AGENDA

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, MAY 11, 2011 – 2:00 p.m.

ACTION

1. Approval of Minutes of Community Relations Committee Meeting of April 13, 2011

2. Designation of May as “Older Americans Month”

INFORMATIONAL

3. Student “Art Takes a Bus Ride” Contest

4. Accessibility Update – Tina DuBost

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

6. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report – Peter Ratto


Committee Members: Rose Guilbault, Carole Groom, Shirley Harris

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.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
1250 SAN CARLOS AVENUE, SAN CARLOS, CALIFORNIA

MINUTES OF COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
APRIL 13, 2011

Committee Members Present:  R. Guilbault (Committee Chair), C. Groom, S. Harris

Other Board Members Present, Constituting Committee of the Whole:  O. Ahmad, J. Deal, A. Lloyd, K. Matsumoto, A. Tissier

Other Board Members Absent, Constituting Committee of the Whole:  Z. Kersteen-Tucker


Committee Chair Rose Guilbault called the meeting to order at 2:13 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Community Relations Committee (CRC) Meeting of March 9, 2011
The committee approved the minutes (Lloyd/Deal); Ahmad abstained.

Recommend Appointment of Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Members
Committee Chair Guilbault said the Committee is recommending the following candidates:
  • Daniel Cruz, Representing Bus Riders
  • Saundra Curry, Representing Bus Riders
  • Sonny Koya, Representing Bus Riders
  • Peter Loranger, Representing Bus Riders
  • Maureen Hall, Representing Community Riders
  • Peter Ratto, Representing Multimodal Riders

Chair Karyl Matsumoto said she and Director Shirley Harris were on the interview panel and she was quite impressed with the caliber of applicants.

Director Harris thanked the incumbents for reapplying and their eagerness to continue their work on the CAC.

A motion (Lloyd/Deal) to recommend appointment of the six candidates to the CAC was approved unanimously.

Accessibility Update
Accessibility Coordinator Tina DuBost said last month an expert from Trapeze, the paratransit scheduling software company, reviewed the agency’s software and made some recommendations for changes. Staff is reviewing the recommendations and is expecting to see some improvements in efficiencies and productivity.
Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update

PCC Chair Nancy Keegan thanked Accessibility Manager Bill Welch for giving the Paratransit Senior Mobility Presentation. The PCC members found the information on the costs and productivity of Redi-Wheels and RediCoast services very informative and pleased to see the slight increase in productivity. Next month the PCC will have a half-day retreat to determine priorities and develop the work plan for the next two years. If any Board member is interested in attending the retreat and giving a 10 minute overview of the District please let her know.

Ms. Keegan distributed the quarterly PCC newsletter to the Board.

CAC Liaison Report

CAC Chair Peter Ratto reported on the April meeting:

- Manager, Planning and Research Marisa Espinosa presented an overview of the Comprehensive Operational Analysis.
- Thanked Chair Matsumoto for attending the meeting and her kind words.
- Termed-out CAC members John Baker and Wayne Kingsford-Smith were presented with Certificates of Appreciation.

Performance Report – Shuttles

Director, Bus Transportation Chester Patton provided the following information:

- There are 31 Caltrain shuttle routes operating in three counties and serving 19 stations.
- Caltrain and SamTrans shuttles depend on many funding partnerships. In spite of the recession, all companies and cities that sponsor shuttles have extended their funding contracts until June 2011.
- Private shuttle partners include Genentech, Stanford University and Oracle.
- Public shuttle partners include the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG), Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA).
- The Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 shuttle allocation is $7.1 million.
- Sixty-one percent of the SamTrans/BART shuttle funding comes from employer partners.
- Employers fund 45 percent of the Caltrain shuttles.
- The SMCTA funds 67.2 percent of the Caltrain/San Mateo County and Community shuttles.
- Average weekday ridership on the BART shuttle is about 2,000 rides per day.
- Caltrain average weekday shuttle ridership is about 5,500 per day.
- Shuttle operators are prepared to respond to unplanned situations, adjusting schedules, bus bridging and supporting various Caltrain emergency situations.
- Current issues include:
  - A $1 million BAAQMD grant approved for calendar year 2011.
  - Operator contract option year for Caltrain shuttles expires September 30, 2011 and one more option year may be exercised.
  - C/CAG grant fluctuates based on license plate fees.
- A shuttle business practices is being developed and should be completed by fall 2011.
Multimodal Ridership Report – February 2011
- Bus ridership was 45,970, an increase of 2 percent.
- Paratransit ridership was 1,054, a decrease of 3.9 percent.
- Caltrain ridership was 36,680, an increase of 4.7 percent.
- Caltrain shuttle ridership was 5,468, an increase of 0.2 percent.
- BART shuttle ridership was 2,022, an increase of 9.1 percent.
- Overall ridership was 91,194, an increase of 3 percent.

Year-to-date
- Bus ridership was 44,420, a decrease of 5.5 percent.
- Paratransit ridership was 1,073, a decrease of 2.9 percent.
- Caltrain ridership was 39,170, an increase of 4.6 percent.
- Caltrain shuttle ridership was 6,072, an increase of 11.2 percent.
- BART shuttle ridership was 1,987, an increase of 3.1 percent.
- Overall ridership was 92,722, a decrease of 0.3 percent.

Adjourned: 2:32 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
Chief Operating Officer

SUBJECT: DESIGNATION OF MAY AS “OLDER AMERICANS MONTH”

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend the Board adopt the proclamation designating May as “Older Americans Month”.

SIGNIFICANCE
The proclamation for “Older Americans Month” is a reaffirmation of the SamTrans commitment to provide quality transit service to senior citizens in San Mateo County. It also is an opportunity to focus special attention on the daily challenges faced by senior citizens throughout the SamTrans service area; to reflect on measures that are being extended to assist them; and to increase public awareness of new opportunities that meet their needs.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
Over the past year, the District has:
• Travel trained seniors to use fixed-route services
• Participated in AARP and CHP-Volunteer senior driver safety training classes to promote transit use
• Performed multiple bus demonstrations to familiarize seniors with public transportation
• Enhanced accessibility of bus stops for the convenience of seniors
• Maintained a “zero trip denials” policy on Redi-Wheels
• Engaged the community in Senior Mobility Action Plan projects

Prepared by: Tina Dubost, Accessibility Coordinator 650-508-6247
Project Manager: Bill Welch, Manager, Accessible Transit Services 650-508-6475
Proclamation

IN HONOR OF OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

WHEREAS, transportation enables individuals to access needed social and recreational resources, as well as medical and social services; and

WHEREAS, SamTrans supports the need for and provision of transportation to seniors through its fixed-route system and Redi-Wheels, a specialized paratransit service for those with mobility impairments; and

WHEREAS, it is recognized that access to services and activities enables individuals to preserve their dignity and maximize their independence; and

WHEREAS, SamTrans is committed to providing comprehensive and quality transportation and paratransit services; and

WHEREAS, May has been officially designated as Older Americans Month throughout the United States of America.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors and staff of the San Mateo County Transit District salute the seniors in San Mateo County, support their personal independence and dignity in the provision of service, and do hereby proclaim the month of May as OLDER AMERICANS MONTH.

Regularly passed and adopted this 11th day of May 2011.

Chair, San Mateo County Transit District
TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: STUDENT “ART TAKES A BUS RIDE” CONTEST

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

SIGNIFICANCE
The San Mateo County Transit District developed a partnership with the San Mateo County Office of Education in 2005 to conduct a countywide art contest through the schools. This year, students in 1st through 6th grades drew pictures with the theme “Postcards from SamTrans.” The winning entries and artists will be presented at the Committee meeting.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The Transit District initiated the art contest in partnership with the county Office of Education and teachers as a way to provide a forum for budding artists and also to convey to the teachers and students that public transit plays an integral role in keeping their communities on the move. The partnership has strengthened over the years and the program continues to be a success. More than 345 submissions were received this year, and 15 schools participated. The entries were judged, and the winning entries will have their artwork displayed on interior bus cards, as well as on a specially wrapped bus.

Prepared by: Rita P. Haskin, Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing  650-508-6248
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 held on a quarterly basis.

The minutes from the March 8 PCC meeting are attached. The minutes from the March SAAC meeting are not yet available.

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, Chair; Dale Edwards, Vice Chair; Mike Levinson, AL-Com Chair; Myria Barnes-Jackson, DOR; Pat Dixon, COD; Maureen Dunn, Senior Focus; Aki Eejima, Consumer; Diane Griffith & Joey, COD; Stephanie Hill, Consumer; Barbara Kalt, Rosener House; Benjamin McMullan, CID; May Nichols, COA; Sammi Riley, Consumer; Marie Violet, Sequoia Hospital; Bill Welch, SamTrans.

Absentees: James Asche, OES; Judy Garcia, Consumer; Craig McCulloh, Aging & Adult Services; Dan Mensing, Consumer; Michel Settles, Coastside.

Guests: Guest speaker, Jean Conger, SamTrans; Elly Colwell, SamTrans; Paul Lee, SamTrans; Marshall Loring, MTC; John Murphy, MV Transportation; Linda Rhine, Nelson\Nygaard; Jim Rusconi, SamTrans; Rose Berta, PCC Staff.

(Total Attendance: 23) Quorum--Yes

WELCOME/INTRODUCTION
Nancy welcomed all to the March PCC meeting.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY PCC MINUTES
Nancy asked for a vote of approval for the February minutes. Barbara moved to approve the minutes and Bill seconded the motion. The motion was approved with May, Myria, Stephanie, and Marie abstaining since they were not present at the February meeting.

Jean Conger, SamTrans Senior Mobility Ambassador Project Coordinator Presentation
Jean gave a thorough and excellent presentation with handouts, forms, and answered questions. The Senior Mobility Ambassador Program presentation included:

- Mobility Ambassador Program launched in October 2009.
- Provides free one-on-one consultations and training to individuals who want to learn how to use public transportation to stay mobile and connected to the community.
- Mobility Ambassadors are volunteers who help older adults and people with disabilities become familiar with their transportation options.
- Ambassadors are based at host centers. Current host centers include: Doelger Senior Center, Daly City; Twin Pines Senior and Community Center Belmont; Foster City Senior Wing, Foster City; Little House, Menlo Park; Fair Oaks Adult Activity Center, Redwood City; Veterans Memorial Senior Center, Redwood City; San Carlos Adult Community Center, San Carlos; Martin Luther King Senior Center, San Mateo; San Mateo Senior Center, San Mateo.
- Ambassadors can help with transportation-related issues, including planning a trip using public transit, finding a driver safety class, and learning about alternatives to driving, as well as give educational presentations, conduct rider training, and organize group trips.
- Recruiting process includes application, personal interview, and criminal background check; agreement on roles and responsibilities, and 16 hours of program training.
Training process includes sign-up, pre-travel interview, trip planning consultation, accompaniment on a trip, follow up interview, and 30-day follow up.

For more information, contact: ambassador@samtrans.com or Jean Conger at 650-508-6362

Nancy thanked Jean for an excellent presentation and sharing the Ambassador Mobility Program with the PCC.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. AL-COM REPORT

Mike said there were no new issues; the usual budget concerns in Sacramento were covered by Seamus Murphy. Next month’s meeting will have a discussion on the volunteer program. Tom Rickert of Access International Exchange will be the guest speaker for the next meeting and will describe transportation in different countries. Next meeting will be on April 5, 1:00-3:00 pm.

B. GRANT/BUDGET REVIEW

Barbara reported that Lifesteps in Burlingame has submitted their 5310 grant application and it will be reviewed and scored by the Review Committee. Bill shared that SamTrans has submitted their application as well. Linda explained that the process includes scoring the applications based on MTC scoring criteria; MTC scores separately and scores are submitted to the state.

C. EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Maureen said the committee met in February and discussed the PCC newsletter. The outreach will include four fairs, one per quarter. The difficulty is recruiting different volunteers for each of the fairs. Maureen encourages volunteers to contact her or Rose. Volunteers are needed for the San Mateo County Fair on June 14.

The spring newsletter is scheduled to be available in April for the next AL-Com meeting. The next meeting will be on April 12, 3:45 pm following the PCC meeting.

D. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Nancy said the committee is in the process of scheduling the next meeting. Agenda will include planning for the May retreat on May 10; invitations will be sent out with more information. Lunch will be provided for members and invited guests.

Nancy mentioned that Supervisor Carole Groom has joined the Sam Trans Board of Supervisors.

SAM TRANS/REDI-WHEELS REPORT

A. Operational Report

Bill spoke of SamTrans’ website, www.samtrans.com. The website will be updated and Bill would like to have consumer input on it. He asks PCC members and consumers to give their input on 1) first impression and graphic information; 2) format—organization and ease of navigation; 3) content—clarity of information. Comments are needed within one week.

The Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system will be tested by Redi-Wheels consumers. There will be imminent arrival call for pickup and a call the evening before the scheduled ride. The
ERC will help test pilot the program as well. There will be a letter and an evaluation form sent to the participating consumers.

Bill distributed a picture of the signs for the SFO pickup points; the signs are visible and identifiable for Redi-Wheels/RediCoast riders. The two pickup points are Courtyard A on the south side, near Southwest Airlines; and Courtyard G on the north side near United Airlines.

**B. Performance Summary**

Bill gave the report for Tina. Late cancels have gone up due to the two-hour late cancel policy change last year. Ridership is up from January; average daily trips are down from last year. Linda commented that ridership is down at other transit agencies due to the economic downturn and fewer discretionary trips. Inter-county transfer trips are significantly up; on-time performance is good and is well above the 90% target; productivity is up; complaints per 1,000 trips is lower than last year and the year before; compliments are down with a decrease in comments; and the average phone wait time is good and is close to last year’s. Diane commented that her experience with wait time is minuscule. Operators are also very pleasant.

**C. Customer Comments**

Elly reported that the total comments have decreased from December to January. Comment cards have also decreased. Comments by category in both policy and service related have gone up but compliments have not, due to the decrease in comment cards. The average response time continues to remain under the 7-day turnaround limit thanks to the work of Lynn and Sophie at Redi-Wheels. Comments by type have gone down, but all categories seem consistent; no trend up or down.

**D. Safety Report**

John had a great report for February with no chargeable accidents for both Redi-Wheels and RediCoast. There were, however, three vehicles that were rear-ended. Nancy thanked John for a great report.

**LIAISON REPORTS**

**A. MTC REPORT**

Marshall reported that the chair of MTC is now Adrienne Tissier of San Mateo County; Amy Worth is the vice chair. MTC is conducting a transit sustainability study; they are looking at equity and strategies for financial sustainability for fixed route and paratransit services.

Marshall shared a chart and trends in transit ridership and costs. Barbara said that these reports are very valuable in order to see the big picture, and thanked Marshall for the report. For further information, please see the MTC website [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/tsp/](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/tsp/)

**B. AGENCY**

Barbara reported that their recent meeting discussed how Redi-Wheels service can improve efficiency for their clients. They also talked about how the IVR system will work for subscription trips.

**C. COASTSIDE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (CTC)**

The next meeting will be on April 21.
D. EFFICIENCY REVIEW COMMITTEE (ERC)
Mike reported that the committee discussed the SamTrans website, the Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system, and reviewed the eligibility data. The goal is for the IVR to be in place sometime this spring. The “night before calls” will be made between 6:00-8:00 pm.

E. COMMISSION ON AGING (COA) REPORT
May announced that she will be retiring in June since it will be her 12th year as a commissioner. The Help at Home booklet is completed but cannot be published due to lack of funds. Community Information Handbook 2011 is the best replacement.

On March 24, May will be inducted in the San Mateo County Women’s Hall of Fame. Nancy and the members congratulated May for a well-deserved honor and thanked May for all her work with the county and the PCC.

F. COMMISSION ON DISABILITY (COD) REPORT
Pat reported that they discussed vacancies and the up-coming art show. Pat announced the Self-Advocacy Boot Camp and Resource Fair for parents of children with disabilities will be held on Tuesday, May 24, 5:30-7:30 pm, at the San Mateo County Aging and Adult Services, 225 37th Ave., Room 100, San Mateo. For more information call (650) 573-2580 or cmcculloh@co.sanmateo.ca.us

Pat announced that after 15-16 years on the Transportation Authority Citizens’ Advisory Committee, she may be leaving. She would like everyone to remember, “When you see people that look healthy, they may not be. Do not base disability on what you see.” Nancy thanked Pat for her years of service.

G. OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES
No report.

OTHER BUSINESS
None

MEETING ADJOURNED: 3:25 pm
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: SAMTRANS PERFORMANCE REPORT – FIXED-ROUTE BUS SERVICE

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 SamTrans fixed-route bus service.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
Staff will report on ridership, on-time performance, token usage, and other developments.

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
TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
       General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: MULTIMODAL RIDERSHIP REPORT - MARCH 2011

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 2009, FY2010, FY2011 and year-to-date comparisons of FY2010 vs. FY2011.

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

MONTHLY RIDERSHIP HIGHLIGHTS—MARCH 2011 COMPARED TO MARCH 2010

All Modes – AWR of 94,088, an increase of 3.2 percent.

Bus – AWR of 47,620, an increase of 2.1 percent.

Paratransit - AWR of 1,090, a decrease of 2.4 percent.

Caltrain - AWR of 37,500, an increase of 4.0 percent.

Caltrain Shuttles - AWR of 5,791, an increase of 6.0 percent.

BART Shuttles - AWR of 2,087, an increase of 11.2 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:

- **Green Alternative to Driving** – Public transit is one of the best ways for individuals to reduce their carbon footprint and be sustainable. To reach the eco-conscious, SamTrans ran an ad in the annual awards program for Sustainable San Mateo County. The ad informed readers that SamTrans is their “green” alternative to driving. The ad also highlighted that SamTrans has been serving San Mateo County’s transit needs for 35 years through 48 bus routes, comfortable seats and friendly bus operators.

- **San Francisco Garden Show** – Those with a green thumb were encouraged to also be green in getting to the San Francisco Garden Show by riding SamTrans. As part of its partnership with SamTrans, the event offered a $1 discount to customers who rode the bus. The event also produced onboard adcards and listed SamTrans information on its website. SamTrans included information on taking the bus to the show in its *Transit Fun Guide*.

- **Catch a Ride** – Instead of catching a wave, Coastside residents and visitors were encouraged to “catch a ride” on SamTrans for work, school or just to explore the beauty of the Coast with an ad in the *Half Moon Bay Guide*.

- **Clipper** – SamTrans staff continued to reach out to customers to assist them with using Clipper, the regional fare payment system. SamTrans customers can load e-cash or Monthly passes on the cards. Other systems using Clipper include AC Transit, BART, Caltrain, Golden Gate Transit & Ferry, Muni and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority. Paper Monthly passes will be eliminated by the end of 2011.

- **Gas Pain Relief** – As gasoline prices climbed higher and higher, SamTrans used the opportunity to advertise that it’s a great antidote for gas relief. Newspaper ads directed readers to calculate the savings of commuting by bus by using a Commute Calculator located on the SamTrans website.

Prepared by: Rita P. Haskin, Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing  650-508-6248
James De Hart, Senior Planner  650-508-6227
### Table A
#### Average Weekday Ridership

#### March 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2009</th>
<th>FY2010^</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus +</td>
<td>50,990</td>
<td>46,620</td>
<td>47,620</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain # +</td>
<td>36,530</td>
<td>36,060</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttle #</td>
<td>6,333</td>
<td>5,464</td>
<td>5,791</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttle</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>97,028</td>
<td>91,138</td>
<td>94,088</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART (Extension Only)*</td>
<td>35,820</td>
<td>35,124</td>
<td>37,518</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>132,848</td>
<td>126,262</td>
<td>131,606</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2009</th>
<th>FY2010^</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus +</td>
<td>47,990</td>
<td>46,980</td>
<td>44,770</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain # +</td>
<td>36,480</td>
<td>37,290</td>
<td>38,980</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttle #</td>
<td>5,203</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>5,366</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttle</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>92,767</td>
<td>92,757</td>
<td>92,189</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART (Extension Only)*</td>
<td>33,426</td>
<td>35,764</td>
<td>37,969</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>126,193</td>
<td>128,521</td>
<td>130,158</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# System
* Extension Only (No Daly City)
+ Rounded to nearest tens
^ Service cuts/reduced (12/09)
** FY10 shuttle figures have been adjusted to reflect corrected number of days operated per month

### Chart A
#### Average Weekday Ridership

- **FY2009**: 136,753
- **FY2010**: 128,360
- **YTD2010**: 128,521
- **YTD2011**: 130,158
ACTION
1. Approval of Minutes of Finance Committee Meeting of April 13, 2011
2. Approval of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for March 2011
4. Authorize Consenting to Assignment of Investment Management Services Agreement by CSI Capital Management, Inc. to SunTrust Bank
5. Authorize Third Amendment to Agreement with Wells Fargo Insurance Services to Extend the Contract Through June 30, 2012 up to an Additional $71,480 from $408,620 to $480,100
6. Authorize Exchanging up to $3,700,000 of San Mateo County Transit District Proposition 1B State Local Partnership Program Funds for an Equivalent Amount of Local Caltrain Operating Funds in Fiscal Year 2012
7. Authorize Negotiation Principles to Explore Certain Funding Options to Finance Caltrain Operations with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board Member Agencies and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in Fiscal Year 2013 and Beyond

CONTRACTS
8. Authorize Award of Contract to Office Max, Inc. and Staples, Inc. for the Purchase and Delivery of General Office Supplies and Related Items for an Aggregate Total Estimated Cost of up to $150,000 for a Two-year Term
9. Authorize Award of Contract to Carl Warren & Company for Public Liability Claims Administration, Investigation and Adjustment Services for an Estimated Cost of $567,000 for a Five-year Term
10. Authorize Award of Contract to Standard Insurance Company for Life and Accidental Death and Dismemberment Insurance for an Estimated Cost of $356,400 for a Three-year Term
INFORMATIONAL

11. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2012 Operating Budget
12. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2012 Capital Budget

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: O. Ahmad (Committee Chair), S. Harris, A. Tissier

Other Board Members Present, Constituting Committee of the Whole: J. Deal, C. Groom, R. Guilbault, A. Lloyd, K. Matsumoto

Other Board Members Absent, Constituting Committee of the Whole: Z. Kersteen-Tucker

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

Committee Chair Omar Ahmad called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Finance Committee Meeting of March 9, 2011
The Committee approved the minutes (Tissier/Harris); Ahmad abstained.

Approval of Revenues and Expenses for February 2011
Deputy CEO Gigi Harrington said fare revenues are slightly under budget and more than $7 million in savings on the expense side. Last week fuel was $3.27 per gallon and year-to-date it is $2.53 per gallon. The fuel hedge has started to trip each month and SamTrans has received payments from the bank totaling $149,000 against a cost of $250,000.

The Committee (Groom/Harris) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the report.

Assessment of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 Fuel Hedging Program and Adoption of Revised Fuel Hedging Policy
Ms. Harrington said staff is asking the Committee to recommend the Board direct staff to start the FY2012 Fuel Hedging Program process. SamTrans has partnered with Caltrain the last two years to increase the quantities of fuel available for the hedge. Staff is making minor changes to the policy to allow a counterparty to be someone other than a financial institution. This request starts the process and staff will be back throughout the process to provide updates.

Director Shirley Harris asked by allowing others to participate does that lower the cost for SamTrans. Ms. Harrington said it provides a wider arena of competition.

Committee Chair Ahmad asked if there is anything that would prevent local bidders from participating. Ms. Harrington said not as long as the company is willing to accept our documents.

The Committee (Groom/Lloyd) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the report.
Authorize Appointment of Orrick, Herrington and Sutcliffe LLP to Serve as Special Counsel in Connection with the FY2012 Fuel Hedging Program
Ms. Harrington said staff is asking the Committee to recommend the Board authorize appointment of this specialized legal team to support the fuel hedging program. These attorneys have supported the transaction in the past and their costs are shared with Caltrain.

Director Jerry Deal asked if the not-to-exceed amount of $125,000 has ever been reached. Ms. Harrington said the last two years it has been at that level, but the fees could come under that amount this year. She said staff works with the attorneys to craft appropriate documents for the transaction and the participants are asked to use these documents.

Director Deal asked if the attorneys spend 312 hours on this program in a year. He asked that staff look at the actual number of hours that were spent on this.

Legal Counsel David Miller said this firm brings a reputation and value of expertise and the agencies truly benefit from this firms’ involvement.

Director Adrienne Tissier asked if this is for both SamTrans and Caltrain. Ms. Harrington said yes, but each agency enters into a separate relationship with the counterparties.

Director Ahmad asked if Mr. Miller and Legal Counsel Joan Cassman are engaged in this process. Mr. Miller said they are working with them and involved in the calls as general counsel.

