AGENDA

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

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 2012 – 2:00 p.m.

1. Pledge of Allegiance

ACTION

2. Approval of Minutes of Community Relations Committee Meeting of April 11, 2012
3. Recommend Appointment of Citizens Advisory Committee Member, Tryn Miller, Representing Multimodal Riders
4. Designation of May as “Older Americans Month”

INFORMATIONAL

5. Student “Art Takes a Bus Ride” Contest
6. Accessibility Update - Tina DuBost
7. Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update - Nancy Keegan
8. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report - Peter Ratto

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), S. Harris, A. Lloyd

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

Other Board Members Absent, Constituting Committee of the Whole:  A. Tissier


Committee Chair Rose Guilbault called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Community Relations Committee (CRC) Meeting of
March 14, 2012
The committee approved the minutes (Harris/Lloyd).

Recommend Appointment of Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Members
Committee Chair Guilbault said 15 applications were received for four positions. Interviews were conducted by Directors Shirley Harris, Art Lloyd and herself on March 30. They are recommending the following for appointment:

- Kristopher Adler, Representing Community Riders
- Kathy Gilbert, Representing Community Riders
- Margaret Pye, Representing Community Riders
- Sondra Price, Representing Multimodal Riders

Accessibility Update
Manager, Accessible Transit Services Bill Welch said the Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) minutes reflect a discussion held on Clipper at the January meeting concerning whether an attendant can get a Clipper card to travel with a person needing assistance.

Committee Chair Guilbault asked how many people will take advantage of the attendant card. Mr. Welch said approximately 10-15 percent.

PCC Update
PCC Chair Nancy Keegan reported:
- Allan Newland, representing the Commission on Disabilities, has joined the PCC and Jim Ash of the Office of Emergency Services has retired and is no longer on the PCC.
• Thanked Mr. Welch and the maintenance division for allowing the PCC to review and offer comments and suggestions on the new 5310 vehicles. This is the only PCC with a Bus Review Committee.

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Liaison Report
CAC Chair Peter Ratto reported on their April 4 meeting:
• Received a SamTrans Service Plan update by Interim Executive Officer Planning and Development Aidan Hughes.
• Received reports from Manager, Operations Planning Eric Harris and Manager, Bus Contracts Paul Lee regarding concerns members raised at the March 7 meeting.
• CAC member Kim Nobles has resigned from the committee and is relocating to Yolo County. May will be her last meeting and the committee will present her with a Certificate of Appreciation.

Mobility Management Report – Fixed-route Bus Service
Director of Bus Transportation Chester Patton reported:
• Average weekday ridership is 42,620, a decrease of 3.2 percent from last year.
• Farebox revenue for February was $1.5 million.
• Tokens remain a popular fare media with 64,000 tokens used in March.
• There were less than five missed schedules in February.
• On-time performance is at 85 percent.
• There were 167 customer complaints in February.
• Continue to see good fleet reliability and currently tracking at 25,000 between service calls.
• Daily cleaning of the buses includes:
  o Washed, floors are mopped with a disinfectant and gum is removed from the floor mats.
  o Any graffiti is removed.
• Bus operators perform a 41-item safety inspection prior to taking a bus into service. Buses do not leave the yard with any defect.
• Daily inspections by the utility workers include:
  o Lights inside and out.
  o Air leak, coolant leak, engine oil leak and transmission oil leak.
  o Ride height.
  o Brake shoe contact.
  o Lift/ramp.
• There are a numerous computer systems on each bus to diagnose any problems.
• Bus maintenance training is very extensive and mechanics from other transit properties have the opportunity to attend our training.
• These shared training efforts realize the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s Transit Sustainability Project strategy of better coordination with other transit systems.

Director Karyl Matsumoto asked if we charge for other transit agencies to attend our maintenance training. Deputy CEO Chuck Harvey said no.
Director Zoe Kersteen-Tucker asked how big of a problem graffiti is. Director of Maintenance David Olmeda said SamTrans is very fortunate with graffiti but do get scratched windows. General Manager/CEO Michael Scanlon said if you are not aggressive with the graffiti it will cause more graffiti to appear.

Mr. Harvey said the biggest expense with graffiti is the windows being scratched in the back of the buses. Many years ago a suggestion was made by two maintenance employees to put a plexiglass liner on the inside of the window which meant the window didn’t have to be torn apart every time a window needed to be replaced just the liner had to be replaced.

Director Shirley Harris said she rode Route 122 and the bus was very clean, driver was very courteous and the passengers seemed very happy.

**Multimodal Ridership Report – February 2012**

- Bus ridership was 42,620, a decrease of 3.2 percent.
- Paratransit ridership was 1,031, a decrease of 2.2 percent.
- Caltrain ridership was 42,960, an increase of 15.9 percent.
- Caltrain shuttle ridership was 7,871, an increase of 45.1 percent.
- BART shuttle ridership was 1,741, a decrease of 13.9 percent.

Director Kersteen-Tucker asked to what degree is the decrease in bus ridership due to the introduction of Clipper. Mr. Harvey said staff continues to look at ridership and Clipper impact and it is a work in progress.

Adjourned: 2:33 p.m.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: DESIGNATION OF MAY AS “OLDER AMERICANS MONTH”

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

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

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

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

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

IN HONOR OF OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of May 2012.

Chair, San Mateo County Transit District
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: STUDENT “ART TAKES A BUS RIDE” CONTEST

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

SIGNIFICANCE
The San Mateo County Transit District developed a partnership with the San Mateo County Office of Education in 2005 to conduct a countywide art contest through the schools. This year, students in 1st through 6th grades drew pictures with the theme “Get Out & Ride.”

The winning entries and artists will be presented at the Committee meeting.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The Transit District initiated the art contest in partnership with the county Office of Education and teachers as a way to provide a forum for budding artists and also to convey to the teachers and students that public transit plays an integral role in keeping their communities on the move.

The partnership has strengthened over the years and the program continues to be a success. More than 300 submissions were received this year, and 30 schools participated. The entries were judged, and the winning entries will have their artwork displayed on interior bus cards, as well as on a specially wrapped bus.

Prepared by: Rita P. Haskin, Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing 650-508-6248
TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: ACCESSIBILITY REPORT

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

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

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

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

Prepared by: Bill Welch, Manager, Accessible Transit Services 650-508-6475
Tina Dubost, Accessibility Coordinator 650-508-6247
SAN MATEO COUNTY
PARATRANSIT COORDINATING COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
March 13, 2012

ATTENDANCE
Members Present:  Nancy Keegan, Chair; Mike Levinson, AL-Com Chair; James Asche, OES; Myria Barnes-Jackson, DOR; Maureen Dunn, Senior Focus; Aki Eejima, Consumer; Diane Griffith, Consumer; Stephanie Hill, Consumer; Barbara Kalt, Rosener House; Benjamin McMullan, CID; Dan Mensing, Consumer; Allan Newlands, COD; Sammi Riley, Consumer; Bill Welch, SamTrans.

Absentees:  May Nichols, Vice Chair; Dale Edwards, Consumer; Judy Garcia, Consumer; Michal Settles, Coastside; Marie Violet, Sequoia Hospital.

Guests:  Elly Colwell, SamTrans; Tina Dubost, SamTrans; Maxine Eastman, Consumer; Paul Lee, SamTrans; John Murphy, MV Transportation; Linda Rhine, Nelson\Nygaard; Gladys Gurbindo, Consumer; Joy McCoy, Visitor; Rose Berta, PCC Staff.

(Total Attendance: 23)  Quorum--Yes

WELCOME/INTRODUCTION
Chair Nancy Keegan called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. and welcomed all to the March PCC meeting.

APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY PCC MINUTES
Nancy asked for a vote of approval for the February minutes. Mike moved to approve the minutes and Diane seconded the motion. Minutes were approved with Myria and Jim abstaining.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. ADVOCATE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE (AL-COM)
Mike said there was no meeting this month. BART construction of the extension from Fremont to San Jose will begin in three months. Next meeting will be on April 3, 2012.

B. GRANT/BUDGET REVIEW
Barbara had no update to report.

C. EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Maureen reported that the Education committee meeting will be held after the PCC meeting this afternoon at 3:45 p.m.
D. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Nancy gave an update on the administration of the PCC contract. SamTrans Legal Department confirmed that private non-profit agencies may administer the PCC contract. Agencies that are well-informed of the PCC and will be good stewards of the contract are under consideration. No decisions have been made at this time.

A schedule of volunteers for the Eligibility Appeal panel has been developed. The next panel is scheduled for March 23, 2012. Nancy thanked Mike for serving on this upcoming panel. A process is in place ensuring a PCC representative is on the panel as scheduled throughout the year.

SAM TRANS/REDI-WHEELS REPORT

A. Operational Report

Bill mentioned that the Bus Review Committee met before the meeting and evaluated the cut-away bus and provided feedback on various changes on the vehicle. Added grab bars, better lighting, and a quieter and smoother motor, are some of the changes in the new vehicle. Bill thanked the members and said SamTrans will review all the comments. Nancy reminded members that we are the only PCC that has a Bus Review Committee and we are proud to have this opportunity of giving input to new vehicles. Aki commented he appreciated Paul Lee and other SamTrans personnel being at the bus review also.

Interactive Voice Response (IVR)

Bill reported Enghouse, the contractor for IVR system, will re-double their efforts to work through bugs and have the system performing up to the expected high standards. Testing will continue with the 30 testers; no new schedule for going live with the system at this time. Allan and Diane commented they appreciate the IVR system.

B. Performance Summary

Tina reported monthly ridership is down; average weekly ridership is up; late cancels and no-shows were down in January, which is positive; on-time performance has declined slightly and SamTrans is working with MV to improve it. Productivity is 1.8 passengers per hour, which is excellent. Complaints per thousand trips are lower. Paul Lee will arrange for a presentation on the updated standards in the MV contract.

There was a discussion on taxi rides and consumer experiences. The number of taxi rides has increased in the last several months and represents a larger share of Redi-Wheels service than in the past. John explained that the increased usage of taxis contributes to the gain in ridership productivity. Part of the challenge is determining the right balance between taxi and sedan service and maintaining service quality. On time performance is tracked separately for taxis and sedans. Nancy asked if information on taxi rides may be furnished for members to review. John will arrange for a Serra Cab representative to be present at the AL-Com meeting to further discuss consumer comments and suggestions for taxi service.
**C. Customer Comments**

Elly reported that total monthly comments have decreased. Under Comments by Category, both policy-related and service-related are down; compliments have increased. The average response time is still under the 7-day turnaround time limit, thanks to Lynn and Sophie. Under Comments by Type, compliments are up and all other comments are static.

**D. Safety Report**

John reported February was not a good month with 5 chargeable and 4 non-chargeable accidents. March is looking better.

**LIAISON REPORTS**

**A. MTC REPORT**

No report.

**B. AGENCY**

Barbara reported no agency meeting.

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

No report.

**D. EFFICIENCY REVIEW COMMITTEE (ERC)**

Mike said all items have been previously discussed—IVR, taxicabs, and on-time performance. Next meeting will be on Tuesday, April 3, 2012 at 11:00 a.m.

**E. COMMISSION ON AGING (COA) REPORT**

No report.

**F. COMMISSION ON DISABILITY (COD) REPORT**

Allan will report next month. Disabilities Awareness Month will include promoting the campaign for disability voting. Voters may pre-register and use the accessible voting machine. The annual car show will take place in September.

**G. OFFICE OF EMERGENCEY SERVICES (OES) REPORT**

Jim mentioned tsunami awareness and preparedness events will take place during the week of March 26, 2012; County’s Annual Preparedness Day is on June 9, 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. at the County Fair—parking is free from 10:00 a.m.-11:00 a.m. Preparedness for people with disabilities was a success last year

Jim announced his retirement from OES is tomorrow; therefore, this is his last meeting. Bill O’Callahan will attend next month. All wished Jim a good retirement; Nancy thanked Jim for his valuable contributions to the PCC.
H. CENTER FOR INDEPENDENCE OF THE DISABLED (CID)

Ben reported on CID’s involvement with Burlingame Long Term Care Facility. CID is facilitating services needed for the transition, including exploring options to provide transportation. Ben will coordinate with Tina and Bill.

I. DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION

Myria distributed flyers and information on the services provided by the Department of Rehabilitation. The San Francisco office of this State agency covers San Francisco to Menlo Park and assists clients with disabilities in procuring employment, provides counseling and guidance, assists with transportation, and many other services. The goal is to help individuals live independently and work. There is no waiting list; there is a website; the services are individualized. The Department works collaboratively with other agencies.

OTHER BUSINESS

Diane said the members from the Council of the Blind were not aware of comment cards.

Regional meeting of PCCs was discussed but no specific plans.

Nancy thanked Diane and Maxine for providing “treats” for everyone.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 3:40 PM.
TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: MULTIMODAL RIDERSHIP REPORT - MARCH 2012

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” shows AWR year-to-date comparisons of FY2010, FY2011 and FY2012.

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

MONTHLY RIDERSHIP HIGHLIGHTS - MARCH 2011 COMPARED TO MARCH 2012

All Modes – AWR of 96,182, an increase of 4.3 percent.

Bus – AWR of 43,170, a decrease of 5.7 percent.

Paratransit - AWR of 1,037, a decrease of 4.9 percent.

Caltrain - AWR of 42,910, an increase of 14.4 percent.

Caltrain Shuttles - AWR of 7,130, an increase of 24.2 percent.

BART Shuttles - AWR of 1,935, a decrease of 7.3 percent.
SamTrans Promotions – March 2012

**Day Pass** – The promotion for the recently introduced Day Pass continued with the addition of two new elements: advertisements on the sides of buses and in bus shelters. The ads focused on key advantages of the pass: Unlimited Rides, New, Easy, All Day, Save and Fast. The pass also is promoted via onboard electronic messages in English and Spanish, and was included in brochures and on timetables. The promotion will continue through September.

**School Administrator Outreach** – To promote SamTrans as a vital link to get students to school, staff hosted a forum for school and school district administrators. The focus of the forum was to educate the administrators on what SamTrans can and can’t do within the parameters of the law and available resources. Staff also let the attendees know what they could do to help make the most efficient use of SamTrans resources. A “SamTrans Information Guide for School Administrators” was produced and provided to attendees.

**Employee of the Year Adcards** – To honor our outstanding Operator and Maintenance Employees of the Year, Victor Ferguson and Seth Thompson, staff produced an interior adcard and placed it on all buses. We also posted it to our Facebook page.

**Employer Outreach** – Marketing staff participated in the Rigel Health & Wellness and Commuter Fair at the company’s South San Francisco campus. Information was provided on the services we offer, as well as information about Clipper.

**Partnerships** – SamTrans Marketing staff works with a number of event organizers to co-promote events that will generate bus ridership and also provide added value for current SamTrans customers. This month, those with a green thumb were encouraged to also be green in getting to the San Francisco Flower & Garden Show by riding SamTrans. As part of its partnership with SamTrans, the event offered a $1 discount to customers who rode the bus. The event listed SamTrans information on its website, and SamTrans included information about the event and discount in its *Transit Fun Guide*.

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

#### March 2012

<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>46,620</td>
<td>45,790</td>
<td>43,170</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>-4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>36,060</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>42,910</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttle</td>
<td>5,464</td>
<td>5,743</td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttle</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>91,138</td>
<td>92,210</td>
<td>96,182</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART (Extension Only)</td>
<td>35,124</td>
<td>37,518</td>
<td>42,262</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>126,262</td>
<td>129,728</td>
<td>138,444</td>
<td>6.7%</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>46,980</td>
<td>42,750</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>37,290</td>
<td>39,020</td>
<td>42,800</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttle</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>5,329</td>
<td>7,016</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttle</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>92,758</td>
<td>90,172</td>
<td>94,930</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART (Extension Only)</td>
<td>35,764</td>
<td>37,969</td>
<td>41,852</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>128,522</td>
<td>128,141</td>
<td>136,781</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Footnotes:

^ Bus service reductions December 20, 2009.

* March and Year to Date FY2011 Bus AWR adjusted.

# Fare increase February 1, 2010

---

## Chart A
### Average Weekday Ridership

AGENDA
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, MAY 9, 2012 – 2:20 p.m.
or immediately following previous Committee meeting

ACTION
1. Approval of Minutes of Finance Committee Meeting of April 11, 2012
2. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for March 2012
4. Authorize Revision of the Fiscal Year 2013 Fuel Hedging Policy, Award of Contract to Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP to Serve as Special Counsel for Not-to-Exceed Fee of $125,000, Approve the Fiscal Year 2013 Fuel Hedging Program and Authorize Execution of Documents and Payment Premium for Commodity Price Cap for the Fiscal Year 2013 Fuel Hedging Program
5. Authorize an Amendment to the Law Enforcement and Related Communications Services Agreement with the County of San Mateo for an Additional Three Years and Execution of a Financial Cost Sharing Agreement with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board
6. Authorize Amendment of the California Public Employees Retirement System Contract to Provide 2 Percent at 60 Modified Formula to Future Employees
7. Authorize Amendment of Life and Accidental Death and Dismemberment Contract with Standard Life Insurance Company for the Basic Life Rate From $0.22 to $0.23 per $1,000 of Basic Life Coverage Through May 31, 2014

CONTRACTS
8. Authorize Award of Three No Guarantee Contracts to Provide On-Call Market Research and Survey Services for an Aggregate Not-to-Exceed Amount of $610,000 for a Five-year Term to:
   - Corey, Canapary & Galanis
   - Dikita Enterprises, Inc.
   - EMC Research, Inc.
9. Authorize Award of Contract to Technology, Engineering & Construction (d.b.a. TEC Accutite) to Provide Underground Storage Tank Inspection and Maintenance Services for an Estimated Amount of $750,000 for a Five-year Term

10. Authorize Rejection of All Bids for Painting and Related Services and Authorization to Resolicit Bids

INFORMATIONAL

11. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2013 Operating Budget

12. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2013 Capital Budget

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

Committee Members Absent: A. Tissier

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


Committee Chair Jeff Gee called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Finance Committee Meeting of March 14, 2011

The Committee approved the minutes (Lloyd/Guilbault).

Approval of Revenues and Expenses for February 2012

Deputy CEO Gigi Harrington said revenue is under budget through February and there is about $6 million in savings on the expense side. Last week fuel was $3.38 per gallon and year-to-date has averaged $3.13 per gallon. The fuel hedge was tripped in March and a check for $28,000 was received. Sales tax is going well for the year. The adopted budget was $61.5 million and staff adjusted the budget to $63 million. She believes $65 million is a reasonable year-end number.

Committee Chair Gee asked if having a shorter month has any correlation to revenues. Ms. Harrington said that is already taken into account.

The Committee (Kersteen-Tucker/Guilbault) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the report.

Authorize the Filing of Applications for State Proposition 1B Transit Security Grant Program Funds

Manager, Grants Funding and Programming Joel Slavit said this item is to authorize the General Manager or his designee to submit applications with a concurrent Letter of No Prejudice to the California Emergency Management Agency and to file and execute certifications, assurances and any other documents needed to receive $1.1 million in Proposition 1B State Transit Security Funds. Projects proposed to be funded include the integrated security center here at Central and access control improvements at Central and North and South Bases. These projects are proposed to be included as part of the upcoming Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 Capital Budget.

The Committee (Kersteen-Tucker/Guilbault) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the report.
Authorize Acceptance of Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization Improvement and Service Enhancement Account Funds in a Total Amount of $2,272,697

Mr. Slavit said this authorizes the General Manager or his designee to accept the Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP) funds and to file an allocation request with the State to receive $2.2 million in Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement Account funds to help underwrite the replacement of the 1998 Gillig fleet. The total cost for this project, which is proposed for inclusion in the FY2013 Capital Budget, is just over $30 million and will be funded with Federal and State money. LTP funds will help the District maximize the leveraging of other funding. The LTP provides funding for both capital and operating projects that help improve mobility for low income.

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

Authorize Reaffirmation of the Investment Policies and Annual Reauthorization to Invest Monies with the Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF)

Ms. Harrington said this is the annual reaffirmation of the Investment Policy. Staff has changed the Investment Policy very little from year-to-year.

Director Rose Guilbault asked what LAIF is. Ms. Harrington said LAIF is a fund available to governmental entities. It is a State of California fund, can only have up to $40 million in it and is very liquid. Staff will put money here as a holding place when LAIF is earning a better rate of return than we can earn through the investment portfolio.

Director Guilbault asked how much is in there now. Ms. Harrington said $30 million.

Director Guilbault asked how much is in the County Investment Pool. Ms. Harrington said SamTrans does not have any funds in the County Pool, but the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority do. This is another place staff will put modest increments of funding if it is outperforming what can be done on the open market.

Director Guilbault asked how LAIF has been performing. Ms. Harrington said very well and is a better option because of where the market is for safe investments.

General Manager/CEO Michael Scanlon said the policies the Board are approving are very heavy on protecting the principal.

Director Karyl Matsumoto said she has concerns about the County Pool. Ms. Harrington said SamTrans has nothing in the County Pool but will confirm.

Ms. Harrington confirmed that there is currently $34 million in LAIF.

The Committee (Lloyd/Harris) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the report.
Authorize Approval of Resolution of Intention to Approve an Amendment to the District’s California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CALPERS) Contract to Provide Two Percent at 60 Modified Formula to Future Employees

Manager, Personnel Operations Juliet Nogales-DeGuzman said staff proposes the Committee recommend approval of the Resolution of Intention to amend the District’s CALPERS retirement contract to provide the second tier of 2 percent at 60 modified formula for all future employees. This is step one of a two-step process of amending the contract. The second step will be adopting the amendment to the contract at the May meeting.

Director Guilbault asked what it is currently for employees. Ms. Nogales-DeGuzman said 2 percent at 55.

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

Authorize Award of Contract to T & J Lewis, Inc. dba Classic Graphics for Autobody Repair and Repainting Services for a Total Estimated Cost of $1,271,310 for a Five-year Term

Director of Contracts and Procurement Cheryl Cavitt said staff is requesting the Committee recommend Board approval of award of contract to Classic Graphics for autobody repair and painting of buses. Two bids were received and staff performed their due diligence and found Classic Graphics to be the lowest responsible responsive bidder.

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

Authorize Award of Contract to Transit Resource Center to Provide Contracted Urban Bus (CUB) Inspection Services for an Estimated Amount of $91,350 for a Three-year Base Term

Ms. Cavitt said staff is requesting the Committee recommend Board approval of a contract to Transit Resource Center to perform inspections on the CUB fleet operated by MV Transportation.

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

Assessment of the Fiscal Year 2012 Fuel Hedging Program

Ms. Harrington said staff will be back in May to approve the legal counsel, the transaction and policy for the fuel hedging. Through March, SamTrans has received $99,000 back from the bank. The transaction has not paid for itself, but that is not why staff recommends doing the fuel hedge. It is recommended to create budget certainty. It is about half the fuel portfolio and we partner with the JPB. Separate transactions are done for each, but it gives the quantity of fuel necessary to make the transaction appealing to potential counter parties. This is a cap and a form of insurance, and if fuel goes over a certain amount, the bank pays us. The transaction can be done with a couple days of notice and staff can always reject bids too. This is the third year of the program. The first year it cost us a little bit of money, second year we made some money and this year we will probably break even, given where the market is today. It will be the same four counterparties with whom the Board has already approved documents.

Chair Jerry Deal said last year we paid $2.90 per gallon and if we had to pay for the rise in diesel cost we would have saved $350,000. Ms. Harrington said yes that is correct.
Chair Deal asked then how did we break even if we had to pay a premium and who do we pay the premium to. Ms. Harrington said it is paid to the counterparty.

Chair Deal asked what the attorney fees were when this contract was negotiated. Ms. Harrington said the attorney fees for special counsel are $125,000 and the cost is split one-third SamTrans and two-thirds JPB because they use twice as much fuel.

Chair Deal said the attorneys are basically just doing the paperwork. Ms. Harrington said they negotiate the transaction with the counterparties and only bill for the actual cost.

Legal Counsel David Miller said this is special counsel who does very specialized work and you pay a premium for people who have the credibility in the market. They have a substantial role in putting the deal together.

Chair Deal said his concern is this would be the fourth year and the only thing changing is the cost of fuel. Mr. Miller said there are other things involved and a lot of parties involved.

Committee Chair Gee said it costs the District roughly $325,000 to provide the District with certainty and allows staff to budget with some certainty.

Mr. Scanlon said this fuel hedge only makes us half certain. The Board doesn’t have to approve this transaction. Staff is only recommending 2 million gallons for SamTrans and 4.5 million gallons for JPB.

Director Guilbault said she thinks this is a good program and staff does their due diligence to get the price that works.

Director Gee said when staff comes back it is worth considering increasing from half to more and also see if there are other agencies that are interested in participating.

Adjourned: 3:01 p.m.
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SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR THE PERIOD ENDING MARCH 31, 2012 AND SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend that the Board accept and enter into the record the Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the month of March 2012 and supplemental information.

SIGNIFICANCE
Revenues: Total Revenues (page 1, line 13) are $657,529 or 0.6 percent worse than revised budget. Passenger Fares (page 1, line 1) are better than budget by $74,187 or 0.6 percent, Investment Interest (page 1, line 8) is worse than budget by $841,834 or 45.6 percent and Other Interest, Rent & Other Income (page 1, line 10) are better than budget by $106,832 or 3.1 percent.

Expenses: Total Expenses (page 4, line 73) are $5,783,226 or 5.9 percent better than revised budget. Within Total Expenses, Total Motor Bus (page 3, line 46) is better than budget by $5,285,244 or 7.0 percent, Total ADA Programs (page 4, line 55) are better than budget by $551,831 or 5.2 percent and Total Multimodal (page 4, line 71) is worse than budget by $53,849 or 0.5 percent.

Budget Amendments: There are no budget amendments for the month of March 2012.

