AGENDA

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

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

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2013 – 2:00 p.m.

1. Pledge of Allegiance

2. Swearing in:
   - Carole Groom (Representing Board of Supervisors)
   - Rose Guilbault (Public Member)
   - Shirley Harris (Public Member)

ACTIONS

3. Approval of Minutes of Community Relations Committee Meeting of January 9, 2013

INFORMATIONAL

4. Accessibility Update - Tina Dubost

5. PCC Update - Mike Levinson

6. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report - Peter Ratto

7. Mobility Management Report – ADA Paratransit Service


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:  S. Harris, A. Lloyd

Committee Members Absent:  R. Guilbault (Committee Chair)

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

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


Swearing in of Jeff Gee (Representing City Selection Committee - South)
District Secretary Martha Martinez administered the Oath of Office to Jeff Gee.

Director Shirley Harris called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Community Relations Committee (CRC) Meeting of December 12, 2012
The Committee approved the minutes (Lloyd/Gee).

Accessibility Update - Tina Dubost
Accessibility Coordinator Tina Dubost said MV Transportation has always had a strong emphasis on safety. They have a new internal safety contest and operators who go 90 days without an accident are entered into a raffle for a cash prize.

Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update - Mike Levinson
PCC Chair Mike Levinson reported:
- The MV Transportation appreciation party will be on February 12.
- The Consumer Corps Process is a group of “secret” riders who submit a trip report after each ride. The PCC has recently modified the form to incorporate the night-before calls, taxi service and an area for noting if the customer used RediCoast.

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Liaison Report - Peter Ratto
CAC Chair Peter Ratto reported that for the first time in his tenure on the CAC there was no quorum and the meeting had to be canceled. There were a few public members in attendance and staff met with them individually. Vice Chair Sondra Price and Saundra Curry have resigned.
Director Karyl Matsumoto asked if there was a specific issue on the agenda that caused people to attend. Mr. Ratto said the public wanted to speak on the SamTrans Service Plan (SSP).

**Mobility Management Report - Fixed-route Bus Service**

Deputy CEO Chuck Harvey reported:

- Average weekday ridership for November was 41,000, down 5 percent.
- Ridership on the weekend Route ECR for November is up 6.3 percent.
- Monthly farebox revenue is almost exactly the same place as last year.
- Token usage had a spike in October and is back to last year’s level for November.
- On-time performance is tracking at 90 percent, above the 85 percent goal.
- Consumer reports are above 200 for the month of November and for the year the average is one complaint per 5,000 daily rides.
- Fleet reliability remains high at 25,000 miles between service calls.
- Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 average trip length was 4.3 miles.
- Emissions reductions:
  - In 2001 the District chose the California Air Resources Board (CARB) diesel path for its fleet. At the same time ultra-low sulfur fuel became the standard in California.
  - In 2010 certified emissions levels for clean diesel and compressed natural gas engines became identical.
  - Particulate matter emissions have been at .01 since 2002.
  - Replacing the 1998 Gilligs will reduce overall fleet emissions and save over $3 million in fuel over 12 years.
  - Twenty-five of the new buses being ordered will be the agency’s first diesel-electric hybrid models and will have lower emissions than standard clean diesels and improved fuel economy compared to non-hybrid models. The purchase is funded by a Federal Transit Administration State of Good Repair grant.
- In calendar year 2012 there were 20,000 hours of human capital training.

Director Matsumoto said two Safeway stores in South San Francisco sell tokens and asked if there are other locations where tokens can be sold, including City Hall. Executive Officer, Customer Service & Marketing Rita Haskin said staff would like to expand the token sales locations and would like every city hall be an outlet for selling tokens.

Director Adrienne Tissier asked if tokens are sold at any schools. Ms. Haskin said most schools moved away from tokens when the Clipper Card was introduced.

Director Harris said the human capital statistics are outstanding and gave kudos for the on-time performance on the weekend Route ECR.

**Multimodal Ridership Report - November 2012**

Mr. Harvey said:

- Bus ridership was 41,670, a decrease of 4.6 percent.
- Paratransit ridership was 1,043, a decrease of 0.8 percent.
- Caltrain ridership was 47,330, an increase of 12 percent.
• BART extension ridership was 46,237, an increase of 9.9 percent.
• Total bus ridership was 1,036,460, a decrease of 3.3 percent.
• Year-to-date bus ridership was 5,279,230, a decrease of 2.5 percent.

Mr. Harvey said some of the smaller community routes are down significantly and Route KX is down more than 11 percent, even though no service changes have been made to this route. He said this is another important reason why the SSP needs to be done.

Adjourned: 2:34 p.m.
TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: ACCESSIBILITY REPORT

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

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

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

The minutes from the December 12 PCC meeting and November 5 SAAC meeting are attached.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
No additional information.

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

Members Present: Mike Levinson, Chair; Stephanie Hill, AL-Com Chair; Dale Edwards, Consumer; Aki Eejima, Consumer; Judy Garcia, Consumer; Diane Griffith, Consumer; Barbara Kalt, Rosener House; Nancy Keegan, SC Adult Day Services; Dan Mensing, Consumer; Sammi Riley, Consumer; Marie Violet, Sequoia Hospital; Maureen Dunn, Senior Focus; Michal Settles, Vice-Chair.

Absentees: Allan Newlands, COD; Bill Welch, SamTrans; Myria Barnes-Jackson, DOR.

Guests: Elly Colwell, SamTrans; Tina Dubost, SamTrans; Maxine Eastman, Consumer; Paul Lee, SamTrans; Linda Rhine, Nelson\ Nygaard; Lynn Spicer, MV Transportation; Russ Whyte, MV Transportation; Erin Swartz, PCC.

(Total Attendance: 21) Quorum--Yes

WELCOME/INTRODUCTION

Chair Mike Levinson called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and welcomed all to the December PCC meeting.

APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER PCC MINUTES

Mike asked for a vote of approval for the November minutes. Diane moved to approve the minutes and Sammi seconded the motion. The minutes were approved with no abstentions.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. ADVOCACY- LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE (AL-COM)

Stephanie had no updates to present. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 2, 2013.

B. GRANT/ BUDGET REVIEW

Barbara reported that the call for 5310 grant applications has been issued by MTC. Every agency in San Mateo County has received a reminder postcard with this announcement. All agencies that are eligible should have received a postcard about the upcoming process. Barbara will coordinate with Linda about outreach. Tina noted that Sam Trans is not planning to participate in this cycle. MTC is hosting a workshop in January. Applications are due on March 11, 2013.

C. EDUCATION COMMITTEE

Maureen reported that the Education Committee will be meeting today at 3:45 p.m. and will be discussing the newsletter and outreach strategy using a speakers' forum.
D. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Mike reported that the most recent meeting was in a conference call on December 3, 2012. The contract for next year will be reviewed beginning in February 2013. We talked about improving communication with the taxi service. Revisions to the Consumer Corps form are in progress and will be presented, along with a letter to the Consumer Corps members, to the full PCC in January. Aki asked if the Consumer Corps members should review the form. The PCC discussed the process of sending a letter to Consumer corps members explaining the changes in the Consumer Corps form. The MV Appreciation party has been scheduled for February 12, 2013. There will be a regular PCC Meeting at 4:00 p.m. for 1.5 hours and the party will follow at 6:00 p.m. An invitation and details will follow.

CONSUMER CORPS REPORT
Linda will present the quarterly Consumer Corps Report at the January PCC Meeting.

SAM TRANS/REDI-WHEELS REPORT
A. OPERATIONAL REPORT
Tina thanked all of the PCC members for participating in the holiday singing. Tina also thanked Dale for a positive comment about Redi-Wheels driver, Isaiah. The driver removed an obstacle in Dale’s path and prevented a serious accident.

Tina reported that the IVR is making night-before calls with a 98% success rate. Tina noted that failures might be due to an incorrect phone number, a busy line, or issues with the customer’s phone. An updated version of Trapeze, the automated software to schedule trips, may be needed in advance of implementing the next phase of the IVR; the imminent arrival calls. This would be a difficult decision because there is a steep learning curve with Trapeze software.

Diane shared her experience with a voice message last night, noting that she didn’t receive a call for her return trip. Stephanie explained that she is getting repeat NB calls for the same ride and the call quality is poor. Tina will research Diane’s event and return her findings at the next meeting.

Nancy asked about the 98% success rate in relation to customer experiences like Diane’s. Tina shared that each trip is counted separately, so her trips would count as one success and one failure.

Stephanie asked if taxi service would be included in IVR calls. Tina reported that it is not financially feasible to fund data terminals in each taxi vehicle. Imminent arrival calls for trips on taxi will be based on the schedule pick up time.

B. PERFORMANCE SUMMARY
Tina reported several significant trends in the data for October. Average weekday ridership increased by 9%. There were over 1,000 trips on an average weekend. Late Cancels have decreased by 1.1%. More individuals rode in October 2012 than in October of 2011. Productivity as measured by Passengers/Hour didn’t meet the standard, although Phone Wait Time is better than the standard.
Mike noted a few minor discrepancies in the Summary Definitions. Tina will follow up with Mike directly to make the needed corrections and changes.

Aki inquired about creating a graph each quarter using the data from the monthly Comments by Type Report and key performance indicators. Tina will provide the Excel spreadsheet and work with PCC staff to format the data and present trends graphically on a quarterly basis.

C. CUSTOMER COMMENTS
Elly reported that comments have decreased in all three categories over the past month. The average response turnaround time is under seven days.

Elly added that most Comments by Type have also decreased slightly, with the exception of Customer Error.

D. SAFETY REPORT
Lynn had zero accidents to report. She thanked everyone for attending the Caroling event and noted that it was great to see John Murphy. Nancy shared that it was wonderful to have so many people participate in the caroling and her center clients enjoyed it. Lynn said that a contest was started on Oct. 1, 2012 to begin a 60-day safety raffle. Each driver has to meet a number of criteria in order to be eligible, including no previous accidents, no consumer complaints, and attendance. If at the end of 60 days, there are no accidents, then three eligible drivers will be entered into a drawing to win a $300.00 gift card. MV started the contest in our division and may be expanded to other divisions soon.

Maureen asked how many drivers there were in our area and Lynn reported that there are 88, with 27 drivers currently qualified for the raffle. The drivers eligible for the raffle are with Redi-Wheels, not Redi-Coast.

Aki asked about the safety patches worn by some drivers. Lynn explained that drivers who earn a year of driving without a preventable accident could earn $200 safety bonus. Starting in 2007, drivers were given the choice between a patch or pin.

Stephanie noticed that the Comment Cards are sometimes being covered up by the driver’s jackets and other materials on the buses. Dan shared that he has observed SamTrans comment cards on vehicles.

LIAISON REPORTS
A. MTC REPORT
No report.

B. AGENCY
Barbara thanked the carolers and described it as one of the highlights of the holiday season. Barbara said it was fabulous and a good time was had by all. Barbara extended her appreciation to Lynn and all of the others who participated in this event.
C. COASTSIDE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (CTC)
Michal reported that she hoped to duplicate the caroling after the fourth quarter meeting on Dec. 19, 2012 that is being held from 9:30-11:00 a.m. Tina will be attending the meeting in Bill’s place. At this meeting, the members will set a calendar for next year. Each agency is expected to host on a rotating basis. The caroling will take place after the meeting. Michal agreed with the others that organizing and coordinating the logistics for the caroling event are challenging. Tina and Paul will be joining us.

A Get Well card will be sent to Zoe Tucker, a SamTrans Board member on the Coast and a card will be sent to Bill Welch from the PCC.

D. EFFICIENCY REVIEW COMMITTEE (ERC)
Aki reported that most items have already been covered in earlier reports during this meeting. The 98% effectiveness status of night-before calls is positive. Trapeze version 12 is being considered. There are 6,564 eligible riders currently in the database. More referrals are being given for travel training. Some appeals are pending and a PCC representative will serve on the Appeals Panel. Aki reported that there were four riders who had no-show/late cancel appeals. Two suspensions were sustained and two were overturned. Jim Rusconi can confirm with users how many valid No-Shows and Late Cancels are currently on record. Tina noted that letters are sent to riders, encouraging them to contact SamTrans if the no-show or late cancel occurs for reasons beyond their control.

The PCC members discussed the process for Fare Exception reporting.

E. COMMISSION ON AGING (COA) REPORT
Linda is seeking a new representative from the Commission on Aging and an additional one from CID. Nancy received an email from a new Systems Change Advocate at CID who might be interested. Linda will follow up with a phone call. Mike noted that Vista Center might also have a candidate. Nancy clarified that we are continuing to look for additional representatives and organizations to serve on the PCC. Maureen noted that outreach could also provide opportunities to make contact with interested parties.

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

G. CENTER FOR INDEPENDENCE OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES (CID)
No report.

H. DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION
Myria absent; no report.

OTHER BUSINESS
Mike reported that there will be no Efficiency Review Committee in January, and the next meeting will be Feb. 5, 2013, instead.

Linda reiterated that there would be an MV appreciation party in February.
Dale and Diane expressed their appreciation to Nancy, Barbara, Maureen, Lynn and Tina for organizing the caroling. Dale and Diane encouraged people to attend the Coast-side caroling event.

Mike reminded PCC members that Jan. 8 is the date for the next PCC Meeting.

**MEETING ADJOURNED: 3:30 P.M.**
SAMTRANS ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY – NOVEMBER 5, 2012

PRESENT: Cam Acker, Alec Karp (Chair), Tom Collette, Jim Engvall, Doris Maez

ABSENT:

GUEST: Jennifer Sutton

SAMTRANS STAFF: Tina Dubost; Jeff Johnson, Manager of Operations and Training; Richard Lesser; Bill Welch

I. INTRODUCTIONS

Everyone introduced themselves.

II. AGENDA

Richard Lesser reviewed the agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes for the 9/24/12 meeting were approved, with the correction that meetings are the first Monday of alternate months, rather than each month.

IV. FIXED ROUTE BUS AND CALTRAIN

A. CALTRAIN UPDATE – GALLERY CAR WHEELCHAIR CAPACITY INCREASE

Richard Lesser explained that Gallery train sets, which were purchased before the ADA, are “grandfathered” to be included under the “one car per train” rule, and have only one accessible car per train, each with two wheelchair spaces. This can cause inconvenience and frustration when a third wheelchair passenger wants to board. By contrast, every car is wheelchair accessible on Caltrain’s newer Bombardier train sets. To help mitigate the limitation of wheelchair spaces on Gallery train sets, Caltrain is going to remove a couple of seats in the ADA car to provide an additional wheelchair space. A timeline on this project is pending but should be available in a couple of months. Also, conductors will ask if a customer who uses a wheelchair can transfer from their chair if needed in an effort to accommodate an additional wheelchair passenger when the spaces are full. Efforts are being made to fully integrate these policies with Caltrain’s new service provider in this period of transition.

Alec Karp asked if it would be possible to transport a wheelchair in the bicycle car and Bill Welch answered that for safety reasons this was not feasible.
B. ADDRESSING SAMTRANS SERVICE COMPLAINTS

Bus Lift Requests: Some consumers report that Bus Operators seem hesitant to lower the lift when asked. Operators are trained to kneel the bus or lower the lift upon request, no questions asked. Sometimes they need to be reminded that disabilities are not always visible.

Bus Pass-Ups: Bus Operators are trained to be diligent and pull up to any stop with waiting passengers. It is important that passengers be waiting at the stop, rather than some distance away.

Jim Engvall stated that sometimes when waiting for the 391, if a 390 bus pulls up to the stop first, then the 391 will pass him up.

Jeff Johnson stated that bus operators are instructed never to pass up a bus stop because another bus is stopped there. They are to wait and complete their assigned stop and/or contact Radio Control to identify a problem. If a bus does not follow this standard procedure, passengers are encouraged to call in a complaint so it can be recognized and remedied.

Alec Karp mentioned the same bus-bunching pass-up issue with San Francisco Muni buses. Bill Welch said that he would bring this up at his regular Metropolitan Transportation Commission accessibility meeting with a request to address common issues.

Jeff Johnson described the intensive sensitivity training undergone by SamTrans bus operators. Jennifer Sutton and Committee member Jim Engvall are part of the panel of public transit consumers with disabilities that help to educate and train operators. In addition to discussion and written materials, the training includes experiential use of mobility aids such as wheelchairs and walkers, and blindfolds to simulate visual impairments. Each Bus Operator also goes through annual refresher training, in which ADA issues are fully covered.

V. Approval of Meeting Date Changes to SAAC By-Laws

Meetings were previously held on the third Thursday of alternate months, from 11 AM TO 12:30 PM but will now be held on the first Monday of alternate months, from 11:30 AM to 1:00 PM. The Chair can call separate meetings at his/her discretion. The wording was also changed to say the Committee should (rather than “does”, as the membership changes) include one member each in a range of disability categories. The changes were approved.

VI. Paratransit Update

Tina Dubost recounted that improving on-time performance has been a priority for the last few months, as it had dipped below the standard and required hard work to bring it up to 90%. Software issues have made time estimates difficult.

The SamTrans Service Plan may eliminate certain fixed routes, and discussions are ongoing as to how changes may affect paratransit scheduling and routing. Doris Maez asked whether a schedule going to Kaiser was headed toward
elimination. Details and updates are posted on the www.samtrans.com website. Commentary and comments from the public are welcome and can be made online and at public meetings.

VII. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Update
Tom Collette reported the CAC met at the South Base Bus terminal and maintenance facility. As in previous years, the Committee was impressed with the organization and work quality that they observed.

VIII. Valley Transportation Authority Committee of Transportation Accessibility Update
Cam Acker said that VTA reports great success with the use of the Clipper Card. There is no cost to obtain a Senior or Youth Clipper card. Beginning in early 2013, MTC will begin accepting applications by mail for Senior and Youth Clipper cards, so that these groups will no longer have to go to the transit agency with proof of age. The new program will allow youth and seniors to mail in a completed Clipper card application, with proof of age, and the Clipper cards will be sent to them. The processing time is expected to be five to seven business days after receipt of an application. Applications will be available to download online and distributed throughout VTA’s service area to libraries, schools, and other locations where VTA information is displayed. The applications can also be obtained by calling VTA customer service.

IX. Announcements and Other Business
Alec Karp asked for progress reports on issues brought up in committee, i.e.:
- A review of SamTrans route maps for clarity, in comparison with VTA maps.
- Braille medallions at major bus stops, such as Redwood City multi-modal station.
- Reflective tape on the counter-balance part of the train crossing barrier for visibility and safety.
- Updates on improvements for Clipper accessibility for vision-impaired consumers on Caltrain.

These issues are still in process, per Richard Lesser.

Doris Maez touted the Abilities Expo at the San Jose Exhibition Center on the 16th, 17th, and 18th of November.

New committee members are sought. A new member from Center for Independence of Individuals with Disabilities (CID) is desired, as well as a consumer with a hearing disability.

X. Set Date for Next Meeting
The next meeting will be on Monday, January 14th, 2013, from 11:30 AM to 1:00 PM.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Community Relations Committee
THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO
FROM: C. H. (Chuck) Harvey
Deputy CEO
SUBJECT: MOBILITY MANAGEMENT REPORT: ADA PARATRANSPORT SERVICE

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

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

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
Staff will report on Redi-Wheels and RediCoast operating statistics.

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

Prepared by: Donald G. Esse, Senior Operations Financial Analyst 650-508-6329
TO: Community Relations Committee
THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO
FROM: C.H. (Chuck) Harvey
Deputy CEO
SUBJECT: MULTIMODAL RIDERSHIP REPORT - DECEMBER 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 and Table “B” summarizes the total ridership figures for all SamTrans transportation modes. Chart “A” features year-to-date comparisons of AWR for Fiscal Year (FY) 2011, FY2012, and FY2013. Chart “B” has figures for total ridership year-to-date for FY2011, FY2012, and FY2013.

Tables “A” and “B” also provide the corresponding data for the BART SFO Extension as a separate line.

AVERAGE WEEKDAY RIDERSHIP - DECEMBER 2012 COMPARED TO DECEMBER 2011

Total District Modes – 90,211, an increase of 4.3 percent.