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

Authorize Amendment to the Investment Policies and Annual Reauthorization to Invest Monies with the Local Agency Investment Fund
Ms. Harrington said staff is asking the Committee to recommend the Board reaffirm the Investment Policy. A minor change is being made to clarify how business is conducted by soliciting three bids and there has been a name change on the index. There is $159 million in the Fund and $31 million is currently in the Local Agency Investment Fund; $25 million in the Paratransit portfolio; the District’s portfolio is $86 million and about $17 million is in other accounts.

Director Rose Guilbault said there is a reference in the staff report that the investment advisors may incur realized capital losses in order to minimize the decrease in real purchasing power. She asked if there have been losses or an amount of losses that is acceptable. Ms. Harrington said generally there have not been any real losses but this gives staff the opportunity, if things go bad, to get out before maturity.

The Committee (Lloyd/Deal) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the report.

Adoption of Advertising Policy
Mr. Miller said a religious ad was run nationally last summer that offended many people and organizations. Due to the tremendous amount of communication received, Executive Officer, Public Affairs Mark Simon and Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing Rita Haskin convened a meeting with Director Ahmad, himself and members of the Peninsula religious community to discuss their concerns about the advertisement and the practices and
customs of the District as they relate to permitted or excluded advertising. There are some categories that are not permitted including defamatory speech, obscenity and pornography, false, misleading and deceptive advertising and political advertising. The conversation was very candid and very open and led to the suggestion of adopting a new policy that would eliminate non-commercial speech. At Director Ahmad’s suggestion, an advisory committee of the Board of Directors was formed, comprised of Directors Harris, Guilbault and Ahmad, that met with staff to discuss possible policy elements and impacts. The policy, from this time forward, for the various platforms where advertising can happen is to not create a public forum for public discourse and expressive activity. The advertising must be subject to a uniform viewpoint-neutral policy and a major purpose, and to try not to put the riders of the District on the buses or on the trains or people who are viewing it from the outside in a position where they feel captive in anyway.

Mr. Miller said staff and the Committee developed a set of policies that govern the outside and inside of a vehicle. The only type of advertising that will be permitted on the exterior will be commercial advertising, coupled with advertising of a type that promotes the SamTrans/Caltrain transportation functions. With respect to interior advertising it would perpetuate the practice that has been in place and allowed for non-profit organizations to promote their activities as well for the District and Caltrain to promote their particular activities. He said the policy has been amended specifically now to add to the list of items that would be excluded from permissive speech, religious speech and unauthorized endorsement speech. Definitions of these particular categories are contained in the policy.

Committee Chair Ahmad said this was an overall very positive engagement with the interfaith community. A tremendous commendation needs to go to staff that listened and addressed these concerns. The group realizes the First Amendment is important; the policy is a good one and offers protection.

Director Tissier asked about non-profits that can advertise, such as Catholic Charities. Mr. Miller said yes as long as they are promoting an activity and not a religion.

Chair Karyl Matsumoto said a member of the Citizens Advisory Committee saw an ad on the side of the bus that upset her, but staff handled it very well and responded to the CAC.

The Committee (Guilbault/Harris) unanimously recommended Board approval of the policy.

Authorize Rejection of Low Monetary Bid as Non-Responsive from Harris Electric and Award of Contract to Liberty Electric for Electrical Maintenance Services for a Total Estimated Cost of $948,094 for a Three Year Term

Director of Contracts and Procurement Cheryl Cavitt said staff is in receipt of a protest for this item. Mr. Miller said under the procurement guidelines there are processes in place that enable any disgruntled proposer to file a protest. Mr. Miller said an opportunity was given for an individual from Harris Electric to speak, but no one from the company was in attendance.

A motion (Lloyd/Harris) to reject the protest by Harris Electric was approved unanimously.

Ms. Cavitt said staff is asking the Committee to recommend the Board award a contract to Liberty Electric. She said Harris Electric failed to meet a material requirement and made their
bid non-responsive. The Liberty Electric bid was reviewed and completely responsive. They are the incumbent and staff has considerable experience with this firm.

The Committee (Tissier/Deal) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the report.

Authorize Rejection of all Bids for Floor Maintenance Services and Related Carpet/Vinyl Work as Non-Responsive and Authorize Reissuing the Solicitation

Ms. Cavitt said staff is asking the Committee to recommend the Board reissue the solicitation for this item. Staff received four bids and three were non-responsive. Staff would like to change some of the materials, quantities and terms of the solicitation in hopes of increasing competition and attracting more bidders.

The Committee (Guilbault/Harris) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the report.

Adjourned: 2:59 p.m.
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 MARCH 31, 2011 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 March 2011 and supplemental information.

SIGNIFICANCE
Revenues: Total Revenues (page 1, line 13) are $72,660 or 0.1 percent worse than revised budget. Passenger Fares (page 1, line 1) are better than budget by $93,110 or 0.7 percent, Operating Grants (page 1, line 3) are worse than budget by $485,726 or 30.1 percent offset by Investment Interest (page 1, line 8) which is better than budget by $209,312 or 7.7 percent and Other Interest, Rent & Other Income (page 1, line 10) is better than budget by $131,692 or 3.4 percent.

Expenses: Total Expenses (page 4, line 74) are $7,755,688 or 7.8 percent better than revised budget. Within Total Expenses, Total Motor Bus (page 3, line 47) is better than budget by $6,707,238 or 9.1 percent, Total ADA Programs (page 4, line 56) are better than budget by $1,083,756 or 10.4 percent and Total Multi-Modal Programs (page 4, line 72) are worse than budget by $35,285 or 0.2 percent.

Budget Amendments: There are no budget amendments for the month of March 2011.

Prepared by: Sheila Tioyao, Manager, Financial Services 650-508-6259
### SOURCES OF FUNDS

#### Operating Revenues
1. **Passenger Fares**
   - Current: 1,616,431
   - Prior: 12,744,163
   - Year-to-Date: 12,961,160
   - Revised Budget: 12,868,050
   - % of Revised: 100.7
   - Approved Budget: 17,157,400
2. **TDA and STA Funds**
   - Current: 0
   - Prior: 19,712,238
   - Year-to-Date: 29,835,175
   - Revised Budget: 29,835,175
   - % of Revised: 100.0
   - Approved Budget: 30,860,639
3. **Operating Grants**
   - Current: 129,724
   - Prior: 1,290,656
   - Year-to-Date: 1,128,983
   - Revised Budget: 1,614,709
   - % of Revised: 69.9
   - Approved Budget: 10,577,283
4. **Measure A Contribution and AB434 Funds**
   - Current: 801,155
   - Prior: 6,522,447
   - Year-to-Date: 6,669,650
   - Revised Budget: 6,690,698
   - % of Revised: 99.7
   - Approved Budget: 8,834,888

#### Subtotal - Operating Revenues
- Total: 2,547,310
- Prior: 40,269,504
- Year-to-Date: 50,594,968
- Revised Budget: 51,008,632
- % of Revised: 99.2
- Approved Budget: 67,430,210

#### Other Revenue Sources
1. **District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax**
   - Current: 5,505,354
   - Prior: 44,408,240
   - Year-to-Date: 45,482,888
   - Revised Budget: 45,482,888
   - % of Revised: 100.0
   - Approved Budget: 60,000,000
2. **Investment Interest**
   - Current: 257,749
   - Prior: 4,228,760
   - Year-to-Date: 2,937,897
   - Revised Budget: 2,728,585
   - % of Revised: 107.7
   - Approved Budget: 4,170,010
3. **Pass through to Other Agencies**
   - Current: 81,275
   - Prior: 0
   - Year-to-Date: 731,470
   - Revised Budget: 731,470
   - % of Revised: 100.0
   - Approved Budget: 975,293
4. **Other Interest, Rent & Other Income**
   - Current: 361,471
   - Prior: 4,300,145
   - Year-to-Date: 4,060,190
   - Revised Budget: 3,928,498
   - % of Revised: 103.4
   - Approved Budget: 5,082,780
5. **Reserves**
   - Current: 0
   - Prior: 1,258,194
   - Year-to-Date: 0
   - Revised Budget: 0
   - % of Revised: 0.0
   - Approved Budget: 2,811,073

#### Subtotal - Other Revenues
- Total: 6,205,849
- Prior: 54,268,340
- Year-to-Date: 53,212,445
- Revised Budget: 52,871,441
- % of Revised: 100.6
- Approved Budget: 73,039,156

#### Total Revenues - All Sources
- Total: 9,911,568
- Prior: 141,539,670
- Year-to-Date: 110,273,106
- Revised Budget: 110,345,766
- % of Revised: 99.9
- Approved Budget: 144,916,720

### USES OF FUNDS

#### Operations
1. **District Motor Bus**
   - Current: 7,971,095
   - Prior: 69,267,468
   - Year-to-Date: 67,093,857
   - Revised Budget: 73,801,095
   - % of Revised: 90.9
   - Approved Budget: 98,189,247
2. **A. D. A. Programs**
   - Current: 1,096,437
   - Prior: 9,710,294
   - Year-to-Date: 9,372,001
   - Revised Budget: 10,455,737
   - % of Revised: 89.6
   - Approved Budget: 13,773,430
3. **Caltrain**
   - Current: 1,055,553
   - Prior: 12,802,181
   - Year-to-Date: 11,541,216
   - Revised Budget: 11,541,216
   - % of Revised: 100.0
   - Approved Budget: 14,707,875
4. **Other Multimodal Programs**
   - Current: 330,258
   - Prior: 2,988,007
   - Year-to-Date: 3,314,376
   - Revised Budget: 3,279,091
   - % of Revised: 101.1
   - Approved Budget: 4,084,620

#### Subtotal - Operating Costs
- Total: 10,453,343
- Prior: 94,767,950
- Year-to-Date: 91,321,450
- Revised Budget: 99,077,138
- % of Revised: 92.2
- Approved Budget: 130,755,172

#### Other Uses of Funds
1. **Pass through to Other Agencies**
   - Current: 81,275
   - Prior: 73,001
   - Year-to-Date: 731,470
   - Revised Budget: 731,470
   - % of Revised: 100.0
   - Approved Budget: 975,293
2. **Transfer Out to Debt Service**
   - Current: 2,037,678
   - Prior: 18,337,761
   - Year-to-Date: 18,339,102
   - Revised Budget: 18,339,102
   - % of Revised: 100.0
   - Approved Budget: 24,451,963
3. **Fiscal Agent Fees**
   - Current: 0
   - Prior: 11,163
   - Year-to-Date: 9,818
   - Revised Budget: 20,025
   - % of Revised: 49.0
   - Approved Budget: 27,400
4. **Land Transfer Interest Expense**
   - Current: 0
   - Prior: 16,600
   - Year-to-Date: 3,878
   - Revised Budget: 80,000
   - % of Revised: 4.8
   - Approved Budget: 80,000

#### Subtotal - Other Uses
- Total: 2,118,953
- Prior: 18,438,525
- Year-to-Date: 19,084,268
- Revised Budget: 19,170,597
- % of Revised: 99.5
- Approved Budget: 25,534,656

#### Capital Programs
- Total: 1,283,642
- Prior: 48,192,589
- Year-to-Date: 7,125,287
- Revised Budget: 7,125,287
- % of Revised: 100.0
- Approved Budget: 8,624,325

#### Total Uses of Funds
- Total: 13,855,938
- Prior: 161,399,064
- Year-to-Date: 125,373,022
- Revised Budget: 125,373,022
- % of Revised: 93.7
- Approved Budget: 164,914,153

#### SURPLUS/(DEFICIT) FOR PERIOD
- Total: 3,944,370
- Prior: 19,859,384
- Year-to-Date: 7,257,899
- Revised Budget: 15,027,256
- % of Revised: 48.3
- Approved Budget: 19,997,433

---

% 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.

*The Approved Budget is the Board adopted budget effective July 1, 2010

**The Revised Budget is the Board approved amended budget passed December 8, 2010, including year to date budget transfers

---

*Note A - The Revised Budget includes the year end rollover of existing capital projects (unaudited).*
## Statement of Revenues and Expense

**San Mateo County Transit District**  
**Statement of Revenues**  
**Fiscal Year 2011**  
**March 2011**  

### OPERATING REVENUES - MOTOR BUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT ACTUAL</td>
<td>PRIOR ACTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MOTOR BUS FARES</td>
<td>1,549,873</td>
<td>12,231,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISTRICT 1/2 CENT SALES TAX:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARCH 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT 1/2 CENT SALES TAX</td>
<td>6,056,861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INVESTMENT INTEREST INCOME:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARCH 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT INTEREST INCOME</td>
<td>15,607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER REVENUE SOURCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARCH 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REVENUE SOURCES:</td>
<td>219,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MARCH 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES:</td>
<td>10,453,343</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.

*The Approved Budget is the Board adopted budget effective July 1, 2010*

**The Revised Budget is the Board approved amended budget passed December 8, 2010, including year to date budget transfers**
### SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### OPERATING EXPENSES
### FISCAL YEAR 2011
### MARCH 2011

#### % OF YEAR ELAPSED: 75.0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT ACTUAL</td>
<td>PRIOR ACTUAL</td>
<td>CURRENT ACTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT OPERATED BUSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>4,447,950</td>
<td>39,783,839</td>
<td>37,557,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>7,104</td>
<td>41,173</td>
<td>36,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>51,864</td>
<td>454,395</td>
<td>509,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Maintenance</td>
<td>102,773</td>
<td>756,672</td>
<td>784,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>186,524</td>
<td>1,460,400</td>
<td>1,565,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>451,062</td>
<td>2,673,900</td>
<td>2,745,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>21,676</td>
<td>252,022</td>
<td>207,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Related Costs</strong></td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>262,611</td>
<td>258,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>53,910</td>
<td>491,220</td>
<td>472,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Supply:</td>
<td>11,097</td>
<td>87,657</td>
<td>81,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total District Operated Buses</td>
<td>6,547,765</td>
<td>47,027,424</td>
<td>54,850,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTRACTED BUS SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Urban Bus Service</td>
<td>1,255,658</td>
<td>10,741,479</td>
<td>10,724,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>27,442</td>
<td>262,611</td>
<td>258,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Related Costs</strong></td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>262,611</td>
<td>258,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contracted Bus Service</strong></td>
<td>1,423,331</td>
<td>12,240,044</td>
<td>12,242,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MOTOR BUS</strong></td>
<td>7,971,095</td>
<td>69,267,468</td>
<td>67,093,857</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.

*The Approved Budget is the Board adopted budget effective July 1, 2010*

**The Revised Budget is the Board approved amended budget passed December 8, 2010, including year to date budget transfer.*
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### OPERATING EXPENSES
### FISCAL YEAR 2011
### MARCH 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>APPROVED BUDGET</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled/Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4,263,033</td>
<td>4,125,060</td>
<td>5,217,675</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,769,180</td>
<td>6,769,180</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Sedan Service</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2,000,537</td>
<td>1,985,116</td>
<td>1,335,768</td>
<td>148.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,781,024</td>
<td>1,781,024</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Accessibility Support</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>557,100</td>
<td>533,450</td>
<td>660,132</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>880,120</td>
<td>880,120</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastside ADA Support</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,634,916</td>
<td>1,510,068</td>
<td>1,896,785</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,527,380</td>
<td>2,527,380</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59,160</td>
<td>58,052</td>
<td>95,910</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,300,726</td>
<td>1,300,726</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Insurance Costs</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,896,785</td>
<td>1,335,768</td>
<td>286,247</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ADA PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,096,437</td>
<td>94,767,950</td>
<td>9,710,294</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,773,430</td>
<td>13,773,430</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTIMODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>94,767,950</td>
<td>91,321,450</td>
<td>99,077,138</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>131,677,656</td>
<td>131,677,656</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALTRAIN SERVICE</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1,055,553</td>
<td>12,802,181</td>
<td>11,541,216</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Rail Service</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1,055,553</td>
<td>11,541,216</td>
<td>11,541,216</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Caltrain Service</strong></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,055,553</td>
<td>12,802,181</td>
<td>11,541,216</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Express Service</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>94,613</td>
<td>94,613</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>126,150</td>
<td>126,150</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM/Caltrain Shuttle Service</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,854,495</td>
<td>1,678,417</td>
<td>1,687,417</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,251,360</td>
<td>2,251,360</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance Multimodal Facilities</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>138,250</td>
<td>138,256</td>
<td>192,100</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>192,100</td>
<td>192,100</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Support</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4,205,354</td>
<td>4,084,620</td>
<td>3,279,091</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,913,229</td>
<td>18,792,495</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MULTI-MODAL PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14,855,592</td>
<td>14,820,307</td>
<td>14,820,307</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,913,229</td>
<td>18,792,495</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14,855,592</td>
<td>130,755,172</td>
<td>131,677,656</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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.

*The Approved Budget is the Board adopted budget effective July 1, 2010
**The Revised Budget is the Board approved amended budget passed December 8, 2010, including year to date budget transfer.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
MOTOR BUS MONTHLY EXPENSES - BUDGET VS ACTUAL
FISCAL YEAR 2011

<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>7,766,610</td>
<td>8,170,634</td>
<td>8,842,573</td>
<td>8,082,258</td>
<td>8,055,171</td>
<td>8,440,075</td>
<td>8,275,876</td>
<td>8,177,492</td>
<td>7,990,412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>7,166,097</td>
<td>7,443,503</td>
<td>7,340,348</td>
<td>8,083,999</td>
<td>6,981,605</td>
<td>7,761,065</td>
<td>7,192,138</td>
<td>7,154,007</td>
<td>7,990,412</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>Budget</td>
<td>7,766,610</td>
<td>15,937,243</td>
<td>24,779,816</td>
<td>32,862,068</td>
<td>40,917,239</td>
<td>57,633,190</td>
<td>65,810,683</td>
<td>73,801,095</td>
<td>73,801,095</td>
<td>73,801,095</td>
<td>73,801,095</td>
<td>73,801,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>7,166,097</td>
<td>13,609,599</td>
<td>21,949,948</td>
<td>30,033,947</td>
<td>37,015,552</td>
<td>51,968,755</td>
<td>59,122,762</td>
<td>67,093,857</td>
<td>73,801,095</td>
<td>73,801,095</td>
<td>73,801,095</td>
<td>73,801,095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Variance - F(U)     | 600,513    | 2,327,644  | 2,828,869  | 2,828,121  | 3,901,687  | 4,580,997  | 5,664,436  | 6,687,921  | 6,707,238  |            |            |            |
| Variance %          | 7.73%      | 8.33%      | 11.42%     | 8.61%      | 9.54%      | 9.28%      | 9.83%      | 10.16%     | 9.09%      |            |            |            |
## MONTHLY EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</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>1,274.897</td>
<td>1,147.355</td>
<td>1,147.355</td>
<td>1,147.355</td>
<td>1,147.355</td>
<td>1,147.355</td>
<td>1,149.355</td>
<td>1,147.355</td>
<td>1,147.355</td>
<td>1,147.355</td>
<td>1,147.355</td>
<td>1,147.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>1,065.703</td>
<td>1,039.441</td>
<td>1,047.356</td>
<td>1,064.705</td>
<td>1,025.377</td>
<td>1,035.058</td>
<td>1,025.650</td>
<td>972.264</td>
<td>1,096.437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance - F(U)</td>
<td>209,194</td>
<td>317,108</td>
<td>417,097</td>
<td>524,592</td>
<td>621,725</td>
<td>734,022</td>
<td>857,727</td>
<td>1,032,818</td>
<td>1,083,736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance %</td>
<td>16.41%</td>
<td>13.09%</td>
<td>11.68%</td>
<td>10.59%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>10.47%</td>
<td>10.51%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>10.36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CUMULATIVE EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</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>1,274.897</td>
<td>2,422.252</td>
<td>3,569.607</td>
<td>4,716.962</td>
<td>5,864.317</td>
<td>7,011.672</td>
<td>8,161.027</td>
<td>9,308.382</td>
<td>10,455.737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>1,065.703</td>
<td>2,005.144</td>
<td>3,152.510</td>
<td>4,217.215</td>
<td>5,242.592</td>
<td>6,277.650</td>
<td>7,303.300</td>
<td>8,275.564</td>
<td>9,372.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance - F(U)</td>
<td>209,194</td>
<td>317,108</td>
<td>417,097</td>
<td>524,592</td>
<td>621,725</td>
<td>734,022</td>
<td>857,727</td>
<td>1,032,818</td>
<td>1,083,736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance %</td>
<td>16.41%</td>
<td>13.09%</td>
<td>11.68%</td>
<td>10.59%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>10.47%</td>
<td>10.51%</td>
<td>11.10%</td>
<td>10.36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MONTHLY EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>3,431,492</td>
<td>1,556,014</td>
<td>1,387,439</td>
<td>1,387,438</td>
<td>1,387,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td>3,421,682</td>
<td>1,563,465</td>
<td>1,377,708</td>
<td>1,499,612</td>
<td>1,416,979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CUMULATIVE EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>3,431,492</td>
<td>4,987,506</td>
<td>6,374,945</td>
<td>7,762,383</td>
<td>9,149,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td>3,421,682</td>
<td>4,985,147</td>
<td>6,362,855</td>
<td>7,862,467</td>
<td>9,179,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variance - F(U)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>9,810</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>12,089</td>
<td>(100,085)</td>
<td>(129,625)</td>
<td>(1,062)</td>
<td>(56,032)</td>
<td>(36,913)</td>
<td>(35,286)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td>9,810</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>12,089</td>
<td>(100,085)</td>
<td>(129,625)</td>
<td>(1,062)</td>
<td>(56,032)</td>
<td>(36,913)</td>
<td>(35,286)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variance %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>-1.29%</td>
<td>-1.42%</td>
<td>-0.01%</td>
<td>-0.47%</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
<td>-0.24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>-1.29%</td>
<td>-1.42%</td>
<td>-0.01%</td>
<td>-0.47%</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
<td>-0.24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
SUMMARY OF BUDGET ACTIVITY FOR MARCH 2011

BUDGET AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mar-11
No Budget Amendments in March 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUDGET REVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mar-11
No Budget Revisions in March 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Approved Budget vs Receipts for FY2010 & FY2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Over/(Under Budget/Projection)</th>
<th>Current Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2010:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>15,555,000</td>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>14,554,695</td>
<td>(1,000,305)</td>
<td>14,554,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>16,492,000</td>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>15,240,785</td>
<td>(1,251,215)</td>
<td>15,240,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>12,306,440</td>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>13,646,042</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,646,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>15,646,560</td>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>15,046,028</td>
<td>(600,532)</td>
<td>15,046,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2010 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY2010 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58,487,550</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>58,487,550</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **FY2011** |              |            |              |                               |                   |
| Jul. 10    | 4,110,600    | Sep. 10    | 4,008,500    | (102,100)                     | 4,008,500         |
| Aug. 10    | 4,110,600    | Oct. 10    | 4,233,000    | 122,400                       | 4,233,000         |
| Sep. 10    | 5,480,800    | Nov. 10    | 5,344,700    | (136,100)                     | 5,344,700         |
| 1st Qtr. Adjustment | 1,522,400 | Dec. 10 | 1,779,797 | 257,397 | 1,779,797 |
| 3 Months Total | 15,224,400 |             | 15,365,997 | 141,597 | 15,365,997 |
| Oct. 10    | 4,295,900    | Dec. 10    | 4,473,500    | 177,600                       | 4,473,500         |
| Nov. 10    | 4,295,900    | Jan. 11    | 4,722,500    | 426,600                       | 4,722,500         |
| Dec. 10    | 5,727,900    | Feb. 11    | 5,964,700    | 236,800                       | 5,964,700         |
| 2nd Qtr. Adjustment | 1,591,100 | Mar. 11    | 1,757,279 | 166,179 | 1,757,279 |
| 6 Months Total | 31,135,200 |              | 32,283,977 | 1,148,777 | 32,283,977 |
| Jan. 11    | 3,741,000    | Mar. 11    | 3,691,700    | (49,300)                      | 3,691,700         |
| Feb. 11    | 3,741,000    | Apr. 11    | 3,691,700    | (49,300)                      | 3,691,700 (1)     |
| Mar. 11    | 4,987,900    | May 11     | 4,922,300    | (65,600)                      | 4,922,300 (1)     |
| 3rd Qtr. Adjustment | 1,385,500 | Jun. 11    | 1,757,279 | (492,289) | 893,211 (1) |
| 9 Months Total | 44,990,600 |              | 35,975,677 | 492,288 | 45,482,888 |
| Apr. 11    | 4,052,500    | Jun. 11    | 0           | 4,052,500                     |                   |
| May 11     | 4,052,500    | Jul. 11    | 0           | 4,052,500                     |                   |
| Jun. 11    | 5,403,400    | Aug. 11    | 0           | 5,403,400                     |                   |
| 4th Qtr. Adjustment | 1,501,000 | Sep. 11    | (492,288) | 1,008,712 |                   |
| **FY2011 Total** | **60,000,000** | **FY2011 Total** | **35,975,677** | (0) | **60,000,000** |

15,365,997 1st Quarter
16,917,979 2nd Quarter
13,198,911 3rd Quarter
4th Quarter
45,482,888 YTD Actual Per Statement of Revenues & Expenses

(1) Accrued
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
          General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
       Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: QUARTERLY INVESTMENT REPORT AND
         FIXED INCOME MARKET REVIEW AND OUTLOOK

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Finance Committee recommend that the Board accept and enter into the record the Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review and Outlook for the quarter ended March 31, 2011.