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

#### MARCH 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV APPROVED</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED: 75.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### SOURCES OF FUNDS

#### Operating Revenues

1. Passenger Fares  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 12,961,160  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 13,156,662  
   - Revised Budget: 13,082,475  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.6  
   - Approved Budget: 17,443,300  
   - % of Approved Budget: 75.4

2. Local TDA and STA Funds  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 35,622,157  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 35,622,157  
   - Revised Budget: 35,622,157  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 33,000,814  
   - % of Approved Budget: 99.9

3. State/Federal Operating Grants  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 2,858,793  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 2,858,793  
   - Revised Budget: 2,858,793  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 10,202,857  
   - % of Approved Budget: 26.9

4. Measure A and AB434 Funds  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 7,068,433  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 7,068,433  
   - Revised Budget: 7,068,433  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 8,996,335  
   - % of Approved Budget: 77.6

#### Subtotal - Operating Revenues  
   - Total: 4,740,689  
   - % of Year Elapsed: 75.0  
   - Approved Budget: 69,643,300  
   - % of Approved Budget: 75.4

#### Other Revenue Sources

5. District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 48,785,554  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 48,785,554  
   - Revised Budget: 48,785,554  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 61,500,000  
   - % of Approved Budget: 77.4

6. Investment Interest  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 1,845,973  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 1,845,973  
   - Revised Budget: 1,845,973  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 2,150,620  
   - % of Approved Budget: 46.4

7. Pass through to Other Agencies  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 181,790  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 181,790  
   - Revised Budget: 181,790  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 281,790  
   - % of Approved Budget: 64.5

8. Other Interest, Rent & Other Income  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 3,454,191  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 3,454,191  
   - Revised Budget: 3,454,191  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 5,972,275  
   - % of Approved Budget: 77.6

9. Other Sources  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 4,229,952  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 4,229,952  
   - Revised Budget: 4,229,952  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 5,700,000  
   - % of Approved Budget: 64.5

#### Subtotal - Other Revenues  
   - Total: 6,823,181  
   - % of Year Elapsed: 75.0  
   - Approved Budget: 75,604,685  
   - % of Approved Budget: 75.9

#### Total Revenues - All Sources  
   - Total: 11,868,454  
   - % of Year Elapsed: 75.0  
   - Approved Budget: 145,247,991  
   - % of Approved Budget: 78.2

### USES OF FUNDS

#### Operations

1. Motor Bus  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 69,951,118  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 75,236,362  
   - Revised Budget: 75,236,362  
   - % of Revised Budget: 93.0  
   - Approved Budget: 99,414,897  
   - % of Approved Budget: 69.9

2. A. D. A. Programs  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 10,551,962  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 10,551,962  
   - Revised Budget: 10,551,962  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 14,069,346  
   - % of Approved Budget: 71.1

3. Caltrain  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 8,475,311  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 8,475,311  
   - Revised Budget: 8,475,311  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 10,620,000  
   - % of Approved Budget: 79.8

4. Other Multimodal Programs  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 2,992,044  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 2,992,044  
   - Revised Budget: 2,992,044  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 3,967,226  
   - % of Approved Budget: 76.8

#### Subtotal - Operating Costs  
   - Total: 10,778,316  
   - % of Year Elapsed: 75.0  
   - Approved Budget: 128,071,469  
   - % of Approved Budget: 71.1

#### Other Uses of Funds

5. Pass through to Other Agencies  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 181,790  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 181,790  
   - Revised Budget: 181,790  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 281,790  
   - % of Approved Budget: 64.5

6. Transfer Out to Debt Service  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 18,337,491  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 18,337,491  
   - Revised Budget: 18,337,491  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 24,477,279  
   - % of Approved Budget: 74.9

7. Fiscal Agent Fees  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 12,860  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 12,860  
   - Revised Budget: 12,860  
   - % of Revised Budget: 100.0  
   - Approved Budget: 29,600  
   - % of Approved Budget: 49.8

8. Land Transfer Interest Expense  
   - Prior Year Actual: 2011, 0  
   - Current Year Actual: 2012, 0  
   - Revised Budget: 0  
   - % of Revised Budget: 0.0  
   - Approved Budget: 70,000  
   - % of Approved Budget: 0.0

#### Subtotal - Other Uses  
   - Total: 2,039,499  
   - % of Year Elapsed: 75.0  
   - Approved Budget: 24,854,149  
   - % of Approved Budget: 74.6

#### Capital Programs

9. Total Revenues - All Sources  
   - Total: 11,868,454  
   - % of Year Elapsed: 75.0  
   - Approved Budget: 159,442,605  
   - % of Approved Budget: 65.5

#### NET SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)

| NET SURPLUS / (DEFICIT) | 1,568,624 | (7,257,900) | 5,435,336 | 311,516 | 1744.8 | (12,664,007) | (11,450,775) | (47.5) |

*Note A - The Revised Budget includes the year end rollover of existing capital projects (audited).*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>REVISED ACTUAL</th>
<th>% REV APPROVED</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MOTOR BUS FARES</td>
<td>1,323,120</td>
<td>12,393,484</td>
<td>12,569,048</td>
<td>12,456,750</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>16,069,000</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL (TDA) TRANSIT FUND:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operating Assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,503,880</td>
<td>30,569,366</td>
<td>30,569,366</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>26,048,636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local STA Operating Assistance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,483,131</td>
<td>2,939,325</td>
<td>2,939,325</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,444,973</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING GRANTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OPERATING GRANTS</td>
<td>2,119,379</td>
<td>1,019,146</td>
<td>2,538,623</td>
<td>2,538,623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8,813,584</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT 1/2 CENT SALES TAX:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operating Ass't</td>
<td>4,638,100</td>
<td>22,307,343</td>
<td>18,310,629</td>
<td>23,673,639</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>39,193,611</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Fixed Route</td>
<td>100,220</td>
<td>786,714</td>
<td>831,654</td>
<td>831,654</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>659,919</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 1/2 CENT SALES TAX</td>
<td>4,738,320</td>
<td>23,094,057</td>
<td>19,142,283</td>
<td>24,505,293</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>39,853,530</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT INTEREST INCOME:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Interest Income (15,245)</td>
<td>112,621</td>
<td>37,847</td>
<td>65,400</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>163,570</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REVENUE SOURCES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight Deposits Interest Income</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>87,937</td>
<td>780,938</td>
<td>790,672</td>
<td>798,165</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>1,064,230</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Income</td>
<td>53,750</td>
<td>854,040</td>
<td>573,278</td>
<td>675,000</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>94,414</td>
<td>851,401</td>
<td>790,221</td>
<td>687,780</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>915,794</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OTHER REVENUES</td>
<td>236,173</td>
<td>2,487,538</td>
<td>2,154,627</td>
<td>2,161,605</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,881,604</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MOTOR BUS</td>
<td>8,411,746</td>
<td>67,093,857</td>
<td>69,951,118</td>
<td>75,236,362</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>99,414,897</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN DISABILITIES ACT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>66,403</td>
<td>567,676</td>
<td>587,614</td>
<td>625,725</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>834,300</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TDA 4.5 Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,237,046</td>
<td>1,608,821</td>
<td>1,608,821</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,064,230</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local STA - Paratransit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>611,118</td>
<td>504,645</td>
<td>504,645</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>504,645</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>320,170</td>
<td>320,170</td>
<td>320,170</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,389,273</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - District ADA Programs</td>
<td>510,493</td>
<td>3,984,544</td>
<td>3,713,091</td>
<td>4,261,828</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>4,786,142</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Paratransit Suppl. Coastside</td>
<td>115,338</td>
<td>833,324</td>
<td>1,007,921</td>
<td>1,254,490</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>1,156,363</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income - Paratransit Fund</td>
<td>32,168</td>
<td>318,949</td>
<td>304,394</td>
<td>311,973</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>135,790</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>254,623</td>
<td>1,819,344</td>
<td>1,953,475</td>
<td>1,953,475</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,460,000</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure M Paratransit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ADA PROGRAMS</td>
<td>1,299,196</td>
<td>9,372,001</td>
<td>10,000,131</td>
<td>10,551,962</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>14,069,346</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTIMODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Caltrain</td>
<td>46,069</td>
<td>7,902,527</td>
<td>338,402</td>
<td>338,402</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>847,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources - Caltrain</td>
<td>159,573</td>
<td>4,229,952</td>
<td>4,229,952</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5,700,000</td>
<td>933,000</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from TA for Caltrain</td>
<td>509,255</td>
<td>3,638,689</td>
<td>3,906,957</td>
<td>3,906,957</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,920,000</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA Funded SM/Caltrain Shuttles</td>
<td>93,822</td>
<td>809,617</td>
<td>816,038</td>
<td>812,001</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,081,335</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Share SM/Caltrain Shuttles</td>
<td>26,968</td>
<td>357,928</td>
<td>234,869</td>
<td>233,453</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>311,271</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/B434 Funds - SamTrans Shuttle</td>
<td>43,917</td>
<td>402,000</td>
<td>395,250</td>
<td>396,000</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer SamTrans Shuttle Funds</td>
<td>138,450</td>
<td>1,214,725</td>
<td>1,171,527</td>
<td>1,059,132</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>1,379,400</td>
<td>84.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - SamTrans Shuttle Program</td>
<td>28,410</td>
<td>237,770</td>
<td>243,565</td>
<td>252,786</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>341,990</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>109,837</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Gen. Operating Asst.</td>
<td>19,911</td>
<td>182,500</td>
<td>184,644</td>
<td>238,673</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>318,230</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MULTIMODAL</td>
<td>1,067,374</td>
<td>14,855,592</td>
<td>11,521,204</td>
<td>11,467,355</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14,587,226</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>10,778,316</td>
<td>91,321,450</td>
<td>91,472,453</td>
<td>97,255,679</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>128,071,469</td>
<td>71.1</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.
## OPERATING EXPENSES
### SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
#### FISCAL YEAR 2012
##### MARCH 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISIONS BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED:</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>4,753,438</td>
<td>37,557,011</td>
<td>37,766,516</td>
<td>39,903,541</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>53,344,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Services:</td>
<td>4,581</td>
<td>36,814</td>
<td>37,901</td>
<td>42,875</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>53,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Contracted Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>32,598</td>
<td>509,620</td>
<td>556,570</td>
<td>650,012</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>785,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Property Maintenance</td>
<td>101,850</td>
<td>784,374</td>
<td>890,275</td>
<td>960,500</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>1,278,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>349,488</td>
<td>1,565,189</td>
<td>2,439,210</td>
<td>3,456,080</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>4,299,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>323,123</td>
<td>2,745,111</td>
<td>2,944,650</td>
<td>3,090,125</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>4,008,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>4,847</td>
<td>207,639</td>
<td>242,645</td>
<td>406,617</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>490,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Materials &amp; Supply:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fuel &amp; Lubricants</td>
<td>441,378</td>
<td>3,114,656</td>
<td>4,089,806</td>
<td>4,227,268</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>5,636,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bus Parts &amp; Materials</td>
<td>116,073</td>
<td>1,042,413</td>
<td>1,067,910</td>
<td>1,342,075</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>1,765,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Uniforms &amp; Driver Expense</td>
<td>8,094</td>
<td>254,048</td>
<td>251,869</td>
<td>338,077</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>391,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Timetables &amp; Tickets</td>
<td>14,573</td>
<td>109,202</td>
<td>82,560</td>
<td>114,825</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>153,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Office Supplies / Printing</td>
<td>26,147</td>
<td>185,443</td>
<td>167,646</td>
<td>278,279</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>334,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Other Materials &amp; Supply</td>
<td>15,110</td>
<td>87,463</td>
<td>103,032</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>334,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>207,351</td>
<td>1,867,170</td>
<td>1,870,000</td>
<td>1,870,476</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,493,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Workers’ Compensation</td>
<td>254,700</td>
<td>2,384,901</td>
<td>2,336,333</td>
<td>2,337,047</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3,183,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Taxes &amp; License Fees</td>
<td>42,845</td>
<td>3,114,656</td>
<td>3,305,278</td>
<td>3,305,278</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,299,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fixed Route Accessibility</td>
<td>100,220</td>
<td>786,715</td>
<td>813,654</td>
<td>813,654</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,012,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Leases &amp; Rentals</td>
<td>57,564</td>
<td>490,242</td>
<td>490,483</td>
<td>491,229</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>659,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Promotional &amp; Legal Advertising</td>
<td>4,114</td>
<td>84,006</td>
<td>56,880</td>
<td>173,525</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>230,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Training &amp; Business Travel</td>
<td>14,960</td>
<td>81,112</td>
<td>99,099</td>
<td>140,552</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>181,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dues &amp; Membership</td>
<td>6,655</td>
<td>61,737</td>
<td>62,902</td>
<td>66,013</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>83,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Postage &amp; Other</td>
<td>4,861</td>
<td>52,801</td>
<td>43,553</td>
<td>228,560</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>346,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Total District Operated Buses</td>
<td>6,938,030</td>
<td>54,850,922</td>
<td>57,357,287</td>
<td>62,139,071</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>81,962,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Contracted Urban Bus Service</td>
<td>1,282,923</td>
<td>10,724,421</td>
<td>11,021,432</td>
<td>11,520,666</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>15,360,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>33,952</td>
<td>258,427</td>
<td>253,181</td>
<td>254,799</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
<td>339,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>57,564</td>
<td>490,242</td>
<td>490,483</td>
<td>491,229</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>655,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Coastsides Services</td>
<td>54,855</td>
<td>452,895</td>
<td>482,078</td>
<td>480,968</td>
<td>100.2%</td>
<td>630,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Redi Coast Non-ADA</td>
<td>21,821</td>
<td>169,671</td>
<td>171,089</td>
<td>178,659</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>238,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>7,341</td>
<td>20,257</td>
<td>31,140</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>41,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>La Honda - Pescadero</td>
<td>6,763</td>
<td>29,925</td>
<td>41,738</td>
<td>39,375</td>
<td>106.0%</td>
<td>52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>SamCoast - Pescadero</td>
<td>11,460</td>
<td>104,097</td>
<td>102,126</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>113.5%</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Other Related Cost - SamCoast</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>5,914</td>
<td>11,449</td>
<td>10,455</td>
<td>109.5%</td>
<td>13,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Total Contracted Bus Service</td>
<td>1,473,715</td>
<td>12,242,935</td>
<td>12,593,831</td>
<td>13,097,291</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>17,452,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Total Motor Bus</td>
<td>8,411,745</td>
<td>67,093,857</td>
<td>69,951,118</td>
<td>75,236,362</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>99,414,897</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.

% 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**

**March 2012**

**% of Year Elapsed: 75.0%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
<td>PRIOR</td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### American Disability Act Programs

47. **American Disability Act Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>429,526</td>
<td>4,125,060</td>
<td>3,837,249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Elderly & Disabled/Redi-Wheels

48. Elderly & Disabled/Redi-Wheels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>201,717</td>
<td>1,510,068</td>
<td>1,618,069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sedan Service

51. Sedan Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>265,848</td>
<td>1,985,116</td>
<td>2,207,356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ADA Accessibility Support

52. ADA Accessibility Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>115,338</td>
<td>833,324</td>
<td>1,007,921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ADA Support

53. Coastside ADA Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>75,368</td>
<td>533,450</td>
<td>576,884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Insurance Costs

54. Insurance Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>211,399</td>
<td>384,983</td>
<td>752,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total ADA Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,299,197</td>
<td>9,372,001</td>
<td>10,000,131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Multimodal Transit Programs

56. Multimodal Transit Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>714,897</td>
<td>11,541,216</td>
<td>8,475,311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Caltrain Service

60. Caltrain Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>10,566</td>
<td>93,517</td>
<td>93,589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Dumbarton Express Service

65. Dumbarton Express Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>211,777</td>
<td>1,854,495</td>
<td>1,810,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SamTrans Shuttle Service

66. SamTrans Shuttle Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>120,789</td>
<td>1,277,382</td>
<td>1,050,906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Maintenance Multimodal Facilities

68. Maintenance Multimodal Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>9,344</td>
<td>88,982</td>
<td>91,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Other Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>352,477</td>
<td>3,314,376</td>
<td>3,045,893</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Multi-Modal Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,067,374</td>
<td>14,855,592</td>
<td>11,521,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Total Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>10,778,316</td>
<td>91,321,450</td>
<td>91,472,453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### MOTOR BUS MONTHLY EXPENSES - BUDGET VS ACTUAL

**FISCAL YEAR 2012**

### Statement of Revenues and Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONTHLY EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>9,056,867</td>
<td>8,173,381</td>
<td>8,165,523</td>
<td>8,319,077</td>
<td>8,141,293</td>
<td>8,484,744</td>
<td>8,210,653</td>
<td>8,521,978</td>
<td>8,162,846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>7,861,175</td>
<td>7,685,322</td>
<td>7,451,351</td>
<td>8,624,165</td>
<td>7,435,134</td>
<td>7,434,679</td>
<td>7,694,778</td>
<td>7,352,769</td>
<td>8,411,745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUMULATIVE EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>9,056,867</td>
<td>17,230,248</td>
<td>25,395,771</td>
<td>33,714,848</td>
<td>41,856,141</td>
<td>50,340,885</td>
<td>58,551,538</td>
<td>67,073,516</td>
<td>75,236,362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>7,861,175</td>
<td>15,546,497</td>
<td>22,997,848</td>
<td>31,622,012</td>
<td>39,057,146</td>
<td>46,491,826</td>
<td>54,186,604</td>
<td>61,539,373</td>
<td>69,951,118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variance - F(U)</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>1,195,692</td>
<td>13.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>1,683,751</td>
<td>9.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>2,397,923</td>
<td>9.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>2,092,836</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>2,708,995</td>
<td>6.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>3,849,059</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>4,364,934</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>5,534,143</td>
<td>7.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>5,285,244</td>
<td>7.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### ADA PROGRAM MONTHLY EXPENSES - BUDGET VS ACTUAL
#### FISCAL YEAR 2012

<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>MONTHLY EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</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>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>1,009,971</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>1,055,090</td>
<td>1,106,575</td>
<td>1,299,197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUMULATIVE EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</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>8,207,080</td>
<td>9,379,521</td>
<td>10,551,962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>1,009,971</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>7,594,360</td>
<td>8,700,935</td>
<td>10,000,131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance - F(U)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>162,470</td>
<td>250,920</td>
<td>332,342</td>
<td>424,655</td>
<td>523,401</td>
<td>495,376</td>
<td>612,720</td>
<td>678,586</td>
<td>551,831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>7.4%</td>
<td>7.23%</td>
<td>5.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**ADA PROGRAM MONTHLY EXPENSES - BUDGET VS ACTUAL**

**FISCAL YEAR 2012**

**Statement of Revenues and Expenses**
## Monthly Expenses - Budget vs Actual

### Fiscal Year 2012

**SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**Multimodal Monthly Expenses - Budget vs Actual**

#### Monthly Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></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>1,045,291</td>
<td>1,045,291</td>
<td>1,045,291</td>
<td>1,045,291</td>
<td>1,045,291</td>
<td>1,045,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></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>1,071,853</td>
<td>1,064,815</td>
<td>1,067,374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cumulative Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></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>9,376,774</td>
<td>10,422,065</td>
<td>11,467,355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td>3,068,088</td>
<td>4,115,451</td>
<td>5,150,969</td>
<td>6,188,972</td>
<td>7,234,341</td>
<td>8,317,162</td>
<td>9,389,015</td>
<td>10,453,830</td>
<td>11,521,204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Variance - F(U)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3rd Quarter</strong></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>(12,241)</td>
<td>(31,766)</td>
<td>(53,849)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance %</strong></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>-0.13%</td>
<td>-0.30%</td>
<td>-0.47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### INTEREST ON INVESTMENTS
March 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL INVESTMENT 03-31-12</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVABLE 02-29-12</th>
<th>INTEREST EARNED 03-31-12</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVED 03-31-12</th>
<th>INTEREST ADJ. 03-31-12</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVABLE 03-31-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESERVE FOR CAPITAL PROJ</td>
<td>4,651,810.35</td>
<td>17,297.57</td>
<td>5,054.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22,351.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF -- CAPITAL PROJ</td>
<td>3,413,771.29</td>
<td>1,956.07</td>
<td>1,074.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,030.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REIMB SECURITIES -- L76R</td>
<td>73,765,227.96</td>
<td>611,243.85</td>
<td>124,675.74</td>
<td>531,625.85</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>204,296.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF -- REIMB FUNDS L76R</td>
<td>21,969,760.55</td>
<td>15,789.29</td>
<td>7,698.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23,487.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARATRANSIT FUNDS</td>
<td>26,451,648.25</td>
<td>57,023.09</td>
<td>31,936.04</td>
<td>(5,607.64)</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>94,579.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF -- PARATRANSIT</td>
<td>261,794.71</td>
<td>5,474.29</td>
<td>2,653.39</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8,127.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK OF AMERICA</td>
<td>2,507,227.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>72.18</td>
<td>72.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Reserves Held by Trustee:</td>
<td>15,019,968.36</td>
<td>19,950.00</td>
<td>3,827.62</td>
<td>23,777.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148,041,209.21</td>
<td>728,734.16</td>
<td>176,992.60</td>
<td>549,868.01</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>355,874.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MARCH 2012 -- SUMMARY OF INTEREST & CAPITAL GAIN

- **Interest Earned 3/31/12**: 177,008.12
- **Add:**
  - CEO Interest: 2,000.00
  - Misc Interest
- **Less:**
  - BNY Mellon Fees & Interest: (2,808.87)
  - Commissions: (7,728.08)
  - GASB 31 Gain/Loss (262,325.71)
  - Total Interest & Capital Gain/Loss (93,854.54)

### YEAR TO DATE -- SUMMARY

- **Interest Earned**: 1,979,425.49
- **Add:**
  - CEO Interest: 15,000.00
  - Misc Income
- **Less:**
  - BNY Mellon Fees & Interest: (5,400.98)
  - Commissions: (62,748.51)
  - GASB 31 Gain/Loss: (849,075.11)
  - Total Interest & Capital Gain/Loss: 1,077,200.89

**Balance Per Ledger as of 1/31/12**

- Interest Acct. 409100: 455.77
- Interest Acct. 409102: 42,545.05
- Interest Acct. 409101: 1,883,275.18
- GASB 31 Gain/Loss Acct. 405220: (849,075.11)
- Gain (Loss) Acct. 405210: (849,075.11)
- Adjustment

**Total**: 1,077,200.89
### BUDGET AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar-12</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Budget Amendments in March 2012

### BUDGET REVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar-12</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Budget Revisions in March 2012,
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>15,365,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011:</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>16,917,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>15,224,400</td>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>16,917,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>15,910,800</td>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>14,737,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>13,855,400</td>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>16,492,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>15,009,400</td>
<td>FY2011 Total</td>
<td>63,513,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011 Total</td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
<td>FY2011 Total</td>
<td>63,513,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY2011 Total</td>
<td>3,257,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY2011 Total</td>
<td>63,513,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY2012 Total</td>
<td>63,000,000</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>1st Quarter</td>
<td>17,041,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,041,202</td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Quarter</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>5,108,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 11</td>
<td>6,034,400</td>
<td>Feb. 12</td>
<td>6,473,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>1,653,700</td>
<td>Mar. 12</td>
<td>1,583,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months Total</td>
<td>32,295,300</td>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>35,061,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,766,304</td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>35,061,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 12</td>
<td>3,927,700</td>
<td>Mar. 12</td>
<td>4,186,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 12</td>
<td>3,927,700</td>
<td>Apr. 12</td>
<td>4,186,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 12</td>
<td>5,354,800</td>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>5,707,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>1,455,100</td>
<td>Jun. 12</td>
<td>(1,811,784)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Months Total</td>
<td>46,960,600</td>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>39,248,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,824,953</td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>48,785,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 12</td>
<td>4,328,300</td>
<td>Jun. 12</td>
<td>4,328,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>4,328,300</td>
<td>Jul. 12</td>
<td>4,328,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 12</td>
<td>5,778,900</td>
<td>Aug. 12</td>
<td>5,778,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>1,603,900</td>
<td>Sep. 12</td>
<td>(1,824,953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012 Total</td>
<td>63,000,000</td>
<td>FY2012 Total</td>
<td>39,248,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY2012 Total</td>
<td>63,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY2012 Total</td>
<td>48,785,554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Accrued
STRUCTIONS

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

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

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Finance Committee recommend that the Board accept and enter into the record the Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review and Outlook for the quarter ended March 31, 2012.

SIGNIFICANCE
The San Mateo County Transit District (District) Investment Policy contains a requirement for a quarterly report to be transmitted to the Board within 30 days of the end of the quarter. This staff report was forwarded to the Board of Directors under separate cover on April 30, 2012 in order to meet the 30-day requirement.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The 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
Interest rates climbed modestly during the first quarter of the year as a combination of solid economic growth and progress on the debt crisis in Europe gave investors’ confidence to shift some funds back towards riskier assets such as the equity markets. Although interest rates have rebounded off their recent record lows, they remain well below what the current pace of economic growth would suggest. In this regard, the future level of interest rates will remain highly dependent on US monetary policy since the Federal Reserve is able to set the short term interest rates at will, moving the Federal Funds overnight rate higher or lower to enforce both monetary and fiscal policy changes.

Recent statements from the Federal Reserve’s Open Market Committee (FOMC, the body responsible for setting the level and direction of the Fed Funds rate) have signaled their intention to keep interest rates low through late 2014. This policy was recently reinforced by Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke in a lecture given to students at George Washington University’s School of Business. In the lecture Chairman Bernanke highlighted his belief that the 1930’s Federal Reserve made a serious error by raising interest rates too soon after the onset of the Great Depression. Given the historical context and the current state of our economy, the market anticipates the Federal Reserve will keep short-term interest rates at their current levels for at least the next several quarters.

This suggests the near term outlook for interest rates appears to be fairly lack luster and range bound, where rates will remain at low to very low levels near the bottom of the yield curve. As to exactly when rates might eventually climb back to more comfortable levels, there are no indicators to cite at this time.

Strategy
Over the foreseeable future CSI expect interest rates to eventually move modestly 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 Government Guaranteed Corporate Bonds, 91.3 percent Agency Securities, 6.5 percent US Treasury Securities and 0.3 percent Mortgage Backed Securities; see Exhibit 5.

**Budget Impact**

The portfolio’s performance is reported on a total economic return basis. This method includes the coupon interest, amortization of discounts and premiums, capital gains and losses and price changes (i.e., unrealized gains and losses). For the quarter ending March 31, the *General Fund portfolio* returned 0.29 percent. This compares to the benchmark return of 0.15 percent. Over this same time period, the *Paratransit Fund portfolio* returned 0.54 percent. This compares to the benchmark return of -0.68 percent.

The Performance graph in Exhibit 3 shows the relative performance of each fund for the trailing 24-month period. The Growth of a Thousand Dollars graph in Exhibit 4 shows the cumulative performance over this same time frame for each portfolio.

The consolidated portfolio’s yield to maturity, the return the portfolio will earn in the future if all securities are held to maturity is also reported. This calculation is based on the current market value of the portfolio including unrealized gains and losses. For the quarter ending March 31, the portfolio’s yield to maturity or call was 0.51 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 1.68 percent.

**Investment Information**

In addition to the investments managed by CSI and held in the investment portfolio, the District invests money in the State of California Money Market Fund known as the Local Agencies Investment Fund (LAIF). The current balance in this fund as of the March 31, 2012 was $25.6 million.

