proposed bid package on file, which includes the forms of Barclays’ documents submitted to the Board in 2009. Staff assumes that other eligible bidders declined to participate in the bid process as they did not wish to enter into the proposed form of documents and risk the need to post collateral in the event of a downgrade.

The bid and settlement of the premium payable by the District for the diesel fuel price cap are expected to occur prior to the beginning of the next fiscal year, with the price cap taking effect as of July 1, 2010. If staff is uncomfortable with the results of the bid, including the required premium for a price cap, the District will elect not to proceed with a fuel hedging program at the time bids are received.

The primary goal for the fuel hedging program is to reduce volatility and uncertainty in the fuel budget for Fiscal Year 2011. Pursuant to the Fuel Hedging Policy, the fuel hedging transaction for FY2011 will be implemented for no more than 75 percent of annual fuel consumption. Staff has proposed that the District hedge 0.9 million gallons, which currently represents approximately 50 percent of its expected annual fuel consumption. Staff has reviewed possible service adjustments and has determined that these adjustments to service will not cause the percent of expected fuel consumption hedged to exceed the 75 percent level authorized in the Fuel Hedging Policy. In order to maximize the hedging program’s potential for economic efficiency, the District will partner with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, which is expected to hedge 2.1 million gallons, which currently represents approximately 50 percent of its expected annual fuel consumption.
Staff expects to return to the Board at the next meeting with a report on the results of the bid. Staff also expects to return to the Board next year with an assessment of the FY2011 fuel hedging program.

**BUDGET IMPACT**

The District’s FY2010 revised budget for fuel expenses is $5.1 million, which incorporates an estimated $1.0 million of savings due to the diesel fuel price cap compared with the FY2009 revised budget. Implementing the fuel hedging program will enable the District to purchase at least half of its fuel within a pre-determined price range, thus giving the District a measure of budgetary certainty and allowing for more effective utilization of budget resources. With a constraint on fuel costs, staff believes the District will be able to hold the FY2011 budget to similar levels as the FY2010 budget, if not better. The proposed FY2011 fuel budget will include the hedging program fees consisting of up to $7,750 for financial advisor, up to $37,500 for outside legal counsel, $5,000 in miscellaneous costs and approximately $250,000 for the cost of a price cap.

**BACKGROUND**

The District currently purchases fuel based on the weekly spot price for ultra-low sulfur diesel (ULSD). This method leaves the District vulnerable to fluctuation in the market for diesel fuel. During the past twelve month period from May 1, 2009 to April 30, 2010, the price of ULSD has ranged from a high of $2.36 per gallon in the last week of April 2010 to a low of $1.52 in the first week of May 2009.

In order to meet the primary goal of the fuel hedging program of reducing volatility and uncertainty in the fuel budget for FY2011, staff will purchase a price cap consistent with the District’s adopted Fuel Hedging Policy. This price cap will not include taxes on the fuel price, however the price commonly reported to the Board of Directors includes taxes. A price cap allows the District to limit its exposure if fuel prices rise, while continuing to receive the benefit if prices fall.

Prepared by:  Trish Reavey, Director of Finance    650-508-6434
RESOLUTION NO.  2010-

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

AUTHORIZING IMPLEMENTATION OF A FUEL HEDGING PROGRAM FOR
THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2011, AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION AND
DELIVERY OF DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT SUCH FUEL
HEDGING PROGRAM, INCLUDING AN ISDA MASTER AGREEMENT, A
SCHEDULE TO THE ISDA MASTER AGREEMENT, A CREDIT SUPPORT ANNEX
AND A CONFIRMATION, AND AUTHORIZING THE TAKING OF ALL ACTION
NECESSARY RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION AND EXECUTION OF SAID
FUEL HEDGING PROGRAM.

WHEREAS, pursuant to the San Mateo County Transit District Act (constituting Part 15
of Division 10 of the Public Utilities Code of the State of California) and Chapter 6 of Part I of
Division 2 of Title 5 of the Government Code of the State of California, as referenced in said San
Mateo County Transit District Act, the Board of Directors (the "Board of Directors") of the San
Mateo County Transit District (the "District") is authorized to provide transit services and to
perform all acts deemed necessary or convenient for the exercise of its power to provide transit
services, including making and entering into contracts; and

WHEREAS, over the past several years in connection with its transit service operations,
the District has consistently purchased over two million gallons of diesel fuel each year; and

WHEREAS, staff, in conjunction with PFM Asset Management LLC and Ross
Financial, studied various options for reducing volatility in the price paid for diesel fuel and
assisting in the process of budgeting for fuel costs; and

WHEREAS, as a result of such study, staff recommended adoption of a fuel hedging
program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010 (hereinafter referred to the "2010 Fuel Hedging
Program") in the form of a diesel fuel price cap; and

WHEREAS, the 2010 Fuel Hedging Program was authorized and approved by the Board
of Directors and implemented by staff; and

WHEREAS, Deutsche Bank AG (hereinafter referred to as "Deutsche Bank") was
selected as provider of the diesel fuel price cap for the 2010 Fuel Hedging Program; and

WHEREAS, in connection with the 2010 Fuel Hedging Program, the District entered
into a 1992 International Swaps and Derivatives Association, Inc. ("ISDA") Master Agreement,
a Schedule to the ISDA Master Agreement, and a 1994 ISDA Credit Support Annex (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Deutsche Bank Hedging Documents") with Deutsche Bank; and

WHEREAS, forms of the Deutsche Bank Hedging Documents were made available to, and approved by, the Board of Directors in connection with the authorization and approval of the 2010 Fuel Hedging Program; and

WHEREAS, staff recommended continuation of the fuel hedging program and prepared a policy (hereinafter referred to as the "Fuel Hedging Policy") which recommended approval of a fuel hedging program, in the form of a diesel fuel price cap, as an appropriate method of decreasing the volatility in the price to be paid for diesel fuel and assisting in the process of budgeting for fuel costs, which Fuel Hedging Policy was approved and adopted by the Board of Directors on March 9, 2010; and

WHEREAS, implementation of such fuel hedging program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011 (hereinafter referred to as the "2011 Fuel Hedging Program") will involve soliciting bids from providers of diesel fuel price caps meeting the credit rating criteria specified in the Fuel Hedging Policy that are interested in bidding on the diesel fuel price cap on substantially such terms as are set forth in the Request for Commodity Price Caps (the "Request") prepared by PFM Asset Management LLC and Ross Financial; and

WHEREAS, a proposed form of the Request has been made available to the Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, implementation of the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program will involve the selection of a provider of diesel fuel price caps as a cap counterparty, such selection to be made by the General Manager/CEO of the District (the "General Manager/CEO") or the Deputy CEO of the District, Finance and Administration (the "Deputy CEO"), with the advice of Ross Financial (the "Financial Advisor"); and

WHEREAS, in the event a provider of diesel fuel price caps other than Deutsche Bank is selected as a cap counterparty, implementation of the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program will also involve execution and delivery of a 1992 ISDA Master Agreement (the "Master Agreement"), a Schedule to the ISDA Master Agreement (the "Schedule") and a 1994 ISDA Credit Support Annex (the "Credit Support Annex"); and

WHEREAS, there has been prepared and made available to the Board of Directors proposed forms of the Master Agreement, the Schedule and the Credit Support Annex; and
WHEREAS, implementation of the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program will also involve execution and delivery of a Confirmation (the "Confirmation"); and

WHEREAS, it is now necessary for the Board of Directors to approve the forms of the Request, the Master Agreement, the Schedule and the Credit Support Annex, to authorize the negotiation and execution and delivery of the Master Agreement, the Schedule, the Credit Support Annex and the Confirmation, to authorize the taking of such other actions as shall be necessary to consummate the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program and to authorize the taking of various actions necessary in connection therewith.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District as follows:

Section 1.  Findings. The Board of Directors hereby finds and determines that the foregoing recitals are true and correct. The Board of Directors hereby further determines that it would be in the best interest of the District and in furtherance of the purposes of the District and the exercise of the powers of the District in connection with the operation of its transit services to mitigate the risk of a rise in diesel fuel cost and to assist the District in its budgeting process by reducing the volatility and uncertainty in the effective cost to the District of diesel fuel by acquiring a diesel fuel price cap through the implementation of the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program and the execution and delivery of such documentation as shall be required to implement such 2011 Fuel Hedging Program, including the Confirmation and, as and to the extent applicable, the Master Agreement, the Schedule and the Credit Support Annex.

Section 2.  Approval of the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program. Implementation of the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program in accordance with the Fuel Hedging Policy with a cap counterparty (the "Cap Counterparty") selected by the General Manager/CEO or the Deputy CEO, with the advice of the Financial Advisor, and on such other terms as are acceptable to the Deputy CEO, with the advice of the Financial Advisor, is hereby authorized and approved.

Section 3.  Approval of Documentation. The proposed forms of Master Agreement, Schedule and Credit Support Annex presented to this meeting are hereby approved. The General Manager/CEO or the Deputy CEO, each acting alone (each, an "Authorized Officer") is hereby authorized and directed, for and in the name and on behalf of the District, to execute and deliver a Master Agreement, Schedule and Credit Support Annex, in substantially the form presented to this meeting, with such changes therein as the Authorized Officer executing the same, with the
advice of the Financial Advisor, may require or approve, such approval to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery thereof.

