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, FEBRUARY 8, 2012 – 2:00 p.m.

1. Pledge of Allegiance

ACTION

2. Approval of Minutes of Community Relations Committee Meeting of January 11, 2012

INFORMATIONAL

3. Accessibility Update - Tina DuBost
4. Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update - Nancy Keegan
5. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report - Peter Ratto
6. Mobility Management Report – Caltrain

Committee Members: Rose Guilbault, Shirley Harris, Art Lloyd

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

Other Board Members Present, Constituting Committee of the Whole:  J. Deal, J. Gee, Z. Kersteen-Tucker, A. Lloyd, K. Matsumoto, A. Tissier


Committee Chair Rose Guilbault called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Community Relations Committee (CRC) Meeting of December 14, 2011
The committee approved the minutes (Lloyd/Deal).

Accessibility Update
Accessibility Coordinator Tina DuBost said in December the Redi-Wheels holiday singers visited six facilities spreading holiday cheer.

Director Shirley Harris arrived at 2:06 p.m.

Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update
Barbara Kalt, Director of Rosener House reported:
  • Newest member Jim Ash is from the Office of Emergency Services.
  • The latest PCC newsletter was distributed.
  • An ad-hoc bus committee was formed to collaborate on the new buses and one will be on site before the March PCC meeting.
  • Productivity has increased due to the increased use of taxi service during non-peak hours.

Director Adrienne Tissier arrived at 2:09 p.m.

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Liaison Report
CAC Chair Peter Ratto reported:
  • Elections were held and he was re-elected chair and Sondra Price was elected vice chair.
  • Received a presentation from Executive Officer Customer Service and Marketing Rita Haskin on fare media transition and Clipper.
Mobility Management Report – ADA Paratransit Service
Director Bus Transportation Chester Patton reported:

- Average weekday ridership is around 1,100.
- Farebox revenue is around $70,000 per month.
- Average cost per trip in Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 was $40.13 per person with a farebox recovery rate of 6 percent. For the first five months of FY2012 the average cost is $39.36.
- Trip denials remain at zero with over 27,000 trip requests per month.
- On-time performance remains above goal of 90 percent. On-time is considered pick-ups within 20 minutes of schedule time.
- Service complaints remain flat at one complaint for every 2,000 rides.
- Passengers per hour is 1.86, above the goal of 1.50.
- Telephone hold time is 1 minute, better than the goal of 1.5 minutes.
- Customer no-shows is about 1.5 percent and late cancels is trending between 1-1.5 percent.
- RediCoast ridership is approximately 100 rides per day.
- RediCoast on time performance was down to 99 percent in November.
- RediCoast passengers per hour is around 1.5.
- Complaints are rare with RediCoast.
- Eligibility denials remain under 5 percent.
- Total registrants is down to 6,800 from a high of 7,400.
- Efficiency measures include implementation of the Interactive Voice Response System, optimal vehicle mix, alternative service delivery models and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) Transit Sustainability Project.

Director Carole Groom arrived at 2:23 p.m.

- Optimal vehicle mix allows for fleet flexibility with small buses, minivans, sedans and taxis.
- The MTC Transit Sustainability project is a study of national and regional ADA best practices.
- Cost of ADA service remains a concern as it is an unfunded mandate that impacts SamTrans’ financial capacity.

Chair Karyl Matsumoto asked if the decline in ridership is attributed to the senior mobility ambassadors. Mr. Patton said he believes it does have an effect and 26 paratransit clients have been travel trained over this past fiscal year.

Director Jeff Gee asked how community awareness is gauged for this service. General Manager/CEO Michael Scanlon said there is a different policy for paratransit in which staff informs but doesn’t promote. There is a high awareness among those within the community who need the service.

Committee Chair Guilbault asked if staff has any strategies for the cost of the service. Mr. Patton said there are cost containment strategies and the screening process is part of that.
Director Zoe Kersteen-Tucker said there is good cooperation between the Senior Coastsiders, Manager of Bus Contracts Paul Lee, Santos Orellana from MV Transportation, and Manager, Accessible Transit Services Bill Welch. The seniors love driver Mr. Orellana and are impressed with the service staff delivers.

Multimodal Ridership Report – November 2011
- Bus ridership was 43,700, a decrease of 6 percent.
- Paratransit ridership was 1,051, a decrease of 1.9 percent.
- Caltrain ridership was 42,270, an increase of 8.3 percent.
- Caltrain shuttle ridership was 7,300, an increase of 29 percent.
- BART shuttle ridership was 1,873, a decrease of 6.7 percent.

Deputy CEO Chuck Harvey said five months into the year average weekday ridership on the bus is tracking down 4.2 percent. This is a source of continuing concern for staff. Revenue is up over last year, yet ridership is down. One-half of the loss of ridership, or 3 percent of the 6 percent loss, is attributable solely to community routes and Routes 260 and 262, which have school trips embedded in their schedules. That is about 1,400 daily trips or 700 round trips that are coming out of local community routes and the two big routes that have a lot of school service. There is a big change in youth ridership and staff doesn’t know why. If ridership losses are sliced for this month compared to last November, the community routes are down 24 percent. The north county local routes are only down 4 percent, the south county local routes are down 15 percent, the multi-city routes are down 10 percent and the mainline, Routes 390, 391, 292 and KX, are down only 1 percent. These four routes represent 17,000 of the total weekday ridership of 43,700.

Mr. Harvey said these numbers are going to inform the SamTrans Service Plan process and how to reinvent the service and what routes need to be modified or eliminated.

Adjourned: 2:39 p.m.
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 December 13 PCC meeting and the November 17 SAAC meeting are attached.

Prepared by: Bill Welch, Manager, Accessible Transit Services 650-508-6475
Tina Dubost, Accessibility Coordinator 650-508-6247
ATTENDANCE
Members Present: Nancy Keegan, Chair; Mike Levinson, AL-Com Chair; James Asche, OES; Myria Barnes-Jackson, DOR; Dale Edwards, Consumer; Aki Eejima, Consumer; Judy Garcia, Consumer; Diane Griffith, Consumer; Stephanie Hill, Consumer; Barbara Kalt, Rosener House; Benjamin McMullan, CID; Sammi Riley, Consumer; Marie Violet, Sequoia Hospital; Bill Welch, SamTrans.
Absentees: May Nichols, Vice Chair; Maureen Dunn, Senior Focus; Dan Mensing, Consumer; Michal Settles, Coastside.
Guests: Elly Colwell, SamTrans; Tina Dubost, SamTrans; Paul Lee, SamTrans; Marshall Loring, MTC; John Murphy, MV Transportation; Jim Engvall, Consumer; Linda Rhine, Nelson\Nygaard; Maxine Eastman, Consumer; Rose Berta, PCC Staff.
(Total Attendance: 23) Quorum--Yes

WELCOME/INTRODUCTION
Chair Nancy Keegan called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and welcomed all to the December PCC meeting.

APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER PCC MINUTES
Nancy asked for a vote of approval for the November minutes. Mike moved to approve the minutes and Barbara seconded the motion. The motion was approved with Marie abstaining.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. ADVOCATE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE (AL-COM)
Mike said there was no meeting this month. No major news from the legislature; $3 million shortfall is estimated from last year. The next AL-Com meeting is January 3, 2012; Seamus Murphy is scheduled to be the guest speaker.

B. GRANT/BUDGET REVIEW
Barbara reported no news on the 5310 grants.

C. EDUCATION COMMITTEE
The winter newsletter is in the process to be distributed in January 2012. Articles to be submitted are due by the end of next week. The next Education meeting is March 13, 2012.
D. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

No report for this month. Nancy thanked the Redi-Wheels and MV volunteer carolers, along with John, Dale, Diane, and Elly for bringing good holiday cheers to the agencies.

SAM TRANS/REDI-WHEELS REPORT
A. Operational Report

Holiday music will be provided by the MV and SamTrans carolers on December 19 and 20 to six agencies throughout the County.

Bill gave an update on the eligibility front. C.A.R.E. Evaluators are expanding their presence in San Mateo County and the Bay Area. Annie Earle will have a local office to oversee the operation. The phone system will be moved from Orange County to Foster City; calls will no longer be routed. Eligibility appointments and ID cards will be processed locally.

The Eligibility brochure was distributed at the Seniors on the Move event; more brochures are needed for future outreach events. Bill said more will be available after the first of the year and can also be accessed from the SamTrans website.

The process of being a guest rider when traveling outside of the San Francisco Bay Area was discussed. An eligibility form must be faxed from the “home” paratransit agency to the “visiting” paratransit agency; typically passengers have reciprocity for a period of 21 days. Tina will write an article for the newsletter on this subject.

Bill gave the progress report on the Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system. The project continues to make progress. Bill thanked the testers who have participated since May 2011; three people have been added and he would like to add other testers. Nancy asked if any incentive is being offered to recruit testers; Bill will take the idea into consideration. The project has run into equipment/software problems; Trapeze and the IVR software are being linked and Bill is confident issues will be resolved in the near future. Barbara commented that it is important to wait for implementation until the system meets performance standards where the night before and imminent arrival calls are 95% accurate. Nancy thanked Bill for his update and looks forward to the results at the next ERC meeting. All testers, which included Judy, Dale, Diane, Mike, Aki, Sammi, and Stephanie, were also thanked for devoting a lot of their time to this project. Diane confirmed that the night before call is beneficial because sometimes the time changes by a few minutes and it is helpful for the rider to be apprised of a more accurate arrival time. Tina’s hard work with communicating with the contractor and testers was acknowledged and appreciated.

B. Performance Summary

Tina reported fewer trips in October 2011 than October 2010; average weekday ridership is down 6%; there were more agency and subscription trips; 92% on-time performance, very positive; excellent productivity with 1.86 passengers per hour.

There was a question about the type of music played on taxis; John suggested asking the driver to change the music if there is an issue. Nancy asked about comment cards in sedans in pouches; John said drivers are given ten cards with them every day and that he will try to use pouches for taxis.
C. Customer Comments
Elly reported that total comments increased due to more comment cards; policy-related and service-related have decreased slightly; compliments have increased. Average overall response time still remains under the 7-day turn around limit, thanks to Sophie and Lynn. On Comments by Type—comment cards have increased, late vehicles have a slight increase due to multiple pickups and add-on trips.

Dale asked for the definition of an “add-on” trip. John explained a passenger’s doctor appointment can be delayed and the pick-up time must be changed; the rider is then added to another driver’s manifest that is close by, or a driver with a canceled trip, or perhaps a taxi. Dale complimented the dispatchers in doing a fabulous job in trying to squeeze in the “add on” trips; fortunately only about 5% of pickups are in this category. Tina said she will write an article on this situation for the newsletter.

In response to a question raised by Linda, Bill said that he and Elly will review the comments by type and consolidate where appropriate and provide definitions to further clarify the definitions of comments. For example, Mike noted that the comment “Stand by” is currently in the list of comments and it hasn’t been used in several years. The review will eliminate comment categories that have been at zero for several months and/or years.

D. Safety Report
John reported a great month in November; zero accidents for both Redi-Wheels and RediCoast. As a result of last month’s accident, MV has devoted many resources to re-training drivers, especially long-time drivers; drivers that have gotten out of the habit of properly using tie downs. Another training of six hours of defensive driving will be completed in the next two to three months.

LIAISON REPORTS
A. MTC REPORT
Marshall was welcomed back after being out on medical leave. A number of projects are underway at MTC but not much dealing specifically with paratransit. MTC is cutting back on infrequently used emergency phones on highways as a cost-savings measure; this could impact paratransit riders. Anyone with a concern or comments can contact Marshall.

MTC is working on transportation and housing plans to see how they meet state greenhouse gas reduction goals. There is a public workshop at the Hiller Museum on January 10, 5:45-8:45 p.m.; check MTC website for more information. Dale asked about paratransit going across the Dumbarton or San Mateo Bridges. Bill explained that the optimal way to travel to the East Bay is to work with East Bay paratransit.

Nancy thanked Marshall for his report.

B. AGENCY
Barbara reported that the agencies are looking forward to testing the IVR with participants in the program. There will be a meeting early next year.

C. COASTSIDE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (CTC)
Next meeting is on December 20, 11:30 a.m. at 535 Kelly St., Half Moon Bay.
D. EFFICIENCY REVIEW COMMITTEE (ERC)
Mike said the meeting covered IVR and comment cards. Next meeting is January 3, 2012.

E. COMMISSION ON AGING (COA) REPORT
No meeting to report. An email on the New Beginning Coalition survey was sent to members to complete, if eligible. The survey is for people over 65 years of age and people with a disability and should be sent to Christina at Aging and Adult Services. Nancy requests anyone eligible to complete the survey.

F. COMMISSION ON DISABILITY (COD) REPORT
No report.

G. OFFICE OF EMERGENCEY SERVICES (OES) REPORT
Jim met with Commission on Aging and they are advocating the Silver Alert program for seniors, which is similar to the Amber Alert program. Jim mentioned the SMC Alert program is excellent and is an effective way to alert people in our county. The County was recently recertified for tsunami and rain storm programs by the National Oceanic & Atmospheric Association (NOAA). The review included 3 years evaluation, redundancy built in for weather services, emergency services and ways to disseminate, and public education program.

The nationwide emergency alert system went well in our area.

OTHER BUSINESS
Paul Lee announced that the District will be moving ahead with the option to contract with MV for another year. In the third year of the option year, there will be a revision in the contract for productivity and a redefining of a “missed trip”.

Paul also shared there is a pending nurses strike at Peninsula and Mills hospital in San Mateo—possibly on December 22 and 23.

John announced MV will be taking over Mobility Plus in San Francisco starting on January 8, 2012.

Diane thanked Dale, Stephanie, Dan and anyone else who attended her installation as President of the American Council of the Blind.

Stephanie announced Lucy Muir, a previous PCC member, is ill and is in the hospital and we send her our good wishes for a quick recovery.

Everyone thanked Diane, Maxine, and Linda for bringing goodies for all to enjoy at the meeting.

Nancy wished all a happy and healthy holiday season.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 3:32 PM.
SAMTRANS ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY – November 17, 2011

PRESENT: Alec Karp (Chair), Tom Collette, Jim Engvall, Alice McGrath,

ABSENT: Doris Maez, Ben McMullan

GUEST: Henry Rutland

SAMTRANS STAFF: Tina Dubost, Richard Lesser

I. Introductions

II. Agenda

III. Approval of Minutes

Minutes approved.

