AGENDA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor
1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

April 4, 2019 - Thursday 5:00 pm

1) Call to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

2) Roll Call

3) Public Comment For Items Not on the Agenda
   Public comment by each individual speaker shall be limited two (2) minutes. Items raised that require a response will be deferred for staff reply.

4) Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

5) Consent Calendar
   Members of the Board may request that an item under the Consent Calendar be considered separately
   a) Approval of Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting of March 7, 2019
   b) Acceptance of Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for February 2019
   c) Award of Contract for Federal Legislative Advocacy Services
   d) Award of Contract for State Legislative Advocacy Services

6) Report of the Chair

7) San Mateo County Transit District Liaison Report

8) Joint Powers Board Liaison Report

9) Report of the Executive Director

10) Program
    a) Paratransit Program Report
    b) Pedestrian & Bicycle Program Report
    c) State and Federal Legislative Update and Approval of Legislative Proposals

11) Requests from the Authority

Note: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.
12) Written Communications to the Authority

13) Date/Time of Next Regular Meeting: Thursday, May 2, 2019, 5:00 pm at San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

14) Report of Legal Counsel

Closed Session: Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation Pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1): Pacificans for a Scenic Coast v. California Department of Transportation, et al.; San Mateo County Superior Court Case No. CIV-523973

15) Adjourn
INFORMATION FOR THE PUBLIC

All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Board. Staff recommendations are subject to change by the Board.

If you have questions on the agenda, please contact the Authority Secretary at 650-508-6242. Assisted listening devices are available upon request. Agendas are posted on the Authority Website at www.smcta.com. Communications to the Board of Directors can be e-mailed to board@smcta.com.

Location, Date and Time of Regular Meetings
Regular meetings are held at the San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building located at 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, which is located one block west of the San Carlos Caltrain Station on El Camino Real. The building is also accessible by SamTrans bus routes ECR, FLX, 260, 295 and 398. Additional transit information can be obtained by calling 1-800-660-4287 (TTY 650-508-6448) or 511.

The Transportation Authority (TA) meets regularly on the first Thursday of the month at 5 p.m. The TA Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meets regularly on the Tuesday prior to the first Thursday of the month at 4:30 p.m. at the San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building.

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 Authority 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 TA 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 Authority Secretary at the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070-1306 or emailed to board@smcta.com; or by phone at 650-508-6279, 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.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
1250 SAN CARLOS AVENUE, SAN CARLOS, CA 94070
MINUTES OF MARCH 7, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT: D. Horsley (Chair), E. Beach (Vice Chair), M. Freschet, C. Groom, K. Matsumoto, R. Medina, C. Romero

MEMBERS ABSENT: None


CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Chair Don Horsley called the meeting to order at 5:03 pm and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

SWEARING IN
Director Carole Groom was sworn for a term ending December 31, 2020.

ROLL CALL
Authority Secretary Dora Seamans called the roll. A quorum was confirmed.

PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA
None.

REPORT OF THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Chair Horsley noted that the report was in the packet.

CONSENT CALENDAR
Approval of Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting of February 7, 2019
Motion/Second: Medina/Romero
Ayes: Beach, Freschet, Groom, Matsumoto, Medina, Romero, Horsley
Absent: None

REPORT OF THE CHAIR
Chair Horsley reported out on the most recent meeting with C/CAG (City and County Governments of San Mateo County) on the Express Lanes project.
Vice Chair Emily Beach said there is absolute equality between the TA and C/CAG for joint governance, policy-making, and revenue expenditure under a single executive director. She said the committee is working out the details of achieving operational equality.

Director Karyl Matsumoto asked about TA getting reimbursed by C/CAG. Chair Horsley said C/CAG was not providing any funding but that TA would be receiving revenues once the facility is in operation. Chair Horsley and Joan Cassman, Legal Counsel, discussed how RM3 (Regional Measure 3) funding from bridge tolls would contribute to the project.

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT LIAISON REPORT
Chair Horsley noted that the report was in the packet.

PENINSULA CORRIDOR JOINT POWERS BOARD REPORT
Executive Director Jim Hartnett said the report was in the packet.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Mr. Hartnett said the report was in the packet. He said that the TA would like to make available for sale a portion of a parcel that it had acquired for the construction of the Broadway-Burlingame/101 project. He said the proceeds of the sale would be used to recover a portion of the $7.5 million cost overruns.

Mr. Hartnett reported on the recent public meetings about the future plans for the Dumbarton Rail Corridor.

Chair Horsley asked which vehicles can use the express lanes for free. Joe Hurley, TA Director, said that this was an incentive for clean-air vehicles. He added that in order to preserve the integrity of the express lanes, LA Metro (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority) has just initiated charging drivers of clean-air vehicles to use their express lanes, with a 15 percent discount. He said that VTA (Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority) would be following suit and charging clean-air vehicles as well at a 50 percent discount. April Chan, Chief Officer, Planning, Grants/Transportation Authority, said that the US 101 Express Lanes JPA can make those types of decisions for its clean-air vehicles.

Director Carlos Romero said he hoped that incentives for electric vehicles could continue. He asked about the appraisal process for the unused land parcel from the Broadway-Burlingame/101 project.

FINANCE
Award of Contract to Provide Project Management and Support Services for the US 101 Managed Lanes Project
Ms. Chan provided the background on the project.
Concepcion Gayotin, Manager, Contracts and Procurement, presented staff’s recommendation as per the staff report.
Director Matsumoto asked about the bidding process. Ms. Gayotin said it was single source. Ms. Chan said the costs were included in the project budget.

Per Director Romero’s question, Mr. Hurley and Ms. Chan said that construction management would be part of another proposal, separate from project management.

Approved by TA Resolution No. 2019-4
Motion/Second: Romero/Beach
Ayes: Beach, Freschet, Groom, Matsumoto, Medina, Romero, Horsley
Absent: None

PROGRAM

San Mateo US 101 Express Lanes Project Update and Outreach Plan for the Construction Phase

Mr. Hurley gave a presentation, noting that the Managed Lanes project was rebranded as the “San Mateo US 101 Express Lane Project.” He said the southern portion of the project is now being branded the “HOV (high occupancy vehicle) to Express Lane Conversion” (Santa Clara County line to Whipple Avenue), scheduled to open June 2021, and the northern portion is now branded as the “Express Lane Addition” (Whipple Avenue to I-380), scheduled to open May 2022. He gave an overview of the construction schedule and street closures.

Mr. Hartnett said the TA and C/CAG have an equal number of seats on the construction change management board. Mr. Hurley said that the construction contractor was integrated with the design team to mitigate some of the risks and keep the project on track.

Director Matsumoto asked about the construction contract arrangements. Mr. Hurley said that Caltrans was administering the construction contract. Director Matsumoto asked about access to Highway 92 during the construction. Mr. Hurley said the work windows would be during the night and that no lane closures were anticipated during commute periods.

Director Carole Groom asked why the Monte Diablo pedestrian overcrossing was not being rebuilt. Mr. Hurley said it is not being reconstructed but will stay in operation. He said that the project team was able to design the project so there would be no impact to the overcrossing and therefore it would not need to be removed and reconstructed.

Directors Rico Medina and Romero had questions about the change order process.

Public Comment:

Rich Hedges, San Mateo, talked about other public projects that came in under budget with PLAs (project labor agreements).

Casey Fromson, Director of Government and Community Affairs, continued with the presentation, talking about the outreach efforts for the different project components.

TA Strategic Plan 2020-2024

Joel Slavit, Manager, Programming and Monitoring, and Ms. Fromson gave a presentation on the history and goals of the TA's strategic plan, including Measure A and Measure W funding.
Director Maureen Freschet asked if outreach included city council meetings. Ms. Fromson said they were targeting Countywide agencies but would be open to presenting at the city level if asked.

Vice Chair Beach thanked staff for their participation on the Measure W outreach efforts.

Director Romero asked for and received a definition from Ms. Fromson of the composition of the stakeholder and technical advisory groups.

Director Matsumoto asked if calls for projects could be combined. Ms. Chan said they were looking into ways to combine Measure A and Measure W funding as appropriate.

Chair Horsley appointed an ad hoc committee to work with staff on implementation strategies with Directors Groom, Romero, and Medina.

**Measure A Semi-Annual Program Status Report**

Connie Mobley-Ritter, Director of Treasury, discussed new Measure A versus original Measure A accounting.

Vice Chair Beach asked about a negative amount under Accessible Services. Ms. Mobley-Ritter said that they likely had not received the funds yet but would confirm.

Motion/Second: Medina/Freschet
Ayes: Beach, Freschet, Groom, Matsumoto, Medina, Romero, Horsley
Absent: None

**State and Federal Legislative Update**

Ms. Fromson briefly summarized highlights of recent federal and state legislation.

Chair Horsley said that diversion of taxes to the airport in the past cost $3.5 million and anticipated the same for Measure W funding. Joan Cassman, Legal Counsel, noted that Measure A funding was also subject to diversion per the FAA (Federal Aviation Administration).

**REQUESTS FROM THE AUTHORITY**

None.

**WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS TO THE AUTHORITY**

None.

**DATE/TIME OF NEXT REGULAR MEETING**

Chair Horsley announced that the next meeting would be on Thursday, April 4, 2019, 5:00 pm at the San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building, Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070.

**REPORT OF LEGAL COUNSEL**

None.
ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 6:32 pm.

An audio/video recording of this meeting is available online at www.smcta.com. Questions may be referred to the Authority Secretary's office by phone at 650.508.6242 or by email to board@smcta.com.
Good evening Chairman Horsley and Members of the Board,

I have the following to report from Tuesday's meeting of the CAC:

After the Nominating Committee for the 2019 CAC Officers presented its recommendations to the CAC, the CAC re-elected myself, Barbara Arietta (Pacifica), as Chair and John Fox (Menlo Park), as Vice Chair for the 2019 term.

(TA Items 6a and 6b) The CAC reviewed and accepted, without questions or comments.

(TA Item 6c) Pursuant to a brief update by Joe Hurley, Director, SMCTA Program, the CAC supported the Board's Acceptance of the Capital Projects Quarterly Status Report 2nd Quarter FY 2019, commenting only on concerns about traffic traveling through the neighborhoods associated with the Peninsula Ave/US 101 I/C Project.

(TA Item 11a) Following a brief update by Joe Hurley, the CAC supported the Award of Contract to Provide Project Management and Support Services for the US 101 Express Lanes Project, without questions or comments.

(TA Item 12a) The CAC received a joint presentation from both Joe Hurley and Jessica Epstein, Government and Community Affairs Officer on the San Mateo US 101 Express Lanes Project Update and Outreach Plan for the Construction Phase. The CAC posed a number of questions, which included the following: Based on traffic congestion concerns, how are we dealing with ramp closures? What detours will be made? What are the time frames for work south of Whipple and north of Whipple? What will be the criteria for the auxiliary lanes to be restored? In what cities will auxiliary lanes not be restored? What is the timeline for re-instituting the auxiliary lanes?

Some members also stated that they did not like that CALTRANS might be the single source of information and would like to see as the TA and other agencies coordinate and collaborate on outreach. Also remarked that relying so much on Twitter will, most likely, not be as big nor successful, as they might imagine it will be...due to the fact that Twitter can be abused, which is a definite reason why a number of people currently don't or won't use it.

What is going to happen with the sound walls that have to be replaced? Will they be the same as before, or changed to a bigger size, as some communities near US Hwy 101 in San Mateo have requested? Have those communities agreed to the current plans for replacing the sound walls in San Mateo? Overall, the CAC appeared to be pleased with the project, response to questions and remarked that the speed with which this project is going is certainly impressive and indicative of a lot of hard work done by a large number of people. Kudos to all!

(TA Item 12b) Joel Slavit, Manager of SMCTA Programming and Monitoring, and Jessica Epstein delivered a power point presentation on the TA Strategic Plan 2020-2024. The CAC complimented on what a great job was done to educate the public on Measure W through the GUM process. Questions were asked about the Pedestrian and Bike Program challenges and goals. Will the competitive call for project process be the best way to go? What has provided the best results to date, using the formula basis or using competitive calls? CAC members remarked that some of our cities simply don't have the staff to research and apply for funding and because of this, inquired about possible resources available to help with application? How do we ensure that there is equity among the cities in the distribution of funds?

One member also remarked that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) has set aside $8.2 million for Calls for Projects to encourage Bay Area Cities, Counties and Parks and Open Space Districts in Alameda,
Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties for Priority Conservation Grants from $100,000 to $1 million or more for projects that include pedestrian and bike facilities, public access to open space and construction of turnouts, overlooks and viewing areas. They said that if we are not taking advantage of that source as yet, we should add it to our list and advise the cities of same.

(TA Item 12c) After receiving a brief update on the Measure a Semi-Annual Program Status Report from Connie Mobley-Ritter, Director, Treasury, and the CAC supported the acceptance of same.

(TA Item 12d) The CAC received a State and Federal Legislative Update from Jessica Epstein and were not happy to hear that the Federal Government is asking for the $2.5 billion already spent on High Speed Rail in California, along with an additional $929 million, to be returned back to the Federal Government because of the current controversy over the completion of High Speed Rail in California. Questions were asked if the electrification of Caltrain and the three grade separations in San Mateo will be affected if the Federal Government prevails in forcing California to return that money.

CAC CHAIR’S REPORT:

• Alameda County Supervisor Scott Hagerty took over the helm of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) on Wednesday, February 28th, after Commissioners unanimously elected him Chair for the two-year term running through February 2021.
• FACEBOOK funding could provide “new” rail service connecting the Peninsula with the East Bay, along the Dumbarton Corridor. This Dumbarton Rail project has limped along since SamTrans purchased 18 miles of the right-of-way, including the bridge in the 1992, never amassing enough capital to see it through. At this point, officials familiar with the project expect most of its funding to come from the private sector. The San Mateo Daily Journal recently reported that bridge toll revenue and a San Mateo County sales tax could provide funding in support of this project. FACEBOOK, in 2016, allocated $1 million dollars for the environmental studies. Whether it’s all their money from or additional money from other tech companies that they might ask to join them remains to be seen. This is expected to be a billion dollar project. FACEBOOK, infrastructure developer Plenary Group and the San Mateo County Transit District will be involved in resurrecting this railroad of the past. Eventually, officials want to stretch the track to the Union City BART Station, where it could connect with the regional backbone rail system, and one day link up with the Capitol Corridor trains traveling to Sacramento and Altamont Corridor Express trains heading into the Central Valley.