Each Authorized Officer is hereby authorized and directed, for and in the name and on behalf of the District, to execute and deliver a Confirmation, such Confirmation to be in such form as shall be acceptable to the Authorized Officer executing the same, with the advice of the Financial Advisor, such acceptability to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery thereof.

Section 4. **Authorized Representative.** All approvals, consents, directions, notices, orders, requests and other actions permitted or required by the Master Agreement, the Schedule, the Credit Support Annex and the Confirmation (hereinafter referred to as the "2011 Hedging Documentation") entered into or to be entered into, as applicable, with the Cap Counterparty, or by any of the other documents authorized by this Resolution may be given or taken by either Authorized Officer without further authorization or direction by the Board of Directors and each Authorized Officer is hereby authorized and directed to give any such approval, consent, direction, notice, order or request and to take any such action which such Authorized Officer may deem necessary or desirable to further the purposes of this Resolution.

Section 5. **Ratification of Deutsche Bank Hedging Documents.** All actions heretofore taken with respect to the authorization, approval, execution and delivery of the Deutsche Bank Hedging Documents are hereby ratified, confirmed, and approved.

Section 6. **Ratification of Actions Relating to 2011 Fuel Hedging Program.** All actions heretofore taken by the officers and agents of the District with respect to the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program are hereby ratified, confirmed, and approved.

Section 7. **Completion of 2011 Fuel Hedging Program.** Each Authorized Officer is hereby authorized and directed, for and in the name and on behalf of the District, to do any and all things and to take any and all actions and to execute and deliver any and all agreements, certificates, documents and instruments and to do any and all things and take any and all actions which may be necessary or advisable to effectuate the actions which the Board of Directors has approved in this Resolution, including, without limitation, payment of the premium for the diesel fuel price cap, and to carry out, consummate and perform the duties of the District set forth in the 2011 Hedging Documentation and all other documents executed in connection with the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program.
Section 8. **Severability of Invalid Provisions.** If any section, paragraph, clause or provision of this Resolution shall for any reason be held to be invalid or unenforceable, the invalidity or unenforceability of such section, paragraph, clause or provision shall not affect any of the remaining provisions of this Resolution which shall continue in full force and effect.

Section 9. **Effective Date.** This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its passage.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of June, 2010, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST

District Secretary
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTION OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE OF CLIPPERSM FARE COLLECTION SYSTEM

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend the Board authorize the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) regarding the operations and maintenance of the ClipperSM fare collection system, in a form acceptable to the initial seven participating transit operators in the regional fare collection program, to take effect upon execution by all of the parties.

SIGNIFICANCE
The MOU, once executed, would replace the Interagency Participation Agreement (IPA) that has been in place since December 12, 2003. The IPA, which was entered into by MTC and participating transit agencies including SamTrans, created a TransLink® Consortium for joint agency decision-making to implement, operate and maintain the regional fare payment system in the San Francisco Bay Area. Due to MTC’s decision to withdraw from the Consortium, it was agreed amongst the stakeholders that another vehicle would need to be put in place to continue to govern obligations of MTC and the participating transit agencies to operate and maintain TransLink®, which is being re-branded as ClipperSM starting in June 2010.

The initial signatories to the MOU are MTC, Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District, the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, the City and County of San Francisco, acting by and through its Municipal Transportation Agency, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, the San Mateo County Transit District, and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.

Attachment A, prepared by MTC staff, summarizes the key principles of the proposed MOU. It formalizes the respective obligations of MTC and the participating transit operators, regarding the operation, maintenance and allocation of costs and revenues for the Clipper automated fare payment system. It sets forth a process for amending the Clipper operating rules and for resolving disputes among the parties. It replaces the prior governance structure under the IPA of the TransLink Management Group, which was comprised of the participating agencies’ general
managers or equivalents, and which was responsible for significant business decisions regarding
the regional fare payment system.

MTC, as the contracting party with Cubic Transportation Systems, Inc., the contractor for the
Clipper system, will oversee and administer the project throughout the contract term, which ends
November 2, 2019. Clipper costs and revenues will be allocated in a similar manner to that
currently provided for under the expiring IPA.

**BUDGET IMPACT**
There is no impact to the budget.

**BACKGROUND**
Clipper\textsuperscript{SM} is an automated fare payment system for intra- and inter-operator transit trips in the
San Francisco Bay Area. MTC, under authority granted to it under SB1474 (Statutes 1996,
Chapter 256), included TransLink\textsuperscript{®}, now Clipper\textsuperscript{SM}, in its regional transit coordination program.
MTC entered into a contract with Motorola, Inc. on June 25, 1999 to design, build, operate and
maintain TransLink\textsuperscript{®} in two phases, first as a demonstration project, and then as a full role-out.
SamTrans is one of the transit operators that has participated in this program.

Prepared by: April Chan, Director, Budgets and Grants 650-508-6228
Attachment A
Principles of MOU

The recommended MOU defines:

1. **High level responsibilities of MTC and the Operators.** Items of note include:
   
   **For MTC:**
   
   - confirm existing obligations under the Clipper℠ Contract to collect and disperse revenues to the participating agencies, according to the stated cost and revenue sharing formula;
   
   - acknowledge responsibility for management of bank accounts and fiduciary duty to the cardholders;
   
   - notify Operators of changes to Operating Rules, participate in consultation process on Rules changes, and provide regular reports to the Operators;
   
   - pay fixed operating costs, specified variable costs and other lump sum and capital costs, and operator incentive fees; and
   
   - make project records available to the operators (exact terms not yet agreed-upon).

   **For the Operators:**
   
   - implement and operate Clipper℠;
   
   - pay specified variable operating costs; and
   
   - accept ownership of equipment one year after acceptance.

2. **Cost and revenue allocation formula.** The formula first adopted in the IPA is carried with minor revisions. Operating costs allocated to MTC and the Operators are specified described, and any changes require an amendment to the MOU. Operators agree to periodic reviews of the cost allocation formula to support fairness among Operators and accommodate changes.

3. **Process for dispute resolution.** The TransLink® IPA called for, but never defined such a process. The proposed process first calls for informal dispute resolution and then allows escalation to mediation or arbitration, binding or nonbinding, as agreed by the parties.

4. **Process for Operator input on MTC-proposed changes to Operating Rules.** MTC will provide at least 90 day notice for any changes impacting Operators’ Roles and Responsibilities, and consult further with Operators, if requested. Disagreement about changes impacting Operators are subject to the dispute resolution process in the MOU, if the consultation process fails to result in agreement.

5. **Process for new operator participation.** To implement Clipper℠, an agency must sign a supplemental agreement with MTC, agreeing to the terms of the MOU. MTC will not sign a supplemental agreement until Cubic and the operator are ready to implement Clipper.

6. **Term of the MOU.** The MOU is effective on the date when all parties have signed the MOU and will terminate at conclusion of the Clipper℠ Contract (November 2 2019), unless otherwise terminated by the parties.
RESOLUTION NO. 2010 –

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

*   *   *

AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTION OF THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE OF CLIPPER® FARE COLLECTION SYSTEM

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), under authority granted to it under SB1474 (Statutes 1996, Chapter 256), included TransLink®, now Clipper®, in its regional transit coordination program; and

WHEREAS, Clipper® is an automated fare payment system for intra- and inter-operator transit trips in the San Francisco Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, the Clipper® Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) sets forth a new governance structure for the participating agencies in the operation and maintenance of Clipper®; and

WHEREAS, the initial seven signatories to the MOU are MTC, Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit), Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD), the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART), the City and County of San Francisco, acting by and through its Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA), the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain); and

WHEREAS, the general principles governing the MOU are set forth in Attachment A, which outlines MTC and operator responsibilities related to the operation and maintenance of
Clipper\textsuperscript{SM}, provides for a process for amending Clipper\textsuperscript{SM} operating rules, for resolving disputes amongst the parties, and for how Clipper\textsuperscript{SM} costs and revenues would be distributed.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the San Mateo County Transit District authorize the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) regarding the operations and maintenance of the Clipper\textsuperscript{SM} fare collection system, in a form acceptable to the initial seven participating operators, to take effect upon execution by all seven agencies.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9\textsuperscript{th} day of June 2010, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

____________________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

______________________________
District Secretary
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZING REVISIONS TO THE SETTLEMENT AUTHORITY POLICY FOR GENERAL LIABILITY CLAIMS

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend Board approval to revise the previously authorized Settlement Authority Policy for General Liability Claims by replacing the position of Risk Manager, which no longer exists, with Deputy CEO (Finance and Administration).

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of this recommendation will bring the levels of authority listed in the policy up to date with the recent staffing reorganization. This action is required to continue the process of effective and efficient processing and settlement of general liability claims.

BUDGET IMPACT
This modification has no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The procedures for the Claims Settlement Authority Policy were enacted by the Board of Directors by Resolution No. 1983-9. The Board of Directors amended the Policy by Resolution No. 2001-28 to revise the settlement authority limits that had not been changed since 1983 and had fallen behind the general business practices of peer agencies.