Bus – 38,230, a decrease of 3.7 percent.

Paratransit – 988, an increase of 0.3 percent.

Caltrain – 42,710, an increase of 11.3 percent.

Caltrain Shuttles – 6,165, an increase of 6.8 percent.

BART Shuttles – 2,118, an increase of 30.0 percent.
### Table A
Average Weekday Ridership

#### December 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>35,920</td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>38,230</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>34,860</td>
<td>38,390</td>
<td>42,710</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttle</td>
<td>4,155</td>
<td>5,771</td>
<td>6,165</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttle</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>2,118</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>77,752</td>
<td>86,475</td>
<td>90,211</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Extension (No Daly City)</td>
<td>36,775</td>
<td>40,644</td>
<td>44,529</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>114,527</td>
<td>127,119</td>
<td>134,740</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Year to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>41,780</td>
<td>42,330</td>
<td>40,940</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>39,880</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>48,300</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttle</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>6,813</td>
<td>8,340</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttle</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>2,166</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>89,961</td>
<td>95,013</td>
<td>100,801</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Extension (No Daly City)</td>
<td>36,549</td>
<td>42,280</td>
<td>46,696</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>126,510</td>
<td>137,292</td>
<td>147,497</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chart A
Average Weekday Ridership (FYTD)

![Chart A](Image)
The following summary and exhibits include total ridership for all modes of transportation for which SamTrans is responsible. These numbers are a gross count of each boarding across all modes and all service days for the Month of December for the past three fiscal years.

**MONTHLY TOTAL RIDERSHIP – DECEMBER 2012 COMPARED TO DECEMBER 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>December 2012</th>
<th>December 2011</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All District Modes</td>
<td>2,253,522</td>
<td>2,192,166</td>
<td>1.3% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>942,270</td>
<td>1,004,374</td>
<td>6.5% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>23,407</td>
<td>23,774</td>
<td>1.2% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>1,126,170</td>
<td>1,038,561</td>
<td>8.6% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttles</td>
<td>124,518</td>
<td>121,457</td>
<td>2.9% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttles</td>
<td>37,157</td>
<td>34,261</td>
<td>8.6% increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FISCAL YEAR-TO-DATE TOTAL RIDERSHIP – DECEMBER 2012 COMPARED TO DECEMBER 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>December 2012</th>
<th>December 2011</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All District Modes</td>
<td>15,436,048</td>
<td>14,522,110</td>
<td>5.9% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>6,221,490</td>
<td>6,479,901</td>
<td>3.1% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>153,081</td>
<td>154,549</td>
<td>0.9% decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>7,727,480</td>
<td>6,926,568</td>
<td>12.0% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttles</td>
<td>1,064,478</td>
<td>873,916</td>
<td>22.4% increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttles</td>
<td>269,519</td>
<td>229,504</td>
<td>17.2% increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table B
#### Total Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1,056,840</td>
<td>1,008,250</td>
<td>942,270</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>24,546</td>
<td>23,697</td>
<td>23,407</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>929,110</td>
<td>1,036,830</td>
<td>1,126,170</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttle</td>
<td>88,320</td>
<td>120,968</td>
<td>124,518</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttle</td>
<td>35,366</td>
<td>34,204</td>
<td>37,157</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,134,182</td>
<td>2,223,949</td>
<td>2,253,522</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Extension (No Daly City)</td>
<td>975,424</td>
<td>1,062,207</td>
<td>1,099,658</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>3,109,606</td>
<td>3,286,156</td>
<td>3,353,180</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Weekdays per Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>23</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Year to Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2011</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>%Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>6,681,030</td>
<td>6,420,590</td>
<td>6,221,490</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>160,191</td>
<td>154,431</td>
<td>153,081</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>6,318,810</td>
<td>6,898,320</td>
<td>7,727,480</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttle</td>
<td>653,111</td>
<td>869,721</td>
<td>1,064,478</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Shuttle</td>
<td>250,926</td>
<td>230,032</td>
<td>269,519</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14,064,068</td>
<td>14,573,094</td>
<td>15,436,048</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Extension (No Daly City)</td>
<td>6,048,026</td>
<td>6,551,261</td>
<td>7,186,252</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>20,112,094</td>
<td>21,124,355</td>
<td>22,622,300</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chart B
#### Total Ridership (FYTD)

- **YTD2011**: 20,112,094
- **YTD2012**: 21,124,355
- **YTD2013**: 22,622,300

- **20,000,000**
- **20,500,000**
- **21,000,000**
- **21,500,000**
- **22,000,000**
- **22,500,000**
- **23,000,000**
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SamTrans Promotions – December 2012

Happy Holidays Video – The San Mateo County Transit District created a video holiday card that focused on the people who provide the service for the people who ride it. The short video included our family of services: Redi-Wheels, Caltrain and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority. It wrapped up with a locomotive engineer saying, “We’re on the move but stopping to wish you happy holidays.” The greeting also was provided in multiple languages.

East Palo Alto Information – SamTrans ran an ad in a new publication, East Palo Alto Information Resource and Community guide. Its goal is to assist residents in identifying available services in the community. The guide is being mailed to every household in the city and also will be available at organizations throughout East Palo Alto.

New Year’s Eve – To ring in the New Year, SamTrans offered complimentary rides beginning at 11 p.m. The service was promoted through onboard announcements, social media, news release and website.

Muni Centennial – SamTrans partnered with Caltrain and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority to run an ad in the Examiner congratulating San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency on the 100th anniversary of Muni service.

Serramonte Center Holiday Shopping – The annual SamTrans/Serramonte Center partnership continued in December to offer extended hours of service on Route 120. The extension coordinated with expanded shopping hours for the holiday season. The extra service to the Daly City shopping center started at the end of November and ran through Dec. 26. The service was promoted through onboard notices, flyers at the shopping center, social media and a web posting.

Connecting with Customers – SamTrans employees brought their holiday spirit to the December Connecting with Customers event held at multiple bus stop locations at the Hillsdale Shopping Center. The team, which included employees from throughout the agency who spoke various languages, donned SamTrans Santa hats and thanked customers for choosing SamTrans. In addition to thanking customers, team members also answered questions and provided information about upcoming events or service changes. Past events were held in East Palo Alto, Pacifica and at the Serramonte Center. Information about the events is distributed via social media and SamTrans publications and also is available online (www.samtrans.com/customers). The Connecting with Customers program continues through May.

Transit Fun Guide – The winter issue of the Transit Fun Guide was released. The guide lists dozens of events and fun destinations that are served by SamTrans and includes the appropriate bus route numbers. Destinations include festivals, parades, theatres and farmers’ markets.

Prepared by: Rita P. Haskin, Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing 650-508-6248
Michael Eshleman, Planner 650-508-6227
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, FEBRUARY 13, 2013 – 2:20 p.m.
or immediately following previous Committee meeting

ACTION
1. Approval of Minutes of Finance Committee Meeting of January 9, 2013
2. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for December 2012
4. Authorize the Execution of a Memorandum of Understanding with the County of San Mateo to Access the County’s Trunked Radio System and Maintenance of the District’s Radio Equipment for Ten Years at a Total Estimated Cost of $3,368,010

INFORMATIONAL

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.
MINUTES OF FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING  
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE  
JANUARY 9, 2013

Committee Members Present:  J. Gee (Committee Chair), A. Tissier

Committee Members Absent:  Z. Kersteen-Tucker

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

Other Board Members Absent, Constituting Committee of the Whole:  C. Groom, R. Guilbault


Committee Chair Jeff Gee called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Finance Committee Meeting of December 12, 2012
The Committee approved the minutes (Deal/Tissier).

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for November 2012
Deputy CEO Gigi Harrington said revenues are on budget and $4.4 million in savings in expenses. Last week fuel was $3.06 per gallon and year to date is $3.16 per gallon. The San Mateo County Transit District (District) received $16,000 in December and year to date has received $156,000 from the fuel hedge. Ms. Harrington said the revised budget Year To Date column on the revenues and expenses attachment has a typo and she will republish the attachment in next month’s report.

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

Authorize Amendment of Fiscal Year 2013 Operating Budget in the Amount of $299,554 for a Total Budget of $132,107,471
Manager of Budgets Ladi Bhuller said the highlights include increasing the District’s sales tax revenues by $3 million to $68 million to reflect the FY2012 audited receipts; decreasing operating grants by $2 million, mostly due to a reduction in preventative maintenance funds; adjusting revenues and expenses for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission Making the Last Mile Project; and including a pass-through of funds to the Paratransit Coordinating Council for support services.

Ms. Bhuller said the proposed amendment increases the FY2013 Operating Budget to a new total of $132.1 million.
The Committee (Tissier/Lloyd) unanimously recommended Board acceptance of the report.

**Authorize Disposition of Two Surplus Vehicles**
Director, Contracts and Procurement Cheryl Cavitt said staff is asking the Committee to recommend the Board authorize disposal of two surplus Ford trucks, a 1997 F450 and a 2000 F650.

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

**Authorize Exercising Option with Gillig, LLC for the Purchase and Delivery of 62 New Heavy-Duty Buses for a Total Estimated Cost of $32,284,040**
Ms. Cavitt said staff is asking the Committee to recommend the Board authorize the CEO/General Manager to exercise the option to purchase 62 Gillig buses.

Committee Chair Gee asked when production would occur. Deputy CEO Chuck Harvey said the hybrid buses will be manufactured this summer, the remaining fleet will be manufactured in the February 2014 to April 2014 timeframe.

Chair Jerry Deal asked where the buses are manufactured. Mr. Harvey said Gillig is in Hayward so the tax dollars received from the Federal Transit Administration will stay in the region.

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

**Authorize Award of Contract to Seven Island Painting, Inc. to Provide Painting and Related Services for a Total Estimated Cost of $200,880 for a Three-year Base Term**
Ms. Cavitt said staff is requesting the Committee recommend the Board authorize the approval of a contract to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder, Seven Island Painting, for facilities painting and related services. This award will cover painting of line striping, waterproofing, sandblasting and caulking. Two bids were received and both were Small Business Enterprise firms.

Chair Deal asked why the method for securing painting services was different from the last time. Ms. Cavitt said it was done for procurement efficiency and also result in reduced costs by putting a larger amount of work together.

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

**Authorize Award of Contract to Holland & Knight, LLP to Provide Federal Legislative Advocacy Services for a Firm-fixed Price of $240,000 for a Five-year Term**
Ms. Cavitt said staff is requesting the Committee recommend Board authorize the approval of a contract to Holland & Knight for Federal legislative services. Staff followed the normal competitive proposal process. Holland & Knight has a dedicated public policy and regulation practice, has an excellent reputation and was rated the highest by the evaluation committee consisting of staff from local transit agencies.
Committee Chair Gee said since most agencies have a Federal legislative advocate is there any economy of scale to have a Joint Powers Agreement for these services. General Manager/CEO Michael Scanlon said Holland & Knight is one of the largest transportation advocacy group in the country. He said there already is a built in economy of scale because they specialize in the business. He said there are times when Holland & Knight has to be very careful which clients they are representing.

Director, Government and Community Affairs Seamus Murphy said staff did one procurement for the District, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority. He said every firm that submitted a proposal had the expectation they could potentially receive contracts from all three business units and their cost proposals were reflective of that. Mr. Murphy said with Holland & Knight staff adjusted their staffing plans so when issues come up on any given bill they would have staff to work on behalf of one business unit and other staff that could work separately on another unit.

Committee Chair Gee asked if there is ever a situation where a neighboring transit agency and the District are on a different alignment and Holland & Knight is representing both agencies. Mr. Murphy said it could happen, but is unlikely.

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

Adjourned: 2:45 p.m.
TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

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

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

SIGNIFICANCE
Revenues: Total Revenues (page 1, line 13) are on target compared to revised budget. Passenger Fares (page 1, line 1) are worse than budget by $249,417 or 2.8 percent and Local TDA and STA (page 1, line 2) are worse than budget by $34,500 or 0.2 percent offset by Investment Interest (page 1, line 8) which is $103,134 or 10.8 percent better than budget. Other Interest, Rent, & Other Income (page 1, line 10) are better than budget by $172,787 or 6 percent.

Expenses: Total Expenses (page 4, line 73) are $4,411,451 or 6.6 percent better than revised budget. Within Total Expenses, Total Motor Bus (page 3, line 46) is better than budget by $3,675,264 or 7.4 percent, Total ADA Programs (page 4, line 55) are better than budget by $708,488 or 9.5 percent and Total Multimodal (page 4, line 71) is better than budget by $27,699 or 0.3 percent.

A revised copy of the accepted Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the period ending November 30, 2012 is also attached for your reference. Line 21 on page 1 has been changed to reflect the correct revised budget of $6,289,914.

BUDGET IMPACT
There are no budget revisions for the month of December 2012.

Prepared By: Jeannie Chen, Senior Accountant 650-508-6259
Sheila Tioyao, Manager, General Ledger 650-508-7752
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### SUMMARY OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES
#### FISCAL YEAR 2013
##### DECEMBER 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>REVISED ACTUAL</th>
<th>% REV APPROVED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV REVISED BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Passenger Fares</td>
<td>1,333,423</td>
<td>8,790,392</td>
<td>8,716,983</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>17,932,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Local TDA and STA Funds</td>
<td>3,179,577</td>
<td>27,415,761</td>
<td>19,180,962</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>35,492,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Measure A and AB434 Funds</td>
<td>1,156,767</td>
<td>4,824,783</td>
<td>4,593,395</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8,354,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Operating Revenues</td>
<td>6,279,195</td>
<td>41,175,015</td>
<td>35,442,209</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>72,504,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td>9,254,789</td>
<td>33,463,768</td>
<td>35,968,722</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Investment Interest</td>
<td>171,682</td>
<td>1,305,846</td>
<td>1,058,392</td>
<td>955,258</td>
<td>110.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pass through to Other Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>181,790</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other Interest, Rent &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>503,068</td>
<td>2,323,446</td>
<td>3,067,031</td>
<td>2,894,244</td>
<td>106.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other Sources</td>
<td>248,659</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,188,248</td>
<td>5,188,248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Other Revenues</td>
<td>10,178,198</td>
<td>37,274,851</td>
<td>45,288,244</td>
<td>45,012,322</td>
<td>100.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>16,457,393</td>
<td>78,449,866</td>
<td>80,730,452</td>
<td>80,738,448</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assistance</td>
<td>870,624</td>
<td>1,009,675</td>
<td>2,445,810</td>
<td>2,445,810</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves Programmed for Capital</td>
<td>299,870</td>
<td>1,871,776</td>
<td>2,797,119</td>
<td>2,797,119</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues - All Sources</td>
<td>17,627,887</td>
<td>81,331,317</td>
<td>85,973,381</td>
<td>85,981,377</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Uses of Funds | | | | | |
| Operations | | | | | |
| 21. A. D. A. Programs | 1,104,711 | 6,734,326 | 7,442,814 | 90.5 | 14,477,220 | 14,477,220 |
| 22. Caltrain | 989,037 | 8,065,778 | 8,065,778 | 100.0 | 14,000,000 | 14,000,000 |
| 23. Other Multimodal Programs | 248,659 | 1,481,581 | 1,599,280 | 98.2 | 3,015,460 | 3,015,460 |
| Subtotal - Operating Costs | 10,886,393 | 62,324,684 | 66,736,135 | 93.4 | 131,233,388 | 131,273,388 |
| Other Uses of Funds | | | | | |
| 26. Pass through to Other Agencies | 0 | 5,850 | 5,850 | 5,850 | 100.0 | 467,959 | 467,959 |
| 27. Transfer Out to Debt Service | 2,037,787 | 12,226,721 | 12,226,721 | 100.0 | 24,543,463 | 24,543,463 |
| 28. Fiscal Agent Fees | 0 | 11,455 | 12,485 | 91.8 | 29,600 | 29,600 |
| 29. Land Transfer Interest Expense | 0 | 0 | 66,570 | 66,570 | 0.0 | 66,570 | 66,570 |
| Subtotal - Other Uses | 2,037,787 | 12,226,721 | 12,245,056 | 100.0 | 25,017,592 | 25,017,592 |
| Capital Programs | 1,235,835 | 5,689,442 | 5,689,442 | 100.0 | 76,023,741 | 76,023,741 |
| Total Uses of Funds | 13,960,015 | 80,258,152 | 84,670,633 | 94.8 | 224,212,325 | 224,212,325 |
| Net Surplus / (Deficit) | 3,667,872 | 4,259,678 | 5,715,229 | 1,310,744 | 436.0 | (10,560,808) | (7,691,778) |

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

Note A - The Revised Budget includes the year end rollover of existing capital projects (Audited).
### Operating Revenues - Motor Bus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MOTOR BUS FARES</td>
<td>1,274,988</td>
<td>8,400,278</td>
<td>8,330,327</td>
<td>8,568,500</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>17,137,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local (TDA) Transit Fund:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL OPERATING ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>2,638,690</td>
<td>22,841,688</td>
<td>15,901,138</td>
<td>15,935,638</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>29,121,548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Transit Assistance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL STA Operating Assistance</td>
<td>367,979</td>
<td>514,548</td>
<td>2,207,876</td>
<td>2,207,876</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4,415,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Grants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OPERATING GRANTS</td>
<td>550,764</td>
<td>2,724,555</td>
<td>2,724,555</td>
<td>2,724,555</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9,725,142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL OPERATING ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>3,084,009</td>
<td>10,151,987</td>
<td>13,996,808</td>
<td>17,638,768</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>34,646,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Investment Interest Income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT INTEREST INCOME</td>
<td>90,952</td>
<td>833,265</td>
<td>784,200</td>
<td>784,200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>966,720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Revenue Sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OTHER REVENUES</td>
<td>247,643</td>
<td>1,534,481</td>
<td>1,361,694</td>
<td>1,361,694</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>2,733,608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Motor Bus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MOTOR BUS</td>
<td>8,346,450</td>
<td>46,491,826</td>
<td>46,042,999</td>
<td>49,718,263</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>99,740,708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADA Programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PASSENGER FARES Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>58,435</td>
<td>390,114</td>
<td>386,657</td>
<td>397,900</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>795,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multimodal Transit Programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTHER SOURCES - Caltrain</td>
<td>248,659</td>
<td>3,652,508</td>
<td>5,188,248</td>
<td>5,188,248</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total ADA Programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ADA PROGRAMS</td>
<td>1,104,711</td>
<td>6,539,271</td>
<td>6,734,326</td>
<td>7,442,814</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>14,477,220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Revenues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>10,686,393</td>
<td>61,348,259</td>
<td>62,324,684</td>
<td>66,736,135</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>131,233,388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

## Operating Expenses

**Fiscal Year 2013**  
**December 2012**

### % of Year Elapsed: **50.0%**

### Expenses

#### Current Actual  
#### Prior Actual  
#### Current Actual  
#### Revised Budget  
#### % Rev  
#### Approved Budget  
#### Revised Budget  
#### % Rev