STAFF REPORT TO CAC:

The staff report was given by Joe Hurley, Transportation Authority Director. He advised the CAC that BAIFA will be the operator of the express lanes in San Mateo County. A Joint Powers Authority made up from members of the TA and C/CAG will be formed and be the owner of the facility. He also advised that they are monitoring other express lanes throughout the state to see what pitfalls and successes have been experienced, to help with their policy making decisions. Additionally, Joe reported that as of last Friday, March 1st, Los Angeles made change to their express lanes pricing policy regarding clean air vehicles. Clean air vehicles will no longer have free access, but rather they will now be charged and given a 15% discount.

Respectfully submitted,

BARBARA ARIETTA
Chair, San Mateo County Transportation Authority CAC
TO: Transportation Authority

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
    Executive Director

FROM: Derek Hansel
    Chief Financial Officer

SUBJECT: STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES FOR THE PERIOD ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2019

ACTION
Staff proposes that the Board accept and enter into the record the Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the month of February 2019 and supplemental information.

The statement columns have been designed to provide easy comparison of year to date prior to current actuals for the current fiscal year including dollar and percentage variances.

SIGNIFICANCE
Year to Date Revenues: As of February year-to-date, the Total Revenue (page 1, line 7) is $12.5 million higher than prior year actuals. This is primarily due to higher Sales Tax (page 1, line 1) and Interest Income (page 1, line 2).

Year to Date Expenses: As of February year-to-date, the Total Expenditures (page 1, line 26) are $36.3 million lower than prior year actuals. This is primarily due to a fluctuation in expenditures associated with various capital projects.

Budget Amendment:
There are no budget amendments for the month of February 2019.

Prepared By: Jia Du, Accountant 650-622-6226
    Jennifer Ye, Manager, General Ledger 650-622-7890
## SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
### STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
#### Fiscal Year 2019
##### February 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIOR ACTUAL</th>
<th>CURRENT ACTUAL</th>
<th>$ VARIANCE</th>
<th>% VARIANCE</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sales Tax</td>
<td>54,545,113</td>
<td>67,274,046</td>
<td>12,728,933</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Interest Income</td>
<td>4,112,052</td>
<td>4,171,034</td>
<td>58,983</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1,500)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Rental Income</td>
<td>739,637</td>
<td>440,372</td>
<td>(299,265)</td>
<td>(40.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Grant Proceeds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>59,398,302</td>
<td>71,885,453</td>
<td>12,487,151</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Annual Allocations</td>
<td>19,908,966</td>
<td>24,555,027</td>
<td>4,646,061</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Dumbarton Maintenance of Way</td>
<td>(40,744)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,744</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Measure A Categories</td>
<td>97,300,287</td>
<td>56,032,167</td>
<td>(41,268,120)</td>
<td>(42.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Oversight</td>
<td>1,101,735</td>
<td>1,064,153</td>
<td>(37,582)</td>
<td>(3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Administrative</td>
<td>756,404</td>
<td>1,096,653</td>
<td>340,249</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Measure A Info-Others</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Other Admin Expenses</td>
<td>398,057</td>
<td>389,397</td>
<td>(8,660)</td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Administrative</strong></td>
<td>1,154,510</td>
<td>1,486,050</td>
<td>331,541</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>119,424,754</td>
<td>83,137,397</td>
<td>(36,287,356)</td>
<td>(30.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCESS (DEFICIT)</strong></td>
<td>(60,026,452)</td>
<td>(11,251,944)</td>
<td>48,774,507</td>
<td>(81.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12,952,980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BEGINNING FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td>489,814,617</td>
<td>407,684,194</td>
<td>(82,130,423)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENDING FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td>429,788,165</td>
<td>396,432,250</td>
<td>(33,355,916)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Previously allocated $12,952,980 of future years' budget to the 25th Avenue Grade Separation Project.
(2) FY19 Beginning Fund Balance updated to reflect FY18 audited actuals.
Current Year Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTHLY EXPENSES</th>
<th>Jul '18</th>
<th>Aug '18</th>
<th>Sep '18</th>
<th>Oct '18</th>
<th>Nov '18</th>
<th>Dec '18</th>
<th>Jan '19</th>
<th>Feb '19</th>
<th>Mar '19</th>
<th>Apr '19</th>
<th>May '19</th>
<th>Jun '19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revised Budget</td>
<td>155,249</td>
<td>155,249</td>
<td>155,250</td>
<td>241,651</td>
<td>144,033</td>
<td>145,366</td>
<td>146,998</td>
<td>173,313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>268,531</td>
<td>183,949</td>
<td>195,928</td>
<td>181,867</td>
<td>210,842</td>
<td>215,290</td>
<td>57,432</td>
<td>172,211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUMULATIVE EXPENSES</th>
<th>Jul '18</th>
<th>Aug '18</th>
<th>Sep '18</th>
<th>Oct '18</th>
<th>Nov '18</th>
<th>Dec '18</th>
<th>Jan '19</th>
<th>Feb '19</th>
<th>Mar '19</th>
<th>Apr '19</th>
<th>May '19</th>
<th>Jun '19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Projections</td>
<td>155,249</td>
<td>310,498</td>
<td>465,748</td>
<td>707,399</td>
<td>851,432</td>
<td>996,798</td>
<td>1,143,796</td>
<td>1,317,109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>268,531</td>
<td>452,480</td>
<td>648,408</td>
<td>830,275</td>
<td>1,041,117</td>
<td>1,256,407</td>
<td>1,313,839</td>
<td>1,486,050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance-F(U)</td>
<td>(113,282)</td>
<td>(141,982)</td>
<td>(182,660)</td>
<td>(122,876)</td>
<td>(189,685)</td>
<td>(259,609)</td>
<td>(170,043)</td>
<td>(168,941)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance %</td>
<td>-72.97%</td>
<td>-45.73%</td>
<td>-39.22%</td>
<td>-17.37%</td>
<td>-22.28%</td>
<td>-26.04%</td>
<td>-14.87%</td>
<td>-12.83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

CAPITAL PROJECT RESERVES

AS OF FEBRUARY 28, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SECURITY</th>
<th>MATUREITY DATE</th>
<th>INTEREST RATE</th>
<th>PURCHASE PRICE</th>
<th>MARKET VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Pool #2</td>
<td>* Liquid Cash</td>
<td>2.355%</td>
<td>$ 228,408,940</td>
<td>$ 228,408,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Investment Fund</td>
<td>** Liquid Cash</td>
<td>2.392%</td>
<td>$ 1,009,913</td>
<td>$ 1,009,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Portfolio</td>
<td>*** Liquid Cash</td>
<td>2.037%</td>
<td>$ 161,169,143</td>
<td>$ 160,576,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>1.990%</td>
<td>$ 1,557,412</td>
<td>$ 1,557,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>Liquid Cash</td>
<td>2.037%</td>
<td>$ 161,169,143</td>
<td>$ 160,576,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Accrued Earnings for February 2019 $ -
Cumulative Earnings FY2019 $ 4,161,058

* County Pool average yield for the month ending February 28, 2019 was 2.355%. As of February 2019, the total cost of the Total Pool was $5,549,152,280 and the fair market value per San Mateo County Treasurer's Office was $5,557,779,652.

** The market value of Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF) is calculated annually and is derived from the fair value factor as reported by LAIF for quarter ending June 30th each year.

*** The Portfolio and this Investment Report comply with the Investment Policy and the provisions of SB 564 (1995).
The Authority has the ability to meet its expenditure requirements for the next six months.

**** May not foot due to rounding.
### SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
### INTEREST ON INVESTMENTS
### February 28, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL INVESTMENT</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVABLE</th>
<th>PREPAID INTER RECEIVABLE</th>
<th>INTEREST EARNED</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVED</th>
<th>ADJ. INTEREST RECEIVABLE</th>
<th>INTEREST RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LAIF</td>
<td>1,009,913.21</td>
<td>5,527.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5,527.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY POOL</td>
<td>228,408,940.49</td>
<td>1,273,614.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,273,614.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANK OF AMERICA</td>
<td>623,244.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELLS FARGO</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US BANK (Cash on deposit)</td>
<td>934,167.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT PORTFOLIO</td>
<td>160,576,890.65</td>
<td>711,544.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>711,544.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>391,553,156.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,990,687.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,990,687.23</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,990,687.23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**January 2019 — Summary of Interest & Capital Gain Year to Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earned Per Report</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Fees</td>
<td>9,415.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortized Premium/Discount</td>
<td>(27,721.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Gain/Loss</td>
<td>8,125.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Interest &amp; Capital Gain/Loss</strong></td>
<td>(10,180.78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year to Date — Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earned</td>
<td>4,161,058.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Add:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Fees</td>
<td>(58,124.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortized Premium/Discount</td>
<td>215,832.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Gain/Loss</td>
<td>(160,693.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Interest</strong></td>
<td>4,158,073.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Balance Per Ledger as of 02/28/19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of Premium/Discount</td>
<td>215,832.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/Bank Fees</td>
<td>(58,124.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest - County Pool</td>
<td>2,466,812.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest - LAIF</td>
<td>10,952.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest - Portfolio Funds</td>
<td>1,683,293.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain/Loss</td>
<td>(160,693.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,158,073.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26-Mar-19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254825T</td>
<td>02/05/17</td>
<td>2,534,338.50</td>
<td>2,586,932.50</td>
<td>04/02/21</td>
<td>5,738.20</td>
<td>11,613.10</td>
<td>2,738.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254845U</td>
<td>09/03/19</td>
<td>1,597,878.75</td>
<td>1,617,407.34</td>
<td>14/05/19</td>
<td>412.00</td>
<td>1,495.00</td>
<td>402.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254857A</td>
<td>12/07/19</td>
<td>494,476.00</td>
<td>497,894.00</td>
<td>05/15/21</td>
<td>974.14</td>
<td>1,729.64</td>
<td>974.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254887G</td>
<td>06/12/17</td>
<td>1,236,042.55</td>
<td>1,257,500.00</td>
<td>07/16/19</td>
<td>1,584.00</td>
<td>1,976.75</td>
<td>1,584.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254899A</td>
<td>05/23/17</td>
<td>523,162.25</td>
<td>578,620.35</td>
<td>05/30/20</td>
<td>752.48</td>
<td>2,219.13</td>
<td>752.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254894H</td>
<td>08/16/17</td>
<td>5,190,302.00</td>
<td>5,155,010.00</td>
<td>05/15/21</td>
<td>6,227.50</td>
<td>9,411.00</td>
<td>6,227.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254874T</td>
<td>09/20/17</td>
<td>9,078.42</td>
<td>9,078.42</td>
<td>2/28/21</td>
<td>1.375%</td>
<td>98.1597</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254874T</td>
<td>09/18/19</td>
<td>11,038.10</td>
<td>11,038.10</td>
<td>12/16/21</td>
<td>1.375%</td>
<td>98.1597</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254874T</td>
<td>09/12/19</td>
<td>13,085.00</td>
<td>13,085.00</td>
<td>03/15/21</td>
<td>1.375%</td>
<td>98.1597</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254874T</td>
<td>09/18/19</td>
<td>15,035.00</td>
<td>15,035.00</td>
<td>03/15/21</td>
<td>1.375%</td>
<td>98.1597</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254874T</td>
<td>09/12/19</td>
<td>17,085.00</td>
<td>17,085.00</td>
<td>03/15/21</td>
<td>1.375%</td>
<td>98.1597</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254874T</td>
<td>09/18/19</td>
<td>19,035.00</td>
<td>19,035.00</td>
<td>03/15/21</td>
<td>1.375%</td>
<td>98.1597</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254874T</td>
<td>09/12/19</td>
<td>21,085.00</td>
<td>21,085.00</td>
<td>03/15/21</td>
<td>1.375%</td>
<td>98.1597</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254874T</td>
<td>09/18/19</td>
<td>23,035.00</td>
<td>23,035.00</td>
<td>03/15/21</td>
<td>1.375%</td>
<td>98.1597</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254874T</td>
<td>09/12/19</td>
<td>25,085.00</td>
<td>25,085.00</td>
<td>03/15/21</td>
<td>1.375%</td>
<td>98.1597</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254874T</td>
<td>09/18/19</td>
<td>27,035.00</td>
<td>27,035.00</td>
<td>03/15/21</td>
<td>1.375%</td>
<td>98.1597</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254874T</td>
<td>09/12/19</td>
<td>29,085.00</td>
<td>29,085.00</td>
<td>03/15/21</td>
<td>1.375%</td>
<td>98.1597</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US TREASURY NOTE</td>
<td>90254874T</td>
<td>09/18/19</td>
<td>31,035.00</td>
<td>31,035.00</td>
<td>03/15/21</td>
<td>1.375%</td>
<td>98.1597</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticker</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>CF Date</td>
<td>CF Date</td>
<td>CF Date</td>
<td>CF Date</td>
<td>CF Date</td>
<td>CF Date</td>
<td>CF Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Approved Budget Receipts Over/(Under) Current Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Over/(Under) Budget/Projection</th>
<th>Current Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2018:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>21,495,463</td>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>22,675,138</td>
<td>1,179,675</td>
<td>22,675,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>22,409,567</td>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>24,376,877</td>
<td>1,967,310</td>
<td>24,376,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>18,912,692</td>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>19,826,509</td>
<td>913,817</td>
<td>19,826,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>21,842,278</td>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>20,939,402</td>
<td>(902,876)</td>
<td>20,939,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2018 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>84,660,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY2018 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,817,926</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,157,926</strong></td>
<td><strong>87,817,926</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2019:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 18</td>
<td>6,017,139</td>
<td>Sep. 18</td>
<td>7,491,211</td>
<td>1,474,072</td>
<td>6,017,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 18</td>
<td>7,017,139</td>
<td>Oct. 18</td>
<td>9,665,752</td>
<td>2,648,613</td>
<td>7,017,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep. 18</td>
<td>8,022,799</td>
<td>Nov. 18</td>
<td>9,885,150</td>
<td>1,862,351</td>
<td>8,022,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>Dec. 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Months Total</td>
<td>21,057,077</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,042,113</td>
<td>5,985,036</td>
<td>21,057,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 18</td>
<td>6,408,256</td>
<td>Dec. 18</td>
<td>8,456,110</td>
<td>2,047,854</td>
<td>6,408,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 18</td>
<td>6,408,256</td>
<td>Jan. 19</td>
<td>8,425,557</td>
<td>2,017,301</td>
<td>6,408,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 18</td>
<td>8,648,652</td>
<td>Feb. 19</td>
<td>9,739,360</td>
<td>1,090,708</td>
<td>8,648,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>Mar. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months Total</td>
<td>42,522,241</td>
<td></td>
<td>53,663,141</td>
<td>11,140,900</td>
<td>42,522,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 19</td>
<td>6,805,453</td>
<td>Mar. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,805,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 19</td>
<td>6,805,453</td>
<td>Apr. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,805,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 19</td>
<td>7,044,605</td>
<td>May 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,044,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>Jun. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Months Total</td>
<td>63,177,752</td>
<td></td>
<td>53,663,141</td>
<td>11,140,900</td>
<td>63,177,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 19</td>
<td>6,793,353</td>
<td>Jun. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,793,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19</td>
<td>6,793,353</td>
<td>Jul. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,793,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 19</td>
<td>9,588,742</td>
<td>Aug. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,588,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Qtr. Adjustment</td>
<td>Sep. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY2019 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>86,353,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY2019 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53,663,141</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,140,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>86,353,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### YTD Actual Per Statement of Revenue & Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter</td>
<td>27,042,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter</td>
<td>23,513,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter</td>
<td>16,718,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter</td>
<td>67,274,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash -- Bank of America Checking Account</td>
<td>623,244.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash -- Wells Fargo Lockbox Account</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash - US Bank (on deposit)</td>
<td>934,167.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIF</td>
<td>1,009,913.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Pool</td>
<td>228,408,940.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Portfolio</td>
<td>160,576,890.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>391,553,156.21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>000240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>000241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>000242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>000243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>000244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>000245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>000246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>000247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>000248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>000249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>000250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>004853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>900145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>900146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMCTA</td>
<td>900147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