Another more liquid investment is the checking account at the Bank of America Merrill Lynch where the District has excess funds swept into a secured investment nightly and returned to the checking account daily. Another investment option for the District could be the San Mateo County Investment Pool; however the District does not have any funds invested there at this time.

The primary goal of the District’s Investment Policy is to safeguard the principal of the taxpayer funds under its jurisdiction. Safe investments are at a premium during these troubled economic times. Many public, non-profit and corporate entities, both domestic and international, compete for the same type of securities. The result is scarcity of A to AAA rated securities to buy, and low returns when available. This has driven down the rate of return for the District’s invested
funds drastically from levels of four or five years ago, with no return to those levels in sight. As investment advisor, CSI cautions regularly that reward for increased returns must justify the additional risks. The District staff has not been made aware of any other investment opportunities that meet this test within the current investment strategy but will consider any proposals that do.

Prepared by: Lori Snow, Manager, Finance Treasury 650-508-6425
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

### REPORT OF INVESTMENTS

FOR QUARTER ENDED MARCH 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date of Maturity</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Carrying Amount</th>
<th>Market Value</th>
<th>Accrued Interest</th>
<th>Market Value + Accr. Int.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORPORATE BONDS</strong></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>2,002,846</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>2,020,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENT BONDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB</td>
<td>03-08-13</td>
<td>13,500,000</td>
<td>13,209,399</td>
<td>14,099,657</td>
<td>43,125</td>
<td>14,142,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>11-21-13</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>2,999,400</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>3,006,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>12-06-13</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,990,725</td>
<td>4,998,250</td>
<td>9,583</td>
<td>5,007,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>12-06-13</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,001,515</td>
<td>11,979</td>
<td>5,013,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>04-18-14</td>
<td>11,000,000</td>
<td>10,993,400</td>
<td>11,006,193</td>
<td>74,708</td>
<td>11,080,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA - Step Up</td>
<td>04-18-14</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
<td>4,499,100</td>
<td>4,500,972</td>
<td>20,375</td>
<td>4,521,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>09-22-14</td>
<td>9,615,000</td>
<td>9,686,632</td>
<td>9,667,988</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>9,669,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>09-28-15</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>9,996,000</td>
<td>9,988,620</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>9,989,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed. Farm Credit Bank</td>
<td>12-29-15</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>1,020,405</td>
<td>1,130,871</td>
<td>14,870</td>
<td>1,145,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>03-21-16</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
<td>8,505,313</td>
<td>8,575,149</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>8,577,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Urban Devel</td>
<td>08-01-17</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>155,513</td>
<td>150,838</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>152,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREASURY INFLATION PROTECTED SECURITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Inflation Indexed Note</td>
<td>04-15-14</td>
<td>3,748,080</td>
<td>3,719,524</td>
<td>3,975,307</td>
<td>21,505</td>
<td>3,996,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLATERALIZED MORTGAGE OBLIGATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLB SERIES 00-0606 CLASS Y</td>
<td>12-28-12</td>
<td>309,658</td>
<td>315,851</td>
<td>318,832</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>318,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL INVESTMENT FUNDS PORTFOLIO MANAGED BY SUNTRUST BANK/CSI GROUP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77,272,738</td>
<td>77,129,721</td>
<td>78,417,039</td>
<td>226,648</td>
<td>78,643,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARATRANSIT TRUST FUND PORTFOLIO:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENT BONDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>01-07-14</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,015,200</td>
<td>5,189,900</td>
<td>29,167</td>
<td>5,219,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>04-23-14</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,510,690</td>
<td>2,607,748</td>
<td>27,431</td>
<td>2,635,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA Step Up</td>
<td>01-27-16</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,299,150</td>
<td>5,271,560</td>
<td>20,781</td>
<td>5,292,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>09-28-15</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,998,000</td>
<td>4,994,310</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>4,994,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>03-21-16</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>5,503,438</td>
<td>5,548,626</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>5,550,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>DATE OF MATURITY</td>
<td>PAR VALUE</td>
<td>CARRYING AMOUNT</td>
<td>MARKET VALUE</td>
<td>ACCRUED INTEREST</td>
<td>MARKET VALUE +ACCR. INT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</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>2,677,200</td>
<td>2,639,162</td>
<td>2,839,505</td>
<td>15,361</td>
<td>2,854,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PARATRANSL PORTFOLIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGED BY SUNTRUST BANK/CSI GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,677,200</td>
<td>25,965,640</td>
<td>26,451,648</td>
<td>94,580</td>
<td>26,546,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DISTRICT PORTFOLIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGED BY SUNTRUST BANK/CSI GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td>102,949,938</td>
<td>103,095,361</td>
<td>104,868,688</td>
<td>321,228</td>
<td>105,189,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIQUIDITY FUNDS MANAGED BY DISTRICT STAFF:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK OF AMERICA CHECKING</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,507,228</td>
<td>2,507,228</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,507,228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,645,327</td>
<td>25,645,327</td>
<td>34,646</td>
<td>25,679,973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FUNDS MANAGED BY DISTRICT STAFF</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,152,554</td>
<td>28,152,554</td>
<td>34,646</td>
<td>28,187,201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST FUNDS MANAGED BY THIRD PARTY TRUSTEE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santander CP</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,042,000</td>
<td>9,042,000</td>
<td>9,042,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,042,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal National Mortgage Association</td>
<td>03-16-2015</td>
<td>2,277,000</td>
<td>2,258,546</td>
<td>2,259,945</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>2,260,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FUNDS MANAGED BY THIRD PARTY TRUSTEE</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,037,023</td>
<td>15,018,569</td>
<td>15,019,968</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>15,020,324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table: Monthly Performance Data

<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>0.46%</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>0.16%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SamTrans - Paratran</strong></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>0.24%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark - Gen Fund</strong></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>0.51%</td>
<td>-0.19%</td>
<td>-0.17%</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark - Paratran</strong></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>0.76%</td>
<td>-0.64%</td>
<td>-0.80%</td>
<td>8.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: ADOPT THE REVISED FUEL HEDGING POLICY, AUTHORIZE
AWARD OF CONTRACT TO ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE
LLP, APPROVE THE FY2013 FUEL HEDGING PROGRAM AND
AUTHORIZE EXECUTION OF DOCUMENTS AND PAYMENT OF
PREMIUM FOR COMMODITY PRICE CAP FOR THE FY2013 FUEL
HEDGING PROGRAM

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend that the Board:

1. Adopt the revised Fuel Hedging Policy (attached); and

2. Authorize appointment of Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP (Orrick) to serve as special
counsel to the San Mateo County Transit District (District) in connection with the Fiscal
Year (FY) 2013 fuel hedging program, fees for special counsel not to exceed $125,000,
and to be allocated to the San Mateo County Transit District and the Peninsula Corridor
Joint Powers Board (JPB) based upon proportional shares; and

3. Approve the Request for Bids and authorize the General Manager/CEO or the Deputy
CEO, Finance and Administration, to select the winning bidder, to execute a
Confirmation and such other commodity price cap documents as shall be required, with
the winning bidder, and to pay the premium for the commodity price cap.

SIGNIFICANCE
Since the inception of the fuel hedging program, pursuant to the Fuel Hedging Policy (the Fuel
Hedging Policy) adopted by the Board in March 2010 and revised in April 2011, each bidder or
its guarantor (herein referred to as a counterparty) has been required to be rated at least “Aa3” or
“AA-” by at least one nationally recognized rating agency at the time of submission of bids. As a
result of ongoing review and revision of rating criteria by each of the rating agencies, the pool of
potential counterparties assigned ratings of at least “Aa3” or “AA-” has decreased and is
expected to continue to decrease. To ensure maximum competition among creditworthy
counterparties, it is recommended that the Fuel Hedging Policy be revised to authorize
submission of bids by counterparties assigned a rating of at least “A” by each nationally
recognized rating agency then rating the counterparty at the time bids are submitted. Revision of
the threshold rating criteria will permit expansion of the pool of creditworthy potential counterparts while maintaining the ability of staff to select a counterparty rated in the preferred rating category, assuming counterparties assigned such ratings submit bids. As has been the case since the inception of the fuel hedging program, the risk that a counterparty will fail to make required payments or otherwise comply with the terms of its agreement with the District will be mitigated by requiring collateral upon counterparty downgrade, limiting the term of the agreement to one fiscal year and monthly monitoring of the rating or ratings assigned to the counterparty selected. The attached revised Fuel Hedging Policy reflects the revision in the ratings threshold.

As staff and the District’s financial advisor move through the process of selecting a potential counterparty, special counsel is necessary to ensure proper review and execution of the necessary documents. Orrick served as counsel on the fuel hedge transaction entered into for the past three fiscal years as well as bond counsel on the District’s 2005 and 2009 debt refinancings and brings a strong understanding of the District’s history and requirements.

In accordance with the Fuel Hedging Policy, staff has been working with the District’s financial advisor to determine the interest of qualified counterparties in bidding on a commodity price cap, to develop a Request for Commodity Price Caps (the Request) and to verify that each counterparty expressing interest is prepared to bid based upon the agreed upon form of commodity price cap documents and, as applicable, amendments (such documents and amendments, being herein referred to as the Bid Documents) previously approved by the District, which are comprised of an ISDA Master Agreement, a Schedule to the Master Agreement, and a Credit Support Annex. The Request and the Bid Documents have been reviewed by Orrick and the District’s financial advisor. In addition to the Bid Documents, a Confirmation (the Confirmation) setting forth the pricing and other economic terms will be drafted and executed after the winning bid is selected.

Based on discussions between staff and the District’s financial advisor, it has been determined that there are four likely bidders for the FY2013 fuel hedging program: Deutsche Bank AG (DB), Barclays Bank PLC (Barclays), Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce (CIBC) and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (Wells Fargo), all of whom have previously bid and have agreed to bid based on the Bid Documents previously approved by, and on file with, the Board. DB was the winning bidder for the price cap for Fiscal Years ending June 30, 2010 and June 30, 2012. Barclays was the winning bidder for the price cap for Fiscal Years ending June 30, 2010 and June 30, 2012. Barclays was the winning bidder for the price cap for Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2011.

Board authorization is required to approve the Request and to authorize the General Manager/CEO or Deputy CEO, Finance and Administration, to select the counterparty for the FY2013 fuel hedging program based on the bids submitted, to execute the Confirmation and such other Bid Documents as shall be required to be entered into with the winning counterparty, and to pay the premium for the commodity price cap. The bid and settlement of the premium payable by the District for the commodity price cap are expected to occur prior to the beginning of the next fiscal year, with the price cap taking effect as of July 1, 2012. If staff is not satisfied with the results of the bid, including the required premium for a price cap, the District will elect not to proceed with a fuel hedging program at the time bids are received.

The primary goal for the FY 2013 fuel hedging program is to reduce volatility and uncertainty in the fuel budget for Fiscal Year 2013. Consistent with the Fuel Hedging Policy, Staff has
proposed that the District hedge 0.9 million gallons, which currently represents approximately 50 percent of its expected annual fuel consumption. In order to maximize the hedging program’s potential for economic efficiency, the District will partner with the JPB, which is expected to hedge 2.1 million gallons, which currently represents approximately 50 percent of its expected annual fuel consumption.

Staff expects to return to the Board at the next meeting with a report on the results of the bid. Staff also expects to return to the Board next year with an assessment of the FY2013 fuel hedging program.

**BUDGET IMPACT**
Implementing the fuel hedging program will enable the District to purchase at least half of its fuel within a pre-determined price range, thus giving the District a measure of budgetary certainty and allowing for more effective utilization of budget resources. Staff is estimating a need to increase the fuel budget to reflect current fuel prices, when funding is available. The cost of the price cap is also anticipated to be higher than the previous year. The proposed FY2013 fuel budget will include the hedging program fees consisting of up to $13,000 for financial advisor, up to $125,000 for outside legal counsel (30% of the total legal fees are the District’s responsibility), $5,000 in miscellaneous costs and approximately $250,000 for the cost of a price cap.

**BACKGROUND**
The District currently purchases fuel from Pinnacle Petroleum based on the average weekly spot price for Oil Price Information Service (OPIS) index, exposing the District to market price fluctuation. Since the beginning of FY2012, the price of OPIS has ranged from a high of $3.45 per gallon in the second week of March 2012 to a low of $2.86 in the third week of December 2011.

In order to meet the primary goal of the fuel hedging program of reducing volatility and uncertainty in the fuel budget for FY2013, staff will purchase a commodity price cap consistent with the District’s adopted Fuel Hedging Policy. The commodity price cap, like prior commodity price cap purchases, will be based on the Gulf Coast Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) index, which has a high historical correlation to the OPIS index.

Staff notes that the price cap will not include taxes on the fuel price, however the price commonly reported to the Board includes taxes. A price cap allows the District to limit its exposure if fuel prices rise, while continuing to receive the benefit of lower costs if prices fall.

Prepared by: Éva Goode, Manager, Budgets  650.508.7914
San Mateo County Transit District
Fuel Hedging Policy

Revised: May 9, 2012

Goal: The primary goal for the District’s fuel hedging program is to reduce volatility in the fuel budget.

Mechanism: There are several mechanisms available to hedge fuel in the market today including commodity price caps, futures contracts, commodity swaps and physical hedging. This policy authorizes a commodity price cap with a counterparty authorized to conduct business in the United States.

Index: The price that the District pays for fuel is based on the Oil Price Information Service (OPIS) index. With respect to the commodity price cap, the District will use an index that has a high historical positive correlation to the OPIS index. In addition, prior to entering into a transaction, staff will examine data from the prior five (5) years to measure the ongoing correlation. The index to be utilized in the commodity price cap is the Platt’s Gulf Coast Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel (ULSD) index. Between 2006 and 2010, the ULSD index had a high correlation of 0.975 with the OPIS index.

Duration: Each transaction will be implemented for no more than 12 months at a time and will not extend beyond one fiscal year.

Transaction Amount: Each transaction will be implemented for no more than 75 percent of District’s projected fuel usage for a fiscal year.

Counterparty Credit Criteria: As a condition for bidding, a counterparty or its guarantor (hereinafter referred to as a “counterparty”) must be rated at least “A” by each of the nationally recognized statistical rating organizations (each, a “Rating Agency”) then assigning a rating to the counterparty. If the counterparty is downgraded to or below “A3” from Moody’s, to or below “A-” from S&P, or to or below “A-” from Fitch after submission and acceptance of its bid by the District, the counterparty must post collateral to secure its performance in an amount and under terms and conditions acceptable to the District. In the event that the counterparty has been assigned a rating by more than one Rating Agency, the counterparty shall not be required to post collateral so long as the counterparty is rated at least “A” by at least one Rating Agency. In addition, the District retains the right to terminate the contract with the counterparty if its ratings are downgraded below “Baa1” in the case of Moody’s, if its ratings are downgraded below “BBB+” in the case of S&P, or if its ratings are downgraded below “BBB+” in the case of Fitch.

Guaranty Requirements: Any guaranty shall be irrevocable and unconditional and shall be in form and substance satisfactory to the District.

Counterparty Selection Criteria: It is the intent that a counterparty be rated at least “Aa3” or “AA-” by at least one Rating Agency as a condition for bidding. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in the event that District staff, with the advice of its fuel
hedge program advisors, determines that it is necessary in order to maintain a competitive bidding process, expressions of interest and bids may be solicited from counterparties meeting the rating requirements specified above under “Counterparty Credit Criteria” and a counterparty rated at least “A” by each Rating Agency then assigning a rating to the counterparty may be selected.

**Monitoring:** Monthly monitoring of the Gulf Coast ULSD average price must be calculated by, or under the direction of, District staff to ensure payments are received from the counterparty if and when due. Hedging practices should also be monitored by District staff to ensure this policy remains up to date with current best practices.

**Board Approval:** Staff shall return to the Board annually to obtain approval on the award of a financial contract for fuel hedging services and the authorization of the General Manager/CEO or designee to execute such a contract for the current fiscal year.

**Reporting:** Annual reports will be presented to the Board in the form of an informational staff report, which will provide details concerning the terms of the fuel hedge and provide an assessment of the current year’s program.

**Risks:** Some of the risks associated with a commodity price cap include:

- **Counterparty Risk** – The risk that the counterparty fails to make required payments or otherwise comply with the terms of the agreement. This risk is mitigated by requiring the counterparty or its guarantor to have at least an “A” rating from each Rating Agency then assigning a rating to a counterparty or its guarantor as a condition for bidding, requiring collateral upon bidder downgrade as described above under “Counterparty Credit Criteria,” limiting the term of the agreement to one fiscal year and monthly monitoring of counterparty rating.

- **Termination Risk** – The risk that there will be a mandatory early termination of the transaction. This risk is mitigated in part by requiring the posting of collateral by the counterparty should the counterparty’s or its guarantor’s credit rating fall to or below “A3” in the case of Moody’s or “A-” in the case of S&P or Fitch subsequent to the execution of the commodity price cap.

- **Basis Risk** – The risk that there is a mismatch between the commodity price cap rate and the amount actually paid for fuel. This risk is mitigated by selecting the Gulf Coast ULSD index which is highly correlated to the rates the District pays for fuel.
RESOLUTION NO. 2012-

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

ADOPT THE REVISED FUEL HEDGING POLICY

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) adopted a Fuel
Hedging Policy in March 2010, which was revised in April 2011, which provides
guidelines on fuel hedging transactions to ensure budget reliability and allows the District
to limit its exposure when fuel prices rise, while continuing to receive the benefit when
prices fall; and

WHEREAS, in order to maintain a competitive bidding process in the future,
staff recommends revising the Fuel Hedging Policy to authorize submission of bids by
counterparties assigned (or having a guarantor assigned) a rating of at least "A" by each
nationally recognized rating agency then rating the counterparty (or guarantor) at the time
bids are submitted.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the
San Mateo County Transit District hereby approves and adopts the attached revised Fuel
Hedging Policy.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of May, 2012 by the following vote:
AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

______________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

______________________________
District Secretary
RESOLUTION NO. 2012-

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

***

AUTHORIZING AWARD OF CONTRACT TO ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP TO SERVE AS SPECIAL COUNSEL IN CONNECTION WITH THE FISCAL YEAR 2013 FUEL HEDGING PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) currently purchases approximately two million gallons of diesel fuel each year to conduct transit service operations; and

WHEREAS, consistent with the fuel hedging policy adopted by the Board in March 2010, revised in April 2011 and on the date hereof (the Policy), the District will shortly begin the process of selecting a counterparty meeting the requirements specified in the Policy for the FY2013 fuel hedging program; and

WHEREAS, the District requires the services of special counsel to assist it in the process of implementing a fuel hedge for the FY2013 fuel hedging program; and

WHEREAS, Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP, has served as the District’s special counsel in prior years, including advising on FY2010’s, FY2011’s and FY2012’s fuel hedging program, and has substantial experience with public transit financial transactions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby authorizes the General Manager/CEO to execute a contract in an amount not to exceed $125,000 with Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP, to serve as special counsel to the District in connection with the proposed fuel hedge for FY2013, with the understanding that the not to exceed amount includes services to be provided under a
separate contract with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, which is expected to pay 70 percent of the total cost of the special counsel services.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of May, 2012 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

_______________________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

_______________________________________
District Secretary
RESOLUTION NO. 2012-

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

* * *

AUTHORIZING IMPLEMENTATION OF A FUEL HEDGING PROGRAM FOR THE
FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2013, AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION AND
DELIVERY OF DOCUMENTS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT SUCH FUEL
HEDGING PROGRAM, INCLUDING, AS APPLICABLE, AN ISDA MASTER
AGREEMENT, A SCHEDULE TO THE ISDA MASTER AGREEMENT, A CREDIT
SUPPORT ANNEX AND/OR A CONFIRMATION, AND AUTHORIZING THE TAKING
OF ALL ACTION NECESSARY RELATING TO THE IMPLEMENTATION AND
EXECUTION OF SAID FUEL HEDGING PROGRAM.

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, Barclays Bank PLC (Barclays Bank) and Deutsche Bank AG (Deutsche
Bank) expressed an interest in bidding on the commodity price cap for the 2010 Fuel Hedging
Program; and

WHEREAS, in connection with the authorization and approval of the 2010 Fuel
Hedging Program by the District, a form of 1992 International Swaps and Derivatives
Association, Inc. (ISDA) Master Agreement (the Deutsche Bank ISDA Master Agreement), a
form of Schedule to the Deutsche Bank ISDA Master Agreement (the Deutsche Bank ISDA Schedule), and a form of 1994 ISDA Credit Support Annex (the Deutsche Bank ISDA Credit Support Annex, and, together with the Deutsche Bank ISDA Master Agreement and the Deutsche Bank ISDA Schedule, hereinafter collectively referred to as the Deutsche Bank Hedging Documents) were made available to, and approved by, the District; and

WHEREAS, in connection with the authorization and approval of the 2010 Fuel Hedging Program by the District, a form of 1992 ISDA Master Agreement (the Barclays Bank ISDA Master Agreement), a form of Schedule to the Barclays Bank ISDA Master Agreement (the Barclays Bank ISDA Schedule), and a form of 1994 ISDA Credit Support Annex (the Barclays Bank ISDA Credit Support Annex, and, together with the Barclays Bank ISDA Master Agreement and the Barclays Bank ISDA Schedule, hereinafter collectively referred to as the Barclays Bank Hedging Documents) were made available to, and approved by, the District; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to a competitive bidding process, Deutsche Bank was selected as provider of the commodity price cap for the 2010 Fuel Hedging Program; and

WHEREAS, in connection with the 2010 Fuel Hedging Program, the District entered into the Deutsche Bank Hedging Documents with Deutsche Bank; and

WHEREAS, based on an evaluation of the 2010 Fuel Hedging Program, staff recommended continuation of the fuel hedging program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011 (the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program), utilizing a fuel hedge in the form of a commodity price cap; and

WHEREAS, the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program was authorized and approved by the Board of Directors of the District and implemented by staff; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to a competitive bidding process, Barclays Bank was selected as provider of the commodity price cap for the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program; and

WHEREAS, in connection with the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program, the District entered into the Barclays Bank Hedging Documents with Barclays Bank; and

WHEREAS, based on an evaluation of the 2011 Fuel Hedging Program, staff recommended continuation of the fuel hedging program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2012 (the 2012 Fuel Hedging Program), utilizing a fuel hedge in the form of a commodity price cap; and
WHEREAS, implementation of the 2012 Fuel Hedging Program involved soliciting bids from Deutsche Bank, Barclays Bank, Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce (CIBC) and Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. (Wells Fargo), each of which expressed an interest in bidding on the commodity price cap for the 2012 Fuel Hedging Program; and

WHEREAS, in connection with the authorization and approval of the 2012 Fuel Hedging Program by the District, a form of 1992 ISDA Master Agreement (the CIBC ISDA Master Agreement), a form of Schedule to the ISDA Master Agreement (the CIBC ISDA Schedule) and a form of 1994 ISDA Credit Support Annex (the CIBC ISDA Credit Support Annex, and, together with the CIBC ISDA Master Agreement and the CIBC ISDA Schedule, hereinafter collectively referred to as the CIBC Hedging Documents), were made available to, and approved by, the District; and

WHEREAS, in connection with the authorization and approval of the 2012 Fuel Hedging Program by the District, a form of 1992 ISDA Master Agreement (the Wells Fargo ISDA Master Agreement), a form of Schedule to the ISDA Master Agreement (the Wells Fargo ISDA Schedule) and a form of 1994 ISDA Credit Support Annex (the Wells Fargo ISDA Credit Support Annex, and, together with the Wells Fargo ISDA Master Agreement and the Wells Fargo ISDA Schedule, hereinafter collectively referred to as the Wells Fargo Hedging Documents), were made available to, and approved by, the District; and

WHEREAS, also in connection with the authorization and approval of the 2012 Fuel Hedging Program by the District, a proposed form of amendment to the Deutsche Bank ISDA Schedule (the Deutsche Bank Schedule Amendment) was made available to, and approved by, the District; and

WHEREAS, Barclays Bank expressed an interest in bidding on the commodity price cap for the 2012 Fuel Hedging Program and agreed to amend the Barclays Bank ISDA Schedule in order to authorize additional transactions to be entered into pursuant to the Barclays Bank ISDA Master Agreement; and

WHEREAS, a proposed form of amendment to the Barclays Bank ISDA Schedule (the Barclays Bank Schedule Amendment) was made available to, and approved by, the District in connection with the authorization and approval of the 2012 Fuel Hedging Program; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to a competitive bidding process, Deutsche Bank was selected as provider of the commodity price cap for the 2012 Fuel Hedging Program; and
WHEREAS, based on an evaluation of the 2012 Fuel Hedging Program, staff recommended continuation of the fuel hedging program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013 (the 2013 Fuel Hedging Program), utilizing a fuel hedge in the form of a commodity price cap; and

WHEREAS, implementation of the 2013 Fuel Hedging Program will involve soliciting bids from providers of commodity price caps meeting the credit rating criteria specified in the fuel hedging policy, adopted by the Board of Directors of the District on April 13, 2011, as amended and restated by the fuel hedging policy adopted by the Board of Directors of the District on the date hereof (hereinafter referred to as the Fuel Hedging Policy), which have expressed an interest in bidding on the commodity price cap on substantially such terms as are set forth in the Request for Commodity Price Caps (the 2013 Program Request) prepared by PFM Asset Management LLC and Ross Financial in connection with the 2013 Fuel Hedging Program; and

WHEREAS, implementation of the 2013 Fuel Hedging Program will involve the selection of a provider of commodity price caps as a cap counterparty, such selection to be made pursuant to a competitive bidding process; and

WHEREAS, implementation of the 2013 Fuel Hedging Program will also involve execution and delivery of a Confirmation (the Confirmation) with the cap counterparty selected pursuant to such competitive bidding process; and

WHEREAS, it is now necessary for the Board of Directors of the District to approve the form of the 2013 Program Request, to authorize the negotiation and execution and delivery of the CIBC Hedging Documents with CIBC if CIBC is the cap counterparty selected, to authorize the negotiation and execution and delivery of the Wells Fargo Hedging Documents with Wells Fargo if Wells Fargo is the cap counterparty selected, to authorize the negotiation and execution and delivery of the Confirmation, to authorize the taking of such other actions as shall be necessary to consummate the 2013 Fuel Hedging Program and to authorize the taking of various actions necessary in connection therewith.