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>District Operated Buses</th>
<th>Contracted Bus Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Wages & Benefits | 4,801,968 | 25,181,844 | 24,400,420 | 25,047,047 | 97.4 | 50,244,115 | 50,006,020 | 48.8 | 1  
| Board of Directors | 3,645 | 25,060 | 24,400,420 | 24,400,420 | 48.8 | 1  
| Contracted Vehicle Maintenance | 30,874 | 458,193 | 204,402 | 395,564 | 51.7 | 791,128 | 791,128 | 25.8 | 5  
| Property Maintenance | 81,443 | 564,331 | 575,855 | 627,250 | 91.8 | 1,258,500 | 1,258,500 | 45.8 | 6  
| Professional Services | 187,961 | 1,949,397 | 2,126,216 | 1,341,763 | 60.1 | 4,829,402 | 5,001,968 | 42.8 | 7  
| Other Services | 66,550 | 144,940 | 268,605 | 638,533 | 42.1 | 1,277,066 | 1,277,066 | 21.0 | 9  
| Materials & Supply: | 421,682 | 2,767,454 | 2,723,266 | 3,275,743 | 83.1 | 6,551,477 | 6,551,477 | 41.6 | 12  
| Fuel & Lubricants | 421,682 | 2,767,454 | 2,723,266 | 3,275,743 | 83.1 | 6,551,477 | 6,551,477 | 41.6 | 12  
| Bus Parts & Materials | 130,720 | 741,408 | 854,223 | 870,572 | 98.1 | 1,758,740 | 1,758,740 | 48.6 | 13  
| Uniforms & Driver Expense | 13,347 | 77,709 | 67,819 | 110,675 | 61.3 | 400,970 | 400,970 | 16.9 | 14  
| Timetables & Tickets | 3,764 | 52,947 | 65,594 | 85,900 | 76.4 | 171,800 | 171,800 | 38.2 | 15  
| Office Supplies / Printing | 18,092 | 77,810 | 104,412 | 174,763 | 59.7 | 342,137 | 342,137 | 30.5 | 16  
| Other Materials & Supply | 12,801 | 55,022 | 62,554 | 79,000 | 79.2 | 156,500 | 156,500 | 40.0 | 17  
| Utilities: | 33,911 | 164,862 | 172,620 | 290,250 | 59.5 | 580,500 | 580,500 | 29.7 | 20  
| Telephone | 33,911 | 164,862 | 172,620 | 290,250 | 59.5 | 580,500 | 580,500 | 29.7 | 20  
| Other Utilities | 65,576 | 517,897 | 498,713 | 498,800 | 101.6 | 981,600 | 981,600 | 50.8 | 21  
| Insurance Costs | 223,467 | 1,247,220 | 1,323,249 | 1,323,250 | 100.0 | 2,647,000 | 2,647,000 | 50.0 | 22  
| Workers’ Compensation | 91,426 | 553,026 | 514,548 | 497,032 | 103.5 | 994,064 | 994,064 | 51.8 | 25  
| Taxes & License Fees | 42,105 | 243,525 | 246,026 | 286,912 | 85.7 | 573,823 | 573,823 | 42.9 | 24  
| Fixed Route Accessibility | 1,240,873 | 7,333,791 | 7,458,917 | 7,529,660 | 99.1 | 15,059,320 | 15,059,320 | 49.5 | 35  
| Contracted Urban Bus Service | 33,035 | 163,626 | 185,221 | 180,800 | 102.4 | 361,600 | 361,600 | 51.2 | 36  
| Insurance Costs | 51,794 | 326,324 | 317,210 | 327,486 | 96.9 | 655,000 | 655,000 | 51.9 | 35  
| Coastsline Services | 60,299 | 319,787 | 337,512 | 323,510 | 104.3 | 647,020 | 647,020 | 52.2 | 38  
| Redi Coast Non-ADA | 18,475 | 106,588 | 120,530 | 109,850 | 109.7 | 219,700 | 219,700 | 54.9 | 39  
| Other Related Costs | 3,152 | 11,071 | 13,222 | 23,520 | 56.2 | 47,040 | 47,040 | 28.1 | 40  
| La Honda - Pescadero | 3,488 | 25,060 | 25,000 | 26,250 | 96.0 | 52,500 | 52,500 | 48.0 | 41  
| SamCoast - Pescadero | 13,906 | 71,101 | 70,248 | 70,000 | 100.4 | 140,000 | 140,000 | 50.2 | 42  
| Other Related Cost - SamCoast | 3,427 | 7,378 | 10,773 | 7,090 | 152.0 | 14,180 | 14,180 | 76.0 | 43  
| Total Contracted Bus Service | 1,428,448 | 8,367,754 | 8,538,833 | 8,598,166 | 99.3 | 17,196,360 | 17,196,360 | 49.7 | 44  
| Total Motor Bus | 8,346,451 | 46,491,826 | 46,042,999 | 49,718,263 | 92.6 | 99,740,708 | 99,780,708 | 46.1 | 45  

*% 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>PRIOR</td>
<td>CURRENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>American Disability Act Programs</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled/Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>458,504</td>
<td>2,553,345</td>
<td>2,823,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>212,172</td>
<td>1,053,820</td>
<td>1,202,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Sedan Service</td>
<td>256,734</td>
<td>1,466,403</td>
<td>1,437,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>ADA Accessibility Support</td>
<td>46,219</td>
<td>385,348</td>
<td>385,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Coastside ADA Support</td>
<td>88,658</td>
<td>668,948</td>
<td>627,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>42,424</td>
<td>411,407</td>
<td>256,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Total ADA Programs</td>
<td>1,104,711</td>
<td>6,539,271</td>
<td>6,734,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multimodal Transit Programs</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Peninsula Rail Service</td>
<td>989,037</td>
<td>6,330,620</td>
<td>8,065,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Total Caltrain Service</td>
<td>989,037</td>
<td>6,330,620</td>
<td>8,065,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Support</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Dumbarton Express Service</td>
<td>12,207</td>
<td>61,865</td>
<td>73,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>SamTrans Shuttle Service</td>
<td>225,234</td>
<td>1,166,318</td>
<td>1,350,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>SM/Caltrain Shuttles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>697,315</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Maintenance Multimodal Facilities</td>
<td>8,755</td>
<td>61,044</td>
<td>57,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Total Other Support</td>
<td>246,195</td>
<td>1,986,542</td>
<td>1,481,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Total Multi-Modal Programs</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>10,686,393</td>
<td>61,348,259</td>
<td>62,324,684</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.
### Monthly Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>8,304,164</td>
<td>6,857,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>8,267,551</td>
<td>6,845,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>8,278,032</td>
<td>8,215,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>8,276,987</td>
<td>7,877,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>8,264,467</td>
<td>7,899,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>8,327,061</td>
<td>8,346,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cumulative Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>8,304,164</td>
<td>6,857,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>16,571,715</td>
<td>13,703,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>24,849,748</td>
<td>21,919,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>33,126,734</td>
<td>29,797,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>41,391,201</td>
<td>37,696,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>49,718,263</td>
<td>46,042,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variance - F(U)</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>1,446,741</td>
<td>17.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>2,868,389</td>
<td>17.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>2,930,577</td>
<td>11.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>3,329,603</td>
<td>10.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>3,694,653</td>
<td>8.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>3,675,264</td>
<td>7.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1,197,315</td>
<td>1,036,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>1,195,900</td>
<td>1,205,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>1,195,900</td>
<td>1,261,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>1,195,900</td>
<td>1,004,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>1,504,900</td>
<td>1,122,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
<td>1,104,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cumulative Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1,197,315</td>
<td>1,036,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>2,393,215</td>
<td>2,241,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>3,589,115</td>
<td>3,502,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>4,785,014</td>
<td>4,506,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>6,289,914</td>
<td>5,629,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>7,442,814</td>
<td>6,734,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
<td>1,152,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Variance - F(U)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>160,913</td>
<td>13.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>151,551</td>
<td>6.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>86,425</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>278,047</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>660,299</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>708,488</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></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
MULTIMODAL MONTHLY EXPENSES - BUDGET VS ACTUAL
FISCAL YEAR 2013

### 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>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>3,371,623</td>
<td>1,240,067</td>
<td>1,243,167</td>
<td>1,240,067</td>
<td>1,240,067</td>
<td>1,240,067</td>
<td>1,240,067</td>
<td>1,240,067</td>
<td>1,240,067</td>
<td>1,240,067</td>
<td>1,240,067</td>
<td>1,240,067</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>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>3,371,623</td>
<td>4,611,690</td>
<td>5,854,857</td>
<td>7,094,924</td>
<td>8,334,991</td>
<td>9,575,058</td>
<td>9,575,058</td>
<td>9,575,058</td>
<td>9,575,058</td>
<td>9,575,058</td>
<td>9,575,058</td>
<td>9,575,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>3,367,131</td>
<td>4,608,042</td>
<td>5,843,965</td>
<td>7,081,339</td>
<td>8,312,127</td>
<td>9,547,359</td>
<td>9,547,359</td>
<td>9,547,359</td>
<td>9,547,359</td>
<td>9,547,359</td>
<td>9,547,359</td>
<td>9,547,359</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>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variance %</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### INTEREST ON INVESTMENTS
#### December 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL INVESTMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVABLE</th>
<th>INTEREST EARNED</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVED</th>
<th>ADJ. INTEREST</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-31-12</td>
<td>150,913.50</td>
<td>11-30-12</td>
<td>3,954.00</td>
<td>988.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,942.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF -- CAPITAL PROJ</td>
<td>7,949,542.49</td>
<td>LAIF</td>
<td>4,411.62</td>
<td>2,201.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,612.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REIMB SECURITIES -- L76R</td>
<td>82,088,029.44</td>
<td>REIMB FUNDS</td>
<td>219,943.97</td>
<td>90,276.89</td>
<td>34,285.00</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>275,943.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF -- REIMB FUNDS L76R</td>
<td>13,852,129.53</td>
<td>LAIF</td>
<td>1,733.07</td>
<td>3,656.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,389.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARATRANSIT FUNDS</td>
<td>26,342,070.10</td>
<td>PARATRANSIT</td>
<td>118,839.14</td>
<td>36,162.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(25.65)</td>
<td>154,975.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF -- PARATRANSIT</td>
<td>510,115.35</td>
<td>BANK OF AMERICA</td>
<td>267.04</td>
<td>141.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>408.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service Reserves</td>
<td>4,741,721.46</td>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held by Trustee:</td>
<td>8,916,955.71</td>
<td>Held by Trustee:</td>
<td>1,423.12</td>
<td>711.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,134.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER 2012 -- SUMMARY OF INTEREST &amp; CAPITAL GAIN</td>
<td>144,551,477.58</td>
<td>DECEMBER 2012 -- SUMMARY OF INTEREST &amp; CAPITAL GAIN</td>
<td>350,571.96</td>
<td>134,138.03</td>
<td>34,285.00</td>
<td>(18.23)</td>
<td>450,406.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- **Interest Earned 12/31/12**: 134,119.80
- **Add**: 0.00
- **Less**: (8,101.66)
- **Capital Gain(Loss)**: 456.41
- **Total Interest & Capital Gain(Loss)**: 126,474.55

### YEAR TO DATE -- SUMMARY

- **Interest Earned**: 842,797.43
- **Add**: 0.00
- **Less**: (48,607.21)
- **Capital Gain(Loss)**: 255,243.11
- **Total Interest & Capital Gain(Loss)**: 1,058,433.33

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

- Interest Acct. 409100: 41.95
- Interest Acct. 409102: 4,262.92
- Interest Acct. 409101: 798,885.35
- Gain(Loss) Acct. 405210: 255,243.11

**Total**: 1,058,433.33
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SECURITY</th>
<th>CUSIP #</th>
<th>ORIGINAL PURCHASE DATE</th>
<th>ORIGINAL PURCHASE PRICE</th>
<th>ORIGINAL ADJUSTED VALUE</th>
<th>ORIGINAL MATURITY DATE</th>
<th>ORIGINAL INT RATE/ADJ.</th>
<th>ORIGINAL APPL. VALUE</th>
<th>ORIGINAL RECEIVED VALUE</th>
<th>ORIGINAL PAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENT BONDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC 3134G3AC4</td>
<td>12-6-11</td>
<td>4,990,725.00</td>
<td>5,001,000.00</td>
<td>5,000,050.00</td>
<td>12-06-13</td>
<td>0.600%</td>
<td>83,333.33</td>
<td>14,583.33</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC 3134G2WG3</td>
<td>2-15-12</td>
<td>9,686,651.75</td>
<td>9,683,651.10</td>
<td>9,693,843.00</td>
<td>09-22-14</td>
<td>0.750%</td>
<td>200,312.50</td>
<td>13,821.57</td>
<td>16,099.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA 3135G0LX9</td>
<td>6-28-12</td>
<td>2,000,600.00</td>
<td>2,002,580.00</td>
<td>2,006,640.00</td>
<td>06-26-15</td>
<td>0.700%</td>
<td>38,888.89</td>
<td>6,027.78</td>
<td>1,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC 3134G3SD3</td>
<td>03-28-12</td>
<td>9,996,000.00</td>
<td>10,052,200.00</td>
<td>10,063,300.00</td>
<td>09-28-15</td>
<td>0.750%</td>
<td>208,333.33</td>
<td>13,125.00</td>
<td>6,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA 3136G0EJ6</td>
<td>5-03-12</td>
<td>4,990,437.50</td>
<td>5,009,700.00</td>
<td>5,010,450.00</td>
<td>10-30-15</td>
<td>0.750%</td>
<td>104,166.77</td>
<td>3,229.17</td>
<td>3,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC 3134G0UV0</td>
<td>5-23-12</td>
<td>5,000,000.00</td>
<td>5,001,550.00</td>
<td>5,007,900.00</td>
<td>11-23-15</td>
<td>0.750%</td>
<td>104,166.77</td>
<td>833.33</td>
<td>3,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC 3135G0LM3</td>
<td>5-25-12</td>
<td>9,997,000.00</td>
<td>9,998,600.00</td>
<td>10,019,500.00</td>
<td>11-24-15</td>
<td>0.750%</td>
<td>208,333.33</td>
<td>1,458.33</td>
<td>6,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA 3135G0MB6</td>
<td>6-28-12</td>
<td>2,999,250.00</td>
<td>2,999,460.00</td>
<td>3,001,110.00</td>
<td>12-28-15</td>
<td>0.750%</td>
<td>62,500.00</td>
<td>9,562.50</td>
<td>1,687.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC 3134G3Y20</td>
<td>12-28-12</td>
<td>5,000,500.00</td>
<td>5,001,550.00</td>
<td>5,006,300.00</td>
<td>11-27-15</td>
<td>0.500%</td>
<td>69,444.44</td>
<td>2,152.78</td>
<td>208.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA 3135G0RX3</td>
<td>12-07-12</td>
<td>7,005,250.00</td>
<td>7,006,930.00</td>
<td>7,006,930.00</td>
<td>11-27-15</td>
<td>0.500%</td>
<td>97,222.22</td>
<td>972.22</td>
<td>2,333.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FED. FARM CREDIT BK 31331H5L7</td>
<td>5-11-07</td>
<td>1,020,404.50</td>
<td>1,128,923.00</td>
<td>1,110,673.50</td>
<td>12-28-15</td>
<td>6.125%</td>
<td>161,631.99</td>
<td>24,568.06</td>
<td>4,848.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC 3134G3SE1</td>
<td>03-21-12</td>
<td>8,505,312.50</td>
<td>8,545,475.00</td>
<td>8,564,600.00</td>
<td>03-21-16</td>
<td>1.000%</td>
<td>236,111.11</td>
<td>16,527.78</td>
<td>7,083.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA 3135G0CA0</td>
<td>5-3-12</td>
<td>8,084,744.20</td>
<td>8,094,984.00</td>
<td>8,082,809.80</td>
<td>04-26-16</td>
<td>1.125%</td>
<td>251,875.00</td>
<td>8,815.63</td>
<td>7,556.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLATERIZED MORTGAGE OBLIGATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC 3134G35E1</td>
<td>03-21-12</td>
<td>8,505,312.50</td>
<td>8,545,475.00</td>
<td>8,564,600.00</td>
<td>03-21-16</td>
<td>1.000%</td>
<td>236,111.11</td>
<td>16,527.78</td>
<td>7,083.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA 3135G0MB6</td>
<td>6-28-12</td>
<td>2,999,250.00</td>
<td>2,999,460.00</td>
<td>3,001,110.00</td>
<td>12-28-15</td>
<td>0.750%</td>
<td>62,500.00</td>
<td>9,562.50</td>
<td>1,687.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TREASURY INFLATION PROTECTED SECURITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREAS INFLATION INDEX 912828KM1</td>
<td>01-21-10</td>
<td>3,737,186.68</td>
<td>3,928,130.97</td>
<td>3,943,933.14</td>
<td>04-15-14</td>
<td>1.250%</td>
<td>132,832.33</td>
<td>6,176.88</td>
<td>3,984.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH INVESTMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH INVESTMENT</td>
<td>12-31-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LAIF 00-0606Y  | 8-29-08  | 0.00                   | 0.00                    | 0.00                    | 12-28-12               | 5.270%                 | 34,500.00          | 103.50                 | 931.50      |

**TOTAL** 81,348,486.13 82,200,475.47 82,088,029.44 7.42 275,943.28 91,450,571
## RESERVE FOR CAPITAL PROJECTS -- INTEREST ON SECURITIES

**December 31, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SECURITY</th>
<th>CUSIP #</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>06-30-12</th>
<th>12-31-12</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>DAYS</th>
<th>11-30-12</th>
<th>12-31-12</th>
<th>12-31-12</th>
<th>ADJ.</th>
<th>12-31-12</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT BONDS</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING URBAN DEVEL</td>
<td>911759EB0</td>
<td>12-23-08</td>
<td>155,581.50</td>
<td>150,844.50</td>
<td>150,913.50</td>
<td>08-01-17</td>
<td>7.908%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>950.0</td>
<td>3,954.00</td>
<td>988.50</td>
<td>4,942.50</td>
<td>4,942.50</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,949,542.49</td>
<td>7,949,542.49</td>
<td>7,949,542.49</td>
<td>08-01-17</td>
<td>7.908%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>950.0</td>
<td>4,411.62</td>
<td>2,201.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,612.66</td>
<td>7,949,542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATURD/CALLED</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LAIF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,949,542.49</td>
<td>7,949,542.49</td>
<td>7,949,542.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL A/C 121100 &amp; 112010</td>
<td></td>
<td>155,381.50</td>
<td>150,844.50</td>
<td>150,913.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,954.00</td>
<td>988.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,942.50</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155,581.50</td>
<td>150,844.50</td>
<td>150,913.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,954.00</td>
<td>988.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,942.50</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11-Jan-13
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SECURITY</th>
<th>CUSIP #</th>
<th>DATE SETTLE</th>
<th>PURCHASE PRICE</th>
<th>ADJUSTED VALUE</th>
<th>MARKET DATE</th>
<th>MARKET RATE/</th>
<th>INT RATE</th>
<th>ADJUSTED INT RATE APPL.</th>
<th>RECEIVABLE 11-30-12</th>
<th>RECEIVED 12-31-12</th>
<th>APPL. RECEIVED 12-31-12</th>
<th>ADJ RECEIVED 12-31-12</th>
<th>VALUE 12-31-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT BONDS</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>3137EABY6</td>
<td>1-30-09</td>
<td>5,015,200.00</td>
<td>5,166,550.00</td>
<td>01-07-14</td>
<td>2.500%</td>
<td>347,222</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>10,416.67</td>
<td>10,416.67</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>60,416.67</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>3137EACH3</td>
<td>3-26-10</td>
<td>2,510,690.00</td>
<td>2,597,375.00</td>
<td>04-23-14</td>
<td>2.500%</td>
<td>173,611</td>
<td>6,597.22</td>
<td>5,208.33</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>11,805.56</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>31398AU34</td>
<td>2-15-12</td>
<td>5,299,150.00</td>
<td>5,256,800.00</td>
<td>07-28-15</td>
<td>2.375%</td>
<td>329,861</td>
<td>40,572.50</td>
<td>9,895.83</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>50,468.75</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHMLC</td>
<td>3134G3SD3</td>
<td>03-28-12</td>
<td>4,998,000.00</td>
<td>5,031,650.00</td>
<td>09-28-15</td>
<td>0.750%</td>
<td>104,166</td>
<td>6,562.50</td>
<td>3,125.00</td>
<td>9,687.50</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHMLC</td>
<td>3134G3SE1</td>
<td>03-21-12</td>
<td>5,501,437.50</td>
<td>5,541,800.00</td>
<td>03-21-16</td>
<td>1.000%</td>
<td>152,778</td>
<td>10,694.44</td>
<td>4,583.33</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>15,277.78</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREASURY INFLATION PROTECTED SECURITIES</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TREAS INFLATION INDEX 91282KMK1</td>
<td>03-26-10</td>
<td>2,639,162.36</td>
<td>2,817,095.10</td>
<td>04-15-14</td>
<td>1.288%</td>
<td>97,764</td>
<td>4,412.06</td>
<td>2,932.94</td>
<td>(25.67)</td>
<td>(7,319.33)</td>
<td>2,732,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH INVESTMENT</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH INVESTMENT</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATURER CALLED</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LAIF</td>
<td>510,115.35</td>
<td>306,030.21</td>
<td>510,115.35</td>
<td>267.04</td>
<td>141.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>408.28</td>
<td>510,115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL A/C 122010</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>25,965,639.86</td>
<td>26,401,257.83</td>
<td>26,342,070.10</td>
<td>118,839.14</td>
<td>36,162.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(25.65)</td>
<td>154,975.59</td>
<td>25,732,551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11-Jan-13
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT  
SUMMARY OF BUDGET ACTIVITY FOR DECEMBER 2012