SIGNIFICANCE
The District Investment Policy contains a requirement for a quarterly report to be transmitted to the Board within 30 days of the end of the quarter. This staff report was forwarded to the Board of Directors under separate cover on April 20, 2011 in order to meet the 30-day requirement.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The San Mateo County Transit District (District) is required by state law to submit quarterly reports within 30 days of the end of the quarter covered by the report. The report is required to include the following information:

1. Type of investment, issuer, date of maturity, par and dollar amount invested in all securities, investments and money held by the local agency;
2. Description of any of the local agency's funds, investments or programs that are under the management of contracted parties, including lending programs;
3. For all securities held by the local agency or under management by any outside party that is not a local agency or the State of California Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF), a current market value as of the date of the report and the source of this information;
4. Statement that the portfolio complies with the Investment Policy or the manner in which the portfolio is not in compliance; and,
5. Statement that the local agency has the ability to meet its pool's expenditure
requirements (cash flow) for the next six months or provide an explanation as to why sufficient money shall or may not be available.

A schedule, which addresses the requirements of 1, 2, and 3 above, is included in this report on pages 6 and 7. The schedule separates the investments into three groups: The Investment Portfolio which is managed by CSI Capital Management, Inc. (CSI); Liquidity funds which are managed by District staff; and Trust funds which are managed by a third party trustee. The Investment Policy governs the management and reporting of the Investment Portfolio and Liquidity funds while the bond covenants govern the management and reporting of the Trust funds.

CSI provides the District a current market valuation of all the assets under its management for each quarter. The valuation is provided by FT Interactive Data, the major operating division of Interactive Data Corporation, (IDC). IDC is a leading provider of global securities data. They offer one of the largest information databases with current and historical prices on securities traded in all major markets including daily evaluations for more than 2.5 million fixed income securities.

Due to the nature of securities which are bought and sold in a principal market, such as fixed income securities, multiple market values may exist for a given security at any given time. CSI has chosen IDC as an unbiased estimator of these prices based on their leading role as a provider of end of the day pricing, an evaluation of their methodology and the experience of their evaluation staff. Unfortunately, given the recent volatility in the markets, not every security is currently supported or accurately reflected by IDC. Therefore at the end of the quarter, CSI surveyed a number of Wall Street firms to get an accurate market value of the securities held in the District’s portfolio. These surveys reflect the levels at which someone is actually willing to purchase the securities held by the District. In the case of money market instruments, which are not supported by IDC, CSI used adjusted cost.

The Liquidity funds managed by District staff are considered to be cash equivalents and therefore market value is considered to be equal to book value, (i.e. cost). The shares of beneficial interest generally establish a nominal value per share. Because the Net Asset Value is fixed at a nominal value per share, book and market value are equal and rate of income is recalculated on a daily basis.

The portfolio and this Quarterly Investment Report comply with the Investment Policy and the provisions of SB 564 (1995). The District has the ability to meet its expenditure requirements for the next six months.
DISCUSSION

Market Review and Outlook

The first quarter of 2011 was eventful, from the shootings in Arizona, to protests in Wisconsin, uprisings in the Middle East, rising food and oil prices, sovereign debt problems in Europe, and volatile equity markets here and abroad. Amidst all this turmoil, the U.S. economy managed to show resilience. Gains in employment, exceptionally strong economic activity survey results, healthy gains in income and robust consumer spending painted a picture of an economy ready to stand on its own two feet.

Global uncertainty and the strength in the economy taken together resulted in interest rates ending the quarter only marginally higher than where they began.

Longer-term, the economy will be the dominant force in driving interest rates. Economists now expect economic growth in 2011 to exceed 3.0 percent. Should business optimism continue to rise, employers will start to hire and banks will become more aggressive in lending. In such an environment economic growth could easily top 4.0 percent. Economic growth of this magnitude would likely be accompanied by meaningfully higher interest rates, particularly for longer-dated securities.

Given the only recently improved and still somewhat fragile state of our economic recovery, several important warning signs bear closer scrutiny as potentially disruptive forces on our path to economic improvement. They are

- Higher prices for food and energy. Rising oil prices in particular present a clear danger for the U.S. economy. Historically a harbinger of a recession, rising oil prices can sap economic growth, raise inflation, lower profit margins and worsen the trade deficit.
- Rising gas prices may be enough to stall corporate America’s desire to increase employment.
- Sovereign debt default from one or more of the problem countries in Europe would be accompanied by fears of a decline in global growth and prevent the type of positive business sentiment described above. Under such a scenario, global economic growth and interest rates could remain low.

- Recent problems in Japan will add to the global pressures on food and energy prices.

- Lack of progress the United States has made in dealing with its budget problems. Last year’s tax breaks and this year’s potential for increased military spending, due to Libya have not improved our situation. Unless our policymakers resolve to deal with our deficit problem, we are likely to see a continued decline of the dollar and renewed pressure on interest rates to rise. If this is accompanied by rising oil prices, the one-two punch to the consumer may hamper whatever recovery we might otherwise have had and result in a bigger budget problem.

It is still too early to tell if the result of these current events will generate a meaningful change in investment strategy. Meanwhile, the exceptionally low level of interest rates continues to make the bond market vulnerable to a negative return if rates continue to rise. CSI’s strategy has been to protect the portfolio from negative returns in an environment of modestly rising rates. For the time being, they continue to believe this is the prudent course of action.

**Strategy**

Over the foreseeable future CSI expect interest rates to move gradually higher. They continue to caution that the current low rates leave no room for a sudden rise in interest rates, which would result in negative returns. Given CSI’s outlook and the current level of uncertainty in the markets, we are comfortable keeping the portfolio’s exposure to a change in interest rates below that of the benchmark.

As of the end of the quarter, the District’s consolidated portfolios consisted of approximately 4.2 percent Corporate Bonds, 85.6 percent Agency Securities, 8.8 percent US Treasury Securities and 1.4 percent Mortgage Backed Securities; see Exhibit 5.

**Budget Impact**

The portfolio’s performance is reported on a total economic return basis. This method includes the coupon interest, amortization of discounts and premiums, capital gains and losses and price changes (i.e., unrealized gains and losses). For the quarter ending March 31, the General Fund portfolio returned 0.33 percent. This compares to the benchmark return of 0.14 percent. Over this same time period, the Paratransit Fund portfolio returned 0.54 percent. This compares to the benchmark return of -0.02 percent.

The Performance graph in Exhibit 3 shows the relative performance of each fund for the trailing 24-month period (or since inception). The Growth of a Thousand Dollars graph in Exhibit 4 shows the cumulative performance over this same time frame for each portfolio. The consolidated portfolio’s yield to maturity, the return the portfolio will earn in the future if all securities are held to maturity is also reported. This calculation is based on the current market value of the portfolio including unrealized gains and losses. For the quarter ending March 31, the portfolio’s yield to maturity or call was 0.94 percent. The General Fund benchmark’s yield to maturity was 1.38 percent.
Another method of measuring the consolidated portfolio's yield to maturity is the yield of the portfolio at cost. This calculation is based on the value of the portfolio at cost and does not include any unrealized gains or losses as part of its computation. As of the end of the quarter the consolidated portfolio's rate of return on investments, at cost, was \textbf{2.54} percent.

Prepared by: Lori Snow, Manager, Finance Treasury

650-508-6425
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
REPORT OF INVESTMENTS
FOR QUARTER ENDED MARCH 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DATE OF MATURITY</th>
<th>PAR VALUE</th>
<th>CARRYING AMOUNT</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE</th>
<th>ACCRUED INTEREST</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE +ACCR. INT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUNDS MANAGED BY CSI CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, INC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORPORATE BONDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP Morgan Chase &amp; Co.</td>
<td>06-16-11</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>3,112,707</td>
<td>3,027,084</td>
<td>42,437</td>
<td>3,069,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America</td>
<td>04-30-12</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,048,120</td>
<td>2,036,652</td>
<td>17,617</td>
<td>2,054,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT BONDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed. Farm Credit Bank</td>
<td>08-25-11</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,387,500</td>
<td>10,150,920</td>
<td>38,750</td>
<td>10,189,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>02-16-12</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,696,875</td>
<td>10,403,070</td>
<td>62,500</td>
<td>10,465,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>03-15-12</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>3,820,469</td>
<td>3,690,904</td>
<td>9,528</td>
<td>3,700,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>03-23-12</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,123,437</td>
<td>5,084,810</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>5,087,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>01-15-13</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>4,540,653</td>
<td>4,502,547</td>
<td>16,625</td>
<td>4,519,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB</td>
<td>03-08-13</td>
<td>15,500,000</td>
<td>14,904,844</td>
<td>14,578,137</td>
<td>43,125</td>
<td>14,621,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>10-21-13</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,008,320</td>
<td>3,983,072</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>4,003,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM - Step Up</td>
<td>11-04-13</td>
<td>7,750,000</td>
<td>7,735,275</td>
<td>7,688,643</td>
<td>15,823</td>
<td>7,704,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>03-07-14</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,994,445</td>
<td>4,994,445</td>
<td>5,833</td>
<td>5,000,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA - Step Up</td>
<td>07-28-15</td>
<td>2,250,000</td>
<td>2,252,115</td>
<td>2,252,925</td>
<td>5,906</td>
<td>2,258,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM - Step Up</td>
<td>10-15-15</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,009,800</td>
<td>4,940,850</td>
<td>28,819</td>
<td>4,969,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed. Farm Credit Bank</td>
<td>12-29-15</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>1,139,406</td>
<td>1,110,715</td>
<td>14,870</td>
<td>1,125,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Urban Devel</td>
<td>08-01-17</td>
<td>829,768</td>
<td>773,790</td>
<td>804,733</td>
<td>10,544</td>
<td>815,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURY INFLATION PROTECTED SECURITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Inflation Indexed Note</td>
<td>04-15-14</td>
<td>3,641,505</td>
<td>3,763,819</td>
<td>3,891,440</td>
<td>20,192</td>
<td>3,911,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLATERALIZED MORTGAGE OBLIGATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM SERIES 4S-2012 CLASS I</td>
<td>01-25-12</td>
<td>1,050,223</td>
<td>1,116,987</td>
<td>1,083,904</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>1,084,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM SERIES 00-0606 CLASS Y</td>
<td>12-28-12</td>
<td>420,774</td>
<td>504,081</td>
<td>444,577</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>444,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM Ref FHR R015 AN</td>
<td>02-15-13</td>
<td>66,772</td>
<td>75,479</td>
<td>66,824</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>67,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INVESTMENT FUNDS PORTFOLIO MANAGED BY CSI CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, INC.</td>
<td>82,459,042</td>
<td>86,008,121</td>
<td>84,736,192</td>
<td>356,171</td>
<td>85,092,363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### REPORT OF INVESTMENTS (Cont'd)
#### FOR QUARTER ENDED MARCH 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DATE OF MATURITY</th>
<th>PAR VALUE</th>
<th>CARRYING AMOUNT</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE</th>
<th>ACCRUED INTEREST</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE +ACCR. INT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARATRANSIT TRUST FUND PORTFOLIO:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT BONDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>01-09-12</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,101,563</td>
<td>5,064,855</td>
<td>22,778</td>
<td>5,087,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Treasury Note</td>
<td>02-15-12</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,054,689</td>
<td>4,037,968</td>
<td>6,837</td>
<td>4,044,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>01-07-14</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,184,360</td>
<td>5,166,195</td>
<td>29,167</td>
<td>5,195,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>04-23-14</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,588,415</td>
<td>2,578,927</td>
<td>27,431</td>
<td>2,606,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA Step Up</td>
<td>01-27-16</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,015,025</td>
<td>5,015,025</td>
<td>8,889</td>
<td>5,023,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREASURY INFLATION PROTECTED SECURITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Inflation Indexed Note</td>
<td>04-15-14</td>
<td>2,601,075</td>
<td>2,688,442</td>
<td>2,779,600</td>
<td>14,423</td>
<td>2,794,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PARATRANSIT PORTFOLIO**
MANAGED BY CSI CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, INC.

| | 24,101,075 | 24,632,493 | 24,642,570 | 109,525 | 24,752,095 |

**TOTAL DISTRICT PORTFOLIO**
MANAGED BY CSI CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, INC.

| | 106,560,117 | 110,640,614 | 109,378,762 | 465,696 | 109,844,458 |

**LIQUIDITY FUNDS MANAGED BY DISTRICT STAFF:**

| BANK OF AMERICA CHECKING                  | 540,602 | 540,602 | 0 | 540,602 |
| LAIF                                      | 33,805,610 | 33,805,610 | 36,633 | 33,842,243 |

**TOTAL FUNDS MANAGED BY DISTRICT STAFF**

| 34,346,212 | 34,346,212 | 36,633 | 34,382,844 |

**TRUST FUNDS MANAGED BY THIRD PARTY TRUSTEE:**

| First American Gov't. Oblig. Cl D        | 1,756,277,03 | 1,756,277,03 | 1,756,277,03 | 0 | 1,756,277 |
| First American Treas. Oblig. Cl D Corp Tr| 1,891,291,83 | 1,891,291,83 | 1,891,291,83 | 0 | 1,891,292 |
| Banco Bilbao Vizcaya, CP                  | 8,871,000,00 | 8,871,000,00 | 8,871,000,00 | 0 | 8,871,000 |
| Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp           | 2,253,000,00 | 2,255,972,14 | 2,291,210,88 | 1,049,34 | 2,292,260 |

**TOTAL FUNDS MANAGED BY THIRD PARTY TRUSTEE**

| 14,771,569 | 14,774,541 | 14,809,780 | 1,049 | 14,810,829 |

**TOTAL AS OF MARCH 31, 2011**

| 121,331,686 | 159,761,367 | 158,534,754 | 503,378 | 159,038,132 |
SamTrans
Historical Yield Curve

Data Source: Bloomberg

CSI Capital Management, Inc.
SamTrans
Duration vs. Benchmark

*Duration* is a measure of a portfolio’s sensitivity to a change in interest rates. It represents the amount a portfolio’s value would change, in percent, if interest rates were to rise or fall by 1%. For example, we would expect a portfolio with a duration of 2 to rise by 2% in value if interest rates fell 1% and to fall by 2% in value if interest rates rose by 1%. 

CSI Capital Management, Inc.
SamTrans
Monthly Review – Account vs. Benchmark
Rolling 24 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Apr-10</th>
<th>May-10</th>
<th>Jun-10</th>
<th>Jul-10</th>
<th>Aug-10</th>
<th>Sep-10</th>
<th>Oct-10</th>
<th>Nov-10</th>
<th>Dec-10</th>
<th>Jan-11</th>
<th>Feb-11</th>
<th>Mar-11</th>
<th>Trailing 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SamTrans - Gen Funds</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>-0.16%</td>
<td>-0.13%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SamTrans - Paratran</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>-0.28%</td>
<td>-0.22%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark - Gen Fund</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td>-0.51%</td>
<td>-0.78%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>-0.05%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark - Paratran</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>-0.84%</td>
<td>-2.22%</td>
<td>-2.22%</td>
<td>-2.22%</td>
<td>-2.22%</td>
<td>-2.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SamTrans
Growth of a Thousand Dollars
Rolling 24 Months

CSI Capital Management, Inc.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manage/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: ASSIGNMENT OF CONTRACT TO SUNTRUST BANK TO PROVIDE INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICES

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend that the Board approve the assignment of the current investment management services agreement (Agreement) between the San Mateo County Transit District (District) and CSI Capital Management, Inc. (CSI) from CSI to SunTrust Bank (STB) on the same terms and conditions contained in the Agreement.

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of the above action will provide the District with uninterrupted investment advisory services in accordance with the Agreement; with William Osher as the primary representative for the District and the same transparent reporting requirements, including a quarterly written report and an oral economic forecast presentation by Mr. Osher.

BUDGET IMPACT
The cost for this service is included in the approved Fiscal Year 2011 operating budget.

BACKGROUND
Pursuant to Resolution 2002-78, the District awarded a five-year contract to Harris Bretall Sullivan & Smith, LLC (Harris Bretall) to provide investment management services. Due to an internal reorganization, Harris Bretall assigned its obligations and responsibilities under the Agreement to Epic Wealth Management (EWM), which subsequently re-branded itself as Tamalpais Wealth Advisors (TWA). Pursuant to Resolution 2008-34 the Board extended the Agreement with TWA for three years with two one-year options. Subsequently, the Board authorized Resolution 2010-18, to assign the Agreement from TWA to CSI Capital Management, Inc. (CSI) on the same terms and conditions contained in the Agreement.

CSI has provided satisfactory investment management services and has approximately two and one-half years remaining of its contract term. Mr. Osher has consistently provided favorable portfolio performance results for the District since 1987. The District’s portfolio is held in the
Bank of New York, as the custodial bank, on behalf of the District. The District’s funds are not held by CSI as it is solely a financial advisory firm and not an investment house.

CSI recently entered into an agreement to join the Wealth Management Group of Atlanta based STB. The proposed transaction will establish CSI Group as a member of STB, which is a publicly traded company listed on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE:STI) with total assets of more than $170 billion. The company has more than 100 years of experience providing financial advice and has approximately 700 skilled investment professionals.

To ensure that the District continues to receive uninterrupted professional investment portfolio management services, CSI has consented to the assignment of the remaining term of the Agreement to STB. Subsequently, STB has agreed to continue providing all investment advisory services under the terms of the Agreement and has furnished the District with information demonstrating its qualifications to assume such investment management services. Mr. Osher, as a Managing Director of STB, will continue to be responsible for the daily management of the District’s portfolio as well as the preparation of monthly reports and a quarterly economic forecast presentation to the Board.

Contract Officer: Adwoa Oni 650-508-6411
Project Manager: Lori Snow, Manager, Treasury 650-508-6425
RESOLUTION NO. 2011 -

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

*   *   *

CONSENSING TO ASSIGNMENT OF
INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICES AGREEMENT
BY CSI CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, INC. TO SUNTRUST BANK

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution 2002-78, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) awarded an Agreement for Investment Management Services (Agreement) for a five-year term to Harris Bretall Sullivan & Smith, LLC (Harris Bretall); and

WHEREAS, with prior District approval, Harris Bretall assigned its obligations and responsibilities under the Agreement to Epic Wealth Management (EWM), which was subsequently re-branded as Tamalpais Wealth Advisors (TWA);

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution 2008-34, the District extended the term of the Agreement for three years with two one-year options; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution 2010-18, the District approved the assignment of the Agreement from TWA to CSI Capital Management, Inc. (CSI) on the same terms and conditions contained in the Agreement; and

WHEREAS, CSI has entered into an agreement to join the Wealth Management Group of Atlanta-based SunTrust Bank (STB), establishing CSI Group as a member of STB, a publicly traded company listed on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE:STI) with total assets of over $170 billion and more than 100 years of experience providing financial advice; and

WHEREAS, the Agreement permits the assignment of CSI’s rights and the transfer of its obligations under the Agreement to another firm upon the prior written consent of the District;
and

WHEREAS, STB has agreed to assume all of the duties and obligations and provide all investment management services under the terms of the Agreement and has furnished the District with information demonstrating its qualifications to assume such investment management services; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that the District consent to the assignment of the Agreement from CSI Capital Management, Inc. to SunTrust Bank.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors (Board) of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby consents to the assignment of the Agreement from CSI Capital Management, Inc. to SunTrust Bank on the same terms and conditions set forth in the Agreement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute appropriate documents as approved by legal counsel, to give effect to this assignment.

Regularly passed and adopted this 11th day of May, 2011, 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: THIRD CONTRACT AMENDMENT FOR INSURANCE BROKER SERVICES

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend that the Board:
1. Authorize the third amendment to the agreement with Wells Fargo Insurance Services, USA, Inc. (Wells Fargo Insurance) for insurance broker services to extend the contract term on a month-to-month basis from June 4, 2011 through June 30, 2012 for up to an additional $71,480.
2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO, or designee, to execute the third amendment to the current agreement.

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of the above actions will allow staff time to develop a scope of services and issue a Request for Proposals for insurance broker services while Wells Fargo Insurance continues to provide the District with these services.

BUDGET IMPACT
This amendment for $71,480 will increase the total contract amount from $408,620 to $480,100. The current estimated contract amount is insufficient to provide insurance broker services for the one-year contract extension. Funds for this amendment will be available under the approved Fiscal Year 2012 operating budget.

BACKGROUND
Pursuant to Resolution 2005-25, the Board awarded a five-year contract to Technology Insurance Services, Inc. (TIS) to provide insurance broker services to the District. The contract has been amended to transfer services under the contract from TIS to ABD Insurance and Financial Services, Inc. (ABD) and again to memorialize ABD’s name change to Wells Fargo Insurance Services, USA, Inc. and extend the contract term for one additional year so that the contract would co-terminate with the insurance broker services contract for the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.
The re-solicitation of insurance broker services has been delayed due to staff reorganizations. Additional time is required to develop the scope of services and the Request for Proposals. Wells Fargo Insurance has agreed to hold the current rate for services at $71,480, prorated on a month-to-month basis during the contract extension. Staff anticipates issuing a Request for Proposals for insurance broker services later this year.

Contract Officer: Adwoa Oni 650-508-6411
Project Manager: Dave Triolo, Acting Director, Risk Management 650-508-6237
RESOLUTION NO. 2011-
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

AUTHORIZING THE THIRD AMENDMENT TO THE CONTRACT
WITH WELLS FARGO INSURANCE SERVICES USA, INC. FOR
INSURANCE BROKER SERVICES TO EXTEND THE CONTRACT TERM
AND INCREASE THE ESTIMATED CONTRACT AMOUNT BY UP TO $71,480

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution 2005-25, the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District (District) authorized the award of Insurance Broker Services Agreement (Agreement) to Technology Insurance Services, Inc. (TIS) of Redwood City, California for a five-year term; and

WHEREAS, the Agreement permits the transfer of the firm’s rights and obligations under the Agreement to an assignee upon the prior written consent of the District; and

WHEREAS, the first amendment transferred the services under the Agreement from TIS to ABD Insurance and Financial Services, Inc. (ABD); and

WHEREAS, the second amendment memorialized ABD’s name change to Wells Fargo Insurance Services, USA, Inc. (Wells Fargo Insurance) of San Carlos, California and extended the contract for an additional one-year term so that the Agreement would co-terminate with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board’s (JPB) Agreement for insurance broker services; and

WHEREAS, staff proposes to extend the Agreement for an additional one-year term to allow the District time to develop the scope of services and to issue the Request for Proposals for re-solicitation of insurance broker services; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that the Board authorize an amendment to the contract with Wells Fargo Insurance to
extend the contract term on a month-to-month basis to June 30, 2012 and increase the estimated contract amount by up to $71,480 for provision of insurance broker services.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District authorizes an amendment to the contract with Wells Fargo Insurance Services, USA, Inc. of San Carlos, California, to extend the contract term on a month-to-month basis from June 4, 2011 through June 30, 2012; and to increase the estimated contract amount by up to $71,480 for provision of insurance broker services; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute an amendment, in a form approved by legal counsel, to the Agreement with Wells Fargo Insurance to extend the contract term on a month-to-month basis through June 30, 2012 and to increase the estimated contract amount by up to $71,480.

Regularly passed and adopted this 11th day of May, 2011 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: APPROVAL TO EXCHANGE SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT PROPOSITION 1B SLPP FUNDS FOR UP TO $3.7 MILLION IN LOCAL CALTRAIN OPERATING FUNDS

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend Board approval of an exchange of up to $3.7 million in Proposition 1B State Local Partnership Program (Prop 1B SLPP) funds for an equivalent amount of local monies to finance a portion of San Mateo County’s share of Caltrain’s operations in Fiscal Year (FY) 2012.

SIGNIFICANCE
The San Mateo County Transit District (District) has been facing a continuing structural deficit, and staff have been working with the Strategic Plan/Financial Capacity Ad Hoc Committee of the Board since 2006 to develop measures to rectify the structural deficit.