IV. Committee Business

A. Election of a Vice-Chair

It was suggested that Cam Acker might be interested in being Vice-Chair. Though she has not yet been voted a Committee member, she has attended several meetings and shown a high degree of interest. She was unable to be present at this meeting.

Jim Engvall said he would consider it.

The issue was continued to the next meeting.

B. New Member Recruitment

The Committee is intended to have from eight to eleven members, and currently has six.

Alec Karp stated that it would be great to have new enthusiastic members who ride public transit, and suggested an announcement at a PCC meeting and a promotion in the newsletter of the Center for Independence of Individuals with Disabilities (CID).

Alice McGrath agreed about CID, citing its similar mission of promoting independence; she also asked about outreach to bus travelers about the Committee through literature placed on buses; and to Senior Centers like “Little House” in Menlo Park – a good method would be to create a flyer with a list of centers and send it to them for posting. Tina Dubost suggested that it could be modeled on the SamTrans recruitment for the
CAC flyers. Accessible Services staff will put together a flyer for the Committee’s review.

Tom Collette and Alice McGrath agreed that contacting Craig McCullough at the Commission on Disabilities could be a good outreach. Tom also suggested the Board of Supervisors of San Mateo.

Henry Rutland said that a large number of bus riders attending local churches such as Pilgrim Baptist, including minority and low-income populations, would benefit from additional information about public transit accessibility. He offered to do outreach to five or six African-American churches that he knows in San Mateo.

Tina Dubost asked about the possibility of contacting an interfaith network.

C. **Phone Participation in Meetings**

Under discussion is whether to accommodate participation by phone.

Alice McGrath posited that it is hard to follow and respond by phone, but that it would be good to have the option for eventualities such as a member unable to attend in person because of weather or other reason, as an occasional alternative if they can contribute.

The Committee agreed that occasional phone participation would be acceptable.

D. **Email Updates between Meetings**

Short emails with bullet points would be useful to give members notice of possible issues and topics of discussion.

V. **Fixed Route Bus and Caltrain**

Richard Lesser presented to the Committee:

A. **Recent ADA Changes including “Common Wheelchair”**

A summary of recent DOT changes was given. Particularly relevant is that the definition of a “common wheelchair” as not exceeding 30” by 48” and 600 pounds would no longer be acceptable as a limitation for providing access, and providers will be expected to “carry a wheelchair and occupant if the lift and vehicle can physically accommodate them, unless doing so is inconsistent with legitimate safety requirements.”

B. **Caltrain Wheelchair Capacity Improvements**

On the older gallery consists, which typically have only one accessible car, as permitted under the “one car per train” ADA rule for train consists built before 1990,
there are often only two available wheelchair spaces. If as occasionally happens, there is a second accessible car, it will be used if a third wheelchair passenger wishes to board. Also steps are being taken to remove or alter seating arrangements so that the accessible car has increased wheelchair capacity.

On the newer Bombardier consists, each of the five cars is wheelchair accessible. The main ADA car aligns with accessible ramps at the stations to accommodate the first two wheelchair passengers. If additional wheelchair passengers wish to board, the mobile lifts on the platforms will be used to board them on the other accessible cars, so that Bombardier consists will theoretically be able to accommodate up to ten wheelchair passengers.

C. Clipper Accessibility on Caltrain

Some issues have been brought to our attention as Clipper use has grown, and Accessible Services and Caltrain are working internally and with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to address them.

It can be difficult for a visually impaired passenger to locate the Clipper card readers on the platforms. Solutions being looked at include a standard location close to the blue assistance requested square and ADA shelter, and looking into the possibility of having the reader closest to that location emit a sound to facilitate finding it.

It can be confusing to know whether one has tagged on or off, or tagged too many times, as there is one beep for a successful tag on or off. It has been proposed to the MTC, who designs the system, that in a future upgrade these tags be differentiated by auditory means.

Caltrain conductors have been instructed to use their portable card readers to give balance and status information to RTC card holders and people with disabilities upon request. In the future card reading machines with auditory components will be available at Caltrain stations, and the next generation of Ticket Vending Machines will also have that capability.

VI. Paratransit Update

Tina Dubost said that the Eligibility contractor is moving to a regional model, and has added a Northern California manager. The contractor will have a local phone center and will prepare packets locally rather than from their Los Angeles headquarters.

Redi-Wheels productivity was a respectable 1.7 passengers per hour.

An update on the IVR system being tested for notifying passengers by phone of an upcoming or impending ride will be given at the next meeting.

VII. Citizens Advisory Committee Update
Tom Collette reported that the Committee took a field trip to SamTrans’ North Base facility.

The SamTrans Service Plan is under discussion. There is a meeting in San Bruno at Bel Aire Elementary.

The Committee looks forward to their annual holiday lunch.

VIII. Announcements and Other Business

Alice McGrath would like SamTrans Bus Operators to be more consistent about clearly indicating to boarding blind passengers where to locate an open seat, and use terms such as “driver side” and “passenger side” rather than the subjective “left” or “right”.

Jim Engvall boards the older lift-equipped buses rolling backwards, and it is also helpful to him if the driver tells him which side is open for his wheelchair as he boards.

Alec Karp suggested that our Customer Service Center should be able to give a standardized accurate description of how to get to SamTrans Headquarters using landmarks and distances that are specific enough and discernable for the blind and visually impaired.

VIII. Set Date for Next Meeting

The date for the next meeting was set for January 19th, 2012
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: MOBILITY MANAGEMENT REPORT: CALTRAIN

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 mobility management reports presented to the Board. The District’s four transportation modes – SamTrans motor bus, Americans with Disabilities Act Paratransit, Caltrain and Shuttles – are featured individually each month. This month features a report on the Caltrain service.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
Staff will report on the major indices involving the Caltrain operations and performance. Staff will report on ridership, fare collection, on-time performance, and project updates.

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 - DECEMBER 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 2010 vs. FY2011 and year-to-date comparisons of FY2011 vs. FY2012.

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

MONTHLY RIDERSHIP HIGHLIGHTS—DECEMBER 2011 COMPARED TO DECEMBER 2010

All Modes – AWR of 86,475, an increase of 6.5 percent.

Bus – AWR of 39,700, an increase of 0.8 percent.

Paratransit - AWR of 985, an increase of 4.9 percent.

Caltrain - AWR of 38,390, an increase of 10.1 percent.

Caltrain Shuttles - AWR of 5,771, an increase of 38.9 percent.

BART Shuttles - AWR of 1,629, a decrease of 13.3 percent.
**SamTrans Promotions – December 2011**

**Clipper** – December saw the final push to get the word to SamTrans customers that Monthly passes were moving to Clipper starting in January. The multi-month campaign included more than 80 outreach events. The switch to Clipper was conveyed via Spanish and Chinese language newspaper ads, exterior bus ads, bus shelter ads, web postings, Tweets, Facebook status updates, onboard electronic message sign and adcards. The design of the December Monthly Pass informed customers that it was their last paper pass and provided Clipper contact information. SamTrans also offered Saturday hours to accept Clipper applications from youth and seniors.

**Holiday Transit Toy Drive** – With the second suspension of the annual Holiday Train because of fiscal issues, SamTrans partnered with Caltrain to provide a downscaled holiday celebration to generate toy donations for the Marine Corps Reserves and Salvation Army’s Toys for Tots programs. The two transit agencies and their crew of North Pole characters staffed a booth at the popular Redwood City Hometown Holidays. More than 500 toys were collected for children in need.

**Serramonte Center Holiday Shopping** – December was the second month that the Route 120 service partnership between SamTrans and the Serramonte Center continued. The expanded service coincided with longer shopping center hours for the holiday season. The extra service to the major Daly City shopping center started at the end of November and ran through most of December. It was promoted through onboard notices, flyers at the shopping center and a web posting.

**Like Us** – Capitalizing on a complimentary ad in the Half Moon Bay Review, SamTrans promoted its presence on Facebook and asked readers to “Like Us.” SamTrans has 68 friends. More friends can “like” the bus agency at www.facebook.com/samtrans.

Prepared by: Rita P. Haskin, Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing  650-508-6248  
Ted Yurek, Senior Planner  650-508-6471
### Table A
**Average Weekday Ridership**

#### December 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2010^</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus +</td>
<td>43,160</td>
<td>39,380</td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain # +</td>
<td>32,600</td>
<td>34,860</td>
<td>38,390</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttle # **</td>
<td>4,258</td>
<td>4,155</td>
<td>5,771</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttle</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>-13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>82,729</td>
<td>81,212</td>
<td>86,475</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART (Extension Only)^</td>
<td>34,764</td>
<td>36,775</td>
<td>40,644</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>117,493</td>
<td>117,987</td>
<td>127,119</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2010^</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus +</td>
<td>47,900</td>
<td>43,860</td>
<td>42,330</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain # +</td>
<td>38,160</td>
<td>39,880</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttle # **</td>
<td>5,352</td>
<td>5,236</td>
<td>6,818</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttle</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>1,798</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>94,456</td>
<td>92,042</td>
<td>95,011</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART (Extension Only)^</td>
<td>36,549</td>
<td>38,641</td>
<td>42,280</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>131,005</td>
<td>130,684</td>
<td>137,290</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# System
* Extension Only (No Daly City)*
+ Rounded to nearest tens
^ Service cuts/reduced (12/09)
^ Service cuts/reduced (12/09)
** FY11 & 12 Caltrain shuttle figures adjusted to remove North Burlingame shuttle that is not District funded.

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

![Average Weekday Ridership Chart](chart.png)
A G E N D A
FINANCE COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2012 – 2:20 p.m.
or immediately following previous Committee meeting

ACTION

1. Approval of Minutes of Finance Committee Meeting of January 11, 2012
2. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for December 2011
4. Authorize Revision to the District’s Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program to Include a Small Business Enterprise Program

CONTRACTS

5. Authorize Contract Extension with Cypress Security, LLC for Security Guard Services on a Month-to-Month Basis From March 1, 2012 Through December 31, 2012 for an Additional $1,156,700
6. Authorize Award of Contract to NS Corporation for a Bus Wash System at South Base for a Total of $324,288

INFORMATIONAL

7. Fiscal Year 2011 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report

Committee Members: Jeff Gee, Zoe Kersteen-Tucker, Adrienne Tissier

NOTE:

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

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

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

Committee Chair Shirley Harris called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Finance Committee Meeting of December 14, 2011
The Committee approved the minutes (Guilbault/Lloyd).

Approval of Revenues and Expenses for November 2011
Deputy CEO Gigi Harrington said revenues are slightly over budget, mostly in farebox, and are offset by a decline in interest income. Expenses are about $3.3 million over budget and the vast majority is in motor bus. In December, budget adjustments were approved and those adjustments will be reflected in the December Revenues and Expenses report. Last week fuel was $2.99 per gallon and year-to-date is $3.08 per gallon. The fuel hedge was not tripped in December. Year-to-date a total of $40,000 has been received from the fuel hedge.

Chair Karyl Matsumoto asked if she could receive a list of where rental income is being received.

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

Adjourned: 2:42 p.m.
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 DECEMBER 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 December 2011 and supplemental information.

SIGNIFICANCE
Revenues: Total Revenues (page 1, line 13) are $245,458 or 0.3 percent better than revised budget. Passenger Fares (page 1, line 1) are better than budget by $68,742 or 0.8 percent, Measure A & AB434 Funds (page 1, line 4) is better than budget by $158,697 or 3.4 percent, Investment Interest (page 1, line 8) is better than budget by $15,921 or 1.2 percent and Other Interest, Rent & Other Income (page 1, line 10) are better than budget by $2,107 or 0.1 percent.

Expenses: Total Expenses (page 4, line 73) are $4,358,756 or 6.6 percent better than revised budget. Within Total Expenses, Total Motor Bus (page 3, line 46) is better than budget by $3,849,059 or 7.6 percent, Total ADA Programs (page 4, line 55) are better than budget by $495,376 or 7.0 percent and Total Multimodal (page 4, line 71) is better than budget by $14,321 or 0.2 percent.

Budget Amendments: Budget amendments adopted at the December 14th board meeting are reflected in the Revised Budget. The amendment primarily accounts for an increase in Transportation Development Act funds and Sales Tax revenues offsetting decrease in State Transit Assistance funds.