BUDGET AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Budget Amendments in December 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BUDGET REVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Budget Revisions in December 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Approved Budget</td>
<td>Revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>15,680,000</td>
<td>15,680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>16,615,300</td>
<td>16,615,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>14,665,300</td>
<td>14,665,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>16,039,400</td>
<td>21,540,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012 Total</td>
<td>63,000,000</td>
<td>68,501,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |                 |         | FY2013:      | Date       | Amount   | Over/(Under | Current | Projection |
|                |                 |         |              | Date       | Amount   | Budget/Projection |         |            |
| FY2013:        |                 |         |              |            |          |              |         |            |
| Jul. 12        | 4,360,900       | Sep. 12 | 4,902,300    | 541,400    | 4,902,300 | 541,400  |
| Sep. 12        | 5,810,000       | Nov. 12 | 6,536,400    | 726,400    | 6,536,400 | 6,536,400 |
| 1st Qtr. Adjustment | 1,650,000 | Dec. 12 | 2,174,982    | 524,982    | 2,174,982 | 2,174,982 |
| 3 Months Total | 16,181,800      |         | 18,855,582   | 2,673,782  | 18,855,582 | 18,855,582 |
| Oct. 12        | 4,507,000       | Dec. 12 | 5,197,300    | 690,300    | 5,197,300 | 5,197,300 |
| Nov. 12        | 4,507,000       | Jan. 13 | 690,300      | 5,197,300  | 5,197,300 |
| Dec. 12        | 6,330,000       | Feb. 13 | 6,330,000    |           | 6,330,000  | 6,330,000 |
| 2nd Qtr. Adjustment | 1,740,000 | Mar. 13 | (1,351,461)  | 388,539    | 388,539  |
| 6 Months Total | 33,265,800      |         | 24,052,882   | 2,702,922  | 35,968,722 |
| Jan. 13        | 4,092,500       | Mar. 13 | 4,092,500    |           | 4,092,500  |
| Feb. 13        | 4,092,500       | Apr. 13 | 4,092,500    |           | 4,092,500  |
| Mar. 13        | 5,580,800       | May 13  | 5,580,800    |           | 5,580,800  |
| 3rd Qtr. Adjustment | 1,516,400 | Jun. 13 | (1,351,461)  | 164,939    | 164,939  |
| 9 Months Total | 48,548,000      |         | 24,052,882   | 1,351,461  | 49,899,461 |
| Apr. 13        | 4,442,000       | Jun. 13 | 4,442,000    |           | 4,442,000  |
| May 13         | 4,442,000       | Jul. 13 | 4,442,000    |           | 4,442,000  |
| Jun. 13        | 5,923,000       | Aug. 13 | 5,923,000    |           | 5,923,000  |
| 4th Qtr. Adjustment | 1,645,000 | Sep. 13 | (1,351,461)  | 293,539    | 293,539  |
| FY2013 Total   | 65,000,000      |         | FY2013 Total | 24,052,882 | 0         | 65,000,000 |

| 18,855,582 | 1st Quarter         |
| 17,113,139 | 2nd Quarter         |
| 3rd Quarter |
| 4th Quarter |

| 35,968,722 | YTD Actual Per Statement of Revenues & Expenses |
# Statement of Revenues and Expenses

## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### SUMMARY OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES
#### FISCAL YEAR 2013
##### NOVEMBER 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT TO-DATE</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>APPROVED REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED: 41.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### SOURCES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Description</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>Prior Actual</th>
<th>Current To-Date</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>% Rev Budget</th>
<th>Approved Revised Budget</th>
<th>% Rev Budget</th>
<th>% of Year Elapsed: 41.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares</td>
<td>1,488,322</td>
<td>7,318,932</td>
<td>7,383,561</td>
<td>7,472,000</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>17,932,800</td>
<td>17,932,800</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TDA and STA Funds</td>
<td>3,179,577</td>
<td>23,336,355</td>
<td>15,066,885</td>
<td>15,984,135</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>35,492,900</td>
<td>38,361,930</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Federal Operating Grants</td>
<td>555,498</td>
<td>122,523</td>
<td>2,375,940</td>
<td>2,375,940</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10,724,485</td>
<td>10,764,485</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A and AB434 Funds</td>
<td>621,020</td>
<td>3,732,771</td>
<td>3,456,628</td>
<td>3,456,628</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>8,354,400</td>
<td>8,354,400</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Operating Revenues</td>
<td>5,844,417</td>
<td>34,510,581</td>
<td>29,163,014</td>
<td>29,248,702</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>72,504,585</td>
<td>75,413,615</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td>4,790,633</td>
<td>25,495,467</td>
<td>26,713,933</td>
<td>26,713,933</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65,000,000</td>
<td>65,000,000</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Interest</td>
<td>133,982</td>
<td>1,092,670</td>
<td>886,710</td>
<td>900,458</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>1,243,920</td>
<td>1,243,920</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass through to Other Agencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>181,790</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>467,959</td>
<td>467,959</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Interest, Rent &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>524,418</td>
<td>1,922,541</td>
<td>2,563,963</td>
<td>2,411,870</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>6,023,708</td>
<td>6,023,708</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Other Revenues</td>
<td>6,054,857</td>
<td>28,692,468</td>
<td>35,110,045</td>
<td>34,971,720</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>81,535,587</td>
<td>81,535,587</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>11,899,274</td>
<td>63,283,049</td>
<td>64,273,859</td>
<td>64,240,403</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>154,040,172</td>
<td>156,949,202</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assistance</td>
<td>1,231,969</td>
<td>392,487</td>
<td>1,575,186</td>
<td>1,575,186</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32,297,067</td>
<td>54,352,487</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Programmed for Capital</td>
<td>620,283</td>
<td>1,783,024</td>
<td>2,497,249</td>
<td>2,497,249</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>525,780</td>
<td>13,321,254</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues - All Sources</td>
<td>13,751,536</td>
<td>65,286,560</td>
<td>68,345,494</td>
<td>68,312,838</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>186,863,019</td>
<td>224,622,943</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### USES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Description</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>Prior Actual</th>
<th>Current To-Date</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>% Rev Budget</th>
<th>Approved Revised Budget</th>
<th>% Rev Budget</th>
<th>% of Year Elapsed: 41.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Bus</td>
<td>7,899,417</td>
<td>39,057,146</td>
<td>37,696,548</td>
<td>41,391,201</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>99,740,708</td>
<td>99,780,708</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. A. Programs</td>
<td>1,122,648</td>
<td>5,338,805</td>
<td>5,629,615</td>
<td>6,289,914</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>14,477,220</td>
<td>14,477,220</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>989,037</td>
<td>5,615,723</td>
<td>7,076,741</td>
<td>7,076,741</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multimodal Programs</td>
<td>241,721</td>
<td>1,638,618</td>
<td>1,235,386</td>
<td>1,238,250</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>3,015,460</td>
<td>3,015,460</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Operating Costs</td>
<td>10,252,853</td>
<td>51,650,292</td>
<td>51,628,290</td>
<td>50,016,106</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>131,252,388</td>
<td>131,278,388</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Transfer Interest Expense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>181,790</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>467,959</td>
<td>467,959</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses of Funds</td>
<td>2,042,692</td>
<td>10,377,110</td>
<td>10,206,239</td>
<td>10,207,269</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>25,017,592</td>
<td>25,017,592</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Programs</td>
<td>1,973,829</td>
<td>2,452,529</td>
<td>4,453,607</td>
<td>4,453,607</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41,172,847</td>
<td>76,023,741</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses of Funds</td>
<td>14,269,374</td>
<td>64,479,931</td>
<td>66,298,137</td>
<td>70,676,982</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>197,425,827</td>
<td>232,314,721</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| NET SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)               | (517,838)      | 818,629      | 2,047,357       | (12,364,144)   | (86.6)      | (10,560,808)            | (7,691,778) | (26.6)                   |

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

Note A - The Revised Budget includes the year end rollover of existing capital projects (unaudited).
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

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

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board accept and enter into the record the Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review and Outlook for the quarter ended December 31, 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 January 22, 2013 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 Senate Bill 564 (1995). The District has the ability to meet its expenditure requirements for the next six months.
Market Review and Outlook
Interest rates rose modestly in the last quarter of the year as the markets turned their attention first to the election and then to the looming fiscal cliff. Despite the uncertainty generated by a strongly divided Congress, consumers remained optimistic and the economy experienced solid although modest growth.

Notable during the quarter were several announcements by the Federal Reserve (the Fed) regarding monetary policy. These included additional stimulative measures designed to keep interest rates artificially low and to increase the supply of money making its way through the economy. It remains to be seen how these measures will affect the economy. The Fed also shared with investors the levels of inflation and unemployment that might trigger a change in policy to raise interest rates. Many economists have interpreted these announcements as the Fed’s recently skewed preference for lower levels of unemployment and a willingness to tolerate higher levels of inflation.

Looking forward, our policy makers have their work cut out for them over the next several months. While a last minute compromise on tax rates may have averted the country from going over the fiscal cliff, we are now headed for a fiscal wall. That wall is the upcoming debate on the country’s debt ceiling and spending policy. The stakes here are exceptionally high. Under a worst case scenario, a failure to raise the debt ceiling could lead to a temporary shutdown of the government, a possible temporary default on US government debt and most certainly another ratings downgrade on U.S. Treasuries. While this scenario is highly unlikely, the exceptionally fractured state of our political system today is reason for continued caution.

If there is a silver lining in our current predicament, it is the sound economic fundamentals that exist for fostering continued growth. Recent improvements in the
housing sector coupled with high profit margins and lower energy costs create a favorable backdrop for job growth and increased spending. Unfortunately, a first step to any sustained meaningful improvement in the economy is the removal of the uncertainty created by our current fiscal policy. The optimists among us recognize that the current wrangling over deficit reduction and the debt ceiling will likely be behind us by spring. The pessimists, however, are more concerned with how we get from here to there in the meantime.

**Strategy**

Over the foreseeable future CSI expects interest rates to remain flat or 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 month, the District’s consolidated portfolios consisted of approximately 93.8 percent Agency Securities and 6.2 percent US Treasury Securities; see Exhibit 5.

**Budget Impact**

The portfolio’s performance is reported on a total economic return basis. This method includes the coupon interest, amortization of discounts and premiums, capital gains and losses and price changes (i.e., unrealized gains and losses). For the quarter ending December 31, the General Fund portfolio returned 0.17 percent. This compares to the benchmark return of 0.11 percent. Over this same time period, the Paratransit Fund portfolio returned 0.19 percent. This compares to the benchmark return of -0.02 percent.

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

The consolidated portfolio’s yield to maturity, the return the portfolio will earn in the future if all securities are held to maturity is also reported. This calculation is based on the current market value of the portfolio including unrealized gains and losses. For the quarter ending December 31, the portfolio’s yield to maturity or call was 0.45 percent. The General Fund benchmark’s yield to maturity was 0.50 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 1.42 percent.

Prepared by: Lori Snow, Manager Finance Treasury

650-508-6425
### FUNDS MANAGED BY SUNTRUST BANK/CSI GROUP

#### INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO:

<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>GOVERNMENT BONDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>03-08-13</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
<td>8,317,029</td>
<td>8,575,990</td>
<td>133,403</td>
<td>8,709,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC</td>
<td>09-22-14</td>
<td>9,615,000</td>
<td>9,686,632</td>
<td>9,693,843</td>
<td>19,831</td>
<td>9,713,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC</td>
<td>09-28-15</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>9,996,000</td>
<td>10,063,300</td>
<td>19,375</td>
<td>10,082,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>10-30-15</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,998,438</td>
<td>5,010,450</td>
<td>6,354</td>
<td>5,016,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC</td>
<td>11-23-15</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,009,700</td>
<td>3,958</td>
<td>5,013,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC</td>
<td>11-24-15</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>9,997,000</td>
<td>10,019,500</td>
<td>7,708</td>
<td>10,027,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC</td>
<td>11-27-15</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,500</td>
<td>5,006,300</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>5,008,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>11-27-15</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>7,005,250</td>
<td>7,006,930</td>
<td>3,306</td>
<td>7,010,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FED. FARM CREDIT BK</td>
<td>12-29-15</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>1,020,405</td>
<td>1,110,674</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1,110,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC</td>
<td>03-21-16</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
<td>8,505,313</td>
<td>8,564,600</td>
<td>23,611</td>
<td>8,588,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>04-26-16</td>
<td>8,060,000</td>
<td>8,084,744</td>
<td>8,082,810</td>
<td>16,372</td>
<td>8,099,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Urban Develop</td>
<td>08-01-17</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>155,582</td>
<td>150,914</td>
<td>4,943</td>
<td>155,856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TREASURY INFLATION PROTECTED SECURITIES

| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

<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>
</table>

#### TOTAL INVESTMENT FUNDS PORTFOLIO MANAGED BY SUNTRUST BANK/CSI GROUP

| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

### PARATRANSIT TRUST FUND PORTFOLIO:

<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>GOVERNMENT BONDS</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>5,119,400</td>
<td>60,417</td>
<td>5,179,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>04-23-14</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>2,510,690</td>
<td>2,575,325</td>
<td>11,806</td>
<td>2,587,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA Step Up</td>
<td>01-27-16</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,299,150</td>
<td>5,256,800</td>
<td>50,469</td>
<td>5,307,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>09-28-15</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,998,000</td>
<td>5,031,650</td>
<td>9,688</td>
<td>5,041,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLM</td>
<td>03-21-16</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>5,503,438</td>
<td>5,541,800</td>
<td>15,278</td>
<td>5,557,078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### San Mateo County Transit District

**Report of Investments**

*For Quarter Ended December 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>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>2,732,550</td>
<td>2,639,162</td>
<td>2,817,095</td>
<td>7,319</td>
<td>2,824,414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Paratransit Portfolio Managed by Suntrust Bank/CSI Group**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,732,550</td>
<td>25,965,640</td>
<td>26,342,070</td>
<td>154,976</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,497,046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total District Portfolio Managed by Suntrust Bank/CSI Group**

|                                        | 107,333,120      | 107,469,717| 108,580,963     | 406,768      |                  | 108,987,781              |

**Liquidity Funds Managed by District Staff:**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America Checking</td>
<td>4,741,721</td>
<td>4,741,721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,741,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF</td>
<td>22,311,787</td>
<td>22,311,787</td>
<td>12,411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,324,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Funds Managed by District Staff**

|                                      | 27,053,509       | 27,053,509| 12,411          |              |                  | 27,065,920               |

**Trust Funds Managed by Third Party Trustee:**

|                                      |                  |           |                 |              |                  |                          |
| First American Gov't. Oblig. Cl D   | 6,636,927        | 6,636,927 | 6,636,927       | 0            |                  | 6,636,927                |
| Federal National Mortgage Association 03-16-2015 | 2,277,000 | 2,258,546 | 2,280,028       | 2,135        |                  | 2,282,163                |

**Total Funds Managed by Third Party Trustee**

|                                      | 8,913,927        | 8,895,473 | 8,916,956       | 2,135        |                  | 8,919,090                |

**Total as of December 31, 2012**

|                                      | 143,418,699      | 144,551,428| 421,313         |              |                  | 144,972,791              |
EXHIBIT 1

Historical Yield Curve

SamTrans

Data Source: Bloomberg

CSI Capital Management, Inc.
### Monthly Review - Account vs. Benchmark

#### Rolling 24 Months

#### MONTHLY PERFORMANCE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trailing 12 Months</th>
<th>Jan-12</th>
<th>Feb-12</th>
<th>Mar-12</th>
<th>Apr-12</th>
<th>May-12</th>
<th>Jun-12</th>
<th>Jul-12</th>
<th>Aug-12</th>
<th>Sep-12</th>
<th>Oct-12</th>
<th>Nov-12</th>
<th>Dec-12</th>
<th>Trailing 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam Trans - Gen Funds</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>-0.08%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Trans - Paratran</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td>-0.28%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>-0.03%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark - Gen Fund</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>-0.19%</td>
<td>-0.17%</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>-0.03%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>-0.07%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>-0.05%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmark - Paratran</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>-0.64%</td>
<td>-0.80%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>-0.25%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>-0.05%</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>-0.35%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

CSI Capital Management, Inc.
TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board authorize the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the County of San Mateo (County) for San Mateo County Transit District (District) access to the County's 700 MHz simulcast Trunked Radio System (System) and County maintenance and repair services for the District's mobile data radio system.

SIGNIFICANCE
District access to the County's System will provide District radio communications for its fixed-route, paratransit and operations functions, and establish interoperability communication with the County and other regional agencies. The MOU will also ensure periodic maintenance of and timely repairs to District radio equipment. The MOU shall be for a term of 10 years, at a total estimated cost of $3,368,010 over the 10-year term.

BUDGET IMPACT
The cost of the MOU will be funded by approved and projected capital and operating budgets.

BACKGROUND
In 2010, the District performed a study of radio system replacement options for its obsolete voice and data radio system. The study evaluated (1) replacing the system, as it is currently designed, with new equipment; (2) upgrading the system with modern radio technology; and (3) opportunities to partner with other regional agencies to reduce capital and operating costs.

At the time of the study, the County had recently deployed its state-of-the-art System. The District may be added onto the System with minimal capital and operating expenses, as compared to the other options evaluated in the study, when accounting for both capital and operating costs over the 15 plus-year service life required for a new system.

The County also currently maintains the District's radio system and has been an excellent partner in keeping the District's current systems fully functional and properly maintained.

Prepared by: Robert Tam, Manager Technology Research & Development

650-508-7969
RESOLUTION NO. 2013 -

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

*   *   *

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
WITH THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO FOR ACCESS TO THE COUNTY'S TRUNKED RADIO
SYSTEM AND MAINTENANCE OF THE DISTRICT'S RADIO EQUIPMENT

WHEREAS, the County of San Mateo (County) owns a 700 MHz simulcast Trunked
Radio System (System), which benefits the communications needs of public safety and
public service agencies operating in the County; and

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) desires to gain access to
the County's System for the District's fixed route, paratransit, and operations radio
communications and to establish interoperability communication with the County and
other regional agencies; and

WHEREAS, the District also desires that the County’s Information Services
Department perform maintenance and repair services for the District's mobile data
radio system; and

WHEREAS, District staff and Legal Counsel have negotiated a Memorandum Of
Understanding (MOU) with the County for access to the County's System and for
County mobile data radio system maintenance and repair services; and

WHEREAS, the MOU will be funded by the capital and operating budget; and

WHEREAS, staff recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that the
Board authorize execution of the MOU, which shall be for a term of ten years, at a total
estimated cost of $3,368,010 over the ten-year term.

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
Memorandum of Understanding with the County of San Mateo for access to the County's 700 MHz simulcast Trunked Radio System and for County maintenance and repair services for the District's mobile data radio system for a ten-year term, at a total estimated cost of $3,368,010.

Regularly passed and adopted this 13th day of February 2013, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

____________________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

_____________________________
District Secretary
TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2012 - INFORMATION ONLY

ACTION
The San Mateo County Transit District’s (District) Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for Fiscal Year 2012 is attached. No action is required.

SIGNIFICANCE
The CAFR is prepared in accordance with the guidelines set forth by the Government Accounting Standards Board and is organized into four sections – Introductory, Financial, Statistical and Single Audit.

- The Introductory Section includes a Transmittal Letter and provides general information on the District’s structure, personnel, economic outlook and finances.
- The Financial Section includes audited financial statements which provide detailed financial information as well as comparative financial data. The Management Discussion & Analysis (MD&A) is also found in the Financial Section. Along with the Transmittal Letter, the MD&A is of most interest to those looking for a narrative annual review of the District’s finances.
- The Statistical Section provides a broad range of data covering key financial trends including revenue and debt capacity, economic and demographic data and operating information.