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

Section 1. Findings. The Board of Directors of the District hereby finds and determines that the foregoing recitals are true and correct. The Board of Directors of the District...
hereby further determines that it would be in the best interest of the District and in furtherance of the purposes of the District and the exercise of the powers of the District in connection with the operation of its transit services to mitigate the risk of a rise in diesel fuel cost and to assist the District in its budgeting process by reducing the volatility and uncertainty in the effective cost to the District of diesel fuel by acquiring a commodity price cap through the implementation of the 2013 Fuel Hedging Program and the execution and delivery of such documentation as shall be required to implement such 2013 Fuel Hedging Program, including a Confirmation and, as and to the extent, applicable, the Barclays Bank Schedule Amendment if Barclays Bank is the cap counterparty selected, the CIBC Hedging Documents if CIBC is the cap counterparty selected, and/or the Wells Fargo Hedging Documents if Wells Fargo is the cap counterparty selected.

Section 2. **Approval of the 2013 Fuel Hedging Program.** Implementation of the 2013 Fuel Hedging Program in accordance with the Fuel Hedging Policy with a cap counterparty (the Cap Counterparty) selected pursuant to a competitive bidding process and on such other terms as are acceptable to the General Manager/CEO of the District (the General Manager/CEO) or the Deputy CEO of the District (the Deputy CEO), with the advice of PFM Asset Management LLC (the Financial Advisor), is hereby authorized and approved.

Section 3. **Authorization of Execution and Delivery of 2013 Fuel Hedge Program Documentation.** The General Manager/CEO or the Deputy CEO, each acting alone (each, an Authorized Officer) is hereby authorized and directed, for and in the name and on behalf of the District: (i) to execute and deliver the Barclays Bank Schedule Amendment to Barclays Bank if Barclays Bank is the Cap Counterparty, such Barclays Bank Schedule Amendment to be in substantially the form approved in connection with the 2012 Hedging Program, with such changes therein as the Authorized Officer executing the same, with the advice of the Financial Advisor, may require or approve, such approval to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery thereof; and (ii) to execute and deliver the CIBC Hedging Documents to CIBC if CIBC is the Cap Counterparty, such CIBC Hedging Documents to be in substantially the form approved in connection with the 2012 Hedging Program, with such changes therein as the Authorized Officer executing the same, with the advice of the Financial Advisor, may require or approve, such approval to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery thereof; or (iii) to execute and deliver the Wells Fargo Hedging Documents to Wells Fargo if Wells Fargo is the Cap Counterparty, such Wells Fargo Hedging Documents to be in substantially the form
approved in connection with the 2012 Hedging Program, with such changes therein as the Authorized Officer executing the same, with the advice of the Financial Advisor, may require or approve, such approval to be conclusively evidenced by the execution and delivery thereof.

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

Section 4. Authorized Representative. All approvals, consents, directions, notices, orders, requests and other actions permitted or required by the Confirmation or by any of the other documents authorized by this Resolution (the 2013 Hedging Documentation) entered into or to be entered into, as applicable, with the Cap Counterparty may be given or taken by either Authorized Officer without further authorization or direction by the Board of Directors of the District and each Authorized Officer is hereby authorized and directed to give any such approval, consent, direction, notice, order or request and to take any such action which such Authorized Officer may deem necessary or desirable to further the purposes of this Resolution.

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

Section 6. Ratification of Barclays Bank Hedging Documents. All actions heretofore taken with respect to the authorization, approval, execution and delivery of the Barclays Bank Hedging Documents and the authorization and approval of the Barclays Bank Schedule Amendment are hereby ratified, confirmed, and approved.

Section 7. Ratification of CIBC Hedging Documents. All actions heretofore taken with respect to the authorization and approval of the CIBC Hedging Documents are hereby ratified, confirmed, and approved.

Section 8. Ratification of Wells Fargo Hedging Documents. All actions heretofore taken with respect to the authorization and approval of the Wells Fargo Hedging Documents are hereby ratified, confirmed, and approved.
Section 9. **Ratification of Actions Relating to 2013 Fuel Hedging Program.** All actions heretofore taken by the officers and agents of the District with respect to the 2013 Fuel Hedging Program are hereby ratified, confirmed, and approved.

Section 10. **Completion of 2013 Fuel Hedging Program.** Each Authorized Officer is hereby authorized and directed, for and in the name and on behalf of the District, to do any and all things and to take any and all actions and to execute and deliver any and all agreements, certificates, documents and instruments and to do any and all things and take any and all actions which may be necessary or advisable to effectuate the actions which the Board of Directors of the District has approved in this Resolution, including, without limitation, payment of the premium for the commodity price cap, and to carry out, consummate and perform the duties of the District set forth in the 2013 Hedging Documentation and all other documents executed in connection with the 2013 Fuel Hedging Program.

Section 11. **Severability of Invalid Provisions.** If any section, paragraph, clause or provision of this Resolution shall for any reason be held to be invalid or unenforceable, the invalidity or unenforceability of such section, paragraph, clause or provision shall not affect any of the remaining provisions of this Resolution which shall continue in full force and effect.

Section 12. **Effective Date.** This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its passage.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of May, 2012 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

______________________________
District Secretary

ATTEST:
TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
          General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
       Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE AMENDMENT TO THE EXISTING AGREEMENT
          WITH COUNTY OF SAN MATEO FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND
          RELATED COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend Board approval to amend the existing agreement (Agreement) with the County of San Mateo for an additional three years, based on the County’s actual costs to provide the Services, at a total cost not-to-exceed $12,346,064 for law enforcement and related communication services. The San Mateo County Transit District’s (District) proportional share (22%) for the service costs during the three-year term will not exceed $2,716,135. The balance of the costs (78%) will be paid for by the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB). Staff also proposes that the Committee recommend Board approval to enter into an agreement with the JPB to memorialize the cost sharing arrangement for these services.

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of this amendment will provide continued contract law enforcement and related communications services for bus operations and for supplemental rail policing on Caltrain by sheriff’s deputies. Approval will continue the existing services, provided under the Agreement, which expired on December 31, 2011. The District and the JPB will enter into a separate financing agreement to set forth the financial obligations of each of the agencies relative to the Agreement.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funding for the District's share of the Agreement costs for the current fiscal year is contained in the District’s current operating budget for the remainder of Fiscal Year 2012 and has been included in the proposed operating budget for Fiscal Year 2013. The amendment is for a three-year term, from January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2014. Current District costs for FY2012 are estimated at $775,000. Proposed costs for FY2013 are estimated at $890,000.
BACKGROUND
The District entered into an initial three-year agreement for law enforcement and related communication services with the County of San Mateo in January 2004. The amendment will extend the agreement's services for a three-year term, which services include sheriff’s deputies riding on District and contract service vehicles and coordinating all requests for police services, collision investigations, police reports and similar functions. Benefits to the District include up to four explosive detecting K-9’s, crime scene investigation and criminal forensics, coroner’s services, and backup personnel as required. Emergency calls and dispatch services will be provided through the San Mateo County Dispatch Center. Local police agencies and citizens alike have praised the District for the services provided under the Agreement, which have resulted in quick and professional responses to bus-related crimes and complaints.

Prepared By: Gigi Harrington 650-508-7950
RESOLUTION NO. 2012 -

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

*   *   *

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE EXISTING AGREEMENT WITH THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND RELATED COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $12,346,064 AND EXECUTION OF A FINANCIAL COST SHARING AGREEMENT WITH THE PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD

WHEREAS, in December, 2004, the San Mateo County Transit District (District), on its behalf and on behalf of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB), entered into an agreement (Agreement) with the County of San Mateo (County) for the provision of law enforcement services and related communications services for both bus operations and rail operations (Services); and

WHEREAS, the District desires to continue contracting with the County for the provision the Services for an additional three-year term effective as of January 1, 2012; and

WHEREAS, this amendment will be funded by the operating budget; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that the Board authorize execution of an amendment to the Agreement, with costs to be based on actual costs to the County to provide the Services, in an amount not-to-exceed $12,346,064 for the additional three-year term; and

WHEREAS, the District's proportional share for the costs of Services during the three-year term will not exceed $2,716,135 and the balance of the costs will be paid by the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO also recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that the Board authorize execution of separate agreement between the District and the
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, pursuant to which each agency will provide its share of funding to cover the Services provided to that agency.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby authorizes the General Manager/CEO or designee to execute an amendment to the Agreement for an additional three-year term based on actual costs to the County, in an amount not-to-exceed $12,346,064, with the understanding that the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board will be responsible for paying for all services provided to it under the Agreement, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager/CEO is authorized to execute a financial agreement between the District and the JPB, which will memorialize the cost sharing responsibilities of each agency relative to the Agreement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager/CEO is authorized to take such further actions as may be required to give effect to this Resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of May, 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: AUTHORIZE APPROVAL FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE CALPERS CONTRACT TO PROVIDE 2%@60 MODIFIED FORMULA TO FUTURE EMPLOYEES

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend approval of an amendment to the San Mateo County Transit District’s (District) CalPERS Retirement Contract providing a second tier benefit of 2%@60 Modified formula for all future employees. Future employees are employees hired after the effective date of the amendment.

SIGNIFICANCE
This is the second step of a two-step process to amend the District’s CalPERS Retirement Contract providing a second tier benefit of 2%@60 for employees hired after the date the amendment is approved. This first step was a resolution of intention which was approved during the April 2012 board meeting.

There are two sets of the following attached for signature: “Resolution Authorizing an Amendment to Contract” and “Amendment to Contract”.

BUDGET IMPACT
There will be an anticipated decrease in the employer rate as employees are hired into the second tier. No adjustment to the budget is required.

BACKGROUND
As part of the District’s continuing efforts to reduce spending, obtain budget efficiencies, and enhance its fiscal sustainability, the District sought and obtained a second tier formula (2%@60) by collective bargaining with the employee groups represented by the Amalgamated Transit Union and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. The same second tier formula (2%@60) will be applied to the administrative employees.

Prepared by: Monica Colondres, Director, Human Resources 650-508-6233
The Board of Administration, California Public Employees' Retirement System, hereinafter referred to as Board, and the governing body of the above public agency, hereinafter referred to as Public Agency, having entered into a contract effective July 20, 1977, and witnessed July 20, 1977, and as amended effective April 8, 1979, April 18, 1979 and December 29, 2002 which provides for participation of Public Agency in said System, Board and Public Agency hereby agree as follows:

A. Paragraphs 1 through 11 are hereby stricken from said contract as executed effective December 29, 2002, and hereby replaced by the following paragraphs numbered 1 through 13 inclusive:

1. All words and terms used herein which are defined in the Public Employees' Retirement Law shall have the meaning as defined therein unless otherwise specifically provided. "Normal retirement age" shall mean age 55 for local miscellaneous members entering membership in the miscellaneous classification on or prior to the effective date of this amendment to contract and age 60 for local miscellaneous members entering membership for the first time in the miscellaneous classification after the effective date of this amendment to contract.
2. Public Agency shall participate in the Public Employees' Retirement System from and after July 20, 1977 making its employees as hereinafter provided, members of said System subject to all provisions of the Public Employees' Retirement Law except such as apply only on election of a contracting agency and are not provided for herein and to all amendments to said Law hereafter enacted except those, which by express provisions thereof, apply only on the election of a contracting agency.

3. Public Agency agrees to indemnify, defend and hold harmless the California Public Employees’ Retirement System (CalPERS) and its trustees, agents and employees, the CalPERS Board of Administration, and the California Public Employees’ Retirement Fund from any claims, demands, actions, losses, liabilities, damages, judgments, expenses and costs, including but not limited to interest, penalties and attorneys fees that may arise as a result of any of the following:

(a) Public Agency’s election to provide retirement benefits, provisions or formulas under this Contract that are different than the retirement benefits, provisions or formulas provided under the Public Agency’s prior non-CalPERS retirement program.

(b) Public Agency’s election to amend this Contract to provide retirement benefits, provisions or formulas that are different than existing retirement benefits, provisions or formulas.

(c) Public Agency’s agreement with a third party other than CalPERS to provide retirement benefits, provisions, or formulas that are different than the retirement benefits, provisions or formulas provided under this Contract and provided for under the California Public Employees’ Retirement Law.

(d) Public Agency’s election to file for bankruptcy under Chapter 9 (commencing with section 901) of Title 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code and/or Public Agency’s election to reject this Contract with the CalPERS Board of Administration pursuant to section 365, of Title 11, of the United States Bankruptcy Code or any similar provision of law.

(e) Public Agency’s election to assign this Contract without the prior written consent of the CalPERS’ Board of Administration.
(f) The termination of this Contract either voluntarily by request of Public Agency or involuntarily pursuant to the Public Employees' Retirement Law.

(g) Changes sponsored by Public Agency in existing retirement benefits, provisions or formulas made as a result of amendments, additions or deletions to California statute or to the California Constitution.

4. Employees of Public Agency in the following classes shall become members of said Retirement System except such in each such class as are excluded by law or this agreement:

a. Employees other than local safety members (herein referred to as local miscellaneous members).

5. In addition to the classes of employees excluded from membership by said Retirement Law, the following classes of employees shall not become members of said Retirement System:

   NO ADDITIONAL EXCLUSIONS

6. The percentage of final compensation to be provided for each year of credited prior and current service for local miscellaneous members entering membership in the miscellaneous classification on or prior to the effective date of this amendment to contract shall be determined in accordance with Section 21354 of said Retirement Law, subject to the reduction provided therein for service on and after July 23, 1977, the effective date of Social Security coverage, for members whose service has been included in Federal Social Security (2% at age 55 Full and Modified).

7. The percentage of final compensation to be provided for each year of credited current service for local miscellaneous members entering membership for the first time in the miscellaneous classification after the effective date of this amendment to contract shall be determined in accordance with Section 21353 of said Retirement Law, subject to the reduction provided therein for Federal Social Security (2% at age 60 Full and Modified).
8. Public Agency elected and elects to be subject to the following optional provisions:

   a. Section 21548 (Pre-Retirement Option 2W Death Benefit).

   b. Section 20475 (Different Level of Benefits). Section 21353 (2% @ 60 Modified formula) is applicable to local miscellaneous members entering membership for the first time in the miscellaneous classification after the effective date of this amendment to contract.

9. Public Agency, in accordance with Government Code Section 20834, shall not be considered an "employer" for purposes of the Public Employees' Retirement Law. Contributions of the Public Agency shall be fixed and determined as provided in Government Code Section 20834, and such contributions hereafter made shall be held by the Board as provided in Government Code Section 20834.

10. Public Agency shall contribute to said Retirement System the contributions determined by actuarial valuations of prior and future service liability with respect to local miscellaneous members of said Retirement System.

11. Public Agency shall also contribute to said Retirement System as follows:

    a. A reasonable amount, as fixed by the Board, payable in one installment within 60 days of date of contract to cover the costs of administering said System as it affects the employees of Public Agency, not including the costs of special valuations or of the periodic investigation and valuations required by law.

    b. A reasonable amount, as fixed by the Board, payable in one installment as the occasions arise, to cover the costs of special valuations on account of employees of Public Agency, and costs of the periodic investigation and valuations required by law.

12. Contributions required of Public Agency and its employees shall be subject to adjustment by Board on account of amendments to the Public Employees' Retirement Law, and on account of the experience under the Retirement System as determined by the periodic investigation and valuation required by said Retirement Law.
13. Contributions required of Public Agency and its employees shall be paid by Public Agency to the Retirement System within fifteen days after the end of the period to which said contributions refer or as may be prescribed by Board regulation. If more or less than the correct amount of contributions is paid for any period, proper adjustment shall be made in connection with subsequent remittances. Adjustments on account of errors in contributions required of any employee may be made by direct payments between the employee and the Board.

B. This amendment shall be effective on the _____ day of _______________, ______.

BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES’ RETIREMENT SYSTEM

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

BY________________________________________
KAREN DE FRANK, CHIEF
CUSTOMER ACCOUNT SERVICES DIVISION
PUBLIC EMPLOYEES’ RETIREMENT SYSTEM

________________________________________
Witness Date

Attest:

________________________________________
Clerk
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT OF THE CONTRACT WITH STANDARD LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY FOR LIFE INSURANCE AND FOR ACCIDENTAL DEATH AND DISMEMBERMENT INSURANCE

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend the Board amend the contract with Standard Life Insurance Company to increase coverage and associated rates of basic life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment (AD&D) insurance for the remainder of the contract through May 31, 2014.

This amendment increases the monthly premiums from $0.22 to $0.23 per $1,000 of basic life coverage, for an estimated annual cost of $123,838. There is no change to the AD&D rate.

SIGNIFICANCE
The San Mateo County Transit District (District) currently provides a minimum of $50,000 basic life and $15,000 AD&D for all regular employees and members of the Board of Directors.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funding for this is available in the current available budget and will be included in proposed future budgets.

BACKGROUND
Since our life and AD&D contract with Standard Life was approved last April 2011, the District has entered into collective bargaining agreements with new employee groups represented by the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters (IBT). The proposed increase will cover part-time employees in the ATU units.

Prepared by: Juliet Nogales-DeGuzman, Manager, Personnel Operations  650-508-6236
RESOLUTION NO. 2012-

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

* * *

AMENDING THE CONTRACT FOR LIFE INSURANCE AND FOR ACCIDENTAL
DEATH AND DISMEMBERMENT INSURANCE WITH
STANDARD INSURANCE COMPANY

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) awarded a contract to Standard Insurance Company for the provision of basic life and accidental death and dismemberment (AD&D) insurance for all regular employees and Board members at an estimated annual premium cost of $118,800 for three years beginning June 1, 2011; and

WHEREAS, as a result of the District recently having entered into a new collective bargaining agreement with the Amalgamated Transit Union providing for life insurance coverage for part-time employees, Standard Insurance Company has proposed an amendment to the contract for the remaining period at a rate of $0.23 per $1,000 of coverage per month for basic life insurance and $0.020 per $1,000 of coverage per month for AD&D insurance, representing a 4.5 percent increase in rates from the current contract.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District approves amending the basic life insurance and AD&D insurance contract with Standard Insurance Company at an estimated annual premium of $123,838 for the remaining two years of the contract, through May 31, 2014; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager/CEO is authorized to execute a contract on behalf of the District with Standard Insurance Company in full conformity with the terms of this resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of May 2012 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

__________________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

__________________________________
District Secretary
AGENDA ITEM # 8
MAY 9, 2012

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

Rita P. Haskin
Executive Officer, Customer Service
& Marketing

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE AWARD OF CONTRACTS TO PROVIDE ON-CALL MARKET RESEARCH AND SURVEY SERVICES

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend that the Board:

1. Award on-call, no guaranteed level-of-effort contracts for an aggregate not-to-exceed amount of $610,000 to provide on-call market research and survey services for a five-year term at the hourly rates quoted in each proposal, to the following firms:
   • Corey, Canapary & Galanis
   • Dikita Enterprises, Inc.
   • EMC Research, Inc.

2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO or his designee to execute a contract with each of the above firms in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents and negotiated agreements.

SIGNIFICANCE
Award of these contracts will provide the San Mateo County Transit District (District) with qualified on-call market research firms to conduct ridership research, counting projects, and passenger satisfaction surveys on a project-by-project basis. Potential projects may include origin/destination studies, focus groups, and run-time surveys.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funding for these services will be available under approved and projected operating and capital budgets.

BACKGROUND
The existing contract was awarded to Corey, Canapary & Galanis in 2007 to meet the requirements of the Marketing department. During the preparation of the Request for Proposal (RFP), the Office of Public Affairs and the Planning and Development department also identified needs for on-call market research services. Therefore, the estimated value of the new five-year
contract was increased to accommodate the anticipated requirements of these departments. Based upon the projected volume of projects, staff determined it is in the agency’s best interests to award contracts to more than one firm.

A RFP to provide Market Research and Survey Services was issued as a joint procurement detailing the scope of services for the District and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board. The solicitation information was advertised in a newspaper of general circulation and on the District’s procurement website. Solicitation notices also were sent to interested proposers, small business enterprises (SBEs) and disadvantaged business enterprises (DBEs). Four proposals were received.

An Evaluation Committee (Committee) composed of qualified District staff reviewed and scored the proposals in accordance with the following weighted criteria:

- Approach to Scope of Services   0-20 points
- Qualifications and Experience of Firm   0-25 points
- Qualifications and Experience of Key Personnel   0-30 points
- Cost Proposal   0-25 points

After review, evaluation, and initial scoring of proposals, three firms were determined to be in the competitive range and were invited for interviews. As part of the evaluation process, staff contacted agencies where the firms in the competitive range are providing similar services and received positive references. Following interviews, the Committee completed the final evaluation and consensus ranking and determined that Corey, Canapary & Galanis, Dikita Enterprises, Inc. and EMC Research, Inc. are qualified to be selected for contract award. Negotiations were conducted successfully with these firms. All the firms are listed below in order of their final consensus ranking:

- Corey, Canapary & Galanis (SBE firm), San Francisco
- Dikita Enterprises, Inc. (DBE firm), Dallas, TX
- EMC Research, Inc., Oakland
- The Modellers, LLC, Salt Lake City, UT

Each firm in the competitive range possesses the requisite depth of experience, has the required qualifications to successfully perform the scope of services defined in the solicitation documents, and is fully capable of providing the specified services at a fair and reasonable price. Staff therefore recommends award of a contract to each of these firms.

Corey, Canapary & Galanis currently provides market research and survey services to the District under a three-year base term contract with two, one-year option terms for an estimated cost of $175,000 for the five-year term.

Senior Contract Officer: Julie Taylor 650-508-7915
Project Manager: Christiane Kwok, Market Research Specialist 650-508-7926
RESOLUTION NO. 2012-

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

*   *   *

AUTHORIZING AWARD OF CONTRACTS
FOR ON-CALL MARKET RESEARCH AND SURVEY SERVICES
FOR AN AGGREGATE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $610,000 FOR FIVE YEARS

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) has solicited competitive proposals to provide on-call market research and survey services; and

WHEREAS, in response to the District’s advertisement, four firms submitted proposals; and

WHEREAS, an Evaluation Committee (Committee) has reviewed proposals, conducted interviews and negotiations, and ranked all of the proposers according to the evaluation criteria set forth in the Request for Proposals (RFP); and

WHEREAS, staff has determined that it would be in the best interest of the JPB to award contracts to three qualified firms to provide on-call market research and survey services; and

WHEREAS, the Committee has determined that Corey, Canapary & Galanis, Dikita Enterprises, Inc. and EMC Research, Inc. are the three highest consensus-ranked firms; and

WHEREAS, legal counsel has reviewed the Corey, Canapary & Galanis, Dikita Enterprises, Inc. and EMC Research, Inc. proposals and determined that they complied with the requirements of the solicitation documents; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that on-call, no guaranteed level-of-effort contracts for market research and survey services be awarded to Corey, Canapary & Galanis, Dikita Enterprises, Inc. and
EMC Research, Inc. for a five-year term for an aggregate not-to-exceed amount of $610,000 provided at the hourly rates quoted in each firm's proposal.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Board of Directors (Board) of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby awards on-call, no guaranteed level-of-effort contracts for market research and survey services to Corey, Canapary & Galanis, of San Francisco, California; Dikita Enterprises, Inc. of Dallas, Texas; and EMC Research, Inc. of Oakland, California for a five-year term for an aggregate not-to-exceed amount of $610,000 in full conformity with all the terms and conditions of the RFP and negotiated agreements; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Board authorizes the General Manager/CEO or his designee to execute contracts on behalf of the District with Corey, Canapary & Galanis, Dikita Enterprises, Inc. and EMC Research, Inc. in full conformity with all of the terms and conditions of the contract documents, and in a form approved by legal counsel.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of May, 2012 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

______________________________
District Secretary
FINANCE ITEM # 9
MAY 9, 2012

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO:          Finance Committee

THROUGH:     Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT:     AUTHORIZE AWARD OF CONTRACT TO PROVIDE UNDERGROUND
STORAGE TANK INSPECTION AND MAINTENANCE SERVICES

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend that the Board:

1. Award a contract to Technology, Engineering, & Construction (d.b.a. TEC Accutite) to perform underground storage tank inspection, testing, maintenance, minor repair and emergency services for the North Base and South Base service centers for an estimated amount of $750,000 for a five-year term at the rates quoted in the proposal.

2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO or his designee to execute a contract with TEC Accutite in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the solicitation.

SIGNIFICANCE
Award of this contract will provide the San Mateo County Transit District (District) with a dedicated and qualified Contractor to perform underground storage tank (UST) inspections, testing and maintenance of the District-owned underground storage tanks located at both North Base and South Base maintenance facilities (Bases). This award also will provide a contractor that can be called upon to react quickly in case of an emergency.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funding for these services will be available under approved and projected operating budgets.

BACKGROUND
The District is responsible for the safe operation and regular maintenance of USTs containing diesel fuel, waste oil and automatic transmission fluid located at the Bases. Detailed inspections are required to monitor maintenance practices and to ensure that necessary repair work and maintenance are performed in a manner that meets the standards of the District, the State Water Resources Control Board, and the County of San Mateo. Failure to comply with monthly inspections, annual certifications and maintenance as required by the State could cause the County to immediately suspend daily fuel deliveries to the Bases, thus significantly impacting bus operations.
A Request for Proposals (RFP) to provide Underground Storage Tank Inspection and Maintenance was issued detailing the District’s scope of services. The solicitation was advertised in a newspaper of general circulation and on the District’s website. Solicitation notices also were sent to small and disadvantaged business enterprises (DBEs) registered on the District’s website. Staff received proposals from three firms (one of which is currently a DBE).

An Evaluation Committee (Committee) comprised of qualified staff reviewed and ranked proposals according to the following weighted criteria set forth in the RFP:

- Approach to Scope of Services 0 - 20 points
- Qualifications and Experience of Firm 0 - 25 points
- Qualifications and Experience of Key Personnel 0 - 25 points
- Cost Proposal 0 - 30 points

Staff contacted references for each of the firms submitting proposals; in addition, a detailed analysis was performed of each firm’s recent fiscal records. Upon review, evaluation, and initial scoring of proposals, the Committee concluded it was unnecessary to conduct interviews because two of the three proposals fell outside the competitive range. The highest-ranked proposer, TEC Accutite, was determined to be within the competitive range for further consideration. The firms are listed below in order of their consensus ranking:

- Technology, Engineering & Construction (d.b.a. TEC Accutite), South San Francisco
- Service Station Systems, Inc., San Jose
- GEMS Environmental Management Services, Inc., Concord, CA (a DBE firm)

TEC Accutite has provided similar services to the District for more than 20 years, including engineering support services and in-plant quality assurance inspections. Staff conducted a survey of transit agencies for which TEC Accutite provides comparable services and determined their inspection costs are fair and reasonable.