101 Interchange to Broadway
101 Peninsula Ave/Polar I/C
101 HOV Ln Whipple - San Bruno $787,733.83; Hwy 1 Grey Whale Cove-Miramar $31,509.09; US 101/SR 92 Direct Connector $3,874.01; 101 Interchange to Broadway $8,264.45; US101/SR92 Interchange Area Imp $3,679.79
101 HOV Ln Whipple - San Bruno $10720; Highway Oversight $800; Local Shuttle Oversight $200
Highway Oversight
Bayfront Willow Adaptive Signa
Hwy 1 Poplar-Wavecrest HMB
101 HOV Ln Whipple - San Bruno
Caltrain Electrification $4,255,711.63; 25th Ave Grade Separation $4,198,138.29
101 Interchange to Willow $1,898,147.84; US 101/SR 92 Direct Connector $40,000; US101/SR92 Interchange Area Imp $30,000

12,037,238.99
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
STAFF REPORT

TO: Transportation Authority

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Derek Hansel
Chief Financial Officer

Seamus Murphy
Chief Communications Officer

SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY SERVICES

ACTION
Staff recommends the Board:

1. Award a contract to Kadesh & Associates, LLC (Kadesh & Associates), of Washington, D.C., for a not-to-exceed amount of $305,000, at fixed monthly and hourly labor rates, to provide federal legislative advocacy services for a five-year term.

2. Authorize the Executive Director, or designee, to execute a contract in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents in a form approved by legal counsel.

SIGNIFICANCE
Award of a contract to Kadesh & Associates will provide the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) with a well-qualified, professional advocacy firm. Kadesh & Associates is a top-ranked, bipartisan federal advocacy firm, recognized for its track record of success and accomplishments. The firm specializes in advocating for California interests and has represented California public and private entities before Congress and the Administration.

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

BACKGROUND
Staff determined that a joint solicitation with the San Mateo County Transit District (District) and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) was a cost-effective approach to procuring such services. A joint Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued detailing the scope of services. The solicitation was advertised in an advocacy-focused print and online newspaper and on the agency’s procurement website. Also, the solicitation was advertised to attract Disadvantaged and Small Business Enterprise (D/SBE) certified firms. Of the three firms that submitted proposals, one was a certified Small Business Enterprise and received the full five preference points available to be awarded during proposal evaluation.
An Evaluation Committee (Committee), comprised of qualified staff from Government & Community Affairs and Grants & Fund Programming and one outside expert with experience in community and legislative advocacy for public transit agencies, reviewed and ranked proposals according to the following weighted criteria set forth in the RFP:

- Qualifications and Experience of Firm 35 points
- Qualifications and Experience of Primary Lobbyist and Key Personnel 30 points
- Approach to Scope of Services 15 points
- Cost Proposal 20 points
- Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Preference 5 points

After review, evaluation, and initial scoring of proposals, two of the three firms were found to be in the competitive range. Both firms are qualified and established consultants that have extensive experience working for one or more of the three agencies. Therefore, the Committee determined oral interviews would not be necessary. As allowed under the RFP, the agencies have discretion to award contracts by agency and firm; the Committee recommends an award to Kadesh & Associates for the TA, and an award to Holland & Knight for both the JPB and District. Staff successfully negotiated contract terms and conditions, including price, with each of the highest ranked firms and determined the prices to be fair, reasonable, and consistent with those currently paid by the agencies.

Kadesh & Associates has a solid transportation advocacy track record and extensive experience on Capitol Hill. The bipartisan team has been recognized by The Hill newspaper for seven consecutive years as one of Washington’s most effective lobbying firms. In addition, each of the key personnel assigned have developed strong relationships with the California Congressional Delegation, members of the House and Senate leadership, and key Congressional Committee staff. Kadesh & Associates has considerable experience working with the Department of Transportation, the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Highway Administration.

The background of this firm demonstrates that it has the requisite depth of knowledge and experience in federal policy and legislative advocacy services to effectively promote the TA’s federal transportation priorities. Staff therefore recommends award of a contract to Kadesh & Associates.

Holland & Knight currently provides federal legislative advocacy services for the TA. The value of the current contract is $210,000 for a six-year term. The contract expires in June 2019.

Procurement Administrator III: Jillian Ragia 650.508.7767
Project Manager: Casey Fromson, Director, Government & Community Affairs 650.508.6493
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

*   *   *

AWARDING A CONTRACT TO KADESH & ASSOCIATES, LLC
TO PROVIDE FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY SERVICES
FOR A NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $305,000 FOR A FIVE-YEAR TERM

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for federal legislative advocacy services; and

WHEREAS, in response to the RFP, the TA received three proposals; and

WHEREAS, an Evaluation Committee (Committee) evaluated, scored and ranked all the proposals according to the qualifications-based evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP, and determined two of the three firms were in the competitive range; and

WHEREAS, the Committee has determined that Kadesh & Associates, LLC (Kadesh & Associates), of Washington, D.C., possesses the necessary qualifications and requisite experience to successfully perform the scope of services defined in the solicitation documents, and has agreed to perform the specified services at fair and reasonable prices; and

WHEREAS, staff and legal counsel have reviewed Kadesh & Associates' proposal and determined that it complies with the requirements of the solicitation documents; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Director recommends that the Board of Directors award a contract to Kadesh & Associates for federal legislative advocacy services for a not-to-exceed amount of $305,000, at fixed monthly and hourly labor rates, for a five-year term.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority hereby awards a contract for federal legislative advocacy services to Kadesh & Associates, LLC for a not-to-exceed amount of $305,000, at fixed monthly and hourly labor rates, for a five-year term; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute a contract on behalf of the TA with Kadesh & Associates in full conformity with all of the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents, and in a form approved by legal counsel.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of April, 2019 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

______________________________
Chair, San Mateo County Transportation Authority

ATTEST:

______________________________
Authority Secretary
AGENDA ITEM # 5 (d)
APRIL 4, 2019

SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
STAFF REPORT

TO: Transportation Authority
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director
FROM: Derek Hansel Seamus Murphy
Chief Financial Officer Chief Communications Officer
SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR STATE LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY SERVICES

ACTION
Staff Coordinating Council recommends the Board:

1. Award a contract to Khouri Consulting, of Sacramento, California, for a not-to-exceed amount of $375,500, at fixed monthly and hourly labor rates, to provide state legislative advocacy services for a five-year two-month term.

2. Authorize the Executive Director, or designee, to execute a contract in full conformity with the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents in a form approved by legal counsel.

SIGNIFICANCE
Award of a contract to Khouri Consulting will provide the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) with the services of a well-qualified, professional advocacy firm. Khouri Consulting possesses complementary skills, in-depth knowledge and broad legislative networks to meet the TA’s state advocacy interests, goals and priorities.

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

BACKGROUND
Staff determined that a joint solicitation with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) and San Mateo County Transit District (District) was a cost-effective approach to procuring such services. A Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued detailing the scope of services. The solicitation was advertised in an advocacy focused print and online newspaper and on the agency’s procurement website. Also, the solicitation was advertised to attract Disadvantaged and Small Business Enterprise (D/SBE) certified firms. Proposals were received from Khouri Consulting and Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc. both of Sacramento, California. Of the two firms that submitted proposals, one was a certified Small Business Enterprise and received the full five preference points available to be awarded during proposal evaluation.
An Evaluation Committee (Committee), comprised of qualified staff from Government & Community Affairs and Grants & Fund Programming and one outside expert with experience in community and legislative advocacy for public transit agencies, reviewed and ranked proposals according to the following weighted criteria set forth in the RFP:

- Qualifications and Experience of Firm: 35 points
- Qualifications and Experience of Primary Lobbyist and Key Personnel: 30 points
- Approach to Scope of Services: 15 points
- Cost Proposal: 20 points
- Small Business Enterprise (SBE) Preference: 5 points

After review, evaluation, and initial scoring of proposals, both firms were found to be in the competitive range. The firms are qualified and established consultants that have extensive experience working for one or more of the three agencies. Therefore, the Committee determined oral interviews would not be necessary. As allowed under the RFP, the agencies have discretion to award contracts by agency and firm; the Committee recommends an award to Khouri Consulting would be in the best interests of the TA. Staff will separately recommend award of contracts to Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc. for the District and JPB.

Khouri Consulting’s state legislative advocacy approach provides thorough analysis of legislation, policies, and regulations as well as strong capabilities to develop and implement effective strategies to further the TA’s interests with a variety of legislative, policy and regulatory entities. The personnel assigned to the TA’s account have provided representation and advocacy on behalf of the TA in its dealings with relevant state legislative bodies, agencies and related interest groups. The personnel have been effective in delivering policy and funding priorities for the TA.

This background of this firm demonstrates that it has the requisite depth of knowledge and experience in policy and legislative advocacy services to effectively promote the TA’s transportation priorities.

Khouri Consulting currently provides state legislative advocacy services for the TA. The contract amount is $223,008 for a five-year term and it expires end of March 2019.

Procurement Administrator III: Jillian Ragia 650-508-7767
Project Manager: Casey Fromson, Director, Government & Community Affairs 650-508-6493
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

*   *   *

AWARDING A CONTRACT TO KHOURI CONSULTING
TO PROVIDE STATE LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY SERVICES
FOR A NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT OF $375,500 FOR A FIVE-YEAR TWO-MONTH TERM

WHEREAS, the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for state legislative advocacy services; and

WHEREAS, in response to the RFP, the TA received two proposals; and

WHEREAS, an Evaluation Committee (Committee) evaluated, scored and ranked all the proposals according to the evaluation criteria set forth in the RFP, and determined both firms were in the competitive range; and

WHEREAS, the Committee determined that Khouri Consulting, of Sacramento, California, possesses the necessary qualifications and requisite experience to successfully perform the scope of services defined in the solicitation documents, and has agreed to perform the specified services at fair and reasonable prices; and

WHEREAS, staff and legal counsel have reviewed Khouri Consulting’s proposal and determined that it complies with the requirements of the solicitation documents; and

WHEREAS, the Executive Director recommends that the Board of Directors award a contract to Khouri Consulting for state legislative advocacy services for a not-to-exceed amount of $375,500, at fixed monthly and hourly labor rates, for a five-year two-month term.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority hereby awards a contract for state legislative advocacy services to Khouri Consulting for a not-to-exceed amount of $375,500, at fixed monthly and hourly labor rates, for a five-year two-month term; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board authorizes the Executive Director, or his designee, to execute a contract on behalf of the TA with Khouri Consulting in full conformity with all of the terms and conditions of the solicitation documents, and in a form approved by legal counsel.

Regularly passed and adopted this 4th day of April, 2019 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, San Mateo County Transportation Authority

ATTEST:

Authority Secretary
Memorandum

Date: March 26, 2019
To: TA Board of Directors
From: Jim Hartnett, Executive Director
Subject: Executive Director’s Report - April 4, 2019

Strategic Plan

TA staff has initiated planning efforts with the development of a new five-year Strategic Plan that will cover both Measure A and the 50 percent of Measure W that SamTrans has authorized the TA to administer. The purpose of the Strategic Plan is to set the policy framework and implementation plan for the TA’s administration of its transportation programs.

Work efforts have kicked into high gear since staff’s March presentation, which focused on the public outreach process. Work has resumed for both the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and Stakeholder Advisor Group (SAG), which were instrumental in the Get Us Moving (GUM) initiative that ultimately led to the passage of Measure W by the San Mateo County voters. Both of these groups will be continuing their good work throughout the development of the TA’s new Strategic Plan. The initial meeting for the TAG was held on March 19 and for the SAG on March 21.

The first meeting of the TA Strategic Plan 2020-2024 Implementation Ad Hoc Committee has been scheduled for April 16. As noted in the March public outreach presentation, in addition to the TAG and SAG meetings, broad community engagement efforts that will be taking place this Spring include: a series of town halls, presentations to various civic and business groups, community pop-up events, online surveys, and leveraging both traditional and social media. A dedicated web page for the Strategic Plan will become available before the public outreach begins. The new five-year Strategic Plan, 2020-2024, will be completed by the end of calendar year 2019.
101 Express Lanes Project

On Friday, March 8, state and local elected officials, staff from the integrated project delivery team, and the construction contractor gathered at the groundbreaking to commemorate the start of construction of the 101 Express Lanes Project.

Speakers acknowledged and expressed much appreciation for the tremendous effort and contributions of those that secured funding and the team that delivered the project to this threshold of construction. Chair Don Horsley, representing the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, recognized the innovative way in which the implementation of the 101 Express Lanes Project will encourage carpooling and transit usage, alleviating congestion in this critical corridor.

Construction is now underway for the southern segment (from the San Mateo/Santa Clara County line to Whipple Avenue in Redwood City), which converts the existing HOV (high-occupancy vehicle) lanes to express lanes. The northern segment, which adds express lanes between Whipple Avenue and I-380, is scheduled to begin construction at the end of this year. The express lanes are targeted to open Summer 2022.