Together, all sections of the CAFR provide the detail as well as the perspective with which to assess the District’s financial condition.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact to the Budget.
BACKGROUND

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

The CAFR is prepared and presented to the Government Finance Officers Association for their review, evaluation and to apply for the certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting which the District has received consistently over the last 20 years.

The Fiscal Year 2012 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report is available online at http://www.samtrans.com/about/Finance/Comprehensive_Annual_Financial_Reports.html.

Prepared by: Jeannie Chen, Senior Accountant 650-508-6274
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, FEBRUARY 13, 2013 – 2:40 p.m.
or immediately following previous Committee meeting

ACTION
1. Approval of Minutes of Legislative Committee Meeting of January 9, 2013
2. Approval of 2013 Legislative Program

INFORMATIONAL
3. 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, A. Tissier

Other Board Members Present, Constituting Committee of the Whole: J. Deal, J. Gee, A. Lloyd

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

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

Committee Chair Shirley Harris called the meeting to order at 2:45 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Legislative Committee Meeting of December 12, 2012
The Committee approved the minutes (Deal/Lloyd).

Update on the State and Federal Legislative Program
State
Director, Government and Community Affairs Seamus Murphy said the Legislature convened on Monday and the governor will release his budget on January 10. Staff doesn’t expect any surprises. The passage of Proposition 1A last November took the pressure off a lot of cuts in transit programs and staff expects those programs to be fully funded in the governor’s budget.

Mr. Murphy said the deadline for submitting legislation is February 22 and a matrix of legislation that has already been introduced will be available at the February 13 Board meeting. There are already a couple of bills staff is interested in. The first is reducing from two-thirds to 55 percent the voter approval necessary to pass transportation sales tax measures. This is a bill that gets introduced frequently but this year it actually has a chance to pass because of the composition of the Legislature. The other bill introduced is the extension and reauthorization of the Carl Moyer Program, which is part of the Caltrain Modernization Program funding.

Mr. Murphy said some committee chairs have been named. Senator Jim Beall, D-San Jose, will chair the Transportation Budget Subcommittee and Senator Mark DeSaulnier, D-Walnut Creek, will chair the Transportation and Housing Committee. Assemblyman Rich Gordon, D-Menlo Park, is no longer chairing the Budget Subcommittee on Transportation but is still on the committee. Assemblyman Tom Ammiano, D-San Francisco, will be a member of the Transportation Committee. Senator Jerry Hill was named Democratic Caucus Chair.
Federal
Mr. Murphy said the big news was avoiding the fiscal cliff and it delayed cuts to the New Starts Program. The cuts were delayed for two months. The fiscal cliff bill contained two items for transportation: the restoration of parity to transit pre-tax benefits, which was extended through the end of the year, and the extension of the alternative fuel tax credit through the end of the year.

Adjourned: 2:50 p.m.
ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend Board adoption of the attached legislative program to guide the San Mateo County Transit District’s (District) advocacy efforts in Sacramento and Washington, D.C. over the course of the 2013 calendar year.

SIGNIFICANCE
The 2013 State and Federal Legislative Program establishes the principles that will guide the District’s State and Federal legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts through the first half of the 2013-14 State Legislative session and the 113th Congress. The program is intended to be broad enough to cover the wide variety of issues that are likely to be considered and flexible enough to allow the District, its staff, and its legislative advocates to respond swiftly and effectively to unanticipated developments. Adoption of the program provides our legislative delegation and our transportation partners with a Board-approved statement of the District’s priorities.

The 2013 State and Federal Legislative Program is organized to guide the District’s actions and positions in support of three primary objectives:

1. Maintain and enhance State and Federal funding opportunities to support the District’s programs and services.
2. Seek a regulatory environment that streamlines project delivery and maximizes the District’s ability to meet public transportation service demands.
3. Reinforce and expand programs that build and incentivize public transportation ridership.

The Legislative Program is structured to apply these core objectives to a series of issues, resulting in a set of policy strategies for each.

State Issues:
1. State Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities
2. Transportation Operations and Project Delivery Regulation
3. MAP-21 Implementation
4. Caltrain Modernization and High-Speed Rail

Federal Issues:
1. MAP-21 Implementation
2. Surface Transportation Reauthorization
3. 2014 Appropriations
4. Climate Change and Livability

Should other issues surface that require the District’s attention, actions will be guided by the three policy objectives listed above. If needed, potential action on issues that are unrelated to these policy goals will be brought to the District’s Board of Directors for consideration.

The District and its State and Federal legislative consultants will employ a variety of advocacy tactics to support the 2013 Legislative Program, including:

1. **Direct Advocacy**
   The District will engage policymakers directly and will sponsor legislation, submit correspondence and provide public testimony that communicates and advances our legislative priorities and positions.

2. **Coalition-based Advocacy**
   The District will work to engage local and regional stakeholders to build awareness about specific issues and foster the creation of local coalitions that will advocate on our behalf. The District will coordinate with local, regional, statewide and national coalitions organized to advance positions that are consistent with the 2013 Legislative Program.

3. **Media Advocacy**
   The District will build public awareness and communicate legislative priorities by issuing press releases, organizing media events, and submitting op-ed pieces. The District will engage the broader public in advocacy efforts through the use of social media and other electronic media that facilitate the public’s ability to communicate on The District’s behalf.

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

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

Prepared By: Seamus Murphy, Government and Community Affairs Director 650-508-6388
Purpose

State and Federal legislative and regulatory actions have the potential to offer dramatic benefits to the San Mateo County Transit District’s programs and services. They also have the potential to present serious challenges that threaten the District’s ability to meet San Mateo County’s most critical public transportation demands.

The 2013 State and Federal Legislative Program establishes the principles that will guide the District’s State and Federal legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts through the first half of the 2013-14 State Legislative session and the 113th Congress. The program is intended to be broad enough to cover the wide variety of issues that are likely to be considered during that time and flexible enough to allow the District to respond swiftly and effectively to unanticipated developments.

Federal and State Policy Objectives

The 2013 State and Federal Legislative Program is organized to guide the District’s actions and positions in support of three primary objectives:

1. Maintain and enhance State and Federal funding opportunities to support the District’s programs and services.
2. Seek a regulatory environment that streamlines project delivery and maximizes the District’s ability to meet public transportation service demands.
3. Reinforce and expand programs that build and incentivize public transportation ridership.

Issues

The Legislative Program is structured to apply these core objectives to a series of issues, resulting in a set of policy strategies for each.

State Issues

1. State Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities
2. Transportation Operations and Project Delivery Regulation
3. MAP-21 Implementation
4. Caltrain Modernization and High-Speed Rail

Federal Issues:

1. MAP-21 Implementation
2. Surface Transportation Reauthorization
3. 2014 Appropriations
4. Climate Change and Livability
Should other issues surface that require the District’s attention, actions will be guided by the three policy objectives listed above. If needed, potential action on issues that are unrelated to these policy goals will be brought to the District Board of Directors for consideration.

**Advocacy Tactics**

The District and its State and Federal legislative consultants will employ a variety of advocacy tactics to support the 2013 Legislative Program, including:

1. **Direct Advocacy**
   The District will engage policymakers directly and will sponsor legislation, submit correspondence and provide public testimony that communicates and advances our legislative priorities and positions.

2. **Coalition-based Advocacy**
   The District will work to engage local and regional stakeholders to build awareness about specific issues and foster the creation of local coalitions that will advocate on our behalf. The District will coordinate with local, regional, statewide and national coalitions organized to advance positions that are consistent with the 2013 Legislative Program.

3. **Media Advocacy**
   The District will build public awareness and communicate legislative priorities by issuing press releases, organizing media events, and submitting op-ed pieces. The District will engage the broader public in advocacy efforts through the use of social media and other electronic media that facilitate the public’s ability to communicate on the District’s behalf.
## STATE ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. State Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities</strong></td>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Transit Assistance (STA)</strong></td>
<td>• Protect against the elimination or diversion of any State-directed funds that support San Mateo County transportation needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After years of diversion to support the State’s General Fund, funding for the STA program has remained stable over the last few budget cycles thanks to successful legal, legislative and political efforts on behalf of the public transportation community. Still, a small increment of STA funding remains vulnerable to diversion under current law.</td>
<td>• Support State funding allocation requests for investments that support San Mateo County public transportation programs and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Underfunded Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>• Work with statewide transit coalitions to identify and advance opportunities for new funding that will support San Mateo County public transportation priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State investment in transportation infrastructure continues to be underfunded. Infrastructure investments are achieved primarily through the sale of voter-approved bonds and despite recent legislation that covers financing costs, the State’s bond debt service needs will soon outpace available revenues.</td>
<td><strong>State Transit Assistance (STA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voter Threshold for Transportation Revenue Measures</strong></td>
<td>• Support the full funding of the STA program at levels called for in the 2011 reenactment of the 2010 gas-tax swap legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite broad-based majority support for dedicating additional revenue to public transportation services and programs, efforts to raise local funds are often unsuccessful due to the requirement that certain revenue measures receive two-thirds supermajority support from voters.</td>
<td><strong>Underfunded Infrastructure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voter Threshold for Transportation Revenue Measures</strong></td>
<td>• Advocate for the regularly scheduled issuance of State infrastructure bonds and the appropriation and equitable allocation of bond revenues to Proposition 1A and Proposition 1B programs that support San Mateo County’s transportation services and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite broad-based majority support for dedicating additional revenue to public transportation services and programs, efforts to raise local funds are often unsuccessful due to the requirement that certain revenue measures receive two-thirds supermajority support from voters.</td>
<td><strong>Voter Threshold for Transportation Revenue Measures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support efforts to eliminate or lower the two-thirds supermajority vote requirement for ballot measures that provide new revenues for transportation services and programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## STATE ISSUES

### Issues and Background

**Cap-and-Trade Revenues**

Last year, the State began implementing the cap-and-trade market-based compliance system approved as a part of the Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32). The state estimates that the system may yield billions of dollars per year in revenues that will be allocated to various emissions-reducing projects and programs throughout the State. Under legislation approved last year, the Administration must submit a three-year expenditure plan to the Legislature as a part of the Governor’s 2014 May Budget Revision. Low carbon public transportation and sustainable transportation infrastructure projects are eligible expenditures.

**Sustainable Communities Strategies**

In conjunction with AB 32 Implementation, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (SB 375) requires regions to develop sustainable communities strategies with integrated housing, land-use and transportation policies that will reduce regional passenger vehicle emissions by specific amounts.

### Strategies

**Cap-and-Trade Revenues**

- Work with Department of Finance and through statewide public transportation coalitions to support the submission of a three-year cap-and-trade expenditure plan that makes a broad array of emissions-reducing transportation projects, programs and services eligible for investment.

**Sustainable Communities Strategies**

- Advocate for policies that provide adequate funding to support increased regional demand and dependence on public transportation associated with the implementation of AB 375.
## STATE ISSUES

### Issues and Background

2. **Transportation Operations and Project Delivery Regulation**

   **Vehicle Weight Limits**
   Transit buses are subject to decades-old vehicle weight limits that do not reflect current operating realities. In 2012, legislation was passed that permanently exempts buses that are currently in operation or procurement. Buses purchased after 2012 will be subject to weight limits again starting in 2015.

   **Zero Emission Bus Purchase Requirement**
   Implementation of the State’s zero emission bus purchase requirement has been delayed indefinitely, but would eventually require at least 15 percent of bus purchases to be zero emissions vehicles.

   **Cap-and-Trade Utility Rebates**
   Current law exempts certain utility ratepayers from electricity cost increases associated with the implantation of AB 32, the State’s landmark greenhouse gas reduction legislation. Transit operations, however, are not exempt from these costs, which are estimated to increase by 30-50 percent.

   **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**
   Several regional and statewide public transportation advocates will be working to modernize CEQA and minimize unnecessary delays during the environmental review process.

### Strategies

**General**
- Work with statewide public transportation partners and advocates to identify and advance opportunities to remove barriers to efficient project delivery and promote innovative contracting and project delivery alternatives

**Vehicle Weight Limits**
- Partner with statewide public transportation agencies and coalitions to develop and support a long term solution to the State’s vehicle weight limit regulations that reflects current public transit operating realities and requirements

**Zero Emission Bus Purchase Requirement**
- Monitor California Air Resources Board action on the implementation of the State’s zero emission bus purchase requirement and support strategies that address the financial challenge associated with mandating the procurement of zero emission buses

**Cap-and-Trade Utility Rebates**
- Work with our public transportation partners and broader coalitions to pursue legislation that exempts public transit agencies from utility rate increases associated with implementation of the State’s Cap-and-Trade emissions reduction strategy

**California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**
- Closely monitor efforts to modernize CEQA and support proposals that integrate a project’s long-term environmental benefits into the review process and expedite overall project review without compromising CEQA’s effectiveness as an environmental protection policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE ISSUES</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) Implementation</strong></td>
<td>• Work with the MTC to support legislation that maximizes the region’s access to Federal funds that will support San Mateo County transportation programs and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The two-year surface transportation authorization bill approved last year makes significant changes to the Federal transportation program funding structure. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and other Metropolitan Planning Organizations continue to meet with State transportation officials to develop a framework for the distribution of Federal transportation funds under MAP-21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Caltrain Modernization and High-speed Rail</strong></td>
<td>• Advocate for the allocation of Proposition 1A connectivity funding requested from the California Transportation Commission to support the implementation of the corridor’s advanced signal system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2012, the State Legislature appropriated $705 million in Proposition 1A high-speed rail funds to modernize the Caltrain corridor in preparation for eventual high-speed rail service. Under a multi-party regional funding agreement, this investment will be used to match a variety of local, regional, state and federal funding sources to electrify the corridor, install an advanced signaling system and replace Caltrain’s aging diesel trains with electric trains that will dramatically improve service between San Francisco and San Jose.</td>
<td>• Support legislation that reauthorizes the Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program to support eventual regional allocation of funds to support the Caltrain Modernization Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to planning these improvements, Caltrain is working to identify what additional infrastructure will be needed to support modernized Caltrain service and the addition of high-speed operations to the corridor as part of a Blended System that requires Caltrain and high-speed rail to primarily share the corridor’s existing infrastructure.</td>
<td>• Work with local and regional stakeholders to identify and secure additional funding to support Blended System improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FEDERAL ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. MAP-21 Implementation</strong></td>
<td>• Monitor and review guidance and rulemaking proposals dealing with MAP-21 implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP-21 Authorizes Federal surface transportation programs through September 2014 and essentially maintains existing funding levels over that time. MAP-21 simplifies the Federal transportation funding structure by consolidating several programs and includes several policy changes including eligibility expansion, the conversion of some discretionary programs to formula-based programs and policies designed to expedite project delivery.</td>
<td>• Collaborate with local, regional, state and national transportation advocacy groups to submit comments and advocate for implementation that maximizes benefits for public transportation programs and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of these changes will require significant guidance and rulemaking by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Surface Transportation Authorization</strong></td>
<td>• Advocate for a dedicated source of revenue that maintains the long-term solvency of the Highway Trust fund, allows for the expansion of Federal transportation funding and supports long-term surface transportation authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While MAP-21 includes significant benefits for transportation agencies, it does not address several critical issues including the long-term solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, the reauthorization of Federal rail programs, the permanent extension of transit-related tax benefits and the passage of a longer-term authorization that guarantees reliable funding for local programs.</td>
<td>• Support the reauthorization of Federal rail programs that includes significant funding eligible to support improvements associated with the modernization of the Caltrain system and the addition of blended high-speed rail service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support the permanent extension of pre-tax transit commute benefits that are equal to or greater than parking benefits. Support additional tax incentives that benefit public transportation programs and riders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2013 San Mateo County Transit District Legislative Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. 2014 Federal Appropriations  
Every year, Congress adopts at least 12 separate appropriations bills, including one for transportation. These measures provide the authority for federal agencies to spend money during the upcoming fiscal year for the programs they administer. 2014 will mark the first appropriations process under MAP-21. In recent years, Congress has essentially maintained existing funding levels. However, under MAP-21, authorized funding has been increased slightly over prior years. | • Partner with local, regional, state and national coalitions to advocate appropriation of the maximum authorized amount for programs that benefit San Mateo County transportation services and needs  
• Work with local and regional coalitions to support the District’s requests for funding from discretionary programs |
| 4. Climate Change and Livability  
Despite several recent efforts, Congress has been unable to pass legislation that would address climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Previous versions of the legislation have included a cap and trade system with emissions allowances that would be traded in a market based system. A portion of the revenues generated through the sale of these allowances could be used to fund clean transportation projects. The transportation sector produces approximately one-third of the greenhouse gas emissions in this country, primarily in the form of carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions generated by automobiles.  
States continue to enact transportation and land-use planning policies that encourage mixed-use, higher density, walkable development near transit. In addition, federal agencies have announced new partnerships intended to reduce VMT by promoting these goals on a national scale. | • Advocate that climate change legislation includes a funding strategy that reflects the opportunity for greenhouse gas reduction through new investment in clean transportation alternatives  
• Support dedicated formula funding that promotes energy efficiency in transit operations  
• Support funding for planning and capital investment related to the promotion of transit oriented development opportunities and sustainable land use strategies that would result in VMT reduction  
• Advocate for the inclusion of funding that furthers coordinated integration of programs that support housing, transportation and land use planning and investment |
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
Cap and Trade
The investment plan approved by the California Air Resources Board includes public transportation as an eligible expense for revenues generated through implementation of the State’s market-based compliance emissions reduction program.

As the Air Resources Board works to craft a more detailed policy proposal, staff is participating, along with the California Transit Association, in an organized effort to develop a coalition called the Transportation Coalition for Livable Communities to advocate for an equitable share of revenues for public transportation.

State Transit Assistance
The State Transit Assistance program has exceeded the estimates in the Governor’s May Revise by $48 million thanks to higher than expected diesel fuel sales over the summer.

FEDERAL ISSUES
Appropriations
On September 22, Congress passed a Continuing Resolution that essentially maintains existing funding levels for transportation programs through March 27, 2013. The bill includes the programmatic changes outlined in recently passed legislation that reauthorizes transportation programs through Fiscal Year 2014, but, as expected, it does not include the authorization bill’s inflationary adjustments, which would have increased overall funding by approximately $1 billion per year.
The Continuing Resolution adheres to cuts called for in the Budget Control Act of 2011, but transportation programs are largely unaffected. The Budget Control Act allowed for an increase in the Federal debt ceiling, but also mandated across-the-board cuts unless a long-term deficit reduction measures were implemented.

Without a deal on deficit reduction, most Federal programs will be cut by about 8.2 percent starting on January 3, 2013. Federal highway programs would experience a small $56 million reduction out of a $40 billion budget. Transit formula programs are exempt from the cuts, but the Federal Transit Administration’s New Starts program would experience a reduction.

Prepared By: Seamus Murphy, Government and Community Affairs Director  650-508-6388
**AB 8**
**Perea**

**D**

**Location**: ASSEMBLY TRANS.

**Summary**: Existing law establishes the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program, administered by the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (commission), to provide to specified entities, upon appropriation by the Legislature, grants, loans, loan guarantees, revolving loans, or other appropriate measures, for the development and deployment of innovative technologies that would transform California's fuel and vehicle types to help attain the state's climate change goals. Existing law specifies that only certain projects or programs are eligible for funding, including block grants administered by public entities or not-for-profit technology entities for multiple projects, education and program promotion within California, and development of alternative and renewable fuel and vehicle technology centers. Existing law requires the commission to develop and adopt an investment plan to determine priorities and opportunities for the program.