Prepared by:  Sheila Tioyao, Manager, Financial Services  650-508-7752
Jeannie Chen, Senior Accountant  650-508-6259
# STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES

## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

### SUMMARY OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES

#### FISCAL YEAR 2012

#### DECEMBER 2011

<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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOURCES OF FUNDS

#### Operating Revenues

1. **Passenger Fares**
   - Current: 1,471,460
   - Prior: 8,524,305
   - Revised: 8,790,392
   - Budget: 8,721,650
   - % of Budget: 100.8
   - Total: 17,443,300

2. **Local TDA and STA Funds**
   - Current: 4,079,406
   - Prior: 29,693,985
   - Revised: 27,415,761
   - Budget: 27,415,761
   - % of Budget: 100.0
   - Total: 33,000,814

3. **State/Federal Operating Grants**
   - Current: 21,556
   - Prior: 245,237
   - Revised: 144,079
   - Budget: 144,089
   - % of Budget: 100.0
   - Total: 10,202,857

4. **Measure A and AB434 Funds**
   - Current: 1,092,012
   - Prior: 4,602,257
   - Revised: 4,824,783
   - Budget: 4,666,086
   - % of Budget: 103.4
   - Total: 8,996,335

5. **Subtotal - Operating Revenues**
   - Total: 6,664,434

#### Other Revenue Sources

6. **District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax**
   - Current: 7,968,301
   - Prior: 31,624,200
   - Revised: 33,463,768
   - Budget: 33,463,768
   - % of Budget: 100.0
   - Total: 61,500,000

7. **Investment Interest**
   - Current: 213,176
   - Prior: 2,179,772
   - Revised: 1,305,846
   - Budget: 1,289,925
   - % of Budget: 101.2
   - Total: 2,150,620

8. **Pass through to Other Agencies**
   - Current: 0
   - Prior: 487,647
   - Revised: 181,790
   - Budget: 181,790
   - % of Budget: 100.0
   - Total: 281,790

9. **Other Interest, Rent & Other Income**
   - Current: 400,905
   - Prior: 2,980,415
   - Revised: 2,323,446
   - Budget: 2,321,339
   - % of Budget: 100.1
   - Total: 5,972,275

10. **Other Sources**
    - Current: 0
    - Prior: 0
    - Revised: 0
    - Budget: 0
    - % of Budget: 0.0
    - Total: 0

11. **Subtotal - Other Revenues**
    - Total: 8,582,382

#### Total Revenues - All Sources

- Total: 16,032,756

### USES OF FUNDS

#### Operations

12. **Motor Bus**
    - Current: 44,776,617
    - Prior: 33,463,768
    - Revised: 33,463,768
    - Budget: 50,340,885
    - % of Budget: 92.4
    - Total: 99,414,897

13. **A. D. A. Programs**
    - Current: 6,277,650
    - Prior: 6,539,271
    - Revised: 7,034,647
    - Budget: 14,069,346
    - % of Budget: 93.0
    - Total: 14,069,346

14. **Caltrain**
    - Current: 8,374,557
    - Prior: 6,330,620
    - Revised: 6,330,620
    - Budget: 10,620,000
    - % of Budget: 100.0
    - Total: 10,620,000

15. **Other Multimodal Programs**
    - Current: 2,284,497
    - Prior: 1,986,542
    - Revised: 2,008,863
    - Budget: 2,000,863
    - % of Budget: 99.3
    - Total: 3,967,226

16. **Subtotal - Operating Costs**
    - Total: 12,591,708

#### Other Uses of Funds

17. **Pass through to Other Agencies**
    - Current: 0
    - Prior: 487,647
    - Revised: 181,790
    - Budget: 181,790
    - % of Budget: 100.0
    - Total: 281,790

18. **Transfer Out to Debt Service**
    - Current: 12,224,994
    - Prior: 12,224,994
    - Revised: 12,224,994
    - Budget: 12,224,994
    - % of Budget: 100.0
    - Total: 24,477,279

19. **Fiscal Agent Fees**
    - Current: 5,055
    - Prior: 7,825
    - Revised: 10,505
    - Budget: 29,600
    - % of Budget: 74.5
    - Total: 25,080

20. **Land Transfer Interest Expense**
    - Current: 0
    - Prior: 0
    - Revised: 0
    - Budget: 70,000
    - % of Budget: 0.0
    - Total: 70,000

21. **Subtotal - Other Uses**
    - Total: 2,037,499

#### Capital Assistance

- Total: 856,242

#### Total Uses of Funds

- Total: 12,591,708

#### NET SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)

- Total: 3,441,048

### % OF YEAR ELAPSED

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

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

### San Mateo County Transit District
**Statement of Revenues**
**Fiscal Year 2012**
**December 2011**

<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>MOTOR BUS</td>
<td>1,412,888</td>
<td>8,141,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL (TDA) TRANSIT FUND</td>
<td>3,806,948</td>
<td>23,503,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,341,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING GRANTS</td>
<td>21,556</td>
<td>135,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT 1/2 CENT SALES TAX</td>
<td>1,953,860</td>
<td>6,691,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT INTEREST INCOME</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>62,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REVENUE SOURCES</td>
<td>235,438</td>
<td>1,899,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MOTOR BUS</td>
<td>7,434,679</td>
<td>44,776,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN DISABILITIES ACT</td>
<td>1,200,466</td>
<td>6,277,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIMODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS</td>
<td>1,062,822</td>
<td>10,659,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>9,697,967</td>
<td>61,713,321</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.

---

1. San Mateo County Transit District
2. December 2011
3. Year-to-Date Revenues
4. Fiscal Year 2012
5. Current Actual vs Prior Actual
6. Current Revised Budget vs Approved Budget
7. Revised Budget vs % Rev Budget
8. Operating Revenues - Motor Bus
9. Local (TDA) Transit Fund
10. State Transit Assistance
11. Local STA Operating Assistance
12. Operating Grants
13. District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax
14. General Operating Assist
15. Accessibility Fixed Route
16. Total 1/2 Cent Sales Tax
17. Investment Interest Income
18. Overnight Deposits Interest Income
19. Rental Income
20. Advertising Income
21. Other Income
22. Total Other Revenues
23. Motor Bus Fares
24. Local TDA 4.5 Redi-Wheels
25. Local STA Operating Assistance
26. General Operating Assist
27. General Operating Assist
28. Local  TDA 4.5 Redi-Wheels
29. Local  STA - Paratransit
30. Operating Grants
31. Sales Tax - District ADA Programs
32. Sales Tax - Paratransit Suppl. Coastside
33. Interest Income - Paratransit Fund
34. Measure A Redi-Wheels
35. Measure M Paratransit
36. Sales Tax - General Operating Asst
37. Sales Tax - Gen. Operating Asst
38. Multimodal Transit Programs
39. Sales Tax - Caltrain
40. Other Sources - Caltrain
41. Transfer from TA for Caltrain
42. TA Funded SM/Caltrain Shuttles
43. Employer Share SM/Caltrain Shuttle
44. AB434 Funds - SanTrans Shuttle
45. Employer SanTrans Shuttle Funds
46. Sales Tax - SanTrans Shuttle Program
47. Operating Grants
49. Total Multimodal
50. Total Revenues
51. % of Year Elapsed: 50.0%
### SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

#### OPERATING EXPENSES

**FISCAL YEAR 2012**

**DECEMBER 2011**

% OF YEAR ELAPSED: **50.0%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT REVISED ACTUAL</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>APPROVED BUDGET</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OPERATED BUSES</td>
<td>Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>3,816,294</td>
<td>25,358,789</td>
<td>25,181,844</td>
<td>26,999,660</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>53,344,734</td>
<td>52,825,668</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>2,907</td>
<td>22,867</td>
<td>25,060</td>
<td>26,650</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>31,100</td>
<td>31,100</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property Maintenance</td>
<td>48,420</td>
<td>383,873</td>
<td>458,193</td>
<td>467,629</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>785,250</td>
<td>785,250</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>102,123</td>
<td>492,747</td>
<td>564,331</td>
<td>637,500</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>1,278,500</td>
<td>1,278,500</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>257,793</td>
<td>1,064,964</td>
<td>1,500,922</td>
<td>2,154,049</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>4,299,827</td>
<td>4,794,525</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>23,845</td>
<td>137,673</td>
<td>144,940</td>
<td>277,625</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Materials &amp; Supply:</td>
<td>447,537</td>
<td>2,040,719</td>
<td>2,767,454</td>
<td>2,818,178</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>5,636,357</td>
<td>5,636,357</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fuel &amp; Lubricants</td>
<td>131,402</td>
<td>521,558</td>
<td>741,408</td>
<td>896,950</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>1,765,700</td>
<td>1,765,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uniforms &amp; Driver Expense</td>
<td>15,553</td>
<td>59,611</td>
<td>77,709</td>
<td>131,895</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>391,130</td>
<td>403,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Timetables &amp; Tickets</td>
<td>33,831</td>
<td>170,993</td>
<td>164,862</td>
<td>240,250</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>480,500</td>
<td>480,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office Supplies / Printing</td>
<td>8,122</td>
<td>130,259</td>
<td>77,810</td>
<td>166,788</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>334,874</td>
<td>366,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Materials &amp; Supply</td>
<td>8,010</td>
<td>56,379</td>
<td>55,022</td>
<td>83,750</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>166,250</td>
<td>166,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>3,816,294</td>
<td>25,358,789</td>
<td>25,181,844</td>
<td>26,999,660</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>53,344,734</td>
<td>52,825,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Utilities</td>
<td>86,643</td>
<td>475,650</td>
<td>517,897</td>
<td>490,800</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>981,600</td>
<td>981,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>209,141</td>
<td>1,232,824</td>
<td>1,247,220</td>
<td>1,247,484</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,493,500</td>
<td>2,493,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workers’ Compensation</td>
<td>299,352</td>
<td>1,580,937</td>
<td>1,572,409</td>
<td>1,572,698</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3,183,888</td>
<td>3,183,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Route Accessibility</td>
<td>37,955</td>
<td>204,759</td>
<td>243,525</td>
<td>248,150</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>496,300</td>
<td>496,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leases &amp; Rentals</td>
<td>53,802</td>
<td>355,102</td>
<td>373,624</td>
<td>377,486</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>755,000</td>
<td>755,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>204,759</td>
<td>204,759</td>
<td>204,759</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>409,518</td>
<td>409,518</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total District Operated Buses</td>
<td>6,020,069</td>
<td>36,562,244</td>
<td>38,124,072</td>
<td>41,606,691</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>81,962,376</td>
<td>82,582,224</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CONTRACTED BUS SERVICES | Contracted Urban Bus Service | 1,240,706 | 7,161,965 | 7,333,791 | 7,680,444 | 95.5 | 15,360,895 | 15,360,895 | 47.7 |
| | Other Related Costs | 30,647 | 178,132 | 163,626 | 169,866 | 96.3 | 339,820 | 339,820 | 48.2 |
| | | Insurance Costs | 53,802 | 355,102 | 373,624 | 377,486 | 99.6 | 755,000 | 755,000 | 50.7 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Coastside Services | 52,974 | 300,089 | 319,787 | 323,312 | 99.6 | 630,630 | 630,630 | 50.7 |
| | | Redi Coast Non-ADA | 19,654 | 115,915 | 106,588 | 119,106 | 89.5 | 238,216 | 238,216 | 44.7 |
| | | Other Related Costs | 2,778 | 42,841 | 41,042 | 42,841 | 99.6 | 85,682 | 85,682 | 48.2 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Total Contracted Bus Service | 1,414,610 | 8,214,372 | 8,367,754 | 8,734,194 | 95.8 | 17,452,521 | 17,452,521 | 47.9 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | TOTAL MOTOR BUS | 7,434,679 | 44,776,617 | 46,491,826 | 50,340,885 | 92.4 | 99,414,897 | 100,034,745 | 46.5 |

% OF YEAR ELAPSED provides a general measure for evaluating overall progress against the annual budget. When comparing it to the amounts shown in the % REV BUDGET column, please note that individual line items reflect variations due to seasonal activities during the year.
# SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
## OPERATING EXPENSES
### FISCAL YEAR 2012
#### DECEMBER 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED:</th>
<th>50.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MONTH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT ACTUAL</td>
<td>PRIOR ACTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT PROGRAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled/Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>171,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedan Service</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>223,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Accessibility Support</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastside ADA Support</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>105,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>202,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ADA PROGRAMS</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,200,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIMODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Rail Service</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>714,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Caltrain Service</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>714,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Express Service</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SamTrans Shuttle Service</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>212,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM/Caltrain Shuttles</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>116,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Multimodal Facilities</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Support</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>347,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MULTI-MODAL PROGRAMS</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,062,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9,697,967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% OF YEAR ELAPSED* provides a general measure for evaluating overall progress against the annual budget. When comparing it to the amounts shown in the "% REV BUDGET" column, please note that individual line items reflect variations due to seasonal activities during the year.
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### ADA PROGRAM MONTHLY EXPENSES - BUDGET VS ACTUAL
#### FISCAL YEAR 2012

### 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><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>1,172,441</td>
<td>1,172,441</td>
<td>1,172,441</td>
<td>1,172,441</td>
<td>1,172,441</td>
<td>1,172,441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td>1,089,971</td>
<td>1,083,991</td>
<td>1,091,019</td>
<td>1,080,128</td>
<td>1,073,695</td>
<td>1,200,466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>1,172,441</td>
<td>2,344,882</td>
<td>3,517,323</td>
<td>4,689,764</td>
<td>5,862,206</td>
<td>7,034,647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td>1,089,971</td>
<td>2,093,962</td>
<td>3,184,981</td>
<td>4,265,110</td>
<td>5,338,805</td>
<td>6,539,271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variance - (U)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</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><strong>Variance - (U)</strong></td>
<td>162,470</td>
<td>250,920</td>
<td>332,342</td>
<td>424,655</td>
<td>523,401</td>
<td>495,376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variance %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</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><strong>Variance %</strong></td>
<td>13.86%</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>9.45%</td>
<td>9.05%</td>
<td>8.93%</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
MULTIMODAL MONTHLY EXPENSES - BUDGET VS ACTUAL
FISCAL YEAR 2012

<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>3,086,529</td>
<td>1,045,291</td>
<td>1,046,191</td>
<td>1,046,891</td>
<td>1,061,291</td>
<td>1,045,291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3,068,088</td>
<td>1,047,363</td>
<td>1,035,517</td>
<td>1,038,003</td>
<td>1,065,369</td>
<td>1,062,822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>3,086,529</td>
<td>4,131,820</td>
<td>5,178,010</td>
<td>6,224,901</td>
<td>7,286,192</td>
<td>8,331,483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3,068,088</td>
<td>4,115,451</td>
<td>5,150,969</td>
<td>6,188,972</td>
<td>7,254,341</td>
<td>8,317,162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance - F(U)</td>
<td>18,441</td>
<td>16,368</td>
<td>27,042</td>
<td>35,929</td>
<td>31,851</td>
<td>14,320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance %</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### BUDGET AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,664,642</td>
<td>page 1, line 2-local STA and TDA funds</td>
<td>budget amendment approved Dec 2011; based on revised STA and TDA estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$361,279</td>
<td>page 1, line 4-state/federal grants</td>
<td>budget amendment approved Dec 2011; includes carryover, revised spending plans, and new grant revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>page 1, line 4-measure A and AB454</td>
<td>budget amendment approved Dec 2011; includes measure A increase for caltrain and AB454 decrease to fit to actual funding amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>page 1, line 8-sales tax</td>
<td>budget amendment approved Dec 2011; based on revised sales tax estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,599</td>
<td>page 1, line 9-investment interest</td>
<td>budget amendment approved Dec 2011; based on revised interest estimates for investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(920)</td>
<td>page 1, line 10-other interest</td>
<td>budget amendment approved Dec 2011; based on revised interest estimates for investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(967,000)</td>
<td>page 1, line 11-other sources</td>
<td>budget amendment approved Dec 2011; based on revised contribution to Caltrain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$589,848</td>
<td>page 1, line 20-district motor bus</td>
<td>budget amendments approved Dec 2011; includes additional consultant and miscellaneous expenses for grant programs, and additional security costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,520</td>
<td>page 1, line 28-fiscal agent fees</td>
<td>budget amendment approved Dec 2011; to increase fiscal agent fees that were under budgeted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Total $4,256,658

