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AGENDA

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

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

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2015 – 2 P.M.

1. Call to Order (Committee of the Whole)

ACTION

2. Approval of Minutes of Community Relations Committee Meeting of January 7, 2015

INFORMATIONAL

3. Accessibility Update – Tina Dubost
4. Paratransit Coordinating Council Update - Mike Levinson
5. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report - Peter Ratto
6. Mobility Management Report – Caltrain

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: K. Matsumoto (Committee Chair), C. Groom, S. Harris

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


Committee Chair Karyl Matsumoto called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Community Relations Committee (CRC) Meeting of December 3, 2014
Motion/Second: Guilbault/Harris
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier

Accessibility Update – Tina Dubost
Tina Dubost, Manager, Accessible Transit Services, said the Redi-Wheels transition from MV Transportation to First Transit occurred on January 1 and is going well. In December staff met with the Coastside Transportation Committee and discussed statistics on Coastside paratransit, Paratransit Coordinating Council’s (PCC) Consumer Corps and Route 17 and other fixed-route services on the Coastside.

PCC Update – Mike Levinson
Mike Levinson, PCC Chair, said the PCC received an update on paratransit-related legislative and local initiative issues and ways for the PCC to get involved on issues that support paratransit. The PCC will be creating a year-end report of all the educational presentations they gave during the year.

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Liaison Report - Peter Ratto
Peter Ratto, CAC Chair, said the CAC received presentations on the Board-adopted Strategic Plan and the draft El Camino Bus Rapid Transit Phasing Study. Mr. Ratto thanked Caltrain and its sponsors for the annual Holiday Train. He said he is the chair of the Salvation Army Harbor Light Center Advisory Board. Mr. Ratto said this event is one of Salvation Army’s largest sources of toys in the Bay Area.

Mobility Management Report – Fixed-Route Bus Service
Chester Patton, Director, Bus Transportation, reported:
- November 2014 statistics:
  - Total monthly ridership is almost at one million riders.
  - Average weekday ridership (AWR) is up 2.5 percent.
  - Farebox revenue is slightly above $1.4 million.
  - Token usage remains popular.
  - Day Pass usage continues to rise and has grown two and a half times since its launch.
On-time performance (OTP) is 84 percent, just below the goal of 85 percent.

Fleet reliability is 27,000 miles between service calls. This is above the average of 20,000 miles between service calls.

Year to date there have been 48 missed schedules.

Complaints are down to about 150 complaints for every one million trips.

During calendar year 2014 there were over 29,000 total hours of employee development and training.

The Maintenance Apprenticeship Program is in final development. This will be a four-year State certified program.

The next bus replacement project will be for the 2002 North American Bus Industries 60-foot articulated buses and 2003 Gillig 40-foot buses.

Director Rose Guilbault asked if the apprenticeship program will be open to employees from outside the agency. Chuck Harvey, Deputy CEO, said the program is still in development, but outside apprentices will be hired and they would go through the program and become full journeyman mechanics.

Director Shirley Harris said she likes seeing all the training being given to employees.

Director Zoe Kersteen-Tucker asked if a person can be hired as an employee once they go through the program. Mr. Harvey said yes and the incentive is to become a full journeyman mechanic because as a person advances in the program there are salary increases.

Director Kersteen-Tucker said the coastside service has taken a deep drop in OTP over the last six months. Mr. Harvey said with the SamTrans Service Plan routes 17 and 294 were combined and there is traffic congestion. The scheduling team is looking at service tweaks.

Committee Chair Matsumoto asked about the factors that affect OTP. Mr. Patton said traffic patterns, customer assistance, or schedules may need to be improved.

Committee Chair Matsumoto asked if the training for first responders on the new hybrid buses has been completed. Mr. Patton said he is not sure, but will follow-up and report back.

Chair Jeff Gee asked if there will be grant opportunities for the replacement of the 2002 and 2003 buses. Mr. Harvey said all these vehicles are in the Federal Transit Administration pot for replacement. He said about 80 percent of the replacement cost is automatically coming from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission pool.

Mr. Harvey said staff can usually obtain other small portions of funding to help reduce the 20 percent local match that comes out of the sales tax. He said staff is not sure if they will buy super-clean diesel or if there is any opportunity to buy hybrids. Mr. Harvey said the California Air Resources Board is considering mandating some sub-zero emissions bus purchases.

**Multimodal Ridership Report – November 2014**

Mr. Harvey reported:

- AWR November 2014 compared to November 2013
  - Bus was 43,960, an increase of 2.5 percent.
Paratransit was 1,040, a decrease of 1 percent.
Caltrain was 56,900, an increase of 9.4 percent.
Caltrain shuttle was 11,600, a decrease of 5.9 percent.

Total year to date November 2014 compared to November 2013
- Bus ridership was 5,607,910, an increase of 3.8 percent.
- Paratransit ridership was 138,900, an increase of 4.5 percent.
- Caltrain ridership was 7,912,370, an increase of 11.2 percent.
- Shuttles ridership was 1,296,310, an increase of 14.1 percent.
- Total ridership on all modes was 14,955,480, an increase of 8.5 percent.

Adjourned: 2:44 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 Board 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 AL-Com meetings are held on a quarterly basis.

Minutes from the December 9 PCC meeting are attached. Minutes from the November 3 SAAC meeting are attached.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
No additional information.

Prepared by: Tina Dubost, Manager, Accessible Transit Services  650-508-6247
ATTENDANCE: Members Present: Mike Levinson, Chair; Dr. Aki Eejima, Consumer; Dale Edwards, Consumer; Dinae Cruise, Consumer; Nancy Keegan, San Carlos Adult Day Services; Judy Garcia, Consumer; Sammi (Wilhelmina) Riley; Marie Violet, Sequoia Hospital; Barbara Kalt, Rosener House; Sandra Lang, COA; Tina Dubost, SamTrans; Vincent Merola, CiD.

GUESTS: John Murphy, MV Transportation; Patti Smith, Consumer; Shannon Sanchez, Consumer; Dave Daley, First Transit; Talib Salamin, Serra Taxi Cab; John Sanderson, SamTrans; Lynn Spicer, MV Transportation; Coli Bertucelli, Community Gatepath; Elly Colwell, SamTrans; Ashish John, SamTrans; Erin Swartz, PCC Staff; Linda Rhine, Nelson-Nygaard.

ABSENTEES: Dr. Michal Settles, Vice-Chair; Maureen Dunn, Senior Focus; Susan Capeloto, DOR; Jim Engvall, COD.

(Member Attendance: 12, 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 THE NOVEMBER PCC MINUTES
Dinae motioned and Vincent, Sandra, and Sammi seconded the approval of the November minutes. None of the PCC members abstained from voting to approve the minutes and no corrections were noted.

COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. ADVOCACY- LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE (AL-COM)
Sandra reported that the next meeting is scheduled for January 6, 2015 from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. Seamus Murphy from SamTrans will be the guest speaker presenting legislation related to paratransit.

B. GRANT/BUDGET REVIEW
Barbara reported that the 5310 Program funding recipients have been announced. All four programs from San Mateo County that applied were fully funded. The applicants were: City of Pacifica, Life Steps Foundation, and a joint application from SamTrans, Outreach and Escort and the PJCC. Barbara and Linda participated in the application ranking process.

C. EDUCATION COMMITTEE
In Maureen’s absence, Mike reported that a report reviewing the 2014 outreach
presentation feedback will be completed in time for the meeting on January 13th.

**D. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**
Mike reported that the Executive Committee last met on November 6th and discussed First Transit taking over January 1, 2015 as the contractor for Redi-Wheels service. He noted that MV Transportation will continue to serve the Coastside. Mike also reported that Dave Daley, General Manager at First Transit, was unable to attend the ERC meeting on December 2nd. Dave is working with SamTrans and the PCC to make the transition as smooth as possible.

**E. WELL-WISHES FOR GUEST JOHN MURPHY**
Mike thanked John Murphy from MV Transportation for his many years of service and partnership with the PCC. Many of the PCC members thanked John for his thoughtfulness, dedication, and kindness that he showed each person that he encountered. Personal stories about John's willingness to “go the extra mile” were shared by riders who attended today’s meeting.

John thanked his team and the larger group of people attending today’s meeting for working together to accomplish a high level of customer service for Redi-Wheels riders.

**SAMTRANS/REDI-WHEELS REPORT**

**F. Operational Report**
Tina reported that the SamTrans Board voted to approve the contract with First Transit. All but one dispatcher and staff person from MV Transportation will be joining First Transit. Tina reported that the changeover process to First Transit is going well. First Transit management has met with the drivers and staff from MV Transportation, along with the union representatives.

Dave stated that First Transit is currently in labor negotiations with the labor union efforts to decrease the reliance on part-time employees with low seniority. Dave pointed out that this effort is to provide stability for employees. Dave Daley reported that First Transit has been working with Talib Salamin from Serra Yellow Cab to extend the taxi contract for the next few months, to minimize complications during the transition period.

Patti Smith, a consumer, commented that quality of her taxi rides have improved greatly since Serra Taxicab has been providing service. Another rider, Shannon Sanchez, reported that drivers of taxi cabs have consistently been late picking her up and one used profanity when responding to her comments on a recent ride. Talib, Tina, and Dave agreed to follow up with Shannon on her complaint.

Dave noted that real-time communication will be important to help avoid delays between Redi-Wheels and Serra Taxi Cab. Mike noted that he would like Talib to attend an upcoming AL-Com or PCC meeting to explain how service is provided by taxi, now that First Transit is taking over on January 1, 2015.

Sammi asked Tina about recent phone connectivity issues at Redi-Wheels. Tina noted that this was due to a problem with the internet connection, resulting in some dropped calls.
Aki thanked Linda for the graphs showing the performance summary statistics.

Nancy asked Lynn and Tina about emergency preparedness, in light of the upcoming storm that is in the weather forecast. Lynn detailed several measures that have been taken at the MV Transportation office to prepare for continued communication in the event of power loss. Nancy asked Tina about an auto-dial message for Redi-Wheels riders to remind them to be prepared for the storm. Sandra asked Lynn about their work with Emergency Preparedness. Linda added that Brian Molver, from the Office of Emergency Services/Sheriff’s Department attended the November PCC meeting and may be interested in becoming a PCC member.

G. Performance Summary

Vincent asked Elly about how Customer Comment cards are processed. Linda noted Erin delivers the hard copies/scans to Elly that are delivered to the PCC’s mailing address. In addition to those Comment Cards, Vincent asked about getting an electronic copy of the Comment Cards to review the written comments. He suggested a sample of one month, once the rider’s personal information is eliminated. The PCC members discussed the pros and cons of taking the time to create a report for this purpose. Elly noted that Customer Comments are also received over the phone at the Redi-Wheels Customer Service Center. Tina added that customer comments are also submitted to Redi-Wheels through the SamTrans website and by email.

Dinae and another rider asked for clarification about how some of their submitted comments would have been categorized in the Monthly Comment Statistics Report.

Linda offered that PCC staff could copy Comment Cards and emailed comments that are received directly by the PCC for a period of one quarter. Dave Daley added that under a contract in another community he analyzes the comments received to understand the cause of the comments, such as routing, staff training, etc... He offered to share this data after January.

Shannon Sanchez, a Redi-Wheels rider, noted that she filed a complaint in October over the phone about her taxi driver. She observed that no driver conduct complaint was logged by Elly in today’s report to the PCC. Dinae related a similar service issue that happened first in October and again this month. This issue will be discussed again in January.

Tina reported that Total ridership was higher in October 2014 than at the same point last year. Transfer trips are down, due to lower use by a few frequent users. On-Time Performance (OTP) did not meet the 90% standard and Productivity did meet the standard of 1.70 (passengers/hour). Telephone hold time did not meet the standard of 1.5 minutes or less. The Total number of trips served reflects seasonal fluctuations in Redi-Wheels ridership. Taxi trips and Inter-county transfer trips continue to decrease, as high frequency users of these services continue to utilize other travel arrangements.
H. Customer Comments
Elly reported that Total comments have decreased from September to October. She noted that in Comments by Type section of the Monthly Comment Statistics Report, Customer error comments have decreased. Elly thanked Sophie and Kyle for their hard work to respond to customer comments, resulting in a decrease in average response time.

I. Safety Report
Lynn reported that RediCoast reported 0 incidents in November. Redi-Wheels had one, minor preventable incident and four non-preventable incidents. Mike asked who would provide the safety update in January for RediCoast service. John agreed to make sure the data would continue to be available.

LIAISON REPORTS
A. COASTSIDE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (CTC)
In Michal’s absence, Mike reported that the quarterly Coastside meeting will be held on December 17, from 9:30 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. at 925 Main Street in Half Moon Bay.

B. AGENCY
Barbara reported that the agencies have not met since the last PCC meeting. Dave Daley from First Transit has provided assurances that the same high quality service to agencies and their clients will continue. An ongoing agency issue regarding mail-in eligibility recertification has been moved to the ERC for further resolution.

C. EFFICIENCY REVIEW COMMITTEE (ERC)
Aki reported that there are currently 7,427 eligible Redi-Wheels riders. Temporary, conditional, and unrestricted eligibility renewal by mail were all discussed by the ERC.

D. COMMISSION ON AGING (COA)
Sandra reported that the next COA meeting will be on Monday, January 12 at 9:00 a.m. The COA meetings are located at 225 37th Avenue, Room 100 in San Mateo. One recent issue discussed by the COA was the high cost of living for residents in San Mateo County. The COA is continuing its outreach activities into 2015 with five more performances of, “Making the Invisible, Visible.” Linda added that Erin recently spoke with Maisoon Sahouria from CiD. In the spring, Maisoon will be giving a presentation to the PCC about “invisible disabilities.”

E. COMMISSION ON DISABILITIES (COD)
Susan absent, no update available.

F. CENTER FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES (CiD)
Vincent reported that in November, CiD collaborated with the ADA Legacy Project and the Pacific ADA Center at the Abilities Expo 2014 in San Jose. Currently, fundraising to honor CiD’s 35th anniversary is being highlighted through the “35 for 35” campaign. More information about the fundraiser and ways to donate can be found on the CiD website at: http://www.cidsanmateo.org/donate.html Vincent noted that CiD was one of the first independent living centers in the country.
G. DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION (DOR)
Susan absent, no report available.

H. METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (MTC)
No report available.

OTHER BUSINESS
Nancy announced that a San Mateo County Measure A Information Session for Nonprofits will take place from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. at the Sobrato Center for Nonprofits in Redwood Shores. One Q & A Session with County Departments will be held on Tuesday, December 16 from 1:30-4:30 p.m. at the Human Services Agency in Belmont. Approximately $80 million dollars will be available over the next eight years through this half cent sales tax. One example given by Nancy was $5 million dollars in funding for paratransit services at SamTrans. Tina noted that this funding was used for Redi-Wheels and also helped with developing the SamTrans Service Plan. Nancy noted that the Measure A funding did not prioritize funding for services for the elderly and disabled, although the number of senior citizen residents in San Mateo County is expected to double in the near future. Tina clarified that there are two different Measure A items that are easily confused. One Measure A is specifically for transportation and is overseen by the Transportation Authority and one is managed by San Mateo County.

Vincent discussed the small number of Comment Cards that are received in proportion to the number of rides taken on Redi-Wheels in a given month. Some of the Redi-Wheels riders present at today’s meeting discussed barriers that prevent more people from commenting on their service from Redi-Wheels.

A rider survey was one suggestion given today, as a way to reach out to people. Mike suggested taking this topic to the Education Committee and AL-Com for the January meetings.

Mike brought forward an issue about a person visiting San Mateo County who had difficulty using Redi-Wheels. Mike asked Tina about the point person who could work with visiting Redi-Wheels riders.

Mike shared information about the memorial service for Daniel Mensing, a longtime PCC member. The memorial service will be held at Bethany Lutheran Church on Saturday, December 13 at 1:00 p.m. The church is located at 1095 Cloud Avenue in Menlo Park.

Mike discussed current issues with the Night Before call service. Mike mentioned that people were not able to cancel rides while listening to their Night Before Calls. Tina provided an update to the PCC about cancelled rides in the IVR system that were not being processed correctly over the past week.

Sammi asked about the new MDT’s on Redi-Wheels vehicles losing a signal when entering San Francisco. Lynn noted that glitches with the new MDT’s are being reviewed by drivers in weekly meetings.
Aki noted that a new Redi-Wheels van picked him up for his ride today. He said that the vehicles are nice and clean and are well marked. Lynn noted that the new markings will eventually be found on the sedans. Tina agreed to check with the Marketing Department to find out if the older vehicles could also be updated with the new marking.

Mike wished everyone a happy holiday and adjourned today’s meeting in memory of Daniel Mensing.

The next PCC meeting is scheduled for January 13, 2015 from 1:30-3:30 p.m.

MEETING ADJOURNED: 3:20 p.m.
SAMTRANS ACCESSIBILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING SUMMARY – November 3rd, 2014

PRESENT: Cam Acker, Alec Karp (Chair), Doris Maez, Judy McKie

ABSENT: Jim Engvall, Donald Jacobberger, Karen Vanderwoert

GUEST: Vincent Merola

SAMTRANS STAFF: Tina Dubost, Michael Eshleman, Richard Lesser, John Sanderson

I. Introductions

II. Agenda

III. Approval of Minutes

Fixed Route Bus and Caltrain

A. SamTrans Service Plan Route Changes Result Analysis Since January, With Focus on Seniors and people with Disabilities

Michael Eshleman, SamTrans Planner, gave the update. Performance measurements for the changes made in January in the SamTrans Service Plan (SSP) are being carefully tracked. The goals are to improve quality of service, grow ridership, and increase efficiency. On-time performance and ridership growth are indicators of service quality - more riders are attracted by better service. Efficiency is measured in passengers per hour and cost per passenger.

To compare the statistics with previous years, data is averaged for comparable weekday and weekend service.

The three month summary of statistics for the SSP shows ridership and on-time performance (OTP) are up. It also shows indicators of efficiency are down, in the form of additional cost per passenger and lower passengers/service hour. The lower efficiency is due to having to add more revenue service than expected, despite plans to keep the SSP revenue neutral, to enact the changes while maintaining high service quality. Extra time was added to schedules to allow drivers to learn new routes; schedules will be tightened gradually. Some routes that had been cut were reinstated due to community concerns.

The six month statistics shows that ridership continues to rise, which is a sign of improved service. Productivity and operating cost/passenger are improving as the new system settles in.
Ridership gains, shown on the graph have been steady since the weekday ECR started, in August 2013.

On-time performance is above the 85% goal, at 85.6%. Being on time is good, but it is a balance, as sometimes a very high OTP shows that there is too much time on the schedule, causing more buses to wait at time points.

The increases in ridership of seniors and people with disabilities are consistent with the system-wide ridership increases. The graph shows a total of 5,251 daily in September 2013, up to 5,977 in September 2014.

Doris Maez brought up the changing demographics of an aging population.

The SSP concentrates more service on the major corridors and reduces service in less traveled areas to achieve more efficiency and to carry the most passengers with the resources available.

The SSP increased service along key corridors, offering service every 15 minutes – routes 120, 130, 131, 281, 296, ECR. These routes account for 3,100 new riders each weekday, potentially 775,000 trips per year. The growth in ridership on these routes is significantly outpacing the overall system growth. With resources limited, this increased service along key corridors comes at the price of reduced service along less central routes.

Exploring new ways to deliver transportation, SamTrans initiated pilot flex programs in Pacifica and San Carlos. The FLX Pacifica deviates from its regular fixed route, with advance reservation, to pick up and drop off passengers. It has been a success, gaining riders steadily. The FLX San Carlos, which runs a fixed route during commute hours, and is demand-response for reserved rides within its area mid-day, has been less successful in terms of passenger numbers.

Alec Karp asked if the San Carlos service was advertised. Tina Dubost said that a mailer was sent out to residents.