California Drive Roundabout (Burlingame)

On Wednesday, April 17 at 11:00 am, Burlingame will be hosting a ribbon cutting to celebrate the completion of the California Drive Roundabout Project. The event will take place in Parking Lot O near the intersection of California Drive and Bellevue Avenue in Burlingame. City of Burlingame has extended an invitation to the TA Board to attend the event.

The Transportation Authority as part of the Fiscal Year 2014-15 Call for Projects contributed $1 million of Measure A funding from the Pedestrian and Bicycle Program for planning through construction.

The project, which has broad community support, addresses a pedestrian and bicyclist safety concern brought on by what was a complicated intersection traffic movement with a lack of clear right-of-way determination between pedestrian, bicyclists, and vehicles. The roundabout provides key access for employees and patrons of the Burlingame Downtown Business District, Caltrans and SamTrans commuters, and Burlingame High school students.

The roundabout will be presented as the feature project in the PowerPoint for the Measure A Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Report on the agenda for this evening.
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
STAFF REPORT

TO: Transportation Authority
THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director
FROM: April Chan
Chief Officer, Planning, Grants
David Olmeda
Chief Operating Officer, Bus
and the Transportation Authority
SUBJECT: PROGRAM REPORT: PARATRANSIT PROGRAM

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

SIGNIFICANCE
This presentation is part of a series of program reports presented to the Board. Each of the Transportation Authority’s six program areas – Transit, Highways, Local Streets/Transportation, Grade Separations, Pedestrian & Bicycle, and Alternative Congestion Relief Programs – will be featured individually throughout the year. This month features a report on the Paratransit Program under the Transit Program Category.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
Paratransit is a service provided for persons with disabilities who are unable to independently use SamTrans fixed-route bus service. The San Mateo County Transit District provides paratransit using Redi-Wheels on the bayside of the county and RediCoast on the Coastsider. Since 1989, the Transportation Authority has provided critical funding in support of the capital and operating needs associated with paratransit service in San Mateo County. The Original Measure A created a $25 million Paratransit Trust Fund to be maintained in perpetuity. Interest earned from this fund was allocated for paratransit. Over the 20 year period that the TA administered the fund, $32 million of Measure A funds went to support paratransit service.
In 2009, as part of the FY2010 TA Budget, the Board took an action to transfer the Paratransit Trust Fund to the San Mateo County Transit District. Interest from the Trust Fund continues to support Paratransit service.

Acknowledging the escalating need and associated costs of this service, voters approved the New Measure A which allocates 4 percent of the total sales tax revenue to help meet the special mobility needs of the county through paratransit and other accessible services. As part of the FY2019 Budget, the TA Board allocated $3,454,128 of Measure A funding to provide accessible service for eligible seniors and people with disabilities in the county.

This month’s presentation will be presented via PowerPoint.

Prepared by: Joel Slavit, Manager Programming and Monitoring   650-508-7942
SamTrans
Paratransit Service
ADA Paratransit Service

• ADA – Americans with Disabilities Act
• Paratransit Customers
• Cost & Funding Source
• Operating Statistics
• Summary
Americans with Disabilities Act passed in 1990

- Full accessibility on all fixed-route buses (lifts/ramps)
- Comparable paratransit service for those unable to ride fixed-route transit
- ADA Paratransit characteristics/requirements:
  - Service must be provided within \(\frac{3}{4}\)-mile zone of fixed-route service
  - Service day/time parallel to fixed-route service
  - Shared ride
  - Advance reservation
  - Zero denial for service
SamTrans Paratransit Service

- Paratransit service provides equal opportunity for mobility to people with disabilities who can’t use conventional fixed-route transit
- SamTrans commitment to paratransit pre-dates ADA
- SamTrans provides service beyond what is required by ADA
- Demand for ADA service is growing
- Unfunded Federal mandate
Paratransit Customers
Paratransit Customers

Approximately 8,200 eligible paratransit customers
67% are 70 years or older
19% are non-ambulatory
28% have cognitive disabilities
16% have visual disabilities
27% receive fare assistance

Source: Paratransit customer data
Paratransit Customers’ Trips

- 10% go to dialysis centers
- 14% go to adult day care centers
- Other key destinations include hospitals, doctor’s appointments, County services, senior centers, colleges, senior housing, and shopping
Paratransit Customers

- All Redi-Wheels and RediCoast users must be certified as eligible for ADA-Paratransit
- SamTrans utilizes a third-party functional assessment process to determine eligibility
Cost & Funding Sources
## Program Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019 (Budget)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs ($000)</strong></td>
<td>$15,649</td>
<td>$18,908</td>
<td>$16,856</td>
<td>$18,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Trips</strong></td>
<td>351,220</td>
<td>361,960</td>
<td>354,680</td>
<td>365,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Cost per trip</strong></td>
<td>$44.56</td>
<td>$52.24</td>
<td>$47.47</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farebox Ratio</strong></td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Mateo County Transportation Authority

Paratransit funding

• Original Measure A
  - $25 million fund established permanent source, invest, use proceeds to fund service

• New Measure A
  - 4% of measure, approximately $3.3 million/year designated “…to meet the special mobility needs of county residents through paratransit and other accessible services.”
Paratransit Funding Sources

FY2019 Budget
San Mateo County TA Measure A $3.5 million
Transportation Development Act funds 2.1
Operating grants 2.1
District sales tax 6.0
TA Measure A Interest income 0.4
San Mateo County Measure K 2.5
Measure M (Motor Vehicle Reg. Fee) 1.4
Passenger fares 0.9

$18.9 million
Operating Statistics
How Service is Delivered

- Redi-Wheels and RediCoast are delivered by a contractor with program oversight by SamTrans staff
  - First Transit is the contractor for Redi-Wheels
  - MV Transit is the contractor for RediCoast
- SamTrans owns & maintains fleet of vehicles for these services (53 cutaway buses & 24 minivans)
- Contractor supplements District fleet with sedans and contracted taxis to meet peak demand
Brewster facility and equipment owned and maintained by SamTrans
On-time Performance

Pick ups within 20 minutes of scheduled pick up time

- Redi-Wheels
- RediCoast
- Goal
Customer Satisfaction

Complaints per thousand trips

- Redi-Wheels
- RediCoast
- Goal
Paratransit Trip Denials

ADA requires transit agencies to plan to meet demand for paratransit service.

Eligible customers were offered a trip within one hour of the requested pick-up time.
Summary

• County demographics pointing towards continued demand in the future
• Service quality is high
  - Very low complaint rate
  - OTP rate above 90% goal
• Paratransit service is a Federal mandate and contributes to SamTrans structural deficit
• SamTrans continues to monitor costs and provide high-quality ADA service
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
STAFF REPORT

TO: Transportation Authority

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

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

SUBJECT: PEDESTRIAN & BICYCLE PROGRAM REPORT

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

SIGNIFICANCE
This presentation is part of a series of program reports presented to the Board. Each of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority’s (TA) six program areas – Transit, Highways, Local Streets/Transportation, Grade Separations, Pedestrian and Bicycle, and Alternative Congestion Relief Programs – will be featured individually throughout the year. This month features a presentation that provides a brief overview on the status of the Measure A Pedestrian and Bicycle Program and highlights the California Roundabout project in Burlingame. The California Roundabout is a traffic calming project that will improve bicycle and pedestrian access, among other City goals, on a busy arterial corridor in Burlingame.

BUDGET IMPACT
There is no impact on the budget.

BACKGROUND
The TA’s pedestrian and bicycle program provides funding for the development and construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities to encourage and improve walking and bicycling. Three percent of the New Measure A sales tax revenue is available to support the Pedestrian and Bicycle Program. Project sponsors are required to submit quarterly progress reports, which the TA uses to track the performance of individual projects as well as the overall program.

This month’s presentation will be presented via PowerPoint. In addition, the following exhibits are included as part of this item:

Exhibit A: New Measure A Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Project Descriptions
Exhibit B: New Measure A Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Project Status Update
Exhibit C: Public Funding Sources Available for Pedestrian & Bicycle Projects/Programs in San Mateo County

Prepared by: Joel Slavit, Manager Programming and Monitoring 650-508-6476
Exhibit A: New Measure A Pedestrian and Bicycle Program - Project Descriptions

1. **Middlefield Road Class II Bike Lanes Project**  
   **Sponsor:** Town of Atherton  
   **Allocated Funding:** $733,000  
   Construction of wider Class II bike lanes on both sides of Middlefield Road from Ravenswood Avenue to Jennings Lane (approximate 1.5 mile segment) as well as pedestrian crossing improvements. Bikeway improvements include roadway widening in select locations to accommodate wider bike lanes and the addition of high visibility green bike lane markings at conflict zones. This project also includes the installation of a flashing LED beacon at the intersection of Middlefield and Glenwood Avenues and improved high visibility pedestrian crossings on Middlefield Road at the intersections of Marsh Road, Watkins Avenue, and Encinal Avenue.

2. **Belmont Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Project**  
   **Sponsor:** Belmont  
   **Allocated Funding:** $882,036  
   Environmental, final design and construction phases for a suite of pedestrian and bicycle improvements at various locations along Ralston Avenue from Highway 101 to South Road. Upgrades along Ralston Corridor include high visibility pavement markings and crosswalks, green bike lanes, sharrows, wayfinding signs and pedestrian refuge islands.

3. **Notre Dame Avenue Street Improvement Project**  
   **Sponsor:** Belmont  
   **Allocated Funding:** $150,000  
   Construction of pedestrian and bicycle improvements on Notre Dame Avenue between Ralston and Miller Avenue (approximately 0.3 miles) including new sidewalks to eliminate gaps, ADA-compliant curb ramps, bicycle “share the road” signs, sharrows and enhanced crosswalks.

4. **Ralston Avenue/Highway 101 Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing Project**  
   **Sponsor:** Belmont  
   **Allocated Funding:** $596,696  
   Construction of a bicycle and pedestrian bridge and path 900 feet north of Ralston Avenue, crossing U.S. 101 and O’Neil Slough. The project includes a Class I bicycle path/sidewalk 8 feet in width plus a 2-foot wide shoulder on each side of at-grade sections. The total length of the project is approximately 2,460 feet, consisting of 1,522 feet of bridge structures/ramps, and 938 feet of paths/sidewalks.

5. **Burlingame Avenue Downtown Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements**  
   **Sponsor:** Burlingame  
   **Allocated Funding:** $300,000  
   Planning and design for approximately 4,400 linear feet of streetscape improvements in the downtown area of Burlingame, including ADA-compliant ramps, sidewalks, crosswalk striping, bicycle racks, lighting, landscaping, curb, and gutter work along Burlingame Avenue from El Camino Real to California Drive.

6. **Burlingame East Side Bicycle Route Improvements**  
   **Sponsor:** Burlingame  
   **Allocated Funding:** $91,700  
   Design and construction of approximately 9,700 linear feet of dedicated Class II bike lanes, markings, and directional signage along Airport Boulevard from Bayshore Highway to Lang Road. Installation of sharrow roadway markings and directional signage for 6,600 feet along Bayshore Highway (between Airport Boulevard and the Millbrae city limits) and for 920 feet along Beach Road (between Sanchez Creek/Bayfront Channel and Airport Boulevard).

7. **Burlingame West Side Bicycle Route Improvements**  
   **Sponsor:** Burlingame  
   **Allocated Funding:** $168,700  
   Design and construction a combination of dedicated Class II bike lanes and Class III sharrow roadway markings and directional signage along a 4,000 foot segment of Hillside Drive from Alvarado Avenue to
El Camino Real and 7,100 feet along Rollins Road (between Broadway and the city limit near Adrian Road).

8. **California Drive/Bellevue Avenue Bike-Pedestrian Roundabout**  
   **Sponsor:** Burlingame  
   **Allocated Funding:** $1,000,000  
   Preliminary engineering/environmental, final design, right of way and construction for a roundabout with enhanced crosswalks and median islands, ADA-compliant curb ramps, green street/sustainable stormwater runoff control and designated bikeway improvements.

9. **Hillside Boulevard Improvements Phase I**  
   **Sponsor:** Colma  
   **Allocated Funding:** $177,541  
   Construction of the following improvements as part of a larger streetscape improvement project: 2,270 linear feet of new sidewalk with ADA-compliant curb ramps, 4,727 linear feet of bicycle lanes (both sides), new enhanced crosswalks, and traffic calming including removal of one vehicular travel lane from each side of the street and sidewalk bulb-outs.

10. **Complete the Gap Trail**  
    **Sponsor:** County of San Mateo  
    **Allocated Funding:** $300,000  
    Preliminary engineering, environmental review and final design to close an approximate 800 foot long trail gap on the Crystal Springs Regional Trail, which will accommodate pedestrians and bicycles, on the west side of Skyline Boulevard between Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir Dam and the existing South of Dam Trail segment. The project consists of an 8 foot wide paved trail and a 2 foot wide gravel shoulder with a k-rail on the east and a chain-link fence on the west and pathway directional signage.

11. **Complete the Gap Trail**  
    **Sponsor:** County of San Mateo  
    **Allocated Funding:** $750,000*  
    Construction of an 800-foot long multi-use trail on the west side of Skyline Boulevard between the Lower Crystal Springs Reservoir Dam and the existing South of Dam Trail segment.  
    *Sponsor decided not to proceed with project as designed and relinquished allocated construction funding, which will be made available for other projects in future funding cycles.

12. **Midcoast Multimodal Trail**  
    **Sponsor:** County of San Mateo  
    **Allocated Funding:** $500,000  
    Preliminary engineering, environmental and design work for approximately 3,750 feet of a multi-use trail from Alto Avenue in Miramar to Coronado Street in El Granada.

13. **Enhanced Pedestrian and Bicycle Visibility Project**  
    **Sponsor:** Daly City  
    **Allocated Funding:** $337,500  
    Design and construction of the installation of crosswalk warning LED light systems at various intersections and build-out of all remaining bicycle routes and lanes, to the extent feasible, from the City’s Bicycle Master Plan.

14. **John Daly Boulevard Streetscape Improvements**  
    **Sponsor:** Daly City  
    **Allocation Funding:** $1,000,000  
    Construction of the following improvements as part of a larger streetscape improvement project: widening of the travel way to accommodate 6 to 7 foot wide bicycle lanes on John Daly Boulevard between Mission and DeLong streets (approx. 0.3 miles), widening of pedestrian refuge islands at Santa Barbara Avenue, installation of pedestrian scale lighting on new, widened sidewalks, and installation of stamped asphalt crosswalks at Santa Barbara and DeLong streets.
15. **Lake Merced Boulevard In-pavement Crosswalk**
   - Sponsor: Daly City
   - Allocated Funding: $77,000
   - Construction of an in-pavement crosswalk warning system, a rectangular rapid flashing beacon, and bulb-out on Lake Merced Boulevard, approximately 280 feet north of Belmar Avenue.