### BUDGET REVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Total $0
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### 1/2 CENT SALES TAX RECEIPTS AND PROJECTIONS
#### FY2011 & FY2012
#### DECEMBER 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Over/(Under) Budget/Projection</th>
<th>Current Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2011:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>15,224,400</td>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>15,365,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>15,910,800</td>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>16,917,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>13,855,400</td>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>14,737,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>15,009,400</td>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>16,492,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2011 Total</strong></td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
<td><strong>FY2011 Total</strong></td>
<td>63,513,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 11</td>
<td>4,225,700</td>
<td>Sep. 11</td>
<td>4,224,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 11</td>
<td>4,225,700</td>
<td>Oct. 11</td>
<td>4,533,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 11</td>
<td>5,634,300</td>
<td>Nov. 11</td>
<td>5,633,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>1,594,300</td>
<td>Dec. 11</td>
<td>2,649,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Months Total</td>
<td>15,680,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,041,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 11</td>
<td>4,463,600</td>
<td>Dec. 11</td>
<td>4,855,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 11</td>
<td>4,463,600</td>
<td>Jan. 12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 11</td>
<td>6,034,400</td>
<td>Feb. 12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>1,653,700</td>
<td>Mar. 12</td>
<td>(584,234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months Total</td>
<td>32,295,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,896,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 12</td>
<td>3,927,700</td>
<td>Mar. 12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 12</td>
<td>3,927,700</td>
<td>Apr. 12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 12</td>
<td>5,354,800</td>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>1,455,100</td>
<td>Jun. 12</td>
<td>(584,234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Months Total</td>
<td>46,960,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,896,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 12</td>
<td>4,328,300</td>
<td>Jun. 12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>4,328,300</td>
<td>Jul. 12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 12</td>
<td>5,778,900</td>
<td>Aug. 12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>1,603,900</td>
<td>Sep. 12</td>
<td>(584,234)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2012 Total</strong></td>
<td>63,000,000</td>
<td><strong>FY2012 Total</strong></td>
<td>21,896,302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 17,041,202 | 1st Quarter |
| 16,422,566 | 2nd Quarter |
| 33,463,768 | 3rd Quarter |
| 33,463,768 | 4th Quarter |

YTD Actual Per Statement of Revenues & Expenses

(1) Accrued
TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
       General Manager/CEO

FROM: Virginia Harrington
       Deputy CEO

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

ACTION
Staff proposes that the 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 December 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 January 27, 2012 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 5 and 6. The schedule separates the investments into three groups: The Investment Portfolio which is managed by SunTrust Banks, doing business as CSI Capital a SunTrust Group (“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**

Despite signs of improving domestic growth, interest rates remained relatively unchanged during the fourth quarter of 2011 as the events surrounding the various debt crises in several of the European Union’s member countries, generally referred to as sovereigns, continued to take center stage. Looking back on the year as a whole, interest rates generally fell through the third quarter and remained near record lows for the balance of the year.
As we recap the year just past and ponder the year ahead, the fixed income markets remain a challenge. Despite inflation near 3.0%, declining unemployment rates and stronger than expected consumption here in the U.S., interest rates remain set at abnormally low levels. Indeed, long-term bonds are at or near their most expensive levels ever, viewed from the standpoint that even a small increase in price could result in negative returns. These abnormally low rates can be attributed in varying parts to actions by the U.S. Federal Reserve stating this past summer, their intention to maintain the current low interest levels through 2012 and into 2013. As well as uncertainty surrounding our political process, uncertainty surrounding the economy and perhaps most importantly, uncertainty surrounding the sovereign debt crisis in Europe.

There is no way to overstate the importance of European policy makers finding a credible solution to their budgetary and debt problems. If the Europeans are unable to stem their financial challenges, the resulting crisis has the potential to surpass the 2008/2009 melt-down here in the U.S. The resulting shock waves would be felt around the globe and could set back our own fledgling recovery for years. On the other hand, a successful outcome could help bring back the much needed confidence that business leaders currently lack and pave the way to an improved economy and stronger growth in employment.

Unfortunately, the challenges the Europeans face are formidable. Experts are calling for either a disbandment of the Euro or a stronger fiscal union that would involve some loss of sovereignty among the member countries of the common European currency. The former would be messy and risks the collapse of the banking system in Europe. The latter is exceptionally difficult to pull off. In the meantime, Europe’s policy makers are frantically seeking an acceptable interim solution, but there are no easy answers.

Undoubtedly the U.S. bond market has been the beneficiary of fund flows out of the Euro and into the U.S. Dollar as investors hedged against the ongoing, disorderly decline in Euro zone markets. In all likelihood this kept U.S. interest rates lower than might have otherwise been the case given recent improvements in the U.S. economy. And, although there has been some recent progress in Europe on a longer-term solution, a near-term fix remains elusive. However, should
a credible plan emerge, some of the recent fund inflows may reverse leading to higher interest rates. If a credible plan fails to emerge, interest rates may very well remain at their recent lows.

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 1.9 percent Corporate Bonds, 86.5 percent Agency Securities, 10.4 percent US Treasury Securities and 1.2 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 December 31, the General Fund portfolio returned 0.18 percent. This compares to the benchmark return of 0.43 percent. Over this same time period, the Paratransit Fund portfolio returned 0.18 percent. This compares to the benchmark return of 1.02 percent.

The Performance graph in Exhibit 3 shows the relative performance of each fund for the trailing 24-quarter 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 December 31, the portfolio’s yield to maturity or call was 0.54 percent. The General Fund benchmark’s yield to maturity was 0.75 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 2.27 percent.

Prepared by: Lori Snow, Manager, Finance Treasury 650-508-6425
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
REPORT OF INVESTMENTS
FOR QUARTER ENDED DECEMBER 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 SUNTRUST BANK/CSI GROUP</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>Bank of America</td>
<td>04-30-12</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,038,460</td>
<td>2,013,670</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>2,020,670</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>02-16-12</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,551,600</td>
<td>10,058,130</td>
<td>187,500</td>
<td>10,245,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>03-15-12</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>3,771,635</td>
<td>3,541,937</td>
<td>63,122</td>
<td>3,605,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>03-23-12</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,993,300</td>
<td>5,022,375</td>
<td>28,924</td>
<td>5,051,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB</td>
<td>03-08-13</td>
<td>13,500,000</td>
<td>13,209,399</td>
<td>14,246,483</td>
<td>211,875</td>
<td>14,458,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>11-21-13</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>2,999,400</td>
<td>2,992,392</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,993,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>12-06-13</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,990,725</td>
<td>4,991,540</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>4,993,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>12-06-13</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,997,885</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>5,000,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>03-14-14</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>7,997,200</td>
<td>7,987,448</td>
<td>14,861</td>
<td>8,002,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>04-18-14</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
<td>10,993,400</td>
<td>11,037,862</td>
<td>33,458</td>
<td>11,071,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA - Step Up</td>
<td>04-18-14</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>4,499,100</td>
<td>4,505,256</td>
<td>9,125</td>
<td>4,514,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed. Fam Credit Bank</td>
<td>12-29-15</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>1,020,405</td>
<td>1,143,252</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1,143,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Urban Devel</td>
<td>08-01-17</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>829,768</td>
<td>804,256</td>
<td>26,360</td>
<td>830,616</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>3,744,825</td>
<td>3,719,537</td>
<td>3,924,168</td>
<td>9,848</td>
<td>3,934,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLATERALIZED MORTGAGE OBLIGATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB SERIES 4S-2012 CLASS 1</td>
<td>01-25-12</td>
<td>891,475</td>
<td>907,354</td>
<td>893,850</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>894,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB SERIES 00-0606 CLASS Y</td>
<td>12-28-12</td>
<td>339,491</td>
<td>346,280</td>
<td>351,501</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>351,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INVESTMENT FUNDS PORTFOLIO MANAGED BY SUNTRUST BANK/CSI GROUP</td>
<td>77,225,790</td>
<td>77,867,563</td>
<td>78,512,006</td>
<td>599,552</td>
<td>79,111,556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
REPORT OF INVESTMENTS (Con't)
FOR QUARTER ENDED DECEMBER 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>PARATRANSIT TRUST FUND PORTFOLIO:</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>5,004,800</td>
<td>5,001,590</td>
<td>47,778</td>
<td>5,049,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Treasury Note</td>
<td>02-15-12</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>3,995,000</td>
<td>4,006,248</td>
<td>20,625</td>
<td>4,026,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>01-07-14</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,015,200</td>
<td>5,205,480</td>
<td>60,417</td>
<td>5,265,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>04-23-14</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,510,690</td>
<td>2,613,348</td>
<td>11,806</td>
<td>2,625,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA Step Up</td>
<td>01-27-16</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,988,750</td>
<td>4,999,715</td>
<td>21,389</td>
<td>5,021,104</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>2,674,875</td>
<td>2,639,162</td>
<td>2,802,977</td>
<td>7,034</td>
<td>2,810,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL PARATRANSIT PORTFOLIO
MANAGED BY SUNTRUST BANK/CSI GROUP | 24,174,875 | 24,153,602 | 24,629,358 | 169,048 | 24,798,406 |

TOTAL DISTRICT PORTFOLIO
MANAGED BY SUNTRUST BANK/CSI GROUP | 101,400,665 | 102,021,165 | 103,141,364 | 768,600 | 103,909,963 |

LIQUIDITY FUNDS MANAGED BY DISTRICT STAFF:

| BANK OF AMERICA CHECKING | 3,031,619 | 3,031,619 | 0 | 3,031,619 |
| LAIF | 30,172,006 | 30,172,006 | 23,347 | 30,195,353 |

TOTAL FUNDS MANAGED BY DISTRICT STAFF | 33,203,625 | 33,203,625 | 23,347 | 33,226,972 |

TRUST FUNDS MANAGED BY THIRD PARTY TRUSTEE:

| First American Gov't. Oblig, Cl D | 3,092,292 | 3,092,292 | 3,092,292 | 0 | 3,092,292 |
| Banco Bilbao Vizcaya CP | 3,537,000 | 3,537,000 | 3,537,000 | 0 | 3,537,000 |
| Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corp | 03-23-2012 | 2,253,000 | 2,255,972 | 2,263,071 | 13,192 | 2,276,263 |

TOTAL FUNDS MANAGED BY THIRD PARTY TRUSTEE | 8,882,292 | 8,885,265 | 8,892,363 | 13,192 | 8,905,555 |

TOTAL AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2011 | 110,282,958 | 144,110,055 | 145,237,352 | 805,139 | 146,042,490 |
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*

### Trailing 12 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SamTrans - Gen Funds</strong></td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>-0.05%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SamTrans - Paratran</strong></td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>-0.06%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>-0.09%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-0.02%</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark - Gen Fund</strong></td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>-0.20%</td>
<td>-0.05%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>-0.01%</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>-0.24%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>-0.08%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>3.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark - Paratran</strong></td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>-0.41%</td>
<td>-0.08%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>-0.09%</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
<td>-0.30%</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>9.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Returns

- General Fund
- Paratransit Fund
- Gen Fund - Benchmark

*CSI Capital Management, Inc.*
SamTrans
Growth of a Thousand Dollars
Rolling 24 Months

CSI Capital Management, Inc.
SamTrans
Percent of Assets Held by Type

CSI Capital Management, Inc.
TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: PROPOSED REVISION TO THE DISTRICT’S DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PROGRAM TO INCLUDE A SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PROGRAM

ACTION
The District’s Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Review Committee proposes the Committee recommend that the Board approve the following actions:

a. Revise the District’s DBE Program to include the following Small Business Enterprise (SBE) program elements:
   i) Implementing a procurement procedure to obtain, when feasible and practicable, at least one of three price quotations from a small business for procurements other than Request for Proposals (RFPs) and Invitation for Bids (IFBs);
   ii) Providing District staff a readily accessible SBE database to locate small businesses;
   iii) Modifying our vendor registration process to facilitate interaction between prime contractors and subcontractors, including small businesses; and
   iv) Applying a 5 percent SBE point or bid preference in the evaluation of proposals or bids that utilize small businesses for all RFPs and IFBs;

b. Authorize the General Manager/CEO to submit the revised DBE Program to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) by the designated deadline of February 28, 2012.

SIGNIFICANCE
The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) issued final rules on DBE Program Improvements on February 28, 2011, requiring DOT grantees to include one or more elements in its DBE program to structure contracting requirements to facilitate competition by small business
enterprises (SBEs). The proposed element(s) must be submitted to the FTA for approval as part of a grantee’s DBE program by February 28, 2012.

**BUDGET IMPACT**

The first three elements referenced above have no impact on the District’s budget. Furthermore, the proposed 5 percent SBE point preference will have no impact on the District’s budget because the point preference applies only to contracts awarded based on highest ranked proposer or, in other words, contracts resulting from RFPs where price is negotiated.

The proposed 5 percent SBE bid preference, however, may have an impact on the budget because the preference is considered in monetary terms. The 5 percent bid preference applies only to contracts awarded based on price (i.e., contracts resulting from IFBs) and the bid preference is capped at $50,000 per contract which limits the District’s monetary exposure. The impact on the District’s budget will only materialize when the application of the bid preference is significant enough to affect the outcome of the bids.

The following illustrates the application of the Bid preference:

**Illustration of SBE Bid Preference Evaluation Adjustment**

*For Construction (Public Works) Contracts Awarded on the Basis of Lowest Responsible Bid*

An SBE Goal must be established and publicized in the IFB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bid Amount $</th>
<th>SBE Goal</th>
<th>Total SBE Utilization $</th>
<th>Total SBE Utilization %</th>
<th>SBE Preference Adjustment $</th>
<th>Adj. Bid Evaluation $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(assume)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c) = (b)/(a)</td>
<td>(d) = (Preference to be assigned from below)</td>
<td>(f) = (a) - (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime A</td>
<td>$998,000.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime B</td>
<td>1,048,000.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>49,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime C</td>
<td>1,096,000.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime D (SBE)</td>
<td>1,036,000.00</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>1,036,000.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>49,900.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Winning Bid = Prime D, which has an adjusted bid of $986,100 for evaluation purposes, but will be awarded a contract at its bid price of $1,036,000

Maximum Preference = 5% of lowest bid (up to a max cap of $50,000)

Lowest Bid = 998,000.00

Preference to be assigned = 49,900.00

Bidders A and C did not meet the agency goal of 20% and were not given the SBE preference.