Coming up in January SamTrans will have a year’s worth of data to review, and will make adjustments for service reliability, evaluate underperforming services, and consider enhancements to Flex services.

Doris Maez suggested publicizing routes through church congregations and church bulletins.

Alec Karp suggested outreach to Senior Centers. Tina mentioned that SamTrans Mobility Ambassadors speak often at the senior center down the street.

VII. Valley Transportation Authority Committee of Transportation Accessibility Update – Cam Acker

This item was moved up on the agenda.
Cam Acker contrasted the SamTrans and VTA accessibility committees that she attends. She prefers the SamTrans committee, as she feels that the agency is listening more and is more willing to take action.

In the recent VTA meeting, they discussed service at the new Levi’s Stadium. Caltrain passengers can de-board at Mountain View Station and transfer to VTA light rail for a 35 minute trip to its large Levi’s Stadium station. Extra runs are added for game days to handle the crowds.

Michael Eshleman contributed that his strategy is to take the VTA bus from Mountain View rather than the light rail, as it is less crowded and faster.

The VTA Committee discussed upcoming capital improvements in conjunction with their “Moving the Silicon Valley Forward” plan. They are looking for public input and taking into account transit ridership, physical barriers at stations, social and financial factors, and housing density.

Of VTA’s 3,600 bus stops, 640 of them are slated for improvement. Federal project grants will pay 20% of the $100,000 cost.

Outreach Mobility is looking at other transportation options in addition to public transit, using mobility management strategies including non-profit and volunteer services.

VTA is pleased that they have a 2% increase in ridership.

V. Paratransit Update

Tina Dubost reported that on-time performance is holding steady at 88%, only slightly short of the 90% goal.

As of January 1st, the new paratransit provider will be First Transit (incorporated in Ohio). The bidding for the contract was a very close call. It is rare for a good contractor to be replaced - MV has done a good job for a long time - but First Transit brought a qualitatively slightly better proposal, at a slightly better price, and narrowly won the contract on points.

The new management is getting ready to take over. They will be hiring almost the entire MV staff. Per Union agreement, the drivers have a right to be offered positions if they meet all of the First Transit employment requirements. First Transit understands the principle of not fixing what isn’t broken, and much of the operation has been working well.

The vehicles are District owned. Additional new cutaways and mini-vans are coming soon.

A distinctive blue “swoosh” has been added to the vans’ paint jobs, making them easier to recognize.
Tina confirmed for Alec Karp that the service will continue to be curb to curb, with door to door upon request as long as the vehicle remains in the sight of the driver.

VI. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Update

Judy McKie reported that for buses of a certain length, a 3rd bicycle spot will be added to the rack on the front of the bus. If a bus is near empty, additional bikes may be allowed on the bus.

Michelle Senatore, Principal Sustainability Planner for SamTrans, spoke to the CAC about green and energy efficient measures, such as cutting down on ozone and emissions on new buses, certified green products used for maintenance, as well as recycling of anti-freeze, motor oil, scrap metals, and plastics. After buses are washed nightly, the water is filtered and re-used. Solar-powered fluorescent lights will be used at bus shelters where possible. Paper usage is being cut down by using more computerized documentation. These measures save the environment and save the District money.

VIII. Announcements and Other Business

Alec Karp welcomed Vincent Merola from Center for Independence of Individuals with Disabilities (CID), thanked him for participating in the Committee.

Vincent Merola advocated restoring the bus stop in front of CID’s offices on Windward Way. The stop was discontinued due to low ridership, but between demand at CID and a new senior living facility nearby, there may be justification to bring it back.

IX. Set Date for Next Meeting

The next meeting will be Wednesday, January 28th, from 11:30 AM to 1:00 PM.

Because Committee Chair Alec Karp will be taking Mondays off next year, it was necessary to change the regular date of the meeting. It was quickly ascertained that the 2nd Wednesday of alternate months would work for Committee members. The quorum present voted to confirm this change, which will be reflected in the updated by-laws.

January’s meeting will be on the 28th, but going forward, future meetings will be on the 2nd Wednesday of alternate months.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: MOBILITY MANAGEMENT REPORT: CALTRAIN

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

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

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

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

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

Prepared by: Donald G. Esse, Senior Operations Financial Analyst 650-508-6329
TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: MULTIMODAL RIDERSHIP REPORT – DECEMBER 2014

ACTION
This report is for information only. No Board 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) 2013, FY2014, and FY2015. Chart “B” reflects total ridership year-to-date for FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015.

Tables “A” and “B” also provide the corresponding data for the Bay Area Rapid Transit San Francisco International Airport Extension as a separate line.

AVGÉRAGE WEEKDAY RIDERSHIP – DECEMBER 2014 COMPARED TO DECEMBER 2013

Total District Modes – 147,810, an increase of 2.2 percent.

Bus – 37,860, a decrease of 3.4 percent.

Paratransit – 1,030, an increase of 4 percent.

Caltrain – 51,570, an increase of 6 percent.

Shuttles – 9,610, a decrease of 4.5 percent.
### Table A
Average Weekday Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>Percent Change FY2014/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>38,230</td>
<td>39,190</td>
<td>37,860</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>42,710</td>
<td>48,630</td>
<td>51,570</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttles</td>
<td>8,980</td>
<td>10,060</td>
<td>9,610</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>90,900</td>
<td>98,860</td>
<td>100,070</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Extension (No Daly City)</td>
<td>44,530</td>
<td>45,760*</td>
<td>47,740</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>135,430</td>
<td>144,620</td>
<td>147,810</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Weekdays | 20 | 21 | 22 |

### December 2014 Year-to-date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>Percent Change FY2014/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>40,940</td>
<td>41,660</td>
<td>42,800</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>48,300</td>
<td>52,580</td>
<td>58,470</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttles</td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td>10,380</td>
<td>11,620</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>101,150</td>
<td>105,690</td>
<td>114,010</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Extension (No Daly City)</td>
<td>46,700</td>
<td>45,290*</td>
<td>50,610</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>147,850</td>
<td>150,980</td>
<td>164,630</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* BART experienced 8 total days of strikes in FY2014, during which time no trains operated.

### Chart A
Average Weekday Ridership (FYTD)
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 2014 COMPARED TO DECEMBER 2013

All District Modes – 3,875,020, an increase of 3.9 percent.

Bus – 1,007,040, an increase of 0.2 percent.

Paratransit – 24,750, an increase of 2.3 percent.

Caltrain – 1,401,540, an increase of 6.8 percent.

Shuttles – 206,880, a decrease of 2.2 percent.
### Table B
**Total Ridership**

#### December 2014 Total Monthly Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>Percent Change FY2014/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>942,270</td>
<td>1,004,590</td>
<td>1,007,040</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>23,410</td>
<td>24,190</td>
<td>24,750</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>1,126,170</td>
<td>1,312,090</td>
<td>1,401,540</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttles</td>
<td>177,490</td>
<td>211,600</td>
<td>206,880</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,269,330</td>
<td>2,552,460</td>
<td>2,640,210</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Extension (No Daly City)</td>
<td>1,099,660</td>
<td>1,177,700*</td>
<td>1,234,800</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>3,368,990</td>
<td>3,730,160</td>
<td>3,875,020</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekdays</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### December 2014 Year-to-date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>Percent Change FY2014/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>6,221,490</td>
<td>6,408,510</td>
<td>6,614,950</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>153,080</td>
<td>157,150</td>
<td>163,650</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>7,727,480</td>
<td>8,427,500</td>
<td>9,313,900</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttles</td>
<td>1,438,820</td>
<td>1,347,910</td>
<td>1,503,190</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15,540,870</td>
<td>16,341,070</td>
<td>17,595,690</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Extension (No Daly City)</td>
<td>7,186,250</td>
<td>6,981,070*</td>
<td>7,780,520</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>22,727,120</td>
<td>23,322,130</td>
<td>25,376,210</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*BART experienced 8 total days of strikes in FY2014, during which time no trains operated.*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22,727,120</td>
<td>23,322,130</td>
<td>25,376,210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Holiday Shopping Campaign – SamTrans ran a marketing campaign on Pandora Internet Radio from December 22 through December 31. The goal of the promotion was to encourage people to ride SamTrans for their holiday shopping. With bus service to nearly two dozen shopping centers, SamTrans wanted to let people know that it is, “Your lift to all the best shopping.”

Electronic Seasons’ Greetings card – The District’s electronic sustainable holiday card highlighted its accomplishments for 2014, with a brief look ahead for what is in store for 2015. The electronic card, which covers SamTrans, Caltrain, and the Transportation Authority, was posted online, to social media and on the SamTrans website, sent out by employees, and included in some employees’ e-mail signatures.

New Year’s Eve Free Fare – SamTrans staff worked with Caltrain, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency staff on coordinating the hours that the systems provided free service on New Year’s Eve. This year, the agencies, including Redi-Wheels, waived fares from 8 p.m. to 5 a.m. to encourage revelers to travel safely between destinations. The information was provided via social media, on the website, and through a news release. SamTrans buses also carried a “Free Fare” message on their headsigns.

Clipper 2.0 – SamTrans, along with other Bay Area transit agencies and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, continued to work on designing the next generation of Clipper. The regional transportation agencies are currently seeking public input on what customers like about the current system, as well as what features and functions they would like included in the new system. All SamTrans buses are stocked with multilingual information about the current process.
ACTION

1. Approval of Minutes of Finance Committee Meeting of January 7, 2015
2. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for December 2014
4. Authorize Amendment of Fiscal Year 2015 Operating Revenues in the Amount of $3 Million for total Operating Revenues of $163,561,129 and Total Operating Expenses of $133,090,358

CONTRACTS

5. Authorize Award of Contract to MV Transportation, Inc. to Provide Contracted Shuttle Services for a Base Term of Five Years and Four Months at an Estimated Cost of $1,487,097
6. Authorize Award of Contract to Anthem Builders, Inc. to Provide Security Upgrades at Three District Facilities for a Total Amount of $1,299,781, Amend the Fiscal Year Capital Budget by $230,000, and Authorize Delegation of Approval of Authority for all Aspects of the Project, Including Design, Construction, Phasing, and Schedule to the General Manager/CEO
7. Authorize Award of Contract to New Flyer Industries Canada ULC for the Provision of Brake Parts and Related Items for an Estimated Cost of $156,496 for a Three-Year Base Term
8. Authorize the Amendment to Extend the Contract with C.A.R.E. Evaluators, LLC for ADA Paratransit Eligibility Assessment Services for up to Five and One-Half Months for a Not-to-Exceed Amount of $257,514

INFORMATIONAL


NOTE:

- This Committee meeting may be attended by Board Members who do not sit on this Committee. In the event that a quorum of the entire Board is present, this Committee shall act as a Committee of the Whole. In either case, any item acted upon by the Committee or the Committee of the Whole will require consideration and action by the full Board of Directors as a prerequisite to its legal enactment.
- All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT (DISTRICT)
1250 SAN CARLOS AVENUE, SAN CARLOS, CALIFORNIA

MINUTES OF FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
JANUARY 7, 2015

Committee Members Present:  Z. Kersteen-Tucker (Committee Chair), R. Guilbault, A. Tissier

Other Board Members Present, Constituting Committee of the Whole: J. Gee, C. Groom, S. Harris, K. Matsumoto, C. Stone


Committee Chair Zoe Kersteen-Tucker called the meeting to order at 2:44 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of Finance Committee Meeting of December 3, 2014
Motion/Second: Harris/Guilbault
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for November 2014
Gigi Harrington, Deputy CEO, said November revenue is better than budget by $3.3 million. Expenses are $1.5 million below budget. Fuel was $1.78 per gallon last week and year to date is $2.66. The fuel hedge has not been tripped.

Ms. Harrington said on page 1 there is a typo in line 32. She said staff will correct and provide a revised statement in February.

Motion/Second: Tissier/Gee
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier

Authorize Adoption of Continuing Disclosure Policy
Ms. Harrington said this is codifying existing practices of how disclosures are made and providing transparency to various financial institutions. She said the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission has made new disclosure rules and staff has been complying with them. Ms. Harrington said staff is recommending the policy be adopted, although it’s not required, in advance of the issuance of the 2015 bonds.

Motion/Second: Tissier/Gee
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier
Authorize Amendment of the District’s Contribution Rates for Monthly Medical Premiums for Members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters (IBT) Group 3-Transit Instructors and the Administrative Special (Part-Time) Employees

Juliet Nogales-DeGuzman, Manager, Personnel Operations, said the District’s contribution for the IBT Group 3-Transit Instructors will be based on the highest Bay Area HMO rates and the District’s contribution rates for the administrative part-time employees will be set at 50 percent. She said the anticipated expenses are already included in the Fiscal Year 2015 budget so no budget adjustments are needed.

Motion/Second: Harris/Gee
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier

Authorize Selection of Pool of Consultants to Provide Underwriting Services for the 2015 Debt Refinancing and Include in the 2015 Debt Refinancing a Fixed-Rate Refinancing of the District’s Outstanding 1993 and 2009 Bonds

Ms. Harrington said this is a continuation of the process to refinance the 2005 bonds. Staff went through a competitive process and nine responses were received. Staff is recommending two senior managers, JPMorgan Securities, LLC and Barclays Capital, Inc. and three managers, Citibank Global Markets Inc., RBC Capital Markets, LLC, and Morgan Stanley and Co., LLC. Ms. Harrington said they are all banking institutions that know the District and understand the agency’s conservative approach toward risk and achieving savings goals. She said with the approval of the banking team, staff will start the process of structuring the debt and going to the rating institutions. Ms. Harrington said she will be back to the Board with documents within the next two months.

Motion/Second: Tissier/Harris
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier

Authorize Award of Contract to MV Transportation, Inc. to Provide Contracted Shuttle Services for a Base Term of Five Years and Five Months at an Estimated Cost of $1,487,097

Michael Scanlon, General Manager/CEO, said one of the two proposers filed a protest and a Request for Public Records. He said to be certain the protestor has adequate time to review these two items staff is recommending postponing this item to the February meeting.

Adjourned: 2:51 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, 2014 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 2014 and supplemental information.

SIGNIFICANCE
Revenues: Total Revenues (page 1, line 14) are $5,119,963 or 6.4 percent better than revised budget. Passenger Fares (page 1, line 1) are better than budget by $215,562 or 2.3 percent, Sales Tax (page 1, line 9) is better than budget by $4,656,025 or 13.1 percent, and Other Interest, Rent & Other Income (page 1, line 12) are $305,439 or 9.1 percent better than budget.

Expenses: Total Expenses (page 4, line 72) are $2,275,769 or 3.5 percent better than revised budget. Within Total Expenses, Total Motor Bus (page 3, line 46) is better than budget by $1,830,027 or 3.5 percent, Total ADA Programs (page 4, line 55) are better than budget by $465,702 or 6.1 percent offset by Total Multimodal (page 4, line 70) that is worse than budget by $19,961 or 0.4 percent.

BUDGET IMPACT
There are no budget revisions for the month of December 2014.

Prepared By: Jeannie Chen, Senior Accountant 650-508-6259
Sheila Tioyao, Manager, General Ledger 650-508-7752
## Statement of Revenues and Expenses

**SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**SUMMARY OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES**

**FISCAL YEAR 2015**

**DECEMBER 2014**

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

### SOURCES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Year Elapsed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenues</td>
<td>24,911,556</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td>8,875,425</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Interest</td>
<td>76,488</td>
<td>948,840 47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Interest, Rent &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>587,710</td>
<td>6,921,784 53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Other Revenues</td>
<td>9,581,818</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>16,308,367</td>
<td>140,561,130 53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assistance</td>
<td>1,116,559</td>
<td>49,474,302 19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves Programmed for Capital</td>
<td>9,378,359</td>
<td>12,619,744 126.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sources of Funds</td>
<td>26,803,285</td>
<td>259,056,384 45.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### USES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>% of Year Elapsed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Bus</td>
<td>9,307,843</td>
<td>106,595,744 46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. A. Programs</td>
<td>1,186,659</td>
<td>15,386,831 47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>521,667</td>
<td>6,260,000 50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multi-modal Programs</td>
<td>235,921</td>
<td>2,913,140 50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Operating Costs</td>
<td>11,252,090</td>
<td>132,655,515 47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses of Funds</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>2,037,401</td>
<td>24,449,078 50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Other Uses of Funds</td>
<td>2,079,596</td>
<td>24,911,556 49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Programs</td>
<td>10,536,753</td>
<td>104,352,532 31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses of Funds</td>
<td>23,868,439</td>
<td>261,919,593 41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)</td>
<td>2,934,846</td>
<td>(363,210) (363.4)</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.

(A) - The Revised Budget includes the year end rollover of existing capital projects (Audited).

(B) - The Budget includes $500K TA funds from prior year.

(C) - Staff has reallocated year to date budget due to timing of expenditures.

1/29/2015 12:11 PM
## Statement of Revenues and Expenses

**San Mateo County Transit District**

**Fiscal Year 2015**

**December 2014**

### OPERATING REVENUES - MOTOR BUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>REVISED</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MOTOR BUS FARES</td>
<td>1,428,987</td>
<td>9,000,072</td>
<td>8,974,157</td>
<td>8,768,000</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>17,536,000</td>
<td>17,536,000</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL (TDA) TRANSIT FUND</td>
<td>2,871,551</td>
<td>22,304,816</td>
<td>17,229,308</td>
<td>17,229,308</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>34,458,615</td>
<td>34,458,615</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE</td>
<td>307,843</td>
<td>3,719,083</td>
<td>1,847,060</td>
<td>1,847,060</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3,694,119</td>
<td>3,694,119</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OPERATING GRANTS</td>
<td>629,899</td>
<td>3,908,442</td>
<td>3,703,973</td>
<td>3,703,973</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6,504,231</td>
<td>6,504,231</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT 1/2 CENT SALES TAX</td>
<td>3,608,968</td>
<td>8,297,823</td>
<td>15,988,223</td>
<td>18,354,772</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>38,991,765</td>
<td>40,491,765</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Fixed Route</td>
<td>96,637</td>
<td>572,172</td>
<td>589,905</td>
<td>509,270</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>1,018,540</td>
<td>1,018,540</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 1/2 CENT SALES TAX</td>
<td>3,705,606</td>
<td>8,869,995</td>
<td>16,578,128</td>
<td>18,864,042</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>40,010,305</td>
<td>41,510,305</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OTHER REVENUES</td>
<td>309,546</td>
<td>1,849,500</td>
<td>2,053,448</td>
<td>1,818,692</td>
<td>112.9</td>
<td>3,772,384</td>
<td>3,772,384</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AMERICAN DISABILITIES ACT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>REVISED</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>66,430</td>
<td>408,086</td>
<td>425,555</td>
<td>416,150</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>832,300</td>
<td>832,300</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TDA 4.5 Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>144,468</td>
<td>888,507</td>
<td>866,807</td>
<td>866,807</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,733,614</td>
<td>1,733,614</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local STA - Paratransit</td>
<td>111,768</td>
<td>281,862</td>
<td>218,633</td>
<td>218,633</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>437,266</td>
<td>437,266</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>43,888</td>
<td>295,945</td>
<td>273,678</td>
<td>273,678</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>388,412</td>
<td>388,412</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - District ADA Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,193,654</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>449,963</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1,050,989</td>
<td>1,050,989</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Paratransit Suppl. Coastside</td>
<td>117,850</td>
<td>656,756</td>
<td>714,543</td>
<td>667,650</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>1,335,300</td>
<td>1,335,300</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income - Paratransit Fund</td>
<td>22,077</td>
<td>197,098</td>
<td>126,467</td>
<td>164,270</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>328,750</td>
<td>328,750</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA Measure A Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>134,881</td>
<td>1,497,071</td>
<td>1,388,265</td>
<td>1,422,200</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>2,880,000</td>
<td>2,880,000</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure M Paratransit</td>
<td>416,667</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,542,539</td>
<td>2,542,539</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure M Paratransit</td>
<td>128,630</td>
<td>536,114</td>
<td>672,422</td>
<td>672,422</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MULTI-MODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>REVISED</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from SMCTA for Caltrain</td>
<td>521,667</td>
<td>2,720,001</td>
<td>3,130,000</td>
<td>3,130,000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6,260,000</td>
<td>6,260,000</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB434 Funds - SamTrans Shuttle</td>
<td>48,500</td>
<td>283,000</td>
<td>291,000</td>
<td>291,000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>582,000</td>
<td>582,000</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer SamTrans Shuttle Funds</td>
<td>149,531</td>
<td>764,830</td>
<td>945,384</td>
<td>874,700</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>1,749,400</td>
<td>1,749,400</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - SamTrans Shuttle Program</td>
<td>24,669</td>
<td>177,686</td>
<td>165,994</td>
<td>187,020</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>377,640</td>
<td>377,640</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Gen. Operating Asst.</td>
<td>13,218</td>
<td>59,017</td>
<td>72,353</td>
<td>102,050</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>204,100</td>
<td>204,100</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL MULTIMODAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>REVISED</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>757,587</td>
<td>4,004,535</td>
<td>4,604,731</td>
<td>4,584,770</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>9,173,140</td>
<td>9,173,140</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>REVISED</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>% OF YEAR ELAPSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11,252,090</td>
<td>60,907,588</td>
<td>62,544,968</td>
<td>64,820,736</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>131,155,515</td>
<td>132,655,515</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

**SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT**  
**OPERATING EXPENSES**  
**FISCAL YEAR 2015**  
**DECEMBER 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>REISED BUDGET (C)</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>APPROVED BUDGET</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>4,079,012</td>
<td>27,178,132</td>
<td>26,540,301</td>
<td>26,566,107</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>52,325,457</td>
<td>53,021,178</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Services:</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>22,802</td>
<td>112,666</td>
<td>126,041</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>51,750</td>
<td>192,748</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Property Maintenance</td>
<td>100,106</td>
<td>200,578</td>
<td>568,954</td>
<td>716,905</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>1,625,280</td>
<td>1,625,280</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Professional Services</td>
<td>292,531</td>
<td>1,517,415</td>
<td>1,329,299</td>
<td>1,654,439</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>4,720,740</td>
<td>4,746,015</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Technical Services</td>
<td>645,693</td>
<td>2,578,832</td>
<td>3,016,790</td>
<td>2,999,250</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>5,704,354</td>
<td>5,849,244</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Other Services</td>
<td>124,334</td>
<td>483,799</td>
<td>664,242</td>
<td>764,614</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>2,447,741</td>
<td>2,921,376</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Materials &amp; Supply:</td>
<td>385,317</td>
<td>2,759,978</td>
<td>2,506,790</td>
<td>3,166,875</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>6,333,750</td>
<td>6,333,750</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Utilities:</td>
<td>30,784</td>
<td>181,715</td>
<td>166,993</td>
<td>333,087</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>666,174</td>
<td>666,174</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Other Utilities</td>
<td>95,979</td>
<td>554,042</td>
<td>565,209</td>
<td>542,000</td>
<td>104.3</td>
<td>1,084,000</td>
<td>1,084,000</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Insurance Costs</td>
<td>683,382</td>
<td>1,649,307</td>
<td>1,221,641</td>
<td>1,233,355</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>2,681,400</td>
<td>2,681,400</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Workers’ Compensation</td>
<td>754,434</td>
<td>1,386,652</td>
<td>1,720,358</td>
<td>1,752,720</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>3,443,160</td>
<td>3,443,160</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Taxes &amp; License Fees</td>
<td>25,904</td>
<td>262,459</td>
<td>211,865</td>
<td>276,447</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>552,894</td>
<td>552,894</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Workers Compensation</td>
<td>96,637</td>
<td>572,172</td>
<td>589,905</td>
<td>509,270</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>1,018,540</td>
<td>1,018,540</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Timetables &amp; Tickets</td>
<td>13,715</td>
<td>52,191</td>
<td>75,863</td>
<td>100,950</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>201,900</td>
<td>201,900</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Office Supplies / Printing</td>
<td>37,629</td>
<td>86,949</td>
<td>116,345</td>
<td>178,081</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>339,062</td>
<td>354,818</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Other Materials &amp; Supply</td>
<td>6,797</td>
<td>53,530</td>
<td>63,290</td>
<td>80,750</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>159,500</td>
<td>159,500</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Total District Operated Buses</td>
<td>7,733,814</td>
<td>41,507,599</td>
<td>41,393,502</td>
<td>43,173,348</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>87,859,104</td>
<td>89,359,104</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTRACTED BUS SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>REISED BUDGET (C)</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
<th>APPROVED BUDGET</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 Contracted Urban Bus Service</td>
<td>1,338,826</td>
<td>7,318,545</td>
<td>7,766,733</td>
<td>7,682,765</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>15,365,530</td>
<td>15,365,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Other Related Costs</td>
<td>28,347</td>
<td>192,352</td>
<td>192,024</td>
<td>190,015</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>380,030</td>
<td>380,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Insurance Costs</td>
<td>23,779</td>
<td>327,148</td>
<td>251,650</td>
<td>327,486</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>655,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Coastride Services</td>
<td>145,972</td>
<td>372,127</td>
<td>829,866</td>
<td>928,725</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>1,857,450</td>
<td>1,857,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Redi Coast Non-ADA</td>
<td>19,413</td>
<td>108,806</td>
<td>115,797</td>
<td>111,110</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>222,220</td>
<td>222,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Other Related Costs</td>
<td>5,519</td>
<td>34,883</td>
<td>36,669</td>
<td>38,235</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>76,470</td>
<td>76,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 La Honda - Pescadero</td>
<td>3,938</td>
<td>28,088</td>
<td>26,250</td>
<td>27,565</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>55,130</td>
<td>55,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 SamCoast - Pescadero</td>
<td>7,607</td>
<td>57,517</td>
<td>96,495</td>
<td>59,075</td>
<td>163.3</td>
<td>118,150</td>
<td>118,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Other Related Cost - SamCoast</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>2,643</td>
<td>3,330</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>6,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Total Contracted Bus Service</td>
<td>1,574,029</td>
<td>8,440,358</td>
<td>9,318,125</td>
<td>9,368,306</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>18,736,640</td>
<td>18,736,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Total Motor Bus</td>
<td>9,307,843</td>
<td>49,947,957</td>
<td>50,711,627</td>
<td>52,541,654</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>106,595,744</td>
<td>108,095,744</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.

(C) - Staff has reallocated year to date budget due to timing of expenditures.
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### OPERATING EXPENSES
#### FISCAL YEAR 2015
##### DECEMBER 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>APRROVED</th>
<th>REVISED</th>
<th>% REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT ACTUAL</td>
<td>PRIOR ACTUAL</td>
<td>CURRENT ACTUAL</td>
<td>REVISED BUDGET</td>
<td>% REV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT PROGRAMS</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>511,444</td>
<td>2,812,659</td>
<td>3,066,043</td>
<td>3,147,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled/Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>178,834</td>
<td>1,206,476</td>
<td>1,231,175</td>
<td>1,531,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Sedan/Taxi Service</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>259,122</td>
<td>1,594,601</td>
<td>1,628,776</td>
<td>1,566,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Accessibility Support</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90,107</td>
<td>367,762</td>
<td>452,711</td>
<td>523,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastsie ADA Support</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>117,850</td>
<td>656,756</td>
<td>714,543</td>
<td>667,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29,301</td>
<td>247,073</td>
<td>135,362</td>
<td>257,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ADA PROGRAMS</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,186,659</td>
<td>6,885,326</td>
<td>7,228,610</td>
<td>7,694,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ MULTIMODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>521,667</td>
<td>2,720,001</td>
<td>3,130,000</td>
<td>3,130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Service</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>521,667</td>
<td>2,720,001</td>
<td>3,130,000</td>
<td>3,130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Caltrain Service</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>521,667</td>
<td>2,720,001</td>
<td>3,130,000</td>
<td>3,130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ OTHER SUPPORT</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>222,702</td>
<td>1,225,517</td>
<td>1,402,377</td>
<td>1,352,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SamTrans Shuttle Service</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Coordinating Activities</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13,219</td>
<td>59,017</td>
<td>72,354</td>
<td>89,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Multimodal Facilities</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>235,921</td>
<td>1,284,533</td>
<td>1,474,731</td>
<td>1,454,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Support</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>235,921</td>
<td>1,284,533</td>
<td>1,474,731</td>
<td>1,454,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ TOTAL MULTI-MODAL PROGRAMS</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>757,587</td>
<td>4,004,535</td>
<td>4,604,731</td>
<td>4,584,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11,252,090</td>
<td>60,837,818</td>
<td>62,544,967</td>
<td>64,820,736</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% OF YEAR ELAPSED: 50.0%

% 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.

(C) - Staff has reallocated year to date budget due to timing of expenditures.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
MOTOR BUS MONTHLY EXPENSES - BUDGET VS ACTUAL
FISCAL YEAR 2015

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></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>Actual</td>
<td>10,335,340</td>
<td>8,648,809</td>
<td>8,857,293</td>
<td>6,717,493</td>
<td>8,011,046</td>
<td>9,971,673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CUMULATIVE EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>10,335,340</td>
<td>18,984,149</td>
<td>27,841,442</td>
<td>34,558,935</td>
<td>42,569,981</td>
<td>52,541,654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>8,504,261</td>
<td>7,699,790</td>
<td>7,938,461</td>
<td>8,196,033</td>
<td>9,071,238</td>
<td>9,307,843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance - F(U)</td>
<td>1,831,080</td>
<td>2,786,098</td>
<td>3,704,930</td>
<td>2,226,390</td>
<td>1,166,197</td>
<td>1,830,027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance %</td>
<td>17.72%</td>
<td>14.68%</td>
<td>13.31%</td>
<td>6.44%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monthly Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>1,284,052</td>
<td>1,284,052</td>
<td>1,282,052</td>
<td>1,282,052</td>
<td>1,282,052</td>
<td>1,282,052</td>
<td>1,282,052</td>
<td>1,282,052</td>
<td>1,282,052</td>
<td>1,282,052</td>
<td>1,282,052</td>
<td>1,282,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td>1,201,166</td>
<td>1,143,821</td>
<td>1,243,330</td>
<td>1,287,912</td>
<td>1,165,721</td>
<td>1,186,659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cumulative Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>1,284,052</td>
<td>2,566,104</td>
<td>3,848,156</td>
<td>5,130,208</td>
<td>6,412,260</td>
<td>7,694,312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual</strong></td>
<td>1,201,166</td>
<td>2,344,988</td>
<td>3,588,317</td>
<td>4,876,229</td>
<td>6,041,951</td>
<td>7,228,610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance - F(U)</strong></td>
<td>82,886</td>
<td>221,117</td>
<td>259,839</td>
<td>253,979</td>
<td>370,309</td>
<td>465,702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance %</strong></td>
<td>6.46%</td>
<td>8.62%</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>5.78%</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
MULTIMODAL MONTHLY EXPENSES - BUDGET VS ACTUAL
FISCAL YEAR 2015

| MONTHLY EXPENSES       | Jul  | Aug  | Sep  | Oct  | Nov  | Dec  | Jan  | Feb  | Mar  | Apr  | May  | June |
|------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Budget                 | 764,108 | 763,418 | 763,408 | 767,019 | 763,408 | 763,408 |       |     |     |     |     |     |
| Actual                 | 756,768 | 762,497 | 752,414 | 819,808 | 755,657 | 757,587 |       |     |     |     |     |     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUMULATIVE EXPENSES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>764,108</td>
<td>1,527,527</td>
<td>2,290,935</td>
<td>3,057,954</td>
<td>3,821,362</td>
<td>4,584,770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>756,768</td>
<td>1,519,264</td>
<td>2,271,678</td>
<td>3,091,486</td>
<td>3,847,143</td>
<td>4,604,731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance - F(U)</td>
<td>7.34</td>
<td>8.263</td>
<td>19.257</td>
<td>(33.533)</td>
<td>(25.781)</td>
<td>(19.960)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance %</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>-1.10%</td>
<td>-0.67%</td>
<td>-0.44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INTEREST ON INVESTMENTS

#### December 31, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL INVESTMENT</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVABLE</th>
<th>PREPAID INT RECEIVABLE</th>
<th>INTEREST EARNED</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVED</th>
<th>INTEREST ADJ. RECEIVABLE</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Capital Proj</td>
<td>8,056,903.00</td>
<td>22,193.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,280.17</td>
<td>19,685.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,787.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF -- Capital Proj</td>
<td>76,531.96</td>
<td>40.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>58.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimb Securities -- L76R</td>
<td>79,114,744.00</td>
<td>94,605.35</td>
<td>16,032.61</td>
<td>39,891.34</td>
<td>29,093.75</td>
<td>355.14</td>
<td>121,790.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF -- Reimb Funds L76R</td>
<td>37,584,908.59</td>
<td>11,957.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,090.56</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21,048.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit Funds</td>
<td>24,929,681.50</td>
<td>67,783.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20,697.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>88,674.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF -- Paratransit</td>
<td>5,067,802.63</td>
<td>2,588.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,186.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,774.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America</td>
<td>16,875,689.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>301,684.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Debt Service Reserves

- Held by Trustee:
  - 14,516,353.06
  - 1,423.12
  - 711.56
  - 0.00
  - 2,134.68

- Total: 186,524,299.64

---

### NOV 2014 -- SUMMARY OF INTEREST & CAPITAL GAIN

- Interest Earned 11/30/14: 77,225.16
- Add:
  - CEO Interest: 0.00
- Less:
  - Commissions: (8,509.22)
  - Capital Gain(Loss): 0.00
- Total Interest & Capital Gain(Loss): 68,715.94

---

### YEAR TO DATE -- SUMMARY

- Interest Earned: 380,929.30
- Add:
  - CEO Interest: 0.00
- Less:
  - Commissions: (42,183.83)
  - Capital Gain(Loss): 0.00
- Total Interest & Capital Gain(Loss): 338,745.47

---

### Balance Per Ledger as of 12/31/14

- Deferred Int Acct. 210852/3: 5,695.08
- Interest Acct. 409102: 3,567.62
- Interest Acct. 409101: 371,666.65
- Less Bank Fees 530040: (42,183.88)
- Gain(Loss) Acct. 405210: 0.00
- Total: 338,745.47
### SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

#### BOND REIMBURSED FUNDS -- INTEREST ON SECURITIES -- L76R

**December 31, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Security</th>
<th>CUSIP #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Original Value</th>
<th>Original Maturity</th>
<th>Adjusted Value</th>
<th>Adjusted Maturity</th>
<th>Interest Rate/Day</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Interest Earned</th>
<th>Interest Received</th>
<th>Interest Received Less Prepaid</th>
<th>Par</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Treasury Notes and Bonds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Treasury Note</td>
<td>812828VL1</td>
<td>06-30-14</td>
<td>2,005,781.25</td>
<td>2,006,100.00</td>
<td>2,003,900.00</td>
<td>07-15-16</td>
<td>0.625%</td>
<td>34,7222</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4,721.47</td>
<td>1,041.67</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>3,774.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Treasury Note</td>
<td>812828WX4</td>
<td>06-30-14</td>
<td>5,999,531.25</td>
<td>6,003,820.00</td>
<td>6,003,820.00</td>
<td>06-30-15</td>
<td>0.500%</td>
<td>83,3333</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10,027.17</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>27.18</td>
<td>12,554.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Treasury Note</td>
<td>812828WA4</td>
<td>05-31-14</td>
<td>8,480,410.16</td>
<td>8,480,410.16</td>
<td>8,502,635.00</td>
<td>10-15-16</td>
<td>0.625%</td>
<td>147,5694</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6,859.55</td>
<td>4,427.08</td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>11,303.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Treasury Note</td>
<td>812828WF3</td>
<td>05-31-14</td>
<td>9,971,093.75</td>
<td>9,971,093.75</td>
<td>10,000,800.00</td>
<td>11-15-16</td>
<td>0.625%</td>
<td>173,6111</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7,662.43</td>
<td>5,208.33</td>
<td>143.88</td>
<td>12,554.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Treasury Note</td>
<td>812828VR8</td>
<td>12-31-14</td>
<td>8,018,125.00</td>
<td>8,034,157.61</td>
<td>8,017,120.00</td>
<td>08-15-16</td>
<td>0.625%</td>
<td>138,8889</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16,032.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,777.78</td>
<td>18,805.39</td>
</tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC</td>
<td>3134G3W55</td>
<td>03-12-13</td>
<td>8,502,380.00</td>
<td>8,514,535.00</td>
<td>8,509,690.00</td>
<td>11-24-15</td>
<td>0.450%</td>
<td>106,2500</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>743.75</td>
<td>3,187.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,931.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOCB</td>
<td>31351H5L7</td>
<td>05-11-07</td>
<td>1,020,404.50</td>
<td>1,032,327.00</td>
<td>1,005,119.00</td>
<td>12-29-15</td>
<td>6.125%</td>
<td>161,6319</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24,568.06</td>
<td>4,848.96</td>
<td>29,093.75</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>3135G0UM3</td>
<td>05-29-13</td>
<td>3,999,600.00</td>
<td>4,002,840.00</td>
<td>3,997,360.00</td>
<td>02-26-16</td>
<td>0.520%</td>
<td>57,7778</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5,488.89</td>
<td>1,733.33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,222.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>3135G0VH3</td>
<td>05-15-13</td>
<td>15,026,145.00</td>
<td>15,026,145.00</td>
<td>15,000,850.00</td>
<td>03-04-16</td>
<td>0.750%</td>
<td>125,0000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10,875.00</td>
<td>3,750.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>3135G0VA8</td>
<td>05-15-13</td>
<td>6,031,500.00</td>
<td>6,017,280.00</td>
<td>6,005,400.00</td>
<td>03-04-16</td>
<td>0.750%</td>
<td>125,0000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10,875.00</td>
<td>3,750.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>3135G0VP3</td>
<td>12-10-13</td>
<td>4,979,900.00</td>
<td>4,976,490.00</td>
<td>4,966,250.00</td>
<td>07-05-16</td>
<td>0.375%</td>
<td>52,8283</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7,604.17</td>
<td>1,562.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,166.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>3135G0VE7</td>
<td>03-07-14</td>
<td>5,009,800.00</td>
<td>5,003,000.00</td>
<td>4,999,000.00</td>
<td>08-26-16</td>
<td>0.625%</td>
<td>84,8556</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8,246.53</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,746.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash and Cash Equivalents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated US Treasury MMF</td>
<td>12-4-14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF</td>
<td>2010493859</td>
<td>37,584,908.59</td>
<td>37,584,908.59</td>
<td>37,584,908.59</td>
<td>08-26-16</td>
<td>0.625%</td>
<td>57,7778</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8,246.53</td>
<td>2,604.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>10,850.69</td>
<td>10,850.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Matured/Called**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Value</th>
<th>Interest Earned</th>
<th>Interest Received</th>
<th>Interest Received Less Prepaid</th>
<th>Par</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79,044,670.91</td>
<td>110,637.96</td>
<td>16,032.61</td>
<td>39,891.34</td>
<td>29,093.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79,073,449.61</td>
<td>355.14</td>
<td>121,700.69</td>
<td>103,728.08</td>
<td>108,534.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total | 79,044,670.91 | 79,073,449.61 | 79,114,744.00 | 103,728.08 | 108,534.90 | 43,705% |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SECURITY</th>
<th>CUSIP #</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>ADJUSTED</th>
<th>VALUE</th>
<th>MATURITY</th>
<th>INT</th>
<th>RATE/</th>
<th>APPL</th>
<th>REC'VBLE</th>
<th>INT REC'VBLE</th>
<th>EARNED</th>
<th>RECEIVED</th>
<th>REC'VBLE</th>
<th>LESS PREPAID</th>
<th>PAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. TREASURY NOTES AND BONDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12-30-13</td>
<td>7,889,816.35</td>
<td>7,909,875.00</td>
<td>7,906,162.00</td>
<td>06-15-16</td>
<td>0.500%</td>
<td>109.7222</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18,239.07</td>
<td>3,291.67</td>
<td>19,685.96</td>
<td>1,844.78</td>
<td>1,844.78</td>
<td>7,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT BONDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12-23-08</td>
<td>155,581.50</td>
<td>150,760.50</td>
<td>150,741.00</td>
<td>08-01-17</td>
<td>7.908%</td>
<td>32.9500</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,954.00</td>
<td>988.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,942.50</td>
<td>4,942.50</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76,531.96</td>
<td>76,531.96</td>
<td>76,531.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>58.32</td>
<td>58.32</td>
<td>76,532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATUR ED/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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LAIF</td>
<td>76,531.96</td>
<td>76,531.96</td>
<td>76,531.96</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 A/C 12/1/00 &amp; 11/2/10</td>
<td>8,045,397.85</td>
<td>8,060,635.50</td>
<td>8,056,903.00</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>8,045,397.85</td>
<td>8,060,635.50</td>
<td>8,056,903.00</td>
<td>22,193.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,280.17</td>
<td>19,685.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,787.28</td>
<td>6,787.28</td>
<td>8,050,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### U.S. Treasury Notes and Bonds