In this regard, one area of focus has been on the District’s level of financial support for Caltrain. Specifically, the District proposed to reduce its operating subsidy to Caltrain by $11.7 million over a two-year period, FY2011 and FY2012, but did a one-time “fund-swap” to keep its contribution near FY2010 levels for FY2011.

After extensive discussion with its Joint Powers Board (JPB) member agencies, the City and County of San Francisco and the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), as well as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the District now proposes to contribute $10.6 million in operating subsidy for Caltrain in FY2012. The $10.6 million is proposed to be made up of: a) $4.9 million in Measure A funds from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority; b) $2 million in funds received from VTA’s repayment of the District investment in the Caltrain right of way as previously approved by the Board; and c) $3.7 million through a swap of capital grants for operating funds.

For item (c) above, the District has access to $3.7 million in Prop 1B SLPP funds, and the $3.7 million has not yet been budgeted to any District projects due to the restrictive nature of this funding source. Prop 1B SLPP funds may only be used for certain types of transportation capital
improvement projects; operations are ineligible to receive funding under this program. Furthermore, only the construction or acquisition phase of a capital project is eligible to be funded under Prop 1B SLPP, and the proposed capital project must be matched dollar-for-dollar with the voter-approved transportation tax and/or fees that qualified the claimant in the program in the first place.

The District has engaged its JPB member agencies to see whether one or more agencies can exchange up to $3.7 million in Prop 1B SLPP grants for an equivalent amount of local funds to finance a portion of San Mateo County’s share of Caltrain’s operations in Fiscal Year 2012. VTA has conceptually agreed to such a fund exchange; however, the amount and the mechanism are still being worked out. Staff is seeking Board approval to allow staff to finalize the mechanics of exchanging up to $3.7 million in Prop 1B SLPP for local funds that can be used for Caltrain operations in FY2012.

**BUDGET IMPACT**
Approval of the fund exchange will allow the District to provide $10.6 million in funding subsidy to Caltrain as San Mateo County’s share to help balance Caltrain’s FY2012 Operating Budget, while facilitating retention of existing Caltrain rail service levels.

**BACKGROUND**
The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, approved by the voters as Proposition 1B on November 7, 2006, authorized $1 billion to be deposited in the State-Local Partnership Program Account. The Bond Act apportions the funds by formula to eligible claimants in the State based on the amount of voter-approved transportation taxes and fees collected. The Prop 1B SLPP program requires a dollar-for-dollar match of local funds for an applicant agency to receive state funds under the program.

San Mateo County receives funds from Prop 1B SLPP and the funds are apportioned equally to the District and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) based on the one-half cent sales tax collected by the District, and another one-half cent sales tax collected by the TA for transportation purposes.

Prepared By: April Chan, Director, Budgets and Grants  650-508-6228
RESOLUTION NO. 2011 –

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

* * *

APPROVAL TO EXCHANGE SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
PROPOSITION 1B STATE LOCAL PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FUNDS
FOR UP TO $3.7 MILLION IN LOCAL CALTRAIN OPERATING FUNDS

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) has been facing a
continuing structural deficit, and District staff have been working with the Strategic Plan/
Financial Capacity Ad Hoc Committee of the Board since 2006 to develop measures to rectify
the structural deficit; and

WHEREAS, one area of focus has been on the District’s level of financial support for
Caltrain; and

WHEREAS, the District proposed to reduce its operating subsidy to Caltrain by
$11.7 million over a two-year period, FY2011 and FY2012, but ultimately was able to
implement a one-time “fund-swap” to maintain its contribution near FY2010 levels during
FY2011; and

WHEREAS, after extensive discussion with its Joint Powers Board (JPB) member
agencies, the City and County of San Francisco and the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA),
as well as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the District now proposes to
contribute $10.6 million in operating subsidy for Caltrain during FY2012, which includes
$3.7 million through a swap of capital grants for operating funds; and

WHEREAS, the District has engaged its JPB member agencies to determine whether
one or more partners can exchange up to $3.7 million in District Proposition 1B State Local
Partnership Program (Prop 1B SLPP) grants for an equivalent amount of local funds to finance a
portion of San Mateo County’s share of Caltrain’s operations in Fiscal Year 2012; and
WHEREAS, VTA has conceptually agreed to such a fund exchange.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District authorizes the General Manager/CEO to approve an exchange of up to $3.7 million in Prop 1B SLPP funds for an equivalent amount of local monies from VTA to finance a portion of San Mateo County’s share of Caltrain’s operations in Fiscal Year 2012, and authorizes staff to finalize the mechanics of the proposed fund exchange with VTA.

Regularly passed and adopted this 11th day of May 2011, 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: APPROVE NEGOTIATION PRINCIPLES TO EXPLORE CERTAIN
FUNDING OPTIONS TO FINANCE CALTRAIN OPERATIONS IN
FY2013 AND BEYOND

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee approve negotiation principles to explore certain funding
options to finance Caltrain operations in Fiscal Year 2013 and beyond. These principles will
allow staff to fully engage the Joint Powers Board (JPB) member agencies and the Metropolitan
Transportation Commission (MTC) in crafting a FY2013 budget-balancing plan.

SIGNIFICANCE
The preliminary FY2012 Caltrain operating budget is proposed to be balanced utilizing a number
of one-time funding sources. Going forward, Caltrain will continue discussions with MTC and
the JPB member agencies in an effort to identify funding options to provide a budget-balancing
proposal for FY2013. Staff intends to bring a proposal back to the Board early this Summer.

Recognizing the challenges faced by the San Mateo County Transit District (District) and the
JPB member agencies in balancing the Caltrain budget over the past several years, staff requests
Board approval on a set of negotiation principles to help facilitate such discussions. These
principles include a number of potential cost allocation formulas that are different from the
allocation arrangements currently being utilized to fund Caltrain. Certain of them, however,
would restore the allocation arrangements to the terms of the 1996 Joint Powers Agreement
(JPA).

Staff proposes that the principles include the following:

1. Changes in the application of the operating cost sharing formulas for the three JPB
   member agencies to better match costs with how each county is currently deriving
   benefits from the Caltrain service;
2. Potential restoration of payment obligations toward operating costs, either in whole or in
   part, associated with the operation of Gilroy Service to the Santa Clara Valley
   Transportation Authority (VTA), in accordance with the JPA;
3. Possible establishment of a management fee for the District, which serves as the managing agency for Caltrain, to better reflect the level of staff resources required to support similar commuter rail operations;

4. Potential use of funds to be received from VTA for partial repayment of the District’s investment in the Caltrain right-of-way, as a funding source of last resort.

**BUDGET IMPACT**

Changes in how Caltrain operating costs are to be allocated, or the potential use of funds received from repayment of District investment in the Caltrain right-of-way, could impact the District’s budget in FY2013 and beyond. The exact budget impacts will depend on which methodology(s) is chosen. As such, when staff returns to the Board with a proposed budget-balancing plan for FY2013, staff will also provide an analysis on the budget impacts at that time.

**BACKGROUND**

The JPB is a compact between the District, the VTA and the City and County of San Francisco through the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA). The District is the managing agency for Caltrain, and per the JPA, as amended in October 3, 1996, each member agency is to subsidize the Caltrain operating budget based upon each county’s morning peak hour boarding.

Over the years, due to financial concerns raised by one or more of the JPB members, these shares have deviated from the terms of the JPA. Currently, the share of Caltrain operating expenses is divided among the member agencies on the following basis: District 42%; VTA 41%; and SFMTA 17%.

Also, per the JPA, VTA was responsible for all net operating costs of the Gilroy Service based upon the fully allocated cost methodology. However, this was changed several years ago, and Gilroy Service is currently included as a mainline component, and operating costs associated with Gilroy have been shared by all three member agencies.

Finally, as the managing agency, the District provides staff support in administering the operating contract for Caltrain as well as providing support in finance, contracting, and other administrative functions. Caltrain, as compared to other public rail agencies, has one of the lowest percentage of administrative staff expenses as a share of the total operating costs.

Prepared By: April Chan, Director, Budgets and Grants 650-508-6228
WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) is a member agency of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB), which is a compact between the District, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and the City and County of San Francisco through the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency; and

WHEREAS, the District is the managing agency and provides staff support in administering the operating contract for Caltrain as well as providing support in finance, contracting, and other administrative functions; and

WHEREAS, the preliminary FY2012 Caltrain operating budget is proposed to be balanced utilizing a number of one-time funding sources, and going forward, the JPB member agencies will need to work to identify funding options to provide a budget-balancing proposal for FY2013; and

WHEREAS, District staff requests Board approval on a set of negotiation principles to help facilitate the discussion of a budget-balancing proposal for FY2013 with the JPB member agencies, and these negotiation principles include a number of potential cost allocation formulas that are different from the cost allocation arrangements currently being utilized to fund Caltrain.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District approves the following negotiation principles to assist staff in exploring certain funding options to finance Caltrain operations in FY 2013 and beyond, and to
allow staff to fully engage the JPB member agencies and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in crafting a FY2013 budget-balancing plan:

1. Changes in the application of the operating cost sharing formulas for the three JPB member agencies to better match costs with how each county is currently deriving benefits from the Caltrain service;
2. Potential restoration of payment obligations toward operating costs, either in whole or in part, associated with the operation of Gilroy Service to the VTA in accordance with the original Joint Powers Agreement (JPA);
3. Possible establishment of a management fee for the District which serves as the managing agency for Caltrain to better reflect the level of staff resources required to support similar commuter rail operations;
4. Potential use of funds to be received from VTA for partial repayment of the District’s investment in the Caltrain right-of-way, as a funding source of last resort.

Regularly passed and adopted this 11th day of May 2011, 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: AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR PURCHASE AND DELIVERY OF
GENERAL OFFICE SUPPLIES AND RELATED ITEMS

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend Board:
1. Award contracts to Office Max, Inc. (Office Max) and Staples, Inc. (Staples) for the
purchase and delivery of general office supplies and related items for a two-year term for
an aggregate total estimated cost of up to $150,000.
2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO or his designee to execute the contracts with Office
Max and Staples.
3. Authorize the General Manager or his designee to exercise up to two one-year option
terms with Office Max and Staples in the aggregate total estimated cost of up to $75,000
for each option year if it is determined to be in the best interest of the District.

SIGNIFICANCE
Award of the contracts will provide the District, as well as the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers
Board (JPB) and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA), with immediate access
for its day-to-day requirements for general office supplies and related items at substantial
discounts compared to retail catalog pricing. Awarding two separate contracts will allow the
District a greater variety of office supplies and the flexibility to shop between the two vendors
for the best price and availability.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funds are available under the approved and projected operating budgets. The District is
reimbursed by the JPB and TA for their share of the supplies.

BACKGROUND
Staff identified cooperative purchasing agreements with both Office Max and Staples that were
competitively negotiated by the State of Oregon using a Best Value approach. The District is
authorized to use the Best Value procurement method to award contracts for equipment,
supplies, or materials over $100,000 where it is determined to be in the best interest of the
District. The Best Value procurement method permits the District to weigh the overall
combination of quality, price, and other elements of a proposal that, when considered together, provide the greatest overall benefit. The Oregon contracts with both Office Max and Staples, available through the Western States Contracting Alliance (WSCA), are offered to state and local government agencies, public schools and not-for-profits nationwide. There is no cost to the District to utilize these contracts. Participants may purchase products on the same highly competitive terms, covenants, conditions, and pricing as Oregon. This contract award will allow the District to avail itself of pricing consistent with wider economies of scale, which is in the District’s best interest.

The contracts will provide for next day desktop delivery directly to designated delivery locations. The contracts will also provide many useful reports such as monthly and year-to-date sales and items ordered for each authorized cost center. The contracts also include catalogs for green or recycled products. Under this program, the District will enjoy volume pricing, generous discounts, an extensive selection of 13,000 items, plus more than 2,500 post-consumer recycled products, and access to over 600 Minority, Women and Emerging Small Business (MWESB)-manufactured items.

Staff conducted a price analysis on the most common office supplies and it was found that Office Max’s and Staples’ pricing is equal to or better than the District’s current cooperative purchasing agreement with Office Max. Staff has determined that the prices offered by Office Max and Staples under the WSCA contracts are fair and reasonable. The contracts will provide the best overall office supply value to the District.

The District’s existing contract with Office Max for $325,000 will expire on May 31, 2011. The contract was procured under the Oakland County, MI cooperative purchasing agreement, America Saves.

Contract Officer: Brian Geiger

650-508-7973
RESOLUTION NO. 2011-

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

* * *

AUTHORIZING AWARD OF CONTRACTS TO OFFICE MAX, INC. AND STAPLES, INC. FOR THE PURCHASE AND DELIVERY OF GENERAL OFFICE SUPPLIES AND RELATED ITEMS THROUGH THE WESTERN STATES CONTRACTING ALLIANCE FOR AN AGGREGATE ESTIMATED COST OF UP TO $150,000 FOR A TWO-YEAR BASE TERM

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) requires general office products, supplies and related items in its day-to-day operations; and

WHEREAS, California Public Contract Code Section 10298 allows the District to participate in cooperative purchasing agreements with agencies outside the state for goods, information technology, and services; and

WHEREAS, the District may contract with suppliers awarded these contracts without additional competitive solicitation procedures; and

WHEREAS, the State of Oregon, through the Western States Contracting Alliance (WSCA) Program, made available to public agencies its general office supplies and related items contracts with Office Max, Inc. (Office Max) and Staples, Inc. (Staples) who were selected through a competitive negotiation process; and

WHEREAS, the District has determined that the purchase of these products through the WSCA Program will allow the District, as well as the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA), to take advantage of volume pricing discounts, extensive selection of items, and high quality service whereas an independent procurement action would likely not yield more favorable pricing or service; and
WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends and the Committee concurs that the Board of Directors authorize the purchase of general office supplies and related items through award of contracts to Staples and Office Max under the WSCA Program.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the District awards contracts to Office Max of Naperville, IL and Staples of Framingham, MA for the purchase of general office supplies and related items through the WSCA Program for a combined total aggregate cost of up to $150,000 for a two-year term, inclusive of all taxes, delivery, and other costs and expenses; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager/CEO or his designee is authorized to execute the contracts on behalf of the District with Office Max and with Staples; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager/CEO or his designee is authorized to execute up to two additional one-year option terms in the aggregate estimated amount of $75,000 for each option year with Office Max and with Staples provided the exercise of such options are determined to be in the best interest of the District.

Regularly passed and adopted this 11 day of May, 2011 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: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR PUBLIC LIABILITY CLAIMS ADMINISTRATION, INVESTIGATION AND ADJUSTMENT SERVICES

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend that the Board:

1. Award a contract for public liability claims administration, investigation and adjustment services to Carl Warren & Company (Carl Warren) for an estimated cost of $542,000 for a five-year period, including assumption fees for approximately 200 open claims, and additional reimbursement for allocated costs estimated at $25,000 for the term of the contract. The total estimated amount for the five-year term is $567,000.

2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO to execute a contract with Carl Warren in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the solicitation and negotiated agreements.

SIGNIFICANCE
Award of this contract will provide the District with an experienced Third Party Administrator to support the District’s public liability claims administration program for claims that fall within established self-insured retentions and insurance deductibles. In the first year of this contract the District will receive the benefit of a 14 percent reduction in per-claim fees as compared to the current contract.

BUDGET IMPACT
These services will be performed for per-claim fees of $550 for the first two years, $565 for the third and fourth years and $580 for the fifth year, plus fees of $250 per claim for assumption of open claims and estimated allocated costs of $25,000 for the five-year term. Allocated costs, such as expert witness fees, photographic expenses, medical reports, and other such reimbursable, out-of-pocket expenses will be reimbursed by the District at cost to Carl Warren. Defense counsel services will be paid at hourly rates of $180 to $195, as needed. In addition, for subrogation services rendered, Carl Warren will receive:

- 20 percent on amounts collected up to $50,000
- 15 percent on collections of $50,000 or more

Funding for these services will be available under future fiscal years’ operating budgets.
BACKGROUND
A Request for Proposals (RFP) to provide public liability claims administration, investigation and adjustment services was issued detailing the scope of services for the District and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board. The solicitation was advertised in a newspaper of general circulation and on the District’s website. Solicitation notices also were sent to interested firms, small business enterprises and disadvantaged business enterprises (DBEs). Staff received proposals from seven firms (one of which is a DBE).

An Evaluation Committee (Committee), comprised of staff with expertise in various disciplines, reviewed and ranked proposals according to the following weighted criteria set forth in the RFP:

- Qualifications and Experience of Firm and Key Personnel 50 points
- Approach to Scope of Services 25 points
- Cost Proposal 25 points

After review, evaluation, and initial scoring of proposals, the Committee invited three firms in the competitive range for interviews. Following interviews, the Committee completed the final evaluation and consensus ranking. The three highest-ranked firms are listed below in order of their consensus rankings.

- Carl Warren & Company, Walnut Creek, CA
- John Glenn Adjusters & Administrators, Inc., San Ramon, CA
- Crawford & Company, Atlanta, GA

The Committee determined that Carl Warren, the highest consensus ranked proposer, is qualified to be selected for contract award. Carl Warren has more than 27 years of transit public liability claims administration experience and is currently providing public liability claims administration services for eleven transit clients, including VTA and Long Beach Transit Authority. This background demonstrates that the firm possesses the depth of experience and required qualifications to successfully perform the scope of services defined in the solicitation documents. In addition, the firm intends to engage one DBE firm as a subcontractor for ancillary and administrative support services.

The firm currently providing public liability claims administration services to the District is John Glenn Adjusters and Administrators, Inc. at a per claim rate of $636.97 and an estimated cost of $1,025,000 for a five-year term.

Contract Officer: Adwoa Oni 650-508-6411
Project Manager: Dave Triolo, Acting Director, Risk Management 650-508-6237
RESOLUTION NO. 2011 -

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

* * *

AUTHORIZING AWARD OF A CONTRACT TO
CARL WARREN & COMPANY FOR PUBLIC LIABILITY CLAIMS
ADMINISTRATION, INVESTIGATION AND ADJUSTMENT SERVICES FOR
A FIVE-YEAR TERM AT AN ESTIMATED COST OF $567,000

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) has solicited competitive proposals for the provision of public liability claims administration, investigation and adjustment services; and

WHEREAS, in response to the District’s advertisement, seven proposals were received; and

WHEREAS, an Evaluation Committee reviewed and ranked the proposals according to the evaluation criteria set forth in the Request for Proposals and conducted interviews with the three highest-ranked firms; and

WHEREAS, upon completion of the evaluation and selection process, Carl Warren & Company (Carl Warren) received the highest consensus ranking; and

WHEREAS, legal counsel has reviewed the Carl Warren proposal and has determined that it complies with the requirements of the solicitation documents; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that the contract be awarded to Carl Warren for a five-year term at an estimated cost of $567,000 inclusive of per claim fees, existing claim assumption fees, and allocated costs, but exclusive of costs for and retention of defense counsel and cost recovery from subrogation services, for which Carl Warren will be paid as a percentage of the subrogation amounts collected.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors (Board) of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby awards a contract to Carl Warren & Company of Walnut Creek, California, for the provision of public liability claims administration, investigation and adjustment services for a five-year term at an estimated cost of $567,000, including assumption fees for approximately 200 open claims; allocated costs of an estimated $5,000 per year; per claim fees of $550 for the first and second contract years, $565 for the third and fourth contract years and $580 for the fifth contract year; and fees for subrogation services rendered as follows: 20 percent on all collections recovered on behalf of the District up to $50,000, and 15 percent on collections of $50,000 or more. Defense counsel fees shall be paid at hourly rates between $180 and $195 during the five-year term.

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 Carl Warren in full conformity with all the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents and negotiated Agreement in a form approved by legal counsel.

Regularly passed and adopted this 11th day of May, 2011, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

____________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

____________________
District Secretary
FINANCE ITEM # 10
MAY 11, 2011

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR LIFE AND ACCIDENTAL DEATH AND DISMEMBERMENT INSURANCE TO STANDARD INSURANCE COMPANY

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend Board approval to contract with Standard Insurance Company (Standard) for the continued provision of basic life and accidental death and dismemberment (AD&D) insurance for a three-year period beginning June 1, 2011. The cost to the District for this coverage is estimated to be $356,400.

SIGNIFICANCE
The District currently provides a minimum of $50,000 life and $15,000 AD&D insurance for all regular employees and members of the Board of Directors.

BUDGET IMPACT
The monthly premium rates for life insurance per $1,000 of coverage will increase from $0.17 to $0.22. The accidental death and dismemberment rate will remain at $0.02 per $1,000 of coverage. Changing from Principal, our current carrier, to Standard results in an annual increase of $25,401. The estimated annual cost is $118,758 incorporated in present and projected budgets. No adjustment to the budget will be necessary.

BACKGROUND
IMAGE Financial & Insurance Services, the District’s insurance brokers for employee benefit programs, solicited for life and accidental death and dismemberment and optional life insurance coverage from eleven carriers. Four carriers, including our current carrier, Principal, provided quotes. A survey of the market has determined that Standard Insurance Company provides the same basic life and accidental death and dismemberment coverage at a lower rate than the other respondents, including our current carrier, Principal. The rate quoted by Standard amounts to a 27.2 percent increase in premiums over last year. The rate is guaranteed for three years effective June 1, 2011.

Standard will also provide Optional Life coverage matching the current benefit levels of a guaranteed issue amount of $200,000 for employees and will grandfather those employees who have already satisfied evidence of insurability. The optional life benefit is an employee-paid benefit.

Prepared by: Monica Colondres, Director, Human Resources 650-508-6233
RESOLUTION NO. 2011-

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

* * *

APPROVING PLACEMENT OF LIFE AND ACCIDENTAL DEATH AND
DISMEMBERMENT INSURANCE COVERAGE WITH
STANDARD INSURANCE COMPANY FOR THREE YEARS
AT AN ESTIMATED ANNUAL COST OF $118,800

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) has solicited life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance coverage from eleven carriers to continue this existing employment benefit, with Standard Insurance Company providing the best prices for the coverage sought; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that the District award a contract to Standard Insurance Company for the placement of life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for all regular employees and Board members at an estimated annual premium cost of $118,800 for three years beginning June 1, 2011.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District approves the placement of life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance coverage with Standard Insurance Company at an estimated annual premium of $118,800 for three years beginning June 1, 2011, with coverage for the entire three-year period at a monthly rate of $0.22 per $1,000 of coverage for basic life insurance coverage and a monthly rate of $0.020 per $1,000 of coverage for accidental death and dismemberment insurance coverage; 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 Standard Insurance Company in full conformity with the terms of this resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 11th day of May 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

District Secretary
TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: PRELIMINARY FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2012 OPERATING BUDGET

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

SIGNIFICANCE
The FY2012 Operating Budget totals $128.4 million, as shown in Attachment A, Total Uses of Funds (page 1, line 24), and is consistent with the directions provided by the Board at a special meeting held on March 24, 2011 to discuss the San Mateo County Transit District’s (District) fiscal crisis. The preliminary budget is projected to decrease by $4.6 million or 3.5 percent from the FY2011 revised budget of $133.0 million.

Sources of Funds
Total sources of funds are projected to be $143.4 million (page 1, line 15), for an increase of $6.4 million or 4.6 percent as detailed below.

Passenger Fares (page 1, line 1), from both Motor Bus and ADA services, are projected at $17.4 million in FY2012, an increase of $0.3 million or 1.7 percent from the FY2011 revised budget.

- Motor Bus Fares are projected to increase by $0.3 million, or 1.5 percent due to a projected ridership increase of 2 percent for FY2012.
- Redi-Wheels Fares are projected to increase by $0.03 million, or 4.4 percent over the FY2011 revised budget primarily due to a Board-approved fare increase effective July 1, 2011 and a projected ridership increase of 2 percent for FY2012.

Local/State/Federal (page 1, lines 2, 4, 5 & 6) funds of $52.2 million reflect a projected increase of $2.0 million or 4.0 percent over the FY2011 revised budget of $50.2 million. The increase is mainly due to the increase in Transportation Development Act funds of $3.3 million or
13.4 percent from the FY2011 revised budget. This is offset by Operating Grants, which are decreasing by $1.3 million or 11.3 percent over the FY2011 revised budget mostly due to less preventive maintenance funding.

Pass through to Other Agencies (page 1, line 3), is $0.3 million, a projected decrease of $1.0 million or 77.5 percent from the FY2011 revised budget, reflecting a decrease in the amount of grants and funds the District passes through to other agencies that cannot claim the funds directly. The corresponding pass through expenditure can be found under Uses of Funds (page 1, line 22), and the amount has been reduced accordingly.