**BACKGROUND**

On February 28, 2011, the DOT issued final rules intended to improve the DBE Program. According to the preamble to the final rules, DOT believes that “a program element that pulls together the various ways that a [grantee] reaches out to small businesses and makes it easier for them to compete for DOT-assisted contracts will foster the objectives of the DBE program.” Accordingly, the DOT is requiring grantees to (1) include one or more elements in its DBE Program to foster small business participation and (2) submit its revised DBE Program to a DOT operating administration (such as the FTA) for approval by February 28, 2012.
For the past ten months, the DBE Officer has been engaged in a series of dialogue with other Bay Area transportation agencies, stakeholders in the District, and general counsel to assess potential small business program elements. An internal SBE Committee comprised of a cross section of District managers and directors (from Finance, Maintenance, Rail Services, Capital Contracts, and Contracts and Procurement) was formed to evaluate program options. Over the past four months, the SBE Committee evaluated more than fifteen options, including programs implemented by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, and the California Department of General Services. The SBE Committee discussed at length the pros and cons of each option and determined that the four elements referenced above are the most feasible within the context of current resources, procurement practices, and budgetary constraints.

The SBE Committee carefully weighed the potential cost impact of the SBE bid preference program and concluded that the impact is minimal. First, the bid preference is capped at $50,000 per contract and its cost impact will only materialize when the application of the bid preference affects the outcome of an IFB. Second, the SBE Committee felt it was important to send the correct message to the business community that the District is incentivizing and rewarding subcontracting practices rather than requiring it. Finally, the SBE Committee concluded that a preference program is preferred over other alternatives, such as requiring bidders to meet an SBE goal or demonstrate good faith efforts to meet the goal because it reduces administrative burden, lessens paperwork on the part of a bidder, and mitigates the potential of a protracted procurement and appeal process. The SBE Committee concluded that the potential cost of an appeal resulting from a disputed good faith effort analysis and the loss of time in delivering a project outweighed the potential cost of the SBE preference. Accordingly, the SBE preference program is being recommended as a core component of the District’s efforts to foster small business participation.

Prepared by: Raymond Lee, DBE Officer 650-508-7939
Bill Carson, Manager, Employee Relations & Civil Rights 650-508-6234
RESOLUTION NO. 2012 -
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

***

AUTHORIZING REVISION TO THE DISTRICT'S DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE PROGRAM TO INCLUDE A SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PROGRAM

WHEREAS, effective February 28, 2011, the United States Department of Transportation (“DOT”) issued amending regulations regarding the participation of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (“DBEs”) in federally assisted contracts (“Regulations”); and

WHEREAS, the Regulations require DOT grantees to include one or more elements in its DBE Program to structure contracting requirements to facilitate competition by small business enterprises (SBEs); and

WHEREAS, the Regulations require DOT grantees to submit its proposed SBE program elements to a DOT operating administration (such as the Federal Transit Administration) for approval by February 28, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO has recommended the following SBE program elements:

i) Implementing a procurement procedure to obtain, when feasible and practicable, at least one of three price quotations from a small business for procurements other than Invitation for Bids (IFBs) and Request for Proposals (RFPs);

ii) Providing agency staff a readily accessible SBE database to locate small businesses;
iii) Modifying the agency’s vendor registration process to facilitate interaction between prime contractors and subcontractors, including small businesses; and

iv) Applying a 5 percent SBE point or bid preference in the evaluation of proposals or bids that utilize small businesses for all RFPs and IFBs; and

**WHEREAS,** the Board of Directors finds that the proposed SBE program elements are appropriate and reasonable.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby authorizes the General Manager/CEO to revise the District’s DBE Program to adopt the foregoing SBE program elements, and to make such other revisions to the DBE Program, and to take such actions as necessary, to implement the SBE component of the DBE Program; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Board of Directors directs the General Manager/CEO to submit the revised DBE Program to the United States Department of Transportation through the Federal Transit Administration by February 28, 2012, in accordance with the Regulations.

Regularly passed and adopted this 8th day of February 2012 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                     C.H. (Chuck) Harvey
Deputy CEO                Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZING CONTRACT EXTENSION AMENDMENT FOR SECURITY GUARD SERVICES

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend that the Board:

1. Authorize the sixth amendment to the agreement with Cypress Security, LLC (Cypress) for furnishing security guard services in order to extend the contract term on a month-to-month basis from March 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012 for an additional estimated $1,156,700.

2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO, or designee, to execute the sixth amendment to the Agreement.

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of the above actions will provide staff sufficient time to develop a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the provision of security guard services that will address the San Mateo County Transportation District's (District’s) requirements while the current contractor continues to provide these services.

BUDGET IMPACT
The current approved contract amount is insufficient to provide security guard services during the 10-month contract extension. This amendment will increase the total contract amount from $6,856,724 to $8,013,424. Funds for the services to be provided pursuant to this amendment will be available under the approved and projected operating budgets.

BACKGROUND
Pursuant to Resolution 2006-36, the Board awarded a three-year contract with two one-year option terms to Cypress Security, LLC of San Francisco to provide security guard services to the District.

The re-solicitation of security guard services for the District has been delayed to give staff sufficient time to develop a new scope of work for the RFP that will solicit services that encompass requirements of both the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and the District.
Cypress and staff negotiated a 25-cent per hour rate increase to the current contracted hourly rates that Cypress bills the District. The rate increase represents a 2.21 percent increase over current billing amounts, is less than the latest published Consumer Price Index of 3.2 percent and is the first rate increase since February 2008. The new estimated monthly rate of $115,670 will apply on a month-to-month basis until a new contract is in place. Staff anticipates issuing the RFP for security guard services in early 2012.

Contract Officer: Luis F. Velásquez 650-622-8099
Project Manager: Dave Triolo, Chief of Protective Services 650-508-6237
RESOLUTION NO. 2012 -

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

*   *   *

AUTHORIZING THE SIXTH AMENDMENT TO EXTEND THE TERM OF THE AGREEMENT WITH CYPRESS SECURITY, LLC FOR PROVISION OF SECURITY GUARD SERVICES AND TO INCREASE THE ESTIMATED AGREEMENT AMOUNT BY $1,156,700

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Resolution 2006-36, the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District (District) authorized the award of a contract to Cypress Security, LLC (Cypress) for provision of security guard services; and

WHEREAS, staff proposes to extend the Agreement for an additional 10 months on a month-to-month basis to allow time for the District to develop and issue a Request of Proposals to provide security guard services for the District and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that the Board authorize the Sixth Amendment to the Agreement with Cypress, which will extend the contract term on a month-to-month basis from March 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012 and increase the contract amount by an estimated $1,156,700.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the District authorizes the sixth amendment to the agreement with Cypress Security, LLC of San Francisco, California to extend the contract term on a month-to-month basis from March 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012, and to increase the contract amount by an estimated $1,156,700; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the General Manager/CEO or his designee to execute the Sixth Amendment, in a form approved by legal counsel.

Regularly passed and adopted this 8th day of February 2012 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

____________________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

_______________________
District Secretary
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR SOUTH BASE BUS WASH SYSTEM

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend that the Board:
1. Award a contract to the sole bidder, NS Corporation of Inglewood, CA to furnish one bus wash system at South Base for a total of $324,288.
2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO or his designee to execute the contract with NS Corporation in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the bid specification documents.

SIGNIFICANCE
Award of this contract will provide the District with a new bus wash system to replace the existing one at South Base.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funds to support the award of this contract have been budgeted in prior year Capital budgets; no additional funding is required for this action.

BACKGROUND
The District is currently utilizing a bus wash system that was designed and fabricated over 34 years ago and was overhauled 21 years ago. It has reached the end of its useful life.

An Invitation for Bids (IFB) was issued to obtain bids for removing the existing bus wash system and to furnish and install a new bus wash system at South Base. This solicitation was a rebid of one previously issued June 2009 for which all bids were rejected. Staff advertised the requirement on the District website and in a local newspaper. Solicitation notifications went out to interested bidders including Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs) that were registered in the District’s vendor database. A single bid was received as listed below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent Cost Estimate</td>
<td>$316,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS Corporation</td>
<td>$324,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A survey on why other companies did not bid resulted in the following findings: 1) a contractor could not obtain a bid proposal from the manufacturer in order to forward a bid; 2) a manufacturer felt that combining engineering, manufacturing and installation into one contract was not in its best interest; 3) firms could not meet specifications; 4) timeline did not meet contractor’s schedule; and 5) a firm felt its price would not have been competitive.

Staff and General Counsel reviewed NS Corporation's bid and determined it was responsive to the specifications. In addition, the Project Manager has determined that NS Corporation possesses the requisite depth of experience, has the required qualifications to successfully perform the scope of services defined in the solicitation documents, and appears fully capable of providing the specified services. Also, in accordance with Federal Transit Administration requirements staff conducted a cost analysis, which demonstrated that NS Corporation’s bid is fair and reasonable. Finally, NS Corporation is responsive to the District’s DBE requirements, as it intends to engage two small business subcontractors, one of which is a DBE.

Contract Officer: Evelyn Marcal 650-508-7958
Project Manager: Jeff Thomas, Contract Administrator, Facilities 650-508-6309
RESOLUTION NO. 2012 -

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

* * *

AUTHORIZING CONTRACT AWARD TO NS CORPORATION FOR FURNISHING A SOUTH BASE BUS WASH SYSTEM AT A TOTAL PRICE OF $324,288.20

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) solicited competitive bids for a South Base bus wash system; and

WHEREAS, in response to the District’s Invitation for Bids (IFB), one firm submitted a bid; and

WHEREAS, staff and General Counsel have reviewed the bid submitted by NS Corporation of Inglewood, CA and determined it meets the requirements of the solicitation documents; and

WHEREAS, staff has determined that NS Corporation possesses the requisite depth of experience, has the required qualifications to successfully perform the scope of services, and appears fully capable of providing the specified services; and

WHEREAS, staff has conducted a cost analysis and finds NS Corporation’s bid to be fair and reasonable; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that a contract be awarded to NS Corporation, whose bid meets all of the requirements of the solicitation documents.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the District awards a contract to NS Corporation for furnishing a bus wash system in South Base for a total price of $324,288.20; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager/CEO or designee is authorized to execute a contract on behalf of the District with NS Corporation in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the bid specifications.

Regularly passed and adopted this 8th day of February, 2012, 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: COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2011

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

SIGNIFICANCE
Maze and Associates conducted the annual audit of the financial statements for the year ended June 30, 2011 and determined that the financial statements fairly represent the financial position of the District for the period of July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011.

The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report has four sections, the introductory, financial, statistical and single audit section. The financial section includes:

1) Independent Auditor’s Report – this report was prepared by the independent auditors, who rendered an unqualified opinion, which is the most favorable opinion an agency can receive in an audit. An unqualified opinion means that the financial statements are presented fairly and in accordance with generally accepted accounting principals in the United States.

2) Management’s Discussion and Analysis – this section provides management’s overview of the financial activities.

3) Basic Financial Statements – the basic financial statements include a statement of net assets, statement of revenues, expenses and changes in net assets, statement of cash flow, and notes to the financial statements which are essential to a full understanding of the data provided.

4) Required Supplementary Information – this includes the budgetary basis comparison for the Revenue and Expenses and the notes to the supplementary schedule which are essential to a full understanding of the data provided.

Together, all sections of the CAFR provide the detail as well as the perspective with which to assess the District’s financial condition.
BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the Budget.

BACKGROUND
The District contracts with an independent auditor to conduct yearly audits of the Financial Statements in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States of America. The introductory section and the statistical section presented in the CAFR are not required by California Government Code to be reported as part of the audited financial statements of the District but are required when producing a CAFR which the District chooses to do in order to provide detailed information about the financial condition of the District in a form that is understandable to the tax payers of the San Mateo County.

The CAFR is prepared and presented to the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) for their review, evaluation and to apply for the certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting which the District has received consistently over the years.

Prepared by: Jeannie Chen, Senior Accountant 650-508-6259
The Fiscal Year 2011 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report is available for review at the following link:

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:  Z. Kersteen-Tucker (Committee Chair), J. Gee, R. Guilbault

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

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

Committee Chair Zoe Kersteen-Tucker called the meeting to order at 2:42 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Legislative Committee Meeting of December 14, 2011
The committee approved the minutes (Groom/Gee).

Update on the State Legislative Program
Government Affairs Manager Seamus Murphy reported:

State
Last week the Legislature returned to session and the governor released his 2013 budget. Staff was looking for two elements in the budget: preservation of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds and whether the governor would proposal substantial appropriation of Proposition 1A connectivity funds. The budget contained no diversion of the STA funds and no mention was made of the connectivity funds. We expect to see more detail in the governor’s revised budget in May.

The bill deadline is February 24. Senate Bill 22 proposes to restrict the expenditure of Proposition 1A funds including the connectivity funds that were killed in committee. There is companion legislation in the Assembly that would do the same thing and will be in committee next week.

Federal
The biggest news was the expiration of the pre-tax transit commuter benefits program. One of the first things the Obama Administration did three years ago was make the pre-tax transit commuter benefits equal to the parking commuter benefits so transit riders would have the same benefit as people who drove to work. The expiration of this benefit means it drops down to $125 per month from $240 per month and parking remains at $240. The good news is that Senator Charles Schumer is proposing to reintroduce a bill to raise it back up to a level that is on par with the parking benefit and make the benefit permanent.

Adjourned:  2:46 p.m.
TO: Legislative Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Mark Simon
Executive Officer for Public Affairs

SUBJECT: 2012 STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend Board adoption of the attached legislative program to guide the District’s advocacy efforts in Sacramento and Washington, D.C. over the course of the 2012 calendar year.

SIGNIFICANCE
The 2012 State and Federal Legislative Program sets forth the principles that will guide Caltrain’s State and Federal advocacy efforts through the second half of the 2011-2012 State Legislative session and the 112th Congress. The program is intended to be broad enough to cover the wide variety of issues that will likely be considered and flexible enough to allow Caltrain, its staff, and its legislative advocates to respond swiftly and effectively to unanticipated developments. Adoption of the program provides our legislative delegation and our transportation partners with a Board-approved statement of Caltrain’s priorities.

The 2012 Legislative Program is divided into two sections:
1. State
2. Federal

Each section of the program consists of a summary of the key policy issues and a series of related goals and advocacy strategies.

