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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 3, 2016 – 2:00 P.M.

ACTION
1. Approval of Minutes of Community Relations Committee Meeting of January 6, 2016
2. Authorize Adoption of Updated Bicycle and Similar Equipment Use and Parking Rules and Regulations

INFORMATIONAL
3. Accessibility Update – Tina Dubost
4. Paratransit Coordinating Council Update – Mike Levinson
5. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report

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

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

Staff Present: J. Averill, J. Cassman, A. Chan, T. Dubost, G. Harrington, J. Hartnett, C. Harvey, M. Martinez, N. McKenna, S. Murphy, C. Patton, M. Simon, S. van Hoften

Committee Chair Zoe Kersteen-Tucker called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of December 2, 2015
Motion/Second: Guilbault/Stone
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Ratto, Stone, Tissier

Authorize Revision of the Lost and Found Policy
Gigi Harrington, Deputy CEO, said this increases the dollar value for goods that are auctioned from $10 to $100. Items are stored for 90 days and after that period staff has a disposal process that is managed by contracts and procurement staff. This revision will also allow for the possibility of donating goods valued under $100. The District has been approached by veterans organizations who would be interested in unclaimed bikes.

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

Accessibility Update
Tina Dubost, Manager, Accessible Transit Services, said last month staff attended the Coastside Transportation Committee meeting. People are very happy to see the expanded weekend service on Route 294. After the meeting MV Transportation arranged for holiday singing at Senior Coastsiders and Coastside Adult Day Care. In November the paratransit contractor, First Transit, went 140,000 between preventable accidents.

Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Update – Mike Levinson
Mike Levinson, Chair, PCC, said the PCC received a presentation on the paratransit customer survey results. The PCC has formed a new policy advocacy legislative committee that is a modification of the advocacy and legislative committee. The committee is getting a list of issues together and will meet monthly before the PCC meeting.
Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Liaison Report – John Baker

John Baker, Chair, CAC, said at the December 2 meeting the CAC received the paratransit customer survey presentation.

Mobility Management Report – Fixed-Route Bus Service

Chester Patton, Director, Bus Transportation, reported:

- Total monthly ridership for Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 is 1,259,490, down 1 percent from FY2015.
- Token usage remains popular.
- On-time performance remains close to the 85 percent goal at 84 percent. Coastside service is more difficult to maintain the goal.
- Miles between accidents remains below the goal of 100,000, but accidents that have occurred are very minor such as curb hits.
- Fleet reliability remains above the goal of 20,000 miles at 30,000 miles.
- Missed schedules remain relatively low except for routes along University Avenue in Palo Alto due to construction activity.
- Consumer Reports remain low with less than 150 complaints for every million trips.
- Approved fare changes go into effect on January 10.
- Route 294 weekend Coastside service from Hillsdale Shopping Center is being increased from every two hours to hourly effective January 10 and this will increase the number of trips from 18 to 32.

Director Karyl Matsumoto asked about the spikes in on-time performance. Mr. Patton said it is changing travel patterns, economy and other factors.

Director Matsumoto asked with ridership leveling off and farebox revenue declining if it will even out. Mr. Patton said there are more rides with discount fares.

Jim Harnett, General Manager/CEO, said staff is looking at this issue and will be analyzing it very closely to determine the causes and come up with strategies.

Director Jeff Gee said he would like to see ridership compared with the sales tax chart that was distributed last month and how this correlates to the economy.

Committee Chair Kersteen-Tucker asked if staff will look at routes that are underperforming and not achieving ridership goals. Mr. Hartnett said everything is going to be looked at.

Public Comment

Adina Levin, Menlo Park, thanked staff and Board for the additional service on Route 294.

Multimodal Ridership Report – November 2015

Mr. Patton reported:

- November 2015 Compared to November 2014
  - Average Weekday Ridership
    - Bus ridership was 43,210, a decrease of 1.7 percent.
    - Paratransit ridership was 1,240, an increase of 19.2 percent.
Caltrain ridership was 58,120, an increase of 2.1 percent.
Shuttle ridership was 11,600, no change.
Total weekday ridership was 114,170, an increase of 0.6 percent.

- Total Monthly Ridership
  - Bus ridership was 1,054,090, an increase of 0.8 percent.
  - Paratransit ridership was 28,850, an increase of 16.2 percent.
  - Caltrain ridership was 1,477,390, an increase of 4.1 percent.
  - Shuttle ridership was 224,090, a decrease of 1 percent.
  - Total weekday ridership was 2,784,420, an increase of 2.5 percent.

- Total Year-to-Date Monthly Ridership
  - Bus ridership was 5,556,580, a decrease of 0.9 percent.

Adjourned: 2:27 p.m.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Jim Harnett
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF UPDATED BICYCLE AND SIMILAR EQUIPMENT PARKING RULES AND REGULATIONS

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board adopt a resolution revising the existing Bicycle Parking and Bicycle/Skateboard Use regulations adopted by the San Mateo County Transit District (District) Board pursuant to Resolution No. 2002-75. The existing regulations govern the use of bicycles, skateboards, rollerblades, roller-skates, scooters and other similar equipment (Personal Transportation Vehicles) on or in District properties and facilities. The revised regulations (Rules & Regulations) expand the existing regulations to include authorizing the removal of such equipment by authorized personnel when parked, stored or abandoned in violation of existing laws and regulations, or when the placement, storage or parking creates an unsafe condition.

SIGNIFICANCE
Existing regulations do not address the removal of improperly stored, parked or abandoned Personal Transportation Vehicles. Improper parking and placement can create tripping hazards, obstruct routes of ingress and egress, and interfere with access for individuals with disabilities. In addition, abandoned Personal Transportation Vehicles can contribute to an environment that is conducive to blight, can be inviting of theft and nuisance activity, and can make the discovery of other potentially dangerous conditions more difficult.

Approval of this recommendation will allow the Transit Police or other authorized personnel to legally move, remove and/or cause the controlled storage of such items in accordance with the procedures set forth in Exhibit A, and will aid in increasing public safety and reducing conditions conducive to blight and criminal conduct in and about District property.

Abandoned Personal Transportation Vehicles will be disposed of in accordance with the District’s Lost and Unclaimed Property Policy.
**BUDGET IMPACT**
No fiscal impact is anticipated and additional funding is not required.

**BACKGROUND**
Staff’s recommendation is consistent with the practices of other transit agencies and with guiding principles identified by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and the American Public Transportation Association for the purpose of improving system safety and security. Removing abandoned Personal Transportation Vehicles will also create more space for legitimate Personal Transportation Vehicle use and parking.

**AUTHORITY**
Various provisions of California law provide the District with authority to enforce the Rules & Regulations including, but not limited to, California Penal Code Section 640 and California Vehicle Code Sections 21113, 21210 and 42001.

Transit agencies may enforce regulations, rules and/or restrictions on, in and about transit system properties, facilities and vehicles, provided that appropriate signage is provided and a resolution that lists and explains the conditions and regulations is on file and available for public inspection at the agency’s headquarters.

Prepared by: Jim Castaneda, Director Safety and Risk Management 650-622-7856
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

BICYCLE AND SIMILAR EQUIPMENT USE & PARKING – RULES & REGULATIONS

(Penal Code §640 and Vehicle Code §§21113, 42001)

The San Mateo County Transit District (District) provides public transportation services within San Mateo County, San Francisco County and Santa Clara County, California. The District is also the managing agency of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB), a joint powers agency that provides Caltrain passenger rail service between San Francisco and Gilroy. These Rules & Regulations apply to the use and parking of all bicycles, scooters and other similar personal transportation vehicles on all District and JPB Property.

(a) Definitions:

The term “contracted operator” means any railroad corporation that operates public rail commuter transit services of any kind for the JPB.

The term “District” means the San Mateo County Transit District.

The term “District Property” means all property owned or used by the District in furtherance of the operation of SamTrans.

The term “JPB” means the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.

The term “JPB Property” means all property owned or used by the JPB in furtherance of the operation of Caltrain.

The term "personal transportation vehicle" means a device having one or more wheels upon which a person may ride. “Personal transportation vehicle” includes, but is not limited to, bicycles, mopeds, unicycles, tricycles, skateboards, scooters, roller-skates, roller-blades or similar equipment, whether human-, gas- or electric-powered. “Personal transportation vehicle” does not mean motorcycles, Segways or automobiles.

(b) No person may ride, use or operate personal transportation vehicles on any District Property or JPB Property, except to transition through District or JPB parking lots in order to get to and from a bus station, rail station, or transit center. At no time may personal transportation vehicles be ridden, used or operated aboard busses or trains, or in pedestrian tunnels, ramps or other walkways, or in violation of other applicable state or local laws. When using personal transportation vehicles on District or JPB Property, users may not use them in an unsafe or negligent manner, or in such a way that would potentially cause property damage or result in personal injury. Abandonment of personal transportation vehicles on District or JPB Property is prohibited.
(c) Personal transportation vehicles, and part(s) thereof, may be left, parked, or stored in or on District Property and JPB Property only in areas specifically designated by the presence of bicycle racks, lockers, sheds, or other similar devices, or in areas designated by the posting of signs indicating the space as a bicycle parking area (collectively, "bicycle parking area").

(d) No personal transportation vehicle, or part(s) thereof, may be left, parked or stored on District Property or JPB Property for a period of more than 72 hours.

(e) Whenever a personal transportation vehicle, or part(s) thereof, has been left, parked or stored in on District or JPB Property other than in a bicycle parking area, and whenever it appears that a personal transportation vehicle has been left, parked or stored in a bicycle parking area for a period of 48 or more hours, a representative of the District or JPB may attach a 72-hour Warning Notice Tag (sample attached herein), thereby notifying the owner that the personal transportation vehicle is subject to impoundment as set forth in these Rules & Regulations.

**Enforcement and Impoundment Procedures**

(f) Any person operating, leaving, parking or storing a personal transportation vehicle in violation of these Rules & Regulations, or other federal, state or local regulations or laws, may be cited by the District’s/JPB’s contracted law enforcement provider ("Transit Police") pursuant to the California Vehicle Code (including sections 21113 and 42001) and/or the California Penal Code (including section 640).

(g) Any personal transportation vehicle left, parked, or stored on District or JPB Property in violation of these Rules & Regulations, or other federal, state or local regulations or laws, may be removed by the Transit Police or other authorized personnel in accordance with these Rules & Regulations, the California Vehicle Code (including sections 21113 and 42001), and/or the California Penal Code (including section 640).

(h) If the Transit Police or other authorized District or JPB employee or agent, including but not limited to the JPB’s contracted operator, (collectively "Bicycle Parking Enforcement Officers") reasonably believes that a personal transportation vehicle, or part(s) thereof, has been left in such a manner as to constitute an immediate safety hazard or an obstruction to the District’s or JPB’s use of District or JPB Property, or has been reported stolen to a law enforcement agency, the owner may be cited and/or their personal transportation vehicle may be removed and impounded without notice, unless otherwise required by law. Bicycle Parking Enforcement Officers will use whatever reasonable measures are necessary to impound the personal transportation vehicle, including removing any lock or other securing mechanism. Alternatively, Bicycle Parking Enforcement Officers may ask local law enforcement officers, consistent with applicable law, to impound and cite a personal transportation vehicle which is left, parked or stored in violation of any section of these Rules & Regulations without further notice. Neither Bicycle Parking Enforcement Officers authorized to remove and impound a personal transportation vehicle in this manner, nor the District or JPB, will be liable to the owner of the securing device or the owner of the personal transportation vehicle for the cost of
(i) For any personal transportation vehicle, or part(s) thereof, to which a 72-hour Warning Notice Tag has been attached as set forth in section (e), above: Upon expiration of 72 hours from issuance of the 72-hour Warning Notice, the personal transportation vehicle may be impounded and placed into Lost & Found in accordance with the District's/JPB's Lost and Unclaimed Property Policy. The District or JPB may make reasonable efforts to contact the owner, if known, prior to impounding a personal transportation vehicle.

(j) Any personal transportation vehicle, or recognizable part(s) thereof, impounded pursuant to any section of these Rules & Regulations will be stored in a secure location. A fee of $120.00 will be charged to the owner prior to the release of any impounded personal transportation vehicle or other property to him or her.

(k) Impounded personal transportation vehicles, or recognizable part(s) thereof, will be stored for a minimum of 90 days. Notices will be sent whenever possible, and as soon as practicable, to the owners of all impounded property. After 90 days the personal transportation vehicle, or part(s) thereof, may be disposed of consistent with the District's/JPB's Lost and Unclaimed Property Policy.

These Rules & Regulations will be available for examination by interested persons at the District's/JPB's office at 1250 San Carlos Ave, San Carlos, California. Any information about removed and/or impounded property may be obtained from the District's/JPB's Transit Police at 1-877-723-7245.
WARNING

☐ This property will be considered abandoned if not removed within 72 hours of this notice and will be removed according to transit district regulations (Sam Trans/Caltrain).

☐ This vehicle will be considered abandoned if not removed within 72 hours of this notice and will be removed per Section 22669 of the California Vehicle Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME (AM)</th>
<th>TIME (PM)</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>S M T W T F S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAKE</td>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td>LICENSE OR SERIAL #</td>
<td>DEPUTY</td>
<td>BADGE #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME (AM)</th>
<th>TIME (PM)</th>
<th>DAY OF THE WEEK</th>
<th>S M T W T F S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LICENSE OR SERIAL #</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>ODOMETER</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>MAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION OF VIOLATION</td>
<td>SECTION(S) VIOLATED</td>
<td>TIRE</td>
<td>DEPUTY AND ID NUMBER</td>
<td>CHALK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

72-hour Warning Notice
RESOLUTION NO. 2016 –

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

*   *   *

ADOPTING UPDATED BICYCLE AND SIMILAR EQUIPMENT USE AND
PARKING RULES AND REGULATIONS

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) previously adopted Resolution No. 2002-75 to establish regulations governing bicycle parking and use of bicycles, skateboards, scooters, roller-skates and rollerblades on District property; and

WHEREAS, the existing regulations do not address the removal of improperly parked, stored, or abandoned bicycles, scooters, skates, or other similar property (Personal Transportation Vehicles) that create an unsafe condition due to their placement on District property; and

WHEREAS, California Vehicle Code sections 21113, 21210, and 42001 and California Penal Code section 640 authorize a transit agency to establish regulations and enforcement procedures to govern the use of bicycles, skateboards, scooters, roller-skates, and rollerblades on its property; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Community Relations Committee concurs, that the District adopt updated and revised regulations (Rules & Regulations) that allow Transit Police or other authorized personnel to remove and/or issue a citation for the operation, parking, storage or abandonment of Personal Transportation Vehicles, when such individuals reasonably believe such operation, parking, storage or abandonment is in violation of applicable laws or regulations.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the San Mateo County Transit District hereby adopts the Rules & Regulations attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by this reference; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Rules & Regulations shall be available for examination by interested persons at the District’s office located at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, California; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the General Manager/CEO or his designee is authorized to execute all documents on behalf of the District necessary for the implementation of the Rules & Regulations and to take such other actions as may be necessary to give effect to this Resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 3rd day of February, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

__________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

__________________________
District Secretary
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
General Manager/CEO

FROM: David Olmeda, Chief Operating Officer, Bus

SUBJECT: ACCESSIBILITY REPORT

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

SIGNIFICANCE
Several groups advise SamTrans on accessible service issues. The Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) provides a forum for consumer input on paratransit issues. The Advocacy and Legislative Committee (AL-Com) is the advocacy arm of the PCC. The SamTrans Accessibility Advisory Committee 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 and the PAL (PCC AL-Com) meet monthly (except for August). The SamTrans Accessibility Advisory Committee (SAAC) meets every two months.

The minutes of the December 8, 2015 PCC meeting and the December 8 and October 6 PAL meetings are attached to this report.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
No additional information.

Prepared by: John Sanderson, Accessibility Coordinator 650-508-6475
Project Manager: Tina Dubost, Manager, Accessible Services 650-508-6247
ATTENDANCE: Mike Levinson, Chair; Vincent Merola, Vice-Chair; Sammi (Wilhelmina) Riley, Consumer; Tina Dubost, SamTrans; Dinae Cruise, Consumer; Barbara Kalt, Rosener House; Maria Kozak, Consumer; Patti Clement-Cihak, Catholic Charities; Maureen Dunn, Senior Focus; Sandra Lang, COA; Aki Eejima, Consumer; Marie Violet, Sequoia Hospital.

GUESTS: Richard Weiner, Nelson-Nygard Consulting Associates; Erin Swartz, PCC Staff; John Sanderson, SamTrans; Dave Daley, First Transit; Talib Salamin, Serra Taxicab; Ashish John, SamTrans; Elly Colwell, SamTrans; and Patrick Thompson, SamTrans.

ABSENTEES: Michal Settles, Coastside; Susan Capeloto, DOR; Dale Edwards, Consumer; and Judy Garcia, Consumer.

(Member Attendance: 11; 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
Sammi motioned to approve the November PCC minutes, Vincent and Barbara seconded with Aki and Marie abstaining. No requests for corrections to the November PCC minutes were noted.

COMMITTEE REPORTS
A. POLICY ADVOCACY - LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE (AL-COM)
Vincent reported that the PAL Committee met prior to today’s PCC meeting from 11:30 to 1:00 p.m. Topics discussed at today’s meeting included legislative updates from SamTrans, Local Advocacy Issues, and the Redi-Wheels No Show/Late Cancel Policy. The PAL Committee members agreed to begin meeting monthly before the PCC meeting on the second Tuesday of each month from 11:30-12:30 p.m. in the 2nd floor auditorium of the SamTrans building in San Carlos.

B. GRANT/BUDGET REVIEW
Barbara reported that there are no new updates available. Tina reported that SamTrans is planning to purchase new vehicles in the future.

C. EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Maureen reported that the Education Committee members held their first conference call meeting in November. Erin presented the PCC Outreach Presentation Evaluation Report. In 2015, the Education Committee developed an additional goal to, “Educate current and prospective riders about the Redi-Wheels service, answer questions, and
distribute PCC materials." The Committee also further defined their target audience to include, "Professionals who work with people who use the [Redi-Wheels] service." Over the past year, the Education Committee members gave a presentation at the Doelger Senior Center in Daly City and participated in the Transition to Independence Fair, Seniors on the Move Conference, and Pacifica Senior Center Health Fair. Erin also reported on an outreach project to agencies in San Mateo County that she and Linda Rhine completed in May 2015. Erin and Maureen discussed the use of internal and external evaluation forms at presentations to gather feedback from the audience and outreach volunteers.

Maureen and Sandra discussed an outreach opportunity with the Mission Hospice Auxiliary in San Mateo County. Mike said that more help for the Nominating Committee is needed with recruiting. Barbara added that the Nominating Committee is working to first identify the appropriate groups to contact to fill gaps in the PCC membership.

D. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mike reported that the Executive Committee held a conference call on Friday, November 20, 2015 at 2:00 p.m. in a conference call. Much of the discussion centered on changes to the PAL Committee. The PAL Committee will be focusing on policy issues that can be brought to the full PCC. The Executive Committee discussed changes to the Renew-by-Mail process that the ERC and Executive Committee has been exploring for some time.

Richard reported on the policy of other paratransit agencies in the area who do not wait for connecting rides on Inter-County Transfer Trips, like Redi-Wheels.

The Executive Committee is continuing to work on clarifying information about Measure A funds and performance measures in San Mateo County.

The next Executive Committee meeting will probably be scheduled for early January.

SAMTRANS/REDI-WHEELS REPORT

A. Operational Report

Tina reported that one of the long-term Redi-Wheels drivers, Jackston Chio, passed away recently. He had been a driver for Redi-Wheels for over 19 years. Dave agreed to send a card on behalf of First Transit and the PCC to Mr. Chio’s family.

Tina also reported that the SamTrans Board voted on Nov. 4, 2015 to approve paratransit fare increases, effective January 1, 2015. Due in part to advocacy efforts by the PCC, the Lifeline Assistance fares will remain the same. Postcards were mailed to all paratransit customers. Staff is making announcements at public meetings, with paratransit contractors and agencies, riders, and to Senior Mobility Ambassadors. Ticket book inserts have reminders about the fare increases. The Paratransit Riders’ Guide will have a sticker with a reminder about the fare increase, as well.

Tina reported that approximately 1,900 Redi-Wheels customers are enrolled in the Lifeline Fare Assistance (low income fare) program, which is about 22% of the total number of Redi-Wheels customers. Maria and Mike said that they received the Fare Increase Postcard sent out by Redi-Wheels.
B. Performance Summary
Tina reported that Late cancels increased from September to October 2015, while Total customer no-shows decreased. Total trips served increased about 9% and average weekday riders increased 7%, in the same time period. Total Redi-Wheels riders continue to increase each month. On-time performance met the standard of 90%. Productivity was good, at 1.80 pass/hr. Compliments per 1000 trips increased to 2.2.

Barbara asked about fleet expansions with increased ridership. Tina confirmed that SamTrans is exploring this option, but cautioned that procuring new vehicles is usually a one to two-year process.

Mike asked Dave if the new InfoSuite software is helping with meeting productivity goals. Dave said it was helpful and that dispatchers and reservationists are able to access the information they need much more easily. The First Transit staff is working to maintain all records electronically, which will eventually lead to a fully automated reporting system.

Aki asked Tina about Total Redi-Wheels riders on the Performance Summary. Tina confirmed that the number referred to unique, individual riders, not duplicates.

John gave the Monthly Redi-Wheels Paratransit Comment Statistics Report. The percentage of Valid Complaints increased from 38% in September to about 60% in October 2015, although the total number of complaints received actually declined from 50 to 48 between the two months. The overall percentage of valid complaints for the year-to-date is nearly unchanged, at about 39%. John said that there can be big variations in complaints and compliments from month-to-month. The proportion of valid Late Vehicle complaints has increased from September to October 2015. John also pointed out that the Rate/1000 trips of Service Related Comments was 0.60 in September 2015 and 0.80 in October 2015, which shows a standard that is proportional and scales with the trip volume. John said that the will provide a Year-in-Review Redi-Wheels Comment Statistics Report at the January 2016 PCC meeting.

Marie Violet asked about Complaints related to Driver Conduct. John said that complaints in that category are broad in nature. In the investigations completed by Redi-Wheels, drivers, passengers, and any others involved are interviewed, whenever possible in order to build the most complete available picture of the incident. Incident Reports filed by drivers are also reviewed in these types of complaints for additional information. Other Driver Conduct complaints might be about how the driver cools/warms the vehicle, use of the radio, or use of hands-free cell phone devices. Dave commented that the Driver Conduct complaints that First Transit receives from Redi-Wheels are well-balanced.

Dinae asked Tina and John to confirm that a complaint category exists in the Performance Summary Report for no-show vehicles that is labeled as Missed Trips.

Aki asked John for information about how the Redi-Wheels staff completes complaint investigations. Mike asked Dave about difficult customers who are known to file complaints on a regular basis. Aki asked for a breakdown of compliments and
complaints about Serra Taxicab drivers. John agreed to provide this information as part of his report at the next PCC meeting. Aki asked John to also confirm that agency trip customers do file both compliments and complaints. John confirmed that they do, and added that most of the comments from this group of riders are compliments. Sandra and John discussed complaints sent from Agency directors and the need for specific details and customer experiences.

C. Safety Report
Dave reported that November only had one preventable and one non-preventable accident with no injuries. In 2015, there were an average of 104,000 miles between preventable accidents, which is much better than the standard of 75,000 miles between preventable accidents.

Mike asked Dave and Lynn for assistance with coordinating a First Transit appreciation event to coincide with a PCC meeting date in 2016.

LIAISON REPORTS
A. COASTSIDE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE (CTC)
In Michal’s absence, Vincent reported that the next meeting will be on December 17, 2015 from 9:30-11:00 a.m., with caroling starting at 11:30 a.m. The meeting and caroling will take place at 925 Main Street in Half Moon Bay.

B. AGENCY
Barbara reported that a meeting has not been scheduled with SamTrans or First Transit recently. Barbara recognized the First Transit drivers for their great skill navigating the roads and traffic in San Mateo County.

C. EFFICIENCY REVIEW COMMITTEE (ERC)
Tina provided the ERC meeting update. The ERC met last week and discussed new fare rates, the taxi dispatch process, and previewed the Paratransit Customer Survey.

D. COMMISSION ON AGING (COA)
Sandra wished everyone a happy and safe holiday season. The COA last met on November 9 and elected a new Chair, Christina Kahn. The COA Transportation Committee is now meeting before the full COA meetings each month. The Transportation Committee has been reviewing the 2006 SamTrans Senior Mobility Plan. The Committee also met on December 3, 2015, when the members reviewed more of the Senior Mobility Plan details. The Committee was concerned about taxicab service, along with pedestrian safety. Customer perception of Redi-Wheels service was another topic that was discussed. Vincent’s Opinion letter to the Daily Journal was also read and discussed. The next COA meeting is scheduled for January 11, 2016. Maureen and Sandra discussed activities of the Transportation Committee.

E. COMMISSION ON DISABILITIES (COD)
Vincent reported that there are no updates.

F. CENTER FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES (CID)
Vincent reported that there are no updates.
H. PRESENTATION BY PATRICK THOMPSON, SAMTRANS MARKET RESEARCH SPECIALIST

Patrick Thompson, the Market Research Specialist from SamTrans presented the Paratransit Customer Survey Key Findings Report. The last SamTrans customer survey was conducted in 1996. Patrick said that the purpose of this year’s survey was to obtain ridership characteristics and assess key customer satisfaction components for Redi-Wheels and RediCoast customers.

The survey questions asked about a recent trip and the overall Redi-Wheels/RediCoast experience for riders. The survey was conducted over the phone by EMC Research Consultants. Surveys were completed with 439 customers and another 61 with were conducted with caregiver/family member assistance. Ridership characteristics of survey participants revealed that most of those interviewed were lower income, women, and over 60 years in age. One-third of the respondents reported riding for 4 years or more, while other participants have been riding for less time. One-sixth of survey participants reported riding Redi-Wheels/RediCoast at least once a week, with most taking a trip in the last month. Mobility impairments are the most common reason given, for people riding Redi-Wheels.

Recent trip ratings revealed that 82% of riders rated their experience a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale. Most riders (91%) are satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the quality of the service. The survey results showed some correlation with customer satisfaction and on-time performance. If the vehicle was perceived to be on-time by the customer, then satisfaction tended to be higher. 81% of survey respondents perceived their most recent trip to be on-time. Calculated trip data shows that the actual on-time performance for those trips was about 91%.

In the category of mobility aids, 66% of riders used mobility devices, like walkers, canes and wheelchairs. Wheelchair users were asked to rate drivers’ ability to secure wheelchairs and operate the wheelchair lift. The most common payment type was cash (two-thirds of responses), followed by pre-purchased tickets from an order form.

About half of trips reported on in the survey were used to make medical appointments. In 1996, about 65% of survey respondent made trips for medical appointments. Internet and cell phones were used by about one-third of respondents. Of the respondents who had cell phones, only 38% had text service available with their phone plans. Next steps for Redi-Wheels include improving customer communications and outreach. An example of improved customer communication and outreach would be to clarify the 20-minute pick-up window. The survey results will also be used for trend analysis, and plans to conduct a survey every 3 years are being considered.

Patrick confirmed that the survey was for both Redi-Wheels and RediCoast customers, with RediCoast customers slightly over-represented, which was necessary in order to poll a statistically meaningful number of Coastside riders. Respondents were also asked if they also used fixed-route service.
Vincent asked about the survey respondent reported rate of Driver Timeliness (82%) that was based on a Customer’s recollection of recent experience. Vincent asked Patrick to double check this number with the information reported at last week’s ERC meeting. Customers perceived their rides to be on time 82% of the time, but the calculated on-time percentages for the same trip sample was 91%. Patrick said that the survey results can also be viewed online at http://www.samtrans.com/about/Bus_Operations_Information/Surveys.html. Patrick confirmed that this presentation was also given to the SamTrans Board.

The PCC members discussed the need to educate new and existing riders about the 20-minute pick up window. Mike added that understanding ride time is important for customers, so that they can schedule their trips correctly.

Patrick reviewed page 21 of the survey results, which was presented to the ERC. Trips were perceived to be on time by 81% of the survey respondents and 88% of those responses showed high satisfaction with the trip experience. Patrick re-read the survey question presented to the customer, “Was the driver on time for this trip, meaning arrival within the 20-minute window?” In the trip purpose question category, the customers were asked to think about a specific recent trip and the marketing company used trip information from the customer database to confirm the trip details. Tina and John confirmed that people using the group ride service were included in this survey. Maureen asked if any group service customers were presented with questions about the group ride service experience. Tina and John also confirmed that these customers were surveyed.

Maria commented that she completed the survey. Maria said that she was asked to recall to a ride that she had taken about 6 weeks prior to the call to complete the survey. Patrick said that reviewing rides about a month prior to the survey call is not unusual for these types of surveys. The survey contractor tries to use more recent trips, however sometimes it becomes necessary to poll less frequent riders about older trips, in order to gather a sufficiently large number of responses. Maria’s request for a more convenient call-back time was declined and Patrick agreed to share her experience with the marketing consultants.

Mike commented that the trip purpose may have been useful for the marketing consultants to consider, so that a unique trip would be easiest for customers to recall.

Maureen asked if it would be possible to sort the survey participants to reveal how many respondents were group ride service customers. Maureen also asked if customers who used taxi service were included in the survey. Tina confirmed that customers using all types of Redi-Wheels/RediCoast vehicles were surveyed.

Maureen thanked Patrick and Tina for sharing the survey results.

OTHER BUSINESS
Erin reported on changes to the PCC Schedule of Meetings for 2016 in the meeting packet. The Education Committee will be meeting bi-monthly, in a conference call. The next Education Committee meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 15, 2016 at 2:00
p.m. The PAL Committee will now be meeting on the second Tuesday of each month, before the monthly PCC meetings, from 11:30-12:30 p.m. in the 2nd floor auditorium of the SamTrans building in San Carlos. The next PAL Committee meeting is scheduled for January 12, 2016 from 11:30-12:30 p.m.