This background demonstrates the firm possesses the depth of experience and required qualifications to successfully perform the scope of services as defined in the solicitation. TEC Accutite met all the solicitation requirements, including nondiscrimination in its subcontracting. It intends to procure supplies as needed from a DBE firm in the performance of this contract.

TEC Accutite currently provides UST inspection and maintenance services to the District under a three-year base term contract with two, one-year option terms for an estimated cost of $1,032,000 for the combined five-year term.

Contract Officer: Tony Esguerra 650-508-6256
Project Manager: Jeff Thomas, Facilities Contract Administrator 650-508-6309
RESOLUTION NO. 2012 -

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

*   *   *

AUTHORIZING AWARD OF A CONTRACT TO
TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING & CONSTRUCTION DBA TEC ACCUTITE FOR
UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK INSPECTION & MAINTENANCE SERVICES
FOR AN ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF $750,000 FOR A FIVE-YEAR TERM

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) has solicited competitive proposals for the provision of Underground Storage Tank Inspection and Maintenance Services; and

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

WHEREAS, an Evaluation Committee (Committee) reviewed and ranked the proposals according to the evaluation criteria set forth in the Request for Proposals and two firms fell outside of the competitive range; and

WHEREAS, upon completion of the evaluation and selection process, Technology, Engineering, & Construction, Inc. d.b.a. TEC Accutite (TEC Accutite) received the highest consensus ranking; and

WHEREAS, staff has determined that TEC Accutite possesses the requisite depth of experience, has the required qualifications to successfully perform the scope of services, and appears fully qualified to provide the specified services, and

WHEREAS, legal counsel has reviewed the TEC Accutite proposal and has determined that it complies with the requirements of the solicitation documents; and
WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that a contract be awarded to TEC Accutite for a five-year term for an estimated amount of $750,000.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors (Board) of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby awards a contract to Technology, Engineering & construction d.b.a. TEC Accutite of South San Francisco, California, for the provision of Underground Storage Tank Inspection and Maintenance services for a five-year term at an estimated amount of $750,000 in full conformity with all the terms and conditions of the RFP; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute a contract on behalf of the District with TEC Accutite in full conformity with all the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents in a form approved by legal counsel.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of May, 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
C. H. (Chuck) Harvey  
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: REJECT ALL BIDS FOR PAINTING AND RELATED SERVICES AND AUTHORIZE TO RE-SOLICIT BIDS

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Committee recommend that the Board:
1. Reject the two bids submitted in response to the San Mateo County Transit District’s (District’s) solicitation for furnishing painting and related services.
2. Authorize staff to re-solicit these services.

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of the above actions will allow rejection of two bids received and will permit the re-issuance of a solicitation.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funds for painting and related services are budgeted annually in the operating budget. The rejection of bids and re-solicitation has no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
An Invitation for Bids (IFB) was issued to obtain bids for furnishing painting and related services for a three-year base term with two one-year options. Staff advertised the requirement on the District website and in a local newspaper of general circulation. Solicitation notification was sent out to interested bidders including small business and disadvantaged business enterprises (SBEs and DBEs) that were registered in the vendor database. Two bids were received as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Cooney Painting, San Carlos</td>
<td>$ 181,637.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OnPoint Construction, Millbrae</td>
<td>$ 268,478.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bid prices from the lowest bidder are non-responsive because the bidder’s fully burdened hourly service rates fall below the minimum hourly wage rates, according to prevailing wage rates issued by the State of California, Department of Industrial Relations. Bid prices from the second bidder exceed the contract budget.

Staff recommends that the Board authorize staff to re-issue the solicitation and include provisions in the Cost Proposal form to remind bidders that any bid that includes hourly service rates that fall below the prevailing hourly wage rates will be rejected as nonresponsive.

Contract Officer: Evelyn Marcal  650-508-7958
Project Manager: Jeff Thomas, Facilities Contract Administrator  650-508-6309
FINANCE ITEM # 11
MAY 9, 2012

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: PRELIMINARY FISCAL YEAR 2013 OPERATING BUDGET

ACTION
This report is submitted for informational purposes only. Staff will bring this item back to the Board at its June 13, 2012 meeting with a request that the Committee recommend Board adoption of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 Operating Budget at that time.

SIGNIFICANCE
The FY2013 Operating Budget totals $131.7 million, as shown in Attachment A, Total Uses of Funds (page 1, line 24). The proposed budget is projected to increase by $2.7 million or 2.1 percent from the FY2012 revised budget of $129.0 million.

Sources of Funds
Total sources of funds are projected to be $154.0 million (page 1, line 15), for an increase of $6.8 million or 4.6 percent as detailed below.

Passenger Fares (page 1, line 1), from both Motor Bus and ADA services, are projected at $17.9 million in FY2013, an increase of $0.5 million or 2.8 percent from the FY2012 revised budget.

- Motor Bus Fares are projected to increase by $0.5 million or 3.2 percent due to a 2 percent increase in ridership over the amount projected for FY2012.
- Redi-Wheels Fares are projected to decrease by $0.04 million, or 4.6 percent due to a 3.6 percent decrease in ridership under the amount estimated in the FY2012 budget.

Local/State/Federal (page 1, lines 2, 4, & 6) funds of $46.8 million are projected to decrease $0.03 million or 0.1 percent from the FY2012 revised budget.

Measure A (page 1, line 5) funds of $7.8 million reflects a projected decrease of $0.8 million or 9.1 percent due to the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) funds of $1.0 million for the San Mateo/Caltrain shuttles budgeted directly in the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) operating budget starting in FY2013, offset by an increase in Measure A funding of $0.1 million for Redi-Wheels and $0.1 million for Caltrain because of a 3.2 percent increase estimated for sales tax receipts.
Pass-through to Other Agencies (page 1, line 3) is $0.5 million, a projected increase of $0.2 million or 66 percent from the FY2012 revised budget, reflecting an increase in the amount of funds SamTrans passes through to other agencies that cannot claim the funds directly. The corresponding pass-through expenditure can be found under Uses of Funds (page 1, line 22), and the amount has been increased accordingly.

District Half-cent Sales Tax (page 1, line 9) receipts is $65.0 million, a projected increase of $2.0 million or 3.2 percent from the FY2012 revised budget, based on current sales tax receipts.

Investment Interest (page 1, line 10) of $1.2 million reflects a projected increase of $0.8 million or 183 percent from the FY2012 revised budget of $0.4 million. The increase is primarily due to refinancing of the revenue bond debt. Previously, the interest was used to cover debt service (page 1, line 34) and now can be used to cover operations.

Other Interest, Rent & Other Income (page 1, line 11) of $6.0 million reflects a projected increase of $0.1 million or 0.9 percent compared to the FY2012 revised budget.

Other Sources (page 1, line 12) of $8.8 million, an increase of $4.1 million or 86 percent over FY2012 revised budget. The increase is the result of an increase of $4.7 million in Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) repayment of the right of way offset by a decrease in the fund swap over the FY2012 amount of $0.6 million. The $8.8 million in one-time sources include $6.7 million in VTA re-payment of the right of way, and $2.1 million of fund swap of capital for operating funds.

Uses of Funds

Operating Costs (page 1, line 24) of $131.7 million are projected to increase by $2.7 million or 2.1 percent from the FY2012 revised budget of $129.0 million. The increase is mostly due to an increase in the SamTrans contribution to Caltrain.

Sales Tax Allocation - Capital Programs (page 1, line 28) is projected to be $8.35 million, a projected increase of $1.5 million or 21.3 percent compared to the FY2012 revised budget.

Motor Bus Highlights

Total Motor Bus Expense (page 1, line 18) of $99.7 million, reflects a projected decrease of $0.3 million or 0.3 percent over the FY2012 revised budget of $100.0 million. Critical Motor Bus elements include:

- **Wages and Benefits** (page 3, line 1) are projected to decrease $2.8 million or 5.2 percent, due mainly to a reduction in SamTrans’s share of managing agency overhead costs ($1.8 million) and a reduction in fringe benefit costs ($0.5 million).

- **Technical Services** (page 3, line 7) costs are projected to increase $0.7 million or 15.7 percent due primarily to software maintenance and license costs and contracted increase for transit police service.

- **Other Services** (page 3, line 8) costs are projected to increase $0.8 million or 160.4 percent due to estimated costs of $0.5 million for Wipro break/fix support for the PeopleSoft system during the design and build phases of the Business Optimization Program and $0.3 million for the contracted services funding needs for planning grants and for triennial market research.

- **Fuel and Lubricants** (page 3, line 11) costs are projected to increase $0.7 million primarily due to increasing the estimated cost per gallon of diesel fuel and gasoline from $3.00 per gallon to $3.25 per gallon.
Telecommunications (page 3, line 19) costs are projected to increase $0.1 million for Wipro hosting costs for the PeopleSoft system communication line.

Insurance Costs (page 3, line 21) are projected to increase $0.2 million due to anticipated increases in insurance premiums.

Fixed-route Accessibility (page 3, line 24) costs are projected to increase $0.3 million to reflect the actual time maintenance employees work on fixed-route accessibility equipment.

Contracted Bus Service (page 3, line 34) costs are projected to decrease $0.3 million or 2.0 percent, due primarily to lower contract costs resulting from a projected decrease in the Vehicle Revenue Mile rate.

Paratransit Highlights
The FY2013 budget (page 1, line 19) of $14.4 million represents a projected increase of $0.4 million or 2.7 percent over the FY2012 revised budget mainly due to contract rate increases for Paratransit services.

Caltrain Service
In FY2013, the proposed SamTrans member agency share for Caltrain Service (page 1, line 20), is $14.0 million, an increase of $3.4 million or 31.8 percent over the FY2012 revised budget. The increase is due to an increase of $0.1 million in funding from the TA, $4.7 million for the repayment of the right of way from the VTA offset by a decrease in the swap of capital for operating funds of $0.6 million and use of sales tax of $0.8 million. For FY2013, the SamTrans contribution to the JPB is comprised of $5.2 million provided by the TA, $6.7 million reimbursement from the VTA for SamTrans’ purchase of the Caltrain right of way, and $2.1 million for the swap of capital for operating funds.

Other Multimodal Programs
In FY2013, support costs for various shuttle programs (Dumbarton Express and SamTrans Shuttles) and the multimodal maintenance facility are projected to be $3 million (page 1, line 21), a decrease of $1 million or 24 percent from the FY2012 revised budget, primarily due to the Caltrain shuttles being funded directly by the TA starting in FY2013 offset by an increase of $0.4 million in the employer share for SamTrans shuttle service as a result of increased costs for the program.

Land Transfer Interest Expense
The FY2013 budget includes $0.1 million (page 1, line 23) a decrease of 4.9 percent in interest expense from the FY2012 revised budget. This is mainly due to a decrease in the interest rate projected in FY2013. The expense represents an interest payment to the TA on a promissory note for four acres of property acquired from the TA which is located in San Carlos along the Caltrain right of way.
BACKGROUND
The SamTrans preliminary FY2013 budget is consistent with the SamTrans Strategic Plan. The proposed budget lays out expenses consistent with the strategic plan vision and goals related to SamTrans’ six focus areas: Financial Integrity, Multimodal Services, Transportation and Land Use, Customers, Business Practices, and Employees. The proposed budget provides for the continuation of safe, reliable and high-quality services to SamTrans customers, while promoting employee excellence in a very challenging economic environment.

Prepared by:  Ladi Bhuller, Manager, Budgets  650-508-7755
             Chris Petak, Senior Budget Analyst  650-508-7754
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### FY2013 PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET

#### SOURCES OF FUNDS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2011 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY2012 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY2012 REVISED</th>
<th>FY2013 PROPOSED</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E = D-C</td>
<td>F = E/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17,373,064</td>
<td>17,443,300</td>
<td>17,443,300</td>
<td>17,932,800</td>
<td>489,500</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29,825,940</td>
<td>33,000,814</td>
<td>35,665,456</td>
<td>35,492,900</td>
<td>(172,556)</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,123,376</td>
<td>281,790</td>
<td>281,790</td>
<td>467,959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,801,782</td>
<td>10,202,857</td>
<td>10,614,136</td>
<td>10,724,845</td>
<td>110,349</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,743,213</td>
<td>6,461,335</td>
<td>8,581,335</td>
<td>7,800,000</td>
<td>(781,335)</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,743,213</td>
<td>6,461,335</td>
<td>8,581,335</td>
<td>7,800,000</td>
<td>(781,335)</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB434 Funds</strong></td>
<td>536,000</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>528,000</td>
<td>554,400</td>
<td>26,400</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Operating Revenues</strong></td>
<td>65,403,375</td>
<td>69,925,096</td>
<td>73,114,017</td>
<td>72,972,544</td>
<td>(141,473)</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Revenue Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>63,513,748</td>
<td>61,500,000</td>
<td>63,000,000</td>
<td>65,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>561,491</td>
<td>299,360</td>
<td>439,888</td>
<td>1,243,920</td>
<td>804,032</td>
<td>182.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5,598,588</td>
<td>5,972,275</td>
<td>5,971,355</td>
<td>6,023,708</td>
<td>52,353</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5,700,000</td>
<td>4,733,000</td>
<td>8,800,000</td>
<td>4,067,000</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Other Revenues</strong></td>
<td>69,673,827</td>
<td>73,471,635</td>
<td>74,144,243</td>
<td>81,067,628</td>
<td>6,923,385</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sources of Funds</strong></td>
<td>135,077,202</td>
<td>143,396,731</td>
<td>147,258,260</td>
<td>154,040,172</td>
<td>6,781,912</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### USES OF FUNDS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUAL B</td>
<td>ADOPTED C</td>
<td>REVISED D</td>
<td>PROPOSED E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motor Bus</strong></td>
<td>92,310,649</td>
<td>99,414,897</td>
<td>100,034,745</td>
<td>99,756,659</td>
<td>(278,086)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.D.A. Programs</strong></td>
<td>12,677,004</td>
<td>14,069,346</td>
<td>14,069,346</td>
<td>14,446,712</td>
<td>377,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>10,620,000</td>
<td>10,620,000</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>3,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4,528,529</td>
<td>3,967,226</td>
<td>3,967,226</td>
<td>3,015,460</td>
<td>(951,766)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,123,376</td>
<td>281,790</td>
<td>281,790</td>
<td>467,959</td>
<td>186,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Transfer Interest Expense</strong></td>
<td>81,248</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>66,570</td>
<td>(3,430)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Uses of Funds</strong></td>
<td>125,428,680</td>
<td>128,423,259</td>
<td>129,043,107</td>
<td>131,753,360</td>
<td>2,710,253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL OPERATING SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)**: 9,648,522

**SURPLUS/(DEFICIT)**: 8,691,391

**DEBT SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUAL B</td>
<td>ADOPTED C</td>
<td>REVISED D</td>
<td>PROPOSED E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt Service</strong></td>
<td>24,451,963</td>
<td>24,477,279</td>
<td>24,477,279</td>
<td>24,453,463</td>
<td>(23,816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Agent Fees</strong></td>
<td>22,180</td>
<td>25,080</td>
<td>29,600</td>
<td>29,600</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Uses of Funds</strong></td>
<td>24,474,143</td>
<td>24,502,359</td>
<td>24,506,879</td>
<td>24,483,063</td>
<td>(23,816)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USE OF RESERVES FOR DEBT SERVICE**: (21,344,545)

**TOTAL USES OF RESERVES**: (12,653,154)
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### FY2013 PROPOSED OPERATING BUDGET

### OPERATING REVENUES - MOTOR BUS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY2011 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY2012 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY2012 REVISED</th>
<th>FY2013 PROPOSED</th>
<th>FY13 PROPOSED Compared to FY12 REVISED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MOTOR BUS FARES</strong></td>
<td>16,615,996</td>
<td>16,609,000</td>
<td>16,609,000</td>
<td>17,137,000</td>
<td>528,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL (TDA) TRANSIT FUND:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operating Assistance</td>
<td>23,503,880</td>
<td>26,648,636</td>
<td>30,569,366</td>
<td>29,121,548</td>
<td>(1,447,818) -4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA Base</td>
<td>4,473,896</td>
<td>4,444,973</td>
<td>2,982,624</td>
<td>4,415,758</td>
<td>1,433,134 48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL OPERATING GRANTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operating Assistance</td>
<td>5,978,948</td>
<td>8,813,584</td>
<td>9,224,863</td>
<td>9,725,142</td>
<td>500,279 5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1/2 CENT SALES TAX:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operating Assistance</td>
<td>37,132,610</td>
<td>39,193,611</td>
<td>37,024,115</td>
<td>34,662,819</td>
<td>(2,361,296) -6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVESTMENT INTEREST INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Interest Income</td>
<td>141,846</td>
<td>163,570</td>
<td>84,174</td>
<td>966,720</td>
<td>882,546 1048.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER REVENUE SOURCES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight Deposit Interest Income</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>(300) -45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>1,042,073</td>
<td>1,064,230</td>
<td>1,064,230</td>
<td>1,052,760</td>
<td>(11,470) -1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Income</td>
<td>1,082,189</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>665,000</td>
<td>(235,000) -26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>1,273,162</td>
<td>915,794</td>
<td>915,794</td>
<td>1,015,488</td>
<td>99,694 10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OTHER REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>3,399,057</td>
<td>2,881,604</td>
<td>2,880,684</td>
<td>2,733,608</td>
<td>(147,076) -5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MOTOR BUS</strong></td>
<td>92,310,155</td>
<td>99,414,897</td>
<td>100,034,745</td>
<td>99,756,659</td>
<td>(278,086) -0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMERICAN DISABILITIES ACT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares-Redi Wheels</td>
<td>757,068</td>
<td>834,300</td>
<td>834,300</td>
<td>795,800</td>
<td>(38,500) -4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TDA 4.5 Redi Wheels</td>
<td>1,237,046</td>
<td>1,402,560</td>
<td>1,608,821</td>
<td>1,463,713</td>
<td>(145,108) -9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local STA-Paratransit</td>
<td>611,118</td>
<td>504,645</td>
<td>504,645</td>
<td>491,881</td>
<td>(12,764) -2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>1,712,997</td>
<td>1,389,273</td>
<td>1,389,273</td>
<td>999,343</td>
<td>(389,930) -28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Paratransit District</td>
<td>4,285,785</td>
<td>4,786,142</td>
<td>4,359,957</td>
<td>4,955,865</td>
<td>595,908 13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Paratransit Suppl. Coastside</td>
<td>1,112,705</td>
<td>1,156,636</td>
<td>1,156,636</td>
<td>1,362,910</td>
<td>206,274 17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income-Paratransit Fund</td>
<td>419,645</td>
<td>135,790</td>
<td>355,714</td>
<td>277,200</td>
<td>(78,514) -22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>2,540,640</td>
<td>2,460,000</td>
<td>2,460,000</td>
<td>2,600,000</td>
<td>140,000 5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure M Paratransit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>100,000 7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ADA PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>12,677,004</td>
<td>14,069,346</td>
<td>14,069,346</td>
<td>14,446,712</td>
<td>377,366 2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTI-MODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Caltrain</td>
<td>9,626,595</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>847,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(847,000) -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources - Caltrain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,700,000</td>
<td>4,733,000</td>
<td>8,800,000</td>
<td>4,067,000 85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from TA for Caltrain</td>
<td>5,081,280</td>
<td>4,920,000</td>
<td>5,040,000</td>
<td>5,200,000</td>
<td>160,000 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA Funded SM/Caltrain Shuttles</td>
<td>1,121,294</td>
<td>1,081,335</td>
<td>1,081,335</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,081,335) -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Share SM/Caltrain Shuttles</td>
<td>436,380</td>
<td>311,271</td>
<td>311,271</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(311,271) -100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB434 Funds - SamTrans Shuttle</td>
<td>536,000</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>528,000</td>
<td>554,400</td>
<td>26,400 5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer SamTrans Shuttle Funds</td>
<td>1,763,151</td>
<td>1,379,400</td>
<td>1,379,400</td>
<td>1,790,100</td>
<td>410,700 29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - SamTrans Shuttle Program</td>
<td>307,995</td>
<td>341,990</td>
<td>348,990</td>
<td>334,040</td>
<td>(14,950) -4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>109,838</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 #DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Gen. Operating Asst.</td>
<td>253,872</td>
<td>318,230</td>
<td>318,230</td>
<td>336,920</td>
<td>18,690 5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MULTI-MODAL</strong></td>
<td>19,236,405</td>
<td>14,587,226</td>
<td>14,587,226</td>
<td>17,015,460</td>
<td>2,428,234 16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>124,223,563</td>
<td>128,071,469</td>
<td>128,691,317</td>
<td>131,218,831</td>
<td>2,527,514 2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The values and calculations have been rounded for simplicity and clarity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services:</th>
<th>FY2011 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY2012 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY2012 REVISED</th>
<th>FY2013 PROPOSED</th>
<th>Increase (Decrease)</th>
<th>FY13 PROPOSED COMPARSED TO FY12 REVISED</th>
<th>BUDGET PERCENT CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT OPERATED BUSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Benefits</td>
<td>50,869,759</td>
<td>53,344,734</td>
<td>53,344,734</td>
<td>50,554,664</td>
<td>(2,790,070)</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>49,891</td>
<td>53,100</td>
<td>53,100</td>
<td>52,900</td>
<td>(200)</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>786,912</td>
<td>785,250</td>
<td>785,250</td>
<td>791,128</td>
<td>5,878</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Maintenance</td>
<td>1,279,164</td>
<td>1,278,500</td>
<td>1,278,500</td>
<td>1,258,500</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>2,702,795</td>
<td>4,299,827</td>
<td>4,709,254</td>
<td>4,777,013</td>
<td>67,759</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>4,080,818</td>
<td>4,008,902</td>
<td>4,173,902</td>
<td>4,829,402</td>
<td>655,500</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>312,565</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>1,277,066</td>
<td>786,566</td>
<td>160.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials &amp; Supply:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel and Lubricants</td>
<td>4,408,209</td>
<td>5,636,357</td>
<td>5,636,357</td>
<td>6,281,433</td>
<td>645,076</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Parts and Materials</td>
<td>1,451,095</td>
<td>1,765,700</td>
<td>1,765,700</td>
<td>1,758,740</td>
<td>(6,960)</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform and Drivers Expense</td>
<td>304,733</td>
<td>391,130</td>
<td>391,130</td>
<td>400,970</td>
<td>9,840</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetables and Tickets</td>
<td>183,196</td>
<td>153,100</td>
<td>153,100</td>
<td>171,800</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies/Printing</td>
<td>283,831</td>
<td>334,874</td>
<td>334,874</td>
<td>342,137</td>
<td>7,263</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Materials and Supply</td>
<td>123,961</td>
<td>166,250</td>
<td>166,250</td>
<td>156,500</td>
<td>(9,750)</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>334,420</td>
<td>480,500</td>
<td>480,500</td>
<td>580,500</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Utilities</td>
<td>934,819</td>
<td>981,600</td>
<td>981,600</td>
<td>981,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>2,491,900</td>
<td>2,493,500</td>
<td>2,493,500</td>
<td>2,647,000</td>
<td>153,500</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers' Compensation</td>
<td>3,186,093</td>
<td>3,183,888</td>
<td>3,183,888</td>
<td>3,197,060</td>
<td>13,172</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes and License Fees</td>
<td>459,880</td>
<td>496,300</td>
<td>496,300</td>
<td>549,267</td>
<td>52,966</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Route Accessibility</td>
<td>1,063,922</td>
<td>659,919</td>
<td>659,919</td>
<td>994,064</td>
<td>334,145</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases and Rentals</td>
<td>103,858</td>
<td>116,229</td>
<td>116,229</td>
<td>119,800</td>
<td>3,571</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prmtnl and Legal Advertising</td>
<td>135,234</td>
<td>230,700</td>
<td>230,700</td>
<td>238,500</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Business Travel</td>
<td>113,030</td>
<td>181,085</td>
<td>181,085</td>
<td>171,800</td>
<td>(9,285)</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues and Membership</td>
<td>79,167</td>
<td>83,785</td>
<td>83,785</td>
<td>87,200</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and other</td>
<td>101,395</td>
<td>346,646</td>
<td>392,067</td>
<td>349,003</td>
<td>(43,064)</td>
<td>-11.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total District Operated Buses</strong></td>
<td>75,840,646</td>
<td>81,962,376</td>
<td>82,582,224</td>
<td>82,560,299</td>
<td>(21,925)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTRACTED BUS SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Urban Bus Service</td>
<td>14,419,061</td>
<td>15,360,895</td>
<td>15,360,895</td>
<td>15,059,320</td>
<td>(301,575)</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>358,963</td>
<td>339,820</td>
<td>339,820</td>
<td>361,600</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>653,953</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coasitde Services</td>
<td>606,583</td>
<td>630,630</td>
<td>630,630</td>
<td>647,020</td>
<td>16,390</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redi Coast Non-ADA</td>
<td>221,579</td>
<td>238,216</td>
<td>238,216</td>
<td>219,700</td>
<td>(18,516)</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>10,540</td>
<td>41,520</td>
<td>41,520</td>
<td>47,040</td>
<td>5,520</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la Honda Pescadero</td>
<td>50,138</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcoast - Pescadero</td>
<td>140,116</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs-SamCoast</td>
<td>9,070</td>
<td>13,940</td>
<td>13,940</td>
<td>14,180</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Contracted Bus Services</strong></td>
<td>16,470,003</td>
<td>17,452,521</td>
<td>17,452,521</td>
<td>17,196,360</td>
<td>(256,161)</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MOTOR BUS</strong></td>
<td>92,310,649</td>
<td>99,414,897</td>
<td>100,034,745</td>
<td>99,756,659</td>
<td>(278,086)</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY2011 ACTUAL</td>
<td>FY2012 ADOPTED</td>
<td>FY2012 REVISED</td>
<td>FY2013 PROPOSED</td>
<td>Increase (Decrease)</td>
<td>FY13 PROPOSED BUDGET PERCENT CHANGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled/Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>5,491,285</td>
<td>6,916,605</td>
<td>6,916,605</td>
<td>6,964,200</td>
<td>47,595</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>2,106,981</td>
<td>2,721,005</td>
<td>2,721,005</td>
<td>2,795,887</td>
<td>74,882</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Sedan Service</td>
<td>2,646,251</td>
<td>1,744,010</td>
<td>1,744,010</td>
<td>1,779,190</td>
<td>35,180</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Accessibility Support</td>
<td>752,061</td>
<td>1,016,090</td>
<td>1,016,090</td>
<td>1,029,525</td>
<td>13,435</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastside Support</td>
<td>1,112,705</td>
<td>1,156,636</td>
<td>1,156,636</td>
<td>1,362,910</td>
<td>206,274</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>567,723</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ADA PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>12,677,004</td>
<td>14,069,346</td>
<td>14,069,346</td>
<td>14,446,712</td>
<td>377,366</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTI-MODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALTRAIN SERVICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Rail Service</td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>10,620,000</td>
<td>10,620,000</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>3,380,000</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Caltrain Service</strong></td>
<td>14,707,875</td>
<td>10,620,000</td>
<td>10,620,000</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>3,380,000</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Express Service</td>
<td>120,381</td>
<td>126,130</td>
<td>126,130</td>
<td>157,820</td>
<td>31,690</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SamTrans Shuttle</td>
<td>2,607,146</td>
<td>2,256,390</td>
<td>2,256,390</td>
<td>2,678,540</td>
<td>422,150</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM/Caltrain Shuttle</td>
<td>1,667,511</td>
<td>1,392,606</td>
<td>1,392,606</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,392,606)</td>
<td>-100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Multimodal Fac</td>
<td>133,490</td>
<td>192,100</td>
<td>192,100</td>
<td>179,100</td>
<td>(13,000)</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Support</strong></td>
<td>4,528,529</td>
<td>3,967,226</td>
<td>3,967,226</td>
<td>3,015,460</td>
<td>(951,766)</td>
<td>-24.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTI-MODAL PROGRAMS</strong></td>
<td>19,236,404</td>
<td>14,587,226</td>
<td>14,587,226</td>
<td>17,015,460</td>
<td>2,428,234</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>124,224,057</td>
<td>128,071,469</td>
<td>128,691,317</td>
<td>131,218,831</td>
<td>2,527,514</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINANCE ITEM # 12
MAY 9, 2012

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
         General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
       Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: PRELIMINARY FISCAL YEAR 2013 CAPITAL BUDGET

ACTION
This report is submitted for informational purposes only. Staff will bring this item back to the Board at its June 13, 2012 meeting with a request that the Committee recommend Board adoption of the Fiscal Year 2013 Capital Budget at that time.