Proposed revisions to the Settlement Authority Policy are shown below in redline format.

a. The District’s Claims Administrator shall be authorized to settle valid claims and actions up to $5,000 and make payment of same in accordance with its contract with the District;

b. The Deputy CEO (Finance and Administration) Risk Manager, after review by General Counsel, shall be authorized to settle valid claims and actions between $5,001 and $25,000 and authorize payment of same;
c. The General Manager/CEO, upon recommendation by the **Deputy CEO (Finance and Administration) Risk Manager** and General Counsel, shall be authorized to settle valid claims and actions between $25,001 and $50,000 and authorize payment of same; and

d. The Board of Directors, upon recommendation by the General Manager/CEO, shall approve all settlements in excess of $50,000 and authorize payment of same.

Prepared by: Monica D. Colondres, Director, Human Resources 650-508-6233
RESOLUTION NO. 2010-

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

AUTHORIZING REVISIONS TO THE SETTLEMENT AUTHORITY POLICY
FOR GENERAL LIABILITY CLAIMS

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 1983-9, the Board of Directors established a Settlement Authority Policy for General Liability Claims (Policy), Resolution No. 1983-9; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 2001-28, the Board of Directors revised the limits of the Policy to authorize the Claims Administrator to settle claims and actions up to $5,000; the Risk Manager, after review by General Counsel, to settle claims and actions between $5,001 and $25,000; the General Manager/CEO, upon recommendation by the Risk Manager and General Counsel, to settle claims and actions between $25,001 and $50,000; and the Board of Directors, upon recommendation by the General Manager/CEO, to approve all settlements in excess of $50,000; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the reorganization of the District, the Risk Manager position no longer exists and the functions of that position now are the responsibility of the Deputy CEO (Finance and Administration); and

WHEREAS, amending the Policy as proposed will allow the District to continue the process of effective and efficient processing and settlement of general liability claims.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby amends the District's Settlement Authority Policy for general liability claims and actions as follows:
1. The Claims Administrator shall be authorized to settle claims and actions up to $5,000 and authorize payment of same;

2. The Deputy CEO (Finance and Administration) Risk Manager, after review by General Counsel, shall be authorized to settle claims and actions between $5,001 and $25,000 and authorize payment of same;

3. The General Manager/CEO, upon recommendation by the Deputy CEO (Finance and Administration) Risk Manager and General Counsel, shall be authorized to settle claims and actions between $25,001 and $50,000 and authorize payment of same; and

4. The Board of Directors, upon recommendation by the General Manager/CEO, shall approve all settlements in excess of $50,000 and authorize payment of same.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager/CEO is authorized to take any actions necessary to effect this resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of June 2010, by the following vote:

AYES: __________________________

NOES: __________________________

ABSENT: _________________________

Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

_______________________________
District Secretary
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZING REVISIONS TO THE SETTLEMENT AUTHORITY POLICY FOR EMPLOYMENT CLAIMS

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend Board approval to revise the previously authorized Settlement Authority Policy for Employment Claims by replacing the position of Chief Administrative Officer, which no longer exists, with Deputy CEO.

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of this recommendation will bring the levels of authority listed in the policy up to date with the recent staffing reorganization. This action is required to continue the process of effective and efficient processing and settlement of employment claims.

BUDGET IMPACT
This modification has no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The Board of Directors at their meeting on May 14, 2003, by Resolution No. 2003-19, approved the establishment of Settlement Authority Policy for Employment Claims.

Proposed revisions to the Settlement Authority Policy are shown in redline below.

a. The Director, Human Resources shall be authorized to settle claims and actions up to $10,000 and authorize payment of same;

b. The Deputy CEO (Finance and Administration) Chief Administrative Officer, after review by General Counsel, shall be authorized to settle claims and actions between $10,001 and $25,000 and authorize payment of same;
c. The General Manager/CEO, upon recommendation by the Deputy CEO (Finance and Administration) Chief Administrative Officer and General Counsel, shall be authorized to settle claims and actions between $25,001 and $50,000 and authorize payment of same; and

d. The Board of Directors, upon recommendation by the General Manager/CEO, shall approve all settlements in excess of $50,000 and authorize payment of same.

Prepared by: Monica D. Colondres, Director, Human Resources 650-508-6233
RESOLUTION NO. 2010-

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

AUTHORIZING REVISIONS TO THE SETTLEMENT AUTHORITY POLICY
FOR EMPLOYMENT CLAIMS

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 2003-19, the Board of Directors established a Settlement Authority Policy for Employment Claims (Policy) that authorized the Director, Human Resources to settle claims and actions up to $10,000; the Chief Administrative Officer, after review by General Counsel, to settle claims and actions between $10,001 and $25,000; the General Manager/CEO, upon recommendation by the Chief Administrative Officer and General Counsel, to settle claims and actions between $25,001 and $50,000; and the Board of Directors, upon recommendation by the General Manager/CEO, to approve all settlements in excess of $50,000; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the reorganization of the District, the Chief Administrative Officer position no longer exists and the functions of that position with respect to employment matters now are the responsibility of the Deputy CEO (Finance and Administration); and

WHEREAS, amending the Policy as proposed will allow the District to continue the process of effective and efficient processing and settlement of employment claims.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby amends the District's Settlement Authority Policy for employment claims and actions as follows:

1. The Director, Human Resources shall be authorized to settle claims and actions up to $10,000 and authorize payment of same;
2. The Deputy CEO (Finance and Administration), after review by General Counsel, shall be authorized to settle claims and actions between $10,001 and $25,000 and authorize payment of same;

3. The General Manager/CEO, upon recommendation by the Deputy CEO (Finance and Administration) and General Counsel, shall be authorized to settle claims and actions between $25,001 and $50,000 and authorize payment of same; and

4. The Board of Directors, upon recommendation by the General Manager/CEO, shall approve all settlements in excess of $50,000 and authorize payment of same.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager/CEO is authorized to take any actions necessary to effect this resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of June 2010, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

________________________
District Secretary
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington C.H. (Chuck) Harvey
Deputy CEO Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: REJECTION OF LOW MONETARY BID AS NON-RESPONSIVE AND
AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR PICO BLVD. PAVING IMPROVEMENTS
PROJECT

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend that the Board:

1. Reject the low monetary bid received from Granite Construction Company as being non-responsive. This firm submitted an incomplete bid package, rendering their bid non-responsive and requiring its rejection.

2. Award the subject contract to the lowest, responsive and responsible bidder, Interstate Grading and Paving, Inc., of South San Francisco, CA for a total amount of $86,910.

3. Authorize the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute a contract with Interstate Grading and Paving, Inc. in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents.

SIGNIFICANCE
The Pico Boulevard Paving Improvements project will provide for the resurfacing of the main access road to the District’s South Base Maintenance and Operations facility. This pavement resurfacing is needed for continuation of the long-term use of this facility.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funding for the project has been budgeted in the approved Fiscal Year 2009 Capital Budget. No additional funding is required for this action.

BACKGROUND
This project provides for the repaving of Pico Boulevard, from Airport Way to the main entrance to the South Base Facility. This road is currently in private ownership, with an easement granted to the District for access to South Base. This part of the road is approximately 30 feet in width and 600 feet in length.

There have been various discussions in recent years to consider the purchase of this segment of Pico Boulevard. However, District funds have not been available to commit to this purchase.
The road surface has developed deep ruts and potholes that require repaving to prevent damage to District vehicles operating on this road.

Invitations for Bids (IFBs) were distributed throughout the construction industry. The solicitation was advertised in local newspapers and on the District’s website. Solicitation notices were also sent to potential bidders and disadvantaged business enterprises (DBEs). Nine bids were received and publicly opened. The three lowest bids are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineer’s Estimate</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Construction Company</td>
<td>$80,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Grading and Paving, Inc.</td>
<td>$86,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Grady Paving, Inc.</td>
<td>$89,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The apparent low bid submitted by Granite Construction Company was determined to be non-responsive due to its submittal of both a certification of compliance and certification of non-compliance with Buy America requirements, resulting in a major irregularity that cannot be waived by the District.

Interstate Grading and Paving, Inc. (IG&P) submitted the second lowest bid at nearly 50 percent lower than the engineer’s estimate. Staff and Legal Counsel verified that Interstate Grading and Paving, Inc. submitted all of the required bid documents and complied with all bidding requirements.

Staff evaluated IG&P for responsiveness and responsibility (the ability to satisfactorily perform the work of the contract) and determined that it is responsible. References provided by IG&P indicate that they have satisfactorily performed construction projects for many local public agencies for over 12 years. Staff analysis concluded that Interstate Grading and Paving, Inc. is a responsible bidder that submitted the lowest, responsive bid.

The District’s DBE Officer reviewed the sub-bid documentation from Interstate Grading and Paving, Inc. and determined that the firm was responsive to the DBE requirements. While there is no DBE participation, IG&P solicited sub-bids from a number of subcontractors and its decision to engage its subcontractor appears nondiscriminatory.