Maria asked for more information about ride reservations made by Redi-Wheels the day of the trip. Maria confirmed for John and Tina that she did not receive a call notifying her of the change. John reported that he will follow up with Dave after today’s meeting to review this scheduling issue. Dinae commented that her ride reservation for today was changed by Redi-Wheels, but she did receive a call last night notifying her of the change.

The next PCC meeting is scheduled for January 12, 2015 from 1:30-3:30 p.m., with the PAL Committee also meeting from 11:30-12:30 p.m. in the 2nd floor auditorium.

**MEETING ADJOURNED** in honor of Jackston Chio: 3:30 p.m.
SAN MATEO COUNTY
PCC POLICY-ADVOCACY-LEGISLATIVE (PAL)
MEETING NOTES

11:30-1:00 p.m.
December 8, 2015

Members Present: Mike Levinson, PCC Chair; Vincent Merola, CiD; Marie Violet, Sequoia Hospital; Sammi Riley, Consumer; Maria Kozak, Consumer; Sandra Lang, COA; Dinae Cruise, Consumer; Aki Eejima, Consumer; Tina Dubost, SamTrans;

Guests: John Sanderson, SamTrans; Elly Colwell, SamTrans; Dave Daley, First Transit; Richard Weiner, Nelson-Nygaard Consulting Associates; and Erin Swartz, PCC Staff.

Absentees: Michal Settles, Coastside; and Dale Edwards, Consumer.

APPROVAL OF OCTOBER PAL MINUTES
Mike motioned and Sammi seconde to approve the October PAL minutes, no abstentions or corrections were noted.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATES
Tina reported that the SamTrans legislative newsletter is no longer in production. She will have a legislative update available for the January PAL meeting. Tina said that Seamus is now the Chief Communications Officer and Shweta Bhatnagar is now the Chief Legislative Officer at SamTrans. Vincent asked if an internal legislative update might be available instead of the newsletter. Tina offered to share a link to the legislative matrix used by SamTrans, along with the quarterly SamTrans Board packet. Richard offered to provide legislative updates from the Transit Access Report on any topics related to the PAL Committee. Richard said that the Report includes recent court cases that are relevant to ADA paratransit and he noted that the update is available every month or so. Vincent said that he was most interested in local funding opportunities to expand paratransit service above and beyond the ADA. Vincent and Tina will coordinate on how to distribute the Board packets.

LOCAL ADVOCACY ISSUES—OPEN DISCUSSION
Vincent discussed two consumers that attended the November PCC meeting who wanted to advocate for additional access to UCSF. Vincent asked Tina for more information about the service area near UCSF. Tina reported that St. Luke’s Hospital is one exception to the ¾ mile distance rule for the SamTrans fixed route service area. In Santa Clara county, SamTrans services the Palo Alto Veteran’s Administration, The Reach Program, and the VISTA Center. All of these services are unique and there are none comparable in San Mateo County. Tina pointed out that the decision to make these service exceptions was made many years ago when a structural deficit did not exist at SamTrans. Vincent asked Tina about the policy for reviewing these service points and how their current ridership is evaluated. Sammi and Mike asked Tina if there are many requests for SamTrans service directly to UCSF. Tina said that SF Access would have the number of people taking trips to UCSF. Tina said that it is possible to get to UCSF using Redi-Wheels, but a transfer is required. Tina said that she is working with SF
Access to coordinate better service for paratransit riders coming from San Mateo County. Tina offered to share information about making transfers into San Francisco using Redi-Wheels. Tina added that Redi-Wheels riders can transfer into San Francisco from Daly City BART, Westlake Shopping Center and Stonestown.

Sandra asked Tina if there were any questions on the SamTrans Paratransit Survey about intercountry transfers. Tina said that the survey questions were more general in nature.

Marie Violet reported that Sequoia Hospital has been conducting interviews to survey community members and that respondents reported a highly negative view of Redi-Wheels. Marie wrote the Volunteer Director at Sequoia Hospital to share information about how Redi-Wheels riders can participate in the PCC and PAL Committees. Vincent said that there is a need for the PCC and SamTrans to provide outreach to patients and visitors using paratransit to get to and from Sequoia Hospital.

Marie said that there are three points throughout the Sequoia Hospital campus where Redi-Wheels needs to define pickup and drop-off points to improve service for patients and visitors at the hospital. Marie added that riders receive assistance from volunteers who call Redi-Wheels to confirm ride reservations, but there is a lot of confusion about when and where riders are supposed to be for their rides home.

Tina said that reservationists are supposed to clarify which of the three addresses where riders would like to be dropped off and picked up, and drivers should utilize the multiple drop off directory that includes a map of the hospital. Dave Daley mentioned that many of the riders who are experiencing long waits for ride pick-ups are probably scheduling trips with an Open Return (“Will Call”). If the riders schedule a specific pick-up time during their initial reservation, the wait time is significantly shorter. Marie Violet also said that patients are fearful of accumulating No Show/Late Cancels on their ride history.

Sandra commented that she is on the Transportation Committee of the COA and has heard a lot of misperceptions about Redi-Wheels service during meetings and outreach events. Aki and Vincent suggested scheduling outreach presentations during the next year at COA and/or Sequoia Hospital to address rider concerns directly.

Marie asked Tina and John if it would be possible to identify how many Comment Cards, phone calls, email and letters are sent in regard to service at Sequoia Hospital. John explained that service complaints about a specific service point would be investigated, but that Comment Cards are tracked by customer name. John added that a few years ago, he went to Sequoia Hospital to view pick up and drop off points, in addition to speaking to some of the Sequoia Hospital Staff about their concerns. John said that passenger requests for changes to their pick-up and drop-off points during their ride has caused confusion for drivers in the past.

Marie asked John to explain how reservationists work with riders who make ride reservations. John said that reservationists have three prompts available for addresses that can be drop off points. Marie noted that there is a lot of confusion with many visitors to Sequoia Hospital about the physical address for the new main entrance and
campus pavilion. John said that having some specific information about issues with rides arriving at and leaving Sequoia Hospital would be needed to pinpoint service issues more clearly. Mike said that an information desk contact at Sequoia Hospital would also be a good resource for Redi-Wheels riders.

REDI-WHEELS NO SHOW/LATE CANCEL POLICY DISCUSSION

A proposal is currently under review by the SamTrans Executive Staff about the No Show/Late Cancel Policy. Tina emphasized that changes to a person’s ride reservation that is beyond the rider’s control would not be counted as a No Show/Late Cancel event. For individuals who receive a No Show/Late Cancel under this type of circumstance, Mike suggested making a call Mike Rusconi’s number at SamTrans that is listed on the No Show/Late Cancel letter. Aki asked Tina about a scenario in which a rider goes to a medical appointment and the doctor is running late. Tina said that either the rider should call dispatch and report a later than scheduled ride pick up. The rider can request a Will Call ride pick up. But, some riders are not able to call ahead of time and receive a No Show letter from SamTrans. In the latter case, the rider can call Jim and resolve the No Show with an explanation of the No Show circumstances.

Maria commented that she only recently became aware of the option to make a Go Back (“Open Return/Will Call”) pick up time when she makes reservations. Dave and Tina added that riders are encouraged to make a specific pick up time, so that they do not have to wait longer than 20 minutes.

Tina and Richard clarified that a No Strand Policy exists for Redi-Wheels riders and it is an industry standard that is above and beyond what is required by the ADA.

OTHER BUSINESS

Vincent reported that a proposed change to the schedule for PAL includes monthly meetings, directly before the PCC meeting from 12:00 to 1:00 p.m. John asked if 11:30 to 12:30 p.m. would be workable for a meeting time. The Committee members, SamTrans Staff, PCC Consultant and PCC Staff in attendance at today’s meeting agreed to this time change. The next PAL Committee meeting is scheduled for January 12, 2016 from 11:30 to 12:30 p.m. Erin agreed to update the PCC Meeting Calendar for the January meeting packet and email reminder templates.

Vincent asked if the January PAL Agenda could include updates on the Redi-Wheels No Show/Late Cancel Policy and Alameda County Same Day Service Policy (subsidized, non-paratransit service).

Meeting adjourned 1:00 p.m.
SAN MATEO COUNTY
PCC POLICY-ADVOCACY-LEGISLATIVE (PAL)
MEETING NOTES
1:00-3:00 p.m.
October 6, 2015

Members Present: Marie Violet, Sequoia Hospital; Sammi Riley, Consumer; Maria Kozak, Consumer; Sandra Lang, COA; Dinae Cruise, Consumer; Vincent Merola, CiD; Mike Levinson, PCC Chair; Tina Dubost, SamTrans; John Sanderson, SamTrans; Elly Colwell, SamTrans; Dave Daley, First Transit; Richard Weiner, Nelson-Nygaard Consulting Associates; and Erin Swartz, PCC Staff.

APPROVAL OF JULY AL-COM MINUTES
Tina motioned and Sammi seconded to approve the July PAL (AL-Com) minutes. Vincent and Marie both abstained from voting and there were no revisions noted for the July meeting minutes.

Mike suggested creating meeting packets for PAL (AL-Com), which would include the prior quarter’s meeting minutes.

DISCUSSION OF THE PURPOSE OF PAL (POLICY-ADVOCACY-LEGISLATIVE) COMMITTEE
Mike discussed the purpose of the PAL (AL-Com) Committee as contained in the outcome from the PCC Retreat in June. All of the PAL responsibilities are contained within the existing by-laws, with the exception of a statement that Vincent asked to have considered as an addition to the by-laws. The additional text reads, “Periodically review Redi-Wheels/RediCoast policies and procedures and make recommendations to PCC members, SamTrans staff, and the Board of Directors when needed.”

Tina asked if the new text could be revised to read, “Periodically review Redi-Wheels/RediCoast policies and procedures and make recommendations to the PCC and SamTrans staff.”

The group discussed different aspects of the by-laws that were sent to Committee members prior to this meeting. Mike noted that the by-laws wouldn’t be changed until after a couple of PAL meetings have taken place. At that point, any changes to the by-laws would be presented to the PCC for consideration and approved by a vote of the full PCC.

Tina asked for further clarification of the additional by-law proposed by Vincent. She requested that the PCC make recommendations to the SamTrans Board of Directors, rather than the PAL Committee making recommendations directly, as proposed. Tina suggested adapting the new by-law language to read, “…to the PCC through the SamTrans staff as needed.” Tina and the other AL-Com members discussed how some suggestions are given to the SamTrans Staff directly at AL-Com meetings, but issues related to policy changes are usually given to SamTrans through the PCC. Erin will collect the comments about the PAL Discussion Points handout.
Vincent and Mike discussed the practicality of revising by-laws only for the PAL (AL-Com), and suggested that a working group of PCC members should be appointed to review the PCC’s by-laws and the by-laws of the sub-committees. All of the PAL members agreed that all recommended changes to the by-laws would be brought to the PCC for a vote of approval.

Richard noted that there are recommendations already in place for the purpose of the PCC and the subcommittees contained within the by-laws currently posted on the PCC’s website.

**LEGISLATIVE UPDATES**

Mike and Vincent asked Tina for an update on the PCC’s request to be included on the SamTrans legislative newsletter list. Sandra added that when she was Chair of AL-Com, the understanding was that Seamus Murphy would provide periodic updates about current legislative issues that would be of interest to the PCC/AL-Com. Tina noted that SamTrans has recently reorganized and Seamus has taken on a new role as Chief Communication Officer of SamTrans, so that he is overseeing the Marketing Department, as well as the Government and Community Affairs Department.

Richard noted that the Final Federal Transit Administration Americans with Disabilities Act: Guidance Circular has just been updated. Richard offered to share updates from the Circular that might be of interest to the PCC/PAL members. Richard agreed to send out a link to the Circular’s Table of Contents from the Paratransit section for the members to review.

**LOCAL ADVOCACY ISSUES—OPEN DISCUSSION**

Tina requested comments/changes to the SamTrans Senior Mobility Guide. Tina said that the Senior Mobility Guide provides information about many different types of transportation available in San Mateo County. The Guide is updated annually and the phone numbers listed within the publication have been checked for accuracy. Tina asked for comments to be submitted ASAP. Sandra asked about how the Guides are distributed. Tina confirmed that mobility ambassadors pass the Guides out at outreach events and they are also given out at Seniors on the Move. Marie asked for more information to be included about the PJCC Get Up and Go Program, FLEX Shuttle, Sequoia Village Programs, and shuttles in Redwood City, Foster City, and San Mateo for older adults. Mike asked if the Guide is still printed in Spanish and Chinese. Sandra asked Tina if the Veteran’s hospital shuttles in South San Francisco and Palo Alto are transportation options listed in the Guide. Dave asked for information to be included about transit available for members of the Health Plan of San Mateo. Marie also suggested including the TIES hotline. Vincent suggested adding information about alternative print formats on the back of the Guide, where space for large font text is available. Tina said new copies of the Guide will be available in time for the Seniors on the Move Event in November.

**REDI-WHEELS NO SHOW/LATE CANCEL POLICY DISCUSSION**

The PAL members agreed to table the discussion of the Redi-Wheels No Show/Late Cancel Policy and revisit it in an extra PAL meeting that is being scheduled for Tuesday, December 8, 2015.
REQUEST FOR QUESTIONS USED IN THE SAMTRANS MARKETING SURVEY

Erin confirmed that she emailed a copy of the June 2015 SamTrans Marketing survey questions from Tina to the PAL (AL-Com) members to review on Oct. 2, 2015. Tina noted that in order for the consultants to give a full and complete report, more time was needed to prepare the report of results.

Sandra commented that she is on the Transportation Sub-Committee of the Commission on Aging. In her most recent liaison report from the PCC to the COA, she noted that the group was unaware of the proposed SamTrans fare increase or related hearings. Sandra referred people with comments and questions directly to Tina at SamTrans.

Tina confirmed that comments will be taken at tomorrow’s SamTrans Board of Directors meeting. Comments can also be emailed to changes@samtrans.com or called in to the toll-free SamTrans Customer Service number. Maria noted that having extra change on hand for the proposed increased fares is cumbersome. Vincent also pointed out that for the individuals who are on a fixed income, a fare increase will be a great hardship. Tina also shared that a Lifeline Fare Assistance Program is available for qualifying extremely low income individuals.

Tina commented that the Customer Service desk will be moving from the second floor to the first floor of the SamTrans building in January.

During the Local Advocacy Issue Discussion, Mike commented that the GPS used by the Redi-Wheels and taxi drivers to locate addresses is highly inaccurate along the street in front of his apartment complex. Mike added that GPS also directs drivers from his house to the Daly City Serramonte Branch Library along a very circuitous route. Tina and Dave agreed to check the geocodes for his address and the Library to determine if an update is needed.

In another Local Advocacy Issue discussion, Maria commented that she has had problems getting through on the reservation line late in the afternoon. Sammi commented that the late afternoon is a very busy time for people calling in to make ride reservations and wait times of several minutes are not unusual.

Dinae asked Dave to explain the policy about taxi drivers leaving passengers in the vehicle to use the restroom. Dave commented that an investigation of her complaint is in progress and an update and a resolution will be available in the next few days. Dave noted that drivers get two 10-minute breaks and an hour long lunch built into their daily schedule, along with times between picking up passengers to use the restroom, so that passengers should never be left unattended in a vehicle for this reason.

Tina and Maria discussed the purpose of having a two hour window needed for ride cancellations. Richard noted that this standard is customary throughout the United States and some other transit agencies even go so far as to categorize any ride that is cancelled the day of the trip as a Late Cancel. Tina reminded Maria to call the no-show administration number to request assistance with a Late Cancel if she has an unexpected medical issue.
CRC—OPEN DISCUSSION

John reported that trends identified in earlier AL-Com meetings still continue to occur. For example, approximately 38% of complaints made are found to be valid. John reported on the number of compliments, as compared to the number complaints received. Most compliments are found to be valid and make up the majority of the comments submitted by riders. About half of comments made about driver assistance and driver conduct are found to be valid.

John reported on Late Vehicle complaints in September 2015. There were 7 total complaints received in this category and two were found to be valid. In September, Missed Trip complaints totaled 5, with 4 found to be valid after investigating the trip details.

On page 2 of the report, John pointed out that the number of working-days counted for Average Response Time to Customer shows an improvement. This statistic does not include weekends and holidays in the total. Comments, like Service-Related Complaints, require a significant amount of time to investigate fully and resolve. John noted that the SamTrans staff is focused on providing high-quality service and will continue working to improve the response time.

John also explained the difference between Comment Cards and Consumer Reports. If a customer calls the toll-free number, that type of comment is referred to a Consumer Report. John pointed out that the overwhelming majority of comments received by SamTrans are Consumer Reports. Dave confirmed that drivers who receive compliments are notified and acknowledged at the staff meetings. For the Year to Date, 267 compliments have been received on Comment Cards and 91 compliments have been received through Customer Reports, compared with 45 complaints received on Comment Cards and 359 complaints received through Consumer Reports.

OTHER BUSINESS
The next PAL Committee meeting is scheduled for January 5, 2016 from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. Vincent requested an additional PAL meeting for the month of November. The PAL members in attendance discussed several dates and times for an extra meeting and decided on Tuesday, December 8, 2015. PAL (AL-Com) will meet that day from 11:30-1:00 p.m. in the 2nd floor auditorium of the SamTrans building, break for lunch, and then return for the PCC meeting from 1:30-3:30 p.m.

Mike reported that he and some of the other PCC members are participating in the Dine Out event on October 13, 2015. He welcomed anyone else who is interested in participating to join the group for a meal that will be either before or after the October 13, 2015 PCC meeting. More information can be found at: penvol.org/dineout

Meeting adjourned 3:12 p.m.
TO: Community Relations Committee

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
          General Manager/CEO

FROM: David Olmeda
       Chief Operating Officer, Bus

SUBJECT: MULTIMODAL RIDERSHIP REPORT – DECEMBER 2015

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

SIGNIFICANCE
Table "A" summarizes the average weekday ridership (AWR) statistics for all modes of transportation for which SamTrans is responsible and Table "B" summarizes the total monthly ridership figures for all SamTrans transportation modes. Chart “A” features year-to-date comparisons of AWR for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014, FY2015, and FY2016. Chart “B” has figures for total ridership year-to-date for FY2014, FY2015, and FY2016.

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

AVERAGE WEEKDAY RIDERSHIP – DECEMBER 2015 COMPARED TO DECEMBER 2014

Total District Modes – 148,120, an increase of 0.2 percent.

Bus – 38,190, an increase of 0.9 percent.

Paratransit – 1,160, an increase of 12.6 percent.

Caltrain – 51,660, an increase of 0.2 percent.

Shuttles – 8,420, a decrease of 12.4 percent.
Table A
Average Weekday Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>39,190</td>
<td>37,860</td>
<td>38,190</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>48,630</td>
<td>51,570</td>
<td>51,660</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttles</td>
<td>10,060</td>
<td>9,610**</td>
<td>8,420</td>
<td>-12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>98,860</td>
<td>100,070</td>
<td>99,420</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BART Extension (No Daly City)</strong></td>
<td>45,760</td>
<td>47,740</td>
<td>48,700</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>144,620</td>
<td>147,810</td>
<td>148,120</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Weekdays | 22     | 22     | 22     |

**December 2015 Year-to-date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>41,660</td>
<td>42,800</td>
<td>42,450</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>52,580</td>
<td>58,350</td>
<td>59,840</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttles</td>
<td>10,380</td>
<td>11,620**</td>
<td>10,850***</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>105,690</td>
<td>114,010</td>
<td>114,370</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BART Extension (No Daly City)</strong></td>
<td>45,290*</td>
<td>50,610</td>
<td>51,220</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>150,980</td>
<td>164,630</td>
<td>165,590</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**The Genentech Glen Park shuttle has been removed from reporting because SamTrans is no longer providing a subsidy for this service. The shuttle generated about 35 percent of the SamTrans ridership.

***Shuttle year-to-date numbers were not reported for July due to inaccuracy with the month’s ridership reporting. Year to date data for FY2016 contains July 2015 data that is an estimate based on the percentage delta change observed in August 2014 versus July 2014.

Chart A
Average Weekday Ridership (FYTD)
The following summary and figures 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 2015 COMPARED TO DECEMBER 2014**

All District Modes – 3,866,210 3,868,630, a decrease of 0.2 percent.

Bus – 994,770 997,190, a decrease of 1.2 1.0 percent.

Paratransit – 28,740, an increase of 16.1 percent.

Caltrain – 1,408,820, an increase of 0.5 percent.

Shuttles – 186,980, a decrease of 9.6 percent.
### Table B
#### Total Monthly Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>1,004,590</td>
<td>1,007,040</td>
<td>994,770</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>24,190</td>
<td>24,750</td>
<td>28,740</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>1,312,090</td>
<td>1,401,540</td>
<td>1,408,820</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttles</td>
<td>211,600</td>
<td>206,880**</td>
<td>186,980</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,552,460</td>
<td>2,640,210</td>
<td>2,621,720</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Extension (No Daly City)</td>
<td>1,177,700</td>
<td>1,234,800</td>
<td>1,246,900</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>3,730,160</td>
<td>3,875,020</td>
<td>3,868,630</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekdays</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### December 2015 Year-to-date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>6,408,510</td>
<td>6,614,950</td>
<td>6,553,770</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>157,150</td>
<td>163,650</td>
<td>180,070</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>8,427,500</td>
<td>9,318,400</td>
<td>9,595,460</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttles</td>
<td>1,347,910</td>
<td>1,503,190**</td>
<td>1,419,290***</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16,341,070</td>
<td>17,595,690</td>
<td>17,748,590</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Extension (No Daly City)</td>
<td>6,981,070*</td>
<td>7,780,520</td>
<td>7,826,590</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>23,322,130</td>
<td>25,376,210</td>
<td>25,575,180</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**The Genentech Glen Park shuttle has been removed from reporting because SamTrans is no longer providing a subsidy for this service. The shuttle generated about 35 percent of the SamTrans ridership.

***Shuttle year-to-date numbers were not reported for July due to inaccuracy with the month’s ridership reporting. Year to date data for FY2016 contains July 2015 data that is an estimate based on the percentage delta change observed in August 2014 versus July 2014.
Chart B
Total Ridership (FYTD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>23,322,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2015</td>
<td>25,376,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2016</td>
<td>25,575,180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SamTrans Promotions – December 2015

Redwood City Hometown Holiday Parade – For the fifth consecutive year, the SamTrans Holiday Bus and family helped kickoff the holiday season by participating in the annual Hometown Holiday Parade. Decked out with hundreds of lights, decorations and festive holiday graphics, the SamTrans bus wowed the parade spectators. The Hometown Holidays Bus runs in conjunction with the Holiday Train on the first weekend in December. Promotional communication channels included: SamTimes newsletter, Transit Fun Guide, SamTrans website, Peninsula moves blog/social media and news release.

SamTrans Social Media Promotions and Analytics
The SamTrans social profile began to undergo several changes as a reflection of the reorganization of the Communications Division. All social media accounts are now streamlined to reflect industry best practices. The @GoSamTrans handle will now be used primarily for fun, promotional announcements and more traditional marketing efforts; the flagship handle @SamTrans_News will continue to provide service alerts, news, meeting announcements and social customer service.

As a result of the marketing reorganization, this month’s report reflects a higher than average increase in total monthly followers because we are now monitoring followers across all District accounts. In December, SamTrans appeared to gain 1,779 followers, but when adjusted to reflect the reorganization of accounts, the actual increase was a more typical 79. Caltrain’s total monthly following is 5,351 with more than 38,820 monthly impressions of content and more than 2,240 direct social media interactions.

December’s social media activities focused on holiday and New Year’s Eve service promotions, as well as the upcoming route and fare changes in early January. Most notably, SamTrans’ LinkedIn profile crossed the 1,000 follower mark in December. This audience plays an important role in our recruitment efforts, which are expected to increase substantially with the start of the New Year.

With the increased focus on this audience in 2015, SamTrans has seen strong organic growth with more than 3,244 impressions of content in the month of December. Impressions are particularly important for LinkedIn users because the goal is to generate interest in the organization as an employer of choice and increase visibility to District job opportunities.

Prepared by: James Namba, Acting Marketing Manager 650-508-7924
Jayme Ackermann, Communications Manager 650-508-7934
David Sorrell, Planner/Scheduler 650-508-6483
INFORMATIONAL
1. Report of the Audit Committee (Gee, Guilbault, Groom)

ACTION
3. Approval of Minutes of Finance Committee Meeting of January 6, 2016
4. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for December 2015
6. Authorize Execution of a Memorandum of Understanding with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority and the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County to Update the Countywide Transportation Plan and Contribute up to a Maximum of $25,000 to the San Mateo County Transportation Authority
7. Authorize Filing and Execution of a Filing Application for the Electric Bus Procurement Project in the Amount of $949,523 and Annual Cap and Trade Funding Authorized Agent Forms and Certifications and Assurances
8. Authorize Execution of an Amendment to the Funding Agreement with the County of San Mateo for their Allocation of $10 Million in County Measure A Funds for Fiscal Years 2016 and 2017

CONTRACTS
9. Authorize Purchase and Delivery of 50 New Heavy-Duty Low-Floor 40-Foot Diesel Buses for a Total Estimated Cost of $25,424,223
10. Authorize Award of Contract to Stertil Koni for the Purchase and Delivery of 11 Sets of Mobile Wheel Lift Systems for a Total Cost of $336,457
11. Authorize Purchase and Delivery of 10 Non-Revenue Support Vehicles with Elk Grove Toyota for a Total Cost of $300,395
12. Authorize Award of On-Call, No-Guarantee Contracts to Essence Printing, Inc., Fong Brothers Printing, Inc. and Pacific Standard Print to Provide Printing Services for a Not-to-Exceed Aggregate Amount of $619,000 for a Five-Year Term

13. Authorize an Increase in Authority for Information Technology Licenses, Maintenance Services and Professional Services for a Not-to-Exceed Amount of $1.5 Million for Fiscal Year 2016
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 2015

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board accept the San Mateo County Transit District’s (District) Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR).

The FY2015 CAFR is also publicly available online at:

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.

- The **Single Audit** Section provides the Independent Auditor’s Report on Internal controls and compliance, and the Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards and Findings and Recommendations from the Auditors.
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 generally accepted auditing standards and the Comptroller General of the United States’ Government Auditing Standards. 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. However, these sections are required when producing a CAFR, which the District chooses to do in order to provide detailed information about the financial condition of the District in a form that is understandable to the taxpayers of San Mateo County.

The CAFR is prepared and presented to the Government Finance Officers Association for its review and evaluation, and to apply for the certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting. The District has received an award for every year in which the report was submitted.

Prepared by: Jeannie Chen, Senior Accountant  
650-508-6259
Committee Members Present: R. Guilbault (Committee Chair), J. Gee, C. Groom

Other Board Members Present, Constituting Committee of the Whole: S. Harris, Z. Kersteen-Tucker, K. Matsumoto, P. Ratto, C. Stone, A. Tissier

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

Committee Chair Rose Guilbault called the meeting to order at 2:27 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of December 2, 2015
Motion/Second: Ratto/Gee
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Ratto, Stone, Tissier

Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for November 2015
Gigi Harrington, Deputy CEO, said November revenue is slightly better than revised budget. Staff will be bringing a budget amendment to the February meeting. Expenses are $6 million better than budget. The fuel budget hasn’t been adjusted so there are savings. Year-to-date fuel is $1.63 per gallon and last week it was $1.30 per gallon.

Director Karyl Matsumoto said in September she questioned why passenger fares were worse by $716,000 or 15.4 percent and she was told there was a glitch in the system, but November passenger fares are down to $443,000 or 5.6 percent. She asked if the glitch has been fixed and this reflects accurate numbers. Ms. Harrington said this is where the budget currently is and staff will be looking at fare revenue in the mid-year budget amendment since the Board approved a fare increase and the budget has not been amended for this.

Director Jeff Gee asked if staff could bring back next month an updated sales tax chart with an additional 10 years added.

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

Authorize Filing of Applications to the California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services to Receive $1,106,406 in State Proposition 1B Transit Security Grant Program Funds for Transportation Security Projects
April Chan, Chief Officer, Planning, Grants and the Transportation Authority, said this is a requirement of the State for the Board to approve resolutions for safety and security funding. The types of projects included in the past are fencing, closed circuit televisions and the improvements being done in the building lobby. This is the 10th and last year this type of funding will be available.
Chair Shirley Harris asked if there will be something similar in the future. Ms. Chan said not at this point.

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

Authorize Executing a Funding Agreement with Facebook to Receive $1 Million to Complete a Dumbarton Transportation Corridor Study and Increasing the Fiscal Year 2016 Capital Budget by $1 Million

Ms. Chan said SamTrans is the record owner of the Dumbarton Rail Bridge. In 1994 the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) financed the purchase of the right of way. The TA, Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC), Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and Metropolitan Transportation Commission provided funding for an environmental process. The process was put on hold due to insufficient funding. SamTrans and ACTC are in discussions of obtaining a California State Department of Transportation planning grant. The grant will be awarded in the June/July 2016 timeframe. Facebook has decided to provide funds to expedite the process and come up with a phased approach to fund the improvements.

Committee Chair Guilbault asked what the $1 million will be funding. Ms. Chan said it will help fund consultant costs.

Director Gee asked if there is going to be a working group or if it will be managed by the TA. Ms. Chan said the primary project partners will be SamTrans and ACTC, but will involve Alameda-Contra Costa Transit and Facebook. As part of the study SamTrans will work with the communities of Redwood City, Menlo Park, East Palo Alto and Palo Alto and ACTC will work with the communities of Newark, Union City and Fremont. Staff will have regular meetings with the cities.