SIGNIFICANCE
In light of the current fiscal climate, the FY2013 Capital Budget contains only those projects necessary and essential to sustain the San Mateo County Transit District’s (District) existing service and infrastructure network, without compromising the District’s plan for visions set forth in the District’s adopted Strategic Plan. The FY2013 Capital Budget contains the following major elements:

- **Revenue Vehicles and Support Equipment Replacement** – Includes the replacement of 62 1998 – Gillig Phantom buses and 14 2009 – El Dorado Amerivans as these vehicles have reached the end of their useful lives. This category also includes the annual procurement of bus parts, engines and transmissions, replacement of maintenance support equipment and the replacement of service support vehicles. The amount budgeted for this category totals $32,312,735.

- **Information Technology (IT) Software and Hardware Upgrade & Replacement** – Includes replacement and upgrade of Informational Technology equipment, networks, and software applications necessary to maintain the connectivity of various departments and external communications. Also included are funds to fully fund the PeopleSoft System Integration Project/Business Optimization Program and funding to support the customization of PeopleSoft software to continue interface with Spear and Hastus. The total amount budgeted for this category totals $5,010,112.

- **Planning / Development** – Includes funding for the continuation of the SamTrans Service Plan, as well as funding to develop the Colma Park and Ride Lot in Daly City into a transit-oriented development project and District Transit Oriented Development Policy to guide the District’s activities related to transit-oriented development and joint developments. This category also includes program planning and management. The amount budgeted for these projects totals $1,165,000.
• **Facilities** – Includes rehabilitation and improvement projects to ensure that maintenance and administrative facilities are adequately maintained to support the District’s revenue service operations. Projects in this category include pavement rehabilitation at North Base and South Base and maintenance of existing heating, ventilation and air conditioning system at Central. The amount budgeted for these projects totals $445,000.

• **Safety and Security** – Includes security improvement projects to continue the SamTrans safety and security program. Projects in this category include safety improvements to the receptionist area, Sequoia Station underground garage and the security office. The amount budgeted for these projects totals $1,990,000.

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

**BUDGET IMPACT**

Of the $41,172,847 recommended for the FY2013 Capital Budget, the total amount of sales tax required is $8,875,780, which includes $500,000 of prior year savings. Federal, State and other fund sources make up the remaining amount of $32,297,067 to fully fund the FY2013 Capital Budget.

**BACKGROUND**

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

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

Prepared by: Leslie Fong, Senior Budgets Analyst 650-508-6332  
Éva Goode, Manager, Budgets 650-508-7914
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost in FY12</th>
<th>FY2013 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>REVENUE VEHICLES REPLACEMENT</td>
<td>Replace 62 1998 Gillig Phantom buses at the end of their useful lives.</td>
<td>$ 30,569,993</td>
<td>$ 22,769,993</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Replacement Buses</td>
<td>Replace 14 2009 El Dorado Amerivans at the end of their useful lives.</td>
<td>$ 793,300</td>
<td>$ 634,640</td>
<td>$ 79,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 31,363,293</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,079,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>REVENUE VEHICLE SUPPORT</td>
<td>Annual funding for procurement of bus parts.</td>
<td>$ 696,442</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Major Bus Components</td>
<td>Replacement of maintenance support equipment at the end of their useful lives.</td>
<td>$ 181,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Maintenance Equipment</td>
<td>Replace 2 non-revenue service support vehicles that have reached the end of their useful lives.</td>
<td>$ 72,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 949,442</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>Replace and upgrade Dell servers and out of warranty printers, copiers, fax machines and scanners. Warranty is expiring in FY2013.</td>
<td>$ 723,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Technology Refresh Project</td>
<td>Redesign and upgrade of PeopleSoft to better match the application to the business needs of the District.</td>
<td>$ 4,137,112</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>PeopleSoft Project Upgrade</td>
<td>PeopleSoft Interface for Spear and Hastus</td>
<td>$ 5,010,112</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>Evaluate and restructure SamTrans services and operations to more efficiently and effectively serve the county’s transit needs and meet regional transportation goals, within the constraints of the current financial and operating environment.</td>
<td>$ 2,359,039</td>
<td>$ 1,894,039</td>
<td>$ 465,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>SamTrans Service Plan</td>
<td>Project will develop the Daly City Park and Ride Lot into a transit oriented development project.</td>
<td>$ 71,000</td>
<td>$ 61,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Daly City TOD</td>
<td>Project will provide the agency with a set of policies to guide its activities related to transit oriented development and joint development.</td>
<td>$ 139,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>District TOD Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### San Mateo County Transit District

**Proposed Fiscal Year 2013 Capital Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost in FY12</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2013 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Capital Program and Project Development</td>
<td>Capitalized funds for annual program development including but not limited to plans, budgets, programs, funding strategies, and preliminary engineering.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Capital Program Management</td>
<td>Capitalized funds for program and project controls support, including monitoring project performance and delivery.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIS. SALES TAX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,165,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Facilities Smaller Projects</td>
<td>Facility maintenance/Improvement Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Operating Facility Pavement Rehab: NB &amp; SB Concrete Rehab</td>
<td>Rehab pavement at North and South Bases to bring the pavement to a state of good repair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 170,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 445,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 445,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Sequoia Station Underground Garage Security Improvements</td>
<td>Project will put in cameras, alarms and communication systems to help reduce vandalism and crime at the Sequoia Station underground parking garage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Receptionist Area Security Improvement</td>
<td>Project will provide improved security for the receptionist on the 2nd floor of Central who is involved in numerous interactions with the public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Central Office Access Control Improvements</td>
<td>Project will improve the security at Central, North Base and South Base with significant upgrades to the card controlled door systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Central Security Office Upgrade</td>
<td>Project provides for technological integration and updates, room reconfiguration and upgrades for effective safety and security monitoring and response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIS. SALES TAX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,990,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,990,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>Annual set-aside for unforeseen and emergency capital expenditures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 41,172,847</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 41,172,847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

- All funding will come from PCJPB and SMCTA for their share of the project.
AGENDA
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 2012 – 2:40 p.m.
or immediately following previous Committee meeting

ACTION
1. Approval of Minutes of Legislative Committee Meeting of April 11, 2012

INFORMATIONAL
2. State and Federal Legislative Update

Committee Members: Shirley Harris, Karyl Matsumoto, 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), K. Matsumoto

Committee Members Absent: A. Tissier

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

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

Committee Chair Shirley Harris called the meeting to order at 3:17 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Legislative Committee Meeting of March 14, 2012
The committee approved the minutes (Lloyd/Gee).

Update on the State Legislative Program
Government Affairs Officer Jayme Ackemann reported:
- The State Legislature is back from recess and starting to move some bills through committee.
- Senate Bill 1339 creates a commute benefits ordinance and requires employers with 50 or more employees to provide a transit benefit. Staff is waiting to see how the bill develops before taking a position.
- Staff is following the cap and trade discussion very closely as to how the revenues that will be collected are going to be allocated. Staff is working with the California Transit Association to ensure our voices are heard.

Ms. Ackemann said at the Federal level a 90-day extension of the transportation funding extension was passed. Staff continues to follow the development of the House bill, which looks worse and worse. They are talking about potentially a five-year bill and up to 30-35 percent reduction in spending on projects. Staff doesn’t expect to see a bill move forward before the November elections.

Adjourned: 3:19 p.m.
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

High Speed Rail
On April 12, the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) approved its Business Plan (Plan) that calls for early investment in the electrification and modernization of the Caltrain corridor and eventual improvements that support blended Caltrain and high-speed rail operations on the Peninsula. The plan reflects the recent Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) being considered by several Bay Area public agencies including the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and San Mateo County Transportation Authority.

The Plan also allows the Legislature to move forward with the consideration of the Governor’s budget request for a $5.9 billion appropriation to start construction of the project in the Central Valley. It is unclear whether funds would also be appropriated in Fiscal Year 2013 to start work on the Caltrain corridor, but the Governor is recommending full appropriation of the remaining funds in the $950 million Proposition 1A connectivity pot. The Bay Area MOU identifies $106 million from the connectivity pot for Caltrain electrification and modernization.

On April 18, the Assembly and Senate transportation budget sub-committees met to review the Plan and discuss the Governor’s budget request, but did not take action on any of the recommended appropriations.
FEDERAL ISSUES

Authorization
Following approval of a 90-day extension of current surface transportation funding levels, Congress continues to work toward a longer-term reauthorization compromise. The Senate-approved two-year proposal (S. 1813) will be considered in conference committee along with H.R. 4348, which extends the program by another 90 days and also includes the approval of the Keystone XL oil pipeline. The approval of the pipeline will likely be a primary topic of debate during conference and the White House has stated that it will veto a bill that includes the pipeline.

Senate conferees include Sens. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) Max Baucus (D-Mont.), Dick Durbin (D-Ill.), Tim Johnson (D-S.D.), Bill Nelson (D-Fla.), Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.), Robert Menendez (D-N.J.), James Inhofe (R-Okla.), David Vitter (R-La.), Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), Richard Shelby (R-Ala.), Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-Texas), Jay Rockefeller (D-W.Va.) and John Hoeven (R-N.D.). House conferees have not been named.

Appropriations
The Senate appropriations subcommittee passed the FY 2013 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill, which maintains highway and transit program funding levels. The bill also provides funding for discretionary programs including:

- $500 million (equal to the FY 2012 funding level) for Significant Transportation Projects (the “TIGER” program) to support projects in a wide variety of modes, including highways and bridges, public transportation, passenger and freight railroads, and port infrastructure;

- $39.1 billion (equal to the FY 2012 funding level) for the annual Federal-aid Highway program to support essential investments in roads and bridges in every State across the country.

- $1.75 billion for rail infrastructure, including $100 million for the High Performance Intercity Passenger Rail grant program to assist states with the improvement of existing intercity services, congestion mitigation and multi-state planning initiatives and $1.45 billion for Amtrak;

- $50 million within HUD’s Community Development Fund for the Sustainable Communities Initiative to promote integrated housing and transportation planning.

House appropriators are working on a bill that will provide lower discretionary spending levels consistent with the House-passed 2013 budget resolution.

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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 41</td>
<td>SENATE THIRD READING 4/9/2012 - Read second time. Ordered to third reading.</td>
<td>Existing provisions of the Political Reform Act of 1974 prohibit a public official at any level of state or local government from making, participating in making, or attempting to use his or her official position to influence a governmental decision in which he or she knows or has reason to know that he or she has a financial interest, as defined. Existing law also requires specified elected and appointed officers at the state and local levels 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 officers 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 3/29/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 57</td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 3/5/2012</td>
<td>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 one member appointed by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, 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 prohibit more than 3 members of the commission from being residents of the same county, as specified. The bill would require the member from the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission to be a member of that commission, a resident of San Francisco, and to be approved by the Mayor of San Francisco. By imposing new requirements on a local agency, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. Last amended on 3/5/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 441</td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 2/16/2012 - Referred to Com. on T. &amp; H.</td>
<td>Existing law requires certain transportation planning activities by the Department of Transportation and by designated regional transportation planning agencies, including development of a regional transportation plan. Existing law authorizes the California Transportation Commission, in cooperation with regional agencies, to prescribe study areas for analysis and evaluation and guidelines for the preparation of a regional transportation plan. This bill would require that the commission, by no later than 2014, include voluntary health and health equity factors, strategies, goals, and objectives in the guidelines promulgated by the commission for the preparation of regional transportation plans. Last amended on 1/23/2012</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 492</strong></td>
<td>SENATE RLS. 6/27/2011 -</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 819</strong></td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 2/16/2012 - Referred to Com. on T. &amp; H.</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. <strong>Last amended on 1/11/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 890</strong></td>
<td>SENATE E.Q. 2/16/2012 - Referred to Com. on E.Q.</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, until January 1, 2026, exempt a project or an activity to repair, maintain, or make minor alterations to an existing roadway if the project or activity is initiated by a city or county to improve public safety, does not cross a waterway, and involves negligible or no expansion of existing use. <strong>Last amended on 1/13/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1126 Calderon, Charles D</td>
<td>SENATE G. &amp; F. 2/2/2012 - Referred to Com. on GOV. &amp; F.</td>
<td>The Transaction and Use Tax Law authorizes a district to impose a transactions tax for the privilege of selling tangible personal property at retail upon every retailer in the district at a rate of 1/4 of 1%, or a multiple thereof, of the gross receipts of the retailer from the sale of all tangible personal property sold by that person at retail in the district. That law also requires that a use tax portion of a transaction and use tax ordinance be adopted to impose a complementary tax upon the storage, use, or other consumption in the district of tangible personal property purchased from any retailer for storage, use, or other consumption in the district at a rate of 1/4 of 1%, or a multiple thereof, of the sales price of the property whose storage, use, or other consumption is subject to the tax, as prescribed. This bill would decrease those rates to 1/8 of 1%. Last amended on 1/4/2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1191 Huber D</td>
<td>SENATE G. &amp; F. 2/16/2012 - Referred to Com. on GOV. &amp; F.</td>
<td>Existing law requires the county auditor, in each fiscal year, to allocate property tax revenue to local jurisdictions in accordance with specified formulas and procedures, and generally requires that each jurisdiction be allocated an amount equal to the total of the amount of revenue allocated to that jurisdiction in the prior fiscal year, subject to certain modifications, and that jurisdiction's portion of the annual tax increment, as defined. Existing property tax law also reduces the amounts of ad valorem property tax revenue that would otherwise be annually allocated to the county, cities, and special districts pursuant to these general allocation requirements by requiring, for purposes of determining property tax revenue allocations in each county for the 1992-93 and 1993-94 fiscal years, that the amounts of property tax revenue deemed allocated in the prior fiscal year to the county, cities, and special districts be reduced in accordance with certain formulas. Existing law requires that the revenues not allocated to the county, cities, and special districts as a result of these reductions be transferred to the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund in that county for allocation to school districts, community college districts, and the county office of education. This bill would, for the 2012-13 fiscal year and for each fiscal year thereafter, if there is not enough ad valorem property tax revenue that is otherwise required to be allocated to a county Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund for the county auditor to complete the decreases required during the fiscal adjustment period, require the county auditor to calculate an amount, as specified, and to submit a claim to the Controller for that amount. This bill would require the Controller, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to deposit the amount of the claim into the Sales and Use Tax Compensation Fund, and would require the county auditor to allocate that amount among the county and to each city in the county. Last amended 1/23/2012</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>AB 1444 Feuer D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/23/2012 - Do pass as amended and be re-referred to the Committee on Appropriations.</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. CEQA establishes a procedure for the preparation and certification of the record of proceedings upon the filing of an action or proceeding challenging a lead agency's action on the grounds of noncompliance with CEQA. This bill would require the lead agency, at the request of a project applicant and the agreement of the project applicant to bear the costs incurred by the lead agency, to, among other things, prepare a record of proceedings concurrently with the preparation, and adoption or certification, of an environmental document. Because the bill would require a lead agency to prepare the record of proceedings as provided, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. In an action or proceeding filed challenging the lead agency's action pursuant to CEQA, the bill would require the court to schedule a hearing within 30 days of the filing of the statement of issues regarding the record of proceedings. <strong>Last amended on 3/29/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1448 Furutani D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/19/2012 - From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR.</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, commencing with the 2012-13 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, prohibit the Legislature from reducing funding for home-to-school transportation below the amount established in the Budget Act of 2011. The bill would also express legislative findings and declarations relating to the provision of home-to-school transportation by school districts, and would express legislative intent to fund home-to-school transportation at the level approved in the Budget Act of 2011. <strong>Last amended on 3/19/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AB 1523
**Perea D**

**Career technical education:** transportation for the 21st century partnership academies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1523</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR.</td>
<td>Existing law provides for the establishment of partnership academies by participating school districts and establishes criteria qualifying pupils in grades 10, 11, and 12 for enrollment in the academies. Existing law establishes the parameters for the Superintendent of Public Instruction to issue grants to school districts maintaining high schools that meet the partnership academy eligibility requirements. This bill would establish one new category of partnership academies, the transportation for the 21st century partnership academy. Commencing with the 2012-13 school year, when funds become available for additional partnership academies, as specified, the Superintendent would be required to issue grants for the establishment of partnership academies in each geographical area of the California High-Speed Rail Project's planned 10 project sections, and would be required to give priority to partnership academies dedicated to educating pupils in transportation in partnership academy eligibility requirements. The selection of school districts to establish the new partnership academies and the planning and development of the new partnership academies would be required to be conducted pursuant to the procedures and requirements established for all partnership academies under existing law. The bill would provide that the funding priorities it creates may be satisfied when the specified number of transportation for the 21st century partnership academies are funded, as specified. <strong>Last amended on 4/17/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1535</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. SUSPENSE FILE 4/25/2012 - In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.</td>
<td>Existing law directs the Department of Transportation and certain local authorities to erect and maintain signage along state and county highways that designate certain traffic lanes as high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and specify conditions for their use. This bill would require the department or a local authority, when replacing signs designating HOV lane use in an area that permits motorcycles to use those lanes, to include language on the new sign stating that motorcycles are permitted in the HOV lanes. <strong>Last amended on 3/14/2012</strong></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1549</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. SUSPENSE FILE 4/25/2012 - In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file.</td>
<td>The Permit Streamlining Act requires each state agency and local agency to compile one or more lists that specify in detail the information that will be required from any applicant for a development project, and requires a public agency that is the lead agency for a development project, or a public agency which is a responsible agency for a development project that has been approved by the lead agency, to approve or disapprove the project within applicable periods of time. The act also requires any state agency which is the lead agency for a development project to inform the applicant that the Office of Permit Assistance has been created to assist, and provide information to, developers relating to the permit approval process. This bill would require the office to provide information to developers explaining the permit approval process at the state and local levels, or assisting them in meeting statutory environmental quality requirements, as specified, and would prohibit the office or the state from incurring any liability as a result of the provision of this assistance. The bill would require the office to assist state and local agencies in streamlining the permit approval process, and an applicant in identifying any permit required by a state agency for the proposed project. The bill would authorize the office to call a conference of parties at the state level to resolve questions or mediate disputes arising from a permit application for a development project. The bill would require that the office be located exclusively in Sacramento, and to consist of no more than 4 personnel through 2013. <strong>Last amended on 3/26/2012</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AB 1570**
*Perea D*
Environmental quality: California Environmental Quality Act: record of proceedings. | ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/25/2012 - In committee: Hearing postponed by committee. (Refers to 4/25/2012 hearing) | The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA establishes a procedure for the preparation and certification of the record of proceedings upon the filing of an action or proceeding challenging a lead agency's action on the grounds of noncompliance with CEQA. This bill would require, until January 1, 2016, the lead agency, at the request of a project applicant, to, among other things, prepare a record of proceedings concurrently with the preparation of negative declarations, mitigated negative declarations, EIRs, or other environmental documents for specified projects. Because the bill would require a lead agency to prepare the record of proceedings as provided, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. [Last amended on 4/10/2012](#) |  |
| **AB 1572**
*Fletcher I*
Service authorities for freeway emergencies: San Diego County. | ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/24/2012 - Referred to Com. on APPR. | Existing law authorizes a service authority for freeway emergencies to be established in any county for the purpose of funding the installation of call boxes along freeways and expressways to enable motorists in need of aid to obtain assistance. Existing law provides that a service authority may impose an annual fee of $1 on vehicles registered in the county for this and other related purposes, which fee is collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). This bill, with respect to the service authority created in the County of San Diego, would provide for the authority to be dissolved and for the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) to become the successor authority and to assume the remaining responsibility for maintaining call boxes. The bill would limit the reserves that SANDAG, as the successor to the authority, may hold at the time this bill becomes operative to $4,000,000, and would require SANDAG to distribute, by January 1, 2013, any reserves in excess of that amount to cities in the County of San Diego, and to the county with respect to the unincorporated area of the county, in proportion to fees paid for purposes of the service authority in the 2010-11 fiscal year by residents of each city and the unincorporated area. The bill would require the recipient jurisdictions to use these revenues for the purposes for which the fees were collected. The bill would also require SANDAG to post its detailed budget relative to the revenues from the collection of the fee, and the expenditure of these funds, on its Internet Web site, as specified. [Last amended on 4/23/2012](#) |  |
| **AB 1606**
*Perea D*
Local public employee organizations: impasse procedures. | SENATE P.E. & R. 4/26/2012 - Referred to Com. on P.E. & R. | The Meyers-Milias-Brown Act contains various provisions that govern collective bargaining of local represented employees, and delegates, jurisdiction to the Public Employment Relations Board to resolve disputes and enforce the statutory duties and rights of local public agency employers and employees. The act requires the governing body of a public agency to meet and confer in good faith regarding wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment with representatives of recognized employee organizations. This bill would instead authorize the employee organization, if the parties are unable to effect settlement of the controversy within 30 days after the appointment of a mediator, or if the dispute was not submitted to mediation within 30 days after the date that either party provided the other with written notice of a declaration of impasse, to request that the parties' differences be submitted to a fact-finding panel. The bill would also specify that its provisions are intended to be technical and clarifying of existing law. This bill contains other existing laws. |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 1618</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/23/2012 - Do pass as amended and be re-referred to the Committee on Appropriations.</td>
<td>Existing law creates the High-Speed Rail Authority, with various powers and duties relative to the development and implementation of a high-speed rail system.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This bill would require the authority to consult with the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges to determine how the state can best meet the educational needs for the future high-speed rail operations and maintenance workforce, including, but not limited to, the use of extension programs, contract education, and new or revised academic programs. The bill would require the authority to seek federal funding in this regard and to report to the Legislature and the Governor by July 1, 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1665</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/24/2012 - From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR.</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.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This bill would exempt from CEQA the closure of a railroad grade crossing by order of the PUC under the above authority if the PUC finds the crossing to present a threat to public safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1671</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY CONSENT CALENDAR 4/26/2012 - Ordered to consent calendar.</td>
<td>Existing law prohibits the Department of Transportation, until January 1, 2014, from withholding retention proceeds when making progress payments for work performed by a contractor.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This bill would make these provisions operative until January 1, 2020. The bill would also make a statement of legislative findings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1702</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY PRINT 2/16/2012 - From printer. May be heard in committee March 17.</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 requires the State Air Resources Board to adopt regulations to require the reporting and verification of emissions of greenhouse gases and to monitor and enforce compliance with the reporting and verification program, and requires the state board to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020. The act requires the state board to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions and authorizes the state board to use market-based compliance mechanisms to achieve these ends.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This bill would make a technical, non-substantive change to these provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1706</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>Under existing law, the gross weight imposed upon the highway by the wheels on any one axle of a vehicle is prohibited from exceeding 18,000 pounds, except the gross weight on any one axle of a bus is prohibited from exceeding 20,500 pounds. A violation of these requirements is a crime. This bill would repeal that weight exception for buses on January 1, 2016. The bill would instead exempt a transit bus from the limits on the weight that may be imposed upon the highway by the wheel of any one axle, until January 1, 2016, and as of that date, the bill would repeal that exemption for transit buses and reinstate the existing prohibition of 20,500 pounds for any one axle of a bus. The bill would prohibit a publicly owned or operated transit system or an operator of a transit system under contract with a publicly owned or operated transit system from procuring a new transit bus whose gross weight exceeds the gross weight of the heaviest transit bus in the system's existing bus inventory, for that transit bus' fleet class as of December 31, 2012, except as specified. The bill would repeal this prohibition on January 1, 2016. The bill would impose a state-mandated local program by imposing new requirements upon buses that are not transit buses. <strong>Last amended on 4/17/2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>APPR.</strong> 4/30/2012 - Action From SECOND READING: Read second time and amended. Re-referred to APPR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1770</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>Existing law creates the California Transportation Financing Authority, with specified powers and duties relative to issuance of bonds to fund transportation projects to be backed, in whole or in part, by various revenue streams of transportation funds, and toll revenues under certain conditions, in order to increase the construction of new capacity or improvements for the state transportation system consistent with specified goals. Existing law defines &quot;project&quot; for these purposes to include, among other things, a rail project. This bill would provide that a rail project may consist of, or include, rolling stock. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td><strong>THIRD READING</strong> 4/19/2012 - Read second time. Ordered to third reading.</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 1778</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>Existing law requires that revenues from 1/4% of the local sales and use tax rate be transferred to the local transportation fund of each county for allocation, as directed by the transportation planning agency, to various transportation purposes, under what is commonly known as the Transportation Development Act. Existing law specifies the allowable uses for local transportation funds, and generally requires, after certain deductions, that the funds attributed to the area of apportionment of each transit operator be used solely for transit purposes in counties with a population of 500,000 or more as of the 1970 census. However, in counties with a population under 500,000 as of the 1970 census and in certain other counties, these funds may also be used for local streets and roads, if the transportation planning agency finds that there are no unmet transit needs or no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, and for other specified purposes. Existing law, effective July 1, 2014, generally requires a county with a population under 500,000 as of the 1970 census that has a population of 500,000 or more as of the 2000 census or a future census to use funds attributable to the urbanized area of the county solely for transit purposes, except that a city with a population of 100,000 or fewer in an urbanized area in that county would not be so restricted. Existing law provides that the July 1, 2014, requirements and exemptions do not apply to Ventura County, and instead generally requires all local transportation funds in that county to be used for transit purposes as of that date unless a specified report is submitted by the Ventura County Transportation Commission to the transportation committees of the Legislature by December 31, 2011, and a recommended legislative proposal in that report relative to reorganization of transit services and expenditure of these funds is enacted by the end of the 2011-12 legislative session. This bill would provide that local transportation funds in Ventura County shall be available solely for transit purposes beginning July 1, 2014, as specified. The bill would also provide that any of those funds that remain unencumbered for more than one year, or unexpended for more than 2 years, be returned to the Ventura County Transportation Commission for reapportionment to other transit operators or transit service in proportional amounts based on population, contingent upon specified criteria. <strong>Last amended on 4/17/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1779</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation to contract with Amtrak for intercity rail passenger services and provides funding for these services from the Public Transportation Account. Existing law, until December 31, 1996, authorized the department, subject to approval of the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing, to enter into an interagency transfer agreement under which a joint powers board assumes responsibility for administering the state-funded intercity rail service in a particular corridor. Existing law, with respect to a transferred corridor, requires the board to demonstrate the ability to meet performance standards established by the secretary. This bill would authorize the department, with the approval of the secretary, to enter into an additional interagency transfer agreement with respect to the San Joaquin Corridor, as defined, if a joint powers authority and governing board are created and organized. In that regard, the bill would provide for the creation of the San Joaquin Corridor Joint Powers Authority, to be governed by a board of not more than 11 members. The bill would provide that the board shall be organized when at least 6 of the 11 agencies elect to appoint members. The bill would provide for the authority to be created when the member agencies enter into a joint powers agreement, as specified. The bill would provide for future appointments of additional members if the service boundaries of the San Joaquin Corridor are expanded. <strong>Last amended on 4/19/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1780</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bonilla D</strong></td>
<td>Department of Transportation: project studies reports.</td>
<td><strong>ASSEMBLY APPR.</strong> 4/24/2012 - From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1783</strong></td>
<td><strong>Perea D</strong></td>
<td>Public contracts: small business preferences.</td>
<td><strong>ASSEMBLY CONSENT CALENDAR</strong> 4/26/2012 - Ordered to consent calendar.</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 1890</strong></td>
<td><strong>Solorio</strong> D <strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Vehicles: toll highways: motorcycles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 4/26/2012</td>
<td>Existing law prohibits any person, except as specified, from driving any motor vehicle with any object or material placed, displayed, installed, affixed, or applied in or upon the vehicle that obstructs or reduces the driver's clear view through the windshield or side windows. Existing law makes it unlawful for any person to refuse to pay tolls or other charges on any vehicular crossing or toll highway and requires, among other things, that if a transponder or other electronic toll payment device is used to pay tolls or other charges due, the device be located in or on the vehicle in a location so as to be visible for the purpose of enforcement at all times when the vehicle is located on the vehicular crossing or toll highway. A violation of these provisions is an infraction. This bill would require a motorcyclist to instead use any one of 5 specified methods when using a transponder or other electronic toll payment device to pay tolls or other charges when entering a vehicle crossing or toll highway. <strong>Last amended on 3/28/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1915</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alejo</strong> D <strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Safe routes to school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/24/2012</td>
<td>Existing law requires the Department of Transportation, in consultation with the California Highway Patrol, to establish and administer a &quot;Safe Routes to School&quot; program for construction of bicycle and pedestrian safety and traffic calming projects, and to award grants to local agencies in that regard from available federal and state funds, based on the results of a statewide competition. Existing law sets forth various factors to be used to rate proposals submitted by applicants for these funds. This bill would provide that up to 10% of program funds may be used to assist eligible recipients in making infrastructure improvements, other than school bus shelters, that create safe routes to bus stops located outside of the vicinity of schools. <strong>Last amended on 3/26/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1916</strong></td>
<td><strong>Buchanan</strong> D <strong>D</strong></td>
<td>State parks: operating agreements: Mount Diablo State Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/26/2012</td>
<td>Existing law vests with the Department of Parks and Recreation control of the state park system. Existing law authorizes the department to enter into an agreement with an agency of the United States, including a city, county, district, or other public agency, or any combination thereof, for the care, maintenance, administration, and control of lands of the state park system. This bill would authorize the department to enter into a restoration agreement with Save Mount Diablo, a nonprofit organization, for the purpose of restoring the beacon on top of the Summit Building in Mount Diablo State Park, and would require that the agreement comply with specified requirements. <strong>Last amended on 4/26/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1924</strong></td>
<td><strong>Buchanan</strong> D <strong>D</strong></td>
<td>CEQA: environmental impact reports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY PRINT 2/23/2012</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. CEQA prescribes certain requirements for the review of draft EIRs, as specified. This bill would make various technical, non-substantive changes in those provisions relating to the requirements for the review</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>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AB 1960** Dickinson D  
State contracts: reports: lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender businesses. | SENATE  
4/30/2012 - Action From THIRD READING: Read third time. Passed Assembly to SENATE. | Existing law requires the Department of General Services to make available a report on contracting activity containing specified information, including the level of participation of business enterprises, by race, ethnicity, and gender of owner, in specified contracts.  
This bill would require the Department of General Services to include in the report on contracting activity information regarding the level of participation of lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender owned businesses in specified contracts, as provided. **Last amended on 3/27/2012** | **D** |
| **AB 2053** Allen D  
Postemployment health benefits: the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District. | ASSEMBLY APPR.  
4/26/2012 - From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. | Existing law requires the Board of Administration of the Public Employees' Retirement System to administer the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act. Existing law permits a contracting agency to elect to be subject to the act for its employees and annuitants, provided that the contracting agency and each employee or annuitant contribute a portion of the cost of providing the benefit coverage afforded under the health benefit plan approved or maintained by the board in which the employee or annuitant may be enrolled.  
This bill would authorize the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District to make contributions for postretirement health benefits for members of the district board of directors, the districts' unrepresented employees, and for any unit of employees whose terms and conditions of employment are determined through collective bargaining, as specified. | **D** |
| **AB 2173** Skinner D  
Metropolitan Transportation Commission: regional gasoline tax. | ASSEMBLY TRANS.  
4/16/2012 - In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author. | Existing law creates the Metropolitan Transportation Commission with specified powers and duties relative to transportation planning and programing for the 9-county Bay Area region comprising the commission's jurisdiction. Existing law authorizes the commission to impose a regional tax on gasoline used by motor vehicles not to exceed $0.10 per gallon for up to 20 years within the region, subject to 2/3 voter approval.  
This bill would modify these provisions by providing for the commission to submit the proposed ballot measure to voters of one or more counties within the 9-county region rather than to all counties. The bill would delete the requirement for an independent audit of the State Board of Equalization relative to reimbursement of the board for its actual administrative costs associated with the regional gasoline tax, and would make various other changes. | **D** |
| **AB 2200** Ma D  
Vehicles: high-occupancy vehicle lanes. | ASSEMBLY APPR.  
4/23/2012 - Do pass as amended and be re-referred to the Committee on Appropriations. | Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation and local agencies, with respect to highways under their respective jurisdictions, to designate certain lanes for preferential or exclusive use by high-occupancy vehicles. This bill would, consistent with the state implementation plan for the San Francisco Bay area adopted pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act and other federal requirements, suspend the hours of operation for highway lanes designated for high-occupancy vehicles, in the Interstate 80 corridor within the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's jurisdiction, in the reverse commute direction. Because the commission would be required to post signage of the above requirements along the Interstate 80 corridor, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. **Last amended on 4/18/2012** | **D** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2245</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES.</td>
<td>The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report 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 additionally exempt a Class II bikeway project, as defined for purposes of the Streets and Highways Code, undertaken by a city, county, or a city and county within an existing road right-of-way. <strong>Last amended on 3/15/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2247</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR.</td>
<td>Under existing law it is an infraction to sell or peddle any goods, merchandise, property, or services on any property, facility, or vehicle owned by the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District or the Southern California Rapid Transit District without the express written consent of the governing board of those respective entities. This bill would repeal those provisions. <strong>Last amended on 4/18/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2298</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY CONSENT CALENDAR</td>
<td>Existing law requires junk dealers and recyclers, as defined, to keep written records of all sales and purchases made in the course of their business. Existing law requires a junk dealer or recycler to allow for periodic inspection by specified persons, including persons authorized by the county sheriff or the head of a city police department, of any premises maintained for purposes of determining compliance with the recordkeeping requirements, and, upon inspection, requires the junk dealer or recycler to produce sales and purchase records. This bill would, in addition, authorize persons appointed by the head of a county agricultural commission to carry out the periodic inspection of the premises of junk dealers and recyclers. <strong>Last amended on 3/29/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Mateo County Transit District
State Legislative Matrix 4/30/2012
## AB 2375
**Knight R**