This bill would provide that the State Air Resources Board (state board), until January 1, 2024, has no authority to enforce any element of its existing clean fuels outlet regulation or other regulation that requires or has the effect of requiring any person to construct, operate, or provide funding for the construction or operation of any publicly available hydrogen fueling station. The bill would require the state board to aggregate and make available to the public, no later than January 1, 2014, and every two years thereafter, the number of vehicles that automobile manufacturers project to be sold or leased, as reported to the state board. The bill would require the commission to allocate $20 million each fiscal year, and up to $20 million each fiscal year thereafter, for purposes of achieving a hydrogen fueling network sufficient to provide convenient fueling to vehicle owners, and expand that network as necessary to support a growing market for vehicles requiring hydrogen fuel, until there are at least 100 publicly available hydrogen fueling stations. The bill, on or before December 31, 2015, and annually thereafter, would require the commission and the state board to jointly review and report on the progress toward establishing a hydrogen fueling network that provides the coverage and capacity to fuel vehicles requiring hydrogen fuel that are being placed into operation in the state. The bill would authorize the commission to design grants, loan incentive programs, revolving loan programs, and other forms of financial assistance, for purposes of assisting in the implementation of these provisions. The bill, no later than July 1, 2013, would require the state board and air districts to jointly convene working groups to evaluate the specified policies and goals of specified programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 8</strong></td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS.</td>
<td>Existing law establishes the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program, administered by the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (commission), to provide to specified entities, upon appropriation by the Legislature, grants, loans, loan guarantees, revolving loans, or other appropriate measures, for the development and deployment of innovative technologies that would transform California's fuel and vehicle types to help attain the state's climate change goals. Existing law specifies that only certain projects or programs are eligible for funding, including block grants administered by public entities or not-for-profit technology entities for multiple projects, education and program promotion within California, and development of alternative and renewable fuel and vehicle technology centers. Existing law requires the commission to develop and adopt an investment plan to determine priorities and opportunities for the program. This bill would provide that the State Air Resources Board (state board), until January 1, 2024, has no authority to enforce any element of its existing clean fuels outlet regulation or other regulation that requires or has the effect of requiring any person to construct, operate, or provide funding for the construction or operation of any publicly available hydrogen fueling station. The bill would require the state board to aggregate and make available to the public, no later than January 1, 2014, and every two years thereafter, the number of vehicles that automobile manufacturers project to be sold or leased, as reported to the state board. The bill would require the commission to allocate $20 million each fiscal year, and up to $20 million each fiscal year thereafter, for purposes of achieving a hydrogen fueling network sufficient to provide convenient fueling to vehicle owners, and expand that network as necessary to support a growing market for vehicles requiring hydrogen fuel, until there are at least 100 publicly available hydrogen fueling stations. The bill, on or before December 31, 2015, and annually thereafter, would require the commission and the state board to jointly review and report on the progress toward establishing a hydrogen fueling network that provides the coverage and capacity to fuel vehicles requiring hydrogen fuel that are being placed into operation in the state. The bill would authorize the commission to design grants, loan incentive programs, revolving loan programs, and other forms of financial assistance, for purposes of assisting in the implementation of these provisions. The bill, no later than July 1, 2013, would require the state board and air districts to jointly convene working groups to evaluate the specified policies and goals of specified programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 160</strong>&lt;br&gt;Alejo D&lt;br&gt;California Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013: exceptions.</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY PRINT</td>
<td>The California Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA), on and after January 1, 2013, requires a public retirement system, as defined, to modify its plan or plans to comply with the act. Among other things, PEPRA prohibits a public employer from offering a defined benefit pension plan exceeding specified retirement formulas, requires new members of public retirement systems to contribute at least a specified amount of the normal cost for their defined benefit plans, and prohibits an enhancement of a public employee's retirement formula or benefit adopted after January 1, 2013, from applying to service performed prior to the operative date of the enhancement. This bill would except from PEPRA, by excepting from the definition of public retirement system, certain multiemployer plans authorized under federal law and retirement plans for public employees whose collective bargaining rights are protected by a specified provision of federal law.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Steinberg D&lt;br&gt;Sustainable Communities Investment Authority.</td>
<td>SENATE G.&amp;F.</td>
<td>The Community Redevelopment Law authorizes the establishment of redevelopment agencies in communities to address the effects of blight. Existing law dissolved redevelopment agencies and community development agencies, as of February 1, 2012, and provides for the designation of successor agencies. This bill would authorize certain public entities of a Sustainable Communities Investment Area to form a Sustainable Communities Investment Authority (authority) to carry out the Community Redevelopment Law in a specified manner. The bill would require the authority to adopt a Sustainable Communities Investment Plan for a Sustainable Communities Investment Area and authorize the authority to include in that plan a provision for the receipt of tax increment funds provided that certain economic development and planning requirements are met. The bill would authorize the legislative body of a city or county forming an authority to dedicate any portion of its net available revenue to the authority through its Sustainable Communities Investment Plan.</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 11 Pavley D</td>
<td>SENATE T.&amp;H.</td>
<td>Existing law establishes the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program, administered by the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (commission), to provide to specified entities, upon appropriation by the Legislature, grants, loans, loan guarantees, revolving loans, or other appropriate measures, for the development and deployment of innovative technologies that would transform California's fuel and vehicle types to help attain the state's climate change goals. Existing law specifies that only certain projects or programs are eligible for funding, including block grants administered by public entities or not-for-profit technology entities for multiple projects, education and program promotion within California, and development of alternative and renewable fuel and vehicle technology centers. Existing law requires the commission to develop and adopt an investment plan to determine priorities and opportunities for the program. This bill would provide that the State Air Resources Board (state board), until January 1, 2024, has no authority to enforce any element of its existing clean fuels outlet regulation or other regulation that requires or has the effect of requiring any person to construct, operate, or provide funding for the construction or operation of any publicly available hydrogen fueling station. The bill would require the state board to aggregate and make available to the public, no later than January 1, 2014, and every two years thereafter, the number of vehicles that automobile manufacturers project to be sold or leased, as reported to the state board. The bill would require the commission to allocate $20 million each fiscal year and up to $20 million each fiscal year thereafter, for purposes of achieving a hydrogen fueling network sufficient to provide convenient fueling to vehicle owners, and expand that network as necessary to support a growing market for vehicles requiring hydrogen fuel, until there are at least 100 publicly available hydrogen fueling stations. The bill, on or before December 31, 2015, and annually thereafter, would require the commission and the state board to jointly review and report on the progress toward establishing a hydrogen fueling network that provides the coverage and capacity to fuel vehicles requiring hydrogen fuel that are being placed into operation in the state. The bill would authorize the commission to design grants, loan incentive programs, revolving loan programs, and other forms of financial assistance for purposes of assisting in the implementation of these provisions. The bill, no later than July 1, 2013, would require the state board and air districts to jointly convene working groups to evaluate the specified policies and goals of specified programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 4</td>
<td>SENATE PRI NT</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 8</td>
<td>SENATE PRI NT</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 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 11</td>
<td>SENATE PRI NT</td>
<td>The California Constitution conditions the imposition of a special tax by a local government upon the approval of 2/3 of the voters of the local government voting on that tax, and prohibits a local government from imposing an ad valorem tax on real property or a transactions tax or sales tax on the sale of real property. This measure would instead condition the imposition, extension, or increase of a special tax by a local government upon the approval of 55% of the voters voting on the proposition. The measure would also make conforming and technical, non-substantive changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A G E N D A

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2013- 2:50 p.m.
or immediately following previous Committee meeting

ACTION

1. Approval of Minutes of Planning, Development and Sustainability Committee Meeting of January 9, 2013

2. Approval of Transit Sustainability Project Strategic Plan

INFORMATIONAL

3. Update on Title VI Requirements

4. SamTrans Triennial Customer Survey Key Findings

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)

Committee Members Absent: C. Groom, R. Guilbault

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

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


Committee Chair Art Lloyd called the meeting to order at 2:50 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Planning, Development and Sustainability Committee Meeting of December 12, 2012
The Committee approved the minutes (Gee/Matsumoto).

Update on SamTrans Service Plan and Title VI Requirements
Executive Officer, Planning & Development April Chan said:
- New requirements have been issued to comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, which ensures public services, including transportation, are provided in a non-discriminatory manner.
- The San Mateo County Transit District (District) receives Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula funds and is subject to the requirements of Title VI.
- The FTA monitors transit providers for compliance and non-compliance can cause Federal funding to be withheld.
- New requirements include: conduct an updated survey of passengers; develop a formal Public Participation Plan; report racial breakdown of membership of District-appointed advisory committees; and adopt policy on major service changes and policies on disparate impact.
- The District must adopt system-wide service standards and policies that must be submitted to the FTA. Staff needs to monitor compliance with these standards and policies and the Board must approve those standards and policies every three years.
- A Major Service Change Policy is used to determine the threshold for when an equity analysis is needed to assess compliance with Title VI policies.
- The Disparate Impact, Disproportionate Burden Policy determines the threshold when fare or service changes would have a disparate impact involving race, color, national origin or disproportionate burden on low-income populations.
The new policy requires that prior to Board adoption of major service or fare changes, equity analyses must be conducted to determine whether adverse impact is present.

The Title VI changes will affect the timing of the SamTrans Service Plan (SSP).

- The SSP draft recommendations were released in August 2012 and a final draft set of recommendations was proposed for December 2012.
- New Title VI rules require that transit operators implementing major service changes after April 1, 2013 must conduct service equity analysis in accordance with the new FTA requirements.
- The proposed SSP changes are considered major service changes and are proposed to be implemented after April 1, 2013, which means the Title VI Major Service Change, Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden policies should be in place before the SSP recommendations are finalized.
- Staff will conduct service equity analysis on the proposed SSP changes in accordance with the new requirements and policies.
- New SSP schedule:
  - Review proposed Title VI policies at the February 13 Board meeting.
  - Conduct outreach on the proposed Title VI policies between February and March 2013.
  - Present the Title VI policies for approval at the March 13 meeting and submit to the FTA.
  - Conduct a public hearing on the SSP at the April 10 Board meeting.
  - Recommend adoption of the SSP, Title VI Analysis and Environmental Assessment at the May Board meeting.

Director Karyl Matsumoto asked if some of the SSP meetings can be held in the evenings. Ms. Chan said staff is working to schedule meetings and locations that are convenient for everyone.

Director Jeff Gee asked if definitions were provided for thresholds or were they left open for interpretation. Ms. Chan said the Title VI Circular has some guidance but it doesn’t give prescriptive percentages.

General Manager/CEO Michael Scanlon said the FTA will use its discretion in reviewing the plans submitted.

Director Gee asked how much Federal funding was made available in the Circular for these ongoing programs. Ms. Chan said none.

Chair Deal said at the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) meeting Director Malia Cohen brought up the point of public outreach and the need to get the outreach to the smaller neighborhood newspapers and bulletin boards so more people are informed. Executive Officer, Public Affairs Mark Simon said all meetings will be in the evening and staff heard JPB Director Cohen’s comment loud and clear and have reached out to her office. Staff will work extensively to inform communities that have
an interest in these services via social media, mainstream and non-traditional news media.

**Public Comment**

Adina Levin, Peninsula Transportation Alternatives, said eliminating the BART Plus ticket is a fare increase for passengers. She asked if this logical fare increase would be an issue considered under the Title VI changes. Ms. Levin said Friends of Caltrain did a survey on how passengers got to the airport and if they used transit, what mode. This information can be used specifically for Route KX and possibly increase ridership by marketing this route as an airport express.

Patricia Niederhofer, Foster City, said she attended the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting, but it was canceled. She and many riders are concerned about the possible elimination of the eastern part of Route 251 in Foster City. She wants no changes to be made. Ms. Niederhofer said to-date she has collected 144 signatures from passengers who do not want the elimination of the eastern section of the route. The petition was submitted to the Board.

Jerry Grace, San Pablo, said he doesn’t understand what SSP means. He wants to know if the buses are being cut because of the lack of funds. Mr. Scanlon said the SSP is taking a look at all the service provided with an eye toward doing more of what works well, less of what doesn’t, and at the same time, look to see if there are alternative service delivery methods.

**Preliminary SamTrans Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) Strategic Plan**

Ms. Chan reported:

- The purpose of the TSP is to improve financial performance and productivity and attract more riders. This is a result of a two-year Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) effort that established performance requirements for seven transit operators. Each operator must achieve a 5 percent real reduction in either cost per revenue hour, cost per passenger or cost per passenger mile by 2017.
- Operators must maintain these reductions and growth in the performance requirements is limited to the Consumer Price Index.
- Operators must adopt a Strategic Plan by March 31, 2013 on how to achieve the targets.
- Operators are required to report on these performance measures to the MTC on an annual basis starting in Fiscal Year (FY) 2014.
- By FY2019, MTC will link operating and capital funds it administers to the achievement of these targets.
- The performance goal baseline year is established at the highest reported cost between FY2008 and FY2011. A 5 percent reduction is calculated from that highest cost and the result is the goal that must be met by 2017.
- TSP strategies for fixed-route service include:
  - Leverage more part-time operators to offset costs
  - Favorable contracted urban bus negotiations
• SSP implementation
• Use of more fuel-efficient vehicles, including hybrids, to reduce operating costs
• Revise fare policy to attract more riders, including discount day and youth passes
• Target marketing

• TSP strategies for paratransit include:
  • Reduce costs rather than increase ridership
  • Continue to implement Senior Mobility Action Plan recommendations
  • Consider a volunteer driver program
  • Explore alternative service delivery models
  • Reduce paratransit service area to what is legally mandated

• The annual monitoring program requires:
  • Annual progress reports to MTC.
  • By FY2018 MTC will review overall progress
  • By FY2019 MTC will link funding to achievement of goals

• Next steps:
  • Review the final draft with the Board at the February meeting
  • Submit a Board-approved TSP Strategic Plan to MTC by the March 31 deadline

Director Adrienne Tissier said there are limited dollars and MTC is trying to see if some of the agencies can look at greater efficiencies. There is some waste in some of the agencies and there is a need to see how these monies are being distributed and used. She said in the intermediate years the MTC will be able to see if the 5 percent is reasonable.

Mr. Scanlon said this was all going to be a precursor because there is general awareness agencies don’t have enough money, but before the public can be asked for more money it needs to be shown that everything is being done efficiently.

Adjourned: 3:29 p.m.
STAFF REPORT

TO: Planning, Development and Sustainability Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: April Chan
Executive Officer, Planning & Development

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF DISTRICT’S TRANSIT SUSTAINABILITY PROJECT (TSP) STRATEGIC PLAN

ACTION
Staff recommends the Committee recommend the Board approve the District’s Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) Strategic Plan for submittal to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

SIGNIFICANCE
The MTC adopted the TSP final recommendations on May 23, 2012, which established TSP performance measures and targets for the seven large San Francisco Bay Area transit operators. The seven large operators include San Mateo County Transit District (District), Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit), Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART), Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB), Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, & Transportation District (GGBHTD), San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA).

As part of the TSP final recommendations, MTC requires the seven large operators to each achieve a 5 percent real reduction in at least one of the following performance measures by Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 and no growth beyond Consumer Price Index (CPI) thereafter: a) cost per service hour; b) cost per passenger; or c) cost per passenger mile. The 5 percent real reduction is measured against the highest reported costs between FY2008 and FY2011 for one of the three performance measures listed above.

The seven operators are required to adopt strategic plans by March 31, 2013, for the purpose of establishing strategies and a monitoring program on how to achieve the 5 percent real reduction. On an annual basis, the agencies are to submit data to MTC on the progress of achieving their reduction targets. MTC will analyze the agencies’ progress in meeting these targets in FY2018. By FY2019, MTC will link existing and new operating and capital funds administered by MTC to the progress that operators have made towards achieving the targets in their strategic plans.
At the January 9, 2013 meeting, staff presented major elements of the draft TSP Strategic Plan to the Board, which included the following:

- Establish a 5 percent reduction target for fixed route service in at least one of the following performance measures by FY2017: a) cost per service hour; b) cost per passenger; or c) cost per passenger mile. The target is established by applying a 5 percent reduction to the highest reported costs between FY2008 and FY2011, shown in bold on the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2008*</th>
<th>FY2009*</th>
<th>FY2010*</th>
<th>FY2011*</th>
<th>FY2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$/Service Hour</td>
<td>$155.81</td>
<td>$160.07</td>
<td>$164.90</td>
<td>$164.70</td>
<td>$156.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$/Passenger</td>
<td>$6.69</td>
<td>$6.74</td>
<td>$6.95</td>
<td>$7.14</td>
<td>$6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$/Passenger Mile</td>
<td>$1.36</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* In 2011 dollars)

- Establish a 5 percent reduction target for paratransit service in at least one of the following performance measures by FY2017: a) cost per service hour; b) cost per passenger; or c) cost per passenger mile. The target is established by applying a 5 percent reduction to the highest reported costs between FY2008 and FY2011, shown in bold on the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2008*</th>
<th>FY2009*</th>
<th>FY2010*</th>
<th>FY2011*</th>
<th>FY2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$/Service Hour</td>
<td>$68.24</td>
<td>$69.35</td>
<td>$71.90</td>
<td>$72.82</td>
<td>$69.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$/Passenger</td>
<td>$43.31</td>
<td>$43.57</td>
<td>$42.78</td>
<td>$41.75</td>
<td>$41.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$/Passenger Mile</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$4.74</td>
<td>$4.64</td>
<td>$4.52</td>
<td>$4.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* In 2011 dollars)

- Consider a range of possible strategies to assist the District in achieving these targets. Strategies include the following:
  - Leverage part-time operators to offset fixed route operating costs
  - Implement SamTrans Service Plan (SSP) recommendations
  - Include in the upcoming budgets the recently approved CUB contract costs, which are more favorable compared with prior years
  - Use more fuel-efficient vehicles, including hybrids, to reduce operating costs
  - Revise fare policy to attract more riders
  - Implement targeted marketing
  - Continue to implement Senior Mobility Action Plan recommendations
  - Consider volunteer driver program
  - Explore alternative service delivery models
  - Reduce paratransit service area to what is legally mandated
Approval of the TSP Strategic Plan by the Board is required before it can be submitted to the MTC by March 31, 2013.

**BUDGET IMPACT**
Approval of the SamTrans TSP Strategic Plan has no impact to the budget.

**BACKGROUND**
The MTC created the TSP in January 2010 to address operating and capital shortfalls experienced by various transit operators in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. The purpose of the TSP is to help improve transit performance and to attract more customers to the transit systems. The TSP focused on financial, service performance and institutional frameworks of the transit agencies. The District was one of the participants in the TSP project.

Prepared by: April Chan, Executive Officer, Planning & Development 650-508-6228
Overview

The San Mateo County Transit District (District) operates fixed-route SamTrans bus service, Redi-Wheels paratransit service for persons with disabilities, and funds shuttle services. The District is also the managing agency for Caltrain and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority. The District strives to meet the mobility needs of San Mateo County residents.

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) initiated the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) in January 2010 to assist the San Francisco Bay Area’s largest transit operators in light of what was revealed in its long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). According to the RTP, financial information gathered during its development showed that the region’s transit system is not sustainable based on projections of transit costs and reasonably anticipated revenues.

The MTC proceeded with the TSP with the purpose to establish a framework and implementation plan for a more robust, financially viable transit system that is both cost-effective and customer-focused. The goal is to help improve transit performance and to attract more customers to the San Francisco Bay Area’s various transit systems. The TSP focused on financial, service performance and institutional frameworks of the transit agencies.

In May 2012, MTC adopted the final TSP recommendations, which established performance measures and targets for the seven large San Francisco Bay Area transit operators: the District, Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit), Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART), Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain), Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, Transportation District (GGBHTD), San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA).

As part of the final TSP recommendations, MTC required the seven large operators to each achieve a five percent real reduction in at least one of the following performance measures by Fiscal Year (FY) 2017, with no growth beyond Consumer Price Index (CPI) thereafter:

a) cost per service hour
b) cost per passenger
c) cost per passenger mile

The 5 percent real reduction is measured against the highest reported costs between FY2008 and FY2011 for one of the three performance measures listed above.

The seven operators are each required to adopt a strategic plan by March 31, 2013, for the purpose of establishing strategies and a monitoring program on how to achieve the 5 percent real reduction. On an annual basis, the agencies are to submit data to the MTC on the progress of achieving their reduction targets. MTC will analyze the agencies’ progress in meeting these targets in FY2018. By FY2019, MTC will link existing and new operating and capital funds it administers to the progress that operators have made towards achieving their established targets.