The State Legislative Program is organized around four primary issues:
1. State Budget and Transportation Funding
2. Transportation Operations and Project Delivery
3. Climate Change, Air Quality Regulation and Environmental Policy
4. High Speed Rail

The Federal Legislative Program is organized around five primary issues:
In order to advance these goals, Government Affairs staff will work closely with the Board and Caltrain’s State and Federal legislative consultants to implement a comprehensive advocacy approach. This approach will include:

1. Direct, consistent Board advocacy efforts with policymakers and their staff to encourage steps that will advance Caltrain’s legislative priorities with an emphasis on funding
2. Participation in coordinated advocacy efforts in collaboration with the California Transit Association, the American Public Transportation Association and other advocacy organizations
3. Coordination of local, regional and statewide stakeholders in support of targeted policy objectives
4. Efforts to educate and build awareness among stakeholders and the public to foster support for legislative goals

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

**BACKGROUND**
Staff actively monitors State and Federal legislative activity and will seek Board positions on selected bills as appropriate to further Caltrain’s legislative objectives and to provide support for our advocacy efforts. Staff will supply updated reports summarizing relevant legislative and regulatory activities, allowing the Board to track legislative developments and providing opportunities to take appropriate action on pending legislation.

Prepared by: Seamus Murphy, Manager, Government Affairs 
650-508-6385
## 2012 Legislative Program

### State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Goals and Background</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Maintain and enhance State funding for public transit operations</strong>&lt;br&gt;The successful reenactment of the gas-tax swap in 2011 was the latest effort to help ensure that transit agencies will have a reliable source of State operating subsidy as long as the State collects a sales tax on diesel fuel. Still, some of the revenues that support the State Transit Assistance program (STA) remain vulnerable to redirection by the State Legislature. As the Governor and the Legislature consider proposals to address the State’s Fiscal Year (FY) 2012-13 budget shortfall it is possible that they will target these revenues. Additionally, at the end of the 2011 Legislative Session, legislation was proposed (SB 791) that would provide metropolitan planning organizations with enhanced authority to propose funding solutions that help meet local and regional transportation needs including operations. There is a strong likelihood that similar legislation will be considered in 2012.</td>
<td>• Support efforts to fund the STA program at levels specified in the 2011 reenactment of the 2010 gas tax swap legislation&lt;br&gt;• Support legislation that provides greater local and regional authority to propose enhanced funding for transit operations and other transportation needs.&lt;br&gt;• Support efforts to lower the two-thirds voter approval requirement for ballot measures that provide increased tax revenue for transportation purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Secure enhanced funding for public transportation infrastructure and capital programs</strong>&lt;br&gt;As a result of the gas tax swap, fewer resources are available for transportation infrastructure improvements. The elimination of the state sales tax on gasoline has left the State Transportation Improvement Program with fewer resources. State transit capital funding is essentially limited to ongoing Proposition 1B programs and, while capital funding for highways and local streets and roads has been maintained, it is still insufficient to meet expansion and ongoing maintenance needs. Additionally, the Governor expressed some reluctance in 2011 to conduct bond sales including the sale of infrastructure bonds that are critical to ongoing local and regional transportation infrastructure needs. The Governor has also, over the last two budget cycles, vetoed the vast majority of Proposition 1A connectivity funding appropriated by the Legislature to assist local and regional rail services connect to the State’s future high-speed rail network. The California Transportation Commission is working with the Department of Finance and the California High Speed Rail Authority to develop a plan to guide the future allocation of these revenues.</td>
<td>• Support efforts to lower the two-thirds voter approval requirement for ballot measures that provide increased tax revenue for transportation purposes&lt;br&gt;• Advocate for regularly scheduled state bond sales and the equitable allocation of bond revenues to Proposition 1A and Proposition 1B programs that address transit and transportation infrastructure needs.&lt;br&gt;• Monitor efforts to develop a plan for allocating Proposition 1A connectivity funds and advocate for a process and a plan that maintains and maximizes potential benefit to the Caltrain system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2012 Legislative Program

### 2. Transportation Operations and Project Delivery

**A. Improve State transportation project delivery, financing, management and oversight policies.**

Project delivery continues to be an area of focus. Oftentimes, transportation projects can take a considerable amount of time to complete. Project sponsors must maneuver through a multi-stage development and review process and delays are common. Therefore, it is important to identify opportunities to expedite the delivery of transportation projects in order to create operational efficiencies and provide the benefits of transportation improvements to the system’s users more quickly.

- Support legislation that would enhance transportation agencies’ ability to benefit from public private partnerships
- Support efforts to preserve and enhance innovative contracting alternatives available to transportation agencies

**B. Remove regulatory barriers to delivering effective public transportation services.**

Regulatory measures exist that sometimes conflict with evolving public transportation technologies, needs and priorities.

- Work internally to identify regulatory barriers that affect the delivery of effective transportation services
- Sponsor or support legislation that adjusts these regulations to maximize the agency’s ability to meet transportation service demands

### 3. Climate Change, Air Quality Regulation and Environmental Policy

**A. Ensure equitable implementation of AB 32 and SB 375**

In 2006, AB 32 (Nunez), the Global Warming Solutions Act, was passed making California the first state in the nation to attempt to cap its greenhouse gas emissions. AB 32 empowers the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to adopt rules and regulations to achieve this. Two years later, SB 375 (Steinberg) was enacted and put in place a framework for cutting vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a strategy for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector. Implementation planning for these regulations is ongoing but no funding source has been identified to support the planning or implementation of the regulation.

- Support implementation and legislation that:
  - Reinforces the overarching goal to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector by promoting clean transportation alternatives
  - Promotes opportunities, including the Grand Boulevard Initiative, to plan and construct high-density, mixed-use development near public transit
  - Promotes bicycle and pedestrian access to, and utilization of, public transit
  - Provides funding to support operations and capital needs required by transit operators to meet State emissions mandates
  - Provides dedicated funding enabling transportation planning agencies to meet specified emissions reduction targets and to accommodate increased service demand resulting from VMT reduction efforts
  - Addresses and accounts for the potential erosion of traditional transportation funding through the reduction of taxable fuel consumption
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Reform</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The governor recently signed AB 900 which offers CEQA reform for certain infrastructure projects. Titled the “Jobs and Economic Improvement Through Environmental Leadership Act,” the bill establishes specified procedures for the expedited judicial review of environmental impact reports (EIRs) and approvals granted for specific types of leadership projects. Overall, the law allows for a shorter judicial review timeline and for certain projects to be completed faster. The bill, however, does not specifically authorize transit projects as qualifying for these CEQA reform measures. Legislative leadership has signaled its intent to create a working group to consider needed “clean up” of AB 900, for possible introduction in 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. High-speed Rail</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continue coordinated planning and funding efforts that advance the study of integrated high-speed rail and modernized Caltrain service on the Caltrain corridor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain and the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) continue to work together to deliver high speed rail and a modernized and electrified Caltrain system between San Jose and San Francisco. Caltrain has released preliminary findings of a capacity analysis showing that integrated service on the corridor is operationally feasible and this integrated approach has been recently included in the CHSRA Draft Business Plan. Additional analysis is underway to determine overall feasibility of an integrated approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Support legislative efforts to simplify the CEQA review process in relation to TOD, infill development, bicycle and pedestrian and other projects and plans so that CEQA takes better account of the positive environmental impacts of a project, allowing for a more comprehensive evaluation of the trade-offs.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Support legislation and policies that equip the California High Speed Rail Authority with the necessary resources and organizational structure to effectively plan and deliver high speed passenger rail and improved commuter rail service along the Caltrain corridor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Support efforts that encourage thorough study of project alternatives that support integrated Caltrain and HSR operations.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>• Advocate for continued efforts that will enhance public participation during the project’s planning process and will prepare the project to capitalize on future funding opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Surface Transportation Authorization | **A. Timing:** Secure predictable federal transportation funding levels through multi-year authorization  
Since the expiration of SAFETEA-LU in 2009, Congress enacted several extensions of the current authorization as they have struggled to address challenges before considering a multi-year bill.  
**B. Investment levels and Project Delivery:** Ensure that authorized funding maintains or enhances current transportation investment levels and includes policies and programmatic reforms that promotes more efficient project delivery  
Under SAFETEA-LU, the overall funding level for highways, public transit, highway safety, motor carrier safety, and transportation research during the legislation’s six-year life was $286.4 billion. While this amount was greater than previous authorizations, it fell far short of the level of federal investment needed to maintain the nation’s existing transportation infrastructure, as well as to expand its capacity in order to keep up with the steadily growing demand for transportation.  
Still, political circumstances have complicated efforts to pass multi-year legislation that increases transportation funding since even maintaining current funding levels will require greater revenues than those that currently support the Highway Trust fund and Mass Transit Accounts.  
In 2011, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee proposed a reauthorization measure that would have reduced federal transportation investment by approximately 30 percent. Alternatively, the Senate is currently considering a two-year proposal that would maintain current investment levels. | • Support efforts to gain swift approval of a multi-year surface transportation authorization act  
• If necessary, support extension of the prior authorization in a manner that minimizes funding uncertainty and enhances overall infrastructure investment  
Support multi-year surface transportation reauthorization proposals that:  
• Maintain or enhance existing federal investment levels  
• Authorize adequate resources to implement federal rail safety requirements including positive train control and continue the planning and development of a nationwide high-speed rail network  
• Provide funding guarantees that promote long-range planning, financing and leveraging by ensuring that authorized funding is appropriated each year  
• Provisions that allow more flexibility to use federal funding to support operating needs  
• Remove roadblocks to efficient project delivery |
### 2012 Legislative Program

#### C. Sustainability & Livability:
- **Establish policies that reflect public transportation’s role in greenhouse gas reduction**
  
  States continue to enact transportation and land use planning policies that encourage mixed-use, higher density, walkable development near transit. In addition, federal agencies have announced new partnerships intended to reduce VMT by promoting these goals on a national scale.

- **Advocate for the inclusion of funding that furthers coordinated integration of programs that support housing, transportation and land use planning and investment**
- **Support other efforts to provide greater resources to coordinated transportation and land use planning efforts including the Grand Boulevard Initiative**

#### 2. FY 2013 Transportation Appropriations

- **Secure full appropriation for public transportation programs at authorized levels and maximize discretionary funding opportunities**
  
  Every year, Congress adopts at least 12 separate appropriations bills, including one for transportation. These measures provide the authority for federal agencies to spend money during the upcoming fiscal year for the programs they administer. In the case of surface transportation, the annual appropriations process is guided by funding and programs authorized in SAFETEA-LU until successor legislation is enacted.

  Funding to support the safety and security of the nation’s public transit systems is also included in the U.S. Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill.

- **Support a minimum appropriations level for federal surface transportation programs equal to the guaranteed spending levels authorized in SAFETEA-LU or its successor**
- **Advocate for the highest possible levels of funding for individual programs within the highway and transit titles of SAFETEA-LU or its successor and in the U.S. Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill**
- **Work with the agency’s Congressional delegation to seek discretionary funding as appropriate**

#### 3. Climate Change

- **Ensure that federal climate change legislation provides funding to expand clean transportation programs and services**
  
  Despite several recent efforts, Congress has been unable to pass legislation that would address climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Previous versions of the legislation have included a cap and trade system with emissions allowances that would be traded in a market based system. A portion of the revenues generated through the sale of these allowances could be used to fund clean transportation projects. The transportation sector produces approximately one-third of the greenhouse gas emissions in this country, primarily in the form of carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions generated by automobiles.

- **Advocate that climate change legislation includes a funding strategy that reflects the opportunity for greenhouse gas reduction through new investment in clean transportation alternatives**
- **Support dedicated formula funding that promotes energy efficiency in transit operations**
- **Support funding for planning and capital investment related to the promotion of transit oriented development opportunities and sustainable land use strategies including the Grand Boulevard Initiative that would result in VMT reduction**
- **Advocate that transportation planning and infrastructure receive its fair share of revenue from a cap-and-trade system, while also emphasizing that such revenue must be supplemental to, and not a substitute for, authorization of a robust federal surface transportation program**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Extend key tax provisions that encourage the use of public transit as a clean transportation alternative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act increased pre-tax transit commuter benefits to the same level offered for parking commuter benefits. Current law also provides a 50-cent per gallon tax credit to transit operators for the purchase of alternative fuels. Both tax provisions expired when Congress was unable to negotiate a year-long tax extenders bill at the end of 2011 and instead passed a short-term bill that did not include either the extension of equitable pre-tax commuter benefits or the alternative fuel credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support a permanent 50-cent per gallon alternative fuel tax credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support permanent pre-tax transit commuter benefits at a level equal to or greater than equivalent parking commuter benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Program (HSIPR)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximize federal investment in California’s High Speed Train Project that will benefit Caltrain modernization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Program (HSIPR) has provided more funding to California than any other state. Continued appropriation and allocation of these funds will be needed to support project alternatives that electrify and modernize Caltrain, while also addressing community concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for increased annual appropriations for the HSIPR program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) to identify and support funding opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advocate for the inclusion of substantial investment in the HSIPR program in the next surface transportation authorization act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that Caltrain electrification and modernization efforts are eligible to benefit from HSIPR funding opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Transit Safety and Security</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Monitor new federal safety proposals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The U.S. Department of Transportation with the authority to establish and implement safety standards for all modes of public transportation, including rail fixed guideway systems, buses and waterborne transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support transit safety proposals that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide opportunities for a collaborative effort between federal, state and local agency partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support consensus-based industry standards developed with input from public transit agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Retain and improves the existing state safety oversight framework by providing state regulators with the tools and resources necessary to ensure the performance of adequate safety oversight functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide public transit agencies with adequate time to achieve compliance without penalty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avoid unintended consequences that adversely affect public transit agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Secure full appropriation of authorized transit security grants and maximize discretionary funding opportunities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security is a top priority for public transit agencies across the United States. Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, public transit agencies have spent more than $2 billion on security and emergency preparedness programs from their own budgets. Although state and local governments, as well as public transit agencies, are doing what they can to improve security, it is important for the federal government to be a full partner in efforts to ensure the security of the nation’s public transit users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote appropriation of transit security grants in the FY 2013 U.S. Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill at authorized levels, separate from existing federal transit programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support Federal public transit security and safety funding that provides a 100 percent federal share with no match requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support funding for the Rail Safety Technology Grant program at levels that will allow rail operators to meet Federal positive train control implementation deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with Congressional delegation to approve and seek discretionary funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage consideration of transferring administration of transit security grant programs to the U.S. Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allow agencies to be direct recipients of grant funding to encourage timely award and receipt of funds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEGISLATIVE ITEM #3
FEBRUARY 8, 2012

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

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
Budget
The Governor released his initial Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 Budget proposal last month. The proposal assumes passage of sales and income tax increases by California voters that would reduce the budget shortfall to $9.2 billion. The remaining shortfall is addressed through cuts to health and human services and education programs. The proposal avoids any impact on state public transportation programs.