**Vehicles: public transit buses: illuminated signs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SENATE 4/30/2012 - Action From CONSENT CALENDAR: Read third time. Passed Assembly to SENATE</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes a bus operated by a publicly owned transit system on regularly scheduled service to be equipped with illuminated signs that display information directly related to public service and include, among other things, destination signs, route-number signs, run-number signs, public service announcement signs, or a combination of those signs, visible from any direction of the vehicle, that emit any light color, other than the color red emitted from forward-facing signs, pursuant to specified conditions. This bill would authorize, until January 1, 2018, a pilot program that would allow up to 25 buses operated by the Antelope Valley Transit Authority’s publicly owned transit system for the first 2 years of the pilot program, and up to 30 buses thereafter, to be equipped with illuminated signs that display advertising subject to certain conditions, including a display area of not greater than 4,464 square inches. The bill would require the authority to submit a specified report to the Legislature and the Department of the California Highway Patrol by July 1, 2017, on the incidence of adverse impacts, if any.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AB 2382
**Gordon D**

**Department of Transportation: Innovation District Demonstration Project.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/24/2012 - From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on Approps.</td>
<td>Existing law provides that the Department of Transportation has full possession and control of the state highway system. Existing law creates the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority with various transportation responsibilities in the County of Santa Clara. This bill would, by July 1, 2014, require the department, working in partnership with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, to establish the Innovation District Demonstration Project, designed to provide a new and innovative business model delivering transportation projects and services in the County of Santa Clara in a more responsive, cost-effective, and efficient manner and to serve as a mechanism for trying out new approaches for project delivery, local assistance, and transportation operations through streamlined processes, improved management techniques, and advanced technologies, with the goal of expediting project delivery and increasing the efficiency of the department. The bill would require the department and the authority to evaluate the effectiveness of the demonstration project and to report to the Legislature by January 1, 2018, on specified matters. By requiring the authority to participate in this demonstration project, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AB 2404

**Fuentes**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 2404</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/23/2012 - Do pass as amended and be re-referred to the Committee on Approps.</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 requires the State Air Resources Board to adopt regulations to require the reporting and verification of emissions of greenhouse gases and to monitor and enforce compliance with the reporting and verification program, and requires the state board to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020. The act requires the state board to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions and authorizes the state board to use market-based compliance mechanisms to achieve these ends. The act authorizes the state board to adopt a schedule of fees to be paid by the sources of greenhouse gas emissions regulated pursuant to the act, and requires the revenues collected pursuant to that fee to be deposited into the Air Pollution Control Fund and be available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for the purposes of carrying out the act. This bill would create the Local Emission Reduction Program and would require specified moneys collected under the market-based compliance mechanisms be available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for award under the program to specified local governmental entities for specified purposes by the state board. The bill would require the state board, in coordination with other state agencies, as appropriate, to develop standards and guidelines to ensure the funded projects maximize the funds appropriated, provide environmental and economic benefits, and do not conflict with the act. <strong>Last amended on 4/11/2012</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/23/2012 - Do pass as amended and be re-referred to the Committee on Approps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AB 2405

**Blumenfield**  
Vehicles: high-occupancy toll lanes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AB 2405      | SENATE RLS. 4/26/2012 - In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. | Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation to designate certain lanes for the exclusive use of high-occupancy vehicles (HOV), which lanes may also be used, until January 1, 2015, by certain eligible low-emission and hybrid vehicles not carrying the requisite number of passengers otherwise required for the use of an HOV lanes if the vehicle displays a valid identifier issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles. Existing law provides that a vehicle, eligible under these provisions to use HOV lanes, that meets the California's enhanced advanced technology partial zero-emission vehicle (enhanced AT PZEV) standard is not exempt from toll charges imposed on single-occupant vehicles in lanes designated for tolls pursuant to a federally supported value-pricing and transit development program involving high-occupancy toll lanes conducted by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.  

This bill would instead exempt, with specified exceptions, all of the low emission and hybrid vehicles eligible to use HOV lanes under these provisions, including vehicles that meet the enhanced AT PZEV standards, from toll charges imposed on single-occupant vehicles in lanes designated for tolls unless prohibited by federal law. The bill would exclude a toll imposed for passage on a toll road, toll highway, or toll bridge from this exemption. The bill would provide that these changes shall be known as the Choose Clean Cars Act of 2012. **Last amended on 4/23/2012** | SENATE RLS. 4/26/2012 - In Senate. Read first time. To Com. on RLS. for assignment. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2488</strong></td>
<td>SENATE 4/30/2012 - Action From THIRD READING: Read third time. Passed Assembly to SENATE.</td>
<td>Existing law imposes a 40-foot limitation on the length of vehicles that may be operated on the highways, with specified exemptions. Existing law exempts from this limitation an articulated bus or trolley and a bus, except a school bus, that is operated by a public agency or passenger stage corporation that is used in a transit system if it is equipped with a folding device attached to the front of the vehicle that is designed and used exclusively for transporting bicycles, does not materially affect efficiency or visibility of vehicle safety equipment, and does not extend more than 36 inches from the front of the body of the bus or trolley when fully deployed. In addition, existing law prohibits a bicycle that is transported on the above-described device from having the bicycle handlebars extend more than 42 inches from the front of the vehicle. This bill would authorize Gold Coast Transit (GCT) to install folding devices attached to the front of its buses that are designed and used exclusively for transporting bicycles if the use of the device meets certain requirements, including, but not limited to, that the device does not extend more than 40 inches from the front of the bus when fully deployed, and that the handlebars of the bicycles being transported do not extend more than 46 inches from the front of the bus. The bill would require GCT, if it installs the bicycle racks, to report to the Assembly Committee on Transportation and the Senate Committee on Transportation and Housing on or before December 31, 2017, regarding safety issues and mobility improvements. <strong>Last amended on 4/12/2012</strong></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2498</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APR. 4/23/2012 - Do pass as amended and be re-referred to the Committee on Appropriations.</td>
<td>Existing law sets forth the requirements for the solicitation and evaluation of bids and the awarding of contracts by state agencies for the erection, construction, alteration, repair, or improvement of any public structure, building, road, or other public improvement. This bill would authorize the Department of Transportation to engage in a Construction Manager/General Contractor project delivery method, as specified, for projects for the construction of a highway, bridge, or tunnel. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2581</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY PRINT 2/27/2012 - Read first time.</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation to designate certain lanes for the exclusive use of high-occupancy vehicles (HOV), which lanes may also be used, until January 1, 2015, by certain low-emission and hybrid vehicles not carrying the requisite number of passengers otherwise required for the use of an HOV lane. The Department of Motor Vehicles is required to make available for issuance distinctive decals, labels, and other identifiers that clearly distinguish those vehicles. This bill would make technical non-substantive changes to those provisions.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2669</strong> Committee on Natural Resources</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES. 4/17/2012 - In committee: Hearing postponed by committee. (Refers to 4/16/2012 hearing)</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 repeal obsolete and duplicative provisions from CEQA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 2679</strong> Committee on Transportation</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY APPR. 4/24/2012 - From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. with recommendation: to consent calendar.</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation (department) to pay claims or damages up to a maximum of $5,000 without the approval of the California Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board. This bill would adjust the claim limit that may be paid by the department under these provisions to equal the maximum amount of a claim that can be brought in small claims court. <strong>Last amended on 3/27/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACA 23</strong> Perea D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY PRINT 2/24/2012 - From printer. May be heard in committee March 25.</td>
<td>The California Constitution conditions the imposition of a special tax by a city, county, or special district upon the approval of 2/3 of the voters of the city, county, or special district voting on that tax, except that certain school entities may levy an ad valorem property tax for specified purposes with the approval of 55% of the voters within the jurisdiction of these entities. This measure would provide that the imposition, extension, or increase of a special tax by a local government for the purpose of providing funding for local transportation projects requires the approval of 55% of its voters voting on the proposition. The measure would also make conforming and technical, non-substantive changes.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### San Mateo County Transit District
#### State Legislative Matrix 4/30/2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 46</strong> Correa D</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.</td>
<td><strong>ASSEMBLY DECK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 52</strong> Steinberg D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY DESK 2/1/2012 - In Assembly. Read first time. Held at Desk.</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.</td>
<td><strong>ASSEMBLY DECK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 95</strong> Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review</td>
<td>SENATE CHAPTERED 2/3/2012 - Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 1, Statutes of 2012</td>
<td>Existing law establishes the Condemnation Deposits Fund in the State Treasury, consisting of all money deposited in the State Treasury pursuant to the Eminent Domain Law, including interest derived from its investment. Existing law requires the Treasurer to receive all money intended for the fund and to duly receipt for, and safe keep all money in the fund. This bill would instead require the Treasurer to receive and duly account for all money in the fund, and would authorize the Controller to use any money in the fund for cash-flow loans to the General Fund, as specified.</td>
<td><strong>SENATE CHAPTERED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 749</strong> Steinberg D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 4/24/2012 - Referred to Coms. on TRANS. and B., P. &amp; C.P.</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.</td>
<td><strong>ASSEMBLY TRANS.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last amended on 6/2/2011