16. **Mission Street Streetscape Project**
   - Sponsor: Daly City
   - Allocated Funded: $810,000
   - Final design and construction work to widen an existing 3-foot wide concrete median on Mission Street to a 7 to 8-foot wide median with drought tolerant landscaping between Crocker and Templeton Avenues. Median noses will be extended further into the intersections at Goethe Street, Evergreen Avenue and Rice Street. A new pedestrian bulb-out will be provided at the intersection of Mission and Goethe Streets and high visibility crosswalks and improved pedestrian crossing signage will be provided in the project area. Existing inside vehicular travel lanes on Mission Street will be narrowed from 12 to 11 feet.

17. **Bike Transportation Plan Implementation – Class II and III Bike Facilities Project**
   - Sponsor: East Palo Alto
   - Allocated Funding: $300,000
   - Construction of Class II bike lanes and Class III bike routes designated in the City’s Bike Plan. Bike lanes are proposed on Newbridge Street, Bay Road, and Pulgas and Clark Avenues (total of 2.3 miles). Sharrows are proposed on 15 different local streets (total of 6.9 miles).

18. **Highway 101 Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing**
   - Sponsor: East Palo Alto
   - Allocated Funding: $300,000
   - Planning, preliminary design and environmental work for an overcrossing of Highway 101 that will connect at East Bayshore Road/Clarke Avenue and West Bayshore Road/Newell Road.

19. **Highway 1 Trail Extension - Ruisseau Francais to Roosevelt**
   - Sponsor: Half Moon Bay
   - Allocated Funding: $250,000
   - Design and construction for the extension of the Highway 1 Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail from north of Ruisseau Francais Avenue to north of Roosevelt Boulevard with a 12-foot Class I Bike/Pedestrian path for approximately 0.5 miles.

20. **Main Street Bridge Bike and Pedestrian Improvements**
    - Sponsor: Half Moon Bay
    - Allocated Funding: $500,000*
    - Design and construction of a new pedestrian and bicycle bridge in conjunction with and independently from, the rehabilitation of the existing motor vehicle bridge.
    
    *Sponsor decided not to proceed with project. Funding was made available to help fund other projects from the 2017 Call for Projects (per Resolution 2018-07).

21. **Pacific Coast Bikeway Connectivity North Project**
    - Sponsor: Half Moon Bay
    - Allocated Funding: $315,000
    - Preliminary engineering/environmental review, final design, and construction of a Class I pedestrian/bike path on the east side of Highway 1 between Roosevelt Boulevard and Mirada Road (0.26 mile segment).
22. **Haven Avenue Streetscape Project**  
   **Sponsor:** Menlo Park  
   **Allocated Funding:** $170,000  
   Design and construction of approximately 3,080 linear feet of bicycle lanes with buffer striping and green pavement treatments in vehicle-bicycle interaction zones, and pedestrian enhanced crosswalks at Haven Avenue and Haven Court.

23. **Menlo Park Bicycle and Pedestrian Enhancement Project**  
   **Sponsor:** Menlo Park  
   **Allocated Funding:** $805,600  
   Final design and construction of the following pedestrian and bicycle enhancements: 1) installation of sidewalks and accessible curb ramps at the intersection of Coleman and Santa Monica Avenues and on Pierce Road from the Ringwood Avenue/101 Pedestrian-bicycle overcrossing to an alleyway east of Carlton Avenue, 2) crosswalk enhancements on Middle Avenue at Blake Street and San Mateo Drive including rapid rectangular flashing beacons, bicycle markings and accessible curb ramps, and 3) installation of sharrows and signage on San Mateo/Wallea Drive.

24. **Menlo Park-East Palo Alto Connectivity Project**  
   **Allocated Funding:** $395,000  
   **Sponsor:** Menlo Park/East Palo Alto  
   Construction of the following improvements: bicycle routes and sharrows on eight separate residential streets bounded by the general area of Willow Road, US 101, University Avenue and San Francisquito Creek, adding new sidewalks to eliminate gaps on O’Connor Street and Menalto Avenue, and bicycle and pedestrian enhancements at the Willow Road/Gilbert Avenue intersection, including enhanced crosswalks, ADA-compliant curb ramps and sharrows.

25. **Middle Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossing**  
   **Sponsor:** Menlo Park  
   **Allocated Funding:** $490,000  
   Preliminary engineering and environmental review for a grade separated crossing through the Caltrain Railroad from El Camino Real to Alma Street at Middle Avenue to create a pedestrian and bicycle connection between east and west Menlo Park.

26. **Magnolia Avenue and Richmond Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Project**  
   **Sponsor:** Millbrae  
   **Allocated Funding:** $260,000  
   Preliminary engineering/environmental review, final design, and construction of Class III bike routes on Park Place between El Camino Real and Magnolia Avenue, on Magnolia Avenue from Park Place to Murchison Drive and on Richmond Drive between Magnolia and the Millbrae Spur Trail (total of approx. 2.5 miles). Existing crosswalks on Magnolia Avenue will be upgraded to high visibility ladder crosswalks and rectangular rapid flashing beacons will be installed at the intersections of Magnolia Avenue and Green Hills and Helen Drives. While the sponsor’s request was for $360,000 with $40,000 of matching funds for a total cost of $400,000, the application included $100,000 of ineligible pavement rehabilitation.

27. **Pacifica Headlands Trail Project**  
   **Sponsor:** Pacifica  
   **Allocated Funding:** $360,000  
   Purchase of right of way for the Headlands Trail Project, which will ultimately include approximately 5,800 feet of natural surface multi-purpose trail from San Pedro Avenue to the northern end of the Devil’s Slide Tunnel Project.
28. Alpine Road at Arastradero & Portola Road at Farm Hill Road Shoulder Widening
   Sponsor: Portola Valley  Allocated Funding: $309,500
   Planning, environmental, design and construction work for the shoulder widening of two “pinch-point” locations along Alpine (500 linear feet) and Portola (600 linear feet) roads.

29. Brewster Avenue Pedestrian Improvements
   Sponsor: Redwood City  Allocated Funding: $734,000
   Design and construction of 19 curb bulb-outs with accessibility ramps at existing school crosswalks on Brewster Avenue from Fulton Street to Arch Street and two curb bulb-outs with accessibility ramps at the intersection of Broadway and Arch Street.

30. Highway 101 Undercrossing Project
   Sponsor: Redwood City  Allocated Funding: $500,000
   Construction of an approximate 700-foot long, pedestrian and bicycle path under the US 101 overpass at Redwood Creek, between and existing path that leads to Bair Island on the north side of US 101 and Convention Way on the south side of US 101.

31. Hudson Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
   Sponsor: Redwood City  Allocated Funding: $532,640
   Design and construction of sharrow roadway markings and directional signage along the entire length of Hudson Street (approximately 1.7 miles). Bicycle detectors and pedestrian signals also will be installed at the signalized intersection of Jefferson Avenue and Woodside Road. Installation of crosswalks and bulb-outs at the following cross streets: Roosevelt Avenue, Oak Avenue and Redwood Avenue.

32. Jefferson/Cleveland Safe Routes to School and Peninsula Bikeway Project
   Sponsor: Redwood City  Allocated Funding: $375,000
   Final design and construction of pedestrian/bicycle improvements at the intersection of Jefferson Avenue and Cleveland Street consisting of a pedestrian hybrid beacon or full traffic signal, marked crosswalks, bulb-outs at the north and southwest corners with accessible curb ramps, and a diverter and partial road closure that limits motor vehicle movements to right-turns only onto Jefferson while allowing bicyclists to continue straight.

33. Kennedy Safe Routes to School Project
   Sponsor: Redwood City  Allocated Funding: $500,000
   Construction of mini roundabout, signage and striping improvements at Alameda de Las Pulgas and Goodwin/Maddux. Curb extensions, expansion of bus loading zone area on Washington Avenue, signage and striping improvements at the Kennedy school intersections.

34. Safe Routes to Schools
   Sponsor: Redwood City  Allocated Funding: $976,780
   Design and construction of high-priority traffic control devices and traffic calming features in the vicinity of Adelante, Hawes, John Gill, Roosevelt and Roy Cloud schools including, curb extensions, high visibility crosswalks, ADA-compliant curb ramps, updated school area signage, stop signs, pavement markings, and bicycle markings for signal detection.

35. Regional Bike Share Pilot Program – Redwood City
   Sponsor: SamTrans  Allocated Funding: $80,000
San Mateo County share of approximate 1,000 bicycle program deployed in strategic locations in San Francisco, Redwood City, Palo Alto, Mountain View, and San Jose. Measure A Funding applied toward capital costs for the installation of bicycles and stations in Redwood City during the pilot phase of the project.

36. El Camino Real/Angus Avenue Intersection Improvements
   Sponsor: San Bruno  Allocated Funding: $300,000
   Design and construction of enhanced crosswalks, corner bulb-outs, median refuge areas and upgraded traffic signals at the intersection of El Camino Real and Angus Avenue.

37. Transit Corridor Pedestrian Connection Project
   Sponsor: San Bruno  Allocated Funding: $350,000
   Design and construction of bulb-outs, lighting, and directional signage on El Camino Real from San Bruno Avenue to Sneath Lane, San Bruno Avenue from El Camino Real to Huntington Avenue, and Huntington Avenue from San Bruno Avenue to Sneath Lane.

38. 101/Holly Street Grade Separated Path Project
   Sponsor: San Carlos  Allocated Funding: $100,000
   Preliminary design and environmental work (project approval and environmental document) for a pedestrian and bicycle bridge through the US 101/Holly Street interchange.

39. 101/Holly Street Pedestrian and Bicycle Overcrossing
   Sponsor: San Carlos  Allocated Funding: $1,000,000
   Construction of a pedestrian and bicycle overcrossing on the south side of the US 101/Holly Street Interchange.

40. Pedestrian Safety Improvement Plan for San Carlos Avenue
    Sponsor: San Carlos  Allocation Funding: $1,000,000
    Construction of new sidewalks on the north side of San Carlos Avenue from Devonshire Boulevard to Prospect Street with accessible curb ramps at intersections. A new traffic signal is also proposed at San Carlos Avenue and Phelps Road. Upgrade existing Class II bike lanes to high visibility green bike lanes in transition zones at Upland Avenue and near the Alameda De Las Pulgas.

41. 28th Avenue Bike Boulevard and Implementation Project
    Sponsor: San Mateo  Allocated Funding: $380,000
    Final design and construction of traffic calming improvements and bicycle/pedestrian enhancements on 28th Avenue from Mason Lane to El Camino Real that include bicycle striping and signage, speed humps, bulb-outs at Hacienda, Garfield and Edison Streets, and high visibility crosswalks.

42. Citywide Bicycle Striping and Signage
    Sponsor: San Mateo  Allocated Funding: $157,163
    Implementation of the City of San Mateo Bicycle Master Plan recommended on-street bicycle network including striping and signage for Class II bicycle lanes, Class bicycle routes, and III bicycle routes with sharrow roadway markings.

43. Hillsdale/101 Bridge Project
    Sponsor: San Mateo  Allocated Funding: $480,000
    Planning work (project initiation document) for the construction of a pedestrian and bicycle overcrossing south of the Hillsdale/US 101 interchange and bicycle lanes from Norfolk Street to the San Mateo/Foster City limit.
44. **Hillsdale/101 Bridge Project**  
Sponsor: San Mateo  
Allocated Funded: $875,000  
Preliminary design and environmental work (project approval and environmental document) for the construction of a pedestrian and bicycle overcrossing south of the Hillsdale/US 101 interchange and bicycle lanes from Norfolk Street to the San Mateo/Foster City limit.

45. **North San Mateo Drive Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvement Project**  
Sponsor: San Mateo  
Allocated Funded: $200,000  
Construction of a road diet on a one-mile stretch of San Mateo Drive from Peninsula Avenue to Baldwin Avenue, converting four vehicular travel lanes to two vehicular travel lanes with a mixture of two-way left turn lanes and pockets. Approximately 5,300 feet of Class II bikeways, curb extensions, striping and signage, green street features, and landscaped curb extension throughout the corridor.

46. **Sharrows and Striping Program**  
Sponsor: South San Francisco  
Allocated Funding: $81,200  
Installation of sharrow roadway markings on existing Class III bicycle routes and the striping of proposed Class II bicycle lanes throughout the city.

47. **Sunshine Gardens Safety and Connectivity Improvements Project**  
Sponsor: South San Francisco  
Allocated Funding: $504,000  
Preliminary engineering, environmental review and final design and construction of safety features in the Sunshine Gardens neighborhood, in the vicinity of Sunshine Gardens Elementary School and El Camino High School to include: advanced stop bars, high-visibility ladder cross walks, pedestrian refuge islands, ADA compliant curb ramps and a Class III bicycle route installed along Holly Avenue between Mission Road and Hillside Boulevard.

48. **Alameda de Las Pulgas Bike and Pedestrian Improvements**  
Sponsor: Woodside  
Allocated Funding: $275,000  
Final design and construction of the following improvements: buffered bike lanes on the Alameda de las Pulgas from Woodside Road to Fernside Street, reduction of through vehicular lanes from two to one in the southbound direction of the Alameda de las Pulgas to match the existing northbound condition, re-channelizing the approach of Fernside Street to a right angle at the Alameda de las Pulgas for southbound automobile traffic, and the removal of median curb projections in the crosswalks at the Alameda de las Pulgas/Woodside Road intersection.