Committee Chair Guilbault asked what Facebook hopes to obtain from this information. Ms. Chan said it is being a good neighbor and recognizing the traffic congestion and their growth in the area and making sure their employees can get to work.

Director Charles Stone asked how long the study will take. Ms. Chan said 15 months.

Director Stone said great job to Ms. Chan and her team for working with the private sector and he hopes this is the first of many examples of the private sector and technology companies helping the District with congestion and transit issues.

Public Comment
Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, expressed thanks to the Board and Facebook in moving forward on this transit improvement. She asked if it would be feasible to have a website for this project as well as the meeting times and locations.

Motion/Second: Tissier/Kersteen-Tucker
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Ratto, Stone, Tissier
Authorize Executing a Funding Agreement with Facebook to Receive $700,000 to Serve as the Environmental Lead for a Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail Environmental Review Process Along the West Alignment of the Dumbarton Rail Corridor and Increasing the Fiscal Year 2016 Capital Budget by $700,000

Ms. Chan said Facebook is interested in expanding the mobility near the Menlo Park campus by installing a bike and pedestrian trail. Staff believes this can be accomplished, but in order for the project to move forward an environmental review needs to be completed.

Director Zoe Kersteen-Tucker asked if any of the $700,000 comes to SamTrans to cover staff’s cost. Ms. Chan said all of the costs associated with staff managing the environmental review process or legal review is included in the $700,000.

Ms. Chan said this action is for the environmental review process and should Facebook decide to move forward with the design or construction of the trail, there would be further conversations on who would handle it.

Director Adrienne Tissier said Facebook is one of the companies that have caused a lot of the congestion on Highway 101 and she is glad to see the funding coming from them to move this project forward.

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

Authorize Award of an Open-Market, Negotiated Contract to City Mechanical, Inc. to Provide Plumbing Maintenance Services for a Total Cost of $294,765 for a Three-Year Base Term

Ms. Harrington said all bids were previously rejected on this item. Staff used a different form of solicitation to engage potential participants and City Mechanical was chosen as the proposed vendor for on-call plumbing services.

Director Carole Groom said she hates to see a company not selected in San Mateo County and asked if there were no bidders from the county. Ms. Harrington said staff sat down with contractors from all over the Bay Area and this company is the only one that met staff’s contract needs and within cost.

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

Authorize Amendment of the Contract to Provide On-Call Real Estate Support Services by Increasing the Aggregate Not-to-Exceed Amount for the Base Six-Year Term from $600,000 to $1,340,000 and Increasing the Aggregate Not-to-Exceed Amount for the Two Two-Year Option Terms from $200,000 to $400,000

Ms. Harrington said this item was previously approved by the Board in December but the dollar amounts were not correct. It is before the Board again to amend the contract and correct the dollar amounts.
Director Matsumoto said the Board is being asked to go from $200,000 to $400,000, but in the December staff report it is listed as $100,000. Ms. Harrington said this is the error that staff needed to correct.

Director Groom said again there is no firm from San Mateo County on this award. Ms. Harrington said she will ask staff to look into seeing the reason why more companies are not awarded contracts in San Mateo County for future items.

**Motion/Second: Stone/Ratto**

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

Adjourned: 2:51 p.m.
TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES FOR THE PERIOD ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2015 AND SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend that the Board accept and enter into the record the Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the month of December 2015 and supplemental information.

SIGNIFICANCE
Revenues: Total Revenues (page 1, line 14) are $2,130,528 or 2.6 percent better than revised budget. Passenger Fares (page 1, line 1) are worse than budget by $525,340 or 5.6 percent and Other Interest, Rent & Other Income (page 1, line 12) are worse than budget by $413,937 or 10.6 percent which are offset by Operating Grant (page 1, line 3) are better than budget by $343,569 or 10.8 percent, Sales Tax (page 1, line 9) is better than budget by $2,672,077 or 7.3 percent and Investment Interest (page 1, line 10) is better than budget by $88,660 or 19.5 percent.

Expenses: Total Expenses (page 4, line 72) are $6,237,443 or 9.3 percent better than revised budget. Within Total Expenses, Total Motor Bus (page 3, line 46) is better than budget by $5,233,016 or 9.9 percent, Total ADA Programs (page 4, line 55) are better than budget by $164,521 or 2 percent and Total Multi-Modal Programs (page 4, line 70) are better than budget by $839,905 or 14.5 percent.

BUDGET IMPACT
There are no budget revisions for the month of December 2015.

Prepared By: Jeannie Chen, Senior Accountant 650-508-6259
Sheila Tioyao, Manager, General Ledger 650-508-7752
### SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
#### SUMMARY OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES
##### FISCAL YEAR 2016
##### DECEMBER 2015

#### % OF YEAR ELAPSED:
- **50.0%**

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

#### SOURCES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>REVISED ACTUAL</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>APPROVED BUDGET</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Fares</td>
<td>1,422,215</td>
<td>9,399,712</td>
<td>8,912,654</td>
<td>9,437,994</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>18,945,000</td>
<td>18,945,000</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TDA and STA Funds</td>
<td>3,198,257</td>
<td>20,161,807</td>
<td>19,189,541</td>
<td>19,224,041</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>38,448,081</td>
<td>38,448,081</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>98,580</td>
<td>3,977,651</td>
<td>3,539,126</td>
<td>3,195,537</td>
<td>110.8</td>
<td>6,131,812</td>
<td>6,131,812</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA Measure A</td>
<td>675,869</td>
<td>4,518,265</td>
<td>5,487,496</td>
<td>5,487,496</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9,240,000</td>
<td>9,240,000</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM County Measure A</td>
<td>483,809</td>
<td>2,542,539</td>
<td>2,567,142</td>
<td>2,567,142</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB434 Funds</td>
<td>50,083</td>
<td>291,000</td>
<td>300,500</td>
<td>300,500</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>601,000</td>
<td>601,000</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Operating Revenues</td>
<td>5,928,813</td>
<td>40,800,975</td>
<td>39,996,457</td>
<td>40,212,729</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>78,365,893</td>
<td>78,365,893</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Revenue Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>REVISED ACTUAL</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>APPROVED BUDGET</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td>7,899,277</td>
<td>40,211,025</td>
<td>39,175,211</td>
<td>36,503,134</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>77,000,000</td>
<td>77,000,000</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Interest</td>
<td>102,380</td>
<td>451,722</td>
<td>543,838</td>
<td>455,178</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>910,357</td>
<td>910,357</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass through to Other Agencies</td>
<td>10,083</td>
<td>184,607</td>
<td>55,026</td>
<td>55,026</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>121,000</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Interest, Rent &amp; Other Income</td>
<td>600,953</td>
<td>3,671,253</td>
<td>3,476,611</td>
<td>3,892,548</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>7,985,257</td>
<td>7,985,257</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Other Revenues</td>
<td>8,612,693</td>
<td>44,518,607</td>
<td>43,252,666</td>
<td>40,905,886</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>86,016,614</td>
<td>86,016,614</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>14,541,506</td>
<td>85,409,582</td>
<td>83,249,144</td>
<td>81,118,616</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>164,382,508</td>
<td>164,382,508</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assistance</td>
<td>141,261</td>
<td>16,907,672</td>
<td>1,902,894</td>
<td>1,902,894</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>36,906,869</td>
<td>102,901,693</td>
<td>(A) 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Operating Costs</td>
<td>9,244,238</td>
<td>62,544,967</td>
<td>60,989,964</td>
<td>67,227,407</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>138,904,462</td>
<td>138,904,462</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sources of Funds</td>
<td>15,467,775</td>
<td>118,239,405</td>
<td>88,191,050</td>
<td>86,060,522</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>201,289,377</td>
<td>272,688,160</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### USES OF FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>REVISED ACTUAL</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>APPROVED BUDGET</th>
<th>REVISED BUDGET</th>
<th>% REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Bus</td>
<td>7,386,503</td>
<td>50,711,627</td>
<td>47,855,971</td>
<td>53,088,987</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>112,268,492</td>
<td>112,273,882</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. D. A. Programs</td>
<td>1,324,018</td>
<td>7,228,610</td>
<td>8,161,573</td>
<td>8,326,094</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>16,725,800</td>
<td>16,720,411</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>359,919</td>
<td>3,130,000</td>
<td>3,920,492</td>
<td>3,920,492</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6,080,000</td>
<td>6,080,000</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Multi-modal Programs</td>
<td>173,788</td>
<td>1,474,731</td>
<td>1,031,928</td>
<td>1,891,833</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>3,830,170</td>
<td>3,830,170</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Operating Costs</td>
<td>9,244,238</td>
<td>62,544,967</td>
<td>60,989,964</td>
<td>67,227,407</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>138,904,462</td>
<td>138,904,462</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass through to Other Agencies</td>
<td>14,656</td>
<td>184,607</td>
<td>63,862</td>
<td>63,862</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>141,780</td>
<td>141,780</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>836,304</td>
<td>12,244,416</td>
<td>5,017,823</td>
<td>5,017,823</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21,645,646</td>
<td>21,645,646</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Agent Fees</td>
<td>2,078</td>
<td>7,290</td>
<td>8,150</td>
<td>14,200</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>28,399</td>
<td>28,399</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Transfer Interest Expense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45,716</td>
<td>45,716</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Other Uses of Funds</td>
<td>853,039</td>
<td>12,416,313</td>
<td>5,089,835</td>
<td>5,095,885</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>21,861,541</td>
<td>21,861,541</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Programs</td>
<td>966,705</td>
<td>32,737,036</td>
<td>5,036,130</td>
<td>5,036,130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>42,403,029</td>
<td>113,801,812</td>
<td>(A) 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses of Funds</td>
<td>11,063,972</td>
<td>107,834,316</td>
<td>71,115,928</td>
<td>77,359,421</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>203,169,032</td>
<td>274,567,816</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET SURPLUS / (DEFICIT)</td>
<td>4,403,803</td>
<td>10,405,089</td>
<td>17,075,121</td>
<td>8,701,100</td>
<td>196.2</td>
<td>(1,879,656)</td>
<td>(1,879,656)</td>
<td>(908.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(A) - The Revised Budget includes the year end rollover of existing capital projects (Unaudited).
(B) - The Budget includes $500K TA funds from prior year.
### Operating Revenues - Motor Bus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year-to-Date</th>
<th>% of Year Elapsed</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>% of Year Elapsed</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>% of Year Elapsed</th>
<th>Current Actual</th>
<th>Prior Actual</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>% Rev</th>
<th>% Rev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Motor Bus Fares</strong></td>
<td>1,460,150</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1,134,000</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>1,134,000</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>1,134,000</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>1,134,000</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local (TDA) Transit Fund:</strong></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>General Operating Assistance</td>
<td>267,64</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>267,64</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>267,64</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>267,64</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>267,64</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Transit Assistance:</strong></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>Local STA Operating Assistance</td>
<td>338,46</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>338,46</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>338,46</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>338,46</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>338,46</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Grants</strong></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><strong>Total Operating Grants</strong></td>
<td>73,674</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>73,674</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>73,674</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>73,674</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>73,674</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 1/2 Cent Sales Tax:</strong></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>General Operating Assistance</td>
<td>243,704</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>243,704</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>243,704</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>243,704</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>243,704</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>America Disabilities Act:</strong></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>Passenger Fares Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>74,172</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>74,172</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>74,172</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>74,172</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>74,172</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TDA 4.5 Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>141,880</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>141,880</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>141,880</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>141,880</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>141,880</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local STA - Paratransit</td>
<td>39,271</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>39,271</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>39,271</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>39,271</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>39,271</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Grants</td>
<td>24,906</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>24,906</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>24,906</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>24,906</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>24,906</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - District ADA Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax - Paratransit Suppl. Coasts</td>
<td>128,308</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>128,308</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>128,308</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>128,308</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>128,308</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income - Paratransit Fund</td>
<td>19,648</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>19,648</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>19,648</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>19,648</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>19,648</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA Measure A Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>305,950</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>305,950</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>305,950</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>305,950</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>305,950</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM County Measure A</td>
<td>483,809</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>483,809</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>483,809</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>483,809</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>483,809</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure M Paratransit</td>
<td>96,075</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>96,075</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>96,075</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>96,075</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>96,075</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ADA Programs</td>
<td>1,324,018</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1,324,018</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1,324,018</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1,324,018</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1,324,018</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Multimodal</strong></td>
<td>533,707</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>533,707</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>533,707</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>533,707</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>533,707</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>9,244,228</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>9,244,228</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>9,244,228</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>9,244,228</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>9,244,228</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### OPERATING EXPENSES
### FISCAL YEAR 2016
### DECEMBER 2015

#### % OF YEAR ELAPSED: 50.0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>Year-To-Date</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>REVISED</th>
<th>% REV</th>
<th>APPROVED</th>
<th>REVISED</th>
<th>% REV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT OPERATED BUSES</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>Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>2,602,845</td>
<td>26,540,301</td>
<td>24,446,138</td>
<td>24,693,070</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>55,439,968</td>
<td>55,303,653</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</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>Board of Directors</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>112,666</td>
<td>20,043</td>
<td>27,375</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>54,750</td>
<td>54,750</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Vehicle Maintenance</td>
<td>106,872</td>
<td>568,954</td>
<td>540,767</td>
<td>738,480</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>1,476,960</td>
<td>1,476,960</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>267,486</td>
<td>1,329,299</td>
<td>1,506,407</td>
<td>2,247,794</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>4,366,600</td>
<td>4,709,600</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services</td>
<td>578,933</td>
<td>3,016,790</td>
<td>2,905,220</td>
<td>3,014,430</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>6,001,765</td>
<td>6,047,732</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>928,054</td>
<td>664,242</td>
<td>1,270,842</td>
<td>1,484,952</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>2,969,903</td>
<td>2,969,903</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</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>Telecommunications</td>
<td>30,568</td>
<td>166,993</td>
<td>181,300</td>
<td>348,567</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>697,134</td>
<td>697,134</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Utilities</td>
<td>68,974</td>
<td>565,209</td>
<td>518,339</td>
<td>570,000</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>1,140,000</td>
<td>1,140,000</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>236,869</td>
<td>1,221,641</td>
<td>1,212,516</td>
<td>1,338,125</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>2,676,250</td>
<td>2,676,250</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Compensation</td>
<td>307,061</td>
<td>1,720,358</td>
<td>1,719,132</td>
<td>1,831,080</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>3,662,160</td>
<td>3,662,160</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes &amp; License Fees</td>
<td>42,746</td>
<td>211,865</td>
<td>264,355</td>
<td>386,815</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>773,629</td>
<td>773,629</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leased Route Accessibility</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>589,905</td>
<td>429,843</td>
<td>562,375</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>1,124,750</td>
<td>1,122,588</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases &amp; Rentals</td>
<td>19,711</td>
<td>65,917</td>
<td>76,451</td>
<td>69,548</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td>139,096</td>
<td>139,096</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional &amp; Legal Advertising</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>97,516</td>
<td>56,624</td>
<td>158,450</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>316,900</td>
<td>316,900</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp; Business Travel</td>
<td>16,207</td>
<td>130,587</td>
<td>89,498</td>
<td>185,905</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>363,145</td>
<td>371,811</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues &amp; Membership</td>
<td>8,271</td>
<td>41,333</td>
<td>48,513</td>
<td>44,644</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td>89,289</td>
<td>89,289</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage &amp; Other</td>
<td>3,761</td>
<td>26,777</td>
<td>30,636</td>
<td>66,004</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>98,013</td>
<td>132,013</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dist. Operated Buses</td>
<td>2,951,719</td>
<td>14,840,345</td>
<td>11,905,316</td>
<td>17,358,491</td>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>36,625,160</td>
<td>36,625,160</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contracted Bus Services</td>
<td>5,891,762</td>
<td>41,393,502</td>
<td>38,633,039</td>
<td>42,972,345</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>92,035,207</td>
<td>92,040,597</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### % OF YEAR ELAPSED provides a general measure for evaluating overall progress against the annual budget. When comparing it to the amounts shown in the "% REV BUDGET" column, please note that individual line items reflect variations due to seasonal activities during the year.
### San Mateo County Transit District
#### Operating Expenses
##### Fiscal Year 2016
##### December 2015

% of Year Elapsed: 50.0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>YEAR-TO-DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CURRENT ACTUAL</td>
<td>PRIOR ACTUAL</td>
<td>REVISED BUDGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Disability Act Programs</td>
<td>471,176</td>
<td>3,066,043</td>
<td>2,634,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled/Redi-Wheels</td>
<td>491,176</td>
<td>3,066,043</td>
<td>2,634,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Costs</td>
<td>251,176</td>
<td>1,231,175</td>
<td>1,786,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Sedan/Taxi Service</td>
<td>388,181</td>
<td>1,628,776</td>
<td>2,182,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Accessibility Support</td>
<td>107,501</td>
<td>452,711</td>
<td>545,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastside ADA Support</td>
<td>128,308</td>
<td>714,543</td>
<td>774,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Costs</td>
<td>29,662</td>
<td>135,362</td>
<td>218,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ADA Programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,324,018</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,228,610</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,161,573</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal Transit Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula Rail Service</td>
<td>359,919</td>
<td>3,130,000</td>
<td>3,920,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Caltrain Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>359,919</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,130,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,920,492</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SamTrans Shuttle Service</td>
<td>157,915</td>
<td>1,402,377</td>
<td>976,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Coordinating Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Multimodal Facilities</td>
<td>15,823</td>
<td>72,354</td>
<td>75,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>173,788</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,474,731</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,051,928</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Multi-Modal Programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>533,707</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,604,731</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,972,420</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,244,228</strong></td>
<td><strong>62,544,967</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,989,964</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Year Elapsed provides a general measure for evaluating overall progress against the annual budget. When comparing it to the amounts shown in the "% Rev Budget" column, please note that individual line items reflect variations due to seasonal activities during the year.
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
### MOTOR BUS MONTHLY EXPENSES - BUDGET VS ACTUAL
#### FISCAL YEAR 2016

### 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>11,017,327</td>
<td>7,696,670</td>
<td>11,846,126</td>
<td>7,824,156</td>
<td>7,355,204</td>
<td>7,349,505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>9,610,508</td>
<td>6,333,213</td>
<td>11,269,159</td>
<td>6,398,834</td>
<td>6,857,755</td>
<td>7,386,503</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>11,017,327</td>
<td>18,713,997</td>
<td>30,560,123</td>
<td>38,384,279</td>
<td>45,739,483</td>
<td>53,088,987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>9,610,508</td>
<td>15,943,720</td>
<td>27,212,879</td>
<td>33,611,713</td>
<td>40,469,468</td>
<td>47,855,971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variance - F(U)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1,406,820</td>
<td>2,770,276</td>
<td>3,347,243</td>
<td>4,772,566</td>
<td>7,386,503</td>
<td>7,386,503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variance %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>12.77%</td>
<td>14.80%</td>
<td>10.95%</td>
<td>12.43%</td>
<td>11.52%</td>
<td>9.86%</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>Budget</td>
<td>1,392,064</td>
<td>1,462,328</td>
<td>1,393,823</td>
<td>1,332,333</td>
<td>1,377,222</td>
<td>1,368,326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>1,358,433</td>
<td>1,416,915</td>
<td>1,309,048</td>
<td>1,342,582</td>
<td>1,340,576</td>
<td>1,324,018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CUMULATIVE EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millions</td>
<td>Millions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>1,392,064</td>
<td>1,358,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>1,358,433</td>
<td>1,324,018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variance - F(U)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>33,631</td>
<td>79,043</td>
<td>163,819</td>
<td>81,569</td>
<td>120,315</td>
<td>164,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</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>

Variance %

<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></td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>3.86%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Monthly Expenses - Budget vs Actual

### Budget vs Actual - Monthly Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</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>2,440,078</td>
<td>424,821</td>
<td>495,316</td>
<td>540,760</td>
<td>1,232,844</td>
<td>678,507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>2,298,095</td>
<td>531,510</td>
<td>530,609</td>
<td>540,760</td>
<td>537,739</td>
<td>533,707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cumulative Expenses - Budget vs Actual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</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>2,440,078</td>
<td>2,864,899</td>
<td>3,360,214</td>
<td>3,900,974</td>
<td>5,133,818</td>
<td>5,812,325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>2,298,095</td>
<td>2,829,605</td>
<td>3,360,214</td>
<td>3,900,974</td>
<td>4,438,713</td>
<td>4,972,420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variance - F(U)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>5.82%</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>13.54%</td>
<td>14.45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Variance %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variance %</td>
<td>5.82%</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>13.54%</td>
<td>14.45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INTEREST ON INVESTMENTS
### December 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL INVESTMENT</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVABLE</th>
<th>PREPAID INT RECEIVABLE</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVED</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVED ADJ.</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVED RECEVABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESERVE FOR CAPITAL PROJ</td>
<td>7,969,380.60</td>
<td>20,134.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,752.97</td>
<td>19,750.00</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF -- CAPITAL PROJ</td>
<td>76,679.99</td>
<td>53.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REIMB SECURITIES -- L76R</td>
<td>87,154,532.08</td>
<td>131,535.94</td>
<td>1,157.10</td>
<td>68,752.18</td>
<td>34,980.39</td>
<td>(718.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF -- REIMB FUNDS L76R</td>
<td>25,835,978.87</td>
<td>29,040.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,619.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARATRANSL FUNDS</td>
<td>24,886,408.23</td>
<td>34,502.36</td>
<td>355.02</td>
<td>18,685.23</td>
<td>2,901.23</td>
<td>(269.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF -- PARATRANSL</td>
<td>5,077,604.89</td>
<td>3,531.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,780.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK OF AMERICA</td>
<td>13,005,126.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,342.01</td>
<td>1,342.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLs FARGO</td>
<td>965,328.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Bank - Custodian account</td>
<td>1,220,649.71</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:

| 7,608,887.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| TOTAL 173,800,577.59 | 218,798.48 | 1,512.12 | 103,959.11 | 58,973.63 | (979.16) | 264,316.91 |

## DECEMBER 2015 -- SUMMARY OF INTEREST & CAPITAL GAIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Earned 12/31/15</th>
<th>102,979.95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Interest</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Fees</td>
<td>(538.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Gain(Loss)</td>
<td>741.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Interest &amp; Capital Gain(Loss)</td>
<td>103,183.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## YEAR TO DATE -- SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Earned</th>
<th>549,911.83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO Interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Fees</td>
<td>(3,114.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Gain(Loss)</td>
<td>3,931.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Interest &amp; Capital Gain(Loss)</td>
<td>550,728.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Balance Per Ledger as of 12/31/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deferred Int Acct. 210852/3</th>
<th>7,968.90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Acct. 409101</td>
<td>541,942.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Trust Fees 530045</td>
<td>(3,114.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain(Loss) Acct. 405210</td>
<td>3,931.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>550,728.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### U.S. Treasury Notes and Bonds

<p>| Type of Security | CUSIP # | Settle Date | Original Rate | Original Purchase Price | Adjusted Purchase Price | Market Value | Maturity/Call Date | Interest Date | Interest Rate | Interest Rate/Adj. | Interest Rate/Adj. Rec. | Interest Rate/Adj. Rec. Earnings | Interest Rate/Adj. Rec. Received | Interest Rate/Adj. Rec. Paid | Interest Rate/Adj. Rec. Rec. | Interest Rate/Adj. Rec. Less Prepaid | Interest Rate/Adj. Rec. Value | Interest Rate/Adj. Rec. ADJ. | Interest Rate/Adj. Rec. TOTAL LAIF |
|------------------|---------|-------------|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| GOVERNMENT BONDS |         |             |               |                         |                         |              |                    |               |               |                   |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                |                                |                             |                                 |                                |
| FFCB             | 31331H5L7 | 5-11-07     | 1,020,404.50  | 977,352.40              | 950,000.00              | 12-29-15     | 6.125%            | 161,611.9     | 24,568.06     | 4,525.69         | 29,055.75                  | (0.00)                           | (0.00)                           |                                 |                                 | 70.47                        |                                 |                                 |
| FMIA             | 3135GOV48 | 5-1-13      | 10,718,010.50 | 10,714,380.21           | 10,700,823.90          | 5-30-16      | 0.500%            | 148,611.0     | 9,065.23      | 4,458.33         |                                 | 0.05                            | 15,523.61                        | 15,523.61                     | 10,710,000                   | 28.01                        |                                 |                                 |
| FMIA             | 3135G0V48 | 5-13-13     | 4,307,494.90  | 4,305,464.79            | 4,301,290.00           | 12-07-15     | 0.500%            | 59,722.2      | 3,643.60      | 358.33           | 4,021.39                   | (0.04)                          | (0.00)                           | (0.00)                         | (0.00)                         | 4,120,000                   | 1.52                          |                                 |                                 |
| FMIA             | 3135G0F03 | 12-10-13    | 4,999,700.00  | 4,998,785.00            | 4,993,970.00           | 7-05-16      | 0.375%            | 52,083.3      | 7,604.17      | 1,562.50         |                                 | 9,166.67                         | 9,166.67                         | 5,000.00                      | 28.01                        |                                 |                                 |
| FMIA             | 3135G0F07 | 03-07-14    | 5,009,800.00  | 5,012,055.00            | 5,000,250.00           | 8-26-16      | 0.625%            | 88,805.6      | 2,604.17      |                                 | 10,850.70                     | 10,850.70                        | 5,000.00                      | 1.52                          |                                 |                                 |
| CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS |         |             | 1,028,005.69  | 1,028,005.69            | 1,028,005.69           |              |                    |               |              | 0.00             |                                 | 0.00                            | 0.00                            | 0.00                          | 0.00                          | 1.52                         |                                 |                                 |
| LAIF             |          |             | 25,835,978.87 | 28,835,978.87           | 28,835,978.87          | 29,040.87    | 9,019.19          | 38,660.06     | 38,660.06     | 25,835,978.87   |                                 | 87,393,000.00                   |                                 | 87,393,000.00                 |                               | 1.52                         |                                 |                                 |
| MATURER/Called  |          |             |                |                         |                         |              |                    |               |              |                  |                                 |                                 |                                 |                                |                                |                              |                                 |                                 |
| FFCB             | 31331H5L7 | 5-11-07     | 1,020,404.50  | (977,352.40)            | (950,000.00)           | 12-29-15     | 6.125%            | 161,611.9     | 787.92        | 787.92           | (1,020,404.50)            | (990,000.00)                    |                                 | (990,000.00)                  | (990,000.00)                   | 610,000                      | (1.52)                       |                                 |                                 |
| FMIA             | 3135GOV48 | 5-13-13     | 4,307,494.90  | (4,305,464.79)          | (4,301,290.00)         | 12-07-15     | 0.500%            | 59,722.2      | 787.92        | 787.92           | (4,301,290.00)            | (4,301,290.00)                |                                 | (4,301,290.00)                | (4,301,290.00)                | 4,120,000                     | (1.52)                       |                                 |                                 |
| TOTAL LAIF       |          |             | 25,835,978.87 | 28,835,978.87           | 28,835,978.87          | 29,040.87    | 9,019.19          | 38,660.06     | 38,660.06     | 25,835,978.87   |                                 | 87,393,000.00                   |                                 | 87,393,000.00                 |                               | 1.52                         |                                 |                                 |
| TOTAL A/C 121100 &amp; 112010 |         |             | 87,391,847.51 | 87,515,383.40           | 87,154,532.08         |              |                    |               |              |                  |                                 | 131,535.94                     | 1,157.10                       | 68,752.18                     | 34,080.39                    | (718.74)                     | 165,746.08                   | 164,588.98                   | 87,393,000.02                | 1.52                         |                                 |                                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SECURITY</th>
<th>CUSIP #</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>06-30-15</th>
<th>12-31-15</th>
<th>12-31-15</th>
<th>INTEREST REC'VBLE</th>
<th>INTEREST PREPAID</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVED</th>
<th>INTEREST EARNED</th>
<th>INTEREST ADJ.</th>
<th>RECI'VBLE 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>912828VG2</td>
<td>12-30-13</td>
<td>7,889,816.35</td>
<td>7,914,852.00</td>
<td>7,899,368.00</td>
<td>06-15-16</td>
<td>109.722</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18,289.04</td>
<td>3,291.67</td>
<td>19,750.00</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>1,839.73</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>housing urban develop</td>
<td>911759EB0</td>
<td>12-23-08</td>
<td>72,572.73</td>
<td>70,007.00</td>
<td>70,012.60</td>
<td>08-01-17</td>
<td>7.908%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,845.20</td>
<td>461.30</td>
<td>2,306.50</td>
<td>2,306.50</td>
<td>70,000</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>first amer us treasury mm</td>
<td>31846V534</td>
<td>125,431.00</td>
<td>125,431.00</td>
<td>125,431.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laif</td>
<td></td>
<td>76,679.99</td>
<td>76,679.99</td>
<td>76,679.99</td>
<td>53.34</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>80.23</td>
<td>80.23</td>
<td>76,680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total laif</td>
<td></td>
<td>76,679.99</td>
<td>76,679.99</td>
<td>76,679.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total a/c 121100 &amp; 112010</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,962,389.08</td>
<td>7,984,859.00</td>
<td>7,969,380.60</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></td>
<td>7,962,389.08</td>
<td>7,984,859.00</td>
<td>7,969,380.60</td>
<td>20,134.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,752.97</td>
<td>19,750.00</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>4,146.23</td>
<td>4,146.23</td>
<td>7,970,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15-Jan-16
| TYPE OF SECURITY | CUSIP # | DATE | SETTLE | PURCHASE | ADJUSTED | VALUE | MATURITY | INT | RATE/ APPL. | REC'VBLE | RECEIVED | INTEREST | INTEREST | INTEREST | INTEREST | PP INTEREST | PP INTEREST | PP INTEREST | INT REC'VBLE | LESS PREPAID | PAR | VALUE |
|-----------------|---------|------|--------|----------|----------|-------|----------|-----|------------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-----|
| **U.S. TREASURY NOTES AND BONDS** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| US TREASURY NOTE 912828WX4 | 08-27-14 | 2,549,800.79 | 2,538,599.20 | 2,548,306.80 | 07-31-16 | 0.500% | 35.4167 | 31 | 4,236.48 | 1,097.92 | 1.20 | 5,335.60 | 5,335.60 | 2,550,000 |
| US TREASURY NOTE 912828WX4 | 08-27-14 | 1,349,894.53 | 1,368,938.03 | 1,349,419.92 | 12-07-15 | 0.500% | 18.7500 | 6 | 2,281.18 | 112.50 | (27.51) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,350,000 |
| US TREASURY NOTE 912828WX4 | 03-21-14 | 5,487,324.22 | 5,514,608.00 | 5,494,841.00 | 10-15-16 | 0.625% | 95.4861 | 31 | 4,414.28 | 1,373.63 | (29.57) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,500,000 |
| US TREASURY NOTE 912828WF3 | 03-28-14 | 4,985,546.88 | 5,012,890.00 | 4,993,360.00 | 11-15-16 | 0.625% | 86.8056 | 31 | 3,737.65 | 1,20 | (5.27) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5,000,000 |
| US TREASURY NOTE 912828SC5 | 03-19-14 | 4,218,225.00 | 4,223,297.40 | 4,203,279.40 | 01-31-17 | 0.875% | 102.0833 | 31 | 12,283.29 | 7,325.82 | 7,325.82 | 5,500,000 |
| US TREASURY NOTE 912828WD8 | 10-13-15 | 2,721,726.56 | 2,721,726.56 | 2,696,203.80 | 10-31-18 | 1.250% | 93.7500 | 31 | 2,874.31 | 2,874.31 | 2,874.31 | 2,700,000 |
| US TREASURY NOTE 912828F62 | 09-09-15 | 2,008,046.88 | 2,022,058.00 | 1,993,750.00 | 10-31-19 | 1.500% | 83.3333 | 30 | 3,154.95 | 3,154.95 | 3,154.95 | 2,000,000 |
| US TREASURY NOTE 912828UQ1 | 11-09-15 | 1,233,544.92 | 1,233,886.25 | 1,229,541.25 | 02-29-20 | 1.250% | 43.4028 | 31 | 3,949.18 | 1,345.49 | (14.79) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,250,000 |
| US TREASURY NOTE 912828VF4 | 12-7-15 | 1,332,544.92 | 1,330,593.75 | 1,330,593.75 | 01-31-18 | 1.375% | 51.5625 | 25 | 1,289.06 | 1,289.06 | 1,289.06 | 1,350,000 |
| **FEDERAL AGENCY COLTERALIZED MORTGAGE OBLIGATION** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fannie Mae 3136AQDQ0 | 10-30-15 | 232,303.20 | 232,303.20 | 229,649.34 | 09-01-19 | 1.646% | 10.5161 | 30 | 315.48 | 315.48 | 315.48 | 230,000 |
| **CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 67,213.02 | 67,213.02 | 67,213.02 | 0.00 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **CASH INVESTMENT** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LAIF | 5,077,604.89 | 5,077,604.89 | 5,077,604.89 | 3,531.73 | 0.00 | 1,780.64 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **MATURED/CALLED** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| US TREASURY NOTE 912828WX4 | 08-27-14 | (1,349,894.53) | (1,368,938.03) | (1,349,419.92) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | (1,350,000) |
| **TOTAL LAIF** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5,077,604.89 | 5,077,604.89 | 5,077,604.89 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **TOTAL A/C 122010** | 24,940,762.76 | 25,001,230.72 | 24,886,408.23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 34,502.36 | 351.02 | 18,645.23 | 2,901.23 | 0.00 | (269.44) | 50,371.94 | 50,016.92 | 24,950,000.00 |
### BUDGET AMENDMENTS

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

Dec-15  
No Budget Revisions in December 2015.