District ½ Cent Sales Tax (page 1, line 8) receipts is $61.5 million, a projected increase of $1.5 million or 2.5 percent from the FY2011 revised budget, based on current sales tax receipts. Investment Interest (page 1, line 10) of $0.3 million reflects a projected decrease of $0.3 million or 46.3 percent from the FY2011 revised budget of $0.6 million. This is due to a decrease in interest rate projections.

Other Interest, Rent & Other Income (page 1, line 11) of $6.0 million reflects a projected increase of $0.9 million or 17.5 percent compared to the FY2011 revised budget. The increase is mostly due to $1.4 million in new Measure M funds for paratransit activities offset by a decrease in advertising revenue. Measure M was approved by the voters in San Mateo County in November 2010 to levy a $10 vehicle registration fee for 25 years on vehicles registered in the county.

Other Sources (page 1, line 12) of $5.7 million represents funds recommended to be used as part of the Samtrans share for Caltrain service and is comprised of a $2 million reimbursement from the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) for the District’s purchase of the Caltrain right-of-way in 1991, and $3.7 million through a one-time swap of capital for operating funds.

Uses of Funds

Operating Costs (page 1, line 24) of $128.4 million are projected to decrease by $4.6 million or 3.5 percent from the FY2011 revised budget of $133.0 million. The decrease is mostly due to a reduction in the District’s contribution to Caltrain and pass-through funding to other organizations.

Sales Tax Allocation - Capital Programs (page 1, line 28) is projected to be $5.0 million, a projected increase of $0.8 million or 19.4 percent compared to the FY2011 revised budget.

Motor Bus Highlights

Total Motor Bus Expense (page 1, line 18) of $99.3 million, reflects a projected increase of $0.4 million or 0.4 percent over the FY2011 revised budget of $99.0 million. Critical Motor Bus elements include:

- Wages and Benefits (page 3, line 1) are projected to decrease $1.1 million or 2.0 percent as a result of decreases in employee allocations to District operations and Bus Operator overtime.
- Professional Services (page 3, line 6) costs are projected to increase $0.6 million or 15.5 percent due to consultant costs associated with several planning projects, including ones funded by Metropolitan Transportation Commission Climate Initiative and U.S. Department of Transportation Tiger II grants. Consultant costs are also included for a facility emergency plan and a Contracts and Procurement plan update.
• Contracted Bus Service (page 3, line 43) is projected to increase $1.0 million or 5.8 percent, primarily due to higher contract costs resulting from an increase of approximately 21,500 vehicle revenue miles and a projected 5 percent increase in the Vehicle Revenue Mile rate.

Paratransit Highlights
The FY2012 budget (page 1, line 19) of $14.1 million is a projected increase of $0.3 million or 2.3 percent over the FY2011 revised budget mainly due to contract rate increases for paratransit services.

Caltrain Service
In FY2012, the proposed District partner member agency share for Caltrain Service (page 1, line 20), is $10.6 million. This amount represents the District’s contribution as one of the three member agencies that support Caltrain operations. This is projected to decrease $4.1 million or 27.8 percent from FY2011 revised budget of $14.7 million. SamTrans has been funding the operating budget with significant amount of reserves which is not a financially sustainable practice. Since decreasing its contribution to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB), it is expected that other JPB member agencies’ shares will decrease accordingly. In FY2012, staff recommends funding the $10.6 million Caltrain payment with $4.92 million from San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) Measure A funds, $2 million reimbursement from the VTA for the District’s purchase of the Caltrain right-of-way in 1991, and $3.7 million through a one-time swap of capital for operating funds.

Other Multi-Modal Programs
In FY2012, support costs for various shuttle programs (Dumbarton Express, SamTrans and Caltrain Shuttles) and the multimodal maintenance facility is projected to decrease $0.2 million or 5.7 percent from the FY2011 revised budget (page 1, line 21), primarily due to the elimination of costs incurred in FY2011 for East Palo Alto’s JARC shuttle. SamTrans was acting as a pass-through agent for the City of East Palo Alto. The grant funds have since been exhausted.

Land Transfer Interest Expense
The FY2012 budget includes $0.1 million (page 1, line 23) in interest expense which represents SamTrans’ 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 preliminary FY2012 budget is consistent with the District’s Strategic Plan. The proposed budget lays out expenses consistent with the strategic plan vision and goals related to the 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 customers, while promoting employee excellence in a very challenging economic environment.

Prepared by: Ladi Bhuller, Manager, Budgets       650.508.7755
Chris Petak, Senior Budget Analyst        650.508.7754
San Mateo County Transit District

 FY2012 Proposed Operating Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF FUNDS:</th>
<th>FY2010 Actual</th>
<th>FY2011 Adopted</th>
<th>FY2011 Revised</th>
<th>FY2012 Proposed</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>FY12 Proposed Compared to FY11 Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BUDGET PERCENT CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares</td>
<td>17,149,123</td>
<td>17,157,400</td>
<td>17,157,400</td>
<td>17,443,300</td>
<td>285,900</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TDA and STA Funds</td>
<td>27,173,376</td>
<td>30,860,639</td>
<td>29,835,175</td>
<td>33,000,814</td>
<td>3,165,639</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass through to Other Agencies</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>975,293</td>
<td>1,250,896</td>
<td>281,790</td>
<td>(969,106)</td>
<td>-77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>10,353,903</td>
<td>10,577,283</td>
<td>11,499,767</td>
<td>10,202,814</td>
<td>1,296,910</td>
<td>-11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A</td>
<td>8,123,327</td>
<td>8,280,728</td>
<td>8,280,728</td>
<td>8,461,335</td>
<td>162,447</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB434 Funds</td>
<td>547,570</td>
<td>536,000</td>
<td>536,000</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>63,422,298</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,405,503</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,578,126</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,925,096</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,346,970</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td>58,487,550</td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
<td>61,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Interest</td>
<td>523,596</td>
<td>564,170</td>
<td>557,121</td>
<td>299,360</td>
<td>(257,711)</td>
<td>-46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Interest, Rent &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>6,094,775</td>
<td>5,082,780</td>
<td>5,082,780</td>
<td>5,972,275</td>
<td>889,495</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources</td>
<td>2,811,073</td>
<td>2,811,073</td>
<td>5,700,000</td>
<td>2,888,927</td>
<td>102.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Other Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,105,921</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,458,023</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,450,974</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,471,635</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,020,661.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources of Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>128,528,219</strong></td>
<td><strong>136,863,526</strong></td>
<td><strong>137,029,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>143,396,731</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,367,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USES OF FUNDS:</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>FY12 Proposed Compared to FY11 Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Bus</td>
<td>90,687,064</td>
<td>98,189,247</td>
<td>98,990,997</td>
<td>99,342,910</td>
<td>351,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D.A. Programs</td>
<td>12,908,024</td>
<td>13,773,430</td>
<td>13,773,430</td>
<td>14,085,146</td>
<td>311,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>10,620,000</td>
<td>(4,087,875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multi-Modal Programs</td>
<td>4,502,064</td>
<td>4,084,620</td>
<td>4,205,354</td>
<td>3,967,406</td>
<td>(237,948)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass through to Other Agencies</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>975,293</td>
<td>1,250,896</td>
<td>281,790</td>
<td>(969,106)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Transfer Interest Expense</td>
<td>142,288</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Uses of Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>124,835,730</strong></td>
<td><strong>131,810,465</strong></td>
<td><strong>133,008,552</strong></td>
<td><strong>128,367,252</strong></td>
<td><strong>(4,641,300)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL OPERATING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>FY12 Proposed Compared to FY11 Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Allocation - Capital Programs</td>
<td>4,185,803</td>
<td>4,176,971</td>
<td>4,176,971</td>
<td>4,986,380</td>
<td>809,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(493,315)</strong></td>
<td><strong>876,090</strong></td>
<td><strong>(156,423)</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,043,099</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,199,522</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEBT SERVICE</th>
<th>SOURCES OF FUNDS:</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>FY12 Proposed Compared to FY11 Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment Interest</td>
<td>4,679,009</td>
<td>3,605,840</td>
<td>2,914,637</td>
<td>2,914,637</td>
<td><strong>1,063,377</strong></td>
<td>-38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources of Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,679,009</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,605,840</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,914,637</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,063,377</strong></td>
<td><strong>-38.5%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USES OF FUNDS:</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>FY12 Proposed Compared to FY11 Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>24,449,862</td>
<td>24,451,963</td>
<td>24,451,963</td>
<td>24,477,279</td>
<td>25,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Agent Fees</td>
<td>21,520</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>25,080</td>
<td>(2,320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Uses of Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,471,382</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,479,363</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,479,363</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,502,359</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,996</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Debt Service - BART - $12.7M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE OF RESERVES FOR DEBT SERVICE</th>
<th>FY2010</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>FY12 Proposed Compared to FY11 Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(19,792,373)</td>
<td>(20,873,523)</td>
<td>(21,564,726)</td>
<td>(22,651,099)</td>
<td>(1,086,373)</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL USES OF RESERVES** | **(20,285,687)** | **(19,997,433)** | **(21,721,149)** | **(12,608,000)** | **9,113,149** | **5.0%**|
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY2012 Proposed Operating Budget</th>
<th>FY2011 Revised Budget</th>
<th>FY2011 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY2010 Actual Budget</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total Motor Bus Fares</td>
<td>16,609,000</td>
<td>16,358,000</td>
<td>16,358,000</td>
<td>16,469,617</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local (TDA) Transit Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>General Operating Assistance</td>
<td>26,648,636</td>
<td>23,503,880</td>
<td>23,503,880</td>
<td>25,426,608</td>
<td>3,144,756</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>State Transit Assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>STA Base</td>
<td>4,444,973</td>
<td>4,483,131</td>
<td>4,483,131</td>
<td>2,66,917</td>
<td>(38,158)</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total STA</td>
<td>4,444,973</td>
<td>4,483,131</td>
<td>4,483,131</td>
<td>2,66,917</td>
<td>(38,158)</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Operating Grants:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>General Operating Assistance</td>
<td>26,648,636</td>
<td>23,503,880</td>
<td>23,503,880</td>
<td>25,426,608</td>
<td>3,144,756</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Total Operating Grants</td>
<td>26,648,636</td>
<td>23,503,880</td>
<td>23,503,880</td>
<td>25,426,608</td>
<td>3,144,756</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Investment Interest Income</td>
<td>39,781,543</td>
<td>39,859,672</td>
<td>39,859,672</td>
<td>35,801,892</td>
<td>3,949,651</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Total Other Revenues</td>
<td>39,781,543</td>
<td>39,859,672</td>
<td>39,859,672</td>
<td>35,801,892</td>
<td>3,949,651</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>99,090,997</td>
<td>98,189,247</td>
<td>98,189,247</td>
<td>90,687,066</td>
<td>8,402,931</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>American Disabilities Act:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Passenger Fares-Redi Wheels</td>
<td>834,300</td>
<td>799,400</td>
<td>799,400</td>
<td>679,505</td>
<td>54,900</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Local TDA 4.5 Redi Wheels</td>
<td>1,420,000</td>
<td>1,420,000</td>
<td>1,420,000</td>
<td>1,268,943</td>
<td>161,057</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Local STA-Paratransit</td>
<td>1,389,273</td>
<td>1,094,747</td>
<td>1,094,747</td>
<td>1,563,052</td>
<td>(163,775)</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Total ADA Programs</td>
<td>3,881,356</td>
<td>3,387,258</td>
<td>3,387,258</td>
<td>3,968,858</td>
<td>(587,502)</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Multi-Modal Transit Programs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sales Tax- Caltrain</td>
<td>4,820,000</td>
<td>4,820,000</td>
<td>4,820,000</td>
<td>4,678,802</td>
<td>141,198</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>State Tax - Caltrain</td>
<td>1,370,135</td>
<td>1,047,940</td>
<td>1,047,940</td>
<td>1,211,315</td>
<td>(163,375)</td>
<td>-13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Total Multi-Modal</td>
<td>14,085,146</td>
<td>14,085,146</td>
<td>14,085,146</td>
<td>12,908,025</td>
<td>1,177,121</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>128,015,462</td>
<td>128,015,462</td>
<td>128,015,462</td>
<td>124,618,446</td>
<td>3,497,016</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY2012 Proposed Operating Budget

### FY2012 Proposed Compared to FY11 Revised Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT OPERATED BUSES</th>
<th>FY2010 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY2011 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY2011 REVISED</th>
<th>FY2012 PROPOSED</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E = D-C</td>
<td>F = E/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Benefits</td>
<td>50,832,635</td>
<td>54,414,983</td>
<td>54,414,983</td>
<td>53,342,357</td>
<td>(1,072,626)</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>52,638</td>
<td>53,100</td>
<td>53,100</td>
<td>53,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>568,345</td>
<td>930,600</td>
<td>930,600</td>
<td>785,250</td>
<td>(145,350)</td>
<td>-15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Maintenance</td>
<td>1,073,561</td>
<td>1,282,500</td>
<td>1,282,500</td>
<td>1,278,500</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>2,359,105</td>
<td>2,950,181</td>
<td>2,950,181</td>
<td>2,418,134</td>
<td>561,417</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>3,654,782</td>
<td>3,907,744</td>
<td>3,907,744</td>
<td>4,008,902</td>
<td>(35,422)</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>325,307</td>
<td>362,924</td>
<td>362,924</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>127,576</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Supply:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel and Lubricants</td>
<td>4,074,175</td>
<td>5,582,214</td>
<td>5,582,214</td>
<td>5,636,357</td>
<td>54,143</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Parts and Materials</td>
<td>1,806,647</td>
<td>1,750,972</td>
<td>1,750,972</td>
<td>1,765,700</td>
<td>14,728</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform and Drivers Expense</td>
<td>290,733</td>
<td>379,098</td>
<td>379,098</td>
<td>391,380</td>
<td>12,282</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetables and Tickets</td>
<td>186,762</td>
<td>213,800</td>
<td>213,800</td>
<td>153,100</td>
<td>(60,700)</td>
<td>-28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies/Printing</td>
<td>283,971</td>
<td>332,130</td>
<td>332,130</td>
<td>334,874</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Materials and Supply</td>
<td>146,260</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>166,000</td>
<td>(9,000)</td>
<td>-5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total District Operated Buses</td>
<td>74,469,526</td>
<td>81,694,357</td>
<td>82,496,107</td>
<td>81,892,009</td>
<td>(604,098)</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONTRACTED BUS SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY2011 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY2011 REVISED</th>
<th>FY2012 PROPOSED</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E = D-C</td>
<td>F = E/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Urban Bus Service</td>
<td>14,200,400</td>
<td>14,488,202</td>
<td>14,488,202</td>
<td>15,360,895</td>
<td>872,693</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>349,014</td>
<td>310,800</td>
<td>310,800</td>
<td>337,960</td>
<td>27,160</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>654,913</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>611,578</td>
<td>568,256</td>
<td>568,256</td>
<td>630,630</td>
<td>62,374</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redi Coast Non-ADA</td>
<td>198,169</td>
<td>222,860</td>
<td>222,860</td>
<td>238,216</td>
<td>15,356</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>17,684</td>
<td>41,660</td>
<td>41,660</td>
<td>41,720</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Honda Pescadero</td>
<td>52,500</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>128,539</td>
<td>141,662</td>
<td>141,662</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>(21,662)</td>
<td>-15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs-SanCoast</td>
<td>5,741</td>
<td>13,950</td>
<td>13,950</td>
<td>13,980</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contracted Bus Service</td>
<td>16,217,538</td>
<td>16,494,890</td>
<td>16,494,890</td>
<td>17,450,901</td>
<td>956,011</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL MOTOR BUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2010 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY2011 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY2011 REVISED</th>
<th>FY2012 PROPOSED</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>PERCENT CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E = D-C</td>
<td>F = E/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90,687,064</td>
<td>98,189,247</td>
<td>98,990,997</td>
<td>99,342,910</td>
<td>351,913</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT PROGRAMS</td>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>Increase/ (Decrease)</td>
<td>PERCENT CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E = D-C</td>
<td>F = E/C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled/Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>5,676,413</td>
<td>6,769,180</td>
<td>6,769,180</td>
<td>6,916,605</td>
<td>147,425</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>2,091,162</td>
<td>2,527,380</td>
<td>2,527,380</td>
<td>2,740,065</td>
<td>212,685</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Sedan Service</td>
<td>2,730,742</td>
<td>1,781,024</td>
<td>1,781,024</td>
<td>1,744,040</td>
<td>(36,984)</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Accessibility Support</td>
<td>773,396</td>
<td>880,120</td>
<td>880,120</td>
<td>1,012,680</td>
<td>132,560</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastside Support</td>
<td>1,121,409</td>
<td>1,300,726</td>
<td>1,300,726</td>
<td>1,156,756</td>
<td>(143,970)</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>514,902</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ADA PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>12,908,024</td>
<td>13,773,430</td>
<td>13,773,430</td>
<td>14,085,146</td>
<td>311,716</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTI-MODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALTRAIN SERVICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Rail Service</td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>10,620,000</td>
<td>(4,087,875)</td>
<td>-27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Caltrain Service</strong></td>
<td>16,521,290</td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>10,620,000</td>
<td>(4,087,875)</td>
<td>-27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Express Service</td>
<td>119,036</td>
<td>126,150</td>
<td>126,150</td>
<td>126,160</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SamTrans Shuttle</td>
<td>2,462,886</td>
<td>2,251,360</td>
<td>2,251,360</td>
<td>2,256,540</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM/Caltrain Shuttle</td>
<td>1,771,585</td>
<td>1,515,010</td>
<td>1,635,744</td>
<td>1,392,606</td>
<td>(243,138)</td>
<td>-14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Multimodal Fac</td>
<td>148,557</td>
<td>192,100</td>
<td>192,100</td>
<td>192,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Support</strong></td>
<td>4,502,064</td>
<td>4,084,620</td>
<td>4,205,354</td>
<td>3,967,406</td>
<td>(237,948)</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTI-MODAL PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>21,023,354</td>
<td>18,792,495</td>
<td>18,913,229</td>
<td>14,587,406</td>
<td>(4,325,823)</td>
<td>-22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>124,618,442</td>
<td>130,755,172</td>
<td>131,677,656</td>
<td>128,015,462</td>
<td>(3,662,194)</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINANCE ITEM # 12
MAY 11, 2011

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: PRELIMINARY FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2012 CAPITAL BUDGET

ACTION
This report is submitted for informational purposes only. Staff will bring this item back to the
Board at the June 8, 2011 meeting with a request that the Committee recommend Board adoption
of the Fiscal Year 2012 Capital Budget at that time.

SIGNIFICANCE
In light of the current fiscal climate, the FY2012 Capital Budget contains only those projects
necessary and essential to sustain the San Mateo County Transit District’s (District’s) existing
service and infrastructure network, without compromising the District’s need to comply with
legal mandates and to plan for visions set forth in the District’s adopted Strategic Plan. The
FY2012 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. This category also includes the annual procurement of
  bus parts, engines and transmissions, replacement of maintenance support equipment and the
  replacement of service support vehicles. The amount budgeted for this category totals
  $2,116,940.

- **Information Technology (IT) Software and Hardware Upgrade & Replacement** –
  Includes funding to upgrade the Radio Backbone, to meet the new Federal Communications
  Commission (FCC) narrowbanding requirements which take effect in January 2013. The
  funding will replace the District’s aging and unsupported communications equipment,
  Computer Aided Dispatch and Automatic Vehicle Location mobile equipment. The total
  replacement cost is $10,700,000.

Also included are funds to fully fund the first two phases of the PeopleSoft System
Integration Project/Business Optimization Program which includes the plan, design and
prototype demonstration of the PeopleSoft applications and deployment of core finance
modules. Funds will come from all three agencies, the District, the Peninsula Corridor Joint
Powers Board (JPB) and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA), which share
the project costs proportionately based on benefits accruing to each agency. The amount
budgeted for this project totals $2,456,200.
The proposed Capital Budget in this category also includes replacement and upgrade of Informational Technology equipment, servers and software applications necessary to maintain the connectivity of various departments and external communications. The total amount budgeted in the IT-related category including the three projects discussed above totals $13,815,200.

- **Planning / 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 $1,098,120.

- **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, security improvement projects to continue the SamTrans safety and security program and a sustainability program to help reduce the District’s carbon footprint. The amount budgeted for these projects totals $1,900,734.

- **Contingency** – Includes funding for any unforeseen and emergency capital expenditures during the fiscal year. The amount budgeted for this category is $250,000.

**BUDGET IMPACT**

Of the $19,180,994 recommended for the FY2012 Capital Budget, the total amount of sales tax required is $4,986,380. Federal, State and other fund sources make up the remaining amount of $14,194,614 to fully fund the FY2012 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 and key Strategic Plan Initiatives. 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
## REVENUE VEHICLES REPLACEMENT

1.1 Replacement (10) Paratransit Cutaways  
Replace 10 2005 El Dorado Cutaways at the end of their useful lives.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2012 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$999,800</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$999,800</td>
<td>$799,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $999,800

## REVENUE VEHICLE SUPPORT

2.1 Major Bus Components  
Annual funding for procurement of bus parts.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2012 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$985,140</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$985,140</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $985,140

2.2 Non-Revenue Service Support Vehicles  
Replace 4 non-revenue service support vehicles that have reached the end of their useful lives.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2012 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$132,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $1,117,140

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

3.1 Radio Backbone (RF Communications) Replacement and Upgrade  
Replace mobile AVL and communications equipment that has reached the end of its useful life and to meet new Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regulations. Increase data and voice communications capabilities, while conforming with the FCC narrowbanding mandate by January 1, 2013.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2012 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,700,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$10,700,000</td>
<td>$8,560,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $10,700,000

3.2 Technology Refresh Project  
Replace and upgrade Dell servers and out of warranty printers, copiers, fax machines and scanners. Warranty is expiring in FY2012.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2012 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$659,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$659,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $659,000

3.3 PeopleSoft Project Upgrade Phases I and II  
Phases 1 & 2 of the PeopleSoft System Integration project including plan, design & prototype demonstration and deployment of core finance functionality.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2012 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$11,200,000</td>
<td>$8,743,800</td>
<td>$2,456,200</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $13,815,200

## PLANNING / DEVELOPMENT

4.1 Comprehensive Operational Analysis  
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.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2012 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,872,720</td>
<td>$1,074,800</td>
<td>$598,120</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $1,872,720

4.2 Capital Program and Project Development  
Capitalized funds for annual program development including but not limited to plans, budgets, programs, funding strategies, and preliminary engineering.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2012 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $250,000

4.3 Capital Program Management  
Capitalized funds for program and project controls support, including monitoring project performance and delivery.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2012 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal: $250,000
## San Mateo County Transit District
### Proposed Fiscal Year 2012 Capital Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2012 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1 Facilities Smaller Projects</td>
<td>Facility maintenance/Improvement Account</td>
<td>$ 562,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 562,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 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>$ 162,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 162,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Central Heating, Ventilation &amp; Air Conditioning (HVAC) Maintenance at Central</td>
<td>Conduct basic repair and maintenance of existing HVAC system that has reached the end of its useful life.</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 Sustainable Program Development</td>
<td>Project will identify proposed actions to reduce the District’s carbon footprint.</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 100,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5 Safety and Risk Management Office Functional Improvement</td>
<td>Project will reconfigure the current office space in Safety and Risk Management Offices and also the Transit Police Offices for more efficient and effective use of these areas.</td>
<td>$ 320,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 85,000</td>
<td>$ 235,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6 Receptionist Area Security Improvement</td>
<td>Project would provide improved security at the Central receptionist area; this is the primary physical receiving point between District staff and the public.</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 55,000</td>
<td>$ 195,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.7 Emergency Operations Center Relocation</td>
<td>This project would relocate the Emergency Operations Center to the 4th floor dining room to provide the necessary working space.</td>
<td>$ 85,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 85,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.8 Sequoia Station Underground Garage Security Improvements</td>
<td>This project would put in cameras, alarms and communication systems to help reduce vandalism and crime at the Sequoia Station Underground Parking Garage.</td>
<td>$ 950,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 255,000</td>
<td>$ 695,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.9 Central Security Office Upgrade</td>
<td>Project provides for technological integration and updates, room reconfiguration and upgrades for effective safety and security monitoring and response.</td>
<td>$ 1,100,000</td>
<td>$ 603,266</td>
<td>$ 496,734</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,900,734</td>
<td>$ 1,225,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 996,734</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1 Contingency</td>
<td>Annual set-aside for unforeseen and emergency capital expenditures.</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL FOR SAMTRANS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 19,180,994</td>
<td>$ 1,225,000</td>
<td>$ 9,359,840</td>
<td>$ 3,146,694</td>
<td>$ 1,688,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
A) Funding will come from PCJPB and SMCTA for their share of the project.
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, MAY 11, 2011 – 2:40 p.m.
or immediately following previous Committee meeting

ACTION

1. Approval of Minutes of Legislative Committee Meeting of April 13, 2011

INFORMATIONAL

2. State and Federal Legislative Update

Committee Members: Zoe Kersteen-Tucker, Omar Ahmad, Rose Guilbault

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: O. Ahmad, R. Guilbault

Committee Members Absent: Z. Kersteen-Tucker (Committee Chair)

Other Board Members Present, Constituting Committee of the Whole: J. Deal, C. Groom, S. Harris, A. Lloyd, K. Matsumoto, A. Tissier

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

Director Rose Guilbault called the meeting to order at 2:59 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Legislative Committee Meeting of March 9, 2011
The committee approved the minutes (Lloyd/Harris); Ahmad abstained.