Last amended on 1/31/2012

Last amended on 1/30/2012

Last amended on 1/4/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 783</td>
<td>SENATE 9/10/2011 -</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. <strong>Last amended on 6/6/2011</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 829</td>
<td>SENATE CHAPTERED 4/26/2012 -</td>
<td>Existing law sets forth the requirements for the solicitation and evaluation of bids and the awarding of contracts by public entities and authorizes a public entity to use, enter into, or require contractors to enter into, a project labor agreement for a construction project if the agreement includes specified taxpayer protection provisions. Existing law also provides that if a charter provision, initiative, or ordinance of a charter city prohibits the governing board's consideration of a project labor agreement for a project to be awarded by the city, or prohibits the governing board from considering whether to allocate funds to a city-funded project covered by such an agreement, state funding or financial assistance may not be used to support that project, as specified. This bill would additionally provide that if a charter provision, initiative, or ordinance of a charter city prohibits, limits, or constrains in any way the governing board's authority or discretion to adopt, require, or utilize a project labor agreement that includes specified taxpayer protection provisions for some or all of the construction projects to be awarded by the city, state funding or financial assistance may not be used to support any construction projects awarded by the city, as specified. <strong>Last amended on 4/9/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SB 878** DeSaulnier D  
Regional planning: Bay Area. | ASSEMBLY L. GOV.  
4/26/2012 - Referred to Coms. on L. GOV. and NAT. RES. | The Metropolitan Transportation Commission Act creates the Metropolitan Transportation Commission as a regional agency in the 9-county Bay Area with comprehensive regional transportation planning and other related responsibilities, including development of a regional transportation plan with a sustainable communities strategy. Existing law requires a joint policy committee of the commission, the Association of Bay Area Governments, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission to coordinate the development and drafting of major planning documents prepared by the 4 agencies.  
This bill would require the joint policy committee to submit a report to the Legislature by January 31, 2013, on, among other things, methods and strategies for developing and implementing a multiagency set of policies and guidelines relative to the Bay Area region's sustainable communities strategy, including recommendations on organizational reforms for the regional agencies. The bill would require preparation of a work plan for a regional economic development strategy to be submitted to the Legislature on that date. The bill would also require the member agencies to report on public outreach efforts that they individually or jointly perform. The bill would require public meetings in each of the region's 9 counties and creation of advisory committees, as specified. By imposing new duties on local agencies, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. **Last amended on 6/9/2011** |  |
| **SB 984** Simitian D  
Environmental quality: California Environmental Quality Act: record of proceedings. | ASSEMBLY DESK  
4/23/2012 - In Assembly. Read first time. Held at Desk. | The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA establishes a procedure for the preparation and certification of the record of proceedings upon the filing of an action or proceeding challenging a lead agency's action on the grounds of noncompliance with CEQA.  
This bill would require, until January 1, 2016, the lead agency, at the request of a project applicant, to, among other things, prepare a record of proceedings concurrently with the preparation of negative declarations, mitigated negative declarations, EIRs or other environmental documents for specified projects. Because the bill would require a lead agency to prepare the record of proceedings as provided, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. **Last amended on 4/9/2012** |  |
| **SB 997** Strickland R  
Environmental quality: environmental leadership development project. | SENATE RLS.  
2/16/2012 - Referred to Com. on RLS. | The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment.  
This bill would make technical, nonsubstantive changes to that provision. This bill contains other existing laws. |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 1076</td>
<td>SENATE APPR. 4/27/2012 - Set for hearing May 7.</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The state board is required to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020, and to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions. A violation of a regulation adopted by the state board pursuant to the act is subject to specified civil and criminal penalties. Pursuant to the act, the state board adopted a regulation requiring automobile service providers, by September 1, 2010, among other things, to check and inflate vehicle tires to the recommended pressure rating when performing automobile maintenance or repair services. This bill, until January 1, 2018, would require a tire pressure gauge used to meet the requirements of this regulation to be accurate within a range of plus or minus 2 pounds per square inch of pressure (2 psi). The bill, until January 1, 2018, would authorize automotive service providers to meet the requirements of the regulation without checking and inflating a vehicle's tires if those tires are determined to be unsafe, as defined. The bill, until January 1, 2018, would require the state board to adopt regulations on tire age and safety if the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration adopts regulations establishing a correlation between tire age and safety. Last amended on 3/19/2012.</td>
<td>SENATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1102</td>
<td>SENATE APPR. 4/20/2012 - Set for hearing April 30.</td>
<td>Existing law establishes the state transportation improvement program process, pursuant to which the California Transportation Commission generally programs and allocates available funds for transportation capital improvement projects over a multiyear period. Existing law provides that the Department of Transportation is responsible for the state highway system. Existing law requires the department to annually prepare a project delivery report that identifies milestone dates for state highway projects costing $1,000,000 or more for which the department is the responsible agency for project development work. This bill would require the department, as part of the annual project delivery report, to report on the difference between the original allocation made by the commission and the actual construction capital and support costs at project close for all state transportation improvement program projects completed during the previous fiscal year.</td>
<td>SENATE</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 1117</strong> DeSaulnier D&lt;br&gt;Statewide passenger rail transportation plan.</td>
<td>SENATE APPR. 4/25/2012 - Do pass as amended, and re-refer to the Committee on Appropriations</td>
<td>Existing law creates the California Transportation Commission, with various powers and duties relating to the programming and allocation of certain funds available for transportation capital improvement projects and various other transportation policy matters. Existing law creates the Department of Transportation with various powers and duties relating to the state highway system and other transportation modes, including the authority to contract for conventional rail passenger service. Existing law requires the department to prepare a 10-year State Rail Plan on a biennial basis. 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, including preparation of a business plan on a biennial basis. 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. This bill would require the California Transportation Commission to prepare a statewide passenger rail transportation plan relative to conventional and high-speed intercity passenger rail, commuter rail, and urban rail transit containing various elements. The bill would require the commission to adopt the plan by September 2014, and update the plan every 4 years thereafter. The bill would require the plan to contain goals for integrated passenger rail services and facilities, and to adopt policies and guidelines to be used by the department, the authority, and regional transportation agencies in the development of their plans, and would prohibit those agencies from taking inconsistent actions. The bill would require regional transportation planning agencies to submit their plans for commuter rail and urban rail transit to the commission by December 31, 2013. <strong>Last amended on 3/29/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1160</strong> Padilla D&lt;br&gt;Communications: service interruptions.</td>
<td>SENATE JUD. 4/26/2012 - Set for hearing May 8.</td>
<td>Existing law provides that an agent, operator, or employee of a telegraph or telephone office who willfully refuses or neglects to send a message received by the office is guilty of a misdemeanor. Existing law provides that these requirements are not applicable when payment for charges for transmittal or delivery of the message has not been paid or tendered, for messages counseling, aiding, abetting, or encouraging treason or resistance to lawful authority, to a message calculated to further any fraudulent plan or purpose, to a message instigating or encouraging the perpetration of any unlawful act, or to a message facilitating the escape of any criminal or person accused of crime. This bill would retain the provision that the above-described requirements are not applicable when payment for charges for transmittal or delivery of the message has not been paid or tendered, but would delete the other enumerated exceptions. <strong>Last amended on 4/9/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1189</strong></td>
<td>SENATE APPR. SUSPENSE FILE 4/30/2012 - Action From APPR.: To APPR. SUSPENSE FILE.</td>
<td>The Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century: project funding.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock D</td>
<td></td>
<td>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 train capital projects and other associated purposes. Existing law makes $950 million of the proceeds of those bonds available for capital improvements to intercity and commuter rail lines and urban rail systems that provide direct connectivity to the high-speed train system and its facilities, or that are part of the construction of the high-speed train system, as specified, or that provide capacity enhancements and safety improvements. Existing law requires the California Transportation Commission to allocate those funds to eligible recipients, as defined, and to develop guidelines to implement those provisions. This bill would appropriate $523,400,000 from the High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Fund to the Department of Transportation for allocation by the California Transportation Commission as provided for in specified guidelines adopted by the commission.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannella R</td>
<td></td>
<td>The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. This bill would require a judicial proceeding challenging a project, except for a high-speed rail project, located in a distressed county, as defined, to be filed with the Court of Appeal with geographic jurisdiction over the project. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1225</strong></td>
<td>SENATE APPR. 4/25/2012 - Do pass as amended, and re REFER to the Committee on Appropriations</td>
<td>Intercity rail agreements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Padilla D |  | Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation to contract with Amtrak for intercity rail passenger services and provides funding for these services from the Public Transportation Account. Existing law, until December 31, 1996, authorized the department, subject to approval of the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, to enter into an interagency transfer agreement under which a joint powers board assumes responsibility for administering the state-funded intercity rail service in a particular corridor. Existing law, with respect to a transferred corridor, requires the board to demonstrate the ability to meet performance standards established by the secretary. This bill would authorize the department, with the approval of the secretary, to enter into an additional interagency transfer agreement with respect to the LOSSAN Corridor, defined to mean the intercity passenger rail corridor between San Diego, Los Angeles, and San Luis Obispo, if the LOSSAN Agency, an existing joint powers agency, is reconstituted through an amended joint powers agreement approved by the governing boards of its members to enable that agency to enter into an interagency transfer agreement with the secretary relative to the LOSSAN Corridor. | }
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 1257 Hernandez D</td>
<td>SENATE G. &amp; F. 4/25/2012 - From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on GOV. &amp; F.</td>
<td>Existing law generally provides that the legislative body of any city and any charter city may make and enforce all ordinances and regulations with respect to municipal affairs, as provided, including, but not limited to, a utility user tax on the consumption of gas and electricity. Existing law provides that the board of supervisors of any county may levy a utility user tax on the consumption of, among other things, gas and electricity, in the unincorporated area of the county. This bill would provide that a local jurisdiction, as defined, may not impose a utility user tax, as specified, upon either the consumption of compressed natural gas dispensed by a gas compressor, within a local jurisdiction, that is separately metered and is dedicated to providing compressed natural gas as a motor vehicle fuel for use by the local agency or public transit operator or the consumption of electricity used to charge electric bus propulsion batteries, within a local jurisdiction, that is separately metered and is dedicated to providing electricity as fuel for an electric public transit bus. <strong>Last amended on 4/25/2012</strong></td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1269 Fuller R</td>
<td>SENATE G. &amp; F. 3/28/2012 - Set for hearing May 9.</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation to enter into an agreement to accept funds, materials, equipment, or services from any person for maintenance or roadside enhancement of a section of a state highway. This bill would authorize a credit against those taxes for each taxable year beginning on or after January 1, 2013, and before January 1, 2017, in an amount equal to 50% of the value of materials, equipment, or, in the case of individuals, services donated, as defined, by the taxpayer during the taxable year for maintenance or roadside enhancement of a section of a state highway pursuant to existing provisions of the Streets and Highways Code. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1339 Yee D</td>
<td>SENATE E.Q. 4/17/2012 - Set for hearing April 30.</td>
<td>Existing law creates the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, with various transportation planning and programming responsibilities in the 9-county San Francisco Bay Area. Existing law creates the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, with various responsibilities relative to the reduction of air pollution in the area of its jurisdiction, which incorporates a specified portion of the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. This bill would authorize the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to jointly adopt a commute benefit ordinance that requires covered employers operating within the common area of the 2 agencies with a specified number of covered employees to offer those employees certain commute benefits. The bill would require that the ordinance specify certain matters, including any consequences for noncompliance, and would impose a specified reporting requirement. The bill would make its provisions inoperative on January 1, 2017.</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>
<tr>
<td>SB 1380</td>
<td>SENATE E.Q. 4/11/2012 - Set for hearing April 30.</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. CEQA requires the lead agencies to make specified findings in an EIR. This bill would enact the California Public Health and Environmental Standards Act and would require documentation prepared pursuant to CEQA for the bicycle transportation plan to disclose applicable environmental laws, as specified. The bill would prohibit a cause of action from being brought in a judicial proceeding alleging noncompliance with CEQA related to those applicable environmental laws. <strong>Last amended on 4/10/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1396</td>
<td>SENATE GOV &amp; FINANCE</td>
<td>The Sales and Use Tax Law imposes a tax on retailers measured by the gross receipts from the sale of tangible personal property sold at retail in this state, or a tax, measured by the sales price, on the storage, use, or other consumption of tangible personal property in this state. That law defines the terms &quot;gross receipts&quot; and &quot;sales price.&quot; This bill would exclude from the terms &quot;gross receipts&quot; and &quot;sales price&quot; the amount charged at retail for gasoline and diesel fuels in excess of $3.88 or $3.52 per gallon, respectively, as provided. Existing law imposes a sales and use tax and an excise tax on gasoline and diesel fuels and requires the State Board of Equalization to annually modify both the gasoline and diesel excise tax rates on a going-forward basis so that the taxes imposed on gasoline and diesel fuels, as described above, are revenue neutral. This bill would require the State Board of Equalization to reduce, but not increase, certain excise tax rates on gasoline and diesel fuels to maintain revenue neutrality. This bill would declare that it is to take effect immediately as an urgency statute.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1417</td>
<td>SENATE G. &amp; F. 4/23/2012 - Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes the creation of infrastructure financing districts, as defined, for the sole purpose of financing public facilities, subject to adoption of a resolution by the legislative body and affected taxing entities proposed to be subject to division of taxes and voter approval. Existing law authorizes the legislative body to, by majority vote, initiate proceedings to issue bonds for the financing of district projects by adopting a resolution, subject to specified procedures and voter approval. Existing law requires an infrastructure financing plan to include the date on which an infrastructure financing district will cease to exist, which may not be more than 30 years from the date on which the ordinance forming the district is adopted. Existing law prohibits a district from including any portion of a redevelopment project area. This bill instead would specify that the date a district shall cease to exist may not be more than 45 years from the date on which the ordinance forming the district is adopted or not more than 45 years from the date on which bonds have been issued, whichever is later. The bill would delete the prohibition on a district including any portion of a redevelopment project area. The bill would make technical changes to a provision on bond issuance. <strong>Last amended on 4/9/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1464</td>
<td>SENATE APPR. 4/27/2012 - Set for hearing May 7.</td>
<td>Under existing law, a driver of a vehicle overtaking another vehicle or a bicycle proceeding in the same direction is required to pass to the left at a safe distance without interfering with the safe operation of the overtaken vehicle or bicycle, subject to certain limitations and exceptions. A violation of this provision is an infraction punishable by a fine not exceeding $100 for a first conviction, and up to a $250 fine for a 3rd and subsequent conviction occurring within one year of 2 or more prior infractions. This bill would recast this provision as to overtaking and passing a bicycle by requiring, with specified exceptions, the driver of a motor vehicle overtaking and passing a bicycle that is proceeding in the same direction on a highway to pass in compliance with specified requirements applicable to overtaking and passing a vehicle, and to do so at a safe distance that does not interfere with the safe operation of the overtaken bicycle, having due regard for the size and speed of the motor vehicle and the bicycle, traffic conditions, weather, and the surface and width of the highway. The bill would prohibit, with specified exceptions, the driver of the motor vehicle that is overtaking or passing a bicycle proceeding in the same direction on a highway from passing at a distance of less than 3 feet between any part of the motor vehicle and any part of the bicycle or its operator. The bill would make a violation of these provisions an infraction punishable by a $35 fine. The bill would also require the imposition of a $220 fine on a driver if a collision occurs between a motor vehicle and a bicyclist causing bodily harm to the bicyclist, and the driver is found to be in violation of the above provisions. Last amended on 4/24/2012.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1533</td>
<td>SENATE APPR. 4/24/2012 - Do pass as amended, and re-refer to Approps.</td>
<td>Existing law, until January 1, 2013, requires the Attorney General to represent the Department of Finance and to succeed to all rights, claims, powers, and entitlements of the Electricity Oversight Board in any litigation or settlement to obtain ratepayer recovery for the effects of the 2000-02 energy crisis. Existing law additionally prohibits the Attorney General from expending the proceeds of any settlements of those claims, except as specified. This bill would delete the repeal of the above-described requirements. Last amended on 3/27/2012.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1545</td>
<td>SENATE APPR. 4/27/2012 - Set for hearing May 7.</td>
<td>Existing law designates the Metropolitan Transportation Commission as the regional transportation planning agency for the 9-county San Francisco Bay Area. Existing law creates the Bay Area Toll Authority with specified powers and duties relative to administration of certain toll revenues from state-owned toll bridges within the geographic jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. This bill would prohibit public money from being used on the development or improvement of an office building at 390 Main Street, San Francisco, until after the State Auditor has completed a specified audit relating to the move of the headquarters of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. Upon completion of the audit, the bill would require the issues raised in the audit to be addressed and a report in that regard to be submitted to the Legislature prior to future expenditure of public money on the headquarters project. These provisions would apply to the Bay Area Toll Authority, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and the Bay Area Headquarters Authority. The bill would thereby impose a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1549</strong> Vargas D</td>
<td>SENATE APPR. 4/30/2012 - Action From SECOND READING: Read second time and amended. Re-referred to APPR.</td>
<td>Existing law sets forth the requirements for the solicitation and evaluation of bids and the awarding of contracts by state agencies for projects, as specified, and for local agencies for public works contracts, as specified. This bill would, upon authorization by the California Transportation Commission, allow a consolidated San Diego regional transportation entity, as specified, or the Department of Transportation to engage in a Construction Manager/General Contractor project delivery method, as specified, for up to 20 total projects for either local street or road, bridge, tunnel, or public transit projects within the jurisdiction of the local transportation entity or state highway, bridge, or tunnel projects by the Department of Transportation. The bill would require a transportation entity, as defined, to pay fees related to prevailing wage monitoring and enforcement into the State Public Works Enforcement Fund, a continuously appropriated fund, except as specified, and, thus, would make an appropriation. The bill would also require a progress report to be submitted by the transportation agency to the commission every year following the award of a contract under these provisions, and would require the commission to submit an annual report to the Legislature that includes the information in the report submitted by the transportation agency, as specified. This bill would require specified information to be verified under oath, thus imposing a state-mandated local program by expanding the scope of an existing crime. The bill would provide that its provisions are severable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1566</strong> Negrete McLeod D</td>
<td>SENATE APPR. 4/27/2012 - Set for hearing May 7.</td>
<td>Existing law requires that a specified amount of motor vehicle license fees deposited to the credit of the Motor Vehicle License Fee Account in the Transportation Tax Fund be allocated by the Controller, as specified, to the Local Law Enforcement Services Account in the Local Revenue Fund 2011, for allocation to cities, counties, and cities and counties. This bill would instead require, on and after July 1, 2012, that those revenues be distributed first to each city that was incorporated from an unincorporated territory after August 5, 2004, in an amount determined pursuant to a specified formula, second to each city that was incorporated before August 5, 2004, in an amount determined pursuant to a specified formula, and third to the Local Law Enforcement Services Account in the Local Revenue Fund 2011, for allocation to cities, counties, and cities and counties. By authorizing within the Motor Vehicle License Fee Account in the Transportation Tax Fund, a continuously appropriated fund, to be used for a new purpose, the bill would make an appropriation. <strong>Last amended on 4/10/2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SB 1572
**Pavley D**

**Location:**

- SENATE APPR.
- 4/23/2012 - Do pass as amended, and re-refer to the Committee on Appropriations

**Summary:**

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 to include use of market-based compliance mechanisms. The act authorizes the state board to adopt a schedule of fees to be paid by the sources of greenhouse gas emissions regulated pursuant to the act, and requires the revenues collected pursuant to that fee schedule be deposited into the Air Pollution Control Fund and be available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for the purposes of carrying out the act.

This bill would create the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Account within the Air Pollution Control Fund. The bill would require moneys, as specified, collected pursuant to a market-based compliance mechanism be deposited in this account. The bill also would require those moneys, upon appropriation by the Legislature, be used for purposes of carrying out the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. The bill would declare the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would establish criteria for the development and implementation of an expenditure plan, as specified, for moneys appropriated from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Account.

### SCA 7
**Yee D**

**Location:**

- ASSEMBLY APPR.
- SUSPENSE FILE

**Summary:**

The California Constitution requires meetings of public bodies to be open to public scrutiny.

This measure would also include in the California Constitution the requirement that each public body provide public notice of its meetings and disclose any action taken. **Last amended on 4/13/2011**
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, MAY 9, 2012– 3:00 p.m.
or immediately following previous Committee meeting

ACTION

1. Approval of Minutes of Planning, Development and Sustainability Committee Meeting of
   April 11, 2012

2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO to Undertake Property Exchanges with the City of
   San Bruno in Furtherance of the San Bruno Grade Separation Project

INFORMATIONAL

3. Update on the Grand Boulevard Initiative

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: A. Lloyd (Committee Chair), C. Groom, R. Guilbault

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

Other Board Members Absent, Constituting Committee of the Whole: A. Tissier

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

Committee Chair Art Lloyd called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Planning, Development and Sustainability Committee Meeting of March 14, 2012
The Committee approved the minutes (Kersteen-Tucker/Gee).

Accessing the Golden Gate National Recreation Area by Transit
Director Zoe Kersteen-Tucker said the Coastside has many recreational areas. The SamTrans Service Plan (SSP) is being updated and this is an opportunity to look at the future of bus service in San Mateo County. She is excited of the opportunities to provide more transit connections to the trails, open space and park lands in the area.

Christine Carey, San Mateo County Coordinator for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) reported:
- GGNRA was established in 1972 with 83,000 acres and 64 miles along the coast of California.
- People visit GGNRA for hiking, mountain biking, bird watching, camping, hang gliding and dog walking.
- San Mateo County data showed there are 6,500 acres in San Mateo County actively managed by GGNRA.
- In 2006, the GGNRA conducted a survey and found most visitors in San Mateo County arrive to the parks by car.
• There is decent access to the Coastside GGNRA lands but service isn’t that frequent especially on the weekends.
• There is an opportunity now that GGNRA is developing its Long Range Transportation Plan and SamTrans is developing their SSP.

Darren Brown, Transportation Planner for the GGNRA reported:
• Over the last eight to nine months, GGNRA has been collecting data and getting ready to put out to bid for the completion of its Long Range Transportation Plan and they hope to complete it by the end of the year.
• Muir Woods Shuttle is a partnership with GGNRA and Marin Transit. It operates May through October on weekends and holidays. This shuttle provides critical capacity during peak periods.
• The GGNRA is working with Bay Area Open Space Council on their on-line transportation trip planning system for people to get to trailheads and campsites.
• Alexander Avenue Planning Study is a partnership with GGNRA, Golden Gate Bridge District and the city of Sausalito to look at a challenging road.

Ms. Carey said they want to establish a partnership between themselves and SamTrans. There are a lot of opportunities where we can work to improve transit service to the parks and directly to the trailheads. With two agencies working together there are more opportunities to collaborate on funding.

Director Jeff Gee asked if it is possible to include in GGNRA’s Long Range Transportation Plan any potential grant or funding agencies to look for funding for additional annexation. Mr. Brown said besides the vision, one of the primary goals in the Plan, is to identify the projects and funding opportunities.

Director Carole Groom said Streets Alive is on May 6 and the GGNRA is participating on the coast.

Director Kersteen-Tucker asked if there is a way to more formally incorporate an analysis of transit and trail connections in the SSP. General Manager/CEO Michael Scanlon said Interim Executive Director Planning and Development Aidan Hughes is overseeing the SSP. Mr. Scanlon suggested Mr. Hughes meet with the GGRNA and come back with some joint ideas on how to move this forward.

Adjourned: 3:17 p.m.
TO: Planning, Development & Sustainability Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager / CEO

FROM: Aidan Hughes
Interim Executive Officer
Planning & Development

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE PROPERTY EXCHANGES WITH THE CITY OF SAN BRUNO IN FURTHERANCE OF THE SAN BRUNO GRADE SEPARATION PROJECT

ACTION
Staff recommends that the Board authorize the General Manager/CEO to undertake the exchange of property rights with the City of San Bruno associated with San Bruno Grade Separation Project (Project) as consistent with the purpose of the Project. Such transfers will be subject to the approval as to form of the property transfer documents by the General Counsel.

SIGNIFICANCE
Pursuant to the terms of the Construction and Maintenance Agreement (CMA) entered into between the City of San Bruno and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB), the parties need to exchange certain property interests to reflect the ongoing maintenance responsibilities of each entity. As co-owner of the right of way in San Mateo County, and because the San Mateo County Transit District (District) is the lead agency in the condemnation action to purchase property from the City and County of San Francisco, the District needs to approve certain property transfers associated with the Project.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no budget impact associated with these transfers, because JPB is paying all Project costs.

BACKGROUND
In 2010, the City of San Bruno and the JPB entered into a CMA which sets forth the roles and responsibilities of each party for the construction and ongoing maintenance of the Project. In general, the City of San Bruno is responsible for maintenance of Posey Park and its street and roadway system, while the JPB is responsible for the operation and maintenance of the railroad facilities. In order to implement the Project, the JPB Board authorized a series of real estate acquisitions from adjacent property owners and the City and County of San Francisco and asked the District to carry out certain condemnation actions on its behalf.
The Project design calls for the reconstruction of Huntington Avenue and the expansion of Posey Park. To accomplish this work, the District, at the request of JPB, exercised its power of eminent domain to acquire certain property from the City and County of San Francisco. The portions of the property required for Posey Park will be transferred to the City of San Bruno, and the District will facilitate the transfer to JPB of the rights that will be required for JPB facilities.

The condemnation action also involved acquisition of property owned by the City and County of San Francisco required for the expansion of Huntington Avenue south of Angus Avenue and for the realignment of Angus Avenue. Because these properties will be incorporated into the City of San Bruno’s street and roadway system, they, too, will need to be transferred to the City of San Bruno.

Finally, the Project will realign three streets that currently cross the Caltrain existing right of way, which is jointly owned by JPB and the District: San Mateo Avenue, San Bruno Avenue and Angus Avenue. After the construction of the Project, these streets will cross the right of way in slightly different locations than they do now. Therefore it is necessary for property rights to be exchanged between the City of San Bruno and the District/JPB to accurately reflect the after-condition location of each street crossing of the JPB right of way. To accomplish this goal, the City will vacate, in favor of the District/JPB, any rights they have within the former roadway areas and the District/JPB will grant the City new property rights within the new roadway areas. Because JPB and the City will both be operating in the area of the road crossings (JPB on an elevated structure and the City at ground level), the JPB will retain fee title and the City’s rights will be in the form of an easement.

Prepared by: Brian W. Fitzpatrick, Manager, Real Estate & Property Development 650.508.7781
RESOLUTION NO. 2012 –

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

***

AUTHORIZING THE GENERAL MANAGER/CEO TO EXECUTE PROPERTY
TRANSFERS WITH THE CITY OF SAN BRUNO IN CONJUNCTION WITH
THE SAN BRUNO GRADE SEPARATION AND NEW STATION PROJECT

WHEREAS, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) is undertaking the
San Bruno Grade Separation and New Station Project (Project) in San Bruno, California,
which will include (1) three grade-separated street crossings; (2) three pedestrian under
crossings; (3) a new San Bruno Station and parking lot; (4) relocation of station platforms
to an elevated structure; and (5) related improvements; and

WHEREAS, the JPB has entered into a Railroad Construction and Maintenance
Agreement with the City of San Bruno to coordinate each agency's responsibilities
relative to the project; and

WHEREAS, the Project requires the realignment of several city streets and the
relocation of a public park; and

WHEREAS, to accomplish these changes, the JPB and the San Mateo County
Transit District, as co-owners of the Caltrain right-of-way, need to make certain transfers
of property rights to the City and to accept certain transfers from the City; and

WHEREAS, staff recommends that the Board of Directors authorize the General
Manager/CEO to execute necessary property transfers to the City and to accept other
transfers from the City, all as more specifically described in the staff report.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute property transfers to the City of San Bruno and to accept other transfers from the City, all in a form acceptable to legal counsel and Real Estate Department staff, as more specifically described in the staff report;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Directors authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to take any other actions necessary to give effect to this resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 9th day of May 2012, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

__________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

__________________________
District Secretary
AGENDA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

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

WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 2012 – 3:00 p.m.
or immediately following Committee meetings

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT CALENDAR
   MOTION
   a. Approval of Minutes of Board of Directors Meeting of April 11, 2012
   b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for March 2012

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)
   MOTION
   i) Appointment of Citizen Advisory Committee Member Tryn Miller, Representing Multimodal Riders
   ii) Designation of May as “Older Americans Month”

SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
b. Student “Art Takes a Bus Ride” Contest
c. Accessibility Update
d. Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update
e. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report
f. Multimodal Ridership Report – March 2012

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 of the Fiscal Year 2013 Fuel Hedging Policy, Award of Contract to Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP to Serve as Special Counsel for Not-to-Exceed Fee of $125,000, Approve the Fiscal Year 2013 Fuel Hedging Program and Authorize Execution of Documents and Payment Premium for Commodity Price Cap for the Fiscal Year 2013 Fuel Hedging Documents

b. Authorize an Amendment to the Law Enforcement and Related Communications Services Agreement with the County of San Mateo for an Additional Three Years and Execution of a Financial Cost Sharing Agreement with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

c. Authorize Amendment of the California Public Employees Retirement System Contract to Provide 2 Percent at 60 Modified Formula to Future Employees

d. Authorize Amendment of Life and Accidental Death and Dismemberment Contract with Standard Life Insurance Company for the Basic Life Rate From $0.22 to $0.23 Per $1,000 of Basic Life Coverage Through May 31, 2014

e. Authorize Award of Three No Guarantee Contracts to Provide On-Call Market Research and Survey Services for an Aggregate Not-to-Exceed Amount of $610,000 for a Five-year Term to:
   - Corey, Canapary & Galanis
   - Dikita Enterprises, Inc.
   - EMC Research Inc.

f. Authorize Award of Contract to Technology, Engineering & Construction (d.b.a. TEC Accutite) to Provide Underground Storage Tank Inspection and Maintenance Services for an Estimated Amount of $750,000 for a Five-year Term

**MOTION**

g. Authorize Rejection of all Bids for Painting and Related Services and Authorization to Resolicit Bids

**SUBJECTS DISCUSSED**

h. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2013 Operating Budget

i. Preliminary Fiscal Year 2013 Capital Budget

8. **LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**

**SUBJECTS DISCUSSED**

a. State and Federal Legislative Update

9. **PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE**

**RESOLUTION**

a. Authorize the General Manager/CEO to Undertake Property Exchanges with the City of San Bruno in Furtherance of the City of San Bruno Grade Separation Project
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
b. Update on the Grand Boulevard Initiative

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

11. BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS/COMMENTS

12. DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING – June 13, 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
   a. Closed Session: Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(a): San Mateo County Transit District v. City and County of San Francisco and Artichoke Joes, San Mateo County Superior Court Case No. CIV494013 County Transit District

14. ADJOURNMENT
INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MINUTES OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
APRIL 11, 2012  

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

Board Members Absent: A. Tissier  

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

Chair Jerry Deal called the meeting to order at 3:19 p.m.  

CONSENT CALENDAR  
The Board approved the consent calendar (Guilbault/Lloyd).  

a. Approval of Minutes of Board of Directors Meeting of March 14, 2012  
b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for February 2012  

PUBLIC COMMENT  
None  

REPORT OF THE CHAIR  
No report.  

REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER/CEO  
General Manager/CEO Michael Scanlon reported:  

• This year’s United Way campaign raised $50,300, which is $300 over our goal. The committee members were recognized and presented with a Certificate of Recognition and a modest gift certificate.  
• SamTrans was awarded a grant from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for a pilot Car Share Program in Redwood City. Zip Car was selected to place nine cars in downtown Redwood City next to the Caltrain station. The program should be starting in mid-May.  
• Investment in human capital continues with eight part-time bus operators starting on April 6.  
• There is a new on-line transportation safety institute class on curbing transit employee distracted driving that will be incorporated into operations training.  
• The Request for Proposal for Coastside Transportation Services has been advertised with Board consideration this summer.  
• A global positioning system was installed on Route 17 buses last August and is showing good results in reporting and improving on-time performance.  
• The next runbook change will go into effect on June 17. It will reestablish the part-time bus operators and make a few adjustments on Routes 280, 281 and 141.
• Staff met with school administrators to discuss SamTrans’ role and the transportation needs of students and to emphasize the bus has to be open to everyone and not specifically school service.
• The reading file includes a listing of quarterly bus-side advertisements and the Spring Edition of Transit Fun Guide.
• Caltrain had another year of all-time-high ridership. The California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) is going to consider a Memorandum of Understanding at their April 12 meeting that includes nine parties and could provide a significant amount of money for Caltrain electrification and advanced signal systems. The CHSRA is also expected to approve a revised Business Plan that embraces the blended system of a two-track system.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE

MOTION

a. Appointment of Citizen Advisory Committee Members
   i) Kristopher Adler, Representing Community Riders
   ii) Kathy Gilbert, Representing Community Riders
   iii) Margaret Pye, Representing Community Riders
   iv) Sondra Price, Representing Multimodal Riders

A motion (Guilbault/Lloyd) to approve the appointments was approved unanimously.

SUBJECTS DISCUSSED

b. Accessibility Update
c. Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update
d. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report
e. Mobility Management Report – Fixed-route Bus Service
f. Multimodal Ridership Report – February 2012

FINANCE COMMITTEE

RESOLUTIONS

a. Authorize the Filing of Applications for State Proposition 1B Transit Security Grant Program Funds
b. Authorize Acceptance of Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization Improvement and Service Enhancement Account Funds in a Total Amount of $2,272,697
c. Authorize Reaffirmation of the Investment Policies and Annual Reauthorization to Invest Monies with the Local Agency Investment Fund
d. Authorize Approval of Resolution of Intention to Approve an Amendment to the District’s California Public Employees’ Retirement System Contract to Provide Two Percent at 60 Modified Formula to Future Employees
e. Authorize Award of Contract to T & J Lewis, Inc. dba Classic Graphics for Autobody Repair and Repainting Services for a Total Estimated Cost of $1,274,310 for a Five-year Term
f. Authorize Award of Contract to Transit Resource Center to Provide Contracted Urban Bus Inspection Services for an Estimated Amount of $91,350 for a Three-year Base Term

A motion (Gee/Groom) to approve the resolutions was approved unanimously by roll call.
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
  g. Assessment of the Fiscal year 2012 Fuel Hedging Program

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
  a. State and Federal Legislative Update

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
  a. Accessing the Golden Gate National Recreation Area by Transit

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
In reading file

BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS
Director Karyl Matsumoto said she sits on the Sustainable Communities Strategy and Regional Housing Needs Allocation Policy Advisory Committee and there used to be 20 city members and one county. She attended a second meeting and now the committee membership includes appointees by the governing Board of SamTrans and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA). District Secretary Martha Martinez said staff is recommending Director Rose Guilbault for the SamTrans representative and will follow-up with her.

Director Matsumoto said she is the SamTrans representative on the TA and they had a very lively discussion on shuttle services at the April 5 meeting.

GENERAL COUNSEL PROPOSAL
No Report

DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING – May 9, 2012 at 2 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District, Administrative Building, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070.

The meeting adjourned at 3:39 p.m.