<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 Maturity</th>
<th>Rate/Adj. Date</th>
<th>Day Days</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Applied Int Rec'vble</th>
<th>Int Rec'vble</th>
<th>Received Int Rec'vble</th>
<th>Received Par</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Treasury Note</td>
<td>912828WX4</td>
<td>08-27-14</td>
<td>4,749,628.91</td>
<td>4,732,612.50</td>
<td>4,732,232.50</td>
<td>07-31-16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>65.722</td>
<td>7,938.18</td>
<td>1,979.17</td>
<td>9,938.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Treasury Note</td>
<td>912828WA4</td>
<td>03-21-14</td>
<td>5,487,304.22</td>
<td>5,306,610.00</td>
<td>5,501,705.00</td>
<td>10-15-16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>95.481</td>
<td>4,438.53</td>
<td>2,864.58</td>
<td>7,366.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Treasury Note</td>
<td>912828WF3</td>
<td>03-28-14</td>
<td>4,985,546.88</td>
<td>5,001,150.00</td>
<td>5,000,400.00</td>
<td>11-15-16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>86.805</td>
<td>1,381.22</td>
<td>2,604.17</td>
<td>4,057.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Treasury Note</td>
<td>912828SC5</td>
<td>03-19-14</td>
<td>4,619,960.72</td>
<td>4,620,470.00</td>
<td>4,613,294.00</td>
<td>01-31-17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>111.805</td>
<td>3,354.17</td>
<td>36.45</td>
<td>16,843.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Government Bonds

<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 Maturity</th>
<th>Rate/Adj. Date</th>
<th>Day Days</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Applied Int Rec'vble</th>
<th>Int Rec'vble</th>
<th>Received Int Rec'vble</th>
<th>Received Par</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>31338AU34</td>
<td>2-15-12</td>
<td>5,299,150.00</td>
<td>5,117,150.00</td>
<td>5,062,050.00</td>
<td>07-28-15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.375</td>
<td>329.861</td>
<td>40,572.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,895.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cash Investment

<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 Maturity</th>
<th>Rate/Adj. Date</th>
<th>Day Days</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Applied Int Rec'vble</th>
<th>Int Rec'vble</th>
<th>Received Int Rec'vble</th>
<th>Received Par</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAIF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,067,802.63</td>
<td>5,067,802.63</td>
<td>5,067,802.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,515.50</td>
<td>1,186.28</td>
<td>3,701.78</td>
<td>3,701.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total

|                    | Total     | 25,141,610.73 | 24,992,992.50 | 24,929,681.50 | 67,783.98 | 0.00 | 20,697.93 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 192.85 | 88,674.76 | 88,674.76 | 24,850.00 |

---

**Note:** The table above shows the interest on securities for the San Mateo County Transit District as of December 31, 2014. It includes details for various types of securities such as U.S. Treasury Notes and Bonds, FNMA government bonds, and cash investments. The data includes purchase prices, adjusted values, and the interest received. The table also shows the total values for each type of security. The values are presented in dollars.
### BUDGET AMENDMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Page 3, line 1: Wages &amp; Benefits. Approved by Board in August 2014. Increase of 1.5M for new agreement with represented employees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $1,500,000 | Total | $ - | Total |

### BUDGET REVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Line Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>No Budget Revisions in December 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| $ - | Total | $ - | Total |
## Statement of Revenues and Expenses

### SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

#### 1/2 CENT SALES TAX RECEIPTS AND PROJECTIONS

**FY2014 & FY2015**

**DECEMBER 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Over/(Under) Budget/Projection</th>
<th>Current Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2014:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>16,550,000</td>
<td>19,084,264</td>
<td>2,534,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>17,525,000</td>
<td>20,581,648</td>
<td>3,056,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>18,132,500</td>
<td>18,012,945</td>
<td>(119,556)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>17,792,500</td>
<td>19,927,940</td>
<td>2,135,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2014 Total</strong></td>
<td>70,000,000</td>
<td><strong>FY2014 Total</strong></td>
<td>77,606,796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| FY2015          |          |                                |                    |
| Jul. 14         | 5,250,000 | Sep. 14                         | 6,020,700          |
| Aug. 14         | 5,250,000 | Oct. 14                         | 6,020,700          |
| Sep. 14         | 6,650,000 | Nov. 14                         | 7,844,200          |
| 3 Months Total  | 17,150,000|                                | 19,885,600         |
| Oct. 14         | 5,725,000 | Dec. 14                         | 7,645,425          |
| Nov. 14         | 5,725,000 | Jan. 15                         | 5,725,000          |
| Dec. 14         | 6,955,000 | Feb. 15                         | 6,955,000          |
| 6 Months Total  | 35,555,000|                                | 27,531,025         |
| Jan. 15         | 5,400,000 | Mar. 15                         | 5,400,000          |
| Feb. 15         | 5,400,000 | Apr. 15                         | 5,400,000          |
| Mar. 15         | 6,700,000 | May 15                          | 6,700,000          |
| 9 Months Total  | 53,055,000|                                | 27,531,025         |
| Apr. 15         | 6,115,000 | Jun. 15                         | 6,115,000          |
| May 15          | 6,215,000 | Jul. 15                         | 6,215,000          |
| Jun. 15         | 6,615,000 | Aug. 15                         | 6,615,000          |
| **FY2015 Total** | 72,000,000 | **FY2015 Total**               | 76,656,025         |

### Notes

- **1st Quarter**
- **2nd Quarter**
- **3rd Quarter**
- **4th Quarter**

YTD Actual Per Statement of Revenues & Expenses

(1) Includes Accrual for Quarterly Adjustment
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 Finance 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, 2014.

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 15, 2015 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 3 and 4. 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.
DISCUSSION

Fixed Income Market Review and Outlook
Interest rates ended mixed in the fourth quarter of 2014 as the demand for U.S. Government bonds from foreign investors pulled longer-term rates lower while a stronger economy and robust labor market here in the United States pushed shorter-term rates higher. This dynamic of competing foreign and domestic influences is likely to be the dominant driver of interest rates as we move forward through 2015. Although CSI predilection remains towards interest rates moving higher by the second quarter of 2015, there are factors in the U.S. and foreign economies that may delay the increases.

Data Source: Bloomberg Finance L.P.

The economy and labor market has been quite strong; GDP growth in the third quarter of the year was revised to an exceptionally strong annualized pace of 5 percent. The outlook for the quarter just past and all of 2015 remains anchored well above a 3 percent pace of growth. In the labor markets, payroll growth has averaged roughly 250,000 new jobs for the past six months and the unemployment rate, as of this writing, had fallen to 5.8 percent. Of particular importance, recent measures of wage growth have begun to pick up.

There are other factors, however, that may delay a hike in rates. These include a notable division among the ranks of the voting members of the FOMC and exceptionally low expectations for inflation.

Given the recent strength in the economy, it is widely expected the Federal Reserve (Fed) will begin to raise the level of short-term interest rates shortly. Indeed, if the strength continues some believe the Fed could begin to hike interest rates as early as March 2015.
Strategy
Over the near future, we expect interest rates to move gradually higher. Currently the portfolio’s sensitivity to a change in interest rates is below that of the benchmark. (See Exhibit 3) The current low rate environment leaves the bond market without much of a yield cushion to avoid negative rates of returns should interest rates begin to rise more than already anticipated by the market. Given our outlook and the current level of uncertainty in the markets, we are comfortable keeping the portfolio’s exposure to a change in interest rates below that of the benchmark.

As of the end of the quarter, the District’s consolidated portfolios consisted of approximately 44.5 percent Agency Securities and 55.5 percent U.S. Treasury Securities. (See Exhibit 6)

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, 2014, the General Fund portfolio returned 0.22 percent. This compares to the benchmark return of 0.55 percent. Over this same time, the Paratransit Fund portfolio returned 0.28 percent. This compares to the benchmark return of 1.60 percent.

The performance graph in Exhibit 4 shows the relative performance of each fund for the trailing 24-month period. The growth of a thousand dollars graph in Exhibit 5 shows the cumulative performance over this same period 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, 2014, the portfolio’s yield to maturity or call was 0.53 percent. The General Fund benchmark’s yield to maturity was 1.13 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 0.63 percent.

Prepared by: Kathryn Watson, Manager, Treasury  650-508-6425
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DATE OF MATURITY</th>
<th>PAR VALUE</th>
<th>CARRYING AMOUNT</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE</th>
<th>ACCRUED INTEREST</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE + ACCR. INT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUNDS MANAGED BY SUNTRUST BANK/CSI GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT BONDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHLMC</td>
<td>11-24-15</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
<td>8,502,380</td>
<td>8,509,690</td>
<td>3,931</td>
<td>8,513,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFCB</td>
<td>12-29-15</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>1,020,405</td>
<td>1,005,119</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1,005,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>02-26-16</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>3,999,600</td>
<td>3,997,360</td>
<td>7,222</td>
<td>4,004,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>03-04-16</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>6,031,500</td>
<td>6,005,400</td>
<td>14,625</td>
<td>6,020,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>03-30-16</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,026.145</td>
<td>15,088,650</td>
<td>18,958</td>
<td>15,107,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>07-05-16</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,979,900</td>
<td>4,986,250</td>
<td>9,167</td>
<td>4,995,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>08-26-16</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,009,800</td>
<td>4,999,000</td>
<td>10,851</td>
<td>5,009,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>07-15-16</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,005,781</td>
<td>2,003,900</td>
<td>5,774</td>
<td>2,009,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>07-31-16</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
<td>5,999,531</td>
<td>6,002,820</td>
<td>12,554</td>
<td>6,015,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>08-15-16</td>
<td>8,000,000</td>
<td>8,018,125</td>
<td>8,013,120</td>
<td>18,886</td>
<td>8,032,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>10-15-16</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
<td>8,480,410</td>
<td>8,502,635</td>
<td>11,384</td>
<td>8,514,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>11-15-16</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>9,971,094</td>
<td>10,000,800</td>
<td>8,115</td>
<td>10,008,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLATERALIZED MORTGAGE OBLIGATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INVESTMENT FUNDS PORTFOLIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGED BY SUNTRUST BANK/CSI GROUP</td>
<td>78,950,000</td>
<td>79,044,671</td>
<td>79,114,744</td>
<td>121,791</td>
<td>79,236,535</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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>FNMA Step Up</td>
<td>07-28-15</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,299,150</td>
<td>5,062,050</td>
<td>50,469</td>
<td>5,112,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>07-31-16</td>
<td>4,750,000</td>
<td>4,749,629</td>
<td>4,752,233</td>
<td>9,939</td>
<td>4,762,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>10-15-16</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>5,487,324</td>
<td>5,501,705</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td>5,509,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>11-15-16</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,985,547</td>
<td>5,000,400</td>
<td>4,057</td>
<td>5,004,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>01-31-17</td>
<td>4,600,000</td>
<td>4,619,961</td>
<td>4,613,294</td>
<td>16,844</td>
<td>4,630,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Paratransit Portfolio Managed by Suntrust Bank/CSI Group:**
24,850,000  25,141,611  24,929,682  88,675  25,018,356

**Total District Portfolio Managed by Suntrust Bank/CSI Group:**
103,800,000  104,186,282  104,044,426  210,465  104,254,891

**Funds Non Managed by Suntrust Bank/CSI Group**

<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>HUD</td>
<td>08-01-17</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>155,582</td>
<td>150,741</td>
<td>4,943</td>
<td>155,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>06-15-16</td>
<td>7,900,000</td>
<td>7,889,816</td>
<td>7,906,162</td>
<td>1,845</td>
<td>7,908,007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Investment Funds Portfolio Non Managed by Suntrust Bank/CSI Group:**
8,050,000  8,045,398  8,056,903  6,787  8,063,690

**Total District Portfolio Managed and Non Managed by Suntrust Bank/CSI Group:**
111,850,000  112,231,679  112,101,329  217,253  112,318,581

**Liquidity Funds Managed by District Staff:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</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>Bank of America Checking</td>
<td>10,803,672</td>
<td>10,803,672</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,803,672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF</td>
<td>42,729,243</td>
<td>42,729,243</td>
<td>23,587</td>
<td>42,752,830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Funds Managed by District Staff:**
53,532,915  53,532,915  23,587  53,556,502

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</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>First American Gov't, Oblig, Cl D</td>
<td>3,008,640</td>
<td>3,008,640</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,008,640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesham Finance Ltd.</td>
<td>4,107,000</td>
<td>4,107,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,107,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA</td>
<td>2,277,000</td>
<td>2,258,546</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>2,280,137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Funds Managed by Third Party Trustee:**
9,392,640  9,374,185  9,393,642  2,135  9,395,776

**Total as of December 30, 2014:**
175,138,780  175,027,885  242,974  175,270,859
**Duration** is a measure of a portfolio’s sensitivity to a change in interest rates. It represents the amount a portfolio’s value would change, in percent, if interest rates were to rise or fall by 1%. For example, we would expect a portfolio with a duration of 2 to rise by 2% in value if interest rates fell 1% and to fall by 2% in value if interest rates rose by 1%.

---

*SamTrans Duration vs. Benchmark*

**Rolling 24 Months**

---

*Exhibit 3*
SamTrans
Monthly Review - Account vs. Benchmark
Rolling 24 Months

Trailing 12 Months
Jan-14  Feb-14  Mar-14  Apr-14  May-14  Jun-14  Jul-14  Aug-14  Sep-14  Oct-14  Nov-14  Dec-14  Trailing 12
MONTHLY PERFORMANCE DATA
SamTrans - Gen Funds  0.16%  0.05%  -0.05%  0.16%  0.12%  -0.05%  -0.05%  0.16%  0.00%  0.11%  0.17%  -0.06%  0.72%
SamTrans - Paratran  0.02%  0.04%  -0.03%  0.16%  0.25%  -0.06%  -0.12%  0.22%  -0.07%  0.27%  0.21%  -0.20%  0.69%
Benchmark - Gen Fund  0.53%  0.18%  -0.35%  0.29%  0.47%  -0.10%  -0.25%  0.39%  -0.22%  0.53%  0.36%  -0.34%  1.49%
Benchmark - Paratran  1.43%  0.29%  -0.66%  0.55%  1.10%  -0.21%  -0.42%  0.99%  -0.59%  1.07%  0.81%  -0.28%  4.13%

CSI Capital Management, Inc.
Exhibit 5

SamTrans
Growth of a Thousand Dollars
Rolling 24 Months

Sam Trans General: $1,009.94
Paratransit Fund: $1,009.43
Benchmark General: $1,013.90
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE AMENDMENT OF FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2015 OPERATING REVENUES
IN THE AMOUNT OF $3 MILLION FOR TOTAL OPERATING REVENUES OF
$163,561,129 AND TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES OF $133,090,358

ACTION
Staff proposes the Finance Committee recommend Board authorization of an
amendment to increase the FY2015 Operating Revenue by $3 million for a new total of
$163,561,129. (See details on Attachment A).

Sources of Funds/Revenues:
• Increase District Half-cent sales tax by $3 million (Line 10)

SIGNIFICANCE
The FY2015 Operating Revenues is amended to include additional sales tax. As of
November 2014, sales tax is over budget by $2.7 million. Staff is proposing to recognize
the year to date excess. If this trend continues during the year, staff will return to the
Board and request another revision to the sales tax estimate. The total Operating
Expenses and, therefore, the total Operating Budget have not changed.

BUDGET IMPACT
OPERATING REVENUES:
District Half-cent Sales Tax: Increase of $3,000,000.
FY2015 sales tax revenue projections have increased by $3 million to $75 million based
on current year actuals.

BACKGROUND
The San Mateo County Transit District (District) annually adopts an operating budget.
On June 4, 2014, the Board adopted the FY2015 Operating Budget in the amount of
$131,590,358 as per Board Resolution No. 2014-27, with Operating Revenues totaling
$161,381,337 and Operating Expenses totaling $131,590,358. On August 6, 2014, as per
Board Resolution No. 2014-38, the Board amended the FY2015 Operating Expenses
and Budget in the amount of $1.5 million for a new total of $133,090,358, to reflect the new agreement with represented employees. The FY2015 Operating Revenues were not amended in August.

Note that the format of the budget differs slightly from the monthly financial statement.