Contract Officer: Patrick May 650-508-7732
Project Manager: Jim Kellner, Project Manager 650-508-6333
RESOLUTION NO. 2010-

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

***

AUTHORIZING AWARD OF CONTRACT
TO INTERSTATE GRADING AND PAVING, INC.
FOR THE PICO BLVD. PAVING IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT
FOR A TOTAL COST OF $86,910.00

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) has solicited competitive bids for the Pico Boulevard Paving Improvements project; and

WHEREAS, in response to the District's Invitation for Bid (IFB), nine firms submitted bids; and

WHEREAS, staff and Legal Counsel have reviewed the bids and determined that the bid submitted by the apparent low bidder, Granite Construction Company of Watsonville, California, is non-responsive due to its submittal of both a certification of compliance and certification of non-compliance with Buy America requirements and therefore must be rejected; and

WHEREAS, staff has duly notified Granite Construction Company of the recommendation to reject its bid and of its right to present evidence on its behalf before the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Committee concurs, that the contract be awarded to the lowest, responsible bidder, Interstate Grading and Paving, Inc. of South San Francisco, California, whose bid meets the requirements of the solicitation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District rejects the bid of Granite Construction Company as non-responsive for the reason stated above; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District awards a contract for the Pico Blvd. Paving Improvements project to Interstate Grading and Paving, Inc. of South San Francisco, California for a total cost of $86,910.00, inclusive of all taxes, other costs and expenses; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, is authorized to execute a contract on behalf of the District with Interstate Grading and Paving, Inc. in full conformity with all the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents and in a form approved by Legal Counsel.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of June, 2010 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

___________________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

____________________
District Secretary
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington   C. H. (Chuck) Harvey
Deputy CEO    Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE AWARD OF A CONTRACT FOR PROVISION OF WORKERS’ COMPENSATION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION SERVICES

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend that the Board:
1. Award a contract to The Cities Group of Burlingame, California to provide comprehensive Workers’ Compensation Program Administration Services for a five-year term for a firm-fixed price of $878,000.
2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO or his designee to execute a contract with The Cities Group in full conformity with the terms and conditions set forth in the solicitation documents and negotiated agreement.

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of the above actions will allow the San Mateo County Transit District (District) to retain the services of a Third Party Administrator (TPA) to manage the District’s Workers’ Compensation Program as required by State of California Law. This encompasses the goal of providing prompt, thorough and effective medical care and treatment for District employees that become ill or injured due to employment-related causes and getting such employees back to work in a timely manner.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funds for these services are included in the current and projected Operating budgets.

BACKGROUND
The TPA will administer the District’s self-administered, self-insured Workers’ Compensation Program including analysis of losses, development of methods to reduce workers’ compensation costs while improving overall program efficiencies and effectiveness.
Staff issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) detailing the District’s scope of services and other requirements for providing Workers’ Compensation Program Administration Services.
The RFP was advertised on the District’s procurement website and in a newspaper of general circulation. Solicitation notices were also sent to Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs) in the insurance industry and potential proposers selected from the District’s vendor database. Staff received six proposals (one from a DBE firm).

An Evaluation Committee consisting of District staff reviewed and ranked proposals according to the following weighted criteria:

- Responsiveness of the proposal  15%
- Approach to Scope of Services  45%
- Qualifications and Experience  20%
- Cost proposal     20%

After review, evaluation and initial ranking of all proposals, two firms were found to be within the competitive range and were invited to participate in interviews. The DBE proposer was not found to be within the competitive range. Upon completion of interviews and final scoring, the evaluation committee determined that The Cities Group was the highest-ranked of the firms listed below in order of their consensus ranking:

- The Cities Group
- CorVel Corporation

The Cities Group is responsive to all of the solicitation requirements and has the depth of knowledge, experience and financial stability to successfully perform the services at a fair and reasonable price. The Cities Group will perform this contract entirely with its own work force. The Cities Group has been the TPA for the District for the past thirty years, and its performance has been outstanding, providing responsive and cost-effective management of the District’s Workers’ Compensation Program at significant savings to the District. Staff, therefore, recommends award of the contract to The Cities Group.

The value of the current contract with The Cities Group is $773,000 for a similar scope of work. The five-year term of the current contract expires on June 30, 2010.

Contract Officer:  Adwoa Oni  
508-6411
Project Manager:  Monica Colondres, Director, Human Resources  650-508-6233
RESOLUTION NO. 2010-

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

AUTHORIZING AWARD OF A CONTRACT TO THE CITIES GROUP TO PROVIDE WORKERS’ COMPENSATION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION SERVICES FOR A FIRM-FIXED PRICE OF $878,000 FOR A FIVE-YEAR TERM

WHEREAS, the District issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for providing Workers’ Compensation Program Administration Services; and

WHEREAS, in response to the District’s solicitation, six firms submitted proposals; and

WHEREAS, an Evaluation Committee has reviewed all of the proposals, conducted interviews, performed financial analyses, and ranked all proposals according to the evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP; and

WHEREAS, upon completion of the evaluation and selection process, The Cities Group of Burlingame, California received the highest consensus ranking; and

WHEREAS, Staff and Legal Counsel have reviewed The Cities Group proposal and conclude that it has complied with the requirements of the solicitation documents; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends and the Finance Committee concurs that a five-year contract be awarded to The Cities Group for the provision of Workers’ Compensation Program Administration Services for a firm-fixed price of $878,000.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors (Board) of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby awards a contract to The Cities Group of Burlingame, California for the provision of Workers’ Compensation Program Administration Services for a total firm-fixed price of $878,000; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the General Manager/CEO or his designee to execute a contract on behalf of the District with The Cities Group in full conformity with all of the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents and negotiated agreement in a form approved by Legal Counsel.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of June 2010 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

---

Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

District Secretary
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington C.H. (Chuck) Harvey
Deputy CEO Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: REJECTION OF ALL BIDS FOR PROVIDING ELECTRICAL MAINTENANCE SERVICES AND ON-CALL EMERGENCY REPAIRS AND AUTHORIZATION TO RESOLICIT BIDS

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend that the Board:
1. Reject all bids submitted in response to the San Mateo County Transit District (District) solicitation for providing electrical maintenance services and on-call emergency repairs.
2. Authorize a re-solicitation that includes Federal contract clauses, which will then permit the use of Federal funds.

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of the above actions will allow rejection of all bids received and will permit the re-issuance of a solicitation that includes Federal contract clauses, which will then allow the use of Federal funds on the contract.

BUDGET IMPACT
Rejection of bids will not cause an immediate impact to the budget; however, the ability to use Federal funds for this procurement would relieve the burden on the Operating budget of fully funding this procurement.

BACKGROUND
An Invitation For Bids (IFB) to provide electrical maintenance services and on-call emergency repairs was issued by the District. The IFB was advertised in a local newspaper and was posted on the District’s procurement website. Six bids were received and opened publicly with the following results:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 B-Side Construction – Oakland, CA</td>
<td>$1,326,239.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Harris Electric – Dublin, CA</td>
<td>$1,377,560.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Liberty Electric – Burlingame, CA</td>
<td>$1,389,776.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Republic ITS – Novato, CA</td>
<td>$1,448,820.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 McMillan Electric – San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$1,503,880.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Engelhard Electric – San Carlos, CA</td>
<td>$1,542,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The District has issued an amendment to extend the existing contract with Liberty Electric of Burlingame, CA, to continue to provide electrical maintenance services until a new contract, resulting from a revised solicitation containing the Federal clauses, is awarded. Based upon expenditures-to-date, sufficient contract capacity remains in the Liberty Electric contract so that it can be extended without increasing the contract amount. The existing contract with Liberty Electric is in the amount of $997,425 and expires on February 8, 2011. The existing contract does not include an allowance of $750,000 for special projects that was included in the IFB’s scope of work and is reflected in the bid results listed above.

Contract Officer: Evelyn Marcal 650-508-7958  
Project Manager: Greg Moyer, Superintendent Maintenance Technical Services 650-508-6408
A G E N D A
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building
Bacciocco Auditorium - Second Floor
1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 2010 – 2:40 p.m.
or immediately following previous Committee meeting

ACTION
1. Approval of Minutes of Legislative Committee Meeting of May 12, 2010

INFORMATIONAL
2. State and Federal Legislative Update

Committee Members: Zoe Kersteer-Tucker, Omar Ahmad, Adrienne Tissier

NOTE:
• This Committee meeting may be attended by Board Members who do not sit on this Committee. In the event that a quorum of the entire Board is present, this Committee shall act as a Committee of the Whole. In either case, any item acted upon by the Committee or the Committee of the Whole will require consideration and action by the full Board of Directors as a prerequisite to its legal enactment.
• All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2010
ROSE GUILBAULT, CHAIR
KARYL MATSUMOTO, VICE CHAIR
OMAR AHMAD
MARK CHURCH
JERRY DEAL
SHIRLEY HARRIS
ZOE KERSTEEN-TUCKER
ARTHUR L. LLOYD
ADRIENNE TISSIER
MICHAEL J. SCANLON
GENERAL MANAGER/CEO
Committee Members Present: Z. Kersteen-Tucker (Committee Chair), O. Ahmad, A. Tissier

Other Board Members Present, Constituting Committee of the Whole: M. Church, J. Deal, R. Guilbault, S. Harris, A. Lloyd, K. Matsumoto

Staff Present: J. Cassman, G. Harrington, C. Harvey, R. Haskin, M. Lee, M. Martinez, N. McKenna, D. Miller, S. Murphy, M. Scanlon, M. Simon

Committee Chair Zoe Kersteen-Tucker called the meeting to order at 3:45 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Legislative Committee Meeting of April 14, 2010
The committee approved the minutes (Lloyd/Ahmad).