49. **School Safety Improvements Project**  
Sponsor: Woodside  
Allocated Funding: $21,600  
Replacement of two existing in-pavement crosswalks with warning lights and a caution sign with rectangular rapid flashing beacon, adjacent to Woodside Elementary School.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Funding Cycle</th>
<th>Impvt Type</th>
<th>Measure A Funded Phase(s)</th>
<th>Measure A Funds</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Project Status as 12/31/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td>Middlefield Road Class II Bike Lanes Project</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$733,000</td>
<td>$607,000</td>
<td>$1,340,000</td>
<td>Final design underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>Belmont Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Project</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Environmental, final design and construction</td>
<td>$882,036</td>
<td>$98,004</td>
<td>$980,040</td>
<td>Final design is nearing completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>Notre Dame Avenue Street Improvement Project</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>Raiston Avenue Hwy 101 Bike/Ped Overcrossing Project</td>
<td>Special Circumstances</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$596,696</td>
<td>$6,723,279</td>
<td>$7,319,975</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>Burlingame Avenue Downtown Pedestrian and Bicycle Project</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Planning &amp; design</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>$645,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>Burlingame East Side Bicycle Route Improvements</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>bike</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$91,700</td>
<td>$39,300</td>
<td>$131,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>Burlingame West Side Bicycle Route Improvements</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>bike</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$168,700</td>
<td>$72,300</td>
<td>$241,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>California Drive/Bellevue Avenue Bike-Pedestrian Roundabout</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering/environmental, final design, right-of-way, construction</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>Construction is nearing completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Colma</td>
<td>Hillside Boulevard Improvements Phase I</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$177,541</td>
<td>$1,340,037</td>
<td>$1,517,578</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>County of San Mateo</td>
<td>Complete the Gap Trail</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering/environmental and final design</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>County of San Mateo</td>
<td>Complete the Gap Trail</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Sponsor rescinded project3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>County of San Mateo</td>
<td>Midcoast Multimodal Trail</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering/environmental &amp; final design</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>Enhanced Pedestrian and Bicycle Visibility Project</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$337,500</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>Final design completed, advertised for construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>John Daly Boulevard Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>Construction ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>Lake Merced Boulevard In-pavement Crosswalk</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$77,000</td>
<td>$103,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>Mission Street Streetscape Project</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$810,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>Final design ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td>Bike Transportation Plan Implementation - Class II &amp; III Bike Facilities Project</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>bike</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering/environmental ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td>Highway 101 Pedestrian/ Bicycle Overcrossing</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Planning &amp; preliminary engineering/environmental</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>Highway 1 Trail Extension - Ruisseau Francais to Roosevelt</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>Main Street Bridge Bike and Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Planning, preliminary engineering/environmental, final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$7,037,000</td>
<td>$7,537,000</td>
<td>Sponsor rescinded project3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>Pacific Coast Bikeway Connectivity North Project</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Planning, preliminary engineering/environmental, final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering/environmental ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit B: New Measure A Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Project Status Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Funding Cycle</th>
<th>Impvt Type</th>
<th>Measure A Funded Phase(s)</th>
<th>Measure A Funds</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Project Status as 12/31/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>Haven Avenue Streetscape Project</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering/environmental, final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>Final design was nearing completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>Menlo Park Bicycle and Pedestrian Enhancement Project</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$805,600</td>
<td>$201,400</td>
<td>$1,007,000</td>
<td>Final design underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>Menlo Park-East Palo Alto Connectivity Project</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$395,000</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>Middle Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Crossing</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering and environmental</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering/environmental ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>Magnolia Avenue and Richmond Drive Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements Project</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Final design ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>Pacifica Headlands Trail Project</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Right of way</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
<td>Alpine Road at Araxstradero Road and Portola Road at Farm Road Shoulder Widening</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Planning, preliminary engineering/environmental, final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$309,500</td>
<td>$138,000</td>
<td>$447,500</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Brewster Avenue Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$734,000</td>
<td>$183,500</td>
<td>$917,500</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Highway 101 Undercrossing Project</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>Construction underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Hudson Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$532,640</td>
<td>$133,160</td>
<td>$665,800</td>
<td>Measure A funded work complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Jefferson/Cleveland Safe Routes to School and Peninsula Bikeway Project</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Final design underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Kennedy Safe Routes to School Project</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Construction underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Safe Routes to Schools</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$976,780</td>
<td>$146,220</td>
<td>$1,123,000</td>
<td>Construction ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>SamTrans</td>
<td>Regional Bike Share Pilot Program - Redwood City</td>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Circumstances</td>
<td>bike Capital investment in Redwood City</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$6,908,900</td>
<td>$6,988,900</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>El Camino Real/Angus Ave Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>Construction underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>San Bruno</td>
<td>Transit Corridor Pedestrian Connection Project</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>Final design nearing completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>101/Holy Street Grade Separated Path Project</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering/ environmental</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td>Measure A funded phase complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>101/Holy Street Pedestrian and Bicycle Overcrossing</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Final design complete, construction permits pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>Pedestrian Safety Improvement Plan for San Carlos Avenue</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>Final design underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>28th Avenue Bike Boulevard and Implementation Project</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$380,000</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>$690,000</td>
<td>Final design underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Citywide Bicycle Striping and Signage</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>bike</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$157,163</td>
<td>$39,284</td>
<td>$196,447</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Hilldale/101 Bridge Project</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>Planning work complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Hilldale/101 Bridge Project</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering/environmental</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>Measure A funded phase of work complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>North San Mateo Drive Improvement Project</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>Final design nearing completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>Sharrows and Striping Program</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>bike</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$81,200</td>
<td>$34,800</td>
<td>$116,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>Sunshine Gardens Safety and Connectivity Improvements Project</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Preliminary engineering/environmental, final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$504,000</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td>Final design nearing completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Exhibit B: New Measure A Pedestrian and Bicycle Program Project Status Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Funding Cycle</th>
<th>Impvt Type</th>
<th>Measure A Funded Phase(s)</th>
<th>Measure A Funds</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Project Status as 12/31/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>Alameda de las Pulgas Bike and Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>School Safety Improvement Project</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>bike/ped</td>
<td>Final design &amp; construction</td>
<td>$21,600</td>
<td>$194,000</td>
<td>$215,600</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:**  
$21,751,656  $41,097,684  $62,849,340

---

**Footnotes:**  
1) Line # is for reference purposes only and doesn’t indicate priority.  
2) First funding cycle awards July 2011, Second funding cycle awards April 2014, Third funding cycle awards March 2016 and Fourth funding cycle awards March 2018.  
3) Match represents secured sponsor funding contribution for project as listed in sponsor’s funding agreement(s).  
4) The total amount currently committed to projects is $21,751,656, $1,250,000 less than the total listed for awarded Measure A funds. This is due to sponsor decisions not to proceed with awarded scopes for the Half Moon Bay Main Street Bridge Bike and Pedestrian Improvements Project (Measure A amount of $500K) and the County of San Mateo Complete the Gap Trail (Measure A amount of $750K for construction).
**Exhibit C: Common Public Funding Sources Available for Pedestrian & Bicycle Projects in San Mateo County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>Eligible Ped./Bicycle Projects</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Funding Call Status</th>
<th>Notes/Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure A Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle Program</td>
<td>San Mateo County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>New capital infrastructure projects, including project planning. City/area-wide planning and maintenance not eligible. Program subject to change, pending completion of next TA Strategic Plan by end of CY 2019.</td>
<td>Minimum of 10% from last Call for Projects. Could be subject to change, pending completion of next TA Strategic Plan by end of CY 2019.</td>
<td>Approx. $5M per biennial cycle, Next cycle amount TBD.</td>
<td>TBD. Next solicitation for proposals anticipated Winter FY 2020. Funding calls posted at: <a href="http://www.smcta.com/Projects/Call_for_Projects.html">www.smcta.com/Projects/Call_for_Projects.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure W Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Program</td>
<td>San Mateo County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>New program that funds bicycle &amp; pedestrian/active transportation projects. Further info pending completion of next TA Strategic Plan by end of CY 2019.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD Approx. $4M in sales tax receipts projected annually</td>
<td>TBD Solicitation for proposals could occur in conjunction with Measure A Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle Program. Funding calls posted at: <a href="http://www.smcta.com/Projects/Call_for_Projects.html">www.smcta.com/Projects/Call_for_Projects.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Public Funding Sources Available for Pedestrian & Bicycle Projects/Programs in San Mateo County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Geographic Area</th>
<th>Eligible Ped./Bicycle Projects</th>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Funding Call Status</th>
<th>Notes/Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Active Transportation Program (ATP)</td>
<td>California Transportation Commission (CTC)</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Infrastructure (e.g. bikeways, walkways, traffic control devices and bike parking) and non-infrastructure (e.g. education, encouragement, enforcement) projects. Also funds bicycle &amp; pedestrian plans for disadvantaged communities.</td>
<td>None historically required</td>
<td>Next cycle amount TBD, potentially $220M statewide.</td>
<td>TBD, projected to occur Spring 2020</td>
<td>CTC to adopt program of projects once every 2 years, covering a four year period. Guidelines for the next ATP pending. <a href="www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/">www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP)</td>
<td>MTC delegated by the CTC for the San Francisco Bay Area</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area</td>
<td>Infrastructure (e.g. bikeways, walkways, traffic control devices and bike parking) and non-infrastructure (e.g. education, encouragement, enforcement) projects. Includes bicycle and pedestrian plans.</td>
<td>Minimum of 11.47%, waivers for projects benefiting communities of concern, stand-alone non-infrastructure projects and SRTS projects</td>
<td>Next cycle amount TBD, potentially $38M for the Bay Area.</td>
<td>TBD, projected to occur Spring 2020</td>
<td>Guidelines similar to State ATP except that additional evaluation criteria are added to the state program. Guidelines for the next ATP pending. Further program information posted at: <a href="www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/ATP/">www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/ATP/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Program</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Geographic Area</td>
<td>Eligible Ped./Bicycle Projects</td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Funding Call Status</td>
<td>Notes/Links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act (TDA), Article 3 (2-3 year cycles)</td>
<td>C/CAG delegated by MTC for San Mateo County</td>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>Comprehensive bicycle &amp; pedestrian plans, design and construction of capital infrastructure projects, maintenance of multi-purpose paths &amp; restriping of Class II bike lanes.</td>
<td>None for capital infrastructure projects, 50% for planning and education projects.</td>
<td>Approx. $2M per biennial cycle</td>
<td>Next call projected to be released Spring 2019</td>
<td>Historical set-asides for planning projects and capital projects with funding caps per project. Guidelines for the next TDA call pending. Funding calls posted at: <a href="http://ccag.ca.gov/opportunities/call-for-projects/">ccag.ca.gov/opportunities/call-for-projects/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG) Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle Improvement Program (BPPIP) (approximate 5 year cycles)</td>
<td>C/CAG delegated by MTC for San Mateo County</td>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>For prior FY 17 cycle, capital infrastructure projects that build out the bike/ped network &amp; reduce vehicle trips (e.g. new construction of bicycle parking/sharing, signal modification and outreach and education programs). Maintenance ineligible.</td>
<td>Minimum of 11.47%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Previously, 70% of funds to be used in priority development areas (PDAs) or for projects that connect or provide proximate access to PDAs. Guidelines for next cycle projected to be under development w/in the next two years. Funding calls posted at: <a href="http://ccag.ca.gov/opportunities/call-for-projects/">ccag.ca.gov/opportunities/call-for-projects/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Program</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Geographic Area</td>
<td>Eligible Ped./Bicycle Projects</td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Funding Call Status</td>
<td>Notes/Links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG) Transportation for Livable Communities Program (TLC) (approximate 5 year cycles)</td>
<td>C/CAG delegated by MTC for San Mateo County</td>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>For prior FY 17 cycle, capital infrastructure projects that improve the link between land use and alternative modes of transportation (e.g. streetscape improvements, street fixtures, includes green street treatments). Maintenance ineligible.</td>
<td>Minimum of 11.47%</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Previously, 70% of funds to be used in priority development areas (PDAs) or for projects that connects or provides proximate access to PDAs. Guidelines for next cycle projected to be under development w/in the next two years. Funding calls posted at: ccag.ca.gov/opportunities/call-for-projects/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement program (HSIP) (Annual or biennial cycles)</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Safety projects on any public road or publicly owned bicycle or pedestrian path that can be designed and constructed expeditiously.</td>
<td>Varies, some ped/bike elements require no match, others minimum of 10%</td>
<td>TBD, last funding cycle $182M statewide</td>
<td>Next call projected to be released Fall 2019 or Fall 2020</td>
<td>Data driven program that promotes countermeasures, including ped/bike countermeasures, to reduce the likelihood of future crashes. Funding calls posted at: <a href="http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hsip.html">http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hsip.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Program</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Geographic Area</td>
<td>Eligible Ped./Bicycle Projects</td>
<td>Match</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Funding Call Status</td>
<td>Notes/Links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking Reimbursement Program</td>
<td>Commute.org</td>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>Purchase and installation of bicycle lockers and racks for private, public and non-profit employers in San Mateo County.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$15K in FY 19</td>
<td>Ongoing on a first-come, first-served basis until funding runs out. Up to $500 per unit, capped at $5k per applicant. Further program information at: <a href="http://www.commute.org/employer-services/179-bike-parking-at-half-cost">http://www.commute.org/employer-services/179-bike-parking-at-half-cost</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Facilities/E-lockers</td>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQD)</td>
<td>Bay Area</td>
<td>TBD – see notes</td>
<td>None required</td>
<td>Not currently funded</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>The bicycle facilities &amp; the bicycle e-locker programs are not currently offered. The Air District is in the process of developing the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Programs for FY 2020. Further program information is pending.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure A
Pedestrian & Bicycle Program Update

April 4, 2019
Board of Directors
Agenda Item #10 (b)
Overview

• Program background
• Program allocations & delivery status
• Feature Project: California Drive Roundabout (Burlingame)
Program Background

• 3% of Measure A Program
• Purpose: to fund capital projects that encourage and improve walking and bicycling conditions
• 2004 Transportation Expenditure Plan includes a list of bikeways and overcrossings but other projects can be considered
• Funding awarded on a discretionary Call for Projects process
### Project Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Award Date</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Circumstances</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
<td>$0.7M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>July 2011</td>
<td>$4.5M</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>April 2014</td>
<td>$5.9M</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>$5.0M</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>March 2018</td>
<td>$5.7M</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$21.8M</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Delivery Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Status</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Preliminary Engineering/Environmental</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded project scopes complete</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor rescinded projects</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Sponsors submit quarterly progress reports on project status.
- To date, 12 awarded projects needed time extensions.
### Distribution of Project Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Sub-area</th>
<th>Funding Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North County</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid County</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastside</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total**: $21.8M
  - North County: $3.9M
  - Mid County: $8.5M
  - South County: $7.5M
  - Coastside: $1.9M

---

**Map:**
- **North County:** $3.9M
- **Mid County:** $8.5M
- **South County:** $7.5M
- **Coastside:** $1.9M

**Legend:**
- North County
- Central County
- South County
- Coastside

- Approximate Project Location
- Rescinded by Sponsor
California Drive Roundabout Overview

- Existing Conditions
- Project Goals
- Funding
- Schedule
- Construction Staging
- Challenges
- Lessons Learned
Project Location

California Drive

Burlingame High School

City Hall/ Main Library

Burlingame Avenue

Caltrain Station

Let's P

Washington Elementary School

AUTO ROW

United States Postal Service

REAL

BURLINGAME

The City of Burlingame

INCORPORATED
Existing Conditions

Conflicting movements creates confusing conditions for pedestrians and cyclists.