The District developed this TSP Strategic Plan to provide a roadmap on how to achieve its 5 percent goal. This plan considers the strategies for achieving the goals in the area of fixed-route and paratransit services. The next three parts of the TSP Strategic Plan include:

- Performance targets
- Proposed strategies for achieving these targets
- Monitoring plan
Performance Targets

The TSP requires the District to establish a 5 percent reduction target for fixed route service in at least one of the following performance measures by FY2017:

a) cost per service hour  
b) cost per passenger  
c) cost per passenger mile

The target is established by applying a 5 percent reduction to the highest reported costs between FY2008 and FY2011, shown in bold on the chart below. In addition to achieving the real reduction in one of the three performance targets, SamTrans must be able to sustain its performance target beyond FY2017 with no growth beyond Consumer Price Index (CPI).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed-route</th>
<th>FY2008*</th>
<th>FY2009*</th>
<th>FY2010*</th>
<th>FY2011*</th>
<th>FY2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$/Service Hour</td>
<td>$155.81</td>
<td>$160.07</td>
<td>$164.90</td>
<td>$164.70</td>
<td>$156.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$/Passenger</td>
<td>$6.69</td>
<td>$6.74</td>
<td>$6.95</td>
<td><strong>$7.14</strong></td>
<td>$6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$/Passenger Mile</td>
<td>$1.36</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td><strong>$1.52</strong></td>
<td>$1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* In 2011 dollars)

The District follows the same process in establishing targets for its paratransit service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paratransit</th>
<th>FY2008*</th>
<th>FY2009*</th>
<th>FY2010*</th>
<th>FY2011*</th>
<th>FY2017 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$/Service Hour</td>
<td>$68.24</td>
<td>$69.35</td>
<td>$71.90</td>
<td><strong>$72.82</strong></td>
<td>$69.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$/Passenger</td>
<td>$43.31</td>
<td><strong>$43.57</strong></td>
<td>$42.78</td>
<td>$41.75</td>
<td>$41.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$/Passenger Mile</td>
<td><strong>$5.00</strong></td>
<td>$4.74</td>
<td>$4.64</td>
<td>$4.52</td>
<td>$4.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* In 2011 dollars)
Strategies

This section discusses the strategies the District has either employed or is considering using to help reach the TSP performance targets. These strategies will seek to reduce costs, improve productivity and/or increase ridership. Strategies for fixed-route service focus on a mixture of approaches that include improvements in service, vehicles, marketing and/or staffing, while strategies for paratransit focus on reducing demand and/or improving service delivery.

FIXED-ROUTE SERVICE STRATEGIES

Implement SamTrans Service Plan

In 2008, SamTrans approved a District Strategic Plan to provide a policy framework to guide District investments over the next five years. One of the key initiatives identified in the Strategic Plan was an in-depth study of the transit system to identify strengths, areas for improvement, and provide suggestions to improve efficiency and increase ridership, that initiative led to the SamTrans Service Plan (SSP).

The SSP is scheduled for approval in late spring 2013. The SSP recommendations will include improvements to service on El Camino Real – San Mateo County’s main arterial route, enhancement of a core market bus network, discontinuation of duplicative and low-ridership routes, and modification to existing routes.

One of the early signs of possible SSP success is the benefit of consolidating multi-city routes 390 and 391 into a single local bus route (Route ECR) on the weekends beginning in August 2012. Ridership on Route ECR has increased, indicating the potential benefit of expanding Route ECR service to weekdays.

As part of the SSP implementation, the District will conduct a comprehensive marketing campaign to target choice riders who desire the cost savings and environmental benefits of improved fixed-route service.
Support Grand Boulevard Initiative

The Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI) is a regional collaboration dedicated to the revitalization of the El Camino Real corridor that runs through San Mateo and Santa Clara counties. The District supports this work in coordinating the regional effort with its project partners to develop walkable communities, and to promote land-use planning that encourages a healthy environment and improved business climate.

The GBI may have positive impacts for both fixed-route and paratransit services. The goals of the GBI are to encourage a more active lifestyle, coordinate more resources and develop more businesses along El Camino Real. Corridors that are more attractive because of strong business development may also attract greater transit ridership as people seek out these shopping and entertainment opportunities on El Camino Real. Additionally, it may reduce demand for paratransit services for individuals who live closer to the corridor.

Leverage Part-time Operators

The District continues to leverage part-time operators to achieve fixed-route cost savings to the extent allowable under existing collective bargaining agreements. Leveraging part-time operators provides SamTrans better flexibility in staffing for route assignments in day-to-day operations that could lead to cost reduction and productivity improvement.

Negotiate More Favorable CUB Contract Costs

SamTrans recently successfully negotiated a new contract to provide its Contracted Urban Bus (CUB) service with a dedicated and qualified contractor to operate a fleet of vehicles including provision of a maintenance and operations facility to provide fixed-route service in the County. The new contract allows for better cost control of management and supervisory staff wages and benefits, reduces general and administrative expenses, and eliminates interest and depreciation expenses of assets the operator formerly charged to the District. Inclusion of these favorable cost reduction measures in future budgets will help reduce operating costs going forward.
**Use More Fuel-efficient Vehicles, Including Hybrids**

SamTrans continues to look at improving fuel efficiency, thereby reducing operating costs. The District is currently in the process of replacing its 1998 Gillig bus fleet with new buses that utilize the latest clean-diesel technology, as well as with a sub-fleet of 25 hybrid electric buses.

**Revise fare policy to attract more operators**

This strategy aims at increasing ridership through making transit more appealing by directly reducing costs to the riders. The District currently offers multiple discounted fares; however, it may be possible for the District to further discount in certain fare classes in order to attract riders from key demographic groups. This strategy has the potential to incentivize riders to take more public transit trips, which could lead to an increase in ridership.

**Improve Clipper Usage**

Improving Clipper usage could reduce operating costs because increased usage would aide in facilitating fare collection and reduce time and labor costs associated with cash collection and accounting. Additionally, increased Clipper usage could reduce bus dwell time which helps improve performance. Possible ways to increase Clipper usage include conducting outreach and promoting its use, distributing Clipper Cards to potential riders, educating riders on the benefits, increasing the number of outlets that sell Clipper products, and improving access to Clipper on the Coastside where there are currently no outlets that support Clipper reloading.

**PARATRANSIT SERVICE STRATEGIES**

The District is committed to providing paratransit services through Redi-Wheels, as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990. The District, like many other agencies, experiences financial difficulties in providing these services due to the much higher operating costs. Unlike fixed routes, increasing paratransit ridership would likely lead to greater costs. Many factors contribute to these costs, including substantial administrative expenses associated with establishing eligibility, scheduling, and dispatching for individual riders. The ADA population has increased and San Mateo County’s senior population continues to grow.
Promotion of Fixed-route Travel
This initiative promotes SamTrans fixed-route service through travel training those with disabilities, reducing demand on paratransit services. Travel training is a one-on-one training provided at no cost to participants, teaching those with disabilities on how to navigate the District’s fixed-route services. Participants are taught where to wait, how to get on the bus, pay the fare, where to sit, how to get off at the right stop, how to make connections, and how to seek help if they have trouble during the trip. By removing possible barriers, riders with disabilities may feel more comfortable and would be encouraged to use fixed-route buses. Additionally, the District offers a Transit Ambassador program that provides group training and one-on-one training for people who are not applying for paratransit. Transit Ambassadors also organize trips to encourage people to try SamTrans.

Enhanced ADA Paratransit Certification Process
Since 2004, the District has utilized a paratransit eligibility contractor to conduct in-person eligibility evaluations, helping to minimize administrative costs by reducing demand of District personnel.

Implement Conditional Eligibility
Conditional eligibility refers to paratransit eligibility for some trips, but not all, as the customer’s ability to use fixed-route service may change according to the circumstance. The District has held customers accountable to their conditional eligibility status for more than 15 years. In instances where paratransit trips are limited, the District allows ADA paratransit customers to ride free on buses. Implementing conditional eligibility has the benefit of reducing paratransit trips that may be better served by fixed routes buses.

Ride Free Policy
The District implemented a ride free policy to incentivize paratransit customers to use fixed-route buses for their daily travel. Eligible participants and their personal care attendants who possess eligibility identification cards are allowed to ride all regular fixed route SamTrans trips without paying a fare. Not only does this help to increase ridership on SamTrans, it helps to reduce demand for paratransit services.
Explore Alternative Service Delivery Model

The District may reduce costs by transferring service delivery and dispatching to a centralized call center. The District also may be able to realize savings by centralizing its reservation call process in a lower cost area. For example, reservation calls for the Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority are answered by a centralized call center in Utah.

Another possibility is the implementation of a volunteer driver program. This could be operated by a non-profit organization and could include vehicle sharing where there is a pool of vehicles available for volunteers to use. The program could provide seniors and people with disabilities with appropriate transportation services by the volunteer drivers.

Align ADA Paratransit Service Area to Legal Mandate

The District currently provides ADA paratransit services beyond the ¾ mile geographic area requirement established by law. However, this has added to the District’s financial burden in providing paratransit services to a larger population and geographic area than required. To help curb costs, the District could consider limiting the geographically eligible population to what is legally required.
Monitoring Plan

As part of the TSP requirement, the District will establish a monitoring program. On an annual basis, the District will submit data on the progress of achieving its selected performance measure.

The District will utilize the annual submittal of operating data to the National Transit Database (NTD) for its submittal to the MTC. The annual NTD submittal takes place each Fall, as a result, the submittal to MTC will occur shortly after that. The District will provide, on an annual basis, information on passenger trips, vehicle revenue hours, vehicle revenue miles, and operating expenses for all its fixed route and paratransit services. Prior to submittal, the District will review the information with the Board to receive input.

The District will track progress in meeting its selected performance measure, identifying areas for improvement with corresponding actions.
RESOLUTION NO. 2013 -

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

***

APPROVING THE SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT'S TRANSIT SUSTAINABILITY PROJECT STRATEGIC PLAN

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) created the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) in January 2010 to address operating and capital shortfalls experienced by various transit operators in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the TSP is to help improve transit performance and to attract more customers to the San Francisco Bay Area’s transit systems; and

WHEREAS, the MTC adopted the TSP’s final recommendations on May 23, 2012, which established TSP performance measures and targets for the seven large San Francisco Bay Area transit operators, including the San Mateo County Transit District (District); and

WHEREAS, as part of the TSP final recommendations, MTC requires the seven large operators to each achieve a five percent real reduction in at least one of the following performance measures by Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 and no growth beyond Consumer Price Index (CPI) thereafter: a) cost per service hour; b) cost per passenger; or c) cost per passenger mile; and

WHEREAS, the five percent real reduction is measured against the highest reported costs between FY2008 and FY2011 for one of the three performance measures listed above; and

WHEREAS, the seven operators are required to adopt strategic plans by March 31, 2013, for the purpose of establishing strategies, and a monitoring program, on how to
achieve the five percent real reduction, and on an annual basis, the operators are to submit data to the MTC on the progress of achieving their reduction targets; and

WHEREAS, MTC will analyze the agencies’ progress in meeting these targets in FY2018, and by FY2019, MTC will link existing and new operating and capital funds administered by MTC to the progress that operators have made towards achieving the targets in their strategic plans; and

WHEREAS, Staff has finalized a Strategic Plan, the draft outline of which was previously provided to the Board on January 9, 2013, and now recommends Board approval of the final Strategic Plan so that Staff can submit it to the MTC by March 31, 2013.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby approves the TSP Strategic Plan for submittal to the MTC by March 31, 2013.

Regularly passed and adopted this 13th day of February 2013, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

____________________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

____________________________________
District Secretary
TO: Planning, Development & Sustainability Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: UPDATE ON SAMTRANS TITLE VI REQUIREMENTS

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

SIGNIFICANCE
Staff will give an update on new Title VI requirements as they relate to SamTrans fixed-route service at the February 13, 2013 Board meeting.

Requirements for compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 were recently updated by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and now require each large public transportation providers’ governing board to approve five standards and policies:

- Major Service Change Policy
- Disparate Impact Policy
- Disproportionate Burden Policy
- System-wide Service Standards
- System-wide Service Policies

The first two policies define service standards and policies to be used when determining whether service and facilities are distributed equitably to minority and non-minority routes and facilities. The third policy defines “major service change” as a threshold for when an agency will conduct a thorough analysis of the potential effects of service changes on protected populations. The last two policies define thresholds for when a fare change or major service change could result in a “disparate impact” on a minority population or a “disproportionate burden” on a low-income population. The new Federal requirements also necessitate transit agencies to seek public input before Board action on the latter three policies. Staff will be seeking public input through four community meetings throughout the county. Comments also can be made through the mail, telephone and the dedicated e-mail address of TitleVI@samtrans.com. Public comments on the proposed standards and policies will be accepted from February 5 to March 5, 2013 at 5:00 p.m.
The community meetings will be held:

- **Tuesday, Feb. 12, 6:30 p.m. to 8 p.m.**  
  Pacifica - Sanchez Library  
  1111 Terra Nova Blvd., Pacifica

- **Tuesday, Feb. 19, 6:40 p.m. to 8 p.m.**  
  War Memorial Activity Room  
  6655 Mission St., Daly City

- **Thursday, Feb. 21, 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.**  
  SamTrans Offices  
  1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos

- **Monday, Feb. 25, 6:30 p.m. to 8 p.m.**  
  Lewis and Joan Platt East Palo Alto Family YMCA  
  550 Bell St., East Palo Alto

Following the conclusion of the public meetings, staff will revise the draft policies based on public and Board input and submit the final policies to the Board for approval at the March 13 meeting.

The draft standards and policies are attached to this staff report for Board review.

**BUDGET IMPACT**

There is no impact on the budget.

**BACKGROUND**

SamTrans, as a recipient of FTA grant assistance, is required to comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and implementing regulations. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act prohibits recipients of Federal assistance from discriminating based on race, color, or national origin. Certain compliance requirements apply specifically to public transit providers operating 50 or more fixed-route vehicles in urbanized areas with populations of 200,000 or more; SamTrans meets this threshold.

Prepared by: Michael Eshleman, Planner  
650-508-6227
SAMTRANS TITLE VI STANDARDS AND POLICIES

Federal Title VI requirements of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 were recently updated by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and now require each large public transportation provider’s governing board to approve five standards and policies:

- Major Service Change Policy
- Disparate Impact Policy
- Disproportionate Burden Policy
- System-wide Service Standards
- System-wide Service Policies

Staff has developed draft standards and policies and included them within this document for Board review.

The first policy defines “major service change” as a threshold for when an agency will conduct a thorough analysis of the potential effects of service changes on protected populations. For the second and third policies, agencies are required to define thresholds for when they will find that a fare change or major service change will result in a “disparate impact” on the minority population or a “disproportionate burden” on the low-income population. The last two policies define service standards and policies to be used when determining whether service and amenities are distributed equitably to minority and non-minority routes and facilities.

The Major Service Change Policy, Disparate Impact Policy, and Disproportionate Impact Policy are currently going through public review via a series of four public meetings held throughout the county. Information about the Title VI process, complaint procedures, and the proposed standards and policies are available via the SamTrans website as well by calling the customer service phone number or emailing a dedicated email address.

These policies are in draft form and will be revised based on input from the public and the Board. They will be brought back as final proposals for approval by the Board at the March 13 meeting.
PART 1

MAJOR SERVICE CHANGE POLICY

All major increases or decreases in transit service are subject to a Title VI Equity Analysis prior to Board approval of the service change. A Title VI Equity Analysis completed for a major service change must be presented to the San Mateo County Transit District Board of Directors for its consideration and included in the SamTrans Title VI Program with a record of action taken by the Board.

A major service change is defined as:

A reduction or increase of 25 percent or more in total vehicle revenue miles in service on any specific route over a one-week period.

The following service changes are exempted:

- Changes to a service on a route with fewer than 10 total trips in a typical service day are not considered “major” unless service on that route is eliminated completely on any such day.
- The introduction or discontinuation of short- or limited-term service (e.g., promotional, demonstration, seasonal or emergency service, or service provided as mitigation or diversions for construction or other similar activities), as long as the service will be/has been operated for no more than twelve months.
- SamTrans-operated transit service that is replaced by a different mode or operator providing a service with the same or better headways, fare, transfer options, span of service, and stops.
PART 2

DISPARATE IMPACT POLICY

This policy establishes a threshold for determining whether a given action has a disparate impact on minority populations. Per FTA Circular 4702.1B:

Disparate impact refers to a facially neutral policy or practice that disproportionately affects members of a group identified by race, color, or national origin, where the recipient’s policy or practice lacks a substantial legitimate justification and where there exists one or more alternatives that would serve the same legitimate objectives but with less disproportionate effect on the basis of race, color, or national origin...

The policy shall establish a threshold for determining when adverse effects of fare/service changes are borne disproportionately by minority populations. The disparate impact threshold defines statistically significant disparity and may be presented as a statistical percentage of impacts borne by minority populations compared to impacts borne by non-minority populations. The disparate impact threshold must be applied uniformly... and cannot be altered until the next Title VI Program submission.

In the course of performing a Title VI Equity Analysis, SamTrans must analyze how the proposed action would impact minority as compared to non-minority populations. In the event the proposed action has a negative impact that affects minorities more than non-minorities with a disparity that exceeds the adopted Disparate Impact Threshold, or that benefits non-minorities more than minorities with a disparity that exceeds the adopted Disparate Impact Threshold, SamTrans must evaluate whether there is an alternative that has a more equitable impact. Otherwise, SamTrans must take measures to mitigate the impact of the proposed action on the affected minority population and demonstrate that a legitimate business purpose cannot otherwise be accomplished and that the proposed change is the least discriminatory alternative.

The Disparate Impact Threshold to determine if the adverse impacts of a major service change (as defined in the first part of this document) or a fare adjustment is established at 20 percent based on the cumulative impact of the proposed service and/or fare changes. This threshold applies to the difference of the impacts borne by minority populations compared to the same impacts borne by non-minority populations.
PART 3

DISPROPORTIONATE BURDEN POLICY

This policy establishes a threshold for determining whether a given action has a disproportionate burden on low-income populations versus non-low-income populations. The Disproportionate Burden Policy applies only to low-income populations that are not also minority populations. Per FTA Circular 4702.1B:

The policy shall establish a threshold for determining when adverse effects of [fare/service] changes are borne disproportionately by low-income populations. The disproportionate burden threshold defines statistically significant disparity and may be presented as a statistical percentage of impacts borne by low-income populations as compared to impacts born by non-low-income populations.... The disproportionate burden threshold must be applied uniformly... and cannot be altered until the next [Title VI] program submission.... At the conclusion of the analysis, if the transit provider finds that low-income populations will bear a disproportionate burden of the proposed fare/service change, the transit provider should take steps to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts where practicable. The transit provider should describe alternatives available to low-income populations affected by the fare/service changes.

The SamTrans Disproportionate Burden Threshold to determine if the adverse impacts of a major service change (as defined in the first part of this document) or a fare adjustment is established at 20 percent based on the cumulative impact of the proposed service and/or fare changes. This threshold applies to the difference of the impacts borne by low-income populations compared to the same impacts borne by non-low-income populations.
PART 4

SYSTEMWIDE SERVICE STANDARDS

Pursuant to requirements set forth in The Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Circular 4702.1B SamTrans must establish and monitor its performance under quantitative Service Standards and qualitative Service Policies. These service standards contained herein are used to develop and maintain efficient and effective fixed-route transit service. In some cases, these standards differ from standards used by SamTrans for other purposes.

The FTA requires all fixed-route transit providers of public transportation to develop quantitative standards for the following indicators. Individual public transportation providers set these standards; therefore, these standards will apply to each individual agency rather than across the entire transit industry:

A. Vehicle Load
B. Vehicle Headways
C. On-time Performance
D. Service Availability

For the purposes of defining service standards and policies for SamTrans fixed-route service, the agency has split its system into four route categories:

- Coastal: Routes serving the coastal community – from Half Moon Bay to Pacifica, excluding those routes which link Pacifica to Daly City.
- Community: Infrequent, community-specific routes which do not operate during off-peak hours.
- Local: Routes designed to carry passengers between major passenger hubs, employment centers, and residential neighborhoods.
- Multi-city: Routes serving multiple cities, including some offering express or late-night service.
- Mainline: Long-distance routes serving significant portions of the county, generally at higher frequency.