*Lines that have been changed in the revised budget are highlighted in bold, blue font as presented in Attachment A.*

Prepared By: Winnie Lum, Senior Accountant 650-508-6345
Ladi Millard, Director, Budgets 650-508-7755
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### FY2015 REVISED OPERATING BUDGET
#### FY15 ADOPTED
Compared to
FY15 REVISED
BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2013 ACTUAL</th>
<th>FY2014 REVISED</th>
<th>FY2015 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY2015 REVISED</th>
<th>INCREASE (Decrease)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E=D-C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOURCES OF FUNDS:

#### Operating Revenues:

1. Passenger Fares
   - Actual: 17,808,366
   - Revised: 17,965,000
   - Adopted: 18,368,300
   - Interior: 18,368,300
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

2. Local TDA and STA Funds
   - Actual: 38,153,079
   - Revised: 42,542,322
   - Adopted: 40,323,614
   - Interior: 40,323,614
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

3. Pass through to Other Agencies
   - Actual: 467,959
   - Revised: 379,169
   - Adopted: 383,948
   - Interior: 383,948
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

4. Operating Grants
   - Actual: 11,012,564
   - Revised: 9,274,579
   - Adopted: 6,892,643
   - Interior: 6,892,643
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

5. SMCTA Measure A
   - Actual: 8,394,311
   - Revised: 8,160,000
   - Adopted: 9,140,000
   - Interior: 9,140,000
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

6. SM County Measure A
   - Actual: 0
   - Revised: 5,000,000
   - Adopted: 5,000,000
   - Interior: 5,000,000
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

7. AB434 Funds
   - Actual: 554,400
   - Revised: 566,000
   - Adopted: 582,000
   - Interior: 582,000
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

### Subtotal - Operating Revenues

- Total: 76,390,680
- Revised: 83,887,070
- Adopted: 80,690,505
- Interior: 80,690,505
- Change: 0
- Percent: 0.0%

#### Other Revenue Sources:

1. District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax
   - Actual: 73,859,183
   - Revised: 70,000,000
   - Adopted: 72,000,000
   - Interior: 75,000,000
   - Change: $3,000,000
   - Percent: 4.3%

2. Investment Interest
   - Actual: 1,624,772
   - Revised: 1,056,160
   - Adopted: 948,840
   - Interior: 948,840
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

3. Other Interest, Rent & Other Income
   - Actual: 6,364,912
   - Revised: 6,438,107
   - Adopted: 6,921,784
   - Interior: 6,921,784
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

4. Other Sources
   - Actual: 6,460,000
   - Revised: 0
   - Adopted: 0
   - Interior: 0
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

### Subtotal - Other Revenues

- Total: 88,308,867
- Revised: 77,494,267
- Adopted: 79,870,624
- Interior: 82,870,624
- Change: $3,000,000
- Percent: 3.9%

### Total Sources of Funds

- Total: 164,699,547
- Revised: 161,381,337
- Adopted: 160,561,129
- Interior: 163,561,129
- Change: $3,000,000
- Percent: 1.9%

#### USES OF FUNDS:

1. Motor Bus
   - Actual: 93,453,085
   - Revised: 102,219,993
   - Adopted: 108,095,744
   - Interior: 108,095,744
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

2. A.D.A. Programs
   - Actual: 13,767,333
   - Revised: 14,780,900
   - Adopted: 15,386,631
   - Interior: 15,386,631
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

3. Caltrain
   - Actual: 14,000,000
   - Revised: 5,440,000
   - Adopted: 6,260,000
   - Interior: 6,260,000
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

4. Other Multi-Modal Programs
   - Actual: 2,624,227
   - Revised: 2,719,603
   - Adopted: 2,913,140
   - Interior: 2,913,140
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

5. Pass through to Other Agencies
   - Actual: 467,959
   - Revised: 383,742
   - Adopted: 388,948
   - Interior: 388,948
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

6. Land Transfer Interest Expense
   - Actual: 59,379
   - Revised: 59,379
   - Adopted: 45,895
   - Interior: 45,895
   - Change: 0
   - Percent: 0.0%

### Subtotal - Uses of Funds

- Total: 124,371,982
- Revised: 125,603,617
- Adopted: 133,090,358
- Interior: 133,090,358
- Change: 0
- Percent: 0.0%

### Total Operating Surplus/(Deficit)

- Actual: 40,327,565
- Revised: 35,777,720
- Adopted: 27,407,771
- Interior: 0
- Change: 0
- Percent: 8.4%

### Sales Tax Allocation - Capital Programs

- Actual: 980,800
- Revised: 5,345,625
- Adopted: 5,857,268
- Interior: 5,857,268
- Change: 0
- Percent: 0.0%

### Surplus/(Deficit)

- Actual: 39,346,765
- Revised: 30,432,095
- Adopted: 21,545,403
- Interior: 0
- Change: 0
- Percent: 9.9%

### Debt Service

- Actual: 24,453,463
- Revised: 24,453,287
- Adopted: 24,449,078
- Interior: 0
- Change: 0
- Percent: 0.0%

### Fiscal Agent Fees

- Actual: 26,493
- Revised: 26,410
- Adopted: 27,635
- Interior: 0
- Change: 0
- Percent: 0.0%

### Total Debt Service

- Actual: 24,479,956
- Revised: 24,479,697
- Adopted: 24,474,713
- Interior: 0
- Change: 0
- Percent: 0.0%

### Use of Reserves for Debt Service

- Actual: (24,479,956)
- Revised: (24,479,697)
- Adopted: (24,474,713)
- Interior: 0
- Change: 0
- Percent: 0.0%

### Total Use of Reserves

- Actual: 14,866,809
- Revised: 5,952,398
- Adopted: (2,863,210)
- Interior: 136,790
- Change: 3,000,000
- Percent: 0.0%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>FY2013 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY2014 REvised</th>
<th>FY2015 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY2016 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY15 ADOPTED Compared to FY15 REVISED BUDGET PERCENT CHANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MOTOR BUS FARES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,985,825</td>
<td>17,156,000</td>
<td>17,536,000</td>
<td>17,536,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL (TDA) TRANSIT FUND:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operating Assistance</td>
<td>31,871,276</td>
<td>34,505,186</td>
<td>34,458,615</td>
<td>34,458,615</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA Base</td>
<td>4,411,706</td>
<td>5,633,670</td>
<td>3,694,119</td>
<td>3,694,119</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA TOTAL</td>
<td>4,411,706</td>
<td>5,633,670</td>
<td>3,694,119</td>
<td>3,694,119</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING GRANTS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>10,150,976</td>
<td>8,275,236</td>
<td>6,504,231</td>
<td>6,504,231</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT 1/2 CENT SALES TAX:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operating Assistance</td>
<td>24,554,829</td>
<td>31,493,796</td>
<td>38,991,765</td>
<td>38,991,765</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility Fixed Route</td>
<td>1,009,438</td>
<td>1,035,143</td>
<td>1,018,540</td>
<td>1,018,540</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL 1/2 CENT SALES TAX</td>
<td>25,564,267</td>
<td>32,528,939</td>
<td>40,010,305</td>
<td>40,010,305</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT INTEREST INCOME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Interest Income</td>
<td>1,123,502</td>
<td>697,450</td>
<td>620,090</td>
<td>620,090</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER REVENUE SOURCES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overnight Deposit Interest Income</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Income</td>
<td>1,071,710</td>
<td>1,087,440</td>
<td>1,035,000</td>
<td>1,035,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Income</td>
<td>936,232</td>
<td>930,000</td>
<td>1,035,000</td>
<td>1,035,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OTHER REVENUES</td>
<td>3,345,533</td>
<td>3,423,512</td>
<td>3,772,384</td>
<td>3,772,384</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MOTOR BUS</td>
<td>93,453,085</td>
<td>102,219,993</td>
<td>106,595,744</td>
<td>106,595,744</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN DISABILITIES ACT:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares-Redi Wheels</td>
<td>822,542</td>
<td>809,000</td>
<td>832,300</td>
<td>832,300</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TDA 4.5 Redi Wheels</td>
<td>1,378,216</td>
<td>1,839,741</td>
<td>1,733,614</td>
<td>1,733,614</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local STA - Paratransit</td>
<td>491,881</td>
<td>563,725</td>
<td>1,035,000</td>
<td>1,035,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>881,588</td>
<td>999,343</td>
<td>1,443,784</td>
<td>1,443,784</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Paratransit District</td>
<td>4,141,998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,050,989</td>
<td>1,050,989</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Paratransit Suppl. Coastside</td>
<td>1,248,275</td>
<td>1,090,381</td>
<td>1,335,300</td>
<td>1,335,300</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income-Paratransit Fund</td>
<td>468,521</td>
<td>358,710</td>
<td>377,640</td>
<td>377,640</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA Measure A Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>2,954,311</td>
<td>2,720,000</td>
<td>2,880,000</td>
<td>2,880,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM County Measure A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure M Paratransit</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ADA PROGRAMS</td>
<td>13,767,332</td>
<td>14,780,900</td>
<td>15,386,631</td>
<td>15,386,631</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULTI-MODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Caltrain</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sources - Caltrain</td>
<td>6,460,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from SMCTA for Caltrain</td>
<td>5,440,000</td>
<td>5,440,000</td>
<td>6,260,000</td>
<td>6,260,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB434 Funds - SamTrans Shuttle</td>
<td>554,400</td>
<td>566,000</td>
<td>582,000</td>
<td>582,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer SamTrans Shuttle Funds</td>
<td>1,619,379</td>
<td>1,614,595</td>
<td>1,749,400</td>
<td>1,749,400</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - SamTrans Shuttle Program</td>
<td>346,517</td>
<td>356,218</td>
<td>377,640</td>
<td>377,640</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Gen. Operating Asst.</td>
<td>103,931</td>
<td>182,790</td>
<td>204,100</td>
<td>204,100</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MULTI-MODAL</td>
<td>16,824,227</td>
<td>8,159,603</td>
<td>9,173,140</td>
<td>9,173,140</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>123,844,644</td>
<td>125,160,496</td>
<td>131,155,515</td>
<td>131,155,515</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OPERATED BUSES</td>
<td>FY2013 ACTUAL</td>
<td>FY2014 REVISED</td>
<td>FY2015 ADOPTED</td>
<td>FY2015 REVISED</td>
<td>FY2015 Increase (Decrease)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Benefits</td>
<td>47,696,860</td>
<td>50,777,535</td>
<td>53,825,457</td>
<td>53,825,457</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>47,923</td>
<td>51,800</td>
<td>51,750</td>
<td>51,750</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>542,852</td>
<td>696,080</td>
<td>1,625,280</td>
<td>1,625,280</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Maintenance</td>
<td>1,107,710</td>
<td>1,273,500</td>
<td>1,242,000</td>
<td>1,242,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>3,412,859</td>
<td>5,195,847</td>
<td>1,625,280</td>
<td>1,625,280</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>4,740,556</td>
<td>5,280,779</td>
<td>5,704,354</td>
<td>5,704,354</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>1,271,395</td>
<td>1,507,128</td>
<td>2,447,741</td>
<td>2,447,741</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76,463,689</strong></td>
<td><strong>84,740,067</strong></td>
<td><strong>89,359,104</strong></td>
<td><strong>89,359,104</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; Supply:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel and Lubricants</td>
<td>5,351,161</td>
<td>6,491,659</td>
<td>6,333,750</td>
<td>6,333,750</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Parts and Materials</td>
<td>2,347,757</td>
<td>2,358,769</td>
<td>1,911,257</td>
<td>1,911,257</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform and Drivers Expense</td>
<td>305,339</td>
<td>444,235</td>
<td>444,235</td>
<td>444,235</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetables and Tickets</td>
<td>151,640</td>
<td>172,000</td>
<td>201,900</td>
<td>201,900</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies/Printing</td>
<td>260,551</td>
<td>369,267</td>
<td>339,062</td>
<td>339,062</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Materials and Supply</td>
<td>129,524</td>
<td>156,500</td>
<td>159,500</td>
<td>159,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,412,859</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,740,556</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,704,354</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,704,354</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contracted bus services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Urban Bus Service</td>
<td>14,780,548</td>
<td>15,041,393</td>
<td>15,365,530</td>
<td>15,365,530</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>360,426</td>
<td>380,030</td>
<td>380,030</td>
<td>380,030</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insurance costs</td>
<td>651,828</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>655,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastside Services</td>
<td>703,283</td>
<td>1,857,450</td>
<td>1,857,450</td>
<td>1,857,450</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redi Coast Non-ADA</td>
<td>230,120</td>
<td>222,220</td>
<td>222,220</td>
<td>222,220</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>47,102</td>
<td>102,180</td>
<td>102,180</td>
<td>102,180</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la Honda Pescadero</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>55,130</td>
<td>55,130</td>
<td>55,130</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcoast - Pescadero</td>
<td>137,068</td>
<td>118,150</td>
<td>118,150</td>
<td>118,150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other related costs-samCoast</td>
<td>26,522</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,989,396</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,736,640</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,736,640</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contracted Bus Service</td>
<td><strong>93,453,085</strong></td>
<td><strong>102,219,993</strong></td>
<td><strong>108,095,744</strong></td>
<td><strong>108,095,744</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN DISABILITY ACT PROGRAMS</td>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>FY2015</td>
<td>FY2015</td>
<td>FY15 ADOPTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E = D-C</td>
<td>F = E/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled/Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>5,627,520</td>
<td>6,359,982</td>
<td>6,294,660</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>2,575,080</td>
<td>2,937,197</td>
<td>3,060,554</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Sedan/Taxi Service</td>
<td>3,012,025</td>
<td>2,534,802</td>
<td>3,133,720</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Accessibility Support</td>
<td>791,132</td>
<td>1,169,580</td>
<td>1,047,397</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastside ADA Support</td>
<td>1,248,275</td>
<td>1,244,339</td>
<td>1,335,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>513,301</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>515,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ADA PROGRAMS</td>
<td>13,767,333</td>
<td>14,780,900</td>
<td>15,386,631</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MULTI-MODAL TRANSIT PROGRAMS     |        |        |        |        |              |
| Peninsular Rail Service          | 14,000,000 | 5,440,000 | 6,260,000 | 0     | 0.0%         |
| Total Caltrain Service           | 14,000,000 | 5,440,000 | 6,260,000 | 0     | 0.0%         |

| OTHER SUPPORT                    |        |        |        |        |              |
| Dumbarton Express Service        | 3,567 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% |
| SamTrans Shuttle                 | 2,520,296 | 2,536,813 | 2,709,040 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Bicycle Coordinating Activities  | 0 | 0 | 25,000 | 25,000 | 0 |
| Maintenance Multimodal Fac       | 100,363 | 182,790 | 179,100 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total Other Support              | 2,624,227 | 2,719,603 | 2,913,140 | 0 | 0.0% |

| TOTAL MULTI-MODAL PROGRAMS       |        |        |        |        |              |
| 16,624,227                       | 8,159,603 | 9,173,140 | 9,173,140 | 0 | 0.0% |

| TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES          |        |        |        |        |              |
| 123,844,644                      | 125,160,496 | 132,655,515 | 132,655,515 | 0 | 0.0% |
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-

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

* * *

AUTHORIZING AN AMENDMENT TO INCREASE THE FISCAL YEAR 2015 OPERATING REVENUES IN THE AMOUNT OF $3 MILLION FOR TOTAL OPERATING REVENUES OF $163,561,129 AND TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES OF $133,090,358.

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

WHEREAS, on June 4, 2014 and pursuant to Resolution No. 2014-27, the Board of Directors of the District adopted the Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 Operating Budget in the amount of $131,590,358, with Operating Revenues totaling $161,381,337 and Operating Expenses totaling $131,590,358; and

WHEREAS, on August 6, 2014 and pursuant to Resolution No. 2014-38, the Board amended the FY2015 Operating Budget to increase the Operating Expenses by $1.5 million to incorporate the costs associated with the first year of a new three-year collective bargaining agreement, for a new FY2015 Adopted Operating Budget total of $133,090,358, with Operating Revenues totaling $161,381,337 and Operating Expenses totaling $133,090,358; and

WHEREAS, since the amendment of the FY2015 Operating Budget, the District’s half-cent sales tax has increased Operating Revenues by $3 million more than originally projected in the FY2015 Operating Budget, increasing Operating Revenues to $163,561,129; and
WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends and the Finance Committee concurs, that the FY2015 Operating Budget be amended to reflect this increase in the FY2015 Operating Revenues by $3 million.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Board of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby approves an amendment increasing the FY2015 Operating Revenues by $3 million, for total amended Operating Revenues of $163,561,129 and total Operating Expenses of $133,090,358.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the General Manager is directed to submit this amended budget to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, together with a copy of this resolution, at the earliest practicable date.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of February, 2015 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

__________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

__________________________
District Secretary
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

FINANCE ITEM # 5
FEBRUARY 4, 2015

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE AWARD OF A CONTRACT TO PROVIDE CONTRACTED SHUTTLE SERVICES

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend Board approval of the following:

1. Award a contract to MV Transportation, Inc. (MV) of Dallas, Texas to provide contracted shuttle services for a base term of five years and four months at an estimated amount of $1,487,097.

2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO or designee to execute a contract with MV in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents and negotiated agreement.

3. Authorize the General Manager/CEO or designee to exercise up to five additional one-year option terms with MV, in the estimated aggregate amount of $1,626,567 for the five-year period, if it is in the best interest of the San Mateo County Transit District (District). The option terms may be exercised in one-year or multi-year increments at the sole discretion of the District.

SIGNIFICANCE
Award of a contract to MV will provide the District with a dedicated shuttle service contractor to provide both community and employer Shuttle Program operations.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funding for these services will be available under approved and projected operating budgets. Awarding a contract base term of five years and four months serves the purposes of aligning the contract years with the District’s fiscal years.

BACKGROUND
The SamTrans Contracted Shuttle Service Program will provide another avenue for the District to support transportation alternatives. Shuttles included under this new procurement include existing and new shuttles operating within San Mateo County that may not connect to Caltrain or Bay Area Rapid Transit stations depending on the service intent or location. The new contract initially will include the existing Pacifica
Weekend and Daly City Bayshore shuttles. Both shuttles were initiated by their respective cities as small, pilot shuttle operations. Other shuttles may be added to this program if determined to be an appropriate SamTrans contracted shuttle service.

The District, the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance (Alliance) (collectively referred to as "Agencies") determined that material benefits would be gained by collaborating on a joint solicitation process for shuttle services. Consequently, the Agencies signed a Memorandum of Understanding directing staff to prepare a joint procurement for the Contracted Shuttle Services.

Prior to the current procurement, a Request for Proposals (RFP) to identify a firm to provide the desired services was jointly developed and staff received five proposals from interested firms. However, after firms were notified of the evaluation results and recommendation of award of contract to MV, the Agencies received a protest from Parking Company of America Management (PCAM) alleging MV’s staffing plan was inadequate. California Labor Code 1070 et seq. requires agencies soliciting public transit services to award preference points to each proposer that agrees to retain the current contractor’s employees. In furtherance of this requirement, the Agencies issued with the RFP a roster provided by PCAM of its then-current employees. As part of its due diligence in evaluating PCAM’s protest, staff concluded that inconsistent staffing information was provided to the proposers. In the interest of fostering a fair, full and transparent solicitation process, staff recommended that the Board reject all proposals. At its January 2014 meeting, the Board rejected all proposals and directed staff to re-solicit the services.

On May 28, 2014, a new RFP to provide Contracted Shuttle Services was issued. The solicitation was advertised in a newspaper of general circulation and on the Agencies’ websites. Notifications went out to interested proposers, including Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) that were registered in the procurement database.

An Evaluation Committee (Committee), comprised of qualified staff and a representative from the Alliance with experience in managing contracted public transportation services, reviewed and ranked proposals according to the following weighted criteria set forth in the RFP:

- Approach to Scope of Services 30 points
- Qualifications and Experience of Firm 20 points
- Financial Condition of Firm 15 points
- Qualifications and Experience of Management Team and Key Personnel 15 points
- Cost Proposal 20 points
- Preference Points 10 points

As required by California Labor Code 1070 et seq., preference points were awarded to firms that agreed to retain the employees of the contractor currently providing contracted shuttle services.
Staff received proposals from two companies, neither of which are Small Business Enterprises or DBE. After review, evaluation, and initial scoring of proposals, the Committee invited the two firms for interviews. Following site visits and interviews, the Committee completed the final evaluation and consensus ranking. The firms are listed below in order of their final consensus ranking:

- MV Transportation, Inc., Dallas, Texas
- Parking Company of America Management (PCAM), Los Angeles, CA

Following notice to the proposers of the staff recommendation of the award of contract to MV, the Agencies received correspondence from PCAM and its attorney, alleging a number of solicitation irregularities and requesting solicitation correspondence, evaluation and scoring records.

The Agencies carefully evaluated PCAM’s protest based on the record to date and determined that the solicitation process had no irregularities and was conducted in a full, open and unbiased manner, and that the PCAM protest should be rejected. On behalf of the Agencies, the District sent a letter to PCAM dated December 31, 2014, responding to the concerns PCAM raised and advising of these conclusions. District Counsel also sent a letter to PCAM’s attorney responding to the Public Records Act issues.

The recommendation to award the contract to MV was postponed from the District’s January 7 board meeting agenda to allow PCAM sufficient time to review the responsive public records provided to them.

The Alliance Board of Directors met on January 15, 2015, heard and rejected the protest lodged by PCAM, and awarded the Shuttle Services contract to MV.

MV is one of the nation’s largest passenger transportation companies. Additionally, it has more than 14 years of successful experience operating services for the District. The MV operations team assigned to the District’s account has in-depth knowledge of State and Federal regulatory requirements as well as extensive experience managing public transportation programs. While MV intends to perform this contract with its own labor force, MV plans to procure operators’ uniforms from a DBE supplier.

MV has the requisite experience and qualified operations team for the successful operation of the District’s Shuttle Program. Staff therefore recommends award of a contract to this company.

After contract award, there will be a mobilization period to allow the Contractor to purchase a new fleet of vehicles required to operate the Shuttle Services.