### BUDGET REVISIONS

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

Dec-15  
No Budget Revisions in December 2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Projected Amount</th>
<th>Budget/Projection</th>
<th>YTD Actual Per Statement of Revenues &amp; Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2015:</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY2016:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>18,235,600</td>
<td>19,885,600</td>
<td>19,885,600</td>
<td>1,650,000</td>
<td>19,885,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>20,319,400</td>
<td>22,628,025</td>
<td>22,628,025</td>
<td>2,308,625</td>
<td>22,628,025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>17,500,000</td>
<td>18,198,785</td>
<td>18,198,785</td>
<td>698,785</td>
<td>18,198,785</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>18,945,000</td>
<td>20,262,315</td>
<td>20,262,315</td>
<td>1,317,315</td>
<td>20,262,315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2015 Total</td>
<td>75,000,000</td>
<td>80,974,725</td>
<td>80,974,725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>FY2016 Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,157,077</td>
<td>26,157,077</td>
<td>77,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,157,077</td>
<td>26,157,077</td>
<td>77,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Months Total</td>
<td>17,607,333</td>
<td>19,520,600</td>
<td>19,520,600</td>
<td>1,913,267</td>
<td>17,607,333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Oct. 15</td>
<td>6,827,333</td>
<td>5,856,200</td>
<td>466,200</td>
<td>5,827,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Nov. 15</td>
<td>7,808,200</td>
<td>5,856,200</td>
<td>466,200</td>
<td>5,827,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dec. 15</td>
<td>7,140,467</td>
<td>6,520,733</td>
<td>193,733</td>
<td>7,140,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months Total</td>
<td>36,503,134</td>
<td>26,157,077</td>
<td>26,157,077</td>
<td>2,672,077</td>
<td>36,503,134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Jan. 16</td>
<td>5,544,000</td>
<td>5,544,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,544,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Feb. 16</td>
<td>6,079,920</td>
<td>6,079,920</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,079,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mar. 16</td>
<td>7,542,920</td>
<td>7,542,920</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,542,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Months Total</td>
<td>55,669,974</td>
<td>26,157,077</td>
<td>26,157,077</td>
<td>2,672,077</td>
<td>55,669,974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Apr. 16</td>
<td>6,884,826</td>
<td>6,884,826</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,884,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>May 16</td>
<td>6,997,760</td>
<td>6,997,760</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,997,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Jun. 16</td>
<td>7,447,440</td>
<td>7,447,440</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,447,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2016 Total</td>
<td>77,000,000</td>
<td>26,157,077</td>
<td>26,157,077</td>
<td>2,672,077</td>
<td>77,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** FY2016 data is preliminary and subject to audit and finalization. YTD Actual represents year-to-date actual revenues compared to the approved budget.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STAFF REPORT

TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
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, 2015.

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 20, 2016, in order to meet the 30-day requirement.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

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

1. Type of investment, issuer, date of maturity, par and dollar amount invested in all
   securities, investments, and money held by the local agency;
2. Description of any of the local agency's funds, investments or programs that are
   under the management of contracted parties, including lending programs;
3. For all securities held by the local agency or under management by any outside
   party that is not a local agency or the State of California Local Agency
   Investment Fund (LAIF), a current market value as of the date of the report and
   the source of this information;
4. Statement that the portfolio complies with the Investment Policy or the manner in
   which the portfolio is not in compliance; and,
5. Statement that the local agency has the ability to meet its pool's expenditure
   requirements(cash flow) for the next six months or provide an explanation as to
   why sufficient money shall or may not be available.
A schedule, which addresses the requirements of 1, 2, and 3 above, is included in this report on pages 5 and 6. The schedule separates the investments into three groups: the Investments, managed by The Public Financial Management Group or "PFM;" 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.

PFM provides the District a current market valuation of all the assets under its management for each quarter. Generally, PFM’s market prices are derived from closing bid prices as of the last business day of the month as supplied by Interactive Data, Bloomberg, or Telerate. Where prices are not available from generally recognized sources, the securities are priced using a yield-based matrix system to arrive at an estimated market value. Prices that fall between data points are interpolated. Non-negotiable FDIC-insured bank certificates of deposit are priced at par.

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
The Federal Open Market Committee (FOMC) raised the target federal funds rate by 25 basis points (bps) at its December meeting. The new target range is 0.25 to 0.50 percent, up from zero to 0.25 percent, where it had been for seven years. Ongoing job growth played a key role in the FOMC’s decision as job gains maintained an average of more than 200,000 per month over the past year, and the unemployment rate held at 5 percent, a post-recovery low.

Oil prices plunged to below $35 per barrel in December, the lowest level in nearly seven years, while demand from emerging markets economies slowed at the same time that production, especially from Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), remained high. The downward pressure on energy prices is expected to remain through late 2016.

While Treasury yields across the curve ended the quarter higher, the path towards higher rates varied by maturity. Short maturity yields (3 years and under) rose steadily throughout the quarter as expectations for a December FOMC rate hike increased with an inflow of modestly strong economic data. After increasing during the first half of the quarter, longer maturities leveled off as market participants priced in moderate growth
expectations and assessed the likely impact of persistently low commodity prices on long-term inflation. These factors combined to produce a flatter yield curve -- a reaction that generally mimics the Greenspan-led rate hikes.

Source: Bloomberg
Ahead of the December FOMC meeting, market expectations were for an initial fed funds hike, supported by assurances that future policy changes would be gradual. Market reaction after the FOMC’s announcement to raise the target range for the federal funds rate was relatively subdued, evidence that the action was in line with these expectations, a goal of the FOMC’s effort to provide transparency to investors.

The yield relationship between U.S. Treasury and federal agency securities remained stable throughout the fourth quarter. Our relative value analysis of these sectors continued to favor investments in U.S. Treasuries. The mortgage-backed securities sector (MBS) produced strong performance during the quarter as the slow rise in long-term rates helped to mitigate prepayment risk (prepayments typically occur when mortgage holders exercise the option to refinance, which can hurt bondholders).

Strategy
PFM maintains the outlook that the economy will continue to expand at a moderate pace in the intermediate term. PFM will continue to monitor any spillover effect that modest global growth and muted inflation may have on the U.S. economy. These factors will help justify the FOMC’s stated intention to remain patient in the pace at which it raises the federal funds rate. Recent FOMC projections indicate that Committee members anticipate that three or four rate hikes may be appropriate in 2016 -- projections that most market participants believe to be overstated. PFM believes that expectations for low inflation will limit this year’s rate hikes to two or three, and that short-term yields will trend only modestly higher in the near term. PFM expects long-term rates to remain within modest ranges, resulting in further flattening of the yield curve.
Given the low likelihood that rates will move significantly higher in the near-term, PFM started the new quarter duration positions closer to the benchmark. Similarly, PFM will continue to position the maturity distribution of the portfolios to generally match the maturity distribution of the benchmark. Because of narrow yield spreads, federal agencies currently have limited appeal relative to comparable-maturity U.S. Treasuries. PFM will monitor the yield relationship between the two sectors and take advantage of opportunities that may arise -- opportunities that are most likely to occur with new-issue securities. PFM’s strategy continues to favor credit sectors, including asset-backed securities. Although yield spreads narrowed in the fourth quarter and remain narrow, their superior income continues to benefit portfolios. The impact of slower global growth (particularly in emerging markets), interest rate uncertainty, and increased regulatory scrutiny will vary by each issuer’s exposure to these market risks, underscoring the importance of fundamental issuer analysis and careful selection of issuers that are added to portfolios.

**Budget Impact**

Total return is interest income plus capital gains (or minus losses) on an investment and is the most important measure of performance as it is the actual return on investment during a specific time interval. For the quarter ending December 31, the total return of the General Funds portfolio was **-0.30 percent**. The Paratransit Fund portfolio returned **-0.32 percent**. This compares to the benchmark return of **-0.59 percent**. The Performance graph on page 8 shows the relative performance of the District’s portfolio over the last twelve months. The Growth of a Thousand Dollars graph on page 10 shows the cumulative performance over this same time frame for the District’s portfolio.

The yield at cost represents the yield on a fixed-income security at its current rate (at the time of purchase) of return until maturity equivalent to the annual percentage rate of interest an investor would receive for investing the purchase price of a given security in a bank account that paid interest semiannually. As of the end of the quarter the yield to maturity at cost for the General Fund’s portfolio was **0.84 percent**. The yield to maturity at cost for the Paratransit Fund’s portfolio was **0.88 percent**.

The yield at market is the yield that an investor can expect to receive in the current interest rate environment utilizing a buy-and-hold investment strategy. This calculation is based on the current market value of the portfolio including unrealized gains and losses. For the quarter ending December 31, the General Fund’s portfolio market yield to maturity was **0.97 percent**. The Paratransit Fund’s portfolio market yield to maturity was **1.00 percent**. The benchmark’s market yield to maturity was **1.49 percent**.

Prepared by: Shannon Gaffney, Finance

650-508-7740
### SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
**REPORT OF INVESTMENTS**
**FOR QUARTER ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF CARRYING</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE</th>
<th>ACCRUED INTEREST</th>
<th>+ACCUR. INT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUNDS MANAGED BY PFM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT BONDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA 03-30-16</td>
<td>10,718,650</td>
<td>10,700,823</td>
<td>13,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA 07-05-16</td>
<td>4,979,900</td>
<td>4,993,765</td>
<td>9,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA 08-26-16</td>
<td>5,009,800</td>
<td>5,000,250</td>
<td>10,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES TREASURY NOTES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN 07-31-16</td>
<td>3,799,703</td>
<td>3,797,477</td>
<td>7,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN 08-15-16</td>
<td>8,018,125</td>
<td>7,998,128</td>
<td>18,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN 10-15-16</td>
<td>8,480,410</td>
<td>8,492,027</td>
<td>11,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN 11-15-16</td>
<td>9,971,094</td>
<td>9,986,720</td>
<td>8,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN 03-31-17</td>
<td>4,569,898</td>
<td>4,542,084</td>
<td>11,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN 10-31-18</td>
<td>7,761,961</td>
<td>7,689,174</td>
<td>16,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN 04-30-19</td>
<td>7,848,467</td>
<td>7,800,019</td>
<td>16,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN 10-31-19</td>
<td>6,124,543</td>
<td>6,080,938</td>
<td>15,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN 02-29-20</td>
<td>4,342,078</td>
<td>4,327,985</td>
<td>18,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN 05-31-20</td>
<td>4,343,109</td>
<td>4,336,750</td>
<td>5,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLATERALIZED MORTGAGE OBLIGATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA 04-01-18</td>
<td>616,098</td>
<td>609,407</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA 09-01-19</td>
<td>808,011</td>
<td>798,780</td>
<td>1,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY MM FUND 07-31-16</td>
<td>1,028,006</td>
<td>1,028,006</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL INVESTMENT FUNDS PORTFOLIO MANAGED BY PFM</td>
<td>88,423,006</td>
<td>88,419,853</td>
<td>88,182,332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT

**REPORT OF INVESTMENTS**

**FOR QUARTER ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DATE OF MATURITY</th>
<th>PAR VALUE</th>
<th>CARRYING AMOUNT</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE</th>
<th>ACCRUED INTEREST</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE +ACCR. INT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PARATRANSIT TRUST FUND PORTFOLIO:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOVERNMENT BONDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNMA Step Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNITED STATES TREASURY NOTES</strong></td>
<td>07-31-16</td>
<td>2,550,000</td>
<td>2,549,801</td>
<td>5,336</td>
<td>2,553,642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>10-15-16</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>5,487,324</td>
<td>7,326</td>
<td>5,502,167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>11-15-16</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>4,985,547</td>
<td>4,035</td>
<td>4,999,395</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>01-31-17</td>
<td>4,200,000</td>
<td>4,218,225</td>
<td>15,379</td>
<td>4,215,707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>10-31-18</td>
<td>2,700,000</td>
<td>2,721,727</td>
<td>5,749</td>
<td>2,701,952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>10-31-19</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,008,047</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>1,998,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>02-29-20</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
<td>1,233,545</td>
<td>5,280</td>
<td>1,238,825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USTN</td>
<td>05-31-20</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>1,332,545</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>1,334,168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLATERALIZED MORTGAGE OBLIGATIONS</strong></td>
<td>04-01-18</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>171,699</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>170,054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMNA</td>
<td>09-01-19</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>232,303</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>229,615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67,213</td>
<td>67,213</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67,213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TOTAL PARATRANSIT PORTFOLIO** | 25,017,213 | 25,007,976 | 24,953,621 | 50,372 | 25,003,993 |
|**MANAGED BY US BANK/PFM** | 25,017,213 | 25,007,976 | 24,953,621 | 50,372 | 25,003,993 |
| **TOTAL DISTRICT PORTFOLIO** | 113,440,219 | 113,427,829 | 113,135,953 | 216,118 | 113,352,071 |
| **MANAGED BY PFM** | 113,440,219 | 113,427,829 | 113,135,953 | 216,118 | 113,352,071 |

| **FUNDS NON MANAGED BY PFM** | 8,095,431 | 8,087,820 | 8,094,812 | 4,146 | 8,098,958 |

| **TOTAL DISTRICT PORTFOLIO** | 121,535,650 | 121,516,469 | 121,230,765 | 220,264 | 121,451,029 |
| **MANAGED AND NON MANAGED BY PFM** | 121,535,650 | 121,516,469 | 121,230,765 | 220,264 | 121,451,029 |

| **LIQUIDITY FUNDS MANAGED BY DISTRICT STAFF:** |                  |           |                  |              |                  |                          |
|**BANK OF AMERICA CHECKING** | 2,180,027 | 2,180,027 | 0          | 2,180,027 |
| LAIF                      | 30,990,264 | 30,990,264 | 44,053      | 31,034,316 |
| **TOTAL FUNDS MANAGED BY DISTRICT STAFF** | 33,170,291 | 33,170,291 | 44,053      | 33,214,343 |

| **TRUST FUNDS MANAGED BY THIRD PARTY TRUSTEE:** |                  |           |                  |              |                  |                          |
|**First American Gov't. Oblig. Cl D** | 7,608,887 | 7,608,887 | 7,608,887 | 60 | 7,608,948 |
| Chesham Finance Ltd. | - | - | - | - | - |
| **TOTAL FUNDS MANAGED BY THIRD PARTY TRUSTEE** | 7,608,887 | 7,608,887 | 7,608,887 | 60 | 7,608,948 |

| **TOTAL AS OF DECEMBER 31, 2015** | 162,294,827 | 162,009,943 | 264,377 | 162,274,320 |
Duration is a measure of the market value sensitivity of a portfolio to changes in interest rates. The longer the duration, the larger the market value fluctuation and more significant the return volatility. For example, if interest rates rise by 1.00%, a portfolio with a duration of 2 years should experience a decrease in market value of 2.0%; a portfolio with a duration of 2.5 years should experience a decrease in market value of 2.5%.

Source: Bloomberg.
District benchmark reflects 40% Merrill Lynch 1-3 Year U.S. Treasury Index, 40% Merrill Lynch 3-5 Year U.S. Treasury Index, 10% Merrill Lynch 1-3 Year AAA-A Corporate Index and 10% Merrill Lynch 3-5 Year AAA-A Corporate Index.
San Mateo County Transit District

Monthly Review Accounts vs. Benchmark

Exhibit 4

Source: Bloomberg.
District benchmark reflects 40% Merrill Lynch 1-3 Year U.S. Treasury Index, 40% Merrill Lynch 3-5 Year U.S. Treasury Index, 10% Merrill Lynch 1-3 Year AAA-A Corporate Index and 10% Merrill Lynch 3-5 Year AAA-A Corporate Index.
San Mateo County Transit District

Growth of a Thousand Dollars

Source: Bloomberg.
District benchmark reflects 40% Merrill Lynch 1-3 Year U.S. Treasury Index, 40% Merrill Lynch 3-5 Year U.S. Treasury Index, 10% Merrill Lynch 1-3 Year AAA-A Corporate Index and 10% Merrill Lynch 3-5 Year AAA-A Corporate Index.
San Mateo County Transit District

Percent of Assets Held by Type

MBS/CMO – Mortgage-backed securities and collateralized mortgage obligations
TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
General Manager/CEO

FROM: April Chan
Chief Officer, Planning, Grants and the Transportation Authority

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE EXECUTION OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY AND THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY TO UPDATE THE COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board authorize the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) and the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) for the San Mateo County Transit District (District) to contribute up to a maximum of $25,000 to the TA for the update of the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP).

SIGNIFICANCE
C/CAG is initiating work on an update of the CTP, which will provide policy guidance and support for the implementation of all modes of surface transportation in San Mateo County. In order to expedite the retention of consultant services for this project, C/CAG will be utilizing a sub-consultant to one of the TA’s on-call general planning consultants. C/CAG estimates the total cost for the CTP planning effort is $185,000.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact to the budget. The $25,000 District contribution toward the CTP will come from Capital Program and Project Development funds that are already included as part of the adopted 2016 and prior year Capital Budgets.

BACKGROUND
C/CAG will be updating its CTP, which was last prepared in 2001. The purpose of the C/CAG CTP is to provide a long-range vision, promote policy and set priorities so that informed decisions can be made to optimize the transportation network in San Mateo County. CTPs in the Bay Area provide context for coordinated transportation planning and feed into the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s Regional Transportation Plan.

The District and C/CAG historically have worked collaboratively on a variety of transportation programs and projects of mutual interest and the proposed funding contribution and MOU will facilitate continuation of this working relationship.

Prepared by: Joel Slavit, Manager, Programming and Monitoring 650-508-6476
RESOLUTION NO. 2016-

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

** * **

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY AND THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION
OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY
TO UPDATE THE COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

**WHEREAS**, the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County
(C/CAG) is initiating work to update the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP), utilizing
a subconsultant to one of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority’s (TA) on-call
general planning consultants; and

**WHEREAS**, the CTP will provide policy guidance and support for the
implementation of all modes of surface transportation in San Mateo County; and

**WHEREAS**, staff recommends that the San Mateo County Transit District (District)
enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the District to contribute up to
$25,000 to the TA in conjunction with funding contributions from C/CAG and the TA
towards the estimated $185,000 cost of this planning effort; and

**WHEREAS**, there is sufficient capacity in the District's Fiscal Year 2016 and prior
year Adopted Budgets in Capital Program and Project Development funds to enable
the District to encumber the funds; and

**WHEREAS**, the General Manager recommends, and the Finance Committee
concurs, that the District authorize the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to
execute an MOU with C/CAG and the TA and for the District to contribute up to $25,000
to update the CTP, and to take any other actions necessary to give effect to this
resolution.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute an MOU with C/CAG and the TA and for the District to contribute up to $25,000 for the update of the CTP, and to take any other actions necessary to give effect to this resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 3rd day of February, 2016 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: Jim Hartnett
General Manager/CEO

FROM: April Chan
Chief Officer, Planning, Grants and Transportation Authority

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE THE FILING AND EXECUTION OF A FUNDING APPLICATION FOR
THE ELECTRIC BUS PROCUREMENT PROJECT IN THE AMOUNT OF $949,523
AND ANNUAL CAP AND TRADE AUTHORIZED AGENT FORMS AND
CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES

ACTION
Staff proposes the Finance Committee recommend the Board:

1. Authorize the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to file and execute a
   funding application in the amount of $949,523 with the California State
   Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to receive California Low Carbon
   Transportation Operations Program (LCTOP) funds for the San Mateo County
   Transit District's (District) electric bus procurement project; and

2. Authorize the filing and execution of annual cap and trade funding
   applications, certifications and assurances, authorized agent forms,
   agreements, related amendments, and any other documentation that may be
   required to apply for and receive LCTOP funds.

SIGNIFICANCE
The LCTOP is one of several funding programs that are part of a broad-based State
effort to invest cap and trade auction proceeds to reduce greenhouse gas emissions as
required under California’s climate action law, Assembly Bill 32. These funds are
distributed annually on a formula basis to transit agencies and Metropolitan Planning
Organizations (MPOs) (the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in the Bay
Area). Similar to the State Transit Assistance program, transit agencies receive a portion
of the funds directly based on operating revenues. Caltrans is the administering
agency for the funds and requires eligible funding recipients to submit annual
resolutions authorizing agency officer(s) to execute and process the application
materials associated with LCTOP funds. Caltrans also requires applicants to specify the
projects to receive the LCTOP funds as part of a separate annual resolution. Both
resolutions are included for the Board’s consideration.
**BUDGET IMPACT**
Based on information from Caltrans and MTC, Staff anticipates the San Mateo County Transit District will receive $949,523 in Fiscal Year 2016. District staff recommends the Board program the available funding from this year’s allocation to a future year project to purchase electric buses.

**BACKGROUND**
The LCTOP provides capital funding as well as operational assistance for expanded transit service to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve mobility. The LCTOP program is funded annually with 5 percent of the auction proceeds from the State’s cap and trade program.

Prepared by: Peter Skinner, Manager, Grants and Fund Programming 650-622-7818
RESOLUTION NO. 2016 –
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

AUTHORIZING THE FILING AND EXECUTION OF A FUNDING APPLICATION FOR THE ELECTRIC BUS PROCUREMENT PROJECT IN THE AMOUNT OF $949,523

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) is an eligible project sponsor and may receive State funding from the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) now or sometime in the future for transit projects; and

WHEREAS, the statutes related to State-funded transit projects require a local or regional implementing agency to abide by various regulations; and

WHEREAS, Senate Bill 862 (2014) named the California State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as the administrative agency for the LCTOP; and

WHEREAS, Caltrans has developed guidelines for the purpose of administering and distributing LCTOP funds to eligible project sponsors, including the District; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends and the Finance Committee concurs, that the Board of Directors authorize the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to apply for and receive $949,523 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2015-16 LCTOP funds for the electric bus procurement project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District, hereby:

1. Agrees to comply with all conditions and requirements set forth in the annual certifications and assurances, authorized agent forms, and any applicable statutes, regulations and guidelines for all LCTOP funded transit projects; and
2. Authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to apply for and receive from Caltrans $949,523 in FY2015-16 LCTOP funds, including funds being contributed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, for the electric bus procurement project that will purchase all-electric transit vehicles, and to take such actions as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution, including filing and executing funding applications, certifications and assurances, authorized agent forms, agreements, related amendments, or other documentation that may be required to receive LCTOP funds.

Regularly passed and adopted this 3rd day of February, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

__________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

__________________________
District Secretary
RESOLUTION NO. 2016 –
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * *

AUTHORIZING THE FILING AND EXECUTION OF ANNUAL CAP AND TRADE FUNDING
AUTHORIZED AGENT FORMS AND CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) is an eligible project sponsor and may receive State funding from the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) now or sometime in the future for transit projects; and

WHEREAS, the statutes related to State-funded transit projects require a local or regional implementing agency to abide by various regulations; and

WHEREAS, Senate Bill 862 (2014) named the California State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as the administrative agency for the LCTOP; and

WHEREAS, Caltrans has developed guidelines for the purpose of administering and distributing LCTOP funds to eligible project sponsors, including the District; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends and the Finance Committee concurs, that the Board of Directors authorize the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to file and execute annual cap and trade funding applications, certifications and assurances, authorized agent forms, agreements, related amendments, and any other documents required to apply for and receive LCTOP funding.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the District,
hereby:

1. Agrees to comply with all conditions and requirements set forth in the annual
certifications and assurances, authorized agent forms, and any applicable
statutes, regulations and guidelines for all LCTOP funded transit projects; and

2. Authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to take such actions as
may be necessary to give effect to this resolution, including filing and executing
annual cap-and-trade funding applications, certifications and assurances,
authorized agent forms, agreements, related amendments, and any other
documents required to apply for and receive LCTOP funds.

Regularly passed and adopted this 3rd day of February, 2016 by the following
vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

__________________________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
District Secretary
TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington David Olmeda
Deputy CEO Chief Operating Officer, Bus

SUBJECT: EXECUTION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE FUNDING AGREEMENT WITH THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO FOR THEIR ALLOCATION OF $10 MILLION FOR FISCAL YEARS 2016 AND 2017

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board authorize the General Manager/CEO or his designee to execute an amendment to a funding agreement between the San Mateo County Transit District (District) and the County of San Mateo (County) by which the County will allocate $10 million in County Measure A funds to the District in Fiscal Years (FY) 2016 and 2017. The County will allocate $5 million per year for a total of $10 million.

SIGNIFICANCE
On October 22, 2013, the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution 072855 which authorized an agreement to subsidize SamTrans services to youth, seniors and people with disabilities in San Mateo County for FY2014 and FY2015. The District Board of Directors adopted Resolution No. 2013-52 to authorize the agreement.

On December 15, 2015, the County Board of Supervisors authorized an amendment that continues the $5 million subsidy for another two fiscal years for a total of $10 million, for a cumulative total of $20 million for FY2014 through FY2017. The allocation will fund transit services provided to the disabled, the elderly and youth, with particular emphasis on funding continued Paratransit services.

BUDGET IMPACT
The funds will assist in addressing the structural deficit in the District budget and supplant general fund monies now spent on Paratransit, allowing those funds to be expended in other critical areas. The allocation is reflected in the current budget.

BACKGROUND
In 2012, the voters of San Mateo County overwhelmingly approved Measure A, a ballot measure to increase the sales tax by a half cent for a 10-year period. The ballot measure stated as its purpose improvement of the quality of life for San Mateo County
residents by enabling the County to continue operating facilities and services that are facing growing demand and increasing costs yet are critical for many residents, particularly older, low-income and disabled adults.

A 2010 study conducted by County health and planning staff concluded that by 2030, nearly one in four residents will be over the age of 65, an increase of 72 percent, and of those persons, one in five will have a physical or mental disability. The same study urged that a priority need of these older residents will be the ability to remain mobile and to obtain essential, health, welfare, social and civic services.

As County officials undertook an assessment of the essential services that would be aided by the revenues from Measure A, District staff was able to demonstrate that a significant number of those individuals who use SamTrans transit services meet the County’s definition of the most needy, and that the District provides an essential mobility link for recipients of County services.

Data shows the District serves the County’s neediest residents, with 41 percent earning below $25,000 per year and 21 percent being senior or disabled; 67 percent of the District’s customers have no access to a car and, therefore, depend on the District for all of their transportation needs, including obtaining critical and recurring medical services such as dialysis and physical therapy. The District provides in excess of 70,000 trips per year to County services.