Update on the State Legislative Program
Government Affairs Manager Seamus Murphy said the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) has been the subject of some scrutinizing reports over the last month. Two legislative budget subcommittee reports and a state audit report echoed the findings of last year’s Legislative Analyst Office, which called for the reassessment of the project’s funding projections and its overall financial management. SamTrans legislative advocates attended both budget subcommittee hearings to highlight the value of CHSRA’s $1.6 million budget request to fund continued coordination with the Peninsula Rail Program. This component is likely to be funded in next year’s budget, but it is becoming increasingly evident that the Legislature has an interest in taking steps to reorganize the CHSRA and provide the project additional legislative oversight and fiscal accountability.

Expenditures is one of the most critical issues and legislative leadership and the SamTrans delegation have been receptive to the idea that, in order to create jobs and aid economic recovery, the projects that are ready to start should be funded first. Since the Recovery Act has a similar goal and the project has been a beneficiary of $2.25 billion in Recovery Act dollars, staff is hopeful that the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has the same principles in mind as it negotiates its cooperative agreement with CHSRA, which will determine how that grant money is spent.

The governor’s revised State budget is due on Friday. Staff is hearing lower than expected tax revenues in April could mean a larger than anticipated FY2011 budget shortfall. The official number won’t come out until next week, but it is safe to say it is in the $18-$19 billion range. There is some concern that a range like this could threaten the gas tax swap that was negotiated
to provide transit with a baseline $350 million State Transit Assistance Program moving forward based on the sales tax on diesel fuel.

The campaign that supports the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act submitted 1.1 million signatures last month and will likely qualify for the November ballot. There is a chance that the measure would be interpreted to completely undo the gas tax swap and that would mean the restoration of the sales tax on gasoline. The State Transit Assistance program would include the full amount of spillover and the program would be fully protected under the terms of the act.

**Federal Level**

Things are still moving slowly. Progress was made on the Climate Change Bill. Three senators who were working on a new version of the bill released a vague outline of its anticipated results. The transportation component of the bill would provide some revenues for the Highway Trust Fund.

Committee Chair Kersteen-Tucker asked if AB32 will have any impact at the Federal level with the Climate Change legislation that is moving forward. Mr. Murphy said it is hard to say what the impact would be, but all the climate change proposals that have come up at the Federal level have been based on the California law.

Adjourned: 3:51 p.m.
TO: Legislative Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Mark Simon
Executive Officer, Public Affairs

SUBJECT: STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

ACTION
This report is for information only. No Board action is required.

SIGNIFICANCE
Staff will provide regular updates to the Board consistent with the approved Legislative Program.

STATE ISSUES

State Budget
On May 14 the Governor released the May Revision to his proposed Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 State Budget. The proposal preserves revenues reserved for transit in the Public Transportation Account in accordance with the “gas tax swap” proposal approved by the Legislature earlier this year.

Under the gas tax swap proposal, funding for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), State Highway Operation and Protection Plan (SHOPP) and Highway Users Tax Account (HUTA) was increased, but the May Revision proposes diverting $650 million from these programs, which would bring funding levels for these programs back to pre-gas tax swap levels. This diversion would have no impact on funding for transit programs.

HSR Budget Hearings
The Senate Budget Subcommittee on Resources, Environmental Protection, Energy and Transportation met to review the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) FY 2010-11 budget requests including a $1.6 million request for funding to participate in the Peninsula Rail Program (PRP).
Caltrain staff met with individual subcommittee members and legislative staff to clarify the nature of the CHSRA request, which was ultimately approved. Subcommittee members also indicated a desire to provide funding for a more active and engaged Peer Review Committee pursuant to AB 3034. They also approved $1 million for a new ridership study and reduced the CHSRA request for land acquisition from $250 million to $1 million.

**FEDERAL ISSUES**

**American Power Act (APA)**
On May 12, Senators Kerry, Lieberman and Graham released their legislative proposal to address climate change. The APA bill directs up to $6.25 billion per year for transportation investments from revenues generated from carbon fees and emissions auctions. A minimum of $19.5 billion in funds will be generated from motor fuels production in 2013 (the year the bill would become effective), with that amount significantly increasing in subsequent years. This means that at least 77 percent of revenue generated from pollution fees on gasoline and diesel would be diverted away from investment in transportation in the first year. In later years as the price of carbon increases, the percentage diverted could be as much as 91 percent.

Staff plans to work with the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) and California’s Senators to ensure that any fee associated with an increase in the price of gasoline be used to finance a long-term transportation authorization bill.

**Federal Tax Extenders Legislation (HR 4213)**
Congress is working to approve a $200 billion tax extenders bill that would extend jobless benefits and contains a number of one-year fuel tax credit extensions including the 50 cents per gallon alternative fuel tax credit for liquid fuels derived from biomass, compressed or liquefied biogas, natural gas and propane, as well as the alternative motor vehicle credit for heavy hybrids (i.e., hybrid motor vehicles that are not passenger automobiles or light trucks). Congress will need to pass the bill by June 1 to prevent unemployment benefits from expiring.

Prepared By: Seamus Murphy, Manager, Government Affairs 650-508-6388
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 153</strong> Ma D</td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 7/2/2009 - In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with specified powers and duties relating to the development and implementation of an intercity high-speed rail system. Existing law authorizes the authority to prepare a plan for the construction and operation of that system and to enter into contracts, acquire rights-of-way through purchase or eminent domain, and take other actions, subject to specified contingencies. Under existing law, a public entity may not commence an eminent domain proceeding until its governing body has adopted a resolution of necessity that meets certain requirements. Existing law generally prohibits a state agency from employing legal counsel other than the Attorney General unless there is a specific statute authorizing that employment. This bill would eliminate those contingencies to the exercise of the authority's authority and would specify that the authority constitutes a &quot;governing body&quot; for the purpose of adopting a resolution of necessity. The bill would authorize the authority to employ its own legal staff or contract with other state agencies for legal services, or both. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **AB 231** Huffman D | SENATE E.Q. 6/18/2009 - From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to committee. Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on EQ. | Requires that revenues collected pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 be deposited into a Climate Protection Trust Fund, and establishes parameters by which those funds can be distributed for the reduction of GHG and mitigation of climate change impacts. **Last Amended on 6/26/2009** | |

| **AB 266** Carter D | SENATE RLS. 6/11/2009 - Referred to Com. on RLS. | Requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to, on an every-5-year basis, to develop an assessment of the unfunded costs of programmed state projects and federally earmarked projects in the state, as well as an assessment of available funding for transportation purposes and unmet transportation needs on a statewide basis. **Last Amended on 4/20/2009** | |
### AB 289
**Galgiani** D  
**Bill ID/Topic:**  
High-speed rail.  
**Location:**  
SENATE T. & H.  
4/21/2010 - From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to committee. Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on T. & H.  
**Summary:**  
Existing law, the California High-Speed Rail Act, creates the High-Speed Rail Authority to develop and implement a high-speed rail system in the state, with specified powers and duties. Existing law, pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, approved by the voters as Proposition 1A at the November 4, 2008, general election, provides for the issuance of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related purposes. Existing law provides for appointment of an executive director by the authority, who is exempt from civil service and serves at the pleasure of the authority. This bill would authorize the Governor to appoint up to 5 deputy directors exempt from civil service who would serve at the pleasure of the executive director.  
**Position:**  
D  
This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.  
**Last Amended on 4/21/2010**

### AB 619
**Blumenfield** D  
**Bill ID/Topic:**  
Transportation projects: federal funds: delays.  
**Location:**  
SENATE T. & H.  
6/17/2009 - In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.  
**Summary:**  
Existing law provides that the Department of Transportation has full possession and control of the state highway system. Existing law provides for allocation of federal transportation funds made available to the state.  
This bill would require the department to notify the Legislature within 30 days of making a determination that a project, including a project designated in the National Corridor Infrastructure Improvement Program, will be delayed beyond its scheduled completion date due to state cashflow or other funding issues, if the delay places at risk federal funds, including funds earmarked for the project.  
**Position:**  
D  
**Last Amended on 4/21/2010**

### AB 726
**Nielsen** R  
**Bill ID/Topic:**  
Transportation capital improvement projects.  
**Location:**  
SENATE T. & H.  
6/16/2009 - In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.  
**Summary:**  
Existing law generally provides for allocation of transportation capital improvement funds pursuant to the State Transportation Improvement Program process. Existing law provides for 75% of funds available for transportation capital improvement projects to be made available for regional projects, and 25% for interregional projects. Existing law describes the types of projects that may be funded with the regional share of funds, and includes local road projects as a category of eligible projects.  
This bill would state that local road rehabilitation projects are eligible for these funds.  
**Position:**  
R  
**Last Amended on 6/16/2009**