Major through movements on California Drive needs to be accommodated.

Four-lane mid-block crosswalk with flashing beacon.

Weaving, merge and diverge movements create a confusing situation.

Stopped vehicles impact traffic on the Bellevue and Lorton approaches.
Project Goals

Improve the California Drive, Bellevue Avenue and Lorton Avenue intersection by:

• Improving safety and flow of all modes (pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles)

• Incorporating Green Streets and Complete Streets components

• Enhancing bicycle and pedestrian access

• Minimizing construction and parking impacts
Rationale for added costs:

- Added design elements from project outreach & increase in construction costs - $2.9M
- Construction admin. & management - $900K
- Upgrade of utilities/facilities in roundabout vicinity - $500K

2015: Burlingame received $1.0M Measure A Ped/Bike Program allocation, matched with $200k of City funds.

Total original project budget: $1.2M.
Total project cost upon completion in 2019: $4.3M.
Conceptual Design
Project Schedule
DESIGN PHASE

October 2015
• 1st public outreach meeting

May 2016
• 2nd public outreach meeting

October 2016
• 3rd public outreach meeting
• City Council

January 2017
• Design Process

Jan/Feb 2018
• Advertise project for construction bids

May 2018
• Begin Construction
# Project Schedule

## CONSTRUCTION PHASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Begin</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>approx. 4 month duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>approx. 1 month duration</td>
<td>Major work suspended between Holidays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>approx. 3 month duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>Completing Stage 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaping, electrical, lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Postponed due to rain and freezing temperatures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Temperatures above 50 degrees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Construction Stage 1

*During Stage 1*
NO VEHICLE ACCESS FROM CALIFORNIA DR. TO BELLEVUE AVE. OR LORTON AVE.
Construction Stage 2

Southbound California Dr. traffic directed around western portion of new roundabout
Construction Stage 3

California Drive Roundabout
Stage 3 Construction Area

LATE SEPTEMBER - LATE DECEMBER 2018

Northbound traffic transitions to one lane

Temporary Pedestrian Walkway

Sidewalk Opened

Temporary Pedestrian Crosswalk

Temporary Pedestrian Crosswalk

* DURING STAGE 2 *
NO VEHICLE ACCESS BETWEEN LORTON AVE. AND CALIFORNIA DR. OR BELLEVUE AVE.
Construction Photos
Construction Challenges

• Maintaining access on California Drive
• Impacts to adjacent businesses
• Educating community during construction, especially when portions of the new alignment opened up in different stages
• Weather, as final stage was anticipated during winter
• Utility improvements
Lessons Learned/Closing Thoughts

- Conform roadway grades
- Existing Utilities
- Construction Manager/Outreach
- Constant Communication/Notification
Roundabout Informational Video

Click to start video
Questions/Comments
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
STAFF REPORT

TO: Transportation Authority

THROUGH: Jim Hartnett
Executive Director

FROM: Seamus Murphy
Chief Communications Officer

SUBJECT: STATE AND FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE UPDATE AND APPROVAL OF LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

ACTION
Staff recommends that the Board:
1. Receive the attached Federal and State Legislative Updates
2. Approve the recommended San Mateo County Transportation Authority positions on those pieces of legislation designated for action on the attached State Legislative Matrix.

SIGNIFICANCE
The 2019 Legislative Program establishes the principles that will guide the legislative and regulatory advocacy efforts. Based on those principles, staff coordinates closely with our Federal and State advocates on a wide variety of issues that are considered in Congress and the State legislature. The attached reports highlight the recent issues and actions that are relevant to the Board, and specifies those bills on which staff proposes that the District take a formal position.

Prepared By: Casey Fromson, Government and Community Affairs Director 650-508-6493
March 6, 2019

TO: Board Members, San Mateo County Transportation Authority
FROM: Gus Khouri, Principal
Khoury Consulting

RE: STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – APRIL

Given that the bill introduction recently passed (February 22), and most committee hearings will not commence until March, much of the conversation has centered on two topics: 1) the Governor’s Budget proposal to tie affordable housing production to the receipt of transportation dollars, and 2) attempts by the California Air Resources Board to influence the decision making of the California Transportation Commission to make funding allocations based on reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

**Tightening the Nexus Between Affordable Housing and Transportation Funding**

On March 11, Governor Newsom announced a major legislative proposal as part of his $1.75 billion package to confront the housing cost crisis. The new proposal sets higher short-term goals for housing that cities and counties must meet, and provides $750 million in support and incentives to help jurisdictions plan and zone for these higher, ambitious housing targets.

The proposal would also update and modernize the state’s long-term housing goals, known as Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA), to better reflect regional housing and transportation needs. Specifically it asks that the California State Transportation Agency and the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), work with the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to engage stakeholders and propose opportunities to link transportation and other non-housing funds with housing goals by the end of 2022. As part of this effort beginning July 1, 2023, SB 1 Local Streets and Roads funds may be withheld from any jurisdiction that does not have a compliant housing element and has not zoned and entitled for its updated annual housing goals. This does not include transit funding.

**CTC and CARB Collaboration to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Per AB 179 of 2017, the CTC and California Air Resources Board are required to convene twice a year to coordinate transportation policies, with a focus on reducing vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions. A particular tension exists with transportation planning agencies who are being asked to go above and beyond to meet future emission reduction targets—
Despite not having purview over housing production or job creation location—while implementing voter-approved expenditure plans, such as Measures A and W. At the state level, there is also concern about the ability to implement SB 1 programs, which voters have overwhelming supported to be constitutionally protected (Proposition 22 of 2010, Proposition 69 of 2018) and continued for purposes of maintaining highway, local streets, and roads infrastructure; easing congestion; and providing multimodal solutions (defeat of Proposition 6 in 2018). There are several bills in the attached bill matrix that we are monitoring that attempt to reshape the decision-making process of several state agencies in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

**Local Partnership Program Allocations**

The Local Partnership Program (LPP) provides $200 million annually for jurisdictions that have acquired a voter-approved tax or fee dedicated for transportation purposes. It is split 50/50 between a formulaic share and a competitive program administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). SMCTA and SamTrans receive roughly $840,000 each annually from the formulaic share, but also succeeded in receiving $20 million from the competitive program in May of 2018 to fund Phase 1 of the US 101 Managed Lanes project. Some Southern California regional transportation planning agencies however have expressed a desire to pursue legislation to change program allocations to be distributed on a 95/5 split favoring a formulaic share, or some hybrid that provides a higher floor of guaranteed funding. The result would limit the CTC’s flexibility to mix and match funding to fully fund projects. Under a best case scenario of an increased formulaic share, TAMC would virtually double its’ formulaic share to roughly $1.6 million annually, notwithstanding an additional allocation for passage of Measure W, which could provide funding for an active transportation project at the expense of competing for prospective resources to address safety or congestion relief initiatives on Highway 101 or other county arterials. We will continue to monitor any prospective legislative effort on this issue.

**Bills of Interest**

1. **AB 252 (Daly) State NEPA Delegation for Transportation Projects**
   
   Federal law requires the United States Secretary of Transportation to carry out a surface transportation project delivery program, under which California may assume certain responsibilities for environmental review and clearance of transportation projects that would otherwise be the responsibility of the federal government, but only until January 1, 2020. This bill would extend the operation of this delegation indefinitely. In 2017, SMCTA supported AB 28 (Frazier), which was sponsored by the Self-Help Counties Coalition and extended the sunset date from January 1, 2017 to January 2020. **We recommend SMCTA SUPPORT this measure.**
CONGRESS

FY 2019 Appropriations Completed: The President signed a bipartisan package funding seven government agencies through FY 2019 on February 15. The funding deal provides $1.375 billion for border fencing, significantly less than the $5.7 billion in border wall funding the President requested. On the same day that he signed the bill, the President also declared a national emergency to secure funding for a border wall. White House Acting Chief of Staff Mick Mulvaney said the President would be diverting money from the Treasury Forfeiture Fund, the Department of Defense’s counter-drug activity funds, and military construction dollars. The move was immediately met with legal challenges, notably a lawsuit filed by sixteen states, led by California. Further, a House resolution was introduced by Democrats that would block the national emergency declaration on February 22. The resolution passed in the House on February 26; its chances of passage in the Senate are less clear, as many Senate Republicans have supported the President’s declaration.

The appropriations measure provided funding for the Department of Transportation, a total of $86.5 billion including:

- $900 million for BUILD grants, with funding available through September 30, 2021. The FY 2018 omnibus provided $1.5 billion for the program.
- $45.3 billion for federal-aid highways (FAST Act authorized level), plus $3.25 billion from the Treasury's general fund (versus the Highway Trust Fund)
- $17.5 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and of that, $56 million is made available for drone integration, and $24 million for drone research. The FY 2018 measure provided $18.115 billion.
- $13.4 billion for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), a $1 billion increase from FY 2018, and within this amount:
  - $2.55 billion for Capital Investment Grants, equal to the FY 2018 level, and directs that FTA may allocate funding for projects without a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA)
    - $1.265 billion for New Starts projects
    - $635 million for Core Capacity projects
    - $526.5 million for Small Starts projects
  - $320 million for Bus and Bus Facilities Grants, of which $160 million is provided for formula grants
  - $30 million for Low or No Emission Grants
  - $263 million available for State of Good Repair grants
• $2.87 billion for the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), a $22 million decrease from FY 2018.
  ○ $255 million for Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements (CRISI) grants.
• $966.3 million for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).

The package also increases the operational budget for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA). Transportation security grants through FEMA are funded at levels equal to FY 2018, and the agreement maintains the $10 million surface transportation grant set aside for Amtrak security and the $2 million surface transportation grant set aside for over-the-road bus security.

• The measure provides $100 million for Public Transit and Rail Security Grants, level with FY 2018 funding.
• $100 million is also provided for Port Security Grants, level with FY 2018 funding.
• The TSA is funded at $49.3 billion, an approximately $2 billion increase from FY 2018. This includes $77 million to maintain existing TSA staffing at airport exit lanes and $44.6 million for additional transportation security officers and associated training and support costs.

Excluding emergency spending, total appropriations for FY 2019 total $1.336 trillion; this is a $36 billion increase from FY 2018.

Infrastructure Discussions Ramp Up: Vice President Mike Pence promised a group of governors on February 22 that the Trump Administration would pass a "historic" infrastructure package this legislative session. To-date, no legislation or draft discussion bills have been introduced, beyond former House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman Bill Shuster’s (R-PA) draft introduced last Congress. Staff have noted that House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman Peter DeFazio (D-OR) plans to introduce a bill in April or May with markup in June. The Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee is not planning to consider infrastructure legislation. The EPW Committee will instead focus on drafting the FAST Act authorization bill with a committee markup in June. The committee would like the bill to pass this year, ahead of the 2020 presidential election year.

Separately, congressional committees have devoted several hearings to discussion on various elements of investment in infrastructure, including financing a package, climate considerations, and stakeholder input.

• Federal Investment in Infrastructure

  House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee

On February 7, the House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee held a hearing to discuss federal investment in infrastructure. Members of Congress focused their questioning on identifying pay-fors, and how the federal government could aid in developing resilient infrastructure, the need for which has been underscored by recent natural disasters. Chairman Peter DeFazio (D-OR) also addressed the economic impacts if infrastructure assets fail, such as the Northeast Corridor (NEC), and the Hudson Tunnel.
Identifying ways to pay for infrastructure investment has long plagued Congress, despite bipartisan calls for an infrastructure package, especially with the Highway Trust Fund running out of money in 2020.

Testimony from witnesses during the hearing focused on the gap in infrastructure investment, which they fear will rise. Witnesses, including Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti and former Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, suggested raising the gas tax as one solution. They noted that it was risky, but could be effective. Some members expressed support for raising the gas tax, but others shared concerns over potential political fallout for adopting such a reform.

Witnesses also noted that the President’s infrastructure plan released last year ignited enthusiasm, though it did not gain momentum. Mayor Garcetti and Mayor Stephen Benjamin of Columbia, South Carolina both encouraged Congress to fund projects that would bring in money from a variety of sources, including local governments and private investors. Mayor Garcetti said federal lawmakers should consider paying part of the cost of maintenance for existing infrastructure, to prevent it from decaying further. Another witness, Amtrak CEO Richard Anderson, called on Congress to take action to address the Hudson River Tunnel project by passing an infrastructure bill that increases federal funding into existing programs that support intercity passenger rail. He also suggested establishing new federal policies and grant programs through reauthorizing the FAST Act, which expires in 2020.

*Senate Commerce Committee*

The Senate Commerce Committee held a hearing on February 13 to discuss what provisions and pay-fors could be included in an infrastructure bill. Senators expressed concern over the existing Highway Trust Fund, but did not focus much discussion around funding sources for a package. Chairman Roger Wicker (R-MS) and Ranking Member Maria Cantwell (D-WA) both recognized that improving infrastructure is a bipartisan issue. Cantwell referenced the partial government shutdown as a “wakeup call” for the importance of investing in critical aspects of infrastructure.

Witnesses represented ports, railroad, cable, trucking, and trade, and all of these stakeholders supported an increase in the gas tax as a pay-for. William Friedman, with the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA), noted that a major issue for ports are last- and first-mile connectivity, as well as a lack of funding for port-related projects. He noted that federal grant programs and lifting the 10 percent funding cap for non-highway projects in the INFRA program could be remedies to those problems. However, Chris Spear, President and CEO of the American Trucking Association (ATA), opposed lifting the cap on non-highway projects, citing that more efficient ports would benefit trucking, but with the interconnected nature of the system, the only solution is a robust infrastructure bill that would increase efficiency across the board. Spear did advocate for the Build America Fund, which would include a modest increase on the cost of the fuel that would generate $340 billion over the course of 10 years.
• Climate Change

*House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee*

The committee held its first hearing on climate change on February 26, a major priority for Chairman Peter DeFazio (D-OR) and House Democrats in crafting an infrastructure package. Nine witnesses testified on a broad range of expertise across climate and the environment. Democrats focused their statements and questioning on how policy can be crafted to reduce emissions, make infrastructure more resilient, and mitigate effects of climate change. Republican members opposed the premise of the hearing, arguing that a market approach, rather than government action, would be the economic incentive to improve climate change effects. Several Republican members further stated that the tax incentives for purchasing electric vehicles (EV) should be eliminated, since most EV buyers are already affluent, and the cost of owning one eventually evens out with that of owning a gas-powered car.