The budget proposal does not include details about the State’s investment in the high-speed rail program through the sale of Proposition 1A and Proposition 1A connectivity bonds. Those details are expected as a part of the Governor’s May Revision.

FEDERAL ISSUES
Authorization
The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee will mark up a new long-term reauthorization proposal on February 2. We expect to see a draft of the bill on January 27.

The Senate continues to work on its two-year authorization proposal. The Senate Finance Committee plans to mark up the bill during the week of January 31. The Finance Committee is charged with identifying revenues to cover the $12 billion needed to maintain current investment levels in Federal transportation programs.
Authorization for current surface transportation investment expires on February 31 and will need to be extended again unless it is reauthorized by Congress.

**Budget**
The President announced that he will release his FY 2013 budget on February 10.

Prepared By: Seamus Murphy, Government Affairs Manager 650.508.6388
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **AB 16** Perea D  
High-Speed Rail Authority. | SENATE INACTIVE FILE 9/9/2011 - Ordered to inactive file at the request of Senator Rubio. | 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. | **SENATE** INACTIVE FILE 9/9/2011 - Ordered to inactive file at the request of Senator Rubio. |
| **AB 41** Hill D  
High-Speed Rail Authority: conflicts of interest: disqualification: ex parte communications. | SENATE DESK 1/13/2012 - In Senate. Held at Desk. | 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.  
*Last Amended on 8/22/2011* | **SENATE DESK** 1/13/2012 - In Senate. Held at Desk. |
| **AB 57** Beall D  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission. | SENATE 2-YEAR 7/8/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(10). (Last location was T. & H. on 6/2/2011) | The Metropolitan Transportation Commission Act creates the Metropolitan Transportation Commission as a regional agency in the 9-county San Francisco Bay Area with comprehensive regional transportation planning and other related responsibilities. Existing law requires the commission to consist of 19 members, including 2 members each from the Counties of Alameda and Santa Clara, and establishes a 4-year term of office for members of the commission. This bill would, instead, require the commission to consist of 21 members, including one member appointed by the Mayor of the City of Oakland and one member appointed by the Mayor of the City of San Jose. The bill would require the initial term of those 2 members to end in February 2015. The bill would, effective with the commission term commencing February 2015, prohibit more than 3 members of the commission from being residents of the same county, as specified. By imposing new requirements on a local agency, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 58</strong> Galgiani D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 5/2/2011 - In committee: Set, second hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</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. Existing law provides for appointment of an executive director by the authority, who is exempt from civil service and serves at the pleasure of the authority. This bill, for purposes of managing and administering the ongoing work of the authority in implementing the high-speed train project, would authorize the Governor, upon the recommendation of the executive director, to appoint up to 6 additional authority officers, exempt from civil service, who would serve in specified positions at the pleasure of the executive director. The bill would require a salary survey to be conducted to determine the compensation for the executive director and additional exempt officers, and would require the salaries to be established by the authority and approved by the Department of Personnel Administration. Last Amended on 3/16/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 145</strong> Galgiani D</td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 8/26/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(11). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 8/16/2011)</td>
<td>Existing law, the California High-Speed Rail Act, creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with 9 members to develop and implement a high-speed train system in the state, with specified powers and duties. Existing law, pursuant to that act, specifies the powers and duties of the authority, which include entering into contracts with private and public entities for the design, construction, and operation of high-speed trains, the acquisition of rights-of-way through purchase or eminent domain, and the relocation of highways and utilities, among other things. Existing law requires the authority to adopt and submit to the Legislature, every 2 years, a business plan. Existing law authorizes the authority to appoint an executive director, and authorizes the Governor to appoint up to 6 additional persons exempt from civil service. Existing law provides for the authority to establish an independent peer review group. 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 repeal all of the provisions of the California High-Speed Rail Act. The bill would enact a new California High-Speed Rail Act. The bill would continue the High-Speed Rail Authority in existence with limited responsibilities and would place the authority within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency. The 5 members of the authority appointed by the Governor would be subject to Senate confirmation, but existing members could continue to serve the remainder of their terms. The bill would authorize the authority to appoint an executive director, and would provide for the Governor to appoint up to 6 additional individuals exempt from civil service as authority staff. The bill would require the authority to adopt policies directing the development and implementation of high-speed rail, prepare and adopt a business plan and high-speed train capital program, establish a peer review group, select alignments for the routes of the high-speed train system established by law, adopt criteria for the award of franchises, and set fares or establish guidelines for the setting of fares. Last Amended on 7/13/2011</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 277</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR 5/28/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). (Last location was APPR. on 5/27/2011)</td>
<td>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. <strong>Last Amended on 4/7/2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 296</strong></td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 8/26/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(11). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 7/11/2011)</td>
<td>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 encourage the department to consult and coordinate with specified state agencies, to implement the act. The bill would require the department to publish or make available on the department's Internet Web site, by January 1, 2014, a Cool Pavements Handbook to detail specifications, testing protocols, and best practices for cool pavements. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. <strong>Last Amended on 6/21/2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AB 333
#### Grove R

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. The act authorizes the state board, in furtherance of achieving the statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit by January 1, 2011, to adopt a regulation that establishes a system of market-based declining annual aggregate emission limits for sources or categories of sources that emit greenhouse gas emissions, applicable from January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2020, inclusive, that the state board determines will achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, in the aggregate, from those sources or categories of sources. The act also authorizes the state board to include in its regulations the use of market-based compliance mechanisms to comply with the regulations, subject to prescribed requirements.

This bill would require the state board to make findings and submit a status report to the Legislature no later than July 31, 2011, on the readiness of a proposed cap-and-trade program to begin January 1, 2012. The bill would authorize the board, if it makes a specified finding in the status report, to commence the cap-and-trade program after January 1, 2012, but no later than January 1, 2013. The bill would require the board to provide an annual cap-and-trade status report to the Legislature. **Last Amended on 5/11/2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 333</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES. 6/28/2011 - In committee: Hearing postponed by committee. (Refers to 6/14/2011 hearing)</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. The act authorizes the state board, in furtherance of achieving the statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit by January 1, 2011, to adopt a regulation that establishes a system of market-based declining annual aggregate emission limits for sources or categories of sources that emit greenhouse gas emissions, applicable from January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2020, inclusive, that the state board determines will achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, in the aggregate, from those sources or categories of sources. The act also authorizes the state board to include in its regulations the use of market-based compliance mechanisms to comply with the regulations, subject to prescribed requirements.</td>
<td><strong>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES. 6/28/2011</strong> In committee: Hearing postponed by committee. (Refers to 6/14/2011 hearing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AB 381       | ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR 5/13/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was PRINT on 2/14/2011) | 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. | **ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR 5/13/2011** Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was PRINT on 2/14/2011) |

<p>| AB 471       | ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR 5/28/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). (Last location was APPR. on 5/27/2011) | 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. <strong>Last Amended on 4/25/2011</strong> | <strong>ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR 5/28/2011</strong> Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). (Last location was APPR. on 5/27/2011) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 485</strong></td>
<td><strong>SENATE INACTIVE FILE 9/7/2011 - Ordered to inactive file at the request of Senator Wolk.</strong></td>
<td>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. <strong>Last Amended on 6/29/2011</strong></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 492</strong></td>
<td><strong>SENATE RLS. 6/27/2011 - From committee chair, with author's amendments: Amend, and re-refer to committee. Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on RLS.</strong></td>
<td>Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority with specified powers and duties relating to the development and implementation of an intercity high-speed rail system. Existing law, pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, authorizes $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail development and other related purposes. This bill would require the authority to consider, to the extent permitted by federal and state law, the creation of jobs and participation by small business enterprises in California when awarding major contracts or purchasing high-speed trains. The bill would require the authority to appoint a small business enterprise advisory committee. <strong>Last Amended on 6/27/2011</strong></td>
<td>Support</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AB 508 Swanson D**  
Displaced public transit, solid waste handling, and recycling services employees. | SENATE 2-YEAR 8/26/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(11). (Last location was APPR. on 6/23/2011) | 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.  
This bill would add employees of solid waste handling and recycling contractors and subcontractors to those provisions. By requiring local agencies to give a bidding preference to such contractors and subcontractors, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. | |
| **AB 522 Bonilla D**  
Vacation of public streets, highways, and public service easements. | ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR 5/13/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was PRINT on 2/15/2011) | Existing law establishes the processes and procedures necessary for vacation of public streets, highways, and public service easements, and defines "vacation" 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. | |
| **AB 567 Valadao R**  
Transportation funds: capital improvement projects. | ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR 5/13/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was PRINT on 2/16/2011) | 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. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 570</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR 5/13/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was PRINT on 2/16/2011)</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 598</td>
<td>NAT. RES. 1/9/2012 - In committee: Set, second hearing. Failed passage.</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. Last Amended on 3/31/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 676</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR 5/13/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was TRANS. on 3/3/2011)</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>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 710</td>
<td>SENATE THIRD READING 9/9/2011 - From inactive file. Senate Rule 29 suspended. (Ayes 24. Noes 12. Page 2453.) Ordered to third reading. Read third time. Refused passage. (Ayes 18. Noes 19. Page 2474.).</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 would also express a legislative finding and declaration that its provisions shall apply to all cities, including charter cities. Last Amended on 8/18/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 819</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY SECOND READING 1/19/2012 - From committee; Do pass. (Ayes 12. Noes 5.) (January 19).</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 requires all city, county, regional, and other local agencies responsible for the development or operation of bikeways or roadways where bicycle travel is permitted to utilize all minimum safety design criteria and uniform specifications and symbols for signs, markers, and traffic control devices established pursuant to specified provisions of existing law. This bill would require the department to establish procedures for cities, counties, and local agencies to request approval to use nonstandard planning, design, and construction features in the construction of bikeways and roadways where bicycle travel is permitted, and nonstandard signs, markers, and traffic control devices, in each case, for purposes of research, experimentation, and verification. Last Amended on 1/11/2012</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>SENATE INACTIVE FILE 8/22/2011 - Ordered to inactive file at the request of Senator Liu.</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 2007 Data Tables of 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. <strong>Last Amended on 5/10/2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>SENATE</strong> INACTIVE FILE 8/22/2011 - Ordered to inactive file at the request of Senator Liu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1092</strong> Lowenthal, Bonnie D</td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 8/26/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(11). (Last location was RLS. on 6/16/2011)</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. This bill would require the authority to report biannually 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><strong>SENATE</strong> 2-YEAR 8/26/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(11). (Last location was RLS. on 6/16/2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1206</strong> Galgiani D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR 5/28/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). (Last location was APPR. on 5/27/2011)</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 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><strong>ASSEMBLY</strong> 2-YEAR 5/28/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). (Last location was APPR. on 5/27/2011)</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 1229 Feuer D</td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 8/26/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(11). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 8/16/2011)</td>
<td>Existing law continuously appropriates the amounts specified in the annual Budget Act as having been deposited in the State Highway Account from federal transportation funds, and pledged by the California Transportation Commission, to the Treasurer for the purposes of issuing federal highway grant anticipation notes, commonly known as GARVEE bonds, to fund transportation projects selected by the commission. Existing law defines an &quot;eligible project&quot; for these purposes as the federally funded portion of a highway or other transportation project that has been designated for accelerated construction by the commission, and increases the capacity, reduces the travel time, or provides long-life rehabilitation of the key bridges and roadways of a corridor or gateway for interregional travel and movement of goods. Existing law prohibits the Treasurer from authorizing the issuance of the notes if the annual repayment obligations of all outstanding notes in any fiscal year would exceed 15% of the total amount of federal transportation funds deposited in the account for any consecutive 12-month period within the preceding 24 months. This bill would provide that an &quot;eligible project&quot; may include projects programmed by a regional transportation planning agency using its share of apportionments of federal regional surface transportation program funds or congestion mitigation and air quality funds, as specified. The bill would authorize no more than 50% of bonding capacity of GARVEE bonds from being made available for these projects and would require the commission to require a regional transportation planning agency to commit to repaying the state for debt service if that agency's share of federal regional surface transportation program funds or federal congestion mitigation and air quality funds is insufficient to repay the GARVEE bonds or if a portion of the project costs is ineligible for federal funding. The bill would, for such a repayment by a regional transportation planning agency, authorize the commission to amend into the State Transportation Improvement Program some or all of the funds necessary for the repayment to be counted against the county share of State Transportation Improvement Program funds for the county in which the project is located. By expanding the types of projects for which GARVEE bonds may be used, the bill would make an appropriation.</td>
<td>Last Amended on 6/21/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1287 Buchanan D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR 5/13/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was L. GOV. on 3/21/2011)</td>
<td>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>Last Amended on 6/21/2011</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AB 1308** Miller R  
Highway Users Tax Account: appropriation of funds. | ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR  
5/28/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). (Last location was APPR. on 5/27/2011) | 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. |  |
| **AB 1444** Feuer D  
Environmental quality: expedited judicial review: public rail transit projects. | ASSEMBLY PRINT  
1/5/2012 - From printer. May be heard in committee February 4. | 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. The Jobs and Economic Improvement Through Environmental Leadership Act of 2011 amended CEQA to establish, until January 1, 2015, an expedited judicial review process and specifies procedures for the preparation and certification of the administrative record for an EIR of a project meeting specified requirements that has been certified by the Governor as an environmental leadership development project.  
This bill would state the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation to provide the benefits provided by the Jobs and Economic Improvement Through Environmental Leadership Act of 2011 for new public rail transit infrastructure projects. |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 1448</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY ED.</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes school district governing boards to provide for the transportation of pupils to and from school whenever, in the judgment of the governing board, the transportation is advisable and reasons exist therefor. Existing law also authorizes school district governing boards to purchase or rent and provide for the upkeep, care, and operation of vehicles, or contract and pay for the transportation of pupils to and from school by common carrier or municipally owned transit system, or contract with and pay responsible private parties for the transportation. This bill would express legislative findings and declarations relating to the provision of home-to-school transportation by school districts. The bill would express legislative intent to fund home-to-school transportation to at least the level approved in the Budget Act of 2011.</td>
<td>Furutani D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 22</td>
<td>DIED in SENATE TRANS.</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.</td>
<td>La Malfa R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 46</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY DESK 8/22/2011 - In Assembly. Read first time. Held at Desk.</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, commencing on January 1, 2013, and continuing until January 1, 2019, require every designated employee and other 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. <strong>Last Amended on 6/2/2011</strong></td>
<td>Correa 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>SB 392</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaines R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation: California Transportation Commission.</td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 5/13/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was RLS. on 2/24/2011)</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>SB 475</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure financing.</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR 7/8/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(10). (Last location was L. GOV. on 6/29/2011)</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, after which time the project would revert to the governmental agency. 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 additionally permit the agreements to lease or license to, or provide other permitted uses by, the private entity. <strong>Last Amended on 6/20/2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 517</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowenthal D</td>
<td>High-Speed Rail Authority.</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY 2-YEAR 8/26/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(11). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 8/18/2011)</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. 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. <strong>Last Amended on 6/30/2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 624</td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 5/13/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was RLS. on 3/3/2011)</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, non-substantive changes to the above requirements.</td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 5/13/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was RLS. on 3/3/2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 693</td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 6/3/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(8). (Last location was T. &amp; H. on 4/13/2011)</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 6/3/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(8). (Last location was T. &amp; H. on 4/13/2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 733</td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 5/28/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 5/23/2011)</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. 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 on March 1, 2012.. Last Amended on 5/11/2011</td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 5/28/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 5/23/2011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Mateo County Transit District
State Legislative Matrix 1/23/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 749</strong> Steinberg D</td>
<td>SENATE THIRD READING 1/18/2012 - Read second time. Ordered to third reading.</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. 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. Last Amended on 1/4/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 783</strong> Dutton R</td>
<td>SENATE 9/10/2011 - Returned to Secretary of Senate pursuant to Joint Rule 62(a).</td>
<td>Under existing law, a person, firm, or corporation that interferes with the access rights of a disabled individual is liable for the actual damages of each offense and any amount determined by a judge or jury of up to 3 times the amount of the actual damages, but in no case less than $1,000. Existing law requires the State Architect to develop and submit for approval and adoption building standards for making buildings, structures, sidewalks, curbs, and related facilities accessible to, and usable by, persons with disabilities, as specified. This bill would establish notice requirements for an alleged aggrieved party to follow before bringing an action against a business for an alleged violation of the above-described provisions. The bill would require that party to provide specified notice to the owner of the property, agent, or other responsible party where the alleged violation occurred. The bill would require that owner, agent, or other responsible party to respond within 30 days with a description of the improvements to be made or with a rebuttal to the allegations, as specified. If that owner, agent, or other responsible party elects to fix the alleged violation, the bill would provide 120 days to do so. The bill would provide that its provisions do not apply to claims for recovery of special damages for an injury in fact, and would authorize the court to consider previous or pending actual damage awards received or prayed for by the alleged aggrieved party for the same or similar injury. The bill would further state the intent of the Legislature to institute certain educational programs related to special access laws. Last Amended on 6/6/2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 785</strong> Dutton R</td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 5/13/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was RLS. on 3/10/2011)</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.</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 832</strong></td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 5/13/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was RLS. on 3/10/2011)</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><strong>Strickland R</strong> California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 851</strong></td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 5/13/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was RLS. on 3/10/2011)</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><strong>Anderson R</strong> Transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 864</strong></td>
<td>SENATE 2-YEAR 5/13/2011 - Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was RLS. on 3/10/2011)</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><strong>Fuller R</strong> Emissions of greenhouse gases: market-based compliance mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2012– 3:00 p.m.
or immediately following previous Committee meeting