### AB 732
**Jeffries** R  
**Bill ID/Topic:**  
Transportation projects: design-sequencing contracts.  
**Location:**  
SENATE APPR. SUSPENSE FILE  
8/27/2009 - In committee: Held under submission.  
**Summary:**  
Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation, until January 1, 2010, to conduct phase 2 of a pilot project through the utilization of design-sequencing contracts, as defined, for the design and construction of not more than 12 transportation projects, which are selected by the Director of Transportation taking into consideration specified geographical considerations.  
This bill would extend the operative date of those provisions until July 1, 2010, thereby extending the authority of the department to conduct phase 2 of the pilot project. The bill would instead specify that the pilot project consist of not more than 9 transportation projects.  
**Position:**  
R  
**Last Amended on 6/16/2009**
San Mateo County Transit District  
Legislative Matrix as of May 25, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 1375</td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 4/21/2010 - From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to committee. Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on T. &amp; H.</td>
<td>Existing law, the California High-Speed Train Act, creates the High-Speed Rail Authority to develop and implement a high-speed train system in the state, with specified powers and duties. Existing law, the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, approved by the voters as Proposition 1A at the November 4, 2008, general election, provides for the issuance of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related purposes. This bill would revise and recast these provisions by repealing and reenacting the California High-Speed Train Act. The bill would continue the High-Speed Rail Authority in existence to establish compensation of certain employees of the department, advise the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing and the Director of the Department of Railroads concerning high-speed rail matters, and annually adopt a 6-year high-speed train program for submission to the Governor and the Legislature. The bill would create the Department of Railroads within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, which would succeed to most of the existing powers and responsibilities of the authority and would be responsible for implementing the high-speed train project. The director of the department would be appointed by the Governor, who would serve at the pleasure of the Governor, and the Governor would be authorized to appoint up to 10 executive employees of the department who would be exempt from civil service and serve at the pleasure of the director. The bill would provide for acquisition and disposition by the department of rights-of-way for the high-speed rail project. The bill would limit the department's authority to use eminent domain to the powers previously granted to the authority in that regard, as specified. The bill would transfer the existing employees of the authority, other than the executive director, to the department. The bill would enact other related provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1405</td>
<td>SENATE INACTIVE FILE</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 requires the State Air Resources Board to adopt regulations to require the reporting and verification of emissions of greenhouse gases and to monitor and enforce compliance with the reporting and verification program, and requires the state board to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020. The act requires the state board to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions. The act authorizes the state board to include the use of market-based compliance mechanisms. The act authorizes the state board to adopt a schedule of fees to be paid by the sources of greenhouse gas emissions regulated pursuant to the act, and requires the revenues collected pursuant to that fee to be deposited into the Air Pollution Control Fund and be available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for purposes of carrying out the act. This bill would establish the Community Benefits Fund, and would require a minimum of 30% of revenues generated pursuant to the act, including the fee discussed above, other than revenues collected for administrative purposes, to be deposited into that fund. The moneys in the fund would be used, upon appropriation by the Legislature, in the most impacted and disadvantaged communities in California to accelerate greenhouse gas emission reductions or mitigate direct health impacts of climate change in those communities. The state board would be required to develop a methodology to identify the most impacted and disadvantaged communities. The state board would be required to prepare a report by June 30, 2011, that describes how this bill will be implemented. The bill would require the report to provide for the formation of an independent panel to review, evaluate, and recommend approval of projects and programs solicited for funding. The state board would also be required to develop and adopt biennial plans for the use of funds. Last Amended on 9/1/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1609</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY BUDGET</td>
<td>This bill would make appropriations for support of state government for the 2010-11 fiscal year. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1747</td>
<td>SENATE RLS.</td>
<td>Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with specified powers and duties relating to the development and implementation of an intercity high-speed rail system. Existing law, pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, authorizes $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail development and other related purposes. This bill would authorize the authority to consider, to the extent permitted by federal and state law, the creation of jobs in California when awarding major contracts including purchasing high-speed trains, as specified. Last Amended on 4/14/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## San Mateo County Transit District
### Legislative Matrix as of May 25, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1830</strong> Galgiani D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY THIRD READING 4/22/2010 - Read second time. To third reading. 5/28/2010 #20 ASSEMBLY ASSEMBLY THIRD READING FILE</td>
<td>Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with specified powers and duties relating to the development and implementation of an intercity high-speed rail system. Existing law, pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, authorizes $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail development and other related purposes. This bill would require the authority to make every effort to purchase high-speed train rolling stock and related equipment that are manufactured in California, consistent with federal and state laws. <strong>Last Amended on 4/8/2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **AB 2121** Harkey R | ASSEMBLY APPR. SUSPENSE FILE 5/12/2010 - In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file. 5/28/2010 Upon Adjournment of Session - State Capitol, Room 4202 ASSEMBLY APPROPRIATIONS SUSPENSE, FUENTES, Chair | Existing law, the California High-Speed Rail Act, creates the High-Speed Rail Authority to develop and implement a high-speed rail system in the state, with specified powers and duties. Existing law, pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, approved by the voters as Proposition 1A at the November 4, 2008, general election, provides for the issuance of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related purposes. This bill would require the authority to annually adopt a 6-year high-speed train program, as specified, for submission to the Legislature and the Governor. The bill would also require the authority to annually prepare and submit to the Legislature and the Governor a report including, among other things, a description of the progress made on the program and a detailed financing plan to pay for construction of the high-speed train network. **Last Amended on 4/28/2010** | **R** |

| **AB 2324** John A. Perez D | SENATE RLS. 5/13/2010 - In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. | Existing law prohibits a person from knowingly possessing specified weapons and other items within any sterile area, as defined, of an airport or passenger vessel terminal, except as specified. This bill would make it a misdemeanor, punishable as specified, for any person to knowingly possess at a public transit vehicle facility, as defined, specified weapons, if a notice is posted at the facility, as specified. By creating a new crime, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. **Last Amended on 5/10/2010** | **D** |

---

**Note:** Bill was amended – SamTrans position of oppose retracted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2579</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. SUSPENSE FILE</td>
<td>The California Constitution regulates the issuance of debt by the state and requires that debt in excess of $300,000 for which the state will be generally obligated be submitted to, and approved by, the voters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans D</td>
<td>5/5/2010 - In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file. 5/28/2010 Upon Adjournment of Session - State Capitol, Room 4202 ASSEMBLY APPROPRIATIONS SUSPENSE, FUENTES, Chair</td>
<td>This bill would create the Master Plan for Infrastructure Financing and Development Commission, the mission of which would be to develop and recommend a plan to be presented to the Governor and Legislature that provides for financing, building, and maintaining the infrastructure necessary to meet the needs of Californians from the present to the year 2050, and to establish a process for periodically adjusting and adapting the plan in coming years to meet changing circumstances. The bill would require that the commission consist of 11 members: the Treasurer or his or her designee, and members appointed by the Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, and the Senate Committee on Rules. The bill would authorize the Governor to appoint the chair of the commission who would work full time on commission business for an unspecified salary. The bill would authorize the chair, with the concurrence of the commission, to appoint an executive director, who would be exempt from civil service and be paid an unspecified salary. The bill would require that funding for the operating costs of the commission be available upon appropriation by the Legislature. The bill would require the chair of the commission to appoint the members of specified task force committees, to be composed of both members and nonmembers of the commission, and would require commission members to chair at least one task force committee in which they have expertise. The bill would provide that the subject matter responsibilities of these task force committees include, but not be limited to, planning and financing, transportation, housing, natural resources and conservation, and education. The commission would be required to establish a timeline for submission of periodic reports on its findings to the Governor and Legislature, provide opportunity for public comment and participation, and to incorporate existing state and local infrastructure reports, as specified, that reflect current or future infrastructure needs into its recommendations. The bill would require the commission to submit its final report to the Governor and Legislature no later than December 1, 2012, and to be dissolved 30 days after issuance of the final report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACA 9</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY INACTIVE FILE</td>
<td>Creates an additional exemption to the 1% limit on the tax rate on real property for a rate imposed by a city, county, or city and county to service bonded indebtedness, incurred to fund specified public improvements, facilities, and housing, and related costs that is approved by 55% of the voters of the city, county, or city and county.</td>
<td>Last Amended on 6/26/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffman D</td>
<td>1/14/2010 - To inactive file on motion of Assembly Member Torrico.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 15</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY INACTIVE FILE 6/1/2009 - To inactive file on motion of Assembly Member Arambula.</td>
<td>Amends the California Constitution to change the two-thirds voter-approval requirement for transportation related special taxes to 55%.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR 14</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES. 4/27/2009 - In committee: Refused adoption.</td>
<td>This measure would call upon the State Air Resources Board, prior to any regulatory action being taken consistent with the scoping plan for the implementation of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, to perform an economic analysis that will give the State of California a more complete and accurate picture of the costs and benefits of the act's implementation. The measure would also call upon the Governor to use the authority granted by the act to adjust any applicable deadlines for regulations.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 409</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 2/11/2010 - To Com. on TRANS. 6/14/2010 Anticipated Hearing ASSEMBLY TRANS., Not in daily file.</td>
<td>Existing law creates the Department of Transportation in the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, with various powers and duties relative to the intercity passenger rail program, among other transportation programs. Existing law creates in state government the High-Speed Rail Authority, with various powers and duties relative to development and implementation of a high-speed passenger train system. The authority has 9 members, 5 appointed by the Governor and 4 appointed by the Legislature. Existing law also creates in state government the California Transportation Commission, with various powers and duties relative to programming of transportation capital projects and assisting the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing in formulating state transportation policies. This bill would place the High-Speed Rail Authority within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency. The bill would require the 5 members of the authority appointed by the Governor to be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill would require the authority to annually submit a funding plan to the California Transportation Commission for approval, identifying the need for investments during the fiscal year and the amount of bond sales necessary to accommodate those investments. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Amended on 3/27/2009