The categories were not developed to, and in fact do not, differentiate routes by minority or income status of the areas or passengers served. The following chart illustrates which routes belong to each category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Routes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>14, 16, 17, 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>24, 35, 36, 38, 43, 46, 53, 54, 55, 58, 72, 73, 83, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>110, 112, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 130, 132, 133, 140, 141, 250, 251, 260, 262, 270, 271, 274, 280, 281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-City</td>
<td>295, 296, 297, 359, 397, KX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline</td>
<td>292, 390, 391, ECR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 1: Routes by Category
SamTrans also defines service standards differently for peak and off-peak service. “Off-peak” refers to weekday midday and evening service, as well as Saturday, Sunday, and Holiday service.

**A. VEHICLE LOAD**

Vehicle Load Factor is described as follows by FTA Circular 4702.1B:

Vehicle load can be expressed as the ratio of passengers to the total number of seats on a vehicle. For example, on a 40-seat bus, a vehicle load of 1.3 means all seats are filled and there are approximately 12 standees. A vehicle load standard is generally expressed in terms of peak and off-peak times. Transit providers that operate multiple modes of transit must describe the specific vehicle load standards for peak and off-peak times for each mode of fixed-route transit service (i.e., bus, express bus, bus rapid transit, light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail, passenger ferry, etc., as applicable), as the standard may differ by mode.

SamTrans calculates Vehicle Load Factor by dividing the average peak passenger load on each route by the number of seats on the type of bus typically assigned to that route. Vehicle Load Factor is monitored regularly to ensure customer comfort and to determine whether additional capacity needs to be added to specific trips or routes based on changing demand patterns. Vehicle Load Factor standards are presented in the exhibit below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Peak</th>
<th>Off-Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-City</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. VEHICLE HEADWAY**

Vehicle headway is described as follows by FTA Circular 4702.1B:

Vehicle headway is the amount of time between two vehicles traveling in the same direction on a given line or combination of lines. A shorter headway corresponds to more frequent service. Vehicle headways are measured in minutes (e.g., every 15 minutes); service frequency is measured in vehicles per hour (e.g., four buses per hour). Headways and frequency of service are general indications of the level of service provided along a route. Vehicle headway is one component of the amount of travel time expended by a passenger to reach his/her destination.
destination. A vehicle headway standard is generally expressed for peak and off-peak service as an increment of time (e.g., peak: every 15 minutes; and off peak: every 30 minutes). Transit providers may set different vehicle headway standards for different modes of transit service. A vehicle headway standard might establish a minimum frequency of service by area based on population density. For example, service at 15-minute peak headways and 30-minute off-peak headways might be the standard for routes serving the most densely populated portions of the service area, whereas 30-minute peak headways and 45-minute off-peak headways might be the standard in less densely populated areas. Headway standards are also typically related to vehicle load. For example, a service standard might state that vehicle headways will be improved first on routes that exceed the load factor standard or on routes that have the highest load factors.

SamTrans calculates headway by determining the average length of time between buses on each route during peak and off-peak times. In the event a route regularly exceeds Vehicle Load Factor standards, SamTrans will evaluate whether frequency on that route should be adjusted within the confines of existing or expected funding levels. Vehicle headway standards are presented in the exhibit below.

**Exhibit 3: Vehicle Headway Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Peak</th>
<th>Off-Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>90 minutes</td>
<td>90 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>60 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-City</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
<td>60 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>60 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. ON-TIME PERFORMANCE**

On-time performance is described as follows by FTA Circular 4702.1B:

On-time performance is a measure of runs completed as scheduled. This criterion first must define what is considered to be “on time.” For example, a transit provider may consider it acceptable if a vehicle completes a scheduled run between zero and five minutes late in comparison to the established schedule. On-time performance can be measured against route origins and destinations only, or against origins and destinations as well as specified time points along the route. Some transit providers set an on-time performance standard that prohibits vehicles from running early (i.e., ahead of schedule) while others allow vehicles to run early within a specified window of time (e.g., up to five minutes ahead of schedule). An acceptable level of performance must be defined (expressed as a percentage). The percentage of runs completed system-wide or on a particular route or line within the standard must be calculated and
measured against the level of performance for the system. For example, a transit provider might define on-time performance as 95 percent of all runs system-wide or on a particular route or line completed within the allowed “on-time” window.

A bus is determined to be late if it departs its scheduled “time point” five or more minutes later than the published time. Buses are considered early if they depart from a published time point at any time prior to the scheduled departure. It is SamTrans’ goal to be on-time at least 85 percent of the time. On-time performance is tracked and published on a weekly basis and also included within monthly performance reports to the SamTrans Board of Directors. Bus Transportation staff also regularly monitors on-time performance and counsels operators who consistently fail to meet on-time performance standards that are within their control. Discussions with bus operators are also used to identify vehicle scheduling issues which are corrected through service changes three times annually. On-time performance standards are presented in the exhibit below.

**Exhibit 4: On-Time Performance Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Peak</th>
<th>Off-Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-City</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainline</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. SERVICE AVAILABILITY**

Service availability/transit access is described as follows by FTA Circular 4702.1B:

Service availability is a general measure of the distribution of routes within a transit provider’s service area. For example, a transit provider might set a service standard to distribute routes such that a specified percentage of all residents in the service area are within a one-quarter mile walk of bus service or a one-half mile walk of rail service. A standard might also indicate the maximum distance between stops or stations. These measures related to coverage and stop/station distances might also vary by population density. For example, in more densely populated areas, the standard for bus stop distance might be a shorter distance than it would be in less densely populated areas, and the percentage of the total population within a one-quarter mile walk of routes or lines might be higher in more densely populated areas than it would be in less densely populated areas. Commuter rail service or passenger ferry service availability standards might include a threshold of residents within a certain driving distance as well as within walking distance of the stations or access to the terminal.
SamTrans’ goal is to ensure 70 percent of county residents live within walking distance (i.e., one quarter mile) of a bus stop. SamTrans service is particularly strong in communities with significant minority and low-income populations. Transit access is determined by mapping all active bus stops within the system and then calculating the population (based on 2010 Census data) within one-quarter mile radii of those stops. This information is then compared to the total county population.
PART 5

SYSTEMWIDE SERVICE POLICIES

The FTA requires fixed-route transit providers to develop a policy for each of the following service indicators. Transit providers also may opt to set policies for additional indicators. The following system-wide policies differ from service standards in that they are not necessarily based on meeting a quantitative threshold, but rather qualitative evaluation results:

A. Vehicle Assignment
B. Transit Amenities

A. VEHICLE ASSIGNMENT

Vehicle assignment is described as follows by FTA Circular 4702.1B:

Vehicle assignment refers to the process by which transit vehicles are placed into service in depots and on routes throughout the transit provider’s system. Policies for vehicle assignment may be based on the age of the vehicle, where age would be a proxy for condition. For example, a transit provider could set a policy to assign vehicles to depots so that the age of the vehicles at each depot does not exceed the system-wide average. The policy could also be based on the type of vehicle. For example, a transit provider may set a policy to assign vehicles with more capacity to routes with higher ridership and/or during peak periods. The policy could also be based on the type of service offered. For example, a transit provider may set a policy to assign specific types of vehicles to express or commuter service. Transit providers deploying vehicles equipped with technology designed to reduce emissions could choose to set a policy for how these vehicles will be deployed throughout the service area.

SamTrans’ policy with respect to vehicle assignment is depot-specific. SamTrans currently has four general types of buses in the fleet, all of which are maintained to the same strict standards (whether by the District or its contract operator):

- 29-foot transit coaches
- 35-foot low-floor transit coaches
- 40-foot transit coaches
- 60-foot articulated coaches

All buses have the same level of amenities available to riders. Coaches are distributed among the various depots according to the number of operator runs assigned to each depot. The specific type of vehicle is then chosen by the operator based on the demands of the specific schedules he/she will be operating that day (i.e., shorter buses...
are used on routes with tighter turning motions, articulated coaches are used on routes with higher ridership). All 29-foot buses are assigned to Route 17, which operates along the coast and generally has lower ridership and features difficult turning motions at certain points along the route. SamTrans is expecting delivery of new diesel-hybrid coaches in the next several years. Those new buses will be assigned in such a manner to ensure they are distributed equitably among the communities SamTrans serves.

In short, buses are not assigned to specific communities within San Mateo County based on vehicle age or size but rather to serve specific routes that call for them based on the needs of that route. Many of the routes and runs serve multiple communities with diverse populations. Given SamTrans’ strict standards with respect to maintenance, age does not serve as a viable proxy for diminished quality.

B. TRANSIT AMENITIES

Transit amenities is described as follows by FTA Circular 4702.1B:

Transit amenities refer to items of comfort, convenience, and safety that are available to the general riding public. Fixed-route transit providers must set a policy to ensure equitable distribution of transit amenities across the system. Transit providers may have different policies for the different modes of service that they provide. Policies in this area address how these amenities are distributed within a transit system, and the manner of their distribution determines whether transit users have equal access to these amenities. This is not intended to impact funding decisions for transit amenities. Rather, this applies after a transit provider has decided to fund an amenity.

Transit amenities are distributed on a system-wide basis. Transit amenities include shelters, benches, trash receptacles, and park-and-ride facilities. The location of transit amenities is determined by factors such as ridership, individual requests, staff recommendations, and vendor preference (in the case of shelters which feature advertisements).

Bus Shelters

District policy states that shelters are considered for installation based on the following criteria:

- Stops where more than 200 passengers board each day.
- 75 percent of shelters shall be located in Census Tracts on routes associated within urbanized areas.
- Distribution of shelters county-wide should match the distribution of minority Census tracts.
- Locations for shelters with advertisements are chosen by the vendor based on the visibility and traffic.
District policy also states that all bus shelters shall include trash receptacles and that all stops with shelters and benches be cleaned and have their trash receptacles emptied at least once each week.

**Bus Stop Benches**

Benches are considered for installation based on the following criteria:
- Stops where more than 200 passengers board each day.
- Distribution of benches county-wide should match the distribution of minority Census tracts.

District policy states that stops with benches shall be cleaned at least once each week.

**Trash Receptacles**

Trash receptacles are considered for installation based on the following criteria:
- Stops where over 200 passengers board each day.
- Distribution of trash receptacles county-wide should match the distribution of minority Census tracts.

District policy states that trash receptacles shall be emptied at least one each week.

**Next Bus Arrival Signage**

Electronic signage informing passengers of the predicted arrival of the next bus for a given route can significantly improve the experience for customers. The District’s policy with respect to electronic bus arrival signage is to install signage at locations meeting the following criteria:
- The location is a multi-modal transit center.
- The location is served by multiple SamTrans routes.
- Ridership is high at the location.
- Funding is available for installation/maintenance (e.g. from partner agencies).
- Installation is coordinated with other applicable agencies.

If and when SamTrans is in a position to introduce a comprehensive, system-wide electronic signage program, new policies will be developed to ensure equitable siting.
TO: Planning, Development & Sustainability Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: SAMTRANS TRIENNIAL CUSTOMER SURVEY KEY FINDINGS

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

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

SamTrans conducts a survey of its customers every three years with the following objectives:

- Determine trip characteristics, such as level of usage, trip purpose and fare category
- Assess the ratings of 11 specific service characteristics
- Identify how customers would like to receive information about SamTrans
- Provide current customer demographics.

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

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
SamTrans retained the services of Corey, Canapary & Galanis Research of San Francisco through a competitive process. CC&G surveyed 5,947 customers in October 2012. The survey was administered in both English and Spanish.

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

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

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2013 – 3:00 p.m.
or immediately following Committee meetings

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

2. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE (LLOYD, MATSUMOTO, TISSIER)
   a. Election of Officers for 2013

3. CONSENT CALENDAR
   MOTION
   a. Approval of Minutes of Board of Directors Meeting of January 9, 2013
   b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for December 2012
   c. Acceptance of Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review
      and Outlook for the Quarter Ended December 31, 2012

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

5. APPROVAL OF MODIFIED SCHEDULE DURING 2013 GOVERNING STANDING COMMITTEE
   AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING DATES

6. REPORT OF THE CHAIR
   a. Resolution of Appreciation to Outgoing Chair, Jerry Deal

7. REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER/CEO
   a. 30-Year Safe Driver Award for Vincent Gavin

8. COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE
   (Accessibility, Senior Services, and Community Issues)
   SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
   a. Accessibility Update
   b. PCC Update
   c. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
Board of Directors  
Agenda for February 13, 2013

d. Mobility Management Report – ADA Paratransit Service  
e. Multimodal Ridership Report - December 2012

9. FINANCE COMMITTEE  
RESOLUTION  
a. Authorize the Execution of a Memorandum of Understanding with the County of San Mateo to Access the County’s Trunked Radio System and Maintenance of the District’s Radio Equipment for Ten Years at a Total Estimated Cost of $3,368,010

SUBJECTS DISCUSSED  

10. LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE  
MOTION  
a. Approval of the 2013 Legislative Program

SUBJECTS DISCUSSED  
b. State and Federal Legislative Update

11. PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE  
RESOLUTION  
a. Approval of the Transit Sustainability Project Strategic Plan

SUBJECT DISCUSSED  
b. Update on Title VI Requirements  
c. SamTrans Triennial Customer Survey Key Findings

12. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

13. BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS/COMMENTS

14. GENERAL COUNSEL PROPOSAL

15. DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING – March 13, 2013 at 2 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District, Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, 1250 Carlos Ave., San Carlos 94070

16. ADJOURNMENT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
Board Members Present: J. Deal (Chair), J. Gee, S. Harris, A. Lloyd, K. Matsumoto, A. Tissier

Board Members Absent: C. Groom, R. Guilbault, Z. Kersteen-Tucker


Chair Jerry Deal called the meeting to order at 3:29 p.m.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE (LLOYD, MATSUMOTO, TISSIER)

a. Election of Officers for 2013

Director Adrienne Tissier asked this item be moved to next month after the public members are sworn in.

CONSENT CALENDAR

a. Approval of Minutes of Board of Directors Meeting of December 12, 2012
b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for November 2012

The Board approved the consent calendar (Lloyd/Tissier).

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jerry Grace, San Pablo, asked if the Metropolitan Transportation Commission Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) requirement is a good idea.

APPOINTMENT OF PUBLIC MEMBERS (DEAL, GEE, TISSIER)

Chair Deal said a subcommittee interviewed six candidates for the public member seats. He said the subcommittee recommends reappointing Directors Rose Guilbault and Shirley Harris to another term. The Committee likes Director Harris’s involvement and participation in the American Public Transportation Association. Chair Deal said there were some very good applicants and it made it very hard to make a decision.

Legal Counsel David Miller said the only members of this Board eligible to vote on the public member appointments are those who are appointees of the Board of Supervisors and City Selection Committee.

A motion (Deal/Gee) to reappoint Directors Guilbault and Harris was approved.
Director Harris said she is appreciative of the opportunity to continue to work on the Board and to remain involved in the American Public Transportation Association.

**REPORT OF CHAIR**

No report.

**REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER/CEO**

General Manager/CEO Michael Scanlon reported:

- Congratulated Directors Gee, Harris and Guilbault on their reappointments.
- The TSP is absolutely the right thing to do and is necessary to make sure the right things are being achieved out of the investment.
- District Secretary Martha Martinez polled the Board on changing the 2013 meeting calendar. Staff will bring an action item to the Board next month to shift the meeting from the second Wednesday to the first Wednesday effective for the April meeting.
- Staff continues to work on providing support service for the Devil’s Slide Tunnel ribbon-cutting event.
- Staff, along with Caltrain and MV Transportation staff, participated in a field emergency exercise on December 15. There was outstanding support from all the first responders, the Federal Railroad Administration and the California Public Utilities Commission.
- An independent contractor conducted a quarterly maintenance audit of MV Transportation and it is in full compliance with the District’s preventative maintenance program. No vehicles were removed from service due to safety problems.
- The scheduling department is working with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority to help the city of Belmont on a proposal for a shuttle.
- Runbook 110 is effective January 13 and one change will move service from Farallone Avenue in Montara.
- The reading file contains the Riders Digest and Transit Fun Guide.

**COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE – S. Harris**

**SUBJECTS DISCUSSED**

a. Accessibility Update
b. PCC Update
c. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report
d. Mobility Management Report – Fixed-route Bus Service
e. Multimodal Ridership Report – November 2012

**FINANCE COMMITTEE – J. Gee**

**RESOLUTIONS**

a. Authorize Amendment of Fiscal Year 2013 Operating Budget in the Amount of $299,554 for a Total Budget of $132,107,471
b. Authorize the Disposition of Two Surplus Vehicles
c. Authorize Exercising Option with Gillig, LLC for the Purchase and Delivery of 62 New Heavy-Duty Buses for a Total estimated Cost of $32,284,040
d. Authorize Award of Contract to Seven Island Painting, Inc. to Provide Painting and Related Services for a Total Estimated Cost of $200,880 for a Three-year Base Term

e. Authorize Award of Contract to Holland & Knight, LLP to Provide Federal Legislative Advocacy Services for a Firm-fixed Price of $240,000 for a Five-year Period

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

**LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE – S. Harris**

**SUBJECT DISCUSSED**

a. State and Federal Legislative Update

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT & SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE – A. Lloyd**

**SUBJECT DISCUSSED**

a. Preliminary SamTrans Transit Sustainability Project Strategic Plan

b. Update on SamTrans Service Plan and Title VI Requirements

**WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

No discussion

**BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS/COMMENTS**

Director Karyl Matsumoto reported Directors Carole Groom, Terry Nagel and herself were sworn in at the January San Mateo County Transportation Authority meeting and Director Rosanne Foust will be sworn in at the February meeting. Also, Director Groom was elected chair.

**GENERAL COUNSEL PROPOSAL**

No report.

**DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING** – February 13, 2013 at 2 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District, Administrative Building, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070.

Meeting adjourned at 3:47 p.m.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

STAFF REPORT

TO: Board of Directors

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Martha Martinez          David J. Miller
District Secretary           Legal Counsel

SUBJECT: APPROVAL OF MODIFIED SCHEDULE DURING 2013 GOVERNING STANDING COMMITTEE AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING DATES

ACTION

Staff proposes the Board approve a modification of the Standing Committees and Board of Directors regular meeting schedule from the second Wednesday of every month to the first Wednesday of every month commencing in April 2013 through December 2013.

SIGNIFICANCE

Action to approve a change in the Standing Committees and Board of Directors regular meeting schedule as proposed will facilitate continued service on the SamTrans Board by Supervisor Carole Groom. Recently, Supervisor Groom was appointed to the California Coastal Commission whose Board meets on the second Wednesday of each month. During the past year Director Groom has served as vice chair of the Board. Additionally, she has participated actively on the SamTrans Service Plan Advisory Committee. SamTrans and its constituents will benefit from the ability of Director Groom to continue her valued service as a member of the SamTrans Board in the coming year during which time, among the many important policy matters to be addressed by the District, the SamTrans Service Plan she has devoted considerable time and attention to will be presented to the public and will be presented to the Board of Directors for final approval.

BUDGET IMPACT

There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND

Section 4 of the Rules of Procedure of the Board of Directors provides:

“Except as otherwise determined by the Board, regular meetings of the Board and the Standing Committees of the Board shall be held on the second Wednesday of every month commencing at 2:00 p.m. at the District’s Administrative Headquarters located at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, California. Meetings of the full Board will take place directly following the noticed Committee meetings.”
For the reasons stated above, staff proposes that the Board take action as permitted by the Rules of Procedure to modify the dates of the regular Standing Committees and Board meetings for the period commencing in April 2013 through December 2013. The proposed revised meeting calendar is attached. Absent further action by the Board of Directors, the regular meeting dates for Standing Committees and the Board of Directors shall revert to the second Wednesday of every month commencing with the January 8, 2014 meeting.

Prepared By: Martha Martinez 650-508-6242