Contract Officer: Adwoa Oni 650.508.6411
Project Manager: Mike Stevenson, Associate Operations Contract Administrator 650.508.7979
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

AUTHORIZING AWARD OF CONTRACT TO MV TRANSPORTATION, INC. TO PROVIDE CONTRACTED SHUTTLE SERVICES FOR AN ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF $1,487,097 FOR A FIVE YEAR AND FOUR-MONTH BASE TERM

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District), the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) and the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance (Alliance) (collectively referred to as "Agencies") previously issued a joint procurement to solicit competitive proposals to provide contracted shuttle services and received proposals from five firms in response to the solicitation; and

WHEREAS, after firms were notified of the evaluation results and recommendation of award of contract to MV Transportation, Inc. (MV), the Agencies received a protest regarding the award of the contract from Parking Company of America Management (PCAM); and

WHEREAS, staff undertook a thorough evaluation of PCAM’s protest, including its allegation that MV’s staffing plan was inadequate; and

WHEREAS, following staff’s evaluation and conclusion that inaccurate staffing information had been provided to the proposers, and in the interest of fostering a fair, full and transparent solicitation process, staff recommended that all proposals be rejected, which rejection was authorized by the Board at its January 2014 meeting, at which time the Board also directed staff to re-solicit the services; and

WHEREAS, on May 28, 2014, a new Request for Proposals (RFP) to provide Contracted Shuttle Services was issued; and
WHEREAS, the solicitation was advertised in a newspaper of general circulation, on the Agencies’ websites, and notifications were sent to interested proposers, including Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs) that were registered in the procurement database; and

WHEREAS, in response to the Agencies’ solicitation, two firms submitted proposals; and

WHEREAS, an Evaluation Committee (Committee) has reviewed proposals, conducted interviews and site visits, and ranked the proposers’ proposals according to the evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP; and

WHEREAS, the Committee has determined that MV is the highest consensus-ranked firm; and

WHEREAS, legal counsel has reviewed MV’s proposal and determined that it complies with the requirements of the solicitation documents; and

WHEREAS, PCAM, the lower ranked proposer in this second procurement, has submitted requests for public records, a written protest, and a letter from their legal representative raising issues under the Public Records Act regarding this second procurement, and the Agencies have responded to all of these communications; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that a five year and four-month base contract for contracted shuttle services be awarded to MV for an estimated amount of $1,487,097.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby awards a contract for contracted shuttle services to MV for a base term of five years and four-months for an estimated amount of $1,487,097; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the Board authorizes the General Manager/CEO or designee to execute a contract on behalf of the District with MV in full conformity with all of the terms and conditions of the RFP and negotiated agreement, and in a form approved by legal counsel; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the Board authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to exercise up to five additional, one-year option terms with MV in the total estimated amount of $1,626,567 for the five-year period, if it is in the best interest of the District, with the understanding that the option terms may be exercised in one-year or multi-year increments at the sole discretion of the District.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of February, 2015 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

___________________________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

___________________________________________
District Secretary

Page 3 of 3
TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: SECURITY UPGRADES AT THREE DISTRICT FACILITIES

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board:

1. Award a contract to the lowest, responsive and responsible bidder, Anthem Builders, Inc. to provide security upgrades at three San Mateo County Transit District (District) facilities for a total amount of $1,299,781; and

2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute a contract with Anthem Builders, Inc. in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents; and

3. Increase the Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 Capital Budget by $230,000: $115,000 for the Receptionist Area Security Improvements Project and $115,000 for the Access Control Improvement Project.

4. Delegate to the General Manager/CEO, or his designee(s), the authority to approve all aspects of the Access Control and Receptionist Area Security Improvements projects and related improvements including the design, construction, phasing, and schedule, to be effective until revoked by an action of the Board.

SIGNIFICANCE
The Access Control and Receptionist Area Security Improvements projects will improve employee and customer security at three District locations (Central and South Base facilities in San Carlos and the North Base facility in South San Francisco) by adding turnstile controlled access features in the lobby area of the Central Office, security card reader door controls in the Central Office stairwells, and similar access control equipment at the North and South Bases. The projects will also relocate the Central Office Receptionist Area (currently on the second floor) to a new facility on the ground floor.
BUDGET IMPACT
The Receptionist Area Security Improvements Project and Access Control Improvements Project were initiated in FY2013. In FY2015, the District approved a total budget of $2,010,000 for the two projects, with $1.2 million allocated to the construction contract. The low bid (from Anthem Builders) exceeded this amount, resulting in a budget shortfall of $230,000. The proposed amendment would increase the budget by this amount to an authorized total of $2,240,000. Funding for the two projects will come entirely from State Proposition 1B Safety and Security funds that are allocated annually to the District.

BACKGROUND
The District approved the FY2015 Capital Budget on June 4, 2014 under Resolution No. 2014-28 in the amount of $55,331,570. The proposed amendment as discussed above would increase the Capital Budget by $230,000 to an authorized total of $55,561,570. Based on a Threat and Vulnerability Assessment of District facilities, completed by New Age Security Solutions on December 7, 2012, these improvements were among those chosen for completion.

Staff advertised the solicitation on the District's procurement web site and in local newspapers. Staff also sent notifications to potential bidders in this field of work.

The bids received are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Total Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineer’s Estimate</td>
<td>$1,200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthem Builders, Inc., Roseville, CA</td>
<td>$1,299,781.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Cumiskey Construction Corporation, San Francisco, CA (SBE firm)</td>
<td>$1,531,493.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocka Construction, Inc., Fremont, CA</td>
<td>$1,597,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angotti &amp; Reilly, Inc., San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>$1,713,253.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bid from Anthem Builders, Inc. (Anthem) is 8 percent higher than the engineer’s estimate. Staff has determined that the difference between the engineer's estimate and Anthem’s bid is fair and reasonable.

References provided by Anthem indicate that they have satisfactorily performed construction projects for many firms for over the past three years. Therefore staff has concluded that Anthem is a responsible bidder. Staff and legal counsel verified that Anthem submitted all of the required bid documents and complied with all bidding requirements, and considers Anthem’s bid to be responsive. Therefore staff analysis concludes that Anthem is the lowest, responsible and responsive bidder.

The Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Officer reviewed the bid documents submitted by Anthem and determined that the firm was responsive to the bid requirements.

In order to provide greater administrative efficiency, responsiveness and flexibility, staff recommends that the Board of Directors delegate to the General Manager/CEO, or his
designee(s), the authority to approve all aspects of the Access Control and Receptionist Area Security Improvements projects and related improvements including the design, construction, phasing, and schedule, to be effective until revoked by an action of the Board.

Contract Officer:  Dwayne Pugh  
Project Manager:  Jim Kellner  

650-508-7730  
650-508-6333
# PROJECT TITLE | PROJECT DESCRIPTION | Total Estimated Project Cost | Previously Budgeted | FY2015 Budget Request | Remaining |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 1. REVENUE VEHICLES REPLACEMENT

1.1 Replacement Buses (Gillig)  
Replace 60 2003 Gillig Low-Floor buses at the end of their useful lives  
$30,203,000  
$24,096,385  
$6,106,615  
$20,000,000  
$4,096,385  
$-

1.2 Replacement Buses (NABI)  
Replace 55 2002 NABI buses at the end of their useful lives  
$47,800,000  
$24,096,385  
$23,703,615  
$20,000,000  
$2,849,037  
$1,247,348

Subtotal  
$48,192,770  
$40,000,000  
$8,192,770  
$1,247,348

## 2. REVENUE VEHICLE SUPPORT

2.1 Major Bus Components  
Annual funding for procurement of bus parts  
$963,800  
$963,800  
$-

2.2 Mobile Bus Lifts  
Replace the mobile bus lifts used for maintenance and repairs on the bus fleets that have reached the end of their useful lives  
$520,000  
$520,000  
$416,000  
$-

2.3 Non-Revenue Service Support Vehicles  
Replace 15 non-revenue service support vehicles that have reached the end of their useful lives  
$399,000  
$399,000  
$319,200  
$-

Subtotal  
$1,882,800  
$735,200  
$1,147,600

## 3. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

3.1 Technology Refresh Project  
Replace and upgrade servers and out of warranty printers, copiers, fax machines and scanners.  
$995,000  
$995,000  
$-

3.2 Wi-Fi Installation at North Base and South Base  
Installation of a Wi-Fi network at North Base and South Base  
$143,000  
$143,000  
$-

3.3 PeopleSoft Upgrade  
Redesign and upgrade of PeopleSoft to better match the application to the business needs of the District  
$21,637,112  
$20,837,112  
$800,000  
$333,680  
$466,320

Subtotal  
$1,938,000  
$1,604,320

## 4. DEVELOPMENT

4.1 Mobility Management Plan  
Evaluate and study the delivery of our current non-fixed route services, including shuttles and paratransit services  
$590,000  
$250,000  
$340,000  
$90,000  
$160,000

4.2 Strategic Plan Update  
Update the agency’s policy framework which will lay out a vision for the agency’s core business  
$435,674  
$291,674  
$144,000  
$-

4.3 Capital Program and Project Development  
Capitalized funds for annual program development including but not limited to plans, budgets, programs, funding strategies, and preliminary engineering  
$250,000  
$250,000  
$-

4.4 Capital Program Management  
Capitalized funds for program and project controls support, including monitoring project performance and delivery  
$250,000  
$250,000  
$-

Subtotal  
$894,000  
$250,000  
$1,144,000  
$90,000  
$804,000
## 5 FACILITIES/CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2015 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Facilities Smaller Projects</td>
<td>Facility maintenance/Improvement Account</td>
<td>$282,000</td>
<td>$282,000</td>
<td>- $- $- $- $282,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Maintenance &amp; Operating Facility Pavement Rehab:</td>
<td>Rehab pavement at North and South Bases to bring the pavement to a state of good repair</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>- $- $- $- $170,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NB &amp; SB Concrete Rehab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Central Heating, Ventilation &amp; Air Conditioning</td>
<td>Conduct basic repair and maintenance of existing HVAC system that has reached the end of its useful life</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>- $- $- $- $75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HVAC Maintenance at Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Belle-Aire Island Erosion Study</td>
<td>A study to determine the effects of erosion around Belle-Aire Island at North Base</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
<td>$117,000</td>
<td>- $- $- $- $117,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Facilities Asset Inventory</td>
<td>Conduct an inventory of all facilities assets at Central, North Base, South Base, Brewster, Sequoia Station and Colma</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>- $- $- $- $160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$804,000</td>
<td>- $- $- $- $804,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 6 SAFETY AND SECURITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2015 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Receptionist Area Security Improvement</td>
<td>Project will provide improved security for the receptionist on the 2nd floor of Central who is involved in numerous interactions with the public</td>
<td>$1,115,000</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$645,000</td>
<td>- $- $- $- $645,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Access Control Improvements</td>
<td>Project will improve the security at Central, North Base and South Base with significant upgrades</td>
<td>$1,010,000</td>
<td>$1,010,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>- $- $- $- $275,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Dumbarton Corridor Right of Way Fencing</td>
<td>Project will install vandal resistant fencing at key locations along the Dumbarton Rail Corridor to deter trespassing, illegal dumping and homeless encampments</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>$3,820,000</td>
<td>- $- $- $- $680,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>- $- $- $- $1,600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 7 OTHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Total Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Previously Budgeted</th>
<th>FY2015 Budget Request</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>FUNDING SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>Annual set-aside for unforeseen and emergency capital expenditures</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>- $- $- $- $250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>- $- $- $- $250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$55,061,570</td>
<td>- $- $- $- $69,855,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

A) Funding will come from PCJPB and SMCTA for their share of the project.
B) Funding will come from SMCTA.
C) The proposed FY2015 budget includes, distributed across the program of projects, $875K in administrative overhead funds to help support the capital program.
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

AUTHORIZE AWARD OF CONTRACT TO ANTHEM BUILDERS, INC.
FOR THE ACCESS CONTROL AND RECEPTIONIST AREA SECURITY
IMPROVEMENTS PROJECTS FOR A TOTAL COST OF $1,299,781,
AUTHORIZE AN AMENDMENT TO INCREASE THE
FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2015 CAPITAL BUDGET IN THE AMOUNT OF
$230,000 FOR A TOTAL CAPITAL BUDGET OF $55,561,570, AND
AUTHORIZE DELEGATION OF APPROVAL AUTHORITY FOR ALL
ASPECTS OF THE PROJECT, INCLUDING DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION,
PHASING, AND SCHEDULE TO THE GENERAL MANAGER/CEO

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) solicited competitive
bids for the Access Control Improvements Project and Receptionist Area Security
Improvements Project (Projects); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 2014-28 adopted on June 4, 2014, the
District approved the FY2015 Capital Budget in the amount of $55,331,570; and

WHEREAS, in response to the District's Invitation for Bids (IFB), four firms submitted
bids, including the apparent low bidder, Anthem Builders, Inc. (Anthem) of Roseville,
California; and

WHEREAS, staff and legal counsel have reviewed the bids and determined that
Anthem is the lowest, responsive and responsible bidder; and

WHEREAS, Anthem's bid of $1,299,781 exceeds the projects' budget by $230,000;
and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance
Committee concurs, that the contract be awarded to Anthem, whose bid meets the
requirements of the solicitation; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance
Committee concurs that the FY2015 Capital Budget be increased by $230,000,
including $115,000 each for the Access Control Security Improvement Project and the Receptionist Area Security Improvements Project, for a total FY2015 Capital Budget of $55,561,570; and

WHEREAS, in order to provide greater administrative efficiency, responsiveness and flexibility, staff recommends the Board of Directors delegate to the General Manager/CEO, or his designee(s), the authority to approve all aspects of the Access Control Improvements Project and Receptionist Area Security Improvements Project, and related improvements, including the design, construction, phasing, and schedule, to be effective until revoked by an action of the Board.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Board of Directors of the District hereby takes the following actions:

1) Awards a contract to Anthem Builders, Inc. for the Access Control and Receptionist Area Security Improvements Projects for a total cost of $1,299,781.00;

2) Authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute a contract on behalf of the San Mateo County Transit District with Anthem Builders, Inc. in full conformity with all the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents; and

3) Amends the FY2015 Capital Budget to include an additional $230,000 for the Access Control and Receptionist Area Security Improvements Projects for a total Capital Budget of $55,561,570; and

4) Authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee(s), effective immediately and until terminated by action of the Board, to approve all aspects of the Access Control and Receptionist Area Security Improvements
Projects, and related improvements, including the design, construction, phasing, and schedule; and

5) Directs the General Manager/CEO and his designee(s), in the exercise of authority for the approval of all aspects of the Access Control and Receptionist Area Security Improvements projects, including the design, construction, phasing, and schedule, to reasonably and appropriately balance considerations of safety and convenience to employees and the public, accessibility to transit facilities and operations, and cost effectiveness, and to balance all benefits, advantages, and potential risks involved; and

6) Directs that the authority for the approval of all aspects of the Access Control and Receptionist Area Security Improvements projects, and related improvements, including the design, construction, phasing, and schedule granted by this Resolution is not intended to alter the process by which funds may be budgeted or expended on the Access Control and Receptionist Area Security Improvements projects.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of February, 2015 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

________________________
District Secretary
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

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

SUBJECT: AWARD OF A CONTRACT FOR FURNISHING BRAKE PARTS AND RELATED ITEMS

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board:

1. Award a contract to New Flyer Industries Canada ULC (New Flyer) of Winnipeg, MB, Canada to provide Brake Parts and Related Items (Brake Parts) to the San Mateo County Transit District (District) for an estimated total amount of $156,496 for a three-year base term.

2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute a contract with New Flyer in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the bid documents, and exercise up to two, one-year option terms with New Flyer, if deemed in the best interest of the District.

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of the above actions will ensure continued, uninterrupted provision of brake parts by a qualified and responsive contractor to the District for its fixed-route bus operations.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funds to support the award of this contract are included in the current and projected operating budgets.

BACKGROUND
An Invitation for Bids (IFB) was issued for provision of brake parts for a three-year base term with two one-year options. Staff advertised the IFB on the District’s procurement website and in a local newspaper of general circulation. Solicitation notifications also were sent to interested bidders, including Small Business and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises that were registered in the District’s vendor database.
The District received one bid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Three-year Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Flyer Industries Canada ULC, Winnipeg, MB, Canada</td>
<td>$156,496.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bid submitted by New Flyer was found to be responsive as it fully complies with the solicitation requirements; and pursuant to staff’s cost analysis, New Flyer’s bid prices were determined to be fair and reasonable. Staff therefore recommends the Board of Directors award a contract to New Flyer for the provision of Brake Parts and Related Items for a three-year base term for an estimated total contract amount of $156,496.

The District’s current contractor is New Flyer who was awarded a three-year contract in 2009 with two one-year options for a total contract value of $225,186. New Flyer’s performance under the contract has been satisfactory.

Contract Officer: Luis F. Velásquez 650-622-8099
Project Manager: Detra Dillon, Contract Administrator 650-508-6418
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-

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

* * *

AUTHORIZING CONTRACT AWARD TO NEW FLYER INDUSTRIES CANADA ULC FOR
FURNISHING BRAKE PARTS AND RELATED ITEMS AT A TOTAL ESTIMATED COST OF $156,496

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) solicited competitive
bids for furnishing brake parts and related items for a three-year base term; and

WHEREAS, in response to the District’s solicitation, one firm, New Flyer Industries
Canada ULC (New Flyer) of Winnipeg, MB, Canada, submitted a bid; and

WHEREAS, staff and legal counsel have reviewed the sole bid and determined
that it meets the requirements of the solicitation documents; and

WHEREAS, staff conducted a cost analysis of the sole bid in accordance with
Federal Transit Administration requirements and determined the prices quoted are fair
and reasonable; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Committee
concurs, a contract be awarded to New Flyer, whose bid meets the requirements of
the solicitation documents.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Board of Directors of the District awards a
three-year contract to New Flyer Industries Canada ULC of Winnipeg, MB, Canada for
Furnishing Brake Parts and Related Items at a total estimated cost of $156,496 based
upon the estimated requirements of the District during this term and at the unit prices
submitted, with an option to extend the contract for up to two additional, one-year
option terms; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the General Manager/CEO or his designee is authorized to execute a contract on behalf of the District with New Flyer in full conformity with all of the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the General Manager/CEO or his designee is authorized to exercise up to two additional, one-year option terms with New Flyer, provided that it is in the best interest of the District.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of February, 2015 by the following vote:

AYES: 

NOES: 

ABSENT: 

___________________________ 
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District 

ATTEST: 

___________________________ 
District Secretary
FINANCE ITEM # 8
FEBRUARY 4, 2015

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

C.H. (Chuck) Harvey
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE AMENDMENT TO THE CONTRACT WITH C.A.R.E EVALUATORS, LLC FOR ADA PARATRANSIT ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT SERVICES

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board authorize the General Manager/CEO, or designee, to execute an amendment to extend the contract with C.A.R.E. Evaluators, LLC (C.A.R.E.) for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit eligibility assessment services on a month-to-month basis, for up to five and one-half months, effective February 16, 2015, at a total additional cost not to exceed $257,514.

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of the above action will allow staff the necessary time to complete on-going negotiations for a new contract for the provision of ADA paratransit eligibility assessment services.

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

BACKGROUND
C.A.R.E. provides ADA paratransit eligibility assessment services for the San Mateo County Transit District (District) under a contract that is set to expire on February 15, 2015. A Request for Proposals (RFP) to identify a firm to provide the desired services under a new contract was issued on October 3, 2014. To ensure a fair and reasonable cost for the District, staff is undertaking additional analysis of proposed prices and cost elements. Staff anticipates this analysis and subsequent negotiations may take several additional months.

The District has a compelling business need for uninterrupted ADA paratransit eligibility assessment services. Therefore, staff desires to extend the term of the current agreement on a month-to-month basis for up five and one-half months.