ACTION

1. Approval of Minutes of Planning, Development and Sustainability Committee Meeting of December 14, 2011

INFORMATIONAL

2. Overview of Shuttle Business Practices Guidebook - Presentation

Committee Members: Art Lloyd, Rose Guilbault, Carole Groom

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: C. Groom (Committee Chair), J. Deal, A. Lloyd

Other Board Members Present, Constituting Committee of the Whole: J. Gee, R. Guilbault, S. Harris, Z. Kersteen-Tucker, K. Matsumoto, A. Tissier

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

Committee Chair Carole Groom called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Planning, Development and Sustainability Committee Meeting of October 12, 2011
The Committee approved the minutes (Deal/Guilbault).

Update on Transition from Paper Monthly Pass to Clipper
Executive Officer Customer Service and Marketing Rita Haskin reported:

- Transition involved 7,000 monthly pass customers by January 2012 of which 2,353 are eligible discount, 2,068 youth and 2,597 adult.
- There will still be some monthly passes in the system for those who qualify for free and reduced lunch programs where SamTrans provides a subsidized pass.
- Outreach to customers began in July 2011.
- There were a total of 76 outreaches at senior centers, schools, malls, street fairs, district headquarters, transit centers, bus stops and on buses.
- Onboard information included Take Ones in both English and Spanish, article in Riders Digest, electronic message sign and an adcard.
- The September pass had the message about switching to Clipper and the December pass had this is the last monthly pass message.
- Media releases were sent to newspapers, Patch.com, radio and television.
- The website had a button on the home page which included general information, the application, frequently asked questions and location of outreach events.
- Information was also posted on Facebook and Twitter.
- To-date have received about 2,800 youth and senior applications and seeing an increase in Clipper card use.

Committee Chair Groom asked what the magic number is. Ms. Haskin said approximately 7,000 people need to be transitioned, but a portion of those are adults that can go to Walgreens or come here and obtain a card.
Chair Karyl Matsumoto asked in areas where there is a heavy Hispanic population are the electronic message boards bilingual too. Ms. Haskin said she believes it is in Spanish.

Director Shirley Harris asked if some vendors were lost because of the elimination of paper passes. Ms. Haskin said there were approximately 80-100 vendors throughout the county where a pass could be purchased. Safeway stores no longer sell passes and a few vendors will continue to sell tokens. All Walgreens will continue to support Clipper and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission is looking into the vendor issue in the county and focusing on the coast since there are no vendors there.

**Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report – First Quarter Fiscal Year 2012**

Director of Budgets and Grants April Chan said this is an informational item only.

**Adjourned:** 3:16 p.m.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO:          SamTrans Board

THROUGH:     Michael J. Scanlon
             General Manager/CEO

FROM:        Aidan Hughes
             Interim Executive Officer, Planning and Development

SUBJECT:     SHUTTLE BUSINESS PRACTICES GUIDEBOOK

ACTION
No action is required. This item is being presented to the Board for information only.

SIGNIFICANCE
This presentation will feature an overview of the Shuttle Business Practices Guidebook which SamTrans has been developing in coordination with the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, and City/County Association of Governments to assist entities involved in shuttle programming with strategies to improve coordination.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
Multiple shuttles operate in San Mateo County, including commuter and community shuttles. Shuttles are planned, funded and operated by a variety of different entities and stakeholders. Support for the overall shuttle program is strong and shuttles provide needed first and last-mile connections to transit, as well as general mobility options to meet community needs.

Opportunities exist to strengthen the role of shuttles as part of an integrated transportation network. The development of the Shuttle Business Practices Guidebook is an effort to address cross-cutting issues affecting the shuttle program and develop strategies to strengthen the effectiveness of the program county-wide. The efforts of the Guidebook are intended to support and supplement existing guiding policies from the respective agencies partnering on this project. The Guidebook is not intended as a shuttle route-level analysis, but as a useful tool to examine shuttle programming system-wide.

Prepared by:  Marisa Espinosa, Manager, Planning and Research  650-508-6226
AGENDA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building
Bacciocco Auditorium - Second Floor
1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2012 – 3:20 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 January 11, 2012
   b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for December 2011
   c. Acceptance of Quarterly Investment report and Fixed Income Market Review and
      Outlook for the Quarter Ended December 31, 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

6. COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE
   (Accessibility, Senior Services, and Community Issues)
   SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
   a. Accessibility Update
   b. Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update
   c. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report
   d. Mobility Management – Caltrain
   e. Multimodal Ridership Report – December 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
RESOLUTIONS
a. Authorize Revision to the District’s Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program to Include a Small Business Enterprise Program
b. Authorize Contract Extension with Cypress Security, LLC for Security Guard Services on a Month-to-Month Basis From March 1, 2012 Through December 31, 2012 for an Additional $1,156,700
c. Authorize Award of Contract to NS Corporation for a Bus Wash System at South Base for a Total of $324,288

SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
d. Fiscal Year 2011 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report

8. LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
MOTION
a. Approval of 2012 State and Federal Legislative Program

SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
b. State and Federal Legislative Update

9. PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
a. Overview of Shuttle Business Practices Guidebook

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

11. BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS/COMMENTS

12. DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING – March 14, 2012 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
b. Closed Session: Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(a): Ella Dupertius v San Mateo County Transit District

14. ADJOURNMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
MINUTES OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
JANUARY 11, 2012

Board Members Present: J. Deal, J. Gee, C. Groom, G. Guilbault, S. Harris, Z. Kersteen-Tucker, A. Lloyd, K. Matsumoto (Chair), A. Tissier

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

Chair Karyl Matsumoto called the meeting to order at 2:46 p.m.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE (GEE, HARRIS, LLOYD) – ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2012
Director Shirley Harris said the nominating committee of Directors Jeff Gee, Art Lloyd and herself recommend Director Jerry Deal as chair and Director Carole Groom as vice chair.

A motion (Harris/Tissier) to elect Director Deal chair and Director Groom as vice chair for 2012 was approved unanimously.

CONSENT CALENDAR
The Board approved the consent calendar (Lloyd/Tissier).
   a. Approval of Minutes of Board of Directors Meeting of December 14, 2011
   b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for November 2011

PUBLIC COMMENT
None

District Secretary Martha Martinez said she received a call from Jerry Grace and he wanted to wish the Board a Happy New Year.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR
Resolution of Appreciation to Outgoing Chair, Karyl Matsumoto
Chair Deal and Director Groom presented Director Matsumoto with a Resolution of Appreciation and a bouquet of flowers.

Director Matsumoto thanked the Board, staff and all employees for helping her this past year.

A motion (Tissier/Lloyd) to approve the Resolution of Appreciation to outgoing Chair Matsumoto was approved unanimously.

REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER/CEO
General Manager/CEO Michael Scanlon:
   • Congratulated Chair Deal and Director Groom as vice chair.
Thanked Director Matsumoto for her service this past year as chair.
Congratulated CAC Chair Peter Ratto on his re-election and Sondra Price’s election as vice chair.
Congratulated Director Adrienne Tissier on her election as President of the Board of Supervisors, Chair of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) and her continuing role as Chair of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

Mr. Scanlon reported:

The American Public Transportation Association (APTA) Safety Audit team was here this week and SamTrans is one of few agencies that consistently show continuous improvement in the culture of the transit safety plan and processes. All transportation supervisors received the APTA recommended Certified National Incident Management System. This is the training offered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

Training activity for the month of December was almost 1,800 hours and 700 hours was for new bus operator training.

Staff is interviewing candidates for part-time bus operators for a class of 12 to start in mid-April.

Customers experienced a rare event on Monday, January 9. The contractor MV Transportation made a critical error. The evening dispatcher went home ill and the relief dispatcher made a significant mistake that resulted in having inadequate operator resources on Monday morning. This caused nine trips to be missed. The missed trips were primarily on Routes 292 and KX and this caused a significant inconvenience to customers. Staff immediately followed-up with MV Transportation to ensure there were adequate resources for the remainder of the day and the next morning. The contract does provide for significant penalties for missed trips and staff is assessing them $1,000 for each missed trip.

The transition to AC Transit for the Dumbarton Express bus service went very smoothly. AC Transit assumed the contract and MV Transportation is operating the service. SamTrans is a member of the Dumbarton Bridge Consortium.

Fixed-routes averaged almost 27,000 between road calls and paratransit was 20,500. Both of these are over the goal of 20,000.

Runbook 107 was implemented on December 18. Initial comments on Routes 120 and 294 have been positive. There were some concerns raised about the San Francisco arrival and departure times on Route KX.

Runbook 108 will be implemented in June 2012 and will include the addition of the 12 part-time bus operators and will be the first runbook timed to accommodate the end of school year. This runbook will focus on time performance for Routes 390, 391 and KX.

Staff is continuing National Transit Database submittals.

The soft launch of the Day Pass is going smoothly. The Day Pass is three times the one way fare. Staff is monitoring progress to determine the date for the hard launch.

Ken Yeager was elected vice chair of the JPB and San Francisco Board of Supervisor Malia Cohen joined the Board replacing Sean Elsbernd.

This coming Monday Caltrain will be operating the Freedom Train. This train is chartered by the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Association of Santa Clara. The train departs from San Jose Diridon and stops at Sunnyvale, Palo Alto and San Mateo stations.

There will be public meetings later this month for Caltrain on proposed changes to the Codified Tariff including the continuing implementation of the Clipper system,
eliminating 8-ride tickets and propose increasing paper tickets by 25-cents for zones and up to 50-cents on Day Pass.

- The reading file contains a new SamTrans system map, quarterly listing of exterior advertising, new Information Guide and the Transit Fun Guide. The Transit Fun Guide shows the number of places people can go to on public transportation.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
- Accessibility Update
- Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update
- Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report
- Mobility Management Report – ADA Paratransit Service
- Multimodal Ridership Report – November 2011

FINANCE COMMITTEE
No report.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
- State and Federal Legislative Update

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
In reading file

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS
Director Matsumoto thanked CAC Chair Peter Ratto and the entire CAC for their great work. She said at the January San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) meeting Directors Don Horsley, Sepi Richardson and Naomi Patridge were sworn in. Director Carole Groom was elected chair of the TA.

Director Jeff Gee extended an invitation to everyone to join Redwood City in the Lunar New Year Celebration on February 4 to welcome the Year of the Dragon. The event will be from 11 a.m. – 4 p.m. on Courthouse Square.

GENERAL COUNSEL PROPOSAL
No report.

DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING – February 8, 2012 at 2 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District, Administrative Building, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070.

The meeting adjourned at 3:12 p.m.