The District is required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to provide paratransit service to qualified disabled passengers within three-quarters of a mile of a fixed transit route (i.e., a pre-determined bus route), an unfunded mandate that cost the District $16.7 million in FY2016; and the District historically has exceeded the minimum Federal paratransit service area requirements in order to provide service throughout the entire County, including to residents who live in areas distant from fixed routes.

The District provides a mobility lifeline for more than 8,000 senior and disabled riders through its Redi-wheels ADA and RediCoast ADA and non-ADA programs.

The District faces an annual budgetary shortfall and lacks sufficient funds to assume continuation of its current operations into the future; the Measure A funds to be provided by the County will diminish that shortfall.

Prepared by: Tina Dubost, Manager, Accessible Transit Services 650-508-6247
Project Manager: Ladi Millard, Director, Budgets 650-508-7755
RESOLUTION NO. 2016-

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

* * *

AUTHORIZE EXECUTION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE FUNDING AGREEMENT WITH THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO FOR THE ALLOCATION OF $10 MILLION TO THE SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2016 AND 2017

WHEREAS, in 2012, the voters of San Mateo County (County) approved Measure A, a half-cent sales tax increase for a 10-year period to enable the County to continue operating facilities and services that are facing growing demand and increasing costs, yet are critical for many residents, particularly older, low-income and disabled adults; and

WHEREAS, a significant number of San Mateo County Transit District (District) passengers meet the County’s definition of those most needy and the District provides an essential mobility link for recipients of County services; and

WHEREAS, the District provides in excess of 70,000 trips per year to County services and provides transit services to the rural coastal regions; and

WHEREAS, the District provides a mobility lifeline for more than 8,000 senior and disabled riders through its Redi-wheels Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and RediCoast ADA and non-ADA Paratransit programs; and

WHEREAS, the District faces an annual budgetary shortfall and lacks sufficient funds to assume continuation of its current operations into the future, which shortfall can be significantly diminished with receipt of County Measure A funds; and

WHEREAS, at its December 15, 2015 meeting, the County Board of Supervisors allocated to the District $5 million per year in County Measure A moneys for Fiscal Years
2016 and 2017 to fund accessible services provided to the disabled, the elderly and youth, with particular emphasis on Paratransit services; and

WHEREAS, the Committee recommends the Board of Directors (Board) approve the amendment to the funding agreement between the District and the County for receipt of County Measure A funds.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Board of the District hereby authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute the amendment to the funding agreement between the District and the County by which the County will provide $10 million in County Measure A funds to the District for Fiscal Years 2016 and 2017; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the Board authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to take any other actions necessary to give effect to this resolution and permit the District to accept $10 million in County Measure A funds.

Regularly passed and adopted this 3rd day of February, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

________________________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

________________________________________
District Secretary
TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH Jim Hartnett
       General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington           David Olmeda
       Deputy CEO                Chief Operating Officer, Bus

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE THE PURCHASE AND DELIVERY OF 50 NEW HEAVY-DUTY
         LOW-FLOOR 40 FOOT DIESEL BUSES

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board to authorize the General
Manager/CEO or his designee to purchase 50 new heavy-duty low-floor 40-foot buses
(buses) under Contract 14-SAMTR-M-028, Heavy-Duty Buses with Gillig, LLC of
Hayward, CA for an estimated amount of $25,424,223 inclusive of charges, taxes, fees,
and delivery.

SIGNIFICANCE
This will allow the San Mateo County Transit District (District) to replace 50 existing 2003
buses or other model year buses, as appropriate, within the five-year term of the
contract. The 2003 low-floor sub-fleet has reached the end of its useful life in 2015 and is
programmed for replacement. The replacement of the buses will ensure continued
reliable service to SamTrans’ customers. The replacement of the fleet also is in
accordance with the replacement schedules of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
and Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funding for this project has been included in approved prior year Capital Budgets.
Funding will come from FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Fund and State
Proposition 1B Fund as local match.

The enactment and implementation of the Public Employee’s Pension Reform Act of
2013 (PEPRA) in California has added a complexity in the FTA grant funding process.
The process requires the Department of Labor (DOL) to certify that the grantee will
satisfy the labor protection requirements under the Federal Transit Act (13(c)
certification). DOL has taken the position that PEPRA violates these labor protections
and has challenged in Federal court the application of PEPRA to transit employees in
California. The Federal district judge has ruled against DOL but the case is still active. In
the meantime, DOL is conditioning its 13(c) certifications for FTA grants to California
transit agencies, including SamTrans, to state that should DOL’s position ultimately be
upheld on appeal, the transit agency will restore for its employees pre-PEPRA retirement benefits. In response, SamTrans, as well as other transit agencies that need to obtain their FTA grant funds to implement critical projects, have responded to DOL by creating a record that clarifies that the agency cannot and will not violate State law. The District has sent DOL such a letter. In the end, this issue will require either a judicial or a political resolution industry wide.

BACKGROUND
On January 8, 2014, per Resolution No. 2014-05, the District Board awarded a five-year contract to Gillig to purchase a minimum of 42 and a maximum of 60 heavy-duty buses during the term of the contract if in the best interest of the District. The resolution required that staff return to the Board for specific authorization to procure the desired number of buses.

Contract Officer:  Brian Geiger  650-508-7973
Project Manager:  Greg Moyer, Supt Maintenance Technical Services  650-508-7987
RESOLUTION NO. 2016 –

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

***

AUTHORIZE THE PURCHASE AND DELIVERY OF 50
NEW HEAVY-DUTY LOW-FLOOR 40-FOOT DIESEL BUSES
FOR A TOTAL ESTIMATED COST OF $25,424,223

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 2014-05, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) awarded a contract to Gillig, LLC to purchase a minimum of 42 and a maximum of 60 heavy-duty buses (buses) during the term of the contract if in the best interest of the District; and

WHEREAS, staff has identified 50 2003 buses that have reached the end of their useful lives and are due for replacement in accordance with replacement schedules established by the Federal Transit Administration and Metropolitan Transportation Commission; and

WHEREAS, staff proposes to acquire 50 new replacement buses under the contract with Gillig, LLC; and

WHEREAS, a combination of Federal funds and local sales tax revenues sufficient for the purchase of the 50 buses was budgeted in prior years’ approved District capital budgets; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that the District Board of Directors (Board) authorize the General Manager/CEO to procure 50 new buses under the contract with Gillig, LLC for a total estimated amount of $25,424,223, inclusive of all charges, taxes, fees, and delivery.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the District Board hereby authorizes the General Manager/CEO or his designee to procure 50 new buses for a total estimated amount of $25,424,223 and to execute such documents and take such actions as required to give effect to this resolution.

Regularly passed and adopted this 3rd day of February, 2016 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: Jim Hartnett
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington                                      David Olmeda
       Deputy CEO                                              Chief Operating Officer, Bus

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE THE PURCHASE AND DELIVERY OF 11 SETS OF MOBILE WHEEL LIFT SYSTEMS

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board:

1. Authorize the purchase of 11 sets of Mobile Wheel Lift Systems through the California Multiple Award Schedule (CMAS) competitively bid contracts, for a total cost of $336,457 inclusive of delivery, setup, training, and taxes.

2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute a contract with Stertil Koni, of Stevensville, MD, in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the State’s contract and the CMAS program, and in a form approved by Legal Counsel.

SIGNIFICANCE
Award of this contract will provide the San Mateo County Transit District (District) with new mobile wheel lifts (Lifts) for North Base and South Base to replace the lifts purchased in 2002 that have reached the end of their useful lives.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funding for this contract has been fully budgeted in the District’s capital budgets approved in prior years. Funding will come from Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Funds, using local sales tax revenue as local match.

BACKGROUND
Pursuant to California Public Contract Code Sections 10298 and 10299, the District is permitted to procure items through the State’s CMAS program. The State has established agreements with vendors under various cooperative purchasing programs such as the CMAS, which provide competitively priced goods and services. Such cooperative purchasing programs save the District considerable time and expense associated with independent procurements which would be unlikely to yield more favorable pricing or service.
Stertil Koni holds a valid agreement under the CMAS program. Staff ascertained that Stertil Koni’s mobile wheel lift system best meets the needs of the District. Additionally, Staff reviewed the pricing and determined it to be fair and reasonable.

Contract Officer: Brian Geiger       650-508-7973
Project Manager: Greg Moyer, Supt. Maintenance Technical Services 650-508-7987
RESOLUTION NO. 2016 –
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
* * *
AUTHORIZING AWARD OF CONTRACT TO STERTIL KONI FOR THE PURCHASE AND DELIVERY OF 11 SETS OF NEW MOBILE WHEEL LIFT SYSTEMS FOR A GRAND TOTAL COST OF $336,457.47

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) requires new mobile wheel lift systems to replace those that have reached the end of their useful lives; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to California Public Contract Code Sections 10298 and 10299, the District is permitted to procure items through the State's California Multiple Award Schedule (CMAS) program, which makes available to public agencies numerous items, including mobile wheel lifts, from approved vendors at prices the State has assessed to be fair, reasonable, and competitive; and

WHEREAS, the District routinely uses this State CMAS program to purchase items to meet its operational needs; and

WHEREAS, Stertil Koni of Stevensville, MD is an approved vendor on the CMAS system; and

WHEREAS, a combination of Federal funds and local sales tax revenues sufficient for the purchase of the mobile wheel lifts was budgeted in the District's capital budgets approved in prior years; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that a contract be awarded to Stertil Koni of Stevensville, MD for the purchase and delivery of 11 sets of new mobile wheel lift systems through the State’s contract for a total cost of $336,457.47, including delivery, setup, training, and taxes.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Board of Directors (Board) of the San Mateo County Transit District hereby awards a contract to Stertil Koni of Stevensville, MD for the purchase and delivery of 11 sets of new mobile wheel lift systems for a total cost of $336,457.47, including delivery, setup, training, and taxes; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute a contract on behalf of the District with Stertil Koni in accordance with all the terms and conditions of the State’s contract and CMAS program, and in a form approved by Legal Counsel.

Regularly passed and adopted this 3rd day of February, 2016 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: Jim Hartnett
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington  David Olmeda
Deputy CEO  Chief Operating Officer, Bus

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE THE PURCHASE AND DELIVERY OF 10 NON-REVENUE SUPPORT VEHICLES

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board:

1. Authorize the purchase of 10 new 2016 Toyota Siennas (Minivans) through a State of California Department of General Services (DGS) competitively bid contract, for a total cost of $300,395 inclusive of fees, delivery, and taxes.

2. Authorize the General Manager/CEO to execute a contract with Elk Grove Toyota of Elk Grove, CA for the purchase and delivery of 10 new Minivans in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the DGS contract for a total cost of $300,395.

SIGNIFICANCE
The San Mateo County Transit District (District) owns and maintains a fleet of non-revenue support vehicles (vehicles) used in a variety of work-related activities, such as deployment of field supervisors to verify routes and monitor service levels, handle emergency situations and accident investigations, and perform periodic site visits and other field inspections. This will allow the District to replace 10 2006 Dodge Caravans that have reached the end of their useful lives. The new vehicles, minivans inclusive of extended warranties, will replace older, unreliable, and costly-to-maintain minivans thereby reducing operating and maintenance costs.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funding has been included in the approved prior year capital budgets. Funding will come from Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Federal Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Fund using local sales tax revenues as local match.

BACKGROUND
The District routinely uses DGS contracts for the purchase of its vehicles. The California Public Contract Code allows the District to purchase vehicles, equipment, and other commodities through the State of California’s competitively bid contracts. With access
to the DGS bid list of vehicle suppliers, the District benefits by purchasing, at highly competitive prices, vehicles of proven design and manufacturing standards that meet District specifications. Because FTA funds are being used for the Minivans, staff obtained Buy America Certificates to ensure that all the Minivans being purchased meet the FTA Buy America requirements.

Contract Officer:   Brian Geiger  650-508-7973
Project Manager:  Greg Moyer, Supt. Maintenance Technical Services  650-508-7987
RESOLUTION NO. 2016-

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

* * *

AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE AND DELIVERY OF 10 NON-REVENUE SUPPORT VEHICLES THROUGH THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA’S COMPETITIVELY BID CONTRACT FOR A TOTAL COST OF $300,394.50

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District) needs to purchase 10 new non-revenue support vehicles (vehicles) to replace older, unreliable, and costly-to-maintain vehicles; and

WHEREAS, staff has identified 10 2006 Dodge Caravans that have reached the end of their useful lives and are due for replacement; and

WHEREAS, staff proposes to acquire 10 Toyota Siennas (Minivans) to be used in a variety of work-related activities, such as deployment of field supervisors to verify routes and monitor service levels; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to California Public Contract Code Section 10298, the State of California Department of General Services (DGS) makes available to public agencies numerous items including vehicles from approved vendors that have been selected by the State through a sealed competitive bid process; and

WHEREAS, the District routinely uses this State procurement system to purchase cars, trucks, cargo vans, minivans and other vehicles to meet its operational needs; and

WHEREAS, a combination of Federal funds and local sales tax revenues sufficient for the purchase of the 10 Minivans was budgeted in prior years’ approved District capital budgets; and

WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that a contract be awarded to Elk Grove Toyota of Elk Grove, CA
for the purchase and delivery of 10 Minivans, through the State’s DGS contracts, for a total cost of $300,394.50 inclusive of delivery, fees, and taxes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors (Board) of the District authorizes the purchase and delivery of 10 2016 Minivans from Elk Grove Toyota through a State DGS contract for a total cost of $300,394.50, inclusive of fees, taxes, and delivery; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the Board authorizes the General Manager/CEO or his designee to execute a contract on behalf of the District with Elk Grove Toyota in accordance with the terms and conditions of the DGS competitively bid contract.

Regularly passed and adopted this 3rd day of February, 2016 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: Jim Hartnett
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington Seamus Murphy
Deputy CEO Chief Communications Officer

SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACTS TO PROVIDE PRINTING SERVICES

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board:

1. Award on-call, no guarantee contracts to each of the firms listed below for the provision of printing services for a not-to-exceed aggregate amount of $619,000 for a five-year term:
   - Essence Printing Inc., South San Francisco, CA
   - Fong Brothers Printing Inc., Brisbane, CA
   - Pacific Standard Print, Sacramento, CA

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

SIGNIFICANCE
Approval of the above actions will provide the San Mateo County Transit District (District) with the necessary services required to print a variety of materials such as letterhead, business cards, newsletters, route schedules, route maps and promotional posters and system maps. The award of three contracts will provide the District with a broad array of printing expertise for greater flexibility in awarding work.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funds are available under the approved and projected operating budgets.
BACKGROUND
Staff determined that a joint solicitation with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board was a cost-effective approach to procure the required printing services. A joint Request for Proposals to provide printing services was issued. The solicitation was advertised in a newspaper of general circulation and on the District and JPB’s procurement website. Staff received proposals from five firms.

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

- Approach to Scope of Services 0 - 30 points
- Qualifications and Experience of Firm and Key Personnel 0 - 30 points
- Cost Proposal 0 - 35 points
- Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Preference 0 - 5 points

Firms that submitted proposals and achieved scoring within the competitive range were invited for interviews. After review, evaluation, and ranking of proposals, the Committee determined that the three firms, listed below in order of their consensus ranking, have the requisite depth of experience and qualifications to successfully perform the services required under these contracts.

- Fong Brothers Printing Inc., Brisbane, CA
- Essence Printing Inc., South San Francisco, CA
- Pacific Standard Print, Sacramento, CA

Fong Brothers Printing, Inc. and Essence Printing are minority-owned firms (Disadvantaged Business Enterprises) and are also the incumbents from the previous contract. Both firms have performed satisfactorily. Fong Brothers Printing, Inc. qualified for the Small Business Enterprise preference points in the evaluation.

Staff reviewed the rates submitted in the proposals and found that they compared favorably to those in the District's current printing services contracts, and the open market. Staff therefore recommends award of a contract to each of the above firms.

The District's previous on-call printing services contract was awarded to Fong Brothers, Essence Printing, and Spectrum Lithographic for an aggregate amount for $455,400 for three years with two additional, one-year option terms of $151,800 for each year.

Prepared By: Sid Levy, Procurement Specialist 650-508-7962
Project Manager: Robert Casumbal, Senior Designer 650-508-6280
RESOLUTION NO. 2016 –

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

* * *

AUTHORIZE AWARD OF CONTRACTS TO PROVIDE PRINTING SERVICES
FOR AN AGGREGATE, NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF
$619,000 FOR A FIVE-YEAR TEAM

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transit District (District), along with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, solicited competitive proposals to provide on-call printing services for a five-year term; and

WHEREAS, in response to the District’s Request for Proposals (RFP), staff received proposals from five firms; and

WHEREAS, an Evaluation Committee (Committee) composed of qualified staff has reviewed and evaluated the proposals in accordance with the criteria set forth in the RFP and found that the proposals submitted by Essence Printing Inc., Fong Brothers Printing Inc., and Pacific Standard Print comply with all of the solicitation requirements and the firms are fully capable of providing the specified services; and

WHEREAS, General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that a five-year contract for on-call printing services be awarded to each firm listed above for an aggregate, not-to-exceed amount of $619,000.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Board of Directors (Board) of the District hereby awards contracts for on-call printing services to Essence Printing Inc. of South San Francisco, CA, Fong Brothers Printing Inc. of Brisbane, CA, and Pacific Standard Print of Sacramento, CA, for five-year terms for an aggregate, not-to-exceed amount of $619,000; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the Board authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute contracts on behalf of the District with the firms named above for printing services in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents and negotiated agreements, and in a form approved by legal counsel.

Regularly passed and adopted this 3rd day of February, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

__________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

ATTEST:

__________________________
District Secretary
TO: Finance Committee

THROUGH Jim Hartnett
    General Manager/CEO

FROM: Gigi Harrington
    Deputy CEO

SUBJECT: AUTHORIZE INCREASE TO INFORMATIONAL TECHNOLOGY LICENSES, MAINTENANCE SERVICES AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES DELEGATED AUTHORITY

ACTION
Staff proposes the Committee recommend the Board authorize an increase of $650,000 to the expenditures authorized under Resolution No. 2015-36 for information technology licenses, maintenance services and professional services. With this action, expenditures with manufacturers, vendors and consultants will be increased to a not-to-exceed amount of $1.5 million throughout Fiscal Year (FY) 2016.

SIGNIFICANCE
Resolution No. 2015-36 delegated an aggregate amount not-to-exceed $850,000 in contract approval authority to the General Manager/CEO or his designee to directly enter into contracts of more than $100,000 with original equipment manufacturers, product licensors and maintainers, and their distributors or consultants for (1) reoccurring product support, additional software licenses, and license renewals, and (2) the provision of sole source professional services necessary to expand or modify previously competitively procured proprietary software when an original provider is the only source of such services. Approval of the proposed $650,000 increase in contract authority, for a total of $1.5 million, will provide the San Mateo County Transit District (District) with a continued cost effective means to upkeep information technology assets owned by the District, such as procuring Xerox’s professional service to support refreshing the more than seven years old server infrastructure supporting Advanced Communication System (ACS) – Bus Satellite Tracking System.

BUDGET IMPACT
Funds for these purchases are programmed in the proposed FY2016 Capital and Operating budgets.

BACKGROUND
On June 3, 2015 under Resolution No. 2015-36, the Board authorized the General Manager/CEO or his designee to enter into contracts of more than $100,000 with
original equipment manufacturers, product licensors and maintainers and their
distributors or consultants, directly and without the utilization of cooperative purchasing
agreements or competitive procurement, to procure recurring maintenance services
and license renewals. This delegation of authority was necessary to permit continued
effective use and upkeep of District-owned computer and telecommunications
hardware and software. The authority was for an aggregate not-to-exceed amount of
$850,000 throughout FY2016. Due to the increased complexity of migrating the ACS
system to District’s new standard computing platform, the cost of professional services is
higher than originally anticipated. Staff has estimated the need for an additional
$650,000 in contract authority, bringing the total aggregate authorization to $1.5 million
for FY2016. As previously requested by the Board, a quarterly handout is provided
detailing purchases made to date under the existing authority.

Prepared by: David Verderosa, Director, Information Technology  
650-508-7954
RESOLUTION NO. 2016-
BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
***

AUTHORIZE UP TO $650,000 IN ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LICENSES, MAINTENANCE SERVICES AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES FOR AN AGGREGATE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $1.5 MILLION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 2015-36, the Board of Directors (Board) of the San Mateo County Transit District (District) authorized the General Manager/CEO or his designee to execute contracts that exceed $100,000 with original equipment manufacturers, product licensors, and their authorized distributors and consultants for reoccurring product support, additional licenses, and license renewals and for the provision of sole source professional services necessary to expand or modify previously competitively procured proprietary software when an original provider is the only source of such services, pursuant to the District’s statutory procurement authority and policy, up to an aggregate, not-to-exceed amount of $850,000 throughout Fiscal Year (FY) 2016; and

WHEREAS, due to the increased complexity of migrating the Advanced Communications System (ACS) bus tracking system to the District’s standard computing platform, the level of professional services needed is more than originally anticipated and additional procurement authority is desired; and

WHEREAS, staff proposes to increase the total aggregate not-to-exceed amount authorized under Resolution No. 2015-36 by $650,000 to meet the District’s business needs for continued cost effective means to upkeep information technology assets owned by the District; and
WHEREAS, the General Manager/CEO recommends, and the Finance Committee concurs, that the General Manager/CEO or his designee be authorized to execute up to $1.5 million in contracts in FY2016 over $100,000 with original equipment manufacturers, product licensors, and their authorized distributors and consultants pursuant to the District’s statutory procurement authority and policy.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transit District authorizes the General Manager/CEO, or his designee, to execute contracts that exceed $100,000 with original equipment manufacturers, product licensors, or their authorized consultants for reoccurring product support, additional licenses, and license renewals and for the provision of sole source professional services necessary to expand or modify previously competitively procured proprietary software when an original provider is the only source of such services, up to an aggregate, not-to-exceed amount of $1.5 million throughout FY2016.

Regularly passed and adopted this 3rd day of February, 2016 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________________ Chair, San Mateo County Transit District

_________________________

ATTEST:

__________________________

District Secretary
A G E N D A
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2016 – 2:30 p.m.
or immediately following previous Committee meeting

ACTION

1. Approval of Minutes of Legislative Committee Meeting of January 6, 2016
2. Approval of the 2016 Legislative Program

INFORMATIONAL

3. State and Federal Legislative Update

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: Peter Ratto, Shirley Harris, Karyl Matsumoto

Back to Top
Committee Members Present: A. Tissier (Committee Chair), Z. Kersteen-Tucker, C. Stone

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

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

Committee Chair Adrienne Tissier called the meeting to order at 2:51 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of December 2, 2015
Motion/Second: Guilbault/Stone
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Ratto, Stone, Tissier

2016 Legislative Program
Seamus Murphy, Chief Communications Officer, presented the draft program:

- Core Objectives
  - Maintain and enhance funding opportunities
  - Seek a regulatory environment that streamlines project delivery and maximizes ability to meet demands
  - Reinforce and expand programs that build and incentivize public transportation ridership, bike and pedestrian improvements, and transit-oriented developments (TOD)
- Public engagement strategies include direct engagement, coalition-based engagement, and media engagement
- The Program is divided into three categories:
  1. Budget and funding opportunities
     - State/Regional level
       - Existing revenues – formula and cap and trade
       - Ballot measures and voter threshold
       - Other innovative funding options including managed lanes and Regional Measure 3
     - Federal level
       - Annual appropriations
       - Tax extenders
       - Surface transportation and rail authorization
  2. Projects – funding requests and needs
     - Authority supported projects – first/last mile connections, Grand Boulevard Initiatives, TODs
     - Caltrain Modernization Program supplemental memorandum of understanding
• Other projects – projects that enhance capacity, service and safety

3. Regulatory and administrative issues
   o State/Regional level
     ▪ Zero emission bus purchase requirements
     ▪ California Environmental Quality Act
     ▪ Sustainable communities strategies
     ▪ Commuter benefits program
   o Federal level
     ▪ Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act and other regulations

• Next steps
   o Solicit feedback on Draft Program
   o Present to the Citizens Advisory Committee at their January meeting
   o Board approval and adoption in February

Director Zoe Kersteen-Tucker asked who is on the statewide advisory committee looking at vehicle miles traveled and the timeframe for results. Mr. Murphy said it is longer term effort and the findings are to be reported in 2018. The committee consists of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, a few transit agencies, the Air Resource Board, and the Strategic Growth Council.

Director Karyl Matsumoto thanked staff for allowing the Board to provide feedback.

Chair Shirley Harris said she thought she heard the Secretary of the Transportation talk about some type of funding available to cities to apply for to be the model transportation city. Mr. Murphy said this may be the mega region outreach effort that the Department of Transportation (DOT) is doing. The DOT is looking for opportunities to partner with transportation stakeholders in the region to identify what specific needs can address congestion in the urban core, specifically in the mega regions.

Mr. Murphy said the bill introduction deadline is January 22 and there will be a lot of legislation that will be introduced. Some of that information will be used to guide what is in the program as well. If there is anything he thinks the Board would be interested in he will forward to them for their comment.

Public Comment
Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, said she is glad to see such a detailed program with funding listed.

Update on the State and Federal Legislative Program
Mr. Murphy said through passage of the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act, Congress decided to equate the benefits that transit riders receive with the tax benefit that that drivers receive up to $255 per month. The appropriations bill also includes $500 million for the TIGER grant program that continues to be oversubscribed. The Bay Area has not been successful in getting money from this program.

Mr. Murphy said the chairman of the Transportation Committee in the Assembly came out with a transportation funding proposal that will be considered by the Legislature.
This is still part of the special session on Transportation from September of last year. The proposal is very heavy on highway and streets funding. This proposal seeks to increase the excise tax on gasoline and diesel fuel sales tax.

Adjourned: 3:09 p.m.
TO: Legislative Committee

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Seamus Murphy
Chief Communications Officer

SUBJECT: 2016 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

ACTION
Staff proposes the Legislative Committee recommend Board adoption of the attached Legislative Program to guide the San Mateo County Transit District’s policy advocacy efforts over the course of the 2016 calendar year.

SIGNIFICANCE
The 2016 Legislative Program (Program) establishes the principles that will guide the San Mateo County Transit District’s (District) legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts through the 2016 calendar year, including the second half of the State legislative session and the second session of 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 2016 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, projects, 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 detailed in the 2016 Legislative Program.
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 engagement tools to support the 2016 Legislative Program, including:

1. Direct Engagement
   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 Engagement
   Engage local and regional stakeholders to build awareness about specific issues and participate in local, regional, statewide and national coalitions organized to advance positions that are consistent with the 2016 Program.

3. Media Engagement
   Build public awareness and communicate legislative priorities by issuing press releases, organizing media events, and through the use of social media and other electronic media.

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

**BACKGROUND**
Staff presented the Program as an informational item at the January Board meeting. Since that meeting, staff has incorporated feedback into this final Program.

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: Shweta Bhatnagar, Government Affairs Officer 650-508-6385
San Mateo County Transit District
2016 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 2016 Legislative Program establishes the principles that will guide the District’s legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts through the 2016 calendar year, including the second half of the 2015-16 State legislative session and 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 2016 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, bike and pedestrian improvements, and transit-oriented developments.

Issues

The Legislative Program is structured to apply these core objectives to a series of State and Federal issues falling in these categories:

1. Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities
2. Transportation Projects - Funding Requests and Needs
3. Regulatory and Administrative Issues

Within these categories are a detailed list of specific legislative initiatives and corresponding set of policy strategies.

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.
Public Engagement Strategies

District staff, led by the Communications Division and its legislative consultants, will employ a variety of public engagement strategies to support the 2016 Legislative Program, including:

1. **Direct Engagement**
   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 Engagement**
   Engage local and regional stakeholders to build awareness about specific issues and participate in local, regional, statewide and national coalitions organized to advance positions that are consistent with the 2016 Legislative Program.

3. **Media Engagement**
   Build public awareness and communicate the District’s legislative priorities by issuing press releases, organizing media events, and through the use of social media.
# 2016 Legislative Program

## State and Regional Issues

### 1. Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities (State/Regional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 1994, its buying power has been diminished, further depleting resources available to maintain, let alone expand or improve the state highway system or transit needs. | • Protect against the elimination or diversion of any State or regional funds that support San Mateo County transportation needs  
  • Support State funding allocation requests for investments that benefit San Mateo County transportation programs and services  
  • Work with statewide transit coalitions to identify and advance opportunities for funding that would support San Mateo County transportation priorities  
  • Monitor recommendations of the Road Usage Charge (RUC) Technical advisory Committee and implementation of a RUC program by the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA)  
  • Monitor and support efforts to study Vehicle Miles Traveled tax as a potential revenue source  
  • Support a funding package that will help address maintenance, rehabilitation, and congestion management needs in San Mateo County for programs that allow locals flexibility in leveraging funding for priority projects, such as congestion management and safety improvements on Highway 101, transit capital and operations, grade separations, bicycle and pedestrian programs, and local streets and roads |
| A statewide advisory committee has been established to assess the implementation of pilot program for a mileage-based user fee as an alternative to the gas tax. |  |
| In addition, Governor Brown has called for a Special Session on Transportation, which will last through the end of the Legislative Session, to find revenues for local streets and roads maintenance and rehabilitation, the state highway system, and funding for public transportation. |  |

### Existing Revenues

**Formula**

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, more revenue is needed in order to meet the demand of increased ridership, reduce highway congestion – especially on Highway 101 – and adhere to the State’s mandate of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and create livable communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Revenues</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **General** | • Support the full funding of the STA program at levels called for in the 2011 reenactment of the 2010 gas-tax swap legislation  
  • Advocate for the regularly scheduled issuance of State infrastructure bonds that support San Mateo County’s transportation services and programs  
  • Support legislation seeking to increase the sales tax on diesel, which serves as the primary source of funding for the STA program  
  • Advocate for the restoration of over $1 billion in annual truck weight fee revenue and $900 million in General Fund loan repayments, which can be used to support Measure A program priorities |
| **Formula** |  |

---
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### 1. Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities (State/Regional) Continued

#### Issues and Background

**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 (approximately $500 million) is subject to annual appropriation through the state budget process.