Update on the State Legislative Program
Government Affairs Manager Seamus Murphy said the governor signed AB 105, which reenacted the gas tax swap. It protects $330 million in State Transit Assistance (STA) funding which turns into $3.4 million for SamTrans and $4.2 million for Caltrain. The governor signed that piece of the budget, but the State still has about a $14.7 billion hole and it is unclear how the gap will be filled. There is a revenue approach that would include ballot measures that at some point would be before voters to extend existing taxes. There also is a suggestion that the Legislature could be presented with a cuts-only budget to fill the gap through cuts to existing programs and staff is concerned this could potentially affect the STA program or a portion of it. Staff met with the local legislative delegation recently to explain to them the risks associated with budget cuts to the STA program and urged them to not approve any budget that includes any reduction to the STA program.

Update on Federal Legislative Program
Mr. Murphy thanked Chair Karyl Matsumoto and Directors Shirley Harris and Zoe Kersteen-Tucker for participating in the American Public Transportation Association Legislative Conference. The group met with the SamTrans’ delegation to advocate for protection of discretionary grant programs or existing grant obligations that have been received by the agency or by transit interests in the county. Congress is moving forward with a number of continuing resolutions that have gradually cut discretionary programs and $16 million has been directed to this corridor from the High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Program through the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). Over the April 9 weekend the Obama Administration avoided a government shutdown by negotiating a short-term continuing resolution and an additional continuing resolution that would cover the remainder of Fiscal Year 2011. The High
Speed Rail Program would have $400 million in 2010 funding rescinded. The $16 million that is directed to the Peninsula corridor is not affected by the rescission. The $400 million comes from the Florida share of the 2010 money which was rejected by Florida and that money will not be available to be reallocated to other states, but $2 billion of the Florida money that was rejected is available because it is American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding. The 2011 program is zero, but none of that affects the California share of funding that has been allocated to the Central Valley or the $16 million that has been allocated to the Peninsula Corridor. The TIGER program is where the funding for the Grand Boulevard Initiative Project originated. Staff was nervous this funding would be rescinded, but the Federal Transit Administration signed the cooperative agreement obligating the funds. The size of the TIGER program was reduced from $600 million in 2010 to $527 million in 2011. The Railroad Safety Technology Grant Program funding for 2011 was zeroed out.

Adjourned: 3:07 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 in accordance with the approved Legislative Program.

STATE ISSUES

Legislation
As budget talks continue, the Legislature is proceeding with committee hearings to consider other legislation. Staff and Caltrain’s legislative advocates have taken steps to support several bills at the committee level including:

AB 147 (Dickenson) – This bill would authorize cities and counties to utilize developer impact fees for transit, bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

AB 485 (Ma) – This bill would authorize cities and counties to create Infrastructure Financing Districts (IFDs) to encourage transit-oriented development.

AB 650 (Blumenfield) – This bill would establish a task force to study the State’s transit needs, evaluate funding solutions and issue a report with recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature.

AB 892 (Lowenthal) – This bill provides for the extension of Caltrans' National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) delegation authority by extending a waiver of sovereign immunity as required by the pilot program authorizing states to assume federal responsibility for all NEPA actions.
AB 1105 (Gordon) – This bill would allow a future high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane implemented through authorization granted to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to extend into the portion of State Route 101 covered by the existing high-occupancy vehicle lane in San Mateo County.

AB 1308 (Miller) – This bill would allow funds from the Highway Users Tax Account to be continuously appropriated to cities and counties when a Budget Act has not been approved by the Legislature and signed by the Governor by July 1 of any year.

SB 582 (Emmerson) – This bill would authorize a metropolitan planning organizations and an air quality management district to jointly adopt an ordinance requiring employers to participate in federal pre-tax transit commuter benefits programs.

SB 867 (Padilla) – This bill authorizes the California Transportation Financing Authority to issue up to $5 billion in Build California Bonds to fund transportation and transit infrastructure improvements throughout the State.

**FEDERAL ISSUES**
Nothing to report.

Prepared By: Seamus Murphy, Government Affairs Manager 650-508-6388
## AB 16
**Perea D**
**High-Speed Rail Authority.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/25/2011 - Action From TRANS.: Do pass. To APPR.</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. The federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) provides funding for allocation nationally to high-speed rail projects. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AB 31
**Beall D**
**Land use: high-speed rail: local master plan.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSEMBLY L. GOV. 3/25/2011 - Re-referred to Com. on L. GOV.</td>
<td>The California High-Speed Rail Act establishes the High-Speed Rail Authority to develop and implement an intercity high-speed rail system in the state, exclusively grants to the authority the responsibility for planning, construction, and operation of that system, and confers upon the authority specified powers and duties relating to that system. This bill would establish the High-Speed Rail Local Master Plan Pilot Program, applicable to specified cities and counties, and would authorize each of those jurisdictions to prepare and adopt, by ordinance, a master plan for development in the areas surrounding the high-speed rail system in each jurisdiction. The bill would authorize the high-speed rail master plan to include incentives for encouraging investment and coherent growth in the areas surrounding the high-speed rail system in each jurisdiction. The bill would also authorize the participating jurisdictions to collaborate with the State Air Resources Board to develop incentives to encourage development while concurrently reducing greenhouse gas emissions, consistent with or pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 or another specified provision of law requiring the board to provide greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for the preparation of regional sustainable communities strategies. The bill would authorize the master plan to exceed the requirements of the jurisdiction's general plan or the applicable regional sustainable communities strategy with respect to fostering sustainable communities around the high-speed rail system. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Last Amended on 3/24/2011

## AB 41
**Hill D**
**Conflicts of interest: disqualification.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENATE RLS. 4/14/2011 - In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment.</td>
<td>Existing provisions of the Political Reform Act of 1974 prohibit a public official at any level of state or local government from making, participating in making, or attempting to use his or her official position to influence a governmental decision in which he or she knows or has reason to know that he or she has a financial interest, as defined. Existing law also requires specified elected and appointed officers at the state and local level of government to disclose specified financial interests by filing periodic statements of economic interests. Existing law further requires public officials who hold specified offices and who have a financial interest in a decision within the meaning of the Political Reform Act of 1974 to publicly identify the financial interest giving rise to the conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest, recuse themselves from discussing and voting on the matter, and leave the room until after the discussion, vote, and other disposition of the matter is concluded, except as specified. This bill would add members of the High-Speed Rail Authority to those specified offices who must publicly identify a financial interest giving rise to a conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest, and recuse themselves accordingly. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 57</strong>&lt;br&gt;Beall D&lt;br&gt;Metropolitan Transportation Commission.</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/7/2011 - From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 9. Noes 0.) (April 6). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 58</strong>&lt;br&gt;Galgiani D&lt;br&gt;High-speed rail.</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 3/17/2011 - Re-referred to Com. on TRANS. 5/2/2011 2 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202 ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION, LOWENTHAL, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 76</strong>&lt;br&gt;Harkey R&lt;br&gt;High-speed rail.</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 4/11/2011 - Action From TRANS.: Failed passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 105</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Budget</td>
<td>CHAPTERED 3/24/2011 - Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 6, Statutes of 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 145</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galgiani D</td>
<td>APPR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-speed rail.</td>
<td>4/25/2011 - Action From TRANS.: Do pass. To APPR.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AB 147**  
Dickinson  
D  
Subdivisions. | ASSEMBLY THIRD READING  
4/28/2011 #79 ASSEMBLY ASSEMBLY THIRD READING FILE | The Subdivision Map Act authorizes a local agency to require the payment of a fee as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a building permit for purposes of defraying the actual or estimated cost of constructing bridges or major thoroughfares if specified conditions are met. The Mitigation Fee Act authorizes a local agency to charge a variety of fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions in connection with the approval of a development project, as defined.  
This bill would authorize a local ordinance to require payment of a fee subject to the Mitigation Fee Act, as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a building permit for purposes of defraying the actual or estimated cost of constructing transportation facilities, as defined. **Last Amended on 4/4/2011** |
| **AB 277**  
Galgiani  
D  
High-speed rail: power supply. | ASSEMBLY APPR.  
4/25/2011 - Do pass and be re-referred to the Appropriations. | Existing law 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. Various federal laws provide funding for allocation nationally to high-speed rail and other related projects.  
This bill would require the California Research Bureau, by May 1, 2012, to develop an energy consumption profile that includes a forecast of the power needs of the high-speed rail system and an analysis of any recommendations for identifying a carbon-free baseline power supply for the system. The bureau's work would be done in consultation with the High-Speed Rail Authority, the Federal Railroad Administration, the Public Utilities Commission, the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission, the United States Department of Energy, and the Legislative Analyst's Office. The bill would require the bureau to submit its report to the authority, the authority's independent peer review group, and specified committees of the Legislature. This bill contains other related provisions. **Last Amended on 4/7/2011** |
| **AB 296**  
Skinner  
D  
Building standards: cool pavement. | ASSEMBLY NAT. RES.  
4/25/2011 - From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on NAT. RES. Read second time and amended.  
5/2/2011 1:30 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 447 ASSEMBLY NATURAL RESOURCES, CHESBRO, Chair | Existing law requires the Department of Transportation to adopt a balanced, multimodal research and development program, including the research and development of new technologies.  
This bill would establish the Cool Pavements Research and Implementation Act and would require the department, in consultation with specified state agencies, to implement the act. The bill would require the department to adopt a strategy, through a public process, to implement the act and, by January 1, 2015, to adopt by regulation a Cool Pavements Handbook to detail testing protocols, standards, and best practices. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. **Last Amended on 4/25/2011** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 320</strong> Hill D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/13/2011 - Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td>The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, which includes a local agency, to prepare, or cause to be prepared by contract, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report on a project, as defined, 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 requires a lead agency to file a notice of approval or a notice of determination containing specified information with the Office of Planning Research or the county clerk of each county in which the project is located, as appropriate. CEQA provides a procedure by which a party may attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the determination, finding, or decision of a public agency on specified grounds and requires that a petitioner or plaintiff name, as a real party in interest, a recipient of an approval that is the subject of an action or proceeding challenging the determination, finding, or decision of a public agency pursuant to CEQA. This bill would require that the named recipient be as identified by the public agency in its notice of determination or notice of exemption. The bill would require that a petition or complaint be subject to dismissal if a petitioner or plaintiff fails to serve any recipient of an approval within the statute of limitations period. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <strong>Last Amended on 4/12/2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 333</strong> Grove R</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES. 2/24/2011 - Referred to Com. on NAT. RES. 5/2/2011 1:30 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 447 ASSEMBLY NATURAL RESOURCES, CHESBRO, Chair</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The state board is required to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020, and to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions. This bill would require the state board to exempt from an emission reduction requirement adopted pursuant to the act an emissions source located within a county that on January 1, 2012, has an unemployment rate of 7% or greater, until that county's unemployment rate drops below 7% for 6 consecutive months.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 348</strong> Buchanan D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY CONSENT CALENDAR 4/25/2011 - Action From TRANS.: Do pass. To CONSENT CALENDAR.</td>
<td>Existing law requires the Department of Transportation to designate a state highway segment as a Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zone if specified conditions are met, including that the governing board of the city or county in which the segment is located has by resolution indicated that it supports the designation. This bill would, notwithstanding these requirements and until January 1, 2017, designate the segment of county highway known as Vasco Road, between the State Highway Route 580 junction in Alameda County and the Walnut Boulevard intersection in Contra Costa County, as a Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zone upon the approval of the boards of supervisors of Alameda County and Contra Costa County. The bill would also impose specified duties on the local governing bodies regarding that double fine zone. <strong>Last Amended on 4/13/2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 381</strong> Alejo D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY PRINT 2/15/2011 - From printer. May be heard in committee March 17.</td>
<td>Existing law creates the Department of Transportation, within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, under the administration of the Director of Transportation, who is required to organize the department, as specified, with the approval of the Governor and the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency. This bill would make a non-substantive, grammatical change to that provision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 385</td>
<td>Assemble Trans. 4/25/2011 - From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on TRANS. Read second time and amended. 5/2/2011 2 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202 ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION, LOWENTHAL, Chair</td>
<td>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. Existing law, the California High-Speed Rail 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 requires the authority to approve and submit to the Director of Finance, a specified peer review group, the transportation policy committees and fiscal committees of the Legislature, a detailed funding plan for that corridor or a usable segment thereof of the high-speed train system. Existing law requires the funding plan to include certain information and meet specified requirements. This bill would require the authority to approve an investment grade analysis, to be prepared by the State Auditor, and to submit that investment grade analysis to those same entities. The bill would require that investment grade analysis to include certain information and meet specified requirements. Last Amended on 4/25/2011</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 426</td>
<td>Senate T. &amp; H. 4/25/2011 - Referred to Com. on T. &amp; H.</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes certain transit operators 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 otherwise applicable, 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. This bill would authorize the Southern California Regional Rail Authority to adopt and enforce such an ordinance. The bill would provide that a person cited under these ordinances adopted by transit operators shall be afforded an opportunity to complete the administrative process under the circumstances set forth in the ordinance. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. Last Amended on 3/31/2011</td>
<td>D</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 427</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/25/2011 - Action From TRANS.: Do pass. To APPR..</td>
<td>Existing law, the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, authorizes the issuance of $19.925 billion of general obligation bonds for specified purposes. Existing law requires the deposit of $1 billion of the bond proceeds in the Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Account to be used, upon appropriation, for capital projects that provide increased protection against a security and safety threat, and for capital expenditures to increase the capacity of transit operators to develop disaster response transportation systems that can move people, goods, and emergency personnel and equipment in the aftermath of a disaster impairing that movement. Existing law designates the California Emergency Management Agency as the administrative agency for this account and requires the allocation of 60% of the funds in the account for capital expenditures to transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions, and certain other transit-related agencies, as specified, and 15% of the funds for capital expenditures to specified intercity passenger rail systems and commuter rail systems. Existing law provides that operators that receive those funds for intercity passenger rail systems and commuter rail systems are not eligible for those funds designated for capital expenditures of transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions, and other specified transit-related agencies. This bill would instead authorize operators that receive funds from the account for intercity passenger rail systems and commuter rail systems to also be eligible for funds designated for capital expenditures of transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions, and other specified transit-related agencies. The bill would require an entity eligible to receive allocations of any of those funds to submit a document within a specified time to the California Emergency Management Agency that indicates the intent to use the funds and would, if the document is not submitted, authorize the California Emergency Management Agency to reallocate the funds. The bill would require the California Emergency Management Agency to notify a transportation planning agency if funds allocated to an entity within the region of the transportation planning agency are being reallocated and, if the transportation planning agency provides a document to the California Emergency Management Agency indicating its intent to distribute the funds to transit operators or rail operators, would require the funds to be allocated to the transportation planning agency. The bill would authorize the California Emergency Management Agency to allocate the funds on a competitive basis to an eligible entity in a different region of the state if the transportation planning agency does not receive an allocation to distribute funds to transit operators and rail operators, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions. Last Amended on 3/29/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **AB 471**  
Lowenthal, Bonnie D | ASSEMBLY TRANS.  
4/25/2011 - From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on TRANS. Read second time and amended.  
5/2/2011 2 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202  
ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION, LOWENTHAL, Chair | Existing law, the California High-Speed Rail 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 create an independent inspector general to oversee the activities of the authority, and conduct investigations and audits in that regard. The inspector general would be appointed for a 6-year term by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the Senate. The bill would require the inspector general to report quarterly to the authority and annually to the Governor and the Legislature. **Last Amended on 4/25/2011** | Support |
| **AB 485**  
Ma D | ASSEMBLY THIRD READING  
4/28/2011 #48  
ASSEMBLY ASSEMBLY THIRD READING FILE | The Transit Village Development Planning Act of 1994 authorizes a city or county to create a transit village plan for a transit village development district that addresses specified characteristics. Existing law authorizes the legislative body of the city or county to adopt an infrastructure financing plan, create an infrastructure financing district, and issue bonds for which only the district is liable, to finance specified public facilities, upon voter approval.  
This bill would eliminate the requirement of voter approval for the adoption of an infrastructure financing plan, the creation of an infrastructure financing district, and the issuance of bonds with respect to a transit village development district. The bill would require a city or county that uses infrastructure financing district bonds to finance its transit village development district to use at least 20% of the revenue from those bonds for the purposes of increasing, improving, and preserving the supply of lower and moderate-income housing; to require that those housing units remain available and occupied by moderate-, low-, very low, and extremely low income households for at least 55 years for rental units and 45 years for owner-occupied units; and to rehabilitate, develop, or construct for rental or sale to persons and families of low or moderate income an equal number of replacement dwellings to those removed or destroyed from the low- and moderate-income segment of the housing market as a result of the development of the district, as specified. The bill would set forth the findings and declarations of the Legislature, and the intent of the Legislature that the development of transit village development districts be environmentally conscious and sustainable, and that related construction meet or exceed the requirements of the California Green Building Standards Code. | Support |
| **AB 492**  
Galgiani D | ASSEMBLY APPR.  
4/25/2011 - Action From TRANS.: Do pass. To APPR., | 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 or purchasing high-speed trains, as specified. | Support |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 508</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/14/2011 - From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 5. Noes 1.) (April 13). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td>Displaced public transit, solid waste handling, and recycling services employees. Existing law requires a local government agency letting a public transit service contract out to bid to give a bidding preference for contractors and subcontractors who agree to retain, for a period of at least 90 days, certain employees who were employed to perform essentially the same services by the previous contractor or subcontractor. Under this law, contractors or subcontractors who agree to retain employees must offer employment to those employees except for reasonable and substantiated cause. Additionally, the law provides that if a successor contractor or subcontractor determines that fewer employees are needed than under the prior contract, qualified employees must be retained by seniority within the job classification. Further, the existing contractor, when required by the awarding authority, must provide employment information relating to wage rates, benefits, dates of hire, and job classifications of employees under the existing service contract to the awarding authority or a successor contractor.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 516</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/14/2011 - Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td>Safe routes to school. Existing law requires the Department of Transportation, in consultation with the California Highway Patrol, to establish and administer a &quot;Safe Routes to School&quot; program for construction of bicycle and pedestrian safety and traffic calming projects, and to award grants to local agencies in that regard from available federal and state funds, based on the results of a statewide competition. Existing law requires the department to rate proposals submitted by applicants using specified factors. One of the factors relates to consultation of and support for projects by school-based organizations, local traffic engineers, local elected officials, law enforcement agencies, school officials, and other relevant community stakeholders. This bill would delete that factor and instead substitute a factor relating to use of a specified public participation process, with involvement by the public, schools, parents, teachers, local agencies, the business community, key professionals, and others, which process identifies community priorities and ensures those priorities are reflected in the proposal, and secures support for the proposal by relevant community stakeholders. The bill would add another factor relating to benefit of a proposal to a low-income school, as defined, and would make other related changes. <strong>Last Amended on 4/13/2011</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 522</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY PRINT 2/16/2011 - From printer. May be heard in committee March 18.</td>
<td>Vacation of public streets, highways, and public service easements. Existing law establishes the processes and procedures necessary for vacation of public streets, highways, and public service easements, and defines &quot;vacation&quot; for these purposes to mean the complete or partial abandonment or termination of the public right to use a public street, highway, or public service easement. Under these provisions, proof of publication of a required notice is made by affidavit. This bill would make a non-substantive change to these provisions.</td>
<td>D</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>AB 535</strong> Morrell R</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY B.,P. &amp; C.P. 3/31/2011 - Referred to Com. on B., P. &amp; C.P. 5/3/2011 9 a.m. - State Capitol, Room 447 ASSEMBLY BUSINESS, PROFESSIONS AND CONSUMER PROTECTION, HAYASHI, chair</td>
<td>The Administrative Procedure Act generally sets forth the requirements for the adoption, publication, review, and implementation of regulations by state agencies. This bill would additionally require a state agency to review and report on regulations that it adopts or amends on and after January 1, 2012, 5 years after adoption, as specified. The bill would require that the review and report include 10 specified factors, including a summary of the written criticisms of the regulation received by the agency within the immediately preceding 5 years and the estimated economic, small business, and consumer impact of the regulation. The bill would require the Office of Administrative Law to make the review and report available on the office's Internet Web site.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 551 Campos D</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY JUD. 4/14/2011 - From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on JUD. (Ayes 5. Noes 1.) (April 13). Re-referred to Com. on JUD. 4/26/2011 9 a.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202 ASSEMBLY JUDICIARY, FEUER, Chair</td>
<td>Existing law generally requires that not less than the general prevailing rate of per diem wages, as specified, be paid to workers employed on a public work, as defined. Existing law requires a contractor or subcontractor to submit, to the state or political subdivision on whose behalf a public work is being performed, a penalty of not more than $50 per calendar day, and not less than $10 per calendar day, as provided and determined by the Labor Commissioner, for violations of these prevailing wage provisions. This bill would increase that maximum penalty to $100 for each calendar day and would increase the minimum penalty to no less than $40 for each calendar day. The bill would also increase the penalty assessed to contractors and subcontractors with prior violations from $20 to $80, and from $30 to $120 for willful violations. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 567 Valadao R</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY PRINT 2/17/2011 - From printer. May be heard in committee March 19.</td>
<td>Existing law requires specified funds made available for transportation capital improvement projects to be programmed and expended for interregional and regional improvements, as specified. This bill would make non-substantive changes to these provisions.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 570 Smyth R</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY PRINT 2/17/2011 - From printer. May be heard in committee March 19.</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 establishes the State Air Resources Board as the state agency responsible for monitoring and regulating sources emitting greenhouse gases. The act requires the state board to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit to be achieved by 2020, equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions levels in 1990. The act requires the state board, on or before January 1, 2011, to adopt greenhouse gas emission limits and emission reduction measures by regulation to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases, in furtherance of achieving the statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit, with the regulations to become operative beginning January 1, 2012. This bill would make technical and non-substantive changes to the above requirements.</td>
<td>R</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 598 Grove R</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES. 4/4/2011 - Re-referred to Com. on NAT. RES.</td>
<td>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. This bill would limit the standing to file and maintain the above action or proceeding to the Attorney General. This bill contains other existing laws. <strong>Last Amended on 3/31/2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 605 Dickinson D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES. 3/3/2011 - Referred to Com. on NAT. RES.</td>
<td>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. This bill would require the Office of Planning and Research, in consultation with specified entities, to prepare and adopt guidelines that would, among other things, establish the percentage reduction in the projected trip generation and vehicle miles traveled for a project as compared to the average for trip generation and vehicle miles traveled for that project type that would assist a region in meeting the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets established by the State Air Resources Board for the automobile and light truck sector for that region, and develop a list of mitigation measures that a project may incorporate to reduce the project's projected trip generation and vehicle miles traveled. The bill would provide that a project meeting or exceeding the percentage reduction in trip generation and vehicle miles traveled or a project that incorporates the listed mitigation measures sufficient to allow the project to meet the percentage reduction would not need to consider the transportation-related impact of the project in environmental documents prepared pursuant to CEQA. Because a lead agency would be required to determine whether a project would meet the percentage reduction established by the guidelines, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bill ID/Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### AB 615
**Lowenthal, Bonnie D**

**High-speed rail.**

**ASSEMBLY TRANS.**

4/25/2011 - From committee chair, with author’s amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on TRANS. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on TRANS.

Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with specified powers and duties relative to development and implementation of a high-speed train system, including the acquisition of rights-of-way through purchase and eminent domain. 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 for high-speed train capital projects and other associated purposes.