Contract Officer: Adwoa Oni 650-508-6411
Project Manager: Tina Dubost, Manager, Accessible Services 650-508-6247
RESOLUTION NO. 2015-
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *
AUTHORIZING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONTRACT WITH C.A.R.E. EVALUATORS, LLC FOR PROVISION OF ADA PARATRANSPORT ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT SERVICES TO EXTEND THE TERM BY UP TO SIX MONTHS AT AN ESTIMATED COST NOT TO EXCEED $257,514

WHEREAS, in October 2014, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) issued a Request for Proposals to identify a qualified contractor to provide Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) paratransit eligibility assessment services; and

WHEREAS, to ensure fair and reasonable price for the District, staff is undertaking on-going analysis regarding the proposed prices and costs elements for the new contract, which analysis and subsequent negotiations may take several additional months; and

WHEREAS, the District's current agreement with the incumbent provider, C.A.R.E. Evaluators, LLC (C.A.R.E.), is set to expire on February 15, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the District has a compelling business need for uninterrupted ADA paratransit eligibility assessment services and, therefore, staff desires to extend the term of the current agreement with C.A.R.E. on a month-to-month basis, for a maximum of six months at a total additional cost not to exceed $257,514; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Committee concurs, that the Board authorize an amendment to the District's current contract with C.A.R.E. to extend the contract on a month-to-month basis for up to six months, at a total additional cost not to exceed $257,514.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute an amendment to the paratransit eligibility assessment services contract with C.A.R.E. Evaluators, LLC in a form approved by legal counsel, to extend the contract on a month-to-month basis for up to six months at a total additional cost not-to-exceed $257,514, effective February 16, 2015.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of February, 2015 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, 2014

ACTION
Staff has attached the San Mateo County Transit District’s (District) Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the 2014 fiscal year for the Finance Committee to present to the Board for informational purposes only. No policy action is required.

The Fiscal Year 2014 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report is available online at http://www.samtrans.com/about/Finance/Comprehensive_Annual_Financial_Reports.html

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 on the Budget.

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

Prepared by: Jeannie Chen, Senior Accountant 650-508-6274
ACTION

1. Approval of Minutes of Legislative Committee Meeting of January 7, 2015
2. Approval of 2015 Legislative Program

INFORMATIONAL

3. State and Federal Legislative Update
Committee Members Present: S. Harris (Committee Chair), Z. Kersteen-Tucker, K. Matsumoto

Other Board Members Present, Constituting Committee of the Whole: J. Gee, C. Groom, R. Guilbault, C. Stone, A. Tissier

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

Committee Chair Shirley Harris called the meeting to order at 2:51 p.m.

Approval of Minutes
Shirley Harris moved to approve the Minutes of Legislative Committee Meeting of December 3, 2014
Second: Z. Kersteen-Tucker

Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier

Update on the State and Federal Legislative Program

State Update
Seamus Murphy, Director, Government and Community Affairs, said a number of bills have been introduced in Sacramento and the number will grow. A primary focus will be the Cap and Trade Program. He said the Legislature approved an allocation strategy for most of the Cap and Trade funding throughout the life of the program. Forty percent of the funds are still unallocated and can be used and appropriated on a year-to-year basis as the Legislature dictates. Mr. Murphy said the District’s 2015 Legislative Program will largely focus on supplemental funding to programs already expected to receive Cap and Trade revenues, and to play a little bit of defense. He said there are a couple of bills seeking to change the allocation strategy that the Legislature approved last year or to exempt some polluters.

Federal Update
Mr. Murphy said the Federal formula funds that were at risk because of a perceived conflict between Federal Collective Bargaining Laws and the California Public Employee Retirement System reforms were approved by the State. The funds continued to flow while a lawsuit was pending and the suit was decided in District Court on December 30 in favor of the State. He said this means transit employees will be subject to the pension reforms that were approved a couple of years ago under the Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act. Mr. Murphy said staff is not clear what this means in terms of timing or if it will be applied retroactively. This needs to be decided by the U.S. Department of Labor, which is working with the State.

Mr. Murphy said the commuter pre-tax benefits that transit riders receive has been an ongoing saga and the news isn’t getting any better. He said that in 2008, a portion of
the Economic Recovery Act created equity in the tax benefits received by transit riders drivers, but that equity is not permanent. Every year the transit commute benefit has to be restored to be equitable to the benefit drivers receive and that doesn’t always happen.

Director Groom asked about the Federal gas tax. Mr. Murphy said he would be surprised if there was any movement on the issue. He said the Administration is not in favor of raising the gas tax.

**Adjourned:** 2:57 p.m.
TO: Legislative Committee

THROUGH: Michael J. Scanlon
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Mark Simon
Executive Officer, Public Affairs

SUBJECT: 2015 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend Board adoption of the attached Legislative Program (Program) to guide the San Mateo County Transit District’s (District) policy advocacy efforts over the course of the 2015 calendar year.

SIGNIFICANCE
The 2015 Program establishes the principles that will guide the District’s legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts through the 2015 calendar year, including the first half of the 2015-16 State legislative session and the 114th 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. Adoption of the Program provides our legislative delegation and our transportation partners with a clear statement of the District’s priorities.

The 2015 Program is organized to guide the District’s actions and positions in support of three primary objectives:

1. Maintain and enhance 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 Program is structured to apply these core objectives to a series of issues, resulting in a set of policy strategies for each.
State and Regional Issues:
1. State Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities
2. Caltrain Modernization, Capacity Improvements and High-Speed Rail
3. Transportation Operations, Administration, Planning and Project Delivery Regulation

Federal Issues:
1. Surface Transportation and Rail Authorization
2. Regulatory Issues
3. Fiscal Year 2016 Appropriations and Tax Extenders

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 legislative consultants will employ a variety of advocacy tactics to support the 2015 Legislative Program, including:

1. Direct Advocacy
   Engage policymakers directly and sponsor legislation, submit correspondence and provide public testimony that communicates and advances the District’s legislative priorities and positions.

2. Coalition-based Advocacy
   Engage local and regional stakeholders to build awareness about specific issues and foster the creation of local coalitions that will advocate on the District’s behalf. Coordinate with local, regional, statewide and national coalitions organized to advance positions that are consistent with the 2015 Program.

3. Media Advocacy
   Build public awareness and communicate legislative priorities by issuing press releases, organizing media events, and submitting op-ed pieces; 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 legislative and regulatory 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, Director, Government and Community Affairs

650-508-6388
San Mateo County Transit District
2015 Legislative Program

Purpose

Legislative and regulatory actions have the potential to significantly benefit San Mateo County Transit District (District) programs and services. They also have potential to present serious challenges that threaten the District’s ability to meet San Mateo County’s most critical transportation demands.

The 2015 Legislative Program establishes the principles that will guide the District’s legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts through the 2015 calendar year, including the second half of the 2014-15 State legislative session and the 114th 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.

Objectives

The 2015 Legislative Program is organized to guide the District’s actions and positions in support of three primary objectives:

1. Maintain and enhance 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 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 and Regional Issues

1. State Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities
2. Caltrain Modernization, Capacity Improvements and High-speed Rail
3. Transportation Operations, Administration, Planning and Project Delivery Regulation

Federal Issues:

1. Surface Transportation and Rail Authorization
2. Regulatory Issues
3. Fiscal Year 2016 Appropriations and Tax Extenders
Should other issues surface that require the District’s attention, actions will be guided by the four 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.

**Advocacy Tactics**

District staff, led by the Government and Community Affairs group and its legislative consultants, will employ a variety of advocacy tactics to support the 2015 Legislative Program, including:

1. **Direct Advocacy**
   Engage policymakers directly and sponsor legislation, submit correspondence and provide public testimony that communicates and advances the District’s legislative priorities and positions.

2. **Coalition-based Advocacy**
   Engage local and regional stakeholders to build awareness about specific issues and foster the creation of local coalitions that will advocate on the District’s behalf. Coordinate with local, regional, statewide and national coalitions organized to advance positions that are consistent with the 2015 Legislative Program.

3. **Media Advocacy**
   Build public awareness and communicate legislative priorities by issuing press releases, organizing media events, and submitting op-ed pieces; 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 and Regional Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. State Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Protect against the elimination or diversion of any State or regional funds that support San Mateo County transportation needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State investment in transportation operations and infrastructure continues to be underfunded despite a rebounding economy and the stabilization of the State budget. While some existing revenues have been protected from diversion, other funds remain vulnerable, and although some State bond revenues are still available to fund specified transportation projects, over $200 billion in new revenue will be required to meet the State’s infrastructure needs over the next six years. Since the gas tax has not been increased or adjusted for inflation since 1993, its buying power has been diminished, further depleting resources available to maintain, let alone expand or improve the state highway system or transit needs. Recently enacted legislation (SB 1077) creates a statewide committee to assess the implementation of pilot program for a mileage-based user fee as an alternative to the gas tax.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Revenues</td>
<td>Support State funding allocation requests for investments that benefit San Mateo County transportation programs and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After years of diversion to support the State’s General Fund, funding for the State Transit Assistance (STA) program has remained stable over the last few budget cycles thanks to successful legal, legislative and political efforts on behalf of the transportation community. Still, a small increment of STA funding remains vulnerable to diversion under current law. Legislation is needed to either extend or make permanent the exemption for the STA efficiency criteria to ensure that funding remains flexible for capital and operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with statewide transit coalitions to identify and advance opportunities for funding that would support San Mateo County transportation priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor recommendations of the Road Usage Charge (RUC) Technical advisory Committee and implementation of a RUC program by the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td>Advocate for the regularly scheduled issuance of State infrastructure bonds and the 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></td>
<td>Support legislation to maintain exemption for STA efficiency criteria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## State and Regional Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure investments are achieved primarily through the sale of voter-approved bonds. Revenues from the sale of Proposition 1A and Proposition 1B bonds will be needed to ensure that the State’s transportation needs are addressed.</td>
<td><strong>Ballot Measures and Voter Threshold</strong>&lt;br&gt;With over $200 billion in unfunded transportation needs and funding from existing infrastructure bond measures waning, proposals for new local, regional and statewide transportation revenues are being discussed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite broad-based majority support for dedicating additional revenue to transportation services and programs, efforts to generate new revenues are often unsuccessful due to the requirement that certain measures receive two-thirds supermajority support from the Legislature and/or voters.

In 2015, legislation may be considered that provides a framework for lowering the thresholds for the State or a city, county, special district or regional public agency to impose a special tax.

Local jurisdictions will also need to consider whether an exemption to the State imposed two percent cap is needed to pursue a sales tax measure.

**Ballot Measures and Voter Threshold**<br>- Engage in efforts to generate new local, regional or statewide transportation funding and support proposals that adequately benefit San Mateo County transportation needs<br>- Support efforts to amend the State Constitution to reduce the voter threshold required for the State or a city, county, special district or regional transportation agency to impose a special tax for transportation projects or programs<br>- Oppose efforts to add burdensome restrictions on the expenditure of these revenues, such as requiring payment for maintenance costs on the state highway system.<br>- Partner with regional partners such as MTC or other transportation planning agencies to allow for the adoption of an ordinance proposing the imposition of a transactions and use tax that exceeds the two percent statutory limitation.
### State and Regional Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lanes</td>
<td>HOT Lanes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| In 2014 legislation was enacted laying the groundwork for implementation of a mileage-based user fee in California. The fee would charge certain motorists based on how many miles they drive in a given year, in lieu of paying California-assessed fuel taxes. As vehicles are becoming more fuel efficient and fuel tax revenues continue to decline, the state is looking for alternatives to maintain the system and provide alternatives for travelers. The 2014 legislation establishes a limited mileage-based user fee demonstration program. | • Monitor the demonstration program and support efforts to ensure transit operations and capital projects remain eligible uses for revenues collected through a mileage-based user-fee or HOT lane program.  
• Support legislation that supports local agencies’ ability to implement HOT lane projects.  
• Support legislation that works to ensure revenues generated through HOT lane projects remain in the County of origin |
| At the same time, various local jurisdictions around the state are looking to expand the existing HOT lane program as a way of generating additional funding for highway maintenance and operations, and, possibly to support alternatives to the auto in those HOT lane corridors, such as public transit. | |
| Cap-and-Trade Revenues | Cap-and-Trade Revenues |
| In 2012, the State began implementing the cap-and-trade market-based compliance system approved as a part of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (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. In 2014, legislation was enacted creating a long-term funding plan for cap-and-trade which dedicates 60 percent of cap-and-trade revenues to transportation. The remaining 40 percent is subject to annual appropriation through the state budget process. | • Work with the Administration and through like-minded transportation coalitions to secure the appropriation of cap-and-trade revenues in 2015 that are eligible to support San Mateo County transportation needs.  
• Support legislation and regional action that establishes a long-term framework for cap-and-trade expenditures and that makes a broad array of San Mateo County emissions-reducing transportation projects, programs and services eligible for investment  
• Protect existing cap-and-trade appropriations for |
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## State and Regional Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, an element of the cap-and-trade expenditure plan, inadvertently precludes bus operators from applying for and securing funding from this program.</td>
<td>transit operations and capital projects and sustainable communities strategy implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work to direct additional revenues to transit-eligible programs, including efforts to secure funding from the remaining discretionary funds and revenues dedicated to the high-speed-rail project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support legislation to make bus operators eligible to apply for funding from the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other State or Local Financing Options**

With the State’s recent dissolution of redevelopment agencies, local governments continue to seek methods for funding new infrastructure around transit.

**Other State or Local Financing Options**

- Advocate for legislation that would create new local financing tools to support transportation infrastructure and services
- Monitor and support efforts to study Vehicle Miles Traveled tax as a potential revenue source.

## 2. Caltrain Modernization, Capacity Improvements and High Speed Rail

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.

In addition to planning these improvements, Caltrain is

- Advocate for the sale and allocation of Proposition 1A funding to meet the commitments specified in SB 1029 with respect to the Caltrain corridor.
- Support the allocation of cap-and-trade funding to advance implementation of the Caltrain Modernization Program and future Caltrain capacity improvements.
- Work with state, local and regional partners to advance policies and actions that will help secure funding needed to fulfill local and regional...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>working to identify additional infrastructure that will provide additional capacity</td>
<td>commitments to the Caltrain Modernization Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and service benefits and will also allow the corridor to accommodate high-speed-rail</td>
<td>• Work to address regulatory challenges that limit the implementation of solutions that will maximize Caltrain capacity and service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as part of a Blended System.</td>
<td>benefits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oppose actions or policies that negatively impact future capacity or service improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Transportation Operations, Administration, Planning and Project Delivery Regulation

**General**
Every year a variety of legislation or regulatory action is pursued that would affect regulations governing transportation-related service operations, administration, planning and project delivery. In addition, opportunities exist to reform or update existing regulations that are outdated, or can be improved to address potential burdens on transportation agencies without affecting regulatory goals.

**General**
- Support opportunities to remove barriers to, and improve the ability to conduct, efficient transportation operations, administration, planning and project delivery efforts, including alternative project delivery methods that provide flexibility to the District.
- Oppose efforts to impose unjustified and burdensome regulations or restrictions on the District’s ability to conduct efficient transportation operations, administration, planning and project delivery efforts.
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### State and Regional Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes to the Penal Code</strong></td>
<td><strong>Changes to the Penal Code</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts will be underway in 2015 to make changes to the Penal Code related to crimes committed on transit properties, to make them more applicable for transit agencies statewide, including the decriminalization of youth fare evasion, and, failure to yield seating to the elderly and disabled.</td>
<td>Support efforts to amend the Penal Code to decriminalize youth fare evasion and penalize individuals for failing to yield seating to elderly and disabled individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Vehicle Weight Limits** | **Vehicle Weight Limits** |
| Transit buses are subject to decades-old vehicle weight limits that do not reflect current operating realities. In 2012 and again in 2014, 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 2016. | Partner with statewide 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** | **Zero Emission Bus Purchase Requirement** |
| Implementation of the State’s zero emission bus purchase requirement has been delayed repeatedly, but will eventually be required to achieve the State’s mandated greenhouse gas reduction goals. | Monitor California Air Resources Board action on the implementation of the State’s zero emission bus purchase requirement and support strategies that recognize and address the financial challenges associated with mandating the procurement of zero emission buses |

| **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)** | **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)** |
| Several regional and statewide transportation organizations continue working to modernize CEQA and minimize unnecessary delays during the environmental review process. | Closely monitor efforts to modernize CEQA and support proposals that advantage transportation projects, including bicycle, pedestrian and transit-oriented development projects, without compromising CEQA’s effectiveness as an environmental protection policy |
### State and Regional Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Strategies Implementation</td>
<td>Sustainable Communities Strategies Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In conjunction with AB 32 implementation, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (SB 375) requires regions to develop Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS) with integrated housing, land-use and transportation policies that will accommodate population growth and reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions by specific amounts. In 2013, regional authorities in the Bay Area approved Plan Bay Area, which includes the region’s SCS.</td>
<td>• Advocate for policies that provide adequate and equitable funding to support increased demand and dependence on San Mateo County’s transportation services associated with the implementation of SB 375 and Plan Bay Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Federal Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Surface Transportation and Rail Authorization</td>
<td>• Advocate for a dedicated source of revenue that ensures long-term solvency of the Highway Trust fund; allows for the expansion of Federal transportation funding to cover transit state-of-good-repair and other transportation expansion needs; and supports long-term surface transportation authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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, additional capacity and service improvements and the accommodation of blended high-speed rail service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocate for a dedicated source of revenue that ensures long-term solvency of the Highway Trust fund; allows for the expansion of Federal transportation funding to cover transit state-of-good-repair and other transportation expansion needs; and supports long-term surface transportation authorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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, additional capacity and service improvements and the accommodation of blended high-speed rail service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Federal Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2. Regulatory Issues** | • Monitor and review guidance and rulemaking proposals affecting MAP-21 implementation and other transportation issues  
• Collaborate with local, regional, State and national transportation advocacy groups to coordinate comments and advocacy efforts that support regulation that maximizes benefits for transportation programs, services and users |
| Under MAP-21, the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) continues to issue guidance and conduct rulemaking to implement various regulatory changes. |
| **3. 2016 Federal Appropriations and Tax Extenders** | • 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  
• Advocate for the permanent extension of pre-tax transit commute benefits at a level equal to benefits that drivers receive. |
| Every year, Congress adopts at least 12 separate appropriations bills, including the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill. These measures provide the authority for federal agencies to spend money during the upcoming fiscal year for the programs they administer. In recent years, Congress has essentially maintained existing funding levels.  
Congress also considers legislation that governs tax issues including benefits provided to transit commuters. In recent years, provisions that grant transit users with commute benefits equal to the benefit that drivers receive have been allowed to expire. |
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**
On January 9, Governor Brown released his proposed 2015-16 State Budget. The spending plan is a modest increase over last year’s $11 billion budget and includes a $2.8 billion Rainy Day Fund set aside.

Notable transportation related highlights include:
- The State Transit Assistance allocation is $388 million, up slightly from the projected amount due to higher than expected diesel fuel consumption.
- Just over $1 billion in projected revenue from the State’s Cap-and-Trade Program, up from $832 million in the current fiscal year.

The availability of cap-and-trade revenues for public transportation allows the administration to focus its attention on the growing problem of funding highway, road and bridge infrastructure, including an annual $6 billion shortfall in highway maintenance funding.

To address this problem, the budget proposes moving forward with implementation of a Road User Charge Pilot Program that would generate revenue through a mileage-based system. The budget also proposes to generate funding through new high-occupancy toll lane projects that would be approved by the California Transportation Commission.

The governor’s May Budget Revision is expected on May 14. The Legislature has until June 15 to submit a budget to the Governor for his signature.