Last Amended on 1/26/2010
## San Mateo County Transit District
### Legislative Matrix as of May 25, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 455</strong></td>
<td><strong>ASSEMBLY INACTIVE FILE</strong> 7/24/2009 - Placed on inactive file on request of Assembly Member Torrico.</td>
<td><strong>High-speed rail.</strong> Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with specified powers and duties relative to development and implementation of a high-speed train system. The authority is composed of 9 members, including 5 members appointed by the Governor. This bill would provide that the members of the authority appointed by the Governor are subject to appointment with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill would require the members of the authority, at a scheduled board meeting, to cause to be prepared an overall project schedule with project delivery milestones on a quarterly basis, and to approve a quarterly contract status report, beginning at the first board meeting after March 1, 2010. The bill would also require the members of the authority to approve all contract amendments at a scheduled board meeting. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <strong>Last Amended on 4/16/2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 476</strong></td>
<td><strong>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES. 7/7/2009 - Hearing postponed by committee. (Refers to 6/22/2009 hearing)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Environment: California Environmental Quality Act: noncompliance allegations: public comment.</strong> The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA provides for a public review period for the public to review a draft EIR, proposed negative declaration, or proposed mitigated negative declaration. CEQA requires a lead agency to evaluate and respond to comments on a draft EIR, proposed negative declaration, or proposed mitigated negative declaration made during the public review period and authorizes a lead agency to evaluate and respond to comments made on a draft EIR when the comments are submitted after the public review period. CEQA requires an action or proceeding alleging noncompliance with its requirements to be based on grounds that were presented to the public agency orally or in writing by any person, and prohibits a person from maintaining an action or proceeding unless the person objected to the approval of the project orally or in writing, during the public comment period provided under CEQA or prior to the close of the public hearing on the project before the issuance of the notice of determination. This bill instead would prohibit these actions or proceedings unless the oral or written presentation or objection occurs during the public comment period provided under CEQA or prior to the close of the public hearing on the project before the filing, rather than issuance, of the notice of determination. <strong>Last Amended on 4/30/2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 874</strong> Ducheny D</td>
<td>SENATE BUDGET &amp; F.R. 1/21/2010 - To Com. on B. &amp; F.R.</td>
<td>This bill would make appropriations for support of state government for the 2010-11 fiscal year. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 964</strong> Alquist D</td>
<td>SENATE APPR. SUSPENSE FILE 5/21/2010 - Set for hearing May 27. (Suspense - for vote only.) 5/27/2010 Upon adjournment of session SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUSPENSE, KEHOE, Chair</td>
<td>Existing law, the California High-Speed Train Act, creates the High-Speed Rail Authority to develop and implement a high-speed train system in the state, with specified powers and duties. Existing law, the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, provides for the issuance of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related purposes. This bill would require the authority to contract with the Employment Development Department to develop a labor market assessment of the workforce and identify the education and skills needed for construction, operation, and maintenance of the high-speed train system. The bill would require the authority and the department to form an advisory committee, as specified, to advise the authority and the department on the availability of skilled labor relative to the high-speed train project and on options for workforce training programs in that regard. The bill would require the labor market assessment to be submitted to the Legislature and incorporated into the authority's biennial revised business plan. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 965</strong> DeSaulnier D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 5/13/2010 - To Com. on TRANS. 6/14/2010 Anticipated Hearing ASSEMBLY TRANS., Not in daily file.</td>
<td>Existing law, the California High-Speed Train Act, creates the High-Speed Rail Authority to develop and implement a high-speed train system in the state, with specified powers and duties. Existing law, the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, approved by the voters as Proposition 1A at the November 4, 2008, general election, provides for the issuance of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related purposes. This bill, subject to appropriation by the Legislature, would authorize the authority to expend federal funds made available by the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) for high-speed rail purposes. The bill would require the authority to take various actions in that regard. The bill would also require the authority to submit to the Legislature an expenditure plan for the federal funds within 60 days of enactment of this act or upon finalization of a cooperative agreement with the federal government, whichever occurs later, and to submit a progress report on expenditure of the funds to the Legislature on the following December 31 and annually thereafter. The bill would make legislative findings and declarations relative to the award of federal funds to the state by ARRA for high-speed rail purposes. The bill would exempt the Transbay Terminal project in San Francisco from these provisions if ARRA funds are made available to the Transbay Joint Powers Authority for that project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Last Amended on 4/22/2010**

**Last Amended on 4/7/2010**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1320</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 5/20/2010 - To Com. on TRANS.</td>
<td>Existing law provides that it is an infraction, punishable by a fine not to exceed $250 and by specified community service, to evade the payment of any fare of, or to engage in passenger misconduct on or in a facility or vehicle of a public transportation system. Existing law authorizes the City and County of San Francisco and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority to adopt and enforce an ordinance to impose and enforce civil administrative penalties for fare evasion or passenger misconduct, other than by minors, on or in a transit facility or vehicle in lieu of the criminal penalties, with specified administrative adjudication procedures for the imposition and enforcement of the administrative penalties, including an initial review and opportunity for a subsequent administrative hearing. Fare evasion and passenger misconduct violation penalties are deposited in the general fund of the City and County of San Francisco or the County of Los Angeles, as applicable. This bill would authorize the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District to adopt and enforce a similar administrative adjudication ordinance. Fare evasion and passenger misconduct violation penalties would be deposited in the general fund of the county in which the citation is administered. This bill contains other related provisions. <strong>Last Amended on 4/26/2010</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1371</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY DESK 5/10/2010 - In Assembly. Read first time. Held at Desk.</td>
<td>Existing law generally provides for programming and allocation of state and federal transportation capital improvement program funds pursuant to the state transportation improvement program process administered by the California Transportation Commission. Under these provisions, 25% of available funds are available for interregional improvement projects nominated by the Department of Transportation, subject to a requirement that 60% of these funds be available for projects in nonurbanized areas on the interregional road system and for intercity rail projects. The remaining 75% of available funds are available for regional improvement projects nominated by regional agencies. All funds programmed through the state transportation improvement program process are subject to the north-south split, and the regional improvement funds are further subject to the county shares formula. This bill would require the Department of Transportation to work with local transportation agencies to develop a list of potential projects that may be awarded within a 90-day period of the award to the state of 2nd round federal transportation economic stimulus funds. The bill would require the department to submit a monthly status report to the Legislature, as specified, with respect to certain milestones for expenditure of these funds. The bill would make related legislative findings and declarations. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 15</td>
<td>SENATE B. &amp; F.R. 4/28/2010 -</td>
<td>The California Constitution requires the Governor to submit to the Legislature by January 10 of each year a budget for the ensuing fiscal year, accompanied by a Budget Bill itemizing recommended expenditures. The Constitution requires specified bills, including a bill making a change in state taxes for the purpose of raising revenue, a bill containing an urgency clause, and a bill, including the Budget Bill, that makes certain appropriations from the General Fund, to be passed in each house of the Legislature by a 2/3 vote. This measure would exempt General Fund appropriations in the Budget Bill for the ensuing fiscal year from the 2/3 -vote requirement if the total amount of General Fund revenues estimated by the Legislative Analyst, on or after May 15, for the current fiscal year is at least 5% below the estimate of General Fund revenues set forth in the Budget Bill enacted for the current fiscal year. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hearing postponed by committee.</td>
<td>(Refers to 4/22/2010 hearing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Amended on 4/13/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building
Bacciocco Auditorium - Second Floor
1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 2010 – 2:50 p.m.
or immediately following previous Committee meeting

ACTION
1. Approval of Minutes of Planning, Development and Sustainability Committee Meeting of May 12, 2010

INFORMATIONAL
2. SamTrans Customer Survey Key Findings

Committee Members: Adrienne Tissier, Jerry Deal, Art Lloyd

NOTE:
• This Committee meeting may be attended by Board Members who do not sit on this Committee. In the event that a quorum of the entire Board is present, this Committee shall act as a Committee of the Whole. In either case, any item acted upon by the Committee or the Committee of the Whole will require consideration and action by the full Board of Directors as a prerequisite to its legal enactment.
• All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
Committee Members Present: A. Tissier (Committee Chair), J. Deal, A. Lloyd

Other Board Members Present, Constituting Committee of the Whole: O. Ahmad, M. Church, R. Guilbault, S. Harris, Z. Kersteen-Tucker, K. Matsumoto


Committee Chair Adrienne Tissier called the meeting to order at 3:51 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Planning, Development and Sustainability Committee Meeting of March 9, 2010
The Committee approved the minutes (Lloyd/Ahmad).

SamTrans Customer Survey Key Findings
This item was postponed to the June 9 meeting.

Adjourned: 3:52 p.m.
TO: Planning, Development & Sustainability Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Rita P. Haskin
Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing

SUBJECT: SAMTRANS CUSTOMER SURVEY KEY FINDINGS

ACTION
This report is for information only. No board action is required.

SIGNIFICANCE
Staff will present the key findings of the recent comprehensive SamTrans customer survey at the committee meeting.

SamTrans conducted a survey of its customers with the following objectives:
- Determine trip characteristics, such as level of usage, trip purpose and fare category
- Assess the ratings of 10 specific service characteristics
- Identify how customers would like to receive information about SamTrans
- Provide current customer profile.