**Return of Earmarks?:** Chairman DeFazio said on February 27 that he intends to bring back earmarks, rebranding them as “Article I projects,” to build support for an increase in user fees that would help passage of a surface transportation bill. DeFazio said it would be key to completing a surface transportation bill; since Democrats won the House majority in the midterm elections, DeFazio has discussed bringing back earmarks, but clarified that the ultimate decision remains with congressional leadership. However, House Appropriations Chair Nita Lowey (D-NY) said there is currently no bipartisan, bicameral agreement to allow the Appropriations Committee to earmark. She does not expect FY 2020 House appropriations bills to include earmarks. DeFazio will still move forward to include earmark projects in Transportation & Infrastructure Committee bills.

**ADMINISTRATION**

**FRA Issues National Trespass Prevention Strategy:** The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) released the first “National Strategy to Prevent Trespassing on Railroad Property” on February 19. The report was issued in response to a House Appropriations Committee request, and examines the causal factors that contribute to trespassing incidents on railroad property. FRA Administrator Ron Batory said the agency examined current data on factors of the problem, and is seeking to “energize” state and local partners to implement solutions. The report analyzes trespasser casualties over a four-year period from November 2013 and October 2017. Findings showed that 4,242 pedestrians were killed or injured while trespassing on railroad property nationwide during this time period. The FRA’s national strategy to prevent trespassing includes four strategic focus areas: data gathering and analysis, community site visits, funding, and partnerships with stakeholders. Short term targets include stakeholder engagement and implementation of strategies that save lives at trespassing “hot spots.”
FHWA Announces Awards to Seven States for New Ways to Fund Highways: The Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) announced $10.2 million in Surface Transportation System Funding Alternatives (STSFA) grants to seven states to test new ways to finance highway and bridge projects. The goal of the program, established under the FAST Act, is to allow states to test user-based alternatives to support the Highway Trust Fund. The grants fund projects to test the design, implementation, and acceptance of user-based alternative revenue tools. The projects will investigate and analyze various mileage-based and road-user charges, including for trucks and automated vehicles, as well as the implementation and operation of technologies at a regional level. States selected were: California, Delaware, Minnesota, Missouri, New Hampshire, Oregon, and Utah.

DOT Deputy Secretary Moves to DOJ: Deputy Transportation Secretary Jeff Rosen will move to the Department of Justice (DOJ), to serve as Deputy Attorney General. Rosen will replace outgoing Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein. At DOT, Rosen was in charge of day-to-day operations, including deregulatory efforts and grant decisions. A replacement for Rosen has not yet been announced.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Bill Summary</th>
<th>Recommended Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 11</td>
<td>1/17/19</td>
<td>This bill would authorize a city or county, or two or more cities acting jointly, to propose the formation of an affordable housing and infrastructure agency by adoption of a resolution of intention that meets specified requirements. The bill would require: • A public hearing process, and the adoption of a resolution that city or county to submit the resolution of intention to the Strategic Growth Council (SGC) for a determination as to whether the agency would promote statewide greenhouse gas reduction goals. • The SGC to approve formation of the agency if it determines that formation of the agency both (1) would not result in a state fiscal impact, determined as specified by the State Controller, that exceeds a specified amount and (2) would promote statewide greenhouse gas reduction goals. • Not less than 30% of all taxes allocated to the agency from an affected taxing entity be deposited into a separate fund, established by the agency, and used for the purposes of increasing, improving, and preserving the community’s supply of low- and moderate-income housing available at an affordable housing cost, as provided. The bill would allow an agency to conduct bond financing.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiu (D)</td>
<td>Assembly Housing &amp; Community Development Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Redevelopment Law of 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 40</td>
<td>1/24/19</td>
<td>This bill, no later than January 1, 2021, would require the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop a comprehensive strategy to ensure that the sales of new motor vehicles and new light-duty trucks in the state have transitioned fully to zero-emission vehicles by 2040. Transportation funding is dependent on motor fuel. The state would need to find an alternative method of funding transportation infrastructure if this bill were to be enacted.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ting (D)</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Emission Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 148</td>
<td>1/24/19</td>
<td>Existing law requires certain transportation planning agencies to prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system. The existing law also requires: • The regional transportation plan to include, if the transportation planning agency is also a metropolitan planning organization, a sustainable communities strategy which would, among other things, identify areas within the region sufficient to house an 8-year projection of the regional housing need for the region, as specified. • The State Air Resources Board, on or before September 1, 2018, and every 4 years thereafter, to prepare a report that assesses progress made by each metropolitan planning organization in meeting the regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets set by the state board. • Each transportation planning agency to adopt and submit to the California Transportation Commission and the Department of Transportation an updated regional transportation plan every 4 or 5 years, as specified. This bill would require each sustainable communities strategy to also identify areas within the region sufficient to house an 8-year projection of the emergency shelter needs for the region, as specified.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quirk-Silva (D)</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Bill Summary</td>
<td>Recommended Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 185 Grayson (D) California Transportation Commission: Joint Meetings</td>
<td>2/4/19 Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td>Existing law requires the CTC and the State Air Resources Board to hold at least 2 joint meetings per calendar year to coordinate their implementation of transportation policies. This bill would require the Department of Housing and Community Development to participate in those joint meetings with the CTC and CARB.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 252 Daly (D) Caltrans: NEPA</td>
<td>2/7/19 Assembly Transportation Committee Hearing on 3/11</td>
<td>This bill would remove the sunset date (January 1, 2020) for Caltrans being able to use the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) delegation to streamline environmental review for projects with federal funding, allowing for environmental review of projects to be expedited. The bill is sponsored by the Self-Help Counties Coalition (SHCC). SMCTA supported the previous version, AB 28 (Frazier) of 2017, which was also sponsored by SHCC, and had extended the sunset date from January 1, 2017 to January 1, 2020.</td>
<td>Recommend Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 285 Friedman (D) California Transportation Plan</td>
<td>2/11/19 Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td>Under existing law, Caltrans is required to prepare the California Transportation Plan, which looks at the movement of goods and people, and how the state will achieve greenhouse gas emission goals. This bill would require Caltrans to address in the California Transportation Plan how statewide greenhouse gas emission goals will be reduced by 2030, with carbon neutrality by 2045.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 352 Garcia (D) Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: Investment Plan &amp; Transformative Climate Communities Program</td>
<td>2/11/19 Assembly Natural Resources Committee</td>
<td>This bill, beginning July 1, 2020, would require state agencies administering competitive grant programs that allocate moneys from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, such as the California Air Resources Board and Strategic Growth Council to give specified communities preferential points during grant application scoring for programs intended to improve air quality, to include a specified application timeline, to allow applicants from the Counties of Imperial and San Diego to include daytime population numbers in grant applications, and to require grant eligibility and scoring criteria to define a disadvantaged community consistent with specified allocation requirements of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund so as not to preclude low-income communities, as defined, from applying for or being awarded a grant.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Bill Summary</td>
<td>Recommended Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 5 Beall (D)</td>
<td>1/24/19</td>
<td>This bill would establish the Local-State Sustainable Investment Incentive Program, to authorize a city, county, city and county, joint powers agency, enhanced infrastructure financing district, affordable housing authority, community revitalization and investment authority or transit village development district to apply for funding for eligible projects include, among other things, construction of workforce and affordable housing, certain transit-oriented development, and “projects promoting strong neighborhoods.” Funding would be available in the amounts of $200,000,000 per year from July 1, 2020, to June 30, 2025, and $250,000,000 per year from July 1, 2025, to June 30, 2029. The source of money would come from reductions in annual ERAF contributions for applicants for projects approved pursuant to this program.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 25 Caballero (D)</td>
<td>2/12/19</td>
<td>This bill would establish specified procedures under CEQA for the administrative and judicial review of the environmental review and approvals granted for projects located in qualified opportunity zones that are funded, in whole or in part, by qualified opportunity funds, or by moneys from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and allocated by the Strategic Growth Council. The bill would apply certain rules of court establishing procedures requiring actions or proceedings seeking judicial review pursuant to CEQA or the granting of project approvals, including any appeals to be resolved, to the extent feasible, within 270 days of the filing of the certified record of proceedings with the court to an action or proceeding seeking judicial review of the lead agency’s action related to those projects located in a qualified opportunity zone.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 43 Allen (D)</td>
<td>2/12/19</td>
<td>This bill would require the California Air Resources Board (CARB), in consultation with the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration, to submit a report to the Legislature on the results of a study to propose, and to determine the feasibility and practicality of, a system to replace the tax imposed pursuant to the Sales and Use Tax Law with an assessment on retail products sold or used in the state based on the carbon intensity of the product to encourage the use of less carbon-intensive products. The bill would require CARB to revise, as necessary, the 2017 scoping plan to reflect the carbon emission reduction benefits that may be realized through the imposition of the assessment based on carbon intensities of products and to consider the results of the study in future updates to the scoping plan.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 50 Wiener (D)</td>
<td>1/24/19</td>
<td>This bill would require a city, county, or city and county to grant upon request an equitable communities incentive when a development proponent seeks and agrees to construct a residential development that is either a job-rich housing project or a transit-rich housing project. The bill would require that a residential development eligible for an equitable communities incentive receive waivers from maximum controls on density and automobile parking requirements greater than 0.5 parking spots per unit, up to 3 additional incentives or concessions under the Density Bonus Law, and specified additional waivers if the residential development is located within a 1/2-mile or 1/4-mile radius of a major transit stop, as defined. The bill would authorize a local government to modify or expand the terms of an equitable communities incentive, provided that the equitable communities incentive is consistent with these provisions. The bill would also declare the intent of the Legislature to delay implementation of this bill in sensitive communities, as defined, until July 1, 2020, as provided.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Bill Summary</td>
<td>Recommended Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 127</strong>&lt;br&gt;Weiner (D)&lt;br&gt;Transportation Funding: Complete Streets</td>
<td>1/24/19&lt;br&gt;Senate Transportation Committee</td>
<td>Existing law establishes the Active Transportation Program (ATP) in Caltrans for the purpose of encouraging increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking, and declares the intent of the Legislature that the program achieve specific goals, including, among other things, increasing the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking and the safety and mobility for nonmotorized users. This bill would establish a Division of Active Transportation within Caltrans and require that an undersecretary of the Transportation Agency be assigned to give attention to ATP matters to guide progress toward meeting Caltrans’ ATP goals and objectives. The bill would require the CTC to give high priority to increasing safety for pedestrians and bicyclists and to the implementation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The bill would require the CTC, in connection with the asset management plan, to adopt performance measures that include conditions of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, accessibility and safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users, and vehicle miles traveled on the state highway system. The bill would require that SHOPP projects include capital improvements relative to accessibility for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users. The bill would also require that each project include in its budget the cost of pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The bill would require that the plain language performance report developed by Caltrans, in consultation with the CTC, include a description of pedestrian and bicycle facilities on each project, including the number, extent, and cost of the elements relative to the overall project. The bill provides an opportunity to address multi-modal solutions. While the SHOPP is oversubscribed in its ability to address maintenance needs on the state highway system, local jurisdictions such are held to the same standards, but state highway projects do not always include active transportation features. The result could be less funding to maintain arterials such as Highway 101 and 92, but more funding to supplement Caltrain and SamTrans service.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 128</strong>&lt;br&gt;Beall (D)&lt;br&gt;Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts</td>
<td>1/24/19&lt;br&gt;Senate Governance &amp; Finance Committee</td>
<td>Existing law authorizes the legislative body of a city or county to establish an enhanced infrastructure financing district, with a governing body referred to as a public financing authority, to finance public capital facilities or other specified projects of communitywide significance. Existing law authorizes the public financing authority to issue bonds for these purposes upon approval by 55% of the voters voting on a proposal to issue the bonds. Existing law requires the proposal submitted to the voters by the public financing authority and the resolution for the issuance of bonds following approval by the voters to include specified information regarding the bond issuance. This bill would instead authorize the public financing authority to issue bonds for these purposes without submitting a proposal to the voters. The bill would require the resolution to issue bonds to contain specified information related to the issuance of the bonds.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Bill Summary</td>
<td>Recommended Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 137</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Dodd (D)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Federal Transportation Funds</td>
<td>1/24/19&lt;br&gt;Senate Transportation Committee</td>
<td>Existing federal law apportions transportation funds to the states under various programs, including the Surface Transportation Program and the Highway Safety Improvement Program, subject to certain conditions on the use of those funds. Existing law provides for the allocation of certain of those funds to local entities, and for the exchange of federal and state transportation funds between local entities and the state under certain circumstances. This bill would authorize Caltrans to allow these federal transportation funds that are allocated as local assistance to be exchanged for Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program funds appropriated to the department.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 277</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Beall (D)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Transit Development: Transit Funds</td>
<td>2/13/19&lt;br&gt;Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td>This is currently a spot bill that may be used to reformulate the current 50/50 formula to competitive program distribution of Local Partnership Program Funds.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 526</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Allen (D)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Regional Transportation Plans: Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>2/21/19&lt;br&gt;Introduced</td>
<td>This bill would require the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to adopt a regulation that requires a metropolitan planning organization to provide any data that CARB requests to determine if the metropolitan planning organization is on track to meet its 2035 greenhouse gas emission reduction target. CARB would be required to determine if each metropolitan planning organization is on track to meet its 2035 greenhouse gas emissions reduction target and to notify the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The bill would require the action element prepared by a metropolitan planning organization to identify near and long-term steps to be taken to implement a sustainable communities strategy and achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets established by the state board. If CARB determines that a metropolitan planning organization is not on track to meet its 2035 greenhouse gas emission reduction target, the bill would require the CTC to assign a lower priority to a project that increases vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions. This bill would establish an interagency working group to be administered by the Strategic Growth Council to develop and implement a State Mobility Action Plan for Healthy Communities to ensure that regional growth and development is designed and implemented in a manner to achieve the state’s environmental, equity, climate, health and housing goals. The bill would require the plan to include specific actions, measures, and timelines, and an investment strategy. The bill would require the interagency working group to submit the plan to the Legislature by December 31, 2020, and every 4 years thereafter. This bill would make MTC responsible for new planning activities outside of the current purview of a regional transportation planning and could also jeopardize funding for safety projects by giving highest priority to projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
<td>Watch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>