**FEDERAL ISSUES**
Nothing to report.

Prepared By: Seamus Murphy, Director, Government and Community 650-508-6388 Director
## Bill ID/Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **AB 2**  
**Alejo**  
D | ASSEMBLY PRINT 12/2/2014 - From printer. May be heard in committee January 1. | The Community Redevelopment Law authorizes the establishment of redevelopment agencies in communities to address the effects of blight, as defined by means of redevelopment projects financed by the issuance of bonds serviced by tax increment revenues derived from the project area. Existing law dissolved redevelopment agencies and community development agencies, as of February 1, 2012, and provides for the designation of successor agencies to wind down the affairs of the dissolved agencies and to fulfill the enforceable obligations of those agencies. Existing law also provides for various economic development programs that foster community sustainability and community and economic development initiatives throughout the state. This bill would state the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would authorize certain local agencies to form a community revitalization authority within a community revitalization and investment area, as defined, to carry out provisions of the Community Redevelopment Law in that area for purposes related to, among other things, infrastructure, affordable housing, and economic revitalization, and to provide for the financing of these activities by, among other things, the issuance of bonds serviced by tax increment revenues. |
| **Community revitalization authority.** | | |

---

San Mateo County Transit District  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 4 Linder R</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 1/16/2015 - Referred to Com. on TRANS.</td>
<td>Existing law imposes weight fees on the registration of commercial motor vehicles and provides for the deposit of net weight fee revenues into the State Highway Account. Existing law provides for the transfer of certain weight fee revenues from the State Highway Account to the Transportation Debt Service Fund to reimburse the General Fund for payment of debt service on general obligation bonds issued for transportation purposes. Existing law also provides for the transfer of certain weight fee revenues to the Transportation Bond Direct Payment Account for direct payment of debt service on designated bonds, which are defined to be certain transportation general obligation bonds issued pursuant to Proposition 1B of 2006. Existing law also provides for loans of weight fee revenues to the General Fund to the extent the revenues are not needed for bond debt service purposes, with the loans to be repaid when the revenues are later needed for those purposes, as specified. This bill, notwithstanding these provisions or any other law, until January 1, 2020, would prohibit weight fee revenues from being transferred from the State Highway Account to the Transportation Debt Service Fund, the Transportation Bond Direct Payment Account, or any other fund or account for the purpose of payment of the debt service on transportation general obligation bonds, and would also prohibit loans of weight fee revenues to the General Fund.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 6 Wilk R</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 1/16/2015 - Referred to Coms. on TRANS. and ED.</td>
<td>Existing law, the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, approved by the voters as Proposition 1A at the November 4, 2008, general election, provides for the issuance of $9 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail purposes and $950 million for other related rail purposes. Article XVI of the California Constitution requires measures authorizing general obligation bonds to specify the single object or work to be funded by the bonds and further requires a bond act to be approved by a 2/3 vote of each house of the Legislature and a majority of the voters. This bill would provide that no further bonds shall be sold for high-speed rail purposes pursuant to the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, expect as specifically provided with respect to an existing appropriation for high-speed rail purposes for early improvement projects in the Phase 1 blended system. The bill, subject to the above exception, would require redirection of the unspent proceeds received from outstanding bonds issued and sold for other high-speed rail purposes prior to the effective date of these provisions, upon appropriation, for use in retiring the debt incurred from the issuance and sale of those outstanding bonds. The bill, subject to the above exception, would also require the net proceeds of other bonds subsequently issued and sold under the high-speed rail portion of the bond act to be made available, upon appropriation, to fund construction of school facilities for K-12 and higher education. The bill would make no changes to the authorization under the bond act for issuance of $950 million for rail purposes other than high-speed rail. These provisions would become effective only upon approval by the voters at the next statewide election.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 21</strong> Perea D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES. 1/16/2015 - Referred to Com. on NAT. RES.</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 establishes the State Air Resources Board as the state agency responsible for monitoring and regulating sources emitting greenhouse gases. The act requires the state board to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit, as defined, to be achieved by 2020, equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions levels in 1990. The act requires the state board to make recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature on how to continue the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions beyond 2020. This bill would require the state board, no later than January 1, 2018, to recommend to the Governor and the Legislature a specific target of statewide emissions reductions for 2030 to be accomplished in a cost-effective manner. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 23</strong> Patterson R</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES. 1/16/2015 - Referred to Com. on NAT. RES.</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The state board is required to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020, and to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum, technologically feasible, and cost-effective greenhouse gas emissions reductions. The act authorizes the state board to include the use of market-based compliance mechanisms. Existing state board regulations require specified entities to comply with a market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2013, and require additional specified entities to comply with that market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2015. This bill would instead exempt those categories of persons or entities that did not have a compliance obligation, as defined, under a market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2013, from being subject to that market-based compliance mechanism through December 31, 2020. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 33 Quirk D</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY NAT. RES. 1/22/2015 - Referred to Com. on NAT. RES.</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 establishes the State Air Resources Board as the state agency responsible for monitoring and regulating sources emitting greenhouse gases. The act requires the state board to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit, as defined, to be achieved by 2020 equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions levels in 1990. The act requires the state board to prepare and approve a scoping plan for achieving the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. The act requires the scoping plan to be updated at least once every 5 years. This bill, until January 1, 2020, would require, for purposes of advising the update of the next scoping plan, the state board to develop specified information by July 1, 2016. The bill would require the state board on or before January 1, 2017, to submit a report to the appropriate committees of the Legislature on the specified information. The bill would provide that the specified information is intended to assist in establishing state policy and does not change any statute, regulation, or regulatory decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 61 Allen, Travis R</td>
<td>ASSEMBLY TRANS. 1/22/2015 - Referred to Com. on TRANS.</td>
<td>Under existing law, a person may not stop, park, or leave a vehicle standing alongside a curb space authorized for the loading or unloading of passengers of a bus engaged as a common carrier in local transportation when indicated by a sign or red paint on the curb, except that existing law allows local authorities to permit schoolbuses to stop alongside these curb spaces upon agreement between a transit system operating buses as common carriers in local transportation and a public school district or private school. This bill would also allow local authorities to permit shuttle service vehicles, as defined, to stop for the loading or unloading of passengers alongside these curb spaces upon agreement between a transit system operating buses engaged as common carriers in local transportation and a shuttle service provider, as defined.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AB 156
**Perea D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: investment plan.</strong></td>
<td><strong>ASSEMBLY PRINT 1/21/2015 - From printer. May be heard in committee February 20.</strong></td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The state board is required to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020. The act authorizes the state board to include the use of market-based compliance mechanisms. Existing law requires all moneys, except for fines and penalties, collected by the state board from the auction or sale of allowances as part of a market-based compliance mechanism to be deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and to be available upon appropriation. Existing law requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to identify disadvantaged communities and requires the Department of Finance, in consultation with the state board and any other relevant state agency, to develop, as specified, a 3-year investment plan for the moneys deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. This bill would require the department to include in the 3-year investment plan an allocation to provide technical assistance to disadvantaged communities to assist them in proposing specified projects for inclusion in the 3-year 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><strong>SB 1</strong></td>
<td>SENATE E.Q. 1/15/2015 - Referred to Com. E.Q.</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The state board is required to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020, and to adopt rules and regulations in an open, public process to achieve the maximum, technologically feasible, and cost-effective greenhouse gas emissions reductions. The act authorizes the state board to include the use of market-based compliance mechanisms. Existing state board regulations require specified entities to comply with a market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2013, and require additional specified entities to comply with that market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2015. This bill instead would exempt categories of persons or entities that did not have a compliance obligation, as defined, under a market-based compliance mechanism beginning January 1, 2013, from being subject to that market-based compliance mechanism. The bill would require all participating categories of persons or entities to have a compliance obligation beginning January 1, 2025. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 5</strong></td>
<td>SENATE E.Q. 1/15/2015 - Referred to Com. E.Q.</td>
<td>Existing law establishes minimum requirements for the issuance of a preliminary multiple or single subject teaching credential by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Among other requirements, existing law requires satisfactory completion of a program of professional preparation accredited by the Committee on Accreditation, but specifies that the program shall not include more than one year, or the equivalent of 1/5 of a 5-year program, of professional preparation. This bill would instead provide that a program of professional preparation shall not include more than 2 years of full-time study of professional preparation. The bill would update cross-references and would make other technical, nonsubstantive changes.</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>SB 9 Beall D</td>
<td>SENATE E.Q. 1/15/2015 - Referred to Coms. on E.Q. and T. &amp; H.</td>
<td>Existing law requires all moneys, except for fines and penalties, collected by the State Air Resources Board from the auction or sale of allowances as part of a market-based compliance mechanism relative to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, to be deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund. This bill would modify the purpose of the program to delete references to operational investments and instead provide for the funding of large, transformative capital improvements with a total cost exceeding $100,000,000. The bill would require the Transportation Agency, in prioritizing and selecting projects for funding, to consider the extent to which a project reduces greenhouse gas emissions, and would add additional factors to be considered in evaluating applications for funding. The bill would require the Transportation Agency to develop, by July 1, 2016, an initial 5-year estimate of revenues reasonably expected to be available for the program, with subsequent estimates to be made every other year for additional 5-year periods, and would require the agency to adopt 5-year programs of projects consistent with those estimates. The bill would require the agency to make a multiyear funding commitment for a project proposed to be funded over more than one fiscal year, and would authorize the California Transportation Commission to approve a letter of no prejudice that allow an applicant to expend its own funds on a project in the adopted program of projects, subject to future reimbursement from program funds for eligible expenditures. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 32</td>
<td>SENATE E.Q. 1/15/2015 - Referred to Com. on E.Q.</td>
<td>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The state board is required to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020 and to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum, technologically feasible, and cost-effective greenhouse gas emissions reductions. This bill would require the state board to approve a statewide greenhouse gas emission limit that is equivalent to 80% below the 1990 level to be achieved by 2050, as specified. The bill would authorize the state board to adopt interim greenhouse gas emissions level targets to be achieved by 2030 and 2040. The bill also would state the intent of the Legislature for the Legislature and appropriate agencies to adopt complementary policies that ensure long-term emissions reductions advance specified criteria.</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 64</td>
<td>SENATE T. &amp; H. 1/15/2015 - Referred to Com. on T. &amp; H.</td>
<td>Existing law requires various transportation planning activities by state and regional agencies. Existing law requires the Department of Transportation to prepare the California Transportation Plan and to update the plan by December 31, 2015, and every 5 years thereafter. Existing law specifies certain subject areas for the movement of people and freight to be considered in the plan. Existing law requires the plan to address how the state will achieve maximum feasible emissions reductions in order to attain a statewide reduction of greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050 and identify the statewide integrated multimodal transportation system needed to achieve greenhouse gas emission reductions. Existing law requires the department to consult with and coordinate its planning activities with specified entities, including the California Transportation Commission, and to provide an opportunity for public input. Existing law authorizes the California Transportation Commission to present the results of its review and comment to the Legislature and the Governor. This bill would require the California Transportation Commission to review recommendations in the update to the California Transportation Plan prepared by the department in 2015, and every 5 years thereafter, to prepare specific recommendations for statewide integrated multimodal transportation system improvements, and to submit a report in that regard to the Legislature and the Governor by December 31, 2016 and every 5 years thereafter.</td>
<td>Liu D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Transportation Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

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

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2015 – 3:00 p.m.
or immediately following Committee meetings

1. ROLL CALL

2. CONSENT CALENDAR
   MOTION
   a. Approval of Minutes of Board of Directors Meeting of January 7, 2015
   b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for December 2014

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

4. REPORT OF THE CHAIR
   a. Resolution of Appreciation to Past Chair Jeff Gee

5. REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER/CEO
   a. Jaime Moran, 30-Year Safe Driver

6. COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE
   SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
   a. Accessibility Update
   b. Paratransit Coordinating Council Update
   c. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report
   d. Mobility Management Report – Caltrain
   e. Multimodal Ridership Report – December 2014

7. FINANCE COMMITTEE
   RESOLUTIONS
   a. Authorize Amendment of Fiscal Year 2015 Operating Revenue in the Amount of $3 Million for Total Operating Revenues of $163,561,129 and Total Operating Expenses of $133,090,358

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
b. Authorize Award of Contract to MV Transportation, Inc. to Provide Contracted Shuttle Services for a Base Term of Five Years and Four Months at an Estimated Cost of $1,487,097

c. Authorize Award a Contract to Anthem Builders, Inc. to Provide Security Upgrades at Three District Facilities for a Total Amount of $1,299,781 and Amend the Fiscal Year Capital Budget by $230,000

d. Authorize Award of Contact to New Flyer Industries Canada ULC for the Provision of Brake Parts and Related Items for an Estimated Total of $156,496 for a Three-Year Base Term

e. Authorize the Amendment to Extend the Contract with C.A.R.E. Evaluators, LLC for ADA Paratransit Eligibility Assessment Services for up to Five and One-Half Months for a Not-to-Exceed Amount of $257,514

INFORMATIONAL

8. LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
   MOTION
   a. Approval of 2015 Legislative Program

SUBJECT DISCUSSED
a. State and Federal Legislative Update

9. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

10. BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS/COMMENTS

11. DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING – March 4, 2015 at 2 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District, Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, 1250 Carlos Ave., San Carlos 94070

12. GENERAL COUNSEL PROPOSAL
   a. Closed Session: Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(a): Ling La v. San Mateo County Transit District
   b. Closed Session: Public Employee Appointment – Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957: General Manager/CEO

13. 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 FOR 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: First Wednesday of the month, 2 p.m.; SamTrans Citizens Advisory Committee: Last 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, accessible by SamTrans bus Routes ECR, FLX, 260, 295 and 398. Map link Additional transit information can be obtained by calling 1-800-660-4287 or 511.

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

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

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

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

MINUTES OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
JANUARY 7, 2015

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


Chair Jeff Gee called the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS
Martha Martinez, District Secretary, administered the Oath of Office to Zoe Kersteen-Tucker Representing Public Member-Coastside, Karyl Matsumoto Representing City Selection Committee-North, Charles Stone Representing City Selection Committee-Central, and Adrienne Tissier Representing San Mateo County Board of Supervisors.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE FILING OF A FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION (FTA) SECTION 5310 ENHANCED MOBILITY OF SENIORS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES GRANT APPLICATION FOR A MOBILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN AND EXPANSION OF THE VETERANS MOBILITY CORPS PROGRAM
The purpose of the public hearing is to receive public comment on the proposed submittal of a Section 5310 Grant.

Martha Martinez, District Secretary, said the Board authorized the public hearing at its December 3, 2014 Board meeting. The public hearing notices were published on December 5, 2014 and letters were sent to 16 nonprofit transportation providers in the area notifying them of the time, place and purpose of the public hearing and giving them the opportunity to attend the hearing or send comments via e-mail. Ms. Martinez said to date, no comments have been received.

Eva Goode, Director, Grants, said in order to be considered for a Section 5310 Grant SamTrans must certify there are no nonprofit entities readily available to provide the same service. Staff is proposing to submit a FTA Section 5310 grant application for $250,000 to develop a San Mateo County Mobility Management Plan and expand the Veterans Mobility Corps. The Mobility Management Plan will examine recent data and design a mix of traditional and innovative transportation services and programs that are sustainable, implementable and replicable to expand mobility options for seniors, veterans, and civilians with disabilities. The Veterans Mobility Corps modifies travel training methods refined in the existing San Mateo County Mobility Ambassador Program by using specially trained volunteers who are veterans, thus creating a Vet-to-Vet Program.
There were no public comments.

Motion to close public hearing: Tissier/Harris
Ayes: Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier, Gee

**AUTHORIZE THE FILING OF A FTA SECTION 5310 ENHANCED MOBILITY OF SENIORS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES GRANT APPLICATION**
Motion/Second: Kersteen-Tucker/Tissier
Ayes: Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier, Gee

Recessed to Committee Meetings at 2:15 p.m.
Reconvened from Committee Meetings at 3:03 p.m.

**REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE (GROOM, GUILBAULT, TISSIER)**
Director Adrienne Tissier said the committee met and is recommending Shirley Harris for chair and Zoe Kersteen-Tucker for vice chair.

Motion/Second: Tissier/Guilbault
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier

Chair Harris thanked Director Gee for his leadership, efforts and energy over the past year. She said she looks forward to serving as chair and working with the Board.

Director Gee thanked the Board members for their trust and confidence over the past year and thanked staff for all their help.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**
- a. Approval of Minutes of Board of Directors Meeting of December 3, 2014
- b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for November 2014

Motion/Second: Tissier/Gee
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier, Harris

**PUBLIC COMMENT**
None

**REPORT OF CHAIR**
Appointment of Karyl Matsumoto as Representative to the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA)
Director Matsumoto was reappointed to the TA.

Motion/Second: Kersteen-Tucker/Stone
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier, Harris

**REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER/CEO**
Michael Scanlon, General Manager/CEO reported:
- Welcomed Director Stone to the Board.
• Congratulated Directors Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, and Tissier on their reappointments.
• Congratulated Director Carole Groom on her election as President of the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors.
• Congratulated Joan Cassman, Legal Counsel, on her first meeting as General Counsel and welcomed Shayna van Hoften, Legal Counsel.
• An Association of American Retired Persons Driver Safety Program was held in Burlingame today.
• In the month of November, 1,400 hours of training occurred for new bus operators and 900 hours of training and professional development for maintenance employees.
• Seven part-time bus operators will be promoted to full-time status on January 11.
• Jeff Johnson, Manager, Transit Operations Training, and Chester Patton, Director, Bus Transportation, presented a class on emotional intelligence for new bus operators.
• Staff successfully met with staff from the city of San Carlos and a neighborhood group and was able to come to a mutual agreement on the Caltrain shuttle circulation plan that involves the use of Old County Road.
• The transition to First Transit from MV Transportation has been seamless. First Transit reached contract terms with Amalgamated Transit Union 1574.
• Proposals for a paratransit eligibility contractor have been received, interviews were conducted in December and staff hopes to bring a contract for Board approval to the February meeting.
• The reading file contains a Take One for bus operator hiring, Transit Fun Guide, and Rider's Digest.
• Will Snell, Assistant Manager, Transit Operations Training, has announced his retirement after 39 years with the District.

Mr. Snell thanked the Board and Mr. Scanlon for giving him the opportunity he has had. He said he was hired in May 1976 to work in the training department. Mr. Snell said he takes no credit for the bus operators as it is a true partnership.

• A video of the Holiday Bus was shown.
• Thanked Director Gee for all his work and efforts over the past year. He has been a terrific leader.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE – K. Matsumoto
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
a. Accessibility Update
b. Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update
c. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report
d. Mobility Management Report – Fixed-Route Bus Service
e. Multimodal Ridership Report – November 2014

FINANCE COMMITTEE – Z. Kersteen-Tucker
RESOLUTIONS
a. Authorize Implementation of Continuing Disclosure Policy
b. Authorize Amendment of the District’s Contribution Rates for Monthly Medical Premiums for Members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters Group 3-Transit Instructors and the Administrative Special (Part-Time) Employees

c. Authorize Selection of Pool of Consultants to Provide Underwriting Services for the 2015 Debt Refinancing and Include in the 2015 Debt Refinancing a Fixed-Rate Refinancing of the District’s Outstanding 1993 and 2009 Bonds

Motion/Second: Kersteen-Tucker/Guilbault
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier, Harris

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE – S. Harris
SUBJECT DISCUSSED
a. State and Federal Legislative Update

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT, AND SUSTAINABILITY – C. Groom
RESOLUTION
a. Adoption of the San Mateo County Transit District’s Fiscal Years 2014-2023 Short-Range Transit Plan

Motion/Second: Groom/Tissier
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier, Harris

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
No discussion.

BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS/COMMENTS
Director Matsumoto thanked everyone for a great 2014 and to staff for providing great reports and always being accessible to answer questions.

DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING – February 4, 2015, at 2 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District, Administrative Building, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070.

GENERAL COUNSEL PROPOSAL

Recessed to closed session at 3:31 p.m.
Reconvened at 4:00 p.m.

Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(a): Ling La v. San Mateo County Transit District
Ms. Cassman said the Board received a status report and there is no action.

Claim of Surag Patel
Ms. Cassman said the Board approved a settlement in the amount of $120,000 for a property damage claim.

Motion/Second: Gee/Tissier
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Stone, Tissier, Harris
Public Employee Appointment – Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957: General Manager/CEO
Ms. Cassman said the Board received an update on the recruitment for a new General Manager/CEO.

Adjourned at 4:05 p.m.