SamTrans is eligible for funding through the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program, the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and the Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities Program. Each program’s requirements, oversight, and competitiveness vary. The programs require a certain percentage of funds be expended in state defined “disadvantaged communities” (as defined by CalEnviroScreen). This can prove difficult in jurisdictions with a small number of disadvantaged communities.

**Ballot Measures and Voter Threshold**

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.

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 2016, 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.

#### Strategies

**Cap-and-Trade Revenues**

- Work with the Administration and like-minded coalitions to secure the appropriation of additional cap-and-trade revenues to support San Mateo County transportation needs
- Support legislation and regional action 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 transit operations and capital projects and sustainable communities strategy implementation
- 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
- Support efforts to revise the State’s definition on “disadvantaged communities” to encompass a larger proportion of disadvantaged communities on the Peninsula

**Ballot Measures and Voter Threshold**

- Engage in efforts to generate new local, regional or statewide transportation funding and support proposals that adequately benefit San Mateo County transportation needs
- Oppose efforts to add burdensome restrictions on the expenditure of these revenues, such as requiring payment for maintenance costs on the state highway system
- 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
1. **Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities (State/Regional) Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Issues and Background</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strategies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other State or Local Funding Options</td>
<td>Other State or Local Funding Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the State’s recent dissolution of redevelopment agencies, local and regional</td>
<td>• Advocate for legislation that would create new local funding tools to support transportation infrastructure and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governments continue to seek methods for funding new infrastructure, facility needs,</td>
<td>• Support innovative local and regional funding options that will provide financial support for SamTrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability initiatives, and projects that will support ridership growth through a</td>
<td>• Support legislation that works to ensure revenues generated through managed lane projects remain in the County of origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variety of methods.</td>
<td>• Advocate for funding sources that would assist transit agencies in obtaining funds for sustainability initiatives including water conservation, waste reduction, long-term resource efficiency of facilities and equipment, and greenhouse gas reductions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various local jurisdictions around the state are looking to expand managed lane programs</td>
<td>• Support funding for workforce housing to attract and retain quality personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a way of generating additional funding for highway maintenance and operations, and,</td>
<td>• Support MTC’s efforts to seeking authority for Bay Area voters to consider raising tolls on state-owned bridges to fund transportation improvements in bridge corridors (Regional Measure 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possibly to support public transit in managed lane corridors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2016 Legislative Program

**State and Regional Issues**

2. Transportation Projects – Funding Requests and Needs (State/Regional)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Issues and Background</strong></th>
<th><strong>Strategies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the Bay Area’s population continues to grow, the region’s transportation infrastructure is being negatively impacted. Highways, local streets and roads are becoming heavily congested, Caltrain is nearing its capacity limits, and the demand for housing with easy access to public transit is increasing.</td>
<td>Work with partners in the region to bring business, community, and transportation stakeholders together to enhance, support and advocate for transportation and mobility in the Bay Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caltrain Modernization Program (CalMod)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Caltrain Modernization Program (CalMod)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2012, the State Legislature appropriated $705 million in Proposition 1A high-speed rail funds to modernize the Caltrain corridor and lay the foundation for future high-speed rail service. Under a multi-party regional funding agreement, this investment will be used to match a variety of local, regional, state and federal funding sources to electrify the corridor, install an advanced signaling system and replace Caltrain’s aging diesel trains with electric trains that will dramatically improve service between San Francisco and San Jose.</td>
<td>Advocate for the sale and allocation of Proposition 1A bonds to meet the commitments specified in SB 1029 with respect to the Caltrain corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to progress on the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project, supplemental funding MOUs with state and local partners needs to be pursued and finalized.</td>
<td>Support the allocation of cap-and-trade funding to advance implementation of the Caltrain Modernization Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with state, local and regional partners to advance policies and actions that will help secure funding needed to fulfill local and regional commitments to the Caltrain Modernization Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work to address regulatory challenges that limit the implementation of solutions that will maximize Caltrain capacity and service benefits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2016 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM
STATE AND REGIONAL ISSUES

2. Transportation Projects – Funding Requests and Needs (State/Regional) Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First and Last Mile Connections</strong>&lt;br&gt;Often times a barrier to taking public transit involves the difficulty in getting commuters on a transit system to their final destination that is not within walking distance. Transit agencies have supported various first and last mile transit options including bike share programs, vanpools, car share, shuttles, transportation network companies (such as Uber and Lyft), and new technology like e-bikes and e-scooters.</td>
<td><strong>First and Last Mile Connections</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Support efforts to provide commuters with easy and convenient options to travel to and from major transit centers to their final destination&lt;br&gt;- Support the development of new and innovative first and last mile options&lt;br&gt;- Support increased funding opportunities for first and last mile projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Boulevard Initiative</strong>&lt;br&gt;The Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI) is a collaboration of 19 cities, counties, local and regional agencies united to improve the performance, safety and aesthetics of El Camino Real. Starting at the northern Daly City city limit and ending near the Diridon Caltrain Station in central San Jose, the initiative brings together for the first time all of the agencies having responsibility for the condition, use and performance of the street.</td>
<td><strong>Grand Boulevard Initiative</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Support funding for GBI projects like complete streets, bike and pedestrian projects, parking improvements, signal improvements, sustainability features like storm water capture, and transportation demand management features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit-Oriented Developments (TOD)</strong>&lt;br&gt;TODs create benefits to individuals, communities, and the region by providing mobility options, increasing public safety, increasing transit ridership and reducing roadway congestion, reducing vehicle miles traveled, decreasing GHGs, conserving resource lands and open space, and providing much needed housing on the Peninsula.</td>
<td><strong>Transit-Oriented Developments (TOD)</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Advocate for policies that promote transit-oriented developments near major transit centers&lt;br&gt;- Support the State’s GHG reduction goals by supporting TOD developments&lt;br&gt;- Support streamlining the process for TOD development&lt;br&gt;- Support state funding incentives for TOD development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Projects</strong>&lt;br&gt;Beyond the CalMod Program, Caltrain has identified capital projects such as a fully electrified 8-car EMU fleet with longer platforms that will provide additional capacity and service benefits to Caltrain commuters. The capital needs also include but are not limited to grade separations and station upgrades.</td>
<td><strong>Other Projects</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Support the allocation of cap-and-trade or other state / regional funding to advance implementation of JPB projects&lt;br&gt;- Work to address regulatory actions or policies that negatively impact future capacity or service improvements&lt;br&gt;- Consistent with existing agreements between JPB and CHSRA, support efforts to plan, engage stakeholders, and implement the Blended System project on the Caltrain corridor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2016, a new round of HSR Blended System planning, outreach and environmental clearance work will kick-off in the corridor. While this project is not being led by the JPB, the agency owns the right-of-way and has a significant interest in the process and success of the project that will “blended” with Caltrain service.
### 3. Regulatory and Administrative Issues (State/Regional)

#### Issues and Background

**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.

**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 and the Air Resources Board could set minimum purchase requirements as early as 2016.

**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.

**Sustainable Communities Strategies Implementation**
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.

**Commuter Benefits Program Pilot**
In 2012, SB 1339 authorized the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and Metropolitan Transportation Commission to adopt a regional commute benefit program, applicable to employers with 50 or more employees, to promote alternative commute modes such as transit, ridesharing, bicycling and walking. As of June 2015, approximately 3,800 employers had registered with the program, of which 53 percent reported they were offering commuter benefits for the first time.

#### Strategies

**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

**Zero Emission Bus Purchase Requirement**
- Monitor California Air Resources Board action on the implementation of the State’s zero emission bus purchase requirement and support strategies that recognize and address the financial challenges associated with mandating the procurement of zero emission buses and other strategies supported by transit agencies to reduce fleet emissions

**California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)**
- 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
- Support efforts to streamline project delivery including expedited reviews and approvals for large transportation projects such as HWY 101 HOV/HOT lane conversion and projects within the Dumbarton Rail Corridor

**Sustainable Communities Strategies Implementation**
- 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

**Commuter Benefits Program Pilot**
- Support legislation that extends the Commuter Benefit Program beyond December 31, 2016 when the pilot program is scheduled to end
# 2016 Legislative Program

## Federal Issues

### 1. Budget and Transportation Funding Opportunities (Federal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Federal Appropriations and Tax Extenders**  
Every year, Congress adopts several appropriations bills that cover 12 major issue areas, 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.  
Congress also considers legislation that governs tax and finance issues that impact transit agencies. | **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’s transportation services and needs  
- Work with local and regional coalitions to support requests for funding from discretionary programs  
- Continue to monitor legislation that impacts tax and finance issue relative to transit agencies |
| **Surface Transportation and Rail Authorization**  
In 2015, Congress passed Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, a five year bill that establishes funding levels and federal policy for the nation’s highways and public transit systems through Fiscal Year 2020. While the FAST Act included significant benefits for transportation agencies, it did not address several critical issues including the long-term solvency of the Highway Trust Fund. | **Surface Transportation and Rail Authorization**  
- 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 |

### 2. Transportation Projects – Funding Requests and Needs (Federal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Background</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **General**  
Support the efforts of partnering agencies to obtain federal funding for transit projects in San Mateo County.  
**Bus and Bus Facilities**  
Currently SamTrans has roughly 135 buses that were purchased in 2002-2003 that are near the end of their useful life. Federal grant funding must be pursued to replace the existing fleet.  
In addition, the United States Department of Labor is releasing previously awarded grant funding until the State resolves the pending PEPRA/13(c) conflict. Procurement of new buses is on hold until the issue is resolved. | **General**  
Work with federal delegation members, as well as local, regional, and state coalitions to support the federal funding requests for our partner transit agencies  
**Bus and Bus Facilities**  
- Advocate for additional funding for bus and bus facilities  
- Pursue a fix to the PEPRA/13(c) issue that prohibits the United States Department of Labor from withholding grant funding for transportation projects, capital and operations |
## 2. Transportation Projects – Funding Requests and Needs (Federal) Continued

### Issues and Background

**Caltrain Modernization Program**

The current Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project funding plan includes funding from several federal funding sources including the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Core Capacity Program. In October 2015, the JPB submitted the PCEP for consideration in the President’s FY17 budget under the FTA Core Capacity Program. To receive the funds, the JPB will need a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) with the FTA. The Core Capacity funding is an important part of the PCEP funding plan that will keep the project on track to award contracts in 2016.

**Other Projects**

Beyond the CalMod Program, the JPB has identified capital projects such as a fully electrified 8-car EMU fleet with longer platforms that will provide additional capacity and service benefits to Caltrain commuters. The capital needs also include but are not limited to grade separations, station upgrades, and supporting regional projects that will increase Caltrain ridership.

### Strategies

**Caltrain Modernization Program**

- Advocate for the PCEP to be included in the FY17 Core Capacity Program Presidential Budget and for a swift FFGA process with the FTA
- Work with federal delegation members, as well as local, regional, and state coalitions to support the PCEP requests for funding

**Other Projects**

- Support the allocation of federal funding to advance implementation of Caltrain projects
- Work with federal delegation members, as well as local, regional, and state coalitions to support requests for federal funding that will benefit transit service and ridership projects

## 3. Regulatory and Administrative Issues (Federal)

### Issues and Background

**FAST Act and other Regulations**

Under FAST Act, the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) will issue guidance and conduct rulemaking to implement various regulatory changes.

USDOT will also issue guidance, new rulemaking, and take action in response to executive orders on a variety of issues outside the scope of the FAST Act.

### Strategies

**FAST Act and other Regulations**

- Monitor and review guidance and rulemaking proposals affecting FAST Act implementation and other transportation issues
- Collaborate with local, regional, state and national transportation advocacy groups to coordinate comments and advocacy efforts that support regulations that maximizes benefits for transportation programs, services and users
TO: Legislative Committee

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
General Manager/CEO

FROM: Seamus Murphy
Chief Communications Officer

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
Transportation Funding Proposals
On January 7th Governor Brown released his proposed 2016-2017 State Budget. The budget consists of a $122.6 billion spending plan which is up $6 billion from last year’s $116 billion plan.

For transportation spending, the Governor proposes to spend $1.7 billion in 2016-17 with $590 million going to local streets and roads, $409 million for transit, $211 million for investments in trade corridors, and $515 million for highway repairs and maintenance.

The proposal lays out the foundation for a 10-year funding plan that will provide a total of $36 billion for transportation with an emphasis on repairing and maintaining the existing transportation infrastructure.

Assembly Member Jim Frazier, Chair of the Assembly Transportation Committee, introduced his own transportation spending plan, Assembly Bill 1591, which will raise approximately $7 billion annually and will mostly fund trade corridor improvements and road maintenance. His proposal doubles the amount of cap and trade funds going into the Transit and Intercity Rail Program from 10 percent to 20 percent, and provides 20 percent of the remaining 40 percent unallocated cap and trade funds for trade corridor improvements.

Summaries of both proposals and a chart comparing the proposals can be found in the agenda packet.
FEDERAL ISSUES

National Transit Database Expansion
The Federal Transit Administration has proposed expanding reporting requirements of asset inventory in the National Transit Database. Staff commented on the proposed expansion and copy of the letter can be found in the correspondence packet.

2017 Budget
President Obama’s Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 budget is expected to be released on February 9, 2016. The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board has requested that the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project be part of the FY2017 budget and funded through the Federal Transit Administration Core Capacity Program.

Prepared By: Shweta Bhatnagar, Government Affairs Officer 650-508-6385
Date: January 7, 2016

To: Jim Hartnett, General Manager, San Mateo County Transit District

From: Joshua Shaw, Partner
Matt Robinson, Legislative Advocate

Re: Proposed California State Budget 2016-2017

The Governor released his proposed 2016-2017 State Budget this morning. Overall, his Department of Finance expects General Fund State Revenues for 2016-17 to total $125 billion and he proposed to spend $122.6 billion of General Fund Revenue (please note there are special funds that increase the overall size of the Budget). The Governor proposes to put a supplemental deposit of $2 billion into the state’s Rainy Day Fund – boosting the balance to $8 billion, from 37 percent today to 65 percent of its constitutional target

The budget summary is laden with references to the next recession. The Governor also noted that historically, deficits are more likely than surpluses. To pre-emptively strike against the likely Legislative proposals to fund more permanent programs, the Governor included these comments in his Budget letter to the Legislature when he presented it today:

...But it would be short-sighted in the extreme to now embark upon a host of new spending only to see massive cuts when the next recession hits. In view of the $27 billion deficit of just five years ago and the much larger one in 2009, it is clear that fiscal restraint must be the order of the day. It also goes without saying that we should be chipping away at the $72 billion unfunded liability that weighs down our retiree health system.

Transportation/Transit/Infrastructure

The Governor’s 2016-17 Proposed Budget doubles down on the need to find a solution to our state’s transportation infrastructure and again points to his proposal to invest $36 billion in transportation over the next decade. The Governor reminds us that the Legislature has convened a conference committee as part of the transportation special session and that work continues toward delivering a comprehensive transportation funding plan and hopes the conference committee will focus on a few key principles:

• Focusing new revenue primarily on “fix-it-first” investments to repair neighborhood roads and state highways and bridges;
• Making key investments in trade corridors to support continued economic growth and implementing a sustainable freight strategy;
• Providing funding to match locally generated funds for high-priority transportation projects;
• Continuing measures to improve performance, accountability and efficiency at Caltrans. Investing in passenger rail and public transit modernization and improvement;
• **Avoiding an impact on the precariously balanced General Fund.**

The Governor’s package includes “a combination of new revenues, additional investments of Cap and Trade auction proceeds, accelerated loan repayments, Caltrans efficiencies & streamlined project delivery, accountability measures, and constitutional protections for the new revenues” and will be split evenly between state and local transportation priorities. As was the case in September 2015, the Governor’s package focuses on maintenance and preservation, and also includes a significant investment in public transit. Specifically, the proposal includes annualized resources as follows:

- **Road Improvement Charge**—$2 billion from a new $65 fee on all vehicles, including hybrids and electrics;
- **Stabilize Gasoline Excise Tax**—$500 million by setting the gasoline excise tax beginning in 2017-18 at the historical average of 18 cents, eliminating the current annual adjustments, and adjusting the tax annually for inflation;
- **Diesel Excise Tax**—$500 million from an 11-cent increase in the diesel excise tax beginning in 2017-18, adjusted annually for inflation;
- **Cap and Trade**—$500 million in additional Cap and Trade proceeds for complete streets and transit;
- **Caltrans Efficiencies**—$100 million in cost-saving reforms.

Additionally, the Budget includes a General Fund commitment to transportation by accelerating $879 million in loan repayments over the next four years. These funds will support additional investments in the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, trade corridor improvements, and repairs on local roads and the state highway system.

The Governor’s Budget proposed spending a lesser amount in 2016-17 ($1.7 billion) and then ramps up to $3.6 billion the following year. In the table below, you can see how the $1.7 billion in new revenue would be split out in 2016-17 and then the upward adjustment moving forward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Category</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2016-17 Amount</th>
<th>Annualized Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets and Roads</td>
<td>Low Carbon Road Program</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Road Maintenance &amp; Repairs</td>
<td>$490</td>
<td>$1,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Partnership Grants</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Transit Capital¹</td>
<td>$409</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pavement¹</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridges and Culverts</td>
<td>$155</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traffic Management Systems</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td>Improved Goods Movement</td>
<td>$211</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,725</td>
<td>$3,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The 2016-17 totals include anticipated loan repayments.
² Provides up to $250 million per year beginning in 2017-18.
³ Excludes one-time loan repayments totaling $879 million.
Caltrans Reform
The transportation package also includes the following reforms and efficiencies at Caltrans to streamline project delivery and advance projects more quickly:

- **State Highway Performance Plan**—Establish measurable targets for improvement including regular reporting to California Transportation Commission, the Legislature, and the public.
- **Streamlined Project Delivery**—Provide a limited California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemption; remove the sunset date for the federal delegation of environmental reviews so they can be completed concurrent with the state review; advance project environmental mitigation to get early buy-in on activities and reduce late challenges that delay projects; and implement more innovative procurement methods, such as combining design and construction management elements to accelerate project delivery, commonly known as Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC) procurements.
- **Staffing Flexibility**— Permit Caltrans to deliver projects funded with new revenue by doubling contract staff over the next five years.
- **Extend Public-Private Partnership Authority**— Allow for these partnerships through 2027 by extending the current sunset date by ten years.

Transit
The Governor’s Budget projects the State Transit Assistance program will be $315 million in 2016-17. **This represents a decrease of $36 million over the current year projection of $351 million.** This is due to a continued reduction in the price of diesel fuel over the level realized in years past.

The Governor’s Budget reflect no change in anticipated revenues to each of the Cap and Trade Programs eligible to transit programs from continuous appropriations, and expenditure are proposed as follows:

- **Low-Carbon Transit Operations Program**—$100 million
- **Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program**—$200 million
- **Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities**—$400 million

The Governor’s Plan Cap and Trade plan also acknowledges his transportation funding proposal mentioned above, proposed expenditures as follows:

- **Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program**—$400 million ($600 million total)
- **Low Carbon Road Program (Complete Streets)**—$100 million
- **Low Carbon Transportation**—$500 million

Cap and Trade
The Governor’s 2016-17 Proposed Budget includes expenditures of $3.1 billion Cap and Trade from, which includes revenues form both 2015-16 and 2016-17. The Governor’s Budget ventures to fund programs that support clean transportation, reduce short-lived climate pollutants, protect natural ecosystems, and benefit disadvantaged communities. **The $3.1 billion plan reflects the balance of auction proceeds that were not appropriated in 2015-16, as well as the expenditure of projected proceeds in 2016-17.** This Plan is consistent with the second triennial investment plan for Cap and Trade auction proceeds and expends at least 10 percent of the proceeds within disadvantaged communities and at least 25 percent of the proceeds to projects that benefit those communities.

Please see the chart below for a breakdown of Cap and Trade funding in the 2016-17 Proposed Budget:
A link to the summary of the Governor’s proposed budget can be found here: [http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/FullBudgetSummary.pdf](http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/FullBudgetSummary.pdf)

We will provide more details as they become available. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions you have about the budget.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Element</th>
<th>Governor's Proposal</th>
<th>AB 1591 (Frazier)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective Term</strong></td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$3.6 billion/year</td>
<td>$7 billion/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing Sources</strong></td>
<td>*6 cents/gal. tax increase on gasoline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*11 cents/gal. tax increase on diesel fuel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*$65 “road improvement charge”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*CalTrans efficiencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*22.5 cents/gal. tax increase on gasoline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*30 cents/gal. tax increase on diesel fuel (dedicated exclusively to trade corridor improvements)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*$38 vehicle registration fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*$165 zero emission vehicle fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Restoration of truck weight fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One-Time Revenue/Sources</strong></td>
<td>*$879 million in loan repayments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*$500 million in Cap and Trade revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit and Intercity Rail</strong></td>
<td>One-time $665 million to Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program ($400 million expected to be ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complete Streets</strong></td>
<td>One-time $100 million to Low Carbon Road Program (expected to be ongoing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goods Movement</strong></td>
<td>*$200 million/year to newly-created Trade Corridor Enhancement Account (to be used in manner consistent with TCIF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*One-time $334 million to Trade Corridor Enhancement Account</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*$840 million/year to trade corridor improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*20% in Cap and Trade auction proceeds (approx. $400 million) to trade corridor improvements annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Help Incentives</strong></td>
<td>$250 million/year</td>
<td>5% to counties that approve transaction and use tax on or after July 1, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distribution of Remainder</strong></td>
<td>*60% to SHOPP/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*40% to Local Streets &amp; Roads/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*One-time $148 million to Traffic Congestion Relief Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*One-time $132 million to SHOPP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inflation Adjustment</strong></td>
<td>Excise tax adjusted annually beginning 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Streets and Road Fund Flexibility</strong></td>
<td>*Other transportation priorities” allowed if PCI exceeds 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Transportation Eligibility</strong></td>
<td>Active transportation and pedestrian and bicycle safety projects in conjunction with any other allowable project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CalTrans Accountability</strong></td>
<td>*CTC to annually evaluate Caltrans for effectiveness in reducing deferred maintenance, improving road maintenance and other goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Caltrans to identify at least $100 million in cost savings/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Increase annual use of contract staff to 20% of capital outlay support staff by FY 20-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Streets and Road Fund Accountability</strong></td>
<td>CTC to annually evaluate cities and counties for effectiveness in reducing deferred maintenance, improving road maintenance and other goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSEMBLY BILL 1591: TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

Assemblymember Jim Frazier

THE PROBLEM IN BRIEF:

California’s transportation infrastructure is extremely underfunded, which has led to significant deferred maintenance and a lost opportunity on economic growth. The current resources are not sufficient to cover the most basic and crucial maintenance and repair of our core transportation infrastructure: state highways, local streets, roads, and bridges. Without increased funding today, the deferred maintenance will soon be too much for our state to catch up.

BACKGROUND:

2015 was supposed to be the year to fix transportation funding in the Capitol. The Governor declared a $6 billion a year need for basic maintenance and repairs to state highways alone and challenged the Legislature to deliver a funding plan to meet that need. A special session was called, hearings were held, and proposals and counter-proposals were floated. Nonetheless, the call for more transportation funding went unanswered.

THE BILL:

AB 1591 answers the call for a long-term sustainable funding solution for transportation focused on relieving congestion, maintaining highways, and improving trade corridors. This bill provides nearly $8 billion a year in additional transportation funding. It also provides clear direction as to how those funds will be used.

AB 1591 takes a broad portfolio approach to investing in our state’s transportation infrastructure by:

- Increasing the excise tax on gasoline by 22.5 cents per gallon and indexing it against the Consumer Price Index every three years thereafter. Almost half of this amount (9.5 cents) will restore funding lost from declining tax revenues in just the last two years due to rate adjustments by the Board of Equalization.

  Revenue raised from the gas tax increase (over $3.3 billion annually) will be split 50/50 between the state and local transportation authorities for highway maintenance and rehabilitation, after setting a nominal portion aside to encourage state-local partnerships.

- Increasing the diesel fuel tax by 30 cents a gallon and indexing it, too. Revenue raised ($840 million annually) will be directed right to where trucks need it most—the state's trade corridors.

- Increasing the vehicle registration fee by $38 annually (just over 10 cents a day) and directing those funds ($1.254 billion) to road maintenance and rehabilitation.

- Imposing an electric vehicle surcharge of $165. Consideration will be given to delaying this fee until the second year of ownership and thereafter. Delaying this fee to the second year of ownership allows financial incentives offered at the purchase of such zero-emission vehicles to remain in full effect while ensuring they do their part to help pay for the system they travel on. The $16 million raised will be directed to road maintenance and rehabilitation.

- Requiring repayment of outstanding transportation loans. Now that the General Fund is stable, it’s time to pay these loans ($879 million) back. Repayments will be sent directly to cities and counties to boost their road improvement efforts.

- Allocating cap and trade revenue auctions, as follows:
  - 20% (approximately $400 million annually) for major freight corridors. Communities near our major freight corridors have borne the brunt of the nation's goods movement system. Improving congestion in these corridors will inherently improve air quality.
  - 10% ($200 million) more for intercity rail and transit, for a total of 20% of the auction proceeds.

- Restoring the truck weight fees. Again, the General Fund is now stable. It’s time for transportation dollars to go back to transportation. This restores $1 billion to the State Highway Account where it belongs.

AB 1591 also includes greater oversight responsibilities for the California Transportation Commission over the state’s roadway operation and rehabilitation efforts and imposes maintenance of effort requirements on cities and counties.