This bill would enact similar exceptions, authorizations, and exemptions relative to real property obtained for high-speed rail purposes by the High-Speed Rail Authority. The bill would make various additional conforming changes. The bill would also enact new provisions governing acquisition or disposal of right-of-way property by the authority. The bill would require payments for leases or other conveyances of property controlled by the authority to be deposited with the authority for use in development, improvement, and maintenance of the high-speed rail system. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Last Amended on 4/25/2011**

#### AB 650
**Blumenfield D**

**Blue Ribbon Task Force on Public Transportation for the 21st Century.**

**ASSEMBLY APPR.**

4/12/2011 - From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 9, Noes 1) (April 11). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

Existing law establishes various boards and commissions within state government. Existing law establishes various transit districts and other local entities for development of public transit on a regional basis and makes various state revenues available to those entities for those purposes. Existing law declares that the fostering, continuance, and development of public transportation systems are a matter of statewide concern. The Public Transportation Account is designated as a trust fund and funds in the account shall be available to the Department of Transportation only for specified transportation planning and mass transportation purposes.

This bill would establish the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Public Transportation for the 21st Century. The bill would require the task force to be comprised of 12 specified members and would require the Senate Committee on Rules and the Speaker of the Assembly to jointly appoint these members, including a chair, by March 31, 2012. The bill would require the task force to issue a written report that contains specified findings and recommendations relating to, among other things, the current state of California’s transit system, the estimated cost of creating the needed system over various terms, and potential sources of funding to sustain the transit system’s needs, and to submit the report by March 31, 2013, to the Governor, the Legislature, the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, the Senate Committee on Rules, the Speaker of the Assembly, and the transportation committees of the Legislature. The bill would require the task force, for purposes of collecting information for the written report, to consult with appropriate state agencies and departments and would require the task force to contract with consultants for preparation of the report. The bill would require the department to provide administrative staffing to the task force. The bill would appropriate $750,000 from the Public Transportation Account to the department, as specified, to accomplish the purposes of these provisions.

**Support**

**Last Amended on 3/31/2011**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 676 Torres D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 4/4/2011 - In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>Existing law establishes a policy for expenditure of certain state and federal funds available to the state for transportation purposes. Under this policy, the Department of Transportation and the California Transportation Commission develop a fund estimate of available funds for purposes of adopting the state transportation improvement program, which is a listing of capital improvement projects. After deducting expenditures for administration, operation, maintenance, local assistance, safety, rehabilitation, and certain environmental enhancement and mitigation expenditures, the remaining funds are available for capital improvement projects. This bill would provide that the remaining funds are available for the study of, and development and implementation of, capital improvement projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 710 Skinner D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY H. &amp; C.D. 4/25/2011 - Re-referred to Com. on H. &amp; C.D. From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on H. &amp; C.D. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on H. &amp; C.D. 4/27/2011 9 a.m. - State Capitol, Room 126 ASSEMBLY HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, TORRES, Chair</td>
<td>The Planning and Zoning Law requires specified regional transportation planning agencies to prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system, and requires the regional transportation plan to include, among other things, a sustainable communities strategy, for the purpose of using local planning to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This bill would state the findings and declarations of the Legislature with respect to parking requirements and infill and transit-oriented development, and would state the intent of the Legislature to reduce unnecessary government regulation and to reduce the cost of development by eliminating excessive minimum parking requirements for infill and transit-oriented development. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <strong>Last Amended on 4/25/2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 819 Wieckowski D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 4/4/2011 - Re-referred to Com. on TRANS.</td>
<td>Existing law requires the Department of Transportation, in cooperation with county and city governments, to establish minimum safety design criteria for the planning and construction of bikeways, and authorizes cities, counties, and local agencies to establish bikeways. Existing law defines 3 classes of bikeways for its purposes. This bill would include a class IV bikeway among the bikeways subject to the above provisions and would define a class IV bikeway to include a segregated bike lane which provides exclusive use of bicycles on streets, as specified. <strong>Last Amended on 3/31/2011</strong></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><strong>AB 845</strong> Ma D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 4/11/2011 - In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author. 5/2/2011 2 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202 ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION, LOWENTHAL, Chair</td>
<td>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, including $950 million to be allocated by the California Transportation Commission to eligible recipients for capital improvements to intercity and commuter rail lines and urban rail transit systems in connection with or otherwise related to the high-speed train system. Of this amount, 80% is to be allocated to eligible commuter and urban rail recipients based on track miles, vehicle miles, and passenger trips pursuant to guidelines to be adopted by the commission. A dollar-for-dollar match is to be provided by a commuter and urban rail recipient for bond funds received. This bill would require the guidelines adopted by the commission to determine the funding share for each eligible commuter and urban rail recipient to use the distribution factors gathered from the most current available data in the National Transit Database of the Federal Transit Administration. The bill would require the commission to accept from each eligible recipient a priority list of projects up to the target amount expected to be available for the recipient and would require matching funds provided by the recipient to be from non-state funds. The bill would define &quot;non-state matching funds&quot; for purposes of these bond fund allocations to mean local, federal, and private funds, as well as state funds available to an eligible recipient that are not subject to allocation by the commission.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 892</strong> Carter D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/25/2011 - Action From TRANS.: Do pass as amended. To APPR..</td>
<td>Existing law gives the Department of Transportation full possession and control of the state highway system. Existing federal law requires the United States Secretary of Transportation to carry out a surface transportation project delivery pilot program, under which the participating states assume certain responsibilities for environmental review and clearance of transportation projects that would otherwise be the responsibility of the federal government. Existing law, until January 1, 2012, provides that the State of California consents to the jurisdiction of the federal courts with regard to the compliance, discharge, or enforcement of the responsibilities it assumed as a participant in the pilot program. This bill would delete this repeal date and extend the operation of these provisions until January 1, 2019, or until the termination of a certain memorandum of understanding between the department and the Federal Highway Administration, as specified.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 912</strong> Gordon D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY L. GOV. 3/14/2011 - Referred to Com. on L. GOV. 5/11/2011 1:30 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 447 ASSEMBLY LOCAL GOVERNMENT, SMYTH, Chair</td>
<td>The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 requires a local agency formation commission, where the commission is considering a change of organization that consists of a dissolution, disincorporation, incorporation, establishment of a subsidiary district, consolidation, or merger, to either order a change of organization subject to confirmation of the voters, as specified, or order the change of organization without an election if the change of organization meets certain requirements. This bill would authorize the commission, where the commission is considering a change of organization that consists of the dissolution of a district with zero sphere of influence, to immediately order the dissolution if the dissolution was initiated by the district board, or to, within 30 days following the approval of the application by the commission, hold at least one noticed public hearing on the proposal, and order the dissolution without an election, unless a majority protest exists, as specified.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Last Amended on 4/6/2011**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 952 Jones R</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY E. &amp; R. 4/25/2011 - Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on E. &amp; R. 5/3/2011 1:30 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 444 ASSEMBLY ELECTIONS AND REDISTRICTING, FONG, Chair</td>
<td>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. Members of the authority are subject to the Political Reform Act of 1974. This bill would prohibit a member, employee, or consultant of the authority from being the recipient of any gift, as defined, in a specified provision of the act. The bill would prohibit a construction company, engineering firm, consultant, legal firm, or any other company, vendor, or business entity with a contract or seeking a contract with the authority, or subcontractor of any of the foregoing, or owner, employee, or any member of their immediate families of any of these companies, firms, vendors, entities, or subcontractors, from making any gift to a member, employee, or consultant of the authority, or to any member of their immediate families. This bill contains other related provisions. <strong>Last Amended on 4/25/2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 953 Jones R</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 4/25/2011 - Action From TRANS.: Reconsideration granted.</td>
<td>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. Under federal law, funding is made available for allocation nationally to high-speed rail and other related projects. This bill would provide that no funds from Proposition 1A shall be available to the High-Speed Rail Authority for construction of the high-speed train system until adequate environmental studies are completed based on a new ridership study that uses an acceptable ridership evaluation methodology. The bill would require the authority to contract with the Institute of Transportation Studies at the University of California at Berkeley to complete a revised ridership study, using the ridership methodology of the institute. The bill would require the authority to use that ridership study as the basis for subsequent environmental studies. The bill would also require the authority to reconsider its adoption of the optimal high-speed rail route based both on the new ridership study and the ridership methodology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 957 Committee on Transportation</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/25/2011 - Action From TRANS.: Do pass. To APPR.</td>
<td>Existing law, the Sacramento Regional Transit District Act, creates the Sacramento Regional Transit District, with specified powers and duties relative to providing transit services in the Sacramento region. Existing law provides that the district is comprised of specified cities and unincorporated territories in the Counties of Sacramento and Yolo. Existing law sets forth provisions for transition from the Sacramento Transit Authority to the district and also sets forth provisions applicable to the establishment of the first board of the district. This bill would provide that the district includes the Cities of Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, and West Sacramento. The bill would delete obsolete provisions relating to the transition from the authority to the district and establishment of the district's first board. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <strong>Last Amended on 4/13/2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 988</strong> Grove R</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY L. &amp; E. 3/10/2011 - Referred to Coms. on L. &amp; E. and JUD.</td>
<td>Existing law defines the term &quot;public works&quot; for purposes of requirements regarding the payment of prevailing wages, the regulation of working hours, and the securing of workers' compensation for public works projects. Existing law further requires that, except as specified, not less than the general prevailing rate of per diem wages, determined by the Director of Industrial Relations as specified, be paid to workers employed on public works projects, and imposes misdemeanor penalties for certain violations of this requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevailing wages.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This bill would revise the manner in which the director determines the rate of general prevailing wages, including deleting the requirement that he or she consider the applicable wage rates established by collective bargaining agreements and the rates that may have been predetermined for federal public works, and deleting the requirement that the director consider further data from labor organizations and employers or employer associations and concerns where the rates do not constitute the rates actually paid in the locality. The bill would also revise the methodology that the director is required to use in determining the general prevailing rate of per diem wages in the locality in which the public work is to be performed, including deleting certain requirement, and requiring the director to conduct a survey of the wages paid for work performed in each locality in which the public work is to be performed. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1092</strong> Lowenthal, Bonnie D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/25/2011 - Action From TRANS.: Do pass. To APPR..</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-speed rail.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This bill would require the authority to report bimonthly to the Legislature beginning March 1, 2012, on the status of the project, including overall progress, the project budget, expenditures to date, a comparison of the current and project work schedule and the baseline schedule contained in the 2009 business plan, project milestones, and other related issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1097</strong> Skinner D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 4/25/2011 - From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to Com. on TRANS. Read second time and amended. 5/2/2011 2 p.m. - State Capitol, Room 4202 ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION, LO WENTHAL, Chair</td>
<td>Existing law creates the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency with various departments of state government that report to the agency secretary. Existing law provides various sources of funding for transit projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit projects: domestic content.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This bill would require the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing to specifically authorize a state or local agency receiving federal funds for transit purposes to provide a bidding preference to a bidder if the bidder meets or exceeds Buy America requirements applicable to federally funded transit projects. <strong>Last Amended on 4/25/2011</strong></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><strong>AB 1105</strong> Gordon D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/14/2011 - Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) to conduct, administer, and operate a value pricing high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane program on 2 corridors included in the high-occupancy vehicle lane system in Santa Clara County. This bill would provide that such a HOT lane established on State Highway Route 101 may extend into San Mateo County as far as the high-occupancy vehicle lane in that county existed as of January 1, 2011, subject to agreement of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <strong>Last Amended on 4/13/2011</strong></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1164</strong> Gordon D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 4/25/2011 - Action From TRANS.: Do pass.</td>
<td>Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority within the state government with various powers and duties relative to development and implementation of a high-speed passenger train system. Existing law provides that 5 of the 9 members comprising the authority shall be appointed by the Governor. This bill would require that those gubernatorial appointments be made with the advice and consent of the Senate. <strong>Last Amended on 4/7/2011</strong></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><strong>AB 1206</strong> Galgiani  D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY  B., P. &amp; C.P. 4/12/2011 - From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on B., P. &amp; C.P. (Ayes 12. Noes 1.) (April 11). Re-referred to Com. on B., P. &amp; C.P.</td>
<td>High-speed rail: contracts: small businesses. 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. Under federal law, funding is made available for allocation nationally to high-speed rail and other related projects. This bill would require the authority to identify essential components of, and adopt, a small business enterprise program as part of contracts to be awarded by the authority relative to development and construction of the high-speed rail system and to adopt an oversight and accountability program for the small business enterprise program. The bill would require the authority to report annually to the Department of General Services and Legislature in that regard and post the report on its Internet Web site. <strong>Last Amended on 3/30/2011</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1287</strong> Buchanan  D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY  L. GOV. 3/21/2011 - Referred to Com. on L. GOV.</td>
<td>Local government: audits. Existing law requires school districts to comply with General Accounting Office standards for financial and compliance audits, as specified, and prohibits an independent auditor from engaging in financial compliance audits unless, within 3 years of commencing the first of the audits, and every 3 years thereafter, the auditor completes a quality control review in accordance with General Accounting Office standards. This bill would require local agencies, defined to include cities, counties, a city and county, special districts, authorities, or public agencies, to comply with General Accounting Office standards for financial and compliance audits and would prohibit an independent auditor from engaging in financial compliance audits unless, within 3 years of commencing the first of the audits, and every 3 years thereafter, the auditor completes a quality control review in accordance with General Accounting Office standards.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1298</strong> Blumenfield  D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY  TRANS. 4/11/2011 - Re-referred to Com. on TRANS.</td>
<td>Vehicles: parking: 72-hour restriction. Existing law authorizes the removal of a parked vehicle when that vehicle is parked or left standing upon a highway for 72 or more consecutive hours in violation of a local ordinance authorizing its removal. This bill would authorize a local jurisdiction, by ordinance, to establish a minimum distance that a vehicle is to be moved for the purpose of the above 72-hour parking restriction. <strong>Last Amended on 4/7/2011</strong></td>
<td>D</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 1308</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR.</td>
<td>Article XIX of the California Constitution requires revenues from state excise taxes on motor vehicle fuels for use in motor vehicles upon public streets and highways, over and above the cost of collection and any refunds authorized by law, to be used for various street and highway purposes and for certain mass transit guideway purposes. Existing law requires state excise fuel tax revenues to be deposited in various accounts and to be allocated, in part, for various purposes, including the cost of collection and authorized refunds. Existing law requires the balance of these funds remaining after authorized deductions to be transferred to and deposited monthly in the Highway Users Tax Account in the Transportation Tax Fund. Existing law provides for formula apportionment of specified revenues in the Highway Users Tax Account to cities and counties for the transportation purposes authorized by Article XIX of the California Constitution, and requires other portions of those revenues to be transferred to and deposited in the State Highway Account in the State Transportation Fund. Existing law provides that the money in the Highway Users Tax Account is appropriated for the above-described transportation purposes, but also generally provides that the money in the State Highway Account may not be expended until appropriated by the Legislature. This bill, in any year in which the Budget Act has not been enacted by July 1, would provide that all moneys in the Highway Users Tax Account in the Transportation Tax Fund, except as specified, are continuously appropriated and may be encumbered for certain purposes until the Budget Act is enacted. The bill would thereby make an appropriation. The bill would authorize the Controller to make estimates in order to implement these provisions.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller R</td>
<td>4/12/2011 - From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. with recommendation: to consent calendar. (Ayes 12, Noes 0) (April 11). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1332</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES.</td>
<td>Existing law establishes the State Air Resources Board as the state agency with primary jurisdiction over the regulation of air pollution, including greenhouse gas emissions. Existing law creates the state board within the California Environmental Protection Agency with prescribed membership. This bill would abolish the State Air Resources Board and transfer its authority, duties, powers, purposes, responsibilities, and jurisdiction to the California Environmental Protection Agency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Air Resources Board: abolishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1335</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY PRINT</td>
<td>Existing law makes certain findings and declarations relating to the prohibition against the availability of state surplus or state loan funds, in the 1978-79 fiscal year, to any local public agency that provides an increase in salary in that fiscal year to any elected or appointed official, and cost-of-living increase for other individuals. This bill would make technical, non-substantive changes to these findings and declarations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lara D</td>
<td>2/22/2011 - From printer. May be heard in committee March 22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government: officials: salary increases.</td>
<td></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><strong>AB 1388</strong> Wieckowski D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY SECOND READING 4/25/2011 - From committee: Do pass as amended. (Ayes 7. Noes 2.) (April 12). 4/28/2011 #12 ASSEMBLY ASSEMBLY SECOND READING FILE</td>
<td>Existing law requires an employer to withhold the amounts required by an earnings withholding order from all earnings of the employee payable for any pay period of the employee that ends during the withholding period. Under existing law, the portion of the judgment debtor's earnings that the judgment debtor proves is necessary for the support of the judgment debtor or the judgment debtor's family supported in whole or in part by the judgment debtor is exempt from the levy of an earnings withholding order. This exemption is not available if the debt was incurred for the common necessaries of life furnished to the judgment debtor or the family of the judgment debtor. This bill would delete that restriction on the exemption from the levy of an earnings withholding order. <strong>Last Amended on 3/14/2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABX1 8</strong> Ma D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY PRINT 12/7/2010 - From printer.</td>
<td>Existing law, the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, authorizes the issuance of general obligation bonds for various transportation purposes. Existing law requires that $1,000,000,000 of those funds be deposited in the Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Account, administered by the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA), for capital projects that provide increased protection against a security and safety threat, and for capital expenditures to increase the capacity of transit operators to develop disaster response transportation systems, as specified. Existing law requires 25% of the available funds to be allocated to certain regional public waterborne transit agencies. Existing law requires entities receiving funds from the account to expend those funds within 3 fiscal years of the fiscal year in which the funds were allocated and requires that funds remaining unexpended after those 3 years revert to Cal EMA for reallocation in subsequent fiscal years. This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AJR 5</strong> Lowenthal, Bonnie D</td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 4/14/2011 - Re-referred to Com. on T. &amp; H. 5/10/2011 1:30 p.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203) SENATE TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING, DESaulnier, Chairman</td>
<td>This measure would request the President and the Congress of the United States to consider and enact legislation to conduct a study regarding the feasibility of the collection process for a transportation revenue source based on vehicle miles traveled, in order to facilitate the creation of a reliable and steady transportation funding mechanism for the maintenance and improvement of surface transportation infrastructure. <strong>Last Amended on 3/29/2011</strong></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>SB 22 La Malfa R</td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 4/4/2011 - Set for hearing April 26. 4/26/2011 1:30 p.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203) SENATE TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING, DESaulnier R, Chairman</td>
<td>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, provides for the issuance of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related purposes. Article XVI of the California Constitution authorizes the Legislature, at any time after the approval of a general obligation bond act by the people, to reduce the amount of the indebtedness authorized by the act to an amount not less than the amount contracted at the time of the reduction or to repeal the act if no debt has been contracted. This bill would reduce the amount of general obligation debt authorized pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century to the amount contracted as of January 1, 2012. Last Amended on 3/24/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 46 Correa D</td>
<td>SENATE G. &amp; F. 4/6/2011 - From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on GOV. &amp; F. 4/27/2011 9:30 a.m. - Room 112 SENATE GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE, Wolk, Chair</td>
<td>Existing provisions of the Political Reform Act of 1974 require certain persons employed by agencies to file annually a written statement of the economic interests they possess during specified periods. The act requires that state agencies promulgate a conflict of interest code that must contain, among other topics, provisions that require designated employees to file statements disclosing reportable investments, business positions, interests in real property, and income. The act requires that every report and statement filed pursuant to the act is a public record and is open to public inspection. This bill would, until January 1, 2019, require every person, except a candidate for public office, who is required to file a statement of economic interests to include, as a part of that filing, a compensation disclosure form that provides compensation information for the preceding calendar year, as specified. This bill would, until January 1, 2019, require each designated employee who is required to file statements under a conflict of interest code to include, as a part of that filing, a compensation disclosure form that provides compensation information for the preceding calendar year. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. Last Amended on 4/6/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 50 Correa D</td>
<td>SENATE APPR. 4/13/2011 - Set for hearing May 2. 5/2/2011 11 a.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room 4203 SENATE APPROPRIATIONS, KEhoe, Chair</td>
<td>Existing provisions of the Political Reform Act of 1974 prohibit a public official at any level of state or local government from making, participating in making, or attempting to use his or her official position to influence a governmental decision in which he or she knows or has reason to know that he or she has a financial interest, as defined. Existing law also requires specified elected and appointed officers at the state and local level of government to disclose specified financial interests by filing periodic statements of economic interests. Existing law further requires public officials who hold specified offices and who have a financial interest in a decision within the meaning of the Political Reform Act of 1974 to publicly identify the financial interest giving rise to the conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest, recuse themselves from discussing and voting on the matter, and leave the room until after the discussion, vote, and other disposition of the matter is concluded, except as specified. This bill would add members of the High-Speed Rail Authority to those specified offices who must publicly identify a financial interest giving rise to a conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest, and recuse themselves accordingly. 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><strong>SB 126</strong></td>
<td>SENATE APPR.</td>
<td>Existing law generally provides for programming and allocation of state and federal funds available for transportation capital improvement projects by the California Transportation Commission, pursuant to various requirements. Existing law authorizes the commission, in certain cases, to adopt guidelines relative to its programming and allocation policies and procedures.</td>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinberg</td>
<td>4/14/2011 - Set for hearing May 2.  5/2/2011 11 a.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room 4203  SENATE APPROPRIATIONS, KEHOE, Chair</td>
<td>This bill would establish specified procedures that the commission would be required to utilize when it adopts guidelines, except as specified, and would exempt the adoption of those guidelines from the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Transportation Commission: guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 211</strong></td>
<td>SENATE E.Q.</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The state board is required to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020, and to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions. A violation of a regulation adopted by the state board pursuant to the act is subject to specified civil and criminal penalties. Pursuant to the act, the state board adopted a regulation requiring automobile service providers, by September 1, 2010, among other things, to check and inflate vehicle tires to the recommended pressure rating when performing automobile maintenance or repair services. This bill would authorize a tire pressure gauge used to meet the requirements of this regulation to be accurate within a range of plus or minus 2 pounds per square inch of pressure (2 psi). The bill would limit penalties for a violation of the requirements of the regulation to a civil penalty of not more than $20 for the first offense and not more than $50 for each subsequent offense. The bill would prohibit the imposition of a civil or criminal penalty upon a customer of an automobile service provider for a violation of the requirements of the regulation. Last Amended on 3/14/2011</td>
<td><strong>R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmerson</td>
<td>4/5/2011 - Set for hearing May 2.  5/2/2011 1:30 p.m. - Room 112  SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, SIMITIAN, Chairman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SB 241
**Cannella R**
**Location:**
- 5/2/2011 1:30 p.m. - Room 112
- SENATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY, SIMITIAN, Chairman

**Summary:**
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 the judicial review of a lead agency's decision to certify an EIR.

The bill would enact the CEQA Litigation Protection Pilot Program of 2011 and would require the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency to select projects that meet specified requirements from specified regions for each calendar year between 2012 and 2016. The bill would exempt from judicial review, pursuant to CEQA, a lead agency's decision to certify the EIR of, or to adopt a mitigated negative declaration based on an initial study for, the selected projects, a lead agency's and responsible agency's approval of the selected project, and the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency's selection of the projects. The bill would require the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, by December 31 of each year, to submit an annual report to the Governor and to the Legislature summarizing the designation of projects, and the job creation and investment attributable to the designated projects. This bill contains other related provisions.

### SB 310
**Hancock D**
**Location:**
- 4/27/2011 9:30 a.m. - Room 112
- SENATE GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE, WOLK, Chair

**Summary:**
Existing law authorizes the legislative body of a city or county to adopt an infrastructure financing plan, which is required to contain specified information, for the purpose of financing certain infrastructure facilities, if specified procedural requirements are met, and requires the legislative body, if it adopts the plan, to submit the proposal to the voters. Existing law authorizes the legislative body to create an infrastructure financing district, by ordinance, if 2/3 of the qualified electors of the proposed district vote in favor of adoption of the plan, and also authorizes the legislative body to initiate proceedings to issue bonds to finance the infrastructure facilities if 2/3 of those electors vote in favor of the issuance. Existing law authorizes infrastructure finance districts to finance specified projects, including financing certain infrastructure facilities.

This bill would eliminate the requirement of voter approval and authorize the legislative body to create the district, adopt the plan, and issue the bonds by resolutions. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. Last Amended on 4/25/2011

### SB 316
**Emmerson R**
**Location:**
- 4/27/2011 9:30 a.m. - Rose Ann Vuich Hearing Room (2040) SENATE LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, LIEU, Chair

**Summary:**
Existing law prohibits, subject to certain exceptions, an employer from requiring an employee to work more than 5 hours per day without providing a meal period and, notwithstanding that provision, authorizes the Industrial Welfare Commission to adopt a working condition order permitting a meal period to commence after 6 hours of work if the order is consistent with the health and welfare of affected employees.