The information will be used to plan future customer communications and promotions.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
SamTrans retained the services of Corey, Canapary & Galanis Research of San Francisco through a competitive process. CC&G surveyed more than 7,000 customers in October 2009, which was a 60 percent response rate. The survey was administered in both English and Spanish.

Prepared by: Rita P. Haskin, Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing 650-508-6248
AGENDA

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building
Bacciocco Auditorium - Second Floor
1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 2010 – 3:00 p.m.
or immediately following Committee meetings

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT CALENDAR
   MOTION
   a. Approval of Minutes of Board of Directors Meeting of May 12, 2010
   b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for April 2010

3. PUBLIC COMMENT
   Public comment by each individual speaker shall be limited to one minute

4. REPORT OF THE CHAIR

5. REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER/CEO

6. COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE
   (Accessibility, Senior Services, and Community Issues)
   SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
   a. Accessibility Update
   b. Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update
   c. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report
   d. Performance Report – Shuttles
   e. Multimodal Ridership Report – April 2010

7. FINANCE COMMITTEE
   RESOLUTIONS
   a. Adoption of Fiscal Year 2011 Operating Budget in the Amount of $131,810,465
   b. Adoption of Fiscal Year 2011 Capital Budget in the Amount of $8,624,325
   c. Authorize Approval of Bid Documents and Execution of Documents for Fuel Hedging Program

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
d. Authorize the Execution of the Memorandum of Understanding with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for the Operations and Maintenance of the ClipperSM Fare Collection System

e. Authorize Revisions to the Settlement Authority Policy for General Liability Claims

f. Authorize Revisions to the Settlement Authority Policy for Employment Claims

g. Authorize Rejection of Low Monetary Bid from Granite Construction Company as Non-Responsive and Award of Contract to Interstate Grading and Paving, Inc. for Pico Boulevard Paving Improvements for a Total Amount of $86,910

h. Authorize Award of Contract to The Cities Group for Provision of Workers Compensation Program Administration Services for a Fixed Price of $878,000 for a Five Year Term

MOTION

i. Authorize Rejection of all Bids for Providing Electrical Maintenance Services and On-call Emergency Repairs and Authorization to Resolicit Bids

9. LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
a. State and Federal Legislative Update

10. PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
a. SamTrans Customer Survey Key Findings

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

11. BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS/COMMENTS

12. DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING – July 7, 2010 at 2 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District, Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, 1250 Carlos Ave., San Carlos 94070

13. GENERAL COUNSEL PROPOSAL
a. Closed Session: Conference with Labor Negotiator – Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6, Teamsters Union, Local 856 (Bus Transportation Supervisors, Dispatchers and Radio Controllers)
b. Closed Session: Conference with Labor Negotiator – Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6, Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1574 (Customer Service Center Employees)

14. ADJOURNMENT

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC

If you have questions on the agenda, please contact the District Secretary at 650-508-6242. Agendas are available on the SamTrans Website at www.samtrans.com.

The San Mateo County Transit District Board and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting schedules are available on the Web site.

**Date and Time of Board and Advisory Committee Meetings**
San Mateo County Transit District Committees and Board: Second Wednesday of the month, 2 p.m.; SamTrans Citizens Advisory Committee: First Wednesday of the month, 6:30 p.m. Date, time and location of meetings may be change as necessary.

**Location of Meeting**
The San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building is located at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, one block west of the San Carlos Caltrain Station on El Camino Real and accessible by SamTrans bus Routes 260, 295, 390, 391, KX. [Map link](#) Additional transit information can be obtained by calling 1-800-660-4287 or 511.

**Public Comment**
- If you wish to address the Board, please fill out a speaker's card located on the agenda table. If you have anything that you wish distributed to the Board and included for the official record, please hand it to the District Secretary, who will distribute the information to the Board members and staff.
- Members of the public may address the Board on non-agendized items under the Public Comment item on the agenda. Public testimony by each individual speaker shall be limited to one minute and items raised that require a response will be deferred for staff reply.

**Accessibility for Individuals with Disabilities**
Upon request, the Transit District will provide for written agenda materials in appropriate alternative formats, or disability-related modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, to enable individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings. Please send a written request, including your name, mailing address, phone number and brief description of the requested materials and a preferred alternative format or auxiliary aid or service at least two days before the meeting. Requests should be mailed to the District Secretary at San Mateo County Transit District, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306; or emailed to board@samtrans.com; or by phone at 650-508-6242, or TTY 650-508-6448.

**Availability of Public Records**
All public records relating to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306, at the same time that the public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body.

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
1250 SAN CARLOS AVENUE, SAN CARLOS, CALIFORNIA

MINUTES OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
MAY 12, 2010

Members Present: O. Ahmad, M. Church, J. Deal, R. Guilbault (Chair), S. Harris, Z. Kersteen-Tucker, A. Lloyd, K. Matsumoto, A. Tissier


Chair Rose Guilbault called the meeting to order at 3:52 p.m.

CONSENT CALENDAR
The Board unanimously approved the consent calendar (Lloyd/Harris):
   a. Approval of Minutes of Board of Directors Meeting of April 14, 2010
   b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for March 2010

PUBLIC COMMENT
Jerry Grace, San Lorenzo, said on May 25 and 26 the Air Board is going to Sacramento.

REPORT OF CHAIR
Chair Guilbault said it is always great to welcome the children, their parents and teachers to showcase their artwork. She attended the Peninsula Coalition dinner where Director Adrienne Tissier was recognized for her work.

REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER/CEO
General Manager/CEO Michael Scanlon reported:
   • Recognized Majid El-Khatib with a 25-year safe driver award and Generosa Maranan with a 20-year safe worker award.
   • The United Way committee, Cindy Strong, Joan Brown, Patrice Givens, Tiffany Gotauco, Melissa Wicklow and Kim Rothschild, were recognized for their efforts in raising $50,000.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE
(Accessibility, Senior Services, and Community Issues)
   MOTION
   a. Designation of May as “Older Americans Month”

The motion (Harris/Lloyd) to approve the designation was unanimous.
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED

b. Student “Art Takes a Bus Ride” Contest
c. Accessibility Update
d. Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update
e. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report
f. Performance Report – Caltrain
g. Multimodal Ridership Report – March 2010

FINANCE COMMITTEE

RESOLUTIONS

a. Approval of the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Overall Goal of Zero Percent for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Funds for Fiscal Years (FY) 2011-2013
b. Authorize Submittal of Grant Applications and the Execution of Standard Agreements with Caltrans Pertaining to FTA Section 5311 Funds for FY2009 and 2010 in the Amount of $208,994
c. Acceptance of the Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review and Outlook for the Quarter Ended March 31, 2010
d. Authorize Execution of Purchase Orders Over $100,000 for Technology Related Products and Services to Vendors Under Cooperative Purchasing Agreements for FY2011 for an Aggregate Not-to-Exceed Amount of $900,000
e. Authorize Execution of Purchase Orders Over $100,000 for Information Technology License Renewals, Maintenance Services and Professional Services for FY2011 for an Aggregate Not-to-Exceed Amount of $850,000
f. Authorize the Purchase of Seven Ford Focus Automobiles Through the State of California Contract for a Total Estimated Cost of $104,248
g. Authorize the Purchase of Four Hybrid Escape Vehicles Through the State of California Contract for a Total Estimated cost of $125,035
h. Authorize Award of Contract to Office Max, Inc. for Purchase and Delivery of General Office Supplies and Related Items for a Total Estimated Cost of $325,000 for Five Years
i. Authorize Award of Contract to Ontira Communications, Inc. for Provision of an Interactive Voice Response System and Maintenance and Support Services for a Fixed Price of $167,622
j. Rejection of the Single Bid Received from National Transit Interiors, Inc. for the Provision of Automotive and Bus Upholstery Repair Services

The motion (Church/Guilbault) to approve the resolutions was approved unanimously by roll call.

INFORMATIONAL

k. Preliminary FY2011 Operating Budget
l. Preliminary FY2011 Capital Budget
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
   a. State and Federal Legislative Update

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
   a. SamTrans Customer Survey Key Findings – this item was postponed to the June meeting.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
In reading file.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS
Director Adrienne Tissier said many of the items on the Finance Committee agenda could be considered consent items and asked if staff would consider changing the status of these items on future agendas to better manage within the meetings’ time constraints. Mr. Scanlon said he would confer with staff and legal counsel about this change.

Director Karyl Matsumoto said she is being questioned by her constituents why SamTrans doesn’t have more east/west feeder service to BART and Caltrain.

Director Omar Ahmad said STS 132 will be the final flight for the space shuttle Atlantis. This was the ultimate bus that did 32 missions and will be retired after this mission.

DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING – June 9, 2010, at 2 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District, Administrative Building, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070.

GENERAL COUNSEL PROPOSAL
   a. Closed Session: Conference with Labor Negotiator – Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6, Teamsters Union, Local 856 (Bus Transportation Supervisors, Dispatchers and Radio Controllers)
   b. Closed Session: Conference with Labor Negotiator – Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6, Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1574 (Customer Service Center Employees)

Board adjourned to closed session at 4:09 p.m.

Board convened to open session at 4:15 p.m.

General Counsel David Miller said, for the record, the Board of Directors met in closed session to discuss pending labor negotiations with the Teamsters Union and a report has been given on recent developments. These two items will remain on the agenda and Mr. Miller will provide updates as developments take place.

Adjourned at 4:16 p.m.