Finally, AB 1591 supports local communities and regional planning efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. It provides the critical funding needed to implement sustainable communities’ strategies.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Janet Dawson  
(916) 319-2093  
Janet.Dawson@asm.ca.gov
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 61</strong></td>
<td>12/17/2015-A. TRANS. 1/12/2016-From committee: Without further action pursuant to Joint Rule 62(a).</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. The bill would state that it is the intent of the Legislature to not replace public transit services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 156</strong></td>
<td>8/28/2015-S. 2 YEAR 8/28/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(11). (Last location was APPR. on 8/27/2015)</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 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 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. Existing law requires the 3-year investment plan to allocate a minimum of 25% of the available moneys in the fund to projects that provide benefits to disadvantaged communities. This bill would require the state board to prepare and post on its Internet Web site a specified report on the projects funded to benefit disadvantaged communities. 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><strong>AB 318</strong></td>
<td>7/17/2015-S. 2 YEAR 7/17/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(10). (Last location was JUD. on 6/11/2015)</td>
<td>Existing law requires a person who finds and takes possession of property that is lost to try and return it to the rightful owner. If the owner of the lost property cannot be determined and the item is worth $100 or more, the finder is required to turn the item over to the police or sheriff, as specified. Existing law provides 90 days for the owner to return and claim the property and to pay any reasonable fee for its bailment. Existing law requires, if the reported value of the property is $250 or more and the owner does not return and claim the property, the police or the sheriff to cause notice of the property to be published, as provided. This bill, until December 31, 2020, would provide that if that lost property is found on a vehicle of public conveyance or on public transit property, that it instead be turned in to the public transit agency, and would provide 90 days for the owner to return and claim the property, as specified. The bill, until December 31, 2020, also would require the public transit agency to cause notice of the property to be published under the circumstances described above. The bill, until January 1, 2021, would authorize a transit agency to utilize alternate unclaimed property procedures with respect to lost or unclaimed bicycles turned in to or held by that public transit agency. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td><strong>Oppose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 378</strong></td>
<td>1/4/2016-A. TRANS. 1/11/2016-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>Existing law provides that the Department of Transportation has full possession and control of the state highway system. Existing law imposes various requirements for the development and implementation of transportation projects. This bill would require the department, in coordination with the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, to create an integrated corridor management team to consider transportation projects addressing congestion relief in the State Highway Route 101 corridor located within the County of San Mateo.</td>
<td><strong>Support</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 471</strong></td>
<td>5/15/2015-A. 2 YEAR&lt;br&gt;5/15/2015-Failed&lt;br&gt;Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(3). (Last location was PRINT on 2/23/2015)</td>
<td>Existing law prohibits, subject to certain exceptions, an employer from requiring an employee to work more than 5 hours per day without providing a meal period. This bill would make a nonsubstantive change to those provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 516</strong></td>
<td>9/11/2015-S. 2 YEAR&lt;br&gt;9/11/2015-Failed&lt;br&gt;Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(14). (Last location was INACTIVE FILE on 9/10/2015)</td>
<td>Existing law requires the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), upon registering a vehicle, to issue to the owner 2 license plates, as specified. Existing law also requires vehicle dealers and lessor-retailers to attach a numbered report-of-sale form issued by the DMV to a vehicle at the time of sale, and to submit to the DMV an application for registration of the vehicle, and the applicable fees, within a specified period after the date of sale. Existing law authorizes a dealer, as specified, to assess a specified document processing charge on the purchaser or lessee of a vehicle for the preparation and processing of documents, disclosures, and titling, registration, and information security obligations imposed by state and federal law. Existing law generally makes a violation of the Vehicle Code an infraction, but makes counterfeiting a license plate a felony. This bill would require the DMV to develop an operational system, no later than January 1, 2018, that allows a dealer or lessor-retailer to electronically report the sale of a vehicle and provide a temporary license plate, as specified. The bill would, commencing January 1, 2017, authorize the department to assess specified administrative fees on processing agencies to support the administration of this system. The bill would also, commencing January 1, 2018, increase the document processing charge, as specified, that a dealer may impose on the purchaser or lessee of a vehicle, and would authorize the imposition of a specified electronic filing charge for reporting vehicle sales and producing temporary license plates. The bill would authorize the DMV to establish contracts with qualified industry partners to provide these vehicle sale reporting and temporary license plate services. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 528</td>
<td>1/6/2016-A. P.E.,R. &amp; S.S. 1/6/2016-In committee: Set, first hearing. Failed passage.</td>
<td>Existing law creates the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District and establishes provisions regulating the collective bargaining of the employees and the board of directors of that district. Existing law prescribes procedures specifically relating to the collective bargaining of transit districts, and authorizes the Governor, when it appears a strike will significantly disrupt transportation services and endanger public health, safety, and welfare, to appoint a board to investigate issues in connection with these labor negotiations and make a report. Existing law prohibits a strike during the period of investigation and permits the Governor, upon receiving a report from a board of investigation, to request the Attorney General to petition a court to enjoin the strike, as specified. This bill would prohibit employees of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District from engaging in a strike or work stoppage if the transit district board maintains the compensation and benefit provisions of an expired contract and an employee or employee organization has agreed to a provision prohibiting strikes in the expired or previous written labor contract. The bill would provide that an employee whom the transit district employer finds willfully engaged in a strike or work stoppage in violation of these provisions is subject to dismissal if that finding is sustained upon conclusion of the appropriate proceedings necessary for the imposition of a disciplinary action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### San Mateo County Transit District
State Legislative Matrix 1/25/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 584</strong></td>
<td>5/29/2015-A. 2 YEAR 5/29/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). (Last location was RLS. on 4/8/2015)</td>
<td>Existing law creates the Joint Legislative Retirement Committee, prescribes the composition of the committee, and requires the committee to study and review the benefits, programs, actuarial condition, practices, investments and procedures of, and all legislation relating to, retirement systems for public officers and employees in this state as well as trends in the field of retirement. Existing law requires a copy of each bill that affects any public employee retirement system to be transmitted to the committee. Existing law requires the committee to establish a board of experts, the composition of which is prescribed, and to retain an independent actuary as a consultant to the board of experts. Existing law makes a statement of legislative findings in this regard. This bill would rename the committee the Joint Pension Administration and Sustainability Committee and, in addition to the duties described above, would require the committee to make reports and recommendations to the Legislature on these retirement issues. The bill would revise the composition of the committee to reflect current legislative practice. The bill would require the committee to transmit an analysis for each bill submitted to it, including an actuarial opinion if appropriate, to the policy committee that is responsible for the bill. The bill would require the committee to retain a legal advisor recognized for expertise in pension and investment law and an academician from a California university with recognized expertise in investing, pension administration, and the operation of financial markets to act as consultants to its board of experts. The bill would revise the statement of legislative findings associated with these provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 828</strong></td>
<td>9/11/2015-S. 2 YEAR 9/11/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(14). (Last location was E. U., &amp; C. on 7/16/2015)</td>
<td>Existing law establishes the Public Utilities Commission and designates the duties of the commission, including regulating specified transportation carriers. This bill would require the commission to conduct an investigation to consider whether existing statutes and regulations relating to transportation services serve the public interest, encourage innovation, and create a fair and competitive transportation market between companies that provide regulated transportation services. The bill would require the commission to complete the investigation and report its conclusions and recommendations to the Legislature on or before January 1, 2017. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 857</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perea D</td>
<td>8/28/2015-S. 2 YEAR 8/28/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(11). (Last location was APPR. on 8/27/2015)</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 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 as part of a market-based compliance mechanism to be deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and to be available upon appropriation by the Legislature. This bill, between January 2, 2018, and January 1, 2023, inclusive, annually would require no less than 50% or $100,000,000, whichever is greater, of the moneys allocated for technology development, demonstration, precommercial pilots, and early commercial deployments of zero- and near-zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty truck technology be allocated and spent to support the commercial deployment of existing zero- and near-zero-emission heavy-duty truck technology that meets or exceeds a specified emission standard. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 869</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper D</td>
<td>9/11/2015-S. 2 YEAR 9/11/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(14). (Last location was INACTIVE FILE on 7/2/2015)</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes a public transportation agency to adopt and enforce an ordinance to impose and enforce civil administrative penalties for fare evasion or other passenger misconduct, other than by minors, on or in a transit facility or vehicle in lieu of the criminal penalties otherwise applicable, with specified administrative procedures for the imposition and enforcement of the administrative penalties, including an initial review and opportunity for a subsequent administrative hearing. This bill would provide that a person who fails to pay the administrative penalty when due or successfully complete the administrative process to dismiss the notice of fare evasion or passenger conduct violation may be subject to those criminal penalties. The bill would require the notice of fare evasion or passenger conduct violation to contain a printed statement that the person may be charged with an infraction or misdemeanor if the administrative penalty is not paid when due or dismissed pursuant to these provisions. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1336</strong></td>
<td>1/21/2016-A. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE 1/21/2016-In committee: Set, first hearing. Referred to APPR. suspense file. Held under submission.</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 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 as part of a market-based compliance mechanism to be deposited in the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and to be available upon appropriation. This bill would establish and require the Strategic Growth Council, in coordination with the state board, to administer the Community Climate Improvement Program to provide grants for the development and implementation of regional projects that reduce or sequester greenhouse gas emissions. The bill would require the council, in coordination with the state board, to develop guidelines for the program. The bill would require the council to implement the program with moneys appropriated from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1340</strong></td>
<td>1/5/2016-A. TRANS. 1/6/2016-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>Existing law imposes a 40-foot limitation on the length of vehicles that may be operated on the highways, with specified exemptions. Existing law exempts from this limitation a bus, except a schoolbus, operated by a public agency or a passenger stage corporation, as defined, used in transit system service if the bus is equipped with a folding device attached to the front of the bus that is designed and used exclusively for transporting bicycles, the device does not materially affect efficiency or visibility of vehicle safety equipment, and the length of the bus, exclusive of that device, does not exceed 40 feet in length. In addition, existing law prohibits, among other things, the above-described device from extending more than 40 inches from the front body of the bus when fully deployed. This bill would instead prohibit the above-described device from extending more than 40 inches from the front of the bus.</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 1364 Linder R</td>
<td>1/21/2016-A. CONSENT CALENDAR 1/21/2016-From committee: Do pass. To Consent Calendar. (Ayes 17, Noes 0.) (January 21). Read second time. Ordered to Consent Calendar.</td>
<td>Existing law establishes in the state government the Transportation Agency, which includes various departments and state entities, including the California Transportation Commission. Existing law vests the California Transportation Commission with specified powers, duties, and functions relative to transportation matters. Existing law requires the commission to retain independent authority to perform the duties and functions prescribed to it under any provision of law. This bill would exclude the California Transportation Commission from the Transportation Agency and establish it as an entity in the state government. The bill would also make conforming changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1384 Baker R</td>
<td>1/4/2016-A. TRANS. 1/7/2016-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>Existing law designates the Metropolitan Transportation Commission as the regional transportation planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area. Existing law creates the Bay Area Toll Authority, governed by the same board as the commission, with specified powers and duties relative to the administration of toll revenues from state-owned toll bridges within the geographic jurisdiction of the commission. Existing law authorizes the authority to make direct contributions to the commission in furtherance of the exercise of the authority's powers, including contributions in the form of personnel services, office space, overhead, and other funding necessary to carry out the function of the authority, with those contributions not to exceed 1% of the gross annual bridge revenues. This bill would instead limit the direct contributions by the authority to the commission in any fiscal year to 1% of funds available to the authority in that fiscal year, and would impose a similar restriction on loans from the authority to the commission.</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 1550</td>
<td>1/4/2016-A. PRINT 1/5/2016-From printer. May be heard in committee February 4.</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 act requires the board to adopt greenhouse gas emission limits and emission reduction measures by regulation, and authorizes the state board to include the use of market-based compliance mechanisms to comply with the regulations. Existing law requires all moneys, except for fines and penalties, collected by the state board 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 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. Existing law requires the investment plan to allocate a minimum of 25% of the available moneys in the fund to projects that provide benefits to disadvantaged communities and a minimum of 10% to projects located in disadvantaged communities. Existing law provides that the allocation of 10% for projects located in disadvantaged communities may be used for projects included in the minimum allocation of 25% for projects that provide benefits to disadvantaged communities. This bill would instead require the investment plan to allocate a minimum of 25% of the available moneys in the fund to projects located within disadvantaged communities and a separate and additional 25% to projects that benefit low-income households.</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 1552</strong></td>
<td>1/4/2016-A. PRINT 1/5/2016-From printer. May be heard in committee February 4.</td>
<td>Existing law requires that contracts between private parties and public entities, defined to include specified local entities, contain various specified provisions. This bill would, with certain exceptions, prohibit a public entity from entering into a contract to acquire or dispose of goods, services, information technology, or construction unless the contract includes a representation that the contractor is not currently engaged in, and an agreement that the contractor will not during the duration of the contract engage in, the boycott, as defined, of a person or an entity based in or doing business with a jurisdiction with which the state can enjoy open trade, defined as a state that is a member of the World Trade Organization. The bill would specify that these provisions constitute a matter of statewide concern. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gomez D</strong></td>
<td>1/4/2016-A. PRINT 1/5/2016-From printer. May be heard in committee February 4.</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. This bill would state the intent of the Legislature to enact future legislation that would appropriate $1,700,000,000 from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund for the 2015-16 fiscal year that would be allocated to different entities in amounts to be determined in the future legislation for purposes including low carbon transportation and infrastructure, clean energy communities, and community climate improvements, wetland and watershed restoration, and carbon sequestration.</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 1569</strong></td>
<td>1/4/2016-A. PRINT 1/5/2016-From printer. May be heard in committee February 4.</td>
<td>The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. This bill would exempt from the provisions of CEQA a project, or the issuance of a permit for a project, that consists of the inspection, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, replacement, or removal of, or the addition of an auxiliary lane or bikeway to, existing transportation infrastructure and that meets certain requirements. The bill would require the public agency carrying out the project to take certain actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1572</strong></td>
<td>1/4/2016-A. PRINT 1/5/2016-From printer. May be heard in committee February 4.</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes the governing board of a school district to provide for the transportation of pupils to and from school whenever in the judgment of the board the transportation is advisable and good reasons exist to do so. This bill would entitle a pupil who attends a school that is eligible for Title 1 federal funding to free transportation to and from school provided by the local educational agency, if certain conditions are met. The bill would require the local educational agency to designate a liaison to implement a plan developed, in consultation with specified stakeholders, to ensure that all entitled pupils receive free transportation in a timely manner. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1591</strong></td>
<td>1/6/2016-A. PRINT 1/7/2016-From printer. May be heard in committee February 6.</td>
<td>Existing law provides various sources of funding for transportation purposes, including funding for the state highway system and the local street and road system. These funding sources include, among others, fuel excise taxes, commercial vehicle weight fees, local transactions and use taxes, and federal funds. Existing law imposes certain registration fees on vehicles, with revenues from these fees deposited in the Motor Vehicle Account and used to fund the Department of Motor Vehicles and the Department of the California Highway Patrol. Existing law provides for the monthly transfer of excess balances in the Motor Vehicle Account to the State Highway Account. This bill would create the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program to address deferred maintenance on the state highway system and the local street and road system. The bill would require the California Transportation Commission to adopt performance criteria to ensure efficient use of the funds available for the program. The bill would provide for the deposit of various funds for the program in the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account, which the bill would create in the State Transportation Fund, including revenues attributable to a $0.225 per gallon increase in the motor vehicle fuel (gasoline) tax imposed by the bill, including an inflation adjustment as provided, an increase of $38 in the annual vehicle registration fee, and a new $165 annual vehicle registration fee applicable to zero-emission motor vehicles, as defined. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AB 1595** Campos D | 1/6/2016-A. PRINT 1/7/2016-From printer. May be heard in committee February 6. | Existing law establishes the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement in the Department of Industrial Relations for the enforcement of labor laws, and establishes certain obligations on an employer, including, requiring an employer to post specified wage and hour information in a location where it can be viewed by employees. Under existing law, any person who deprives or violates the personal liberty of another with the intent to obtain forced labor or services is guilty of the crime of human trafficking.

This bill would require a private or public employer that provides mass transportation services, as specified, in the state to train its employees, who are likely to interact or come into contact with victims of human trafficking, in recognizing the signs of human trafficking and how to report those signs to the appropriate law enforcement agency. The bill would require that, by January 1, 2018, the training be incorporated into the initial training process for all new employees and that all existing employees receive the training. |
| **AB 1640** Stone, Mark D | 1/7/2016-A. PRINT 1/8/2016-From printer. May be heard in committee February 7. | The California Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA) requires a public retirement system, as defined, to modify its plan or plans to comply with the act and, among other provisions, establishes new retirement formulas that may not be exceeded by a public employer offering a defined benefit pension plan for employees first hired on or after January 1, 2013. PEPRA exempts from its provisions certain public employees whose collective bargaining rights are subject to specified provisions of federal law until a specified federal district court decision on a certification by the United States Secretary of Labor, or until January 1, 2016, whichever is sooner.

This bill would extend indefinitely that exemption for those public employees, whose collective bargaining rights are subject to specified provisions of federal law and who became a member of a state or local public retirement system prior to December 30, 2014. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 1641</td>
<td>1/11/2016-A. PRINT 1/12/2016-From printer. May be heard in committee February 11.</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. The bill would state that it is the intent of the Legislature to not replace public transit services. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1661</td>
<td>1/13/2016-A. PRINT 1/14/2016-From printer. May be heard in committee February 13.</td>
<td>Existing law requires all local agency officials to receive training in ethics, at specified intervals, if the local agency provides any type of compensation, salary, or stipend to those officials. Existing law also requires any civil or political subdivision of the state and all cities to provide at least 2 hours of training and education regarding sexual harassment to all supervisory employees, as specified. This bill would additionally require local agency officials, as defined, to receive sexual harassment training and education if the local agency provides any type of compensation, salary, or stipend to those officials, and would allow a local agency to require employees to receive sexual harassment training or information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AB 1665** Bonilla D  
Transactions and use taxes: County of Alameda, County of Contra Costa, and Contra Costa Transportation Authority. | 1/14/2016-A. PRINT 1/15/2016-From printer. May be heard in committee February 14. | Existing law authorizes the County of Alameda and the County of Contra Costa to impose a transactions and use tax for the support of countywide transportation programs at a rate of no more than 0.5% that, in combination with other specified taxes, exceeds the combined rate of all these taxes that may be imposed, if certain requirements are met, including a requirement that the ordinance proposing the transactions and use tax be submitted to, and approved by, the voters. Existing law repeals this authority on December 31, 2020, if the ordinance is not approved by the voters by that date. This bill would extend this taxing authority of the County of Alameda until December 31, 2014, and would shift this same taxing authority, or so extended, from the County of Contra Costa to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority. |  |
| **ABX1 1** Alejo D  
Transportation funding. | 6/23/2015-A. PRINT 6/24/2015-From printer. | Existing law provides for loans of revenues from various transportation funds and accounts to the General Fund, with various repayment dates specified. This bill, with respect to any loans made to the General Fund from specified transportation funds and accounts with a repayment date of January 1, 2019, or later, would require the loans to be repaid by December 31, 2018. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. |  |
| **ABX1 2** Perea D  
Transportation projects: comprehensive development lease agreements. | 6/25/2015-A. PRINT 6/26/2015-From printer. | Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation and regional transportation agencies, as defined, to enter into comprehensive development lease agreements with public and private entities, or consortia of those entities, for certain transportation projects that may charge certain users of those projects tolls and user fees, subject to various terms and requirements. These arrangements are commonly known as public-private partnerships. Existing law provides that a lease agreement may not be entered into under these provisions on or after January 1, 2017. This bill would extend this authorization indefinitely and would include within the definition of "regional transportation agency" the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, thereby authorizing the authority to enter into public-private partnerships under these provisions. The bill would also delete obsolete cross-references and make technical changes to these provisions. |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABX1 3</td>
<td>9/24/2015-A. CONFERENCE COMMITTEE 9/24/2015-Senators Beall (Co-Chair), Allen, Leyva, Cannella, and Gaines appointed to Conference Committee.</td>
<td>Existing law requires the Department of Transportation to improve and maintain the state’s highways, and establishes various programs to fund the development, construction, and repair of local roads, bridges, and other critical transportation infrastructure in the state. This bill would declare the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation to establish permanent, sustainable sources of transportation funding to maintain and repair highways, local roads, bridges, and other critical infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABX1 6</td>
<td>7/16/2015-A. PRINT 7/17/2015-From printer.</td>
<td>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 by the Legislature. Existing law continuously appropriates 20% of the annual proceeds of the fund to the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program, administered by the Strategic Growth Council, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through projects that implement land use, housing, transportation, and agricultural land preservation practices to support infill and compact development and that support other related and coordinated public policy objectives. This bill would require 20% of moneys available for allocation under the program to be allocated to eligible projects in rural areas, as defined. The bill would further require at least 50% of those moneys to be allocated to eligible affordable housing projects. The bill would require the council to amend its guidelines and selection criteria consistent with these requirements and to consult with interested stakeholders in this regard.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABX1 7</td>
<td>7/16/2015-A. PRINT 7/17/2015-From printer.</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 instead continuously appropriate 20% of those annual proceeds to the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 10% of those annual proceeds to the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program, thereby making an appropriation. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABX1 8</strong></td>
<td>7/16/2015-A. PRINT 7/17/2015-From printer.</td>
<td>Existing law, beyond the sales and use tax rate generally applicable, imposes an additional sales and use tax on diesel fuel at the rate of 1.75%, subject to certain exemptions, and provides for the net revenues collected from the additional tax to be transferred to the Public Transportation Account. Existing law continuously appropriates these revenues to the Controller, for allocation by formula to transportation agencies for public transit purposes. This bill, effective July 1, 2016, would increase the additional sales and use tax rate on diesel fuel to 5.25%. By increasing the revenues deposited in a continuously appropriated fund, the bill would thereby make an appropriation. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chiu D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel sales and use tax.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>ABX1 10</strong> | 8/19/2015-A. PRINT 8/20/2015-From printer. | Existing law sets forth requirements for provisions in public works contracts awarded by a state entity. Under existing law, the state or any other public entity in any competitively bid public works contract may provide for the payment of extra compensation to the contractor for cost reduction changes. This bill would provide that a state entity in a megainfrastructure project contract, as defined, may not provide for the payment of extra compensation to the contractor until the megainfrastructure project, as defined, has been completed and an independent third party has verified that the megainfrastructure project meets all architectural or engineering plans and safety specifications of the contract. This bill would apply to contracts entered into or amended on or after the effective date of this bill. | |
| <strong>Levine D</strong> | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABX1 13 Grove R</td>
<td>8/31/2015-A. PRINT 9/1/2015</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: streets and highways. 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 continuously appropriates 20% of the annual proceeds of the fund to the Strategic Growth Council for the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program, as provided. This bill would reduce the continuous appropriation to the Strategic Growth Council for the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program by half. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABX1 14 Waldron R</td>
<td>8/31/2015-A. PRINT 9/1/2015</td>
<td>State Highway Operation and Protection Program: local streets and roads: appropriation. Existing law requires the Department of Transportation to prepare a State Highway Operation and Protection Program every other year for the expenditure of transportation capital improvement funds for projects that are necessary to preserve and protect the state highway system, excluding projects that add new traffic lanes. Existing law provides for apportionment of specified portions of revenues in the Highway Users Tax Account derived from gasoline and diesel excise taxes to cities and counties by formula, with the remaining revenues to be deposited in the State Highway Account for expenditure on various state transportation programs, including maintenance of state highways and transportation capital improvement projects. This bill would continuously appropriate $1 billion from the General Fund, with 50% to be made available to the Department of Transportation for maintenance of the state highway system or for purposes of the State Highway Operation and Protection Program, and 50% to be made available to the Controller for apportionment to cities and counties by a specified formula for street and road purposes.</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>ABX1 15</strong>&lt;br&gt;Patterson R</td>
<td>8/31/2015-A. PRINT 9/1/2015-From printer.</td>
<td>Existing law appropriates the sum of $663,287,000 for the 2015-16 fiscal year from the State Highway Account to the Department of Transportation for Capital Outlay Support. This bill would reduce the $663,287,000 appropriation for Capital Outlay Support by $500 million, and would appropriate $500 million from the State Highway Account for the 2015-16 fiscal year, with 50% to be made available to the Department of Transportation for maintenance of the state highway system or for purposes of the State Highway Operation and Protection Program, and 50% to be made available to the Controller for apportionment to cities and counties by formula for street and road purposes. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABX1 17</strong>&lt;br&gt;Achadjian R</td>
<td>8/31/2015-A. PRINT 9/1/2015-From printer.</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 continuously appropriates 60% of the annual proceeds of the fund for transit, affordable housing, sustainable communities, and high-speed rail purposes. This bill, beginning in the 2016-17 fiscal year, would continuously appropriate 25% of the annual proceeds of the fund to fund projects in the state highway operation and protection program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABX1 18</strong></td>
<td>8/31/2015-A. PRINT 9/1/2015-From printer.</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 Account 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. This bill, notwithstanding these provisions or any other law, effective January 1, 2016, would prohibit weight fee revenue from being transferred from the State Highway Account to the Transportation Debt Service Fund or to the Transportation Bond Direct Payment Account, and from being used to pay the debt service on transportation general obligation bonds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linder R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABX1 19</strong></td>
<td>8/31/2015-A. PRINT 9/1/2015-From printer.</td>
<td>Existing law establishes in the state government the Transportation Agency, which includes various departments and state entities, including the California Transportation Commission. Existing law vests the California Transportation Commission with specified powers, duties, and functions relative to transportation matters. Existing law requires the commission to retain independent authority to perform the duties and functions prescribed to it under any provision of law. This bill would exclude the California Transportation Commission from the Transportation Agency and establish it as an entity in the state government. The bill would also make conforming changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linder R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABX1 23</td>
<td>9/4/2015-A. PRINT 9/5/2015-From printer.</td>
<td>Existing law requires the Department of Transportation to prepare a State Highway Operation and Protection Program every other year for the expenditure of transportation capital improvement funds for projects that are necessary to preserve and protect the state highway system, excluding projects that add new traffic lanes. Existing law provides for the programming of transportation capital improvement funds for other objectives through the State Transportation Improvement Program administered by the California Transportation Commission, which includes projects recommended by regional transportation planning agencies through adoption of a regional transportation improvement program and projects recommended by the department through adoption of an interregional transportation improvement program, as specified. This bill, by January 1, 2017, would require the California Transportation Commission to establish a process whereby the department and local agencies receiving funding for highway capital improvements from the State Highway Operation and Protection Program or the State Transportation Improvement Program prioritize projects that provide meaningful benefits to the mobility and safety needs of disadvantaged community residents, as specified. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABX1 24 Levine D</td>
<td>9/11/2015-A. PRINT 9/12/2015-From printer.</td>
<td>Existing law designates the Metropolitan Transportation Commission as the regional transportation planning agency for the San Francisco Bay area, with various powers and duties with respect to transportation planning and programming, as specified, in the 9-county San Francisco Bay area region. Existing law creates the Bay Area Toll Authority, governed by the same board as the commission, but created as a separate entity, with specified powers and duties relative to the administration of certain toll revenues from state-owned toll bridges within the geographic jurisdiction of the commission. Under existing law, the commission is comprised of 21 appointed members, as specified. This bill, effective January 1, 2017, would redesignate the Metropolitan Transportation Commission as the Bay Area Transportation Commission. The bill would require commissioners to be elected by districts comprised of approximately 750,000 residents. The bill would require each district to elect one commissioner, except that a district with a toll bridge, as defined, within the boundaries of the district would elect 2 commissioners. The bill would require commissioner elections to occur in 2016, with new commissioners to take office on January 1, 2017. The bill would state the intent of the Legislature for district boundaries to be drawn by a citizens' redistricting commission and campaigns for commissioners to be publicly financed. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABX1 25</strong>&lt;br/&gt;Allen, Travis R</td>
<td>1/11/2016-A. PRINT 1/12/2016-From printer.</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. The bill would state that it is the intent of the Legislature to not replace public transit services. This bill contains other related provisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACA 4</strong>&lt;br/&gt;Frazier D</td>
<td>8/19/2015-A. APPR. SUSPENSE FILE 8/27/2015-In committee: Hearing postponed by committee.</td>
<td>The California Constitution conditions the imposition of a special tax by a city, county, or special district upon the approval of 2/3 of the voters of the city, county, or special district voting on that tax, except that certain school entities may levy an ad valorem property tax for specified purposes with the approval of 55% of the voters within the jurisdiction of these entities. This measure would provide that the imposition, extension, or increase of a sales and use tax imposed pursuant to the Bradley-Burns Uniform Local Sales and Use Tax Law or a transactions and use tax imposed in accordance with the Transactions and Use Tax Law by a county, city, city and county, or special district for the purpose of providing funding for local transportation projects, as defined, requires the approval of 55% of its voters voting on the proposition. The measure would also make conforming and technical, nonsubstantive changes. This measure would also provide that it would become effective immediately upon approval by the voters and would apply to any local measure imposing, extending, or increasing a sales and use tax or transactions and use tax for local transportation projects submitted at the same election. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 32 Pavley D</td>
<td>9/11/2015-A. 2 YEAR 9/11/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(14). (Last location was NAT. RES. on 9/10/2015)</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 emissions limit that is equivalent to 40% below the 1990 level to be achieved by 2030. The bill also would state the intent of the Legislature for the Legislature and appropriate agencies to adopt complementary policies that ensure the long-term emissions reductions advance specified criteria. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 122 Jackson D</td>
<td>8/28/2015-A. 2 YEAR 8/28/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(11). (Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE on 7/15/2015)</td>
<td>The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA also requires a lead agency to prepare a mitigated negative declaration for a project that may have a significant effect on the environment if revisions in the project would avoid or mitigate that effect and there is no substantial evidence that the project, as revised, would have a significant effect on the environment. CEQA establishes a procedure for the preparation and certification of the record of proceedings upon the filing of an action or proceeding challenging a lead agency’s action on the grounds of noncompliance with CEQA. This bill would require the lead agency, at the request of a project applicant and consent of the lead agency, to prepare a record of proceedings concurrently with the preparation of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, EIR, or other environmental document for projects. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 207</strong></td>
<td>7/17/2015-A. 2 YEAR 7/17/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(10).</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 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 by the Legislature. Existing law requires a state agency expending moneys from the fund to create a record, prior to the expenditure, that includes, among other things, a description of the expenditure proposed to be made and a description of how the proposed expenditure will contribute to achieving and maintaining greenhouse gas emissions reductions, as specified. This bill would require that record to be posted on the Internet Web sites of the state agency and the State Air Resources Board prior to the state agency expending those moneys.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wieckowski D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 321</strong></td>
<td>9/11/2015-S. 2 YEAR 9/11/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(14).</td>
<td>Existing law, as of July 1, 2010, exempts the sale of, and the storage, use, or other consumption of, motor vehicle fuel from specified sales and use taxes and increases the excise tax on motor vehicle fuel, as provided. This bill for the 2016-17 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter would, instead require the board on March 1 of the fiscal year immediately preceding the applicable fiscal year, as specified, to adjust the rate in a manner as to generate an amount of revenue equal to the amount of revenue loss attributable to the exemption, based on estimates made by the board that reflect the combined average of the actual fuel price over the previous 4 fiscal years and the estimated fuel price for the current fiscal year, and continuing to take into account adjustments required by existing law to maintain revenue neutrality for each year. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beall D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle fuel taxes: rates: adjustments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SB 400       | 8/28/2015-A. **2 YEAR** 8/28/2015-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(11). (Last location was APPR. on 8/27/2015) | 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 makes a specified continuous appropriation to the High-Speed Rail Authority from the fund. This bill would require the High-Speed Rail Authority to allocate not less than 25% of the moneys continuously appropriated to the authority from the fund to projects that either reduce or offset greenhouse gas emissions directly associated with the construction of the high-speed rail project and provide a cobenefit of improving air quality. The bill would require priority to be given within this expenditure category to measures and projects that are located in communities in areas designated as extreme nonattainment. The bill would expand the purposes of a continuous appropriation, thereby making an appropriation. | }
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 824</strong></td>
<td>1/7/2016-S. PRINT 1/8/2016-From printer. May be acted upon on or after February 7.</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 authorize a recipient transit agency that does not submit a project for funding under the program in a particular fiscal year to retain its funding share for expenditure in a subsequent fiscal year. The bill would, in that regard, require the department to annually calculate a funding share for each eligible recipient transit agency. The bill would allow a recipient transit agency to loan or transfer its funding share in a particular fiscal year to another recipient transit agency, to pool its funding share with those of other recipient transit agencies, or to apply to the department to reassign, to other eligible expenditures under the program, any savings of surplus moneys from an approved and completed expenditure under the program or from an approved expenditure that is no longer a priority, as specified. The bill would also allow a recipient transit agency to apply to the department for a letter of no prejudice for a capital project or component of a capital project for which the department has authorized a disbursement of funds, and if granted, would allow the recipient transit agency to expend its own moneys and to be eligible for future reimbursement from the program, under specified conditions. The bill would also require a recipient transit agency to provide additional information to the department to the extent funding is sought for capital projects. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 882</strong></td>
<td>1/15/2016-S. PRINT 1/19/2016-From printer. May be acted upon on or after February 18.</td>
<td>Existing law makes it an infraction or a misdemeanor to evade the payment of a fare on a public transit system, to misuse a transfer, pass, ticket, or token with the intent to evade the payment of a fare, or to use a discount ticket without authorization or fail to present, upon request from a transit system representative, acceptable proof of eligibility to use a discount ticket. This bill would prohibit the minor from being charged with an infraction or a misdemeanor for those acts.</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 901</strong></td>
<td>1/21/2016-S. PRINT 1/22/2016-From printer. May be acted upon on or after February 21.</td>
<td>The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of an environmental impact report on a project, as defined, that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment, as defined, or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect, subject to certain exceptions. The bill would create the Advanced Mitigation Program in the Department of Transportation to implement environmental mitigation measures in advance of future transportation projects. The bill would require the department to set aside certain amounts of future appropriations for this purpose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation projects: Advanced Mitigation Program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 903</strong></td>
<td>1/21/2016-S. PRINT 1/22/2016-From printer. May be acted upon on or after February 21.</td>
<td>Existing law creates the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund, as a continuously appropriated fund, for the purpose of funding a list of transportation projects specified in statute. Existing law provided for the transfer of specified amounts from the General Fund to the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund, beginning in the 2000-01 fiscal year. Existing law also provided for the transfer of a portion of the sales tax on gasoline to the Transportation Investment Fund subsequent to voter approval on March 5, 2002, of Article XIX B of the California Constitution, which thereafter dedicated those sales tax revenues to specified transportation purposes. Existing law required a portion of the revenues in the Transportation Investment Fund to be transferred to the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund. This bill would acknowledge, as of June 30, 2015, $879,000,000 in outstanding loans of certain transportation revenues, and would require this amount to be repaid from the General Fund by June 30, 2016, to the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund for allocation to the Traffic Congestion Relief Program, the Trade Corridors Improvement Fund, the Public Transportation Account, and the State Highway Account, as specified. The bill would thereby make an appropriation. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation funds: loan repayment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SBX1 1</strong></td>
<td>9/1/2015-S. APPR. 9/1/2015-From committee with author’s amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td>Existing law provides various sources of funding for transportation purposes, including funding for the state highway system and the local street and road system. These funding sources include, among others, fuel excise taxes, commercial vehicle weight fees, local transactions and use taxes, and federal funds. Existing law imposes certain registration fees on vehicles, with revenues from these fees deposited in the Motor Vehicle Account and used to fund the Department of Motor Vehicles and the Department of the California Highway Patrol. Existing law provides for the monthly transfer of excess balances in the Motor Vehicle Account to the State Highway Account. This bill would create the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program to address deferred maintenance on the state highway system and the local street and road system and for other specified purposes. The bill would provide for the deposit of various funds for the program in the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account, which the bill would create in the State Transportation Fund, including revenues attributable to a $0.12 per gallon increase in the motor vehicle fuel (gasoline) tax imposed by the bill and $0.10 of a $0.22 per gallon increase in the diesel fuel excise tax imposed by the bill, including an inflation adjustment, as provided, an increase of $35 in the annual vehicle registration fee, a new $100 annual vehicle registration fee applicable to zero-emission motor vehicles, as defined, a new annual road access charge on each vehicle, as defined, of $35, and repayment, over a 3-year period, of outstanding loans made in previous years from certain transportation funds to the General Fund. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SBX1 2</strong></td>
<td>6/30/2015-S. T. &amp; I.D. 9/1/2015-September 1 set for first hearing. Failed passage in committee. (Ayes 3. Noes 9. Page 56.) Reconsideration granted.</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 exclude from allocation under these provisions the annual proceeds of the fund generated from the transportation fuels sector. The bill would instead provide that those annual proceeds shall be appropriated by the Legislature for transportation infrastructure, including public streets and highways, but excluding high-speed rail. This bill contains other existing laws.</td>
<td>Oppose</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>SBX1 3</strong></td>
<td>9/14/2015-S. SENATE 9/14/2015-Returned to Secretary of Senate pursuant to Joint Rule 62(a).</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 general obligation bonds in the amount of $9 billion 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, except 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 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 bonds subsequently issued and sold under the high-speed rail portion of the bond act, upon appropriation, to be made available to the Department of Transportation for repair and new construction projects on state highways and freeways, and for repair and new construction projects on local streets and roads, as specified. The bill would make no changes to the authorization under the bond act for the issuance of $950 million in bonds for rail purposes other than high-speed rail. These provisions would become effective only upon approval by the voters at the June 7, 2016, statewide primary election.</td>
<td>Oppose</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>SBX1 4</td>
<td>9/24/2015-S. CONFERENCE COMMITTEE 9/24/2015-Senators Beall (Co-Chair), Allen, Leyva, Cannella and Gaines appointed to Conference Committee.</td>
<td>Existing law requires the Department of Transportation to improve and maintain the state's highways, and establishes various programs to fund the development, construction, and repair of local roads, bridges, and other critical transportation infrastructure in the state. This bill would declare the intent of the Legislature to enact statutory changes to establish permanent, sustainable sources of transportation funding to maintain and repair the state's highways, local roads, bridges, and other critical transportation infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBX1 5</td>
<td>9/1/2015-A. DESK 9/1/2015-In Assembly. Read first time. Held at Desk.</td>
<td>Existing law establishes various programs to fund the development, construction, and repair of local roads, bridges, and other critical transportation infrastructure in the state. This bill would declare the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation to establish permanent, sustainable sources of transportation funding to improve the state's key trade corridors and support efforts by local governments to repair and improve local transportation infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBX1 6</td>
<td>9/14/2015-S. SENATE 9/14/2015-Returned to Secretary of Senate pursuant to Joint Rule 62(a).</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 delete the continuous appropriations from the fund for the high-speed rail project, and would prohibit any of the proceeds from the fund from being used for that project. The bill would continuously appropriate the remaining 65% of annual proceeds of the fund to the California Transportation Commission for allocation to high-priority transportation projects, as determined by the commission, with 40% of those moneys to be allocated to state highway projects, 40% to local street and road projects divided equally between cities and counties, and 20% to public transit projects. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SBX1 7       | 9/3/2015-S. APPR.  
Allen D  
Diesel sales and use tax.  
9/3/2015-Read second time and amended. Referred to Com. on APPR. | Existing law, beyond the sales and use tax rate generally applicable, imposes an additional sales and use tax on diesel fuel at the rate of 1.75%, subject to certain exemptions, and provides for the net revenues collected from the additional tax to transferred to the Public Transportation Account. Existing law continuously appropriates these revenues to the Controller, for allocation by formula to transportation agencies for public transit purposes.  
This bill, as of July 1, 2016, would increase the additional sales and use tax rate on diesel fuel to 5.25%. By increasing the revenues deposited in a continuously appropriated fund, the bill would thereby make an appropriation. The bill would restrict expenditures of revenues from the July 1, 2016, increase in the sales and use tax on diesel fuel to transit capital purposes and certain transit services. The bill would require an existing required audit of transit operator finances to verify that these new revenues have been expended in conformance with these specific restrictions and all other generally applicable requirements. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. | Support |
| SBX1 8       | 9/2/2015-S. APPR.  
Hill D  
Public transit: funding.  
9/2/2015-From committee: Do pass and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 8, Noes 0. Page 57.) (September 1). Re-referred to Com. on APPR. | 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 instead continuously appropriate 20% of those annual proceeds to the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, and 10% of those annual proceeds to the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program, thereby making an appropriation. This bill contains other existing laws. | Support |
| SBX1 9       | 9/14/2015-S. SENATE  
Moorlach R  
Department of Transportation.  
9/14/2015-Returned to Secretary of Senate pursuant to Joint Rule 62(a). | Existing law creates the Department of Transportation with various powers and duties relative to the state highway system and other transportation programs.  
This bill would prohibit the department from using any nonrecurring funds, including, but not limited to, loan repayments, bond funds, or grant funds, to pay the salaries or benefits of any permanent civil service position within the department. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. |         |
| SBX1 10      | 7/16/2015-S. T. & I.D.  
Bates R  
September 8 | Existing law establishes the state transportation improvement program process, pursuant to which the California Transportation Commission generally programs |         |
San Mateo County Transit District  
State Legislative Matrix 1/25/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional transportation capital improvement funds.</td>
<td>hearing: Testimony taken. Hearing postponed by committee.</td>
<td>and allocates available state and federal funds for transportation capital improvement projects, other than state highway rehabilitation and repair projects, over a multiyear period based on estimates of funds expected to be available. Existing law provides funding for these interregional and regional transportation capital improvement projects through the state transportation improvement program process, with 25% of funds available for interregional projects selected by the Department of Transportation through preparation of an interregional transportation improvement program and 75% for regional projects selected by transportation planning agencies through preparation of a regional transportation improvement program. Existing law requires funds available for regional projects to be programmed by the commission pursuant to the county shares formula, under which a certain amount of funding is available for programming in each county, based on population and miles of state highway. Existing law specifies the various types of projects that may be funded with the regional share of funds to include state highways, local roads, transit, and others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SBX1 11**  
Berryhill R  
Environmental quality: transportation infrastructure. | 9/4/2015-S. T. & I.D.  
9/4/2015-From committee with author’s amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on T. & I.D. | The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a lead agency, as defined, to prepare, or cause to be prepared, and certify the completion of, an environmental impact report (EIR) on a project that it proposes to carry out or approve that may have a significant effect on the environment or to adopt a negative declaration if it finds that the project will not have that effect. CEQA establishes a procedure by which a person may seek judicial review of the decision of the lead agency made pursuant to CEQA.  
This bill would exempt from these CEQA provisions a project that consists of the inspection, maintenance, repair, restoration, reconditioning, relocation, replacement, or removal of existing transportation infrastructure if certain conditions are met, and would require the person undertaking these projects to take certain actions, including providing notice to an affected public agency of the project's exemption. Because a lead agency would be required to determine if a project qualifies for this exemption, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. | |
| **SBX1 12**  
Runner R  
California Transportation Commission. | 8/20/2015-S. APPR.  
8/20/2015-Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR. | Existing law establishes in state government the Transportation Agency, which includes various departments and state entities, including the California Transportation Commission. Existing law vests the California Transportation Commission with specified powers, duties, and functions relative to transportation matters. Existing law requires the commission to retain independent authority to perform the duties and functions prescribed to it under any provision of law.  
This bill would exclude the California Transportation Commission from the Transportation Agency, establish it as an entity in state government, and require it to act in an independent oversight role. The bill would also make conforming changes. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws. | |
## San Mateo County Transit District
### State Legislative Matrix 1/25/16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill ID/Topic</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SBX1 13</strong>&lt;br&gt;Vidak R&lt;br&gt;Office of the Transportation Inspector General.</td>
<td>9/3/2015-S. APPR. 9/3/2015-From committee with author's amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td>Existing law creates various state transportation agencies, including the Department of Transportation and the High-Speed Rail Authority, with specified powers and duties. Existing law provides for the allocation of state transportation funds to various transportation purposes. This bill would create the Office of the Transportation Inspector General in state government, as an independent office that would not be a subdivision of any other government entity, to build capacity for self-correction into the government itself and to ensure that all state agencies expending state transportation funds are operating efficiently, effectively, and in compliance with federal and state laws. The bill would provide for the Governor to appoint the Transportation Inspector General for a 6-year term, subject to confirmation by the Senate, and would provide that the Transportation Inspector General may not be removed from office during the term except for good cause. The bill would specify the duties and responsibilities of the Transportation Inspector General, would require an annual report to the Legislature and Governor, and would provide that funding for the office shall, to the extent possible, be from federal transportation funds, with other necessary funding to be made available from the State Highway Account and an account from which high-speed rail activities may be funded.</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SBX1 14</strong>&lt;br&gt;Cannella R&lt;br&gt;Transportation projects: comprehensive development lease agreements.</td>
<td>7/16/2015-S. T. &amp; I.D. 8/17/2015-August 19 set for first hearing canceled at the request of author.</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes the Department of Transportation and regional transportation agencies, as defined, to enter into comprehensive development lease agreements with public and private entities, or consortia of those entities, for certain transportation projects that may charge certain users of those projects tolls and user fees, subject to various terms and requirements. These arrangements are commonly known as public-private partnerships. Existing law provides that a lease agreement may not be entered into under these provisions on or after January 1, 2017. This bill would extend this authorization indefinitely and would include within the definition of &quot;regional transportation agency&quot; the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, thereby authorizing the authority to enter into public-private partnerships under these provisions. The bill would also delete obsolete cross-references and make technical changes to these provisions.</td>
<td>R</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>SCA 5</td>
<td>7/16/2015-S. GOV. &amp; F. 7/16/2015-From committee with author’s amendments. Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on GOV. &amp; F.</td>
<td>The California Constitution provides that all property is taxable, unless exempted by the California Constitution or by federal law. The California Constitution authorizes the Legislature to classify personal property for differential taxation or for exemption by means of a statute approved by a 2/3 vote of the membership of each house. This measure would exempt from taxation for each taxpayer an amount up to $500,000 of tangible personal property used for business purposes. This measure would prohibit the Legislature from lowering this exemption amount or from changing its application, but would authorize it to be increased consistent with the authority described above. This measure would provide that this provision shall become operative on January 1, 2019. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill ID/Topic</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAX1 1 Huff R</td>
<td>9/9/2015-S. APPR. 9/9/2015-From committee: Be adopted and re-refer to Com. on APPR. (Ayes 13. Noes 0.) (September 8). Re-referred to Com. on APPR.</td>
<td>(1) Article XIX of the California Constitution restricts the expenditure of revenues from taxes imposed by the state on fuels used in motor vehicles upon public streets and highways to street and highway and certain mass transit purposes, and restricts the expenditure of revenues from fees and taxes imposed by the state upon vehicles or their use or operation to state administration and enforcement of laws regulating the use, operation, or registration of vehicles used upon the public streets and highways, as well as to street and highway and certain mass transit purposes. These restrictions do not apply to revenues from taxes or fees imposed under the Sales and Use Tax Law or the Vehicle License Fee Law. This measure would prohibit the Legislature from borrowing revenues from fees and taxes imposed by the state on vehicles or their use or operation, and from using those revenues other than as specifically permitted by Article XIX. The measure would also prohibit those revenues from being pledged or used for the payment of principal and interest on bonds or other indebtedness. The measure would delete the provision that provides for use of any fuel tax revenues allocated to mass transit purposes to be pledged or used for payment of principal and interest on voter-approved bonds issued for those mass transit purposes, and would instead subject those expenditures to the existing 25% limitation applicable to the use of fuel tax revenues for street and highway bond purposes. O This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A G E N D A