This bill would add employees employed in the transportation industry, as defined, to the list of employees exempt from the above provisions. This bill contains other existing laws.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 392</strong></td>
<td>SENATE</td>
<td>Existing law establishes the California Transportation Commission and authorizes the commission to alter or change the location of any state highway if, in the opinion of the commission, the alteration is for the best interest of the state. This bill would make a non-substantive change to these provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaines R</strong></td>
<td>RLS. 2/24/2011 - Referred to Com. on RLS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 468</strong></td>
<td>SENATE</td>
<td>Existing law provides that the Department of Transportation has full possession and control of the state highway system. Existing law imposes various requirements for the development and implementation of transportation projects. This bill would impose additional requirements on the department with respect to proposed capacity-increasing state highway projects in the coastal zone, including requiring the department to collaborate with local agencies, the California Coastal Commission, and countywide or regional transportation planning agencies to develop traffic congestion reduction goals. The bill would, for these projects, require the department to suspend a notice of determination relating to environmental impact, issued between January 1, 2011, and January 1, 2012, until it is determined that environmental documents for the projects satisfy the requirements of the bill. The bill would also make legislative findings and declarations. <strong>Last Amended on 3/29/2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kehoe D</strong></td>
<td>T. &amp; H. 4/14/2011 - Set for hearing May 3. 5/3/2011 1:30 p.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203) SENATE TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING, DESAULNIE R, Chairman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Transportation: capacity-increasing state highway projects: coastal zone.</strong></td>
<td></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><strong>SB 475</strong>&lt;br&gt;Wright D&lt;br&gt;Infrastructure financing.</td>
<td>SENATE G. &amp; F.&lt;br&gt;4/12/2011 - From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Referred to Com. on GOV. &amp; F.&lt;br&gt;4/27/2011 9:30 a.m. - Room 112&lt;br&gt;SENATE GOVERNANCE AND FINANCE, WOLK, Chair</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes a governmental agency, as defined, to solicit proposals and enter into agreements with private entities for the design, construction, or reconstruction by, and lease to, private entities, for specified types of fee-producing infrastructure projects. Existing law permits these agreements to provide for infrastructure facilities owned by a governmental entity, but constructed by a private entity, to be leased to or owned by that private entity for a period of up to 35 years. This bill would authorize a local governmental agency to enter into an agreement with a private entity for financing for specified types of revenue-generating infrastructure projects. The bill would require an agreement entered into under these provisions to include adequate financial resources to perform the agreement, and would permit the agreements to lease or license to, or provide other permitted uses by, the private entity for a term of up to 50 years, after which time the project would revert to the governmental agency. <strong>Last Amended on 4/12/2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 517</strong>&lt;br&gt;Lowenthal D&lt;br&gt;High-Speed Rail Authority.</td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H.&lt;br&gt;4/25/2011 - From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Referred to Com. on T. &amp; H.&lt;br&gt;4/26/2011 1:30 p.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203)&lt;br&gt;SENATE TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING, DESAULNIE R, Chairman</td>
<td>Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority in state government 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. Existing law creates the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, which consists of various state agencies, including the Department of Transportation. This bill would place the High-Speed Rail Authority within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency. The bill would provide for the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing to serve on the authority as a nonvoting, ex officio member. The bill would require the secretary to propose an annual budget for the authority upon consultation with the authority. The bill would require the members of the authority appointed by the Governor to be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill would provide for the members that are appointed to have specified background or experience, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <strong>Last Amended on 4/25/2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 522</strong>&lt;br&gt;Walters R&lt;br&gt;Public employees' retirement: additional service credit.</td>
<td>SENATE P.E. &amp; R.&lt;br&gt;4/12/2011 - Set for hearing May 2.&lt;br&gt;5/2/2011 1 p.m. or upon adjournment of session&lt;br&gt;SENATE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT AND RETIREMENT, NEGRET E MCLEOD, Chair</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes certain members of the Public Employees' Retirement System, the State Teachers' Retirement System, and county, city, and district retirement systems that have adopted specified provisions, to make additional contributions to the retirement system and receive up to 5 years of additional retirement service credit for time that does not qualify for public service, as specified. The bill would repeal the provisions that authorize these additional contributions and service credit, and would make related technical changes. <strong>Last Amended on 3/22/2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bill ID/Topic | Location | Summary | Position
--- | --- | --- | ---
**SB 523**  
Walters R  
Public employees' retirement: elected local officials.  
Existing law authorizes the creation of retirement systems for public employees by counties, cities, and districts. Existing law creates the Public Employees' Retirement System and the State Teachers' Retirement System, which provide a defined benefit to their members based on age at retirement, service credit, and final compensation. Existing law establishes the criteria for membership in the various public employee retirement systems and may exclude certain employment classifications from membership. The California Constitution provides for the division of the state into counties and requires that a county have an elected sheriff, elected district attorney, elected assessor, and elected governing body. Existing law provides for the incorporation of cities in various forms and requires that certain city offices be filled pursuant to elections, as prescribed. Existing law provides for the creation of districts, the governing bodies of which may be elected.  
This bill would prohibit a person who is publicly elected to a local office of any kind, on and after January 1, 2012, from becoming a member of a retirement system by virtue of that service or from acquiring any retirement right or benefit for serving in that elective local office. The bill would also apply these prohibitions to a person who is appointed to fill the term of a person so elected, but would not apply them to a person who obtained membership by virtue of holding an elective local office prior to January 1, 2012, for so long as he or she holds that office or is reelected to that office.  
**Last Amended on 3/22/2011**

**SB 524**  
Walters R  
Public employees' retirement: retroactive benefits.  
The Meyers-Milias-Brown Act, the Ralph C. Dills Act, provisions commonly referred to as the Educational Employment Relations Act, the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act, the Trial Court Employment Protection and Governance Act, the Trial Court Interpreter Employment and Labor Relations Act, and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Transit Employer-Employee Relations Act each provide for the representation of state or local public employees by recognized employee organizations, and provide that the scope of this representation includes negotiations concerning wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment between the state or local public employer and representatives of those employee organizations.  
This bill would exclude matters relating to the retroactive effect of pension benefit increases from the scope of representation of public employees by recognized employee organizations, and would thereby prohibit these employee organizations from negotiating for a retroactive effect of pension benefit increases with public employers. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.  
**Last Amended on 3/22/2011**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 582</strong></td>
<td>SENATE  T. &amp; H.</td>
<td>Existing law requires transportation planning agencies to undertake various transportation planning activities, including preparation of a regional transportation plan. Existing law requires transportation planning agencies that are designated under federal law as metropolitan planning organizations to include a sustainable communities strategy as part of the regional transportation plan for their region. Existing law creates air quality management districts with various responsibilities relative to reduction of air pollution.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmerson R</td>
<td>4/25/2011 1:30 p.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203)</td>
<td>This bill, beginning on January 1, 2013, would authorize a metropolitan planning organization jointly with the local air quality management district to adopt a commute benefit ordinance that requires covered employers operating within the common area of the organization and district with a specified number of covered employees to offer those employees certain commute benefits. The bill would require that the ordinance specify certain matters, including any consequences for noncompliance, and would impose a specified reporting requirement. The bill would provide for the ordinance to be adopted by the county transportation commission rather than the metropolitan planning organization in those counties where the Southern California Association of Governments is the designated metropolitan planning organization. The bill would make its provisions inoperative on January 1, 2017.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute benefit policies.</td>
<td>SENATE TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING, DESAULNIER R, Chairman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 620</strong></td>
<td>SENATE E.Q.</td>
<td>The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report on a project, as defined, that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment, as defined, or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correa D</td>
<td>4/4/2011 - Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>This bill would, until January 1, 2015, exempt from those CEQA requirements a project that consists of the alteration of a vacant retail structure that existed prior to January 1, 2009, is not more than 120,000 square feet in area, and that meets specified requirements. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act: retail facilities: project review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 624</strong></td>
<td>SENATE RLS.</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 establishes the State Air Resources Board as the state agency responsible for monitoring and regulating sources emitting greenhouse gases. The act requires the state board to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit to be achieved by 2020, equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions levels in 1990. The act requires the state board, on or before January 1, 2011, to adopt greenhouse gas emission limits and emission reduction measures by regulation to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases, in furtherance of achieving the statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit, with the regulations to become operative beginning January 1, 2012.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harman R</td>
<td>3/3/2011 - Referred to Com. on RLS.</td>
<td>This bill would make technical, nonsubstantive changes to the above requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SB 683
**Correa** D

**Location:**

**Summary:**
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 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.

### SB 693
**Dutton** R

**Location:**
- **4/13/2011** - From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on T. & H.
- **5/3/2011** 1:30 p.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203)

**Summary:**
Existing law sets forth requirements for the solicitation and evaluation of bids and the awarding of contracts by public entities for the erection, construction, alteration, repair, or improvement of any public structure, building, road, or other public improvement. Existing law also authorizes specified state agencies, cities, and counties to implement alternative procedures for the awarding of contracts on a design-build basis. Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation and regional transportation agencies to enter into public-private partnerships for transportation projects under certain conditions. Existing law authorizes the department to delegate to any city or county any part of its powers and jurisdiction, except the power of approval, with respect to any portion of any state highway within the city or county, and to withdraw the delegation.

This bill would specify that the delegation authority includes the authority to utilize private-public partnership agreements for transportation projects. **Last Amended on 4/13/2011**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 733</strong></td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 4/25/2011 - Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>High-speed rail: business plan; contracts: small business participation. <strong>SB 733</strong> Price D</td>
<td>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. Under federal law, funding is made available for allocation nationally to high-speed rail and other related projects. Existing law requires the authority to prepare, publish, adopt, and submit to the Legislature a business plan containing specified elements beginning January 1, 2012, and every 2 years thereafter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 749</strong></td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 4/14/2011 - Set for hearing May 3.</td>
<td>High-speed rail. <strong>SB 749</strong> Steinberg D</td>
<td>This bill would require the authority, in awarding contracts for the construction of the high-speed rail system with state or federal funds, to develop a strategy in conjunction with the Employment Development Department to ensure that at least 25% of the project workforce used at each authority worksite is from the local workforce, and to report on that strategy in the business plan to be submitted on January 1, 2012, or as an addendum to that plan to be submitted as soon as possible after that date. This bill contains other related provisions. <strong>Last Amended on 4/14/2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 775</strong></td>
<td>SENATE G. &amp; F. 4/25/2011 - Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>Bonds. <strong>SB 775</strong> Walters R</td>
<td>The existing State General Obligation Bond Law contains procedures for use in authorizing the issuance and sale and providing for the repayment of state general obligation bonds. Existing law also requires prescribed accountability measures to be included in local bond measures. This bill would incorporate a requirement into the State General Obligation Bond Law that would require a committee created by a bond act to periodically prepare a report on, among other topics, the amount of bonds that the committee has issued in the past five years and the likelihood that the committee will issue any additional bonds in the future. This bill would require that this report is submitted to standing committees in the Legislature with responsibility for budget and fiscal affairs. This bill would specifically authorize house committees to recommend to the Legislature, based upon the contents of that report, that the amount of bonds authorized by the act should be reduced if they conclude either that it is unlikely that the bond committee will issue any additional bonds in the future or that the amount of bonds authorized by the act is excessive or unnecessary in relation to the purpose for which the bond act was passed. This bill contains other related provisions.</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 783</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton R</td>
<td>SENATE RLS. 3/10/2011 - Referred to Com. on RLS.</td>
<td>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. This bill would make technical, non-substantive changes to the term &quot;project&quot; for the purposes of CEQA. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 785</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton R</td>
<td>SENATE RLS. 3/10/2011 - Referred to Com. on RLS.</td>
<td>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. This bill would make a technical, non-substantive change in those provisions relating to the requirements imposed on a lead agency for the compliance project. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 832</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strickland R</td>
<td>SENATE RLS. 3/10/2011 - Referred to Com. on RLS.</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 levels in 1990 to be achieved by 2020. This bill would make a technical, non-substantive change to a provision of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 851</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson R</td>
<td>SENATE RLS. 3/10/2011 - Referred to Com. on RLS.</td>
<td>Existing law provides the Department of Transportation with full possession and control of all state highways and authorizes the department to lay out and construct all state highways, as specified. This bill would state intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would address the need for highway construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bill ID/Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 862</strong> Lowenthal D</td>
<td><strong>Southern California Goods Movement Authority.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 864</strong> Fuller R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 867</strong> Padilla D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 862</strong> Lowenthal D</td>
<td><strong>SENATE T. &amp; H.</strong> 4/4/2011 - From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on T. &amp; H. 5/3/2011 1:30 p.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203) <strong>SENATE TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING, DESAULNIE R, Chairman</strong></td>
<td>Existing law requests the California Marine and Intermodal Transportation System Advisory Council, a federal entity, to compile data on, among other issues, air pollution caused by the movement of goods through the state's maritime ports and proposed methods of mitigating or alleviating that pollution. This bill would establish the Southern California Goods Movement Authority consisting of representatives from specified entities. The bill would require the authority to establish a priority list of infrastructure and air quality improvement projects related to the movement of port-related cargo and port operations in southern California. The bill would require the Alameda Corridor East Construction Authority, a local agency, to provide staff and meeting space for the authority, thereby imposing a state-mandated local program. The bill would authorize the authority to enter into a memorandum of understanding with PierPASS or a similar entity created by the West Coast Marine Terminal Operator Agreement, for funding the list of infrastructure and air quality improvement projects. The bill would provide that this funding is intended to leverage funding from other sources and is not intended to be the sole source of funding for the projects. The bill would require the authority to consider specified projects for inclusion in the priority list and would require the authority to consult with the South Coast Air Quality Management District regarding air quality improvement projects. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <strong>Last Amended on 4/4/2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 864</strong> Fuller R</td>
<td><strong>SENATE RLS.</strong> 3/10/2011 - Referred to Com. on RLS.</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 establishes the State Air Resources Board as the state agency responsible for monitoring and regulating greenhouse gas emission sources. The act requires the state board to adopt regulations to require the reporting and verification of statewide greenhouse gas emissions and to monitor and enforce compliance with this program. The act also requires the state board to adopt regulations to provide for a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit to be achieved by 2020, equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions levels in 1990. Existing law authorizes the state board to include market-based compliance mechanisms, as defined, to comply with the regulations. This bill would make technical, non-substantive changes to this authorization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 867</strong> Padilla D</td>
<td><strong>SENATE T. &amp; H.</strong> 4/12/2011 - Set for hearing April 26. 4/26/2011 1:30 p.m. - John L. Burton Hearing Room (4203) <strong>SENATE TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING, DESAULNIE R, Chairman</strong></td>
<td>Existing law creates the California Transportation Financing Authority with specified powers and duties relative to the issuance of bonds to fund transportation projects to be backed, in whole or in part, by various revenue streams of transportation funds and toll revenues in order to increase the construction of new capacity or improvements for the state transportation system. This bill would, in addition, provide for the authority to issue Build California Bonds, the proceeds of which would be used for specified transportation capital improvements. Bondholders would be entitled to nonrefundable tax credits against their personal income tax or corporate tax liability. The bonds would not be a debt or liability of the state or a political subdivision of the state, except for the authority. The bill would provide for the authority to enter into financing agreements with participating local transportation authorities for the purpose of financing or refinancing transportation projects. Each series of bonds issued by the authority would be secured by a financing agreement between the authority and the local transportation authority. The bill would limit the principal amount of bonds to be issued by the authority under these provisions to $5 billion over a 5-year period commencing January 1, 2012. The bill would enact other related provisions.</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2011 – 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 April 13, 2011
   b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for March 2011

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
   a. Presentation from Councilmembers of the City of San Bruno Regarding the San Bruno Fire

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

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 – Fixed-route Bus Service
g. Multimodal Ridership Report – March 2011

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
7. **FINANCE COMMITTEE**  
   **RESOLUTION**  
   a. Authorize Consenting to Assignment of Investment Management Services Agreement by CSI Capital Management, Inc. to SunTrust Bank  
   b. Authorize Third Amendment to Agreement with Wells Fargo Insurance Services to Extend the Contract Through June 30, 2012 up to an Additional $71,480 from $408,620 to $480,100  
   c. Authorize Exchanging up to $3,700,000 of San Mateo County Transit District Proposition 1B State Local Partnership Program Funds for an Equivalent Amount of Local Caltrain Operating Funds in Fiscal Year 2012  
   d. Authorize Negotiation Principles to Explore Certain Funding Options to Finance Caltrain Operations with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board Member Agencies and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in Fiscal Year 2013 and Beyond  
   e. Authorize Award of Contract to Office Max, Inc. and Staples, Inc. for the Purchase and Delivery of General Office Supplies and Related Items for an Aggregate Total Estimated Cost of up to $150,000 for a Two-year Term  
   f. Authorize Award of Contract to Carl Warren and Company for Public Liability Claims Administration, Investigation and Adjustment Services for an Estimated Cost of $567,000 for a Five-year Term  
   g. Authorize Award of Contract to Standard Insurance Company for Life and Accidental Death and Dismemberment Insurance for an Estimated Cost of $356,400 for a Three-year Term  

**INFORMATIONAL**  
   h. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2012 Operating Budget  
   i. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2012 Capital Budget

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

10. **WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

11. **BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS/COMMENTS**

12. **DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING** – June 8, 2011 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 Legal Counsel – Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(a), Maria DeMartini v San Mateo County Transit District  
   b. Closed Session: Conference with Labor Negotiator – Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6, Teamsters Union, Local 856 (Bus Transportation Supervisors, Dispatchers and Radio Controllers)

Note: 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
Agenda for May 11, 2011

c. Closed Session: Conference with Labor Negotiator – Pursuant to Government Code
   Section 54957.6, Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1574 (Customer Service Center
   Employees)

d. Closed Session: Conference with Labor Negotiator – Pursuant to Government Code
   Section 54957.6, Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1574 (Bus Operators, Mechanics,
   Utility Workers and Storeskeeper Employees)

14. ADJOURNMENT
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
APRIL 13, 2011

Board Members Present: O. Ahmad, J. Deal, C. Groom, R. Guilbault, S. Harris, A. Lloyd, K. Matsumoto (Chair), A. Tissier

Board Members Absent: Z. Kersteen-Tucker

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

Chair Karyl Matsumoto called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m.

District Secretary Martha Martinez gave the oath of office to transit expert, Art Lloyd.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE FILING OF A FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA) SECTION 5310 GRANT APPLICATION FOR THE PURCHASE OF TWO REDI-WHEELS BUSES

Ms. Martinez said today’s public hearing was set at the March 9 Board of Directors meeting. The purpose of the hearing is to receive public input and to make a determination as to whether there are any non-profit agencies that are readily available to provide the same type and level of service to the elderly and disabled population of San Mateo County as Redi-Wheels. The public hearing notice was published on March 10 and copies were sent to 15 non-profit transportation providers in the area notifying them of the time, place and purpose of the hearing. To-date, no comments have been received.

Director Adrienne Tissier arrived at 2:11 p.m.

Director of Budget and Grants April Chan said in order to be considered eligible for Section 5310 funding, SamTrans must certify that there are no non-profit entities readily available to provide the same service. Redi-Wheels provides transportation services for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) certified persons throughout San Mateo County and portions of San Francisco and Santa Clara counties seven days a week from 5:30 a.m. to midnight at a nominal fare of $3.50 per trip. Redi-Wheels service is currently at capacity and additional service is often subcontracted out to taxis during peak periods to accommodate demand. The procurement of two additional buses will enable Redi-Wheels to continue to meet the needs of the community while also saving costs by reducing the need to subcontract for supplementary taxi service.

Legal Counsel David Miller said the Board of Directors has offered the public an opportunity to address the Board, both in writing and orally and accordingly, has satisfied all the legal obligations and may proceed to close the public hearing and consider action on the item.
A motion (Deal/Lloyd) to close the public hearing was approved unanimously.

The motion (Tissier/Deal) to authorize the filing of a FTA Section 5310 grant was approved unanimously by roll call.

Recessed to Committee Meetings at 2:13 p.m.
Reconvened Board Meeting at 3:29 p.m.

CONSENT CALENDAR
The Board approved the consent calendar (Harris/Lloyd); Ahmad abstained from approval of the March 9 minutes.

a. Approval of Minutes of Board of Directors Meeting of March 9, 2011
b. Approval of Minutes of Board of Directors Special Meeting of March 24, 2011
c. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for February 2011

PUBLIC COMMENT
Jerry Grace, San Lorenzo, said he doesn’t like what he is seeing on the news about what is happening in Sacramento and Washington D.C.

Ed DeLanoy, San Carlos, said Caltrain is short of cash. Successful transit operators save money by operating long trains only during peak hours.

REPORT OF CHAIR
Chair Matsumoto said the Board held a special study session on March 24 to discuss what is in the works for the remainder of the year for SamTrans.

She thanked Manager of Government Affairs Seamus Murphy for guiding the Board members at the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) Legislative Conference.

Chair Matsumoto thanked the Citizens Advisory Committee for the work it does.

REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER/CEO
Deputy CEO Gigi Harrington reported:

- On March 17 SamTrans participated in an Older Driver Traffic Safety class at the San Mateo Senior Center.
- The Leadership Program is ongoing and this session is 50 percent complete.
- Fifteen District personnel are participating in the University of the Pacific Transit and Paratransit Management Certificate Program.
- The Interactive Voice Program for paratransit is undergoing internal testing and pilot testing will begin in May.
- The new fareboxes will be rolling out in a pilot phase with a 30-day trial on five revenue service buses.
- After the Board workshop last month, there was a discussion at the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) meeting last week on fares and services. The JPB declined to take action and set a special meeting for April 21. The JPB wants to maintain the current 86-train schedule.
- Staff will be presenting a preliminary SamTrans budget at the May 11 meeting.
Director Jerry Deal asked about the fareboxes costing $10 million for 300. He said that is $33,000 per farebox. He asked why are they so expensive and why didn’t staff go in with other transit agencies to purchase them to get the price down. Deputy CEO Chuck Harvey said staff did a consortium bid with three other agencies. The fareboxes are very complex. This was the lowest bid and best technical bid.

Public Comment
Jerry Grace, San Lorenzo, said he just heard about Caltrain service cuts and people don’t want the stations closed.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE

MOTION
a. Appointment of Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Members
   i. Daniel Cruz, Representing Bus Riders
   ii. Saundra Curry, Representing Bus Riders
   iii. Sonny Koya, Representing Bus Riders
   iv. Peter Loranger, Representing Bus Riders
   v. Maureen Hall, Representing Community Riders
   vi. Peter Ratto, Representing Multimodal Riders

The motion (Lloyd/Groom) of the appointment of the CAC members was approved unanimously.

SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
b. Accessibility Update
c. Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update
d. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report
e. Performance Report – Shuttles
f. Multimodal Ridership Report – February 2011

FINANCE COMMITTEE

RESOLUTIONS
a. Assessment of the Fiscal Year 2011 Fuel Hedging Program and Adoption of Revised Fuel Hedging Policy
b. Authorize Appointment of Orrick, Herrington and Sutcliffe LLP to Serve as Special Counsel in Connection with the Fiscal Year 2012 Fuel Hedging Program
c. Authorize Amendment to the Investment Policies and Annual Reauthorization to Invest Monies with the Local Agency Investment Fund
d. Adoption of Advertising Policy

A motion (Tissier/Deal) to approve the resolutions was approved unanimously by roll call.

e. Authorize Rejection of Low Monetary Bid as Non-Responsive from Harris Electric and Award of Contract to Liberty Electric for Electrical Maintenance Services for a Total Estimated Cost of $948,094 for a Three Year Term

A motion (Lloyd/Ahmad) to reject the protest of Harris Electric was approved unanimously.
The motion (Tissier/Groom) to approve the resolution was approved unanimously by roll call.

   f. Authorize Rejection of all Bids for Floor Maintenance Services and Related Carpet/Vinyl Work as Non-Responsive and Authorize Reissuing the Solicitation

The motion (Lloyd/Tissier) to reject all bids as non-responsive and reissue the solicitation was approved unanimously.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
   a. State and Federal Legislative Update

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
   a. Sustainability Program Overview

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
In reading file

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS
Director Adrienne Tissier said the minutes and presentation from the April 5 JPB meeting are available and that might be helpful to Mr. Grace’s request under public comment.

Director Tissier congratulated Director Art Lloyd on his reappointment.

Director Omar Ahmad said there was a discussion of having a retreat and a strategic discussion. Chair Matsumoto suggested this occur in early fall.

DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING – May 11, 2011 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)
   c. Closed Session: Conference with Labor Negotiator – Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.6, Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1574 (Bus Operators, Mechanics, Utility Workers and Storeskeeper Employees)

Mr. Miller reported that there is no need for a closed session today.

Adjourned at 3:48 p.m.