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

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

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2016 – 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 6, 2016
   b. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for December 2015
   c. Acceptance of Quarterly Investment Report and Fixed Income Market Review
      for the Period Ending December 31, 2015
   d. Acceptance of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year
      Ending June 30, 2015

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 Shirley Harris

5. REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER/CEO

6. COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE – J. GEE
   RESOLUTION
   a. Authorize Adoption of Updated Bicycle and Similar Equipment Use and Parking
      Rules and Regulations

   SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
   b. Accessibility Update
   c. Paratransit Coordinating Council Update
   d. Citizens Advisory Committee Liaison Report
   e. Multimodal Ridership Report – December 2015

9. FINANCE COMMITTEE – C. STONE
   SUBJECT DISCUSSED
   a. Report of the Audit Committee
RESOLUTIONS
b. Authorize Execution of a Memorandum of Understanding with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority and the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County to Update the Countywide Transportation Plan and Contribute up to a Maximum of $25,000 to the San Mateo County Transportation Authority
c. Authorize Filing and Execution of an Application for the Electric Bus Procurement Project in the Amount of $949,523 and Annual Cap and Trade Funding Authorized Agent Forms and Certifications and Assurances
d. Authorize Execution of an Amendment to the Funding Agreement with the County of San Mateo for the Allocation of $10 Million in County Measure A Funds to the San Mateo County Transit District for Fiscal Years 2016 and 2017
e. Authorize Purchase and Delivery of 50 New Heavy-Duty Low-Floor 40-Foot Diesel Buses for a Total Estimated Cost of $25,424,223
f. Authorize Award of Contract to Stertil Koni for the Purchase and Delivery of 11 Sets of Mobile Wheel Lift Systems for a Total Cost of $336,457
g. Authorize Purchase and Delivery of 10 Non-Revenue Support Vehicles with Elk Grove Toyota for a Total Cost of $300,395
h. Authorize Award of On-Call, No-Guarantee Contracts to Essence Printing, Inc., Fong Brothers Printing, Inc. and Pacific Standard Print to Provide Printing Services for a Not-to-Exceed Amount of $619,000 for a Five-Year Term
i. Authorize an Increase in Authority for Information Technology Licenses, Maintenance Services and Professional Services for a Not-to-Exceed Amount of $1.5 Million for Fiscal Year 2016

10. LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE – P. RATTO
   MOTION
   a. 2016 Legislative Program

   SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
   b. State and Federal Legislative Update

11. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

12. BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS/COMMENTS

13. GENERAL COUNSEL PROPOSAL

14. DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING – March 2, 2016 at 2 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District, Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, 1250 Carlos Ave., San Carlos 94070

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

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

Chair Shirley Harris called the meeting to order at 3:09 p.m.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE (GEE, MATSUMOTO, STONE)

Election of Officers
Director Jeff Gee said the committee is recommending Director Zoe Kersteen-Tucker as chair and Director Rose Guilbault as vice chair

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

Director Harris thanked everyone on the Board and staff for their support in help to make her term very successful. A lot was accomplished with many changes including a new General Manager/CEO and an off-site Board workshop.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker thanked Director Harris for her leadership last year.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker said she is honored to serve as chair at such an extraordinary juncture in the history of SamTrans. She said the District is at a point in time where there are confluences that will allow for redefining the way in which public transportation services are delivered in this county. Those are technological innovations that are happening faster than anyone can keep up with, private sector buy in as witnessed by Facebook and their desire to be at the table as the District moves forward to start planning for this region and the growing demand, on the part of the public, for more environmentally sustainable and efficient transportation options. All of these things are working together right now to allow the District to really move forward smartly in the future with brand new solutions for congestion in the region and the sustained economic vitality in the region.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker said always at heart is to serve those that rely on SamTrans to get to work, the doctor, church, and to just live their lives. What is changing now and challenging is that more and more people who have transportation choices are choosing to ride public transportation.
Chair Kersteen-Tucker said last November the Board came together for a retreat. Time was spent brainstorming about District accomplishments the Board is most proud of, trends happening in the county that the Board believes require some attention and refining a list of priorities the Board would like to see accomplished by 2018. She said most important to her was the sense that every member of the Board is eager to participate and to dig-in as staff moves forward to address the challenges ahead. Chair Kersteen-Tucker proposed a new standing Strategic Planning Committee be added to the Board meetings. The Strategic Plan recognizes that the District doesn’t have all the answers now, but commits to a thoughtful process of tackling critical issues over time and prioritizing resources accordingly. The role of this new sub-committee will be to work with staff in this process and to help keep the Strategic Plan alive. She said the Board also agreed at the retreat there is no need to reprint the Strategic Plan, but as changes do occur to the priorities and goals she would like to see documents created and distributed to inform the public of changes the Board is making. Chair Kersteen-Tucker said now more than ever it is important to communicate with stakeholders and the public to keep them actively engaged in what the District is doing. Finally, she would propose that the Board have another retreat at the end of this year and would like to see another Board Retreat ad-hoc committee reconvened in May to plan it.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker said people want to ride public transportation and now more than ever opportunities abound for innovation, both in the way people think about public transportation and the way it is delivered. She is eager to dig-in with her fellow Board members to tap in to new flexibility and resourcefulness and engage in expanded array of community partners. She is confident that together the District will continue to be the mobility leader of San Mateo County.

CONSENT CALENDAR
a. Approval of Minutes of Board of Directors Meeting of December 2, 2015
b. Approval of Minutes of Board Retreat on November 6, 2015
c. Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenses for November 2015

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

PUBLIC COMMENT
None

UPDATE ON SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT’S STRATEGIC PLAN – YEAR ONE UPDATE
Doug Kim, Director, Planning, reported:
- Three priorities of the Plan
  1. Become a more effective organization
  2. Expand mobility options
  3. Strengthen fiscal health
The Plan has five goals in five years

1. Increase Ridership 15 percent
   - 2.9 percent annual growth
   - Actual growth of 1 percent in year 1 (January-November 2015)
   - Commenced Mobility Management Plan to address:
     - Shuttle operations
     - Youth transportation
     - Paratransit

2. Increase Revenue 20 Percent
   - Based on ridership growth
   - 15 percent ridership growth plus one fare update before 2019 equals 20 percent plus revenue growth
   - November 2015 Board approved fare increases in 2016 and 2019
   - Farebox revenue growth goals dependent on ridership increases

3. Reduce Annual Debt Service by $1.5 Million
   - March 2015 the Board approved debt refinancing structure and closed financial transaction
   - Reduces annual debt service average $3 million between 2016-2019 and $5 million from 2020-2023

4. Improve Organizational Performance
   - Awaited re-organization
     - Employee survey to provide state of organization in 2015 and 2016 and the $50,000 is included in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 budget
     - Communications Plan will begin and the $50,000 cost is included in the FY2016 budget

5. Manage Workforce Change
   - Awaited agency re-organization
   - New positions in human resources to increase recruitment capacity, develop business continuity plan for agency and departments
   - Investigate workforce housing options, including pursuing grants to address workforce housing programs

- Input from November 2015 Board retreat
  - Engage private sector to improve transportation
  - Improve system ease of use for patrons, including technology
  - Financial flexibility, “no scarcity mentality”
  - Fill workforce vacancies
  - Workforce housing

- Next steps
  - Consider Board input from retreat

REPORT OF CHAIR
Board Retreat Ad-hoc Committee Update (Kersteen-Tucker, Matsumoto, Tissier)
There were no changes or comments to the written report.
Joan Cassman, Legal Counsel, said the creation of the Strategic Plan Committee is not on the agenda. She said she will bring back amended Rules of the Board that would establish this committee for the Board to approve.

REPORT OF THE GENERAL MANAGER/CEO – Jim Hartnett
Update on Super Bowl 50 Transportation Planning
Chuck Harvey, Deputy CEO, Organizational Support/Special Projects, reported:
- Caltrain will run six-car trains the weekends of January 30 and February 6 to increase capacity.
- Enhanced Safety Measures
  - Increased patrols throughout the system
  - Regular sweeps of high visibility locations
  - Communication of National Football League (NFL) bag policy to customers
  - Pre-inspection of every train departing San Francisco on Super Bowl Sunday
  - Participating in multi-jurisdictional law enforcement planning task force
  - Increased use of K-9s for system-wide inspections
- Event preparation
  - All staff time off cancelled
  - Additional Transit America Services, Inc. staff brought in to support operations and maintenance activities
  - Standby maintenance teams to address equipment malfunctions
  - Preventative pre-event maintenance
  - Station brightening and cleaning at San Francisco, Millbrae, Redwood City, Palo Alto, Mountain View, Santa Clara and San Jose stations

Seamus Murphy, Chief Communications Officer, reported:
- Communication
  - Participating in region-wide Super Bowl informational planning effort
  - Using hashtag campaigns across Twitter, Facebook and Instagram #SB50
  - Staffing joint information center in Santa Clara
  - Targeted digital and print advertising efforts
  - Paid social media campaign
  - Outreach to local tourism organizations and area hotels
- Customer Communication
  - Onboard take ones and brochures
  - Conductor announcements
  - Website information
  - Platform announcements
  - Use of visual messaging system on platforms
  - Expanded hours for customer service representatives and social media officer
  - News releases
  - Social media
- Ambassadors
Customer information ambassadors at San Francisco beginning January 30 and at Millbrae throughout the week prior to Super Bowl 50
More than 122 shifts scheduled throughout the week beginning January 30
Targeted locations include San Francisco, Millbrae, Redwood City, Palo Alto Mountain View, Santa Clara and San Jose stations
Created a “train the trainer” program to rollout conductor information
- Fares and Parking
  - Customers may use all forms of regular fare media throughout Super Bowl 50 week
  - New Joint Caltrain/Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Levi’s Stadium Tickets sold at ticket vending machines
  - For Super Bowl Sunday, only customers holding a special VTA light rail ticket will be allowed to board Levi’s Stadium-bound trains
  - The joint VTA mobile application ticket will be accepted on Caltrain
  - VTA capping the number of tickets sold at 12,000
  - Due to anticipated demand, parking at all Caltrain lots will be increased to $20 on February 7, Super Bowl Sunday

Mr. Harvey continued:
- Bus Contingency Plans
  - SamTrans bus service into San Francisco during Super Bowl 50 week not directly impacted by street closures
  - Staff will be monitoring loads and adding bus tripper service if additional demand requires
  - Traffic conditions and delays of bus service will be monitored daily by SamTrans Bus Operations Control Center
- Super Bowl Sunday
  - VTA will be staging contingency bus fleets at Mountain View and Santa Clara County to address any light rail service interruptions
  - In San Mateo County, SamTrans will have a fleet of articulated buses, drivers, and field supervisors staged in South San Francisco and San Carlos to respond to any Caltrain Service interruptions
- Budget
  - Super Bowl Host Committee and NFL are not reimbursing local transit agencies for expenses
  - Staff is establishing budgets for Transit America, Inc., the Transit Police, ambassadors, communications and all other related expenses
  - Final accounting of all expenses will be prepared
  - Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and SamTrans budgets have operating budget

Director Adrienne Tissier asked if there are any opportunities to wrap trains for additional revenue. Mr. Murphy said five trains have been wrapped for the month leading up to Super Bowl and the San Francisco Caltrain Station has been sold for a saturation marketing campaign.
Director Tissier asked if there is an increase in bus side advertising. Mr. Murphy said not so far, but staff is pointing people who have inquired about Caltrain advertising to bus or bus shelter advertising.

Director Guilbault asked if this is a money loss. Mr. Harvey said on SamTrans no, on Caltrain yes.

Director Gee asked if there is an emergency response plan in place. Mr. Harvey said that is already being done.

Director Gee said the communities Caltrain runs through need to be communicated to about the extra service.

Director Tissier asked if the Transit Police will be paid for their work. Mr. Harvey said yes.

Chair Kersteen-Tucker said this event will bring awareness of Caltrain to new riders. She asked if there will be opportunities to communicate to people after the event to pull them in as new riders.

**Business Optimization Program Update**

Gigi Harrington, Deputy CEO, reported:

- Transitioned fully to new system
- Five year contract to host system off site
- First set of claims with the vendor were settled in May 2014
- System go-live date delayed nine months because of contractor staff availability, data conversion and testing, and infrastructure readiness.
- Implications for delay include additional project expenses and potential claim from vendor for the delay
- Conclude commercial negotiations with Wipro to settle all claims
- Staff will be back in February with a settlement recommendation and release of claims and contract closeout, and a request for a budget adjustment of $1.1 million
- Complete project close-out activities will be completed in March 2016

Director Gee asked if it is $1.1 million plus vendor claims. Ms. Harrington said yes.

Mr. Harvey reported that MV Transportation operates a number of shuttles from employer centers to Caltrain. Recently the Teamsters that operate these shuttles for MV voted to authorize a strike. Federal mediators have been brought in to help both parties find a middle ground to settle.

Director Tissier asked if the two sides are far apart. Mr. Harvey said initially they weren’t but now they are.

Jim Hartnett, General Manager/CEO, reported:

- Recognized Kathie Hollinger, Assistant Superintendent, Bus Transportation, on her upcoming retirement on January 15. Ms. Hollinger is the longest tenured employee and has been with the District since 1976.
• Recognized Chester Patton, Director, Bus Transportation, on his upcoming retirement on January 15. Mr. Patton will be retiring to Austin, Texas with his family.
• New runbook becomes effective January 10 and schedules have been adjusted for more efficiency.
• Investment in human capital continues with 3,000 hours of training in December.
• A new class of 13 bus operators will graduate this week.
• Ten part-time bus operators are being promoted to full-time.
• Thanked the San Mateo Board of Supervisors for their continued support in providing funding assistance for paratransit service.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS COMMITTEE – Z. Kersteen-Tucker
RESOLUTION
a. Authorize Revision of the Lost and Found Policy

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

SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
   b. Accessibility Update
   c. Paratransit Customer Survey Results
   d. Citizens Advisory Committee Update
   e. Mobility Management Report – Fixed-Route Bus Service

FINANCE COMMITTEE – R. Guilbault
RESOLUTIONS
a. Authorize Filing of Applications to the California Governor’s Office of Emergency Services to Receive $1,106,406 in State Proposition 1B Transit Security Grant Program Funds for Transportation Security Projects
b. Authorize Executing a Funding Agreement with Facebook to Receive $1 Million to Complete a Dumbarton Transportation Corridor Study and Increasing the Fiscal Year 2016 Capital Budget by $1 Million
c. Authorize Executing a Funding Agreement with Facebook to Receive $700,000 to Serve as the Environmental Lead for a Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail Environmental Review Process Along the West Alignment of the Dumbarton Rail Corridor and Increasing the Fiscal Year 2016 Capital Budget by $700,000
d. Authorize Award of an Open-Market, Negotiated Contracted to City Mechanical, Inc. to Provide Plumbing Maintenance Services for a Total Cost of $294,765 for a Three-Year Base Term
e. Authorize Amendment of the Contract to Provide On-Call Real Estate Support Services by Increasing the Aggregate Not-to-Exceed Amount for the Base Six-Year Term from $600,000 to $1,340,000 and Increasing the Aggregate Not-to-Exceed Amount for the Two Two-Year Option Terms from $200,000 to $400,000

Motion/Second: Ratto/Stone
Ayes: Gee, Groom, Guilbault, Harris, Matsumoto, Ratto, Stone, Tissier, Kersteen-Tucker
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE – A. TISSIER
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED
a. 2016 Legislative Program
b. State and Federal Legislative Update

WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS
No discussion.

BOARD MEMBER REQUESTS/COMMENTS
None

DATE AND TIME OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING – February 3, 2016, at 2 p.m., San Mateo County Transit District, Administrative Building, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070.

Meeting recessed to close session at 4:30 p.m.

Meeting reconvened to open session at 4:54 p.m.

GENERAL COUNSEL PROPOSAL
Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1): Todd v. San Mateo County, et. al., Case No. 4:15-cv-05823-JSW
Ms. Cassman said a report was provided and no action was taken.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.