



STAFF REPORT

Authorization for the C/CAG Representative to Support The Continuation of Measure A with Modifications

Summary

The C/CAG representatives have requested direction on several elements of the proposed Measure A Continuation plan. This report provides background on the Continuation Plan and a discussion of the issues identified for direction.

Background and Discussion

In 1988 a Sales Tax Measure (Measure A – 0.5%) was developed and approved by 62 percent of the voters. The City of Belmont supported the Measure in 1988. Measure A will expire on 12/31/08. Given the importance of the Measure A funding for Countywide and Local Transportation, it is important that the sales tax be reauthorized. The Measure A allocation to the City is a key source of funding for maintaining the local streets and road.

The Transportation Authority (TA), as the managing authority for the sales tax, has initiated the continuation of Measure A. There was a call for projects to include in the reauthorization of Measure A in June 2003. A Measure A Technical Advisory Committee consisting of all the Planning Directors and Public Works Directors was created to review the projects and provide technical input on the Measure. This group primarily focused on the Highways and Local Streets and Roads. Our staff did participate in this development process. A special group, consisting of transit professionals was created to review and comment on the Transit component of the Measure.

After numerous meetings the technical staff has completed a Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan. This is the collective staff recommendation for the continuation of Measure A. C/CAG/ TA staff reviewed the Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan in detail with the City Manager and key staff. The current proposal is for a 20-year term for the Measure. However, depending on the polling it may be increased to 25 or 30 years. Measure A Continuation requires a 2/3rds vote to

pass. Therefore, it is important to keep in mind that there must be a broad constituency in order for the Measure A Continuation to pass. In order to accomplish this, the Measure includes a broad range of projects. While some of the projects may not be that important to some, one must recognize that there is a constituency for which that project is important. Therefore, one must look at the Measure from a big picture. If the Measure A Continuation is reasonable and generally addresses the local issues, it is important to support it.

Measure A Continuation Proposal:

The Measure A continuation is projected to raise \$1.2B in current year dollars. An overview of the Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan is as follows.

Program Category	Current Measure A	TAC Recommendation	Funding (\$M)
Transit	26%	30%	360
Highways	29%	30%	360
Local Transportation	20%	20%	240
Grade Separations	23%	15%	180
Pedestrian/ Bikes	0	3%	36
TSM/ TDM	0.7%	1%	12
Administration	up to 1%	up to 1%	12

Specific details are provided in Attachment A with the language of the Measure A continuation provided in Attachment B. The proposal is very similar to the current Measure A. The language is more flexible than in the current Measure. Highway projects are divided into 22% for Hot Spot/ Equity Projects and 8% for Supplemental Projects. The Supplemental Projects Category allows other projects to be identified in the future to be considered for Measure A funding. Any current or future highway or roadway project of interest to the Council is either included in the Hot Spot Equity Project Category or may be considered under the Supplemental Category. This is far more flexible than the current Measure. The Measure also includes two new categories that potentially provide additional funding for local projects. These categories are Pedestrian/ Bikes (3%) and Transit (Up to 2% for local shuttle service). The Transit (30%) provides Caltrain (16%), Local Bus/ Shuttle (4%), Special Services Senior/ Disabled (4%), Ferry Terminal Facilities (2%), BART Route and Station Planning Evaluation (2%), and Dumbarton rail Station Facilities (2%). Grade separation is 15% with all current grade crossings identified as eligible for funding. Overall the new Measure is a reasonable and provides a balanced program.

Measure A Benefit to Belmont:

Measure A reauthorization may benefit the City in the following ways:

1. Provides \$ 8.5 million in funding for local transportation services/ maintenance with total local discretion.

2. Funding for the Ralston Avenue/ US 101 Pedestrian Bicycle Bridge.

The latter project is one of many non-motorized transportation projects that will be identified within the measure. We will have to compete for these funds. Belmont will be in a very strong position to receive funding for the pedestrian/bicycle bridge because our project will have completed plans, specifications and estimates and all the Caltrans approvals needed for construction.

Measure A Technical Advisory Committee:

A Measure A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), consisting of Planning Directors and Public Works Directors throughout the County, was created to review the projects and provide technical input on the Measure. The TAC met five times and recommends approval of the Draft Expenditure Plan.

Discussion with Belmont C/CAG Representatives:

City staff met with Council members Dave Bauer and Phil Mathewson regarding the Measure A Continuation proposal and identified and discussed several issues. They are requesting guidance from the Council (see attached memo) as a whole on the following issues:

Local Share Percentage:

The question is whether or not the local share percentage should be increased from the existing Measure A level of 20 percent to a higher percentage to help local agencies address the significant pavement management backlogs over the next 20 years. It has been suggested the proposed 20 percent for the Continuation proposal be increased to 25 percent.

Pedestrian/ Bicycle Bridge Project:

The City's project is not guaranteed as part of the Continuation proposal that there will be funded. The project is one of a number of similar projects identified in the Continuation that may be built. The City's project will have complete plans, specifications and cost estimates along with all the Caltrans' approvals for construction. We expect to be one of the first projects eligible for funding. Should this project be specifically identified in the Continuation proposal as being funded for construction?

BART Funding:

The Continuation proposal identifies \$24 million for a feasibility study for the further extension of BART in San Mateo County. There is concern whether or not this feasibility study is needed and whether or not all the funds will go toward the feasibility study or towards the subsidy of future operational and maintenance needs of BART within the County.

Water Transit Authority Facilities:

The Continuation proposal identifies \$24 million to provide passenger terminal facilities for the Water Transit Authority service to South San Francisco and Redwood City. Water transit ferries are not a proven cost effective means of commuter travel. The likely users of ferries will be the land uses in the immediate vicinity of the terminal facilities. In the case of Redwood City, the primary users will be the development on the eastern end of the port area. The issue is whether or not the Continuation proposal should fund development based projects or should that be a requirement of the adjacent development. Regional Measure 2 on the March 2nd ballot may address this issue and make this point moot.

Development Based Projects:

There are a number of projects identified in the Continuation Plan proposed to facilitate recent or future development in the area. Some examples are the improvements to the Hillsdale Caltrain Station to facilitate the recent construction on Bay Meadows property, parking structures adjacent to BART in Daly City, and a future Caltrain station in Brisbane to facilitate future development in the area. It could be argued that all of these projects should be paid for by developer fees and not by Measure A.

Fiscal Impact

The actions of the City Council will have no immediate fiscal impact. There are significant long-term impacts should the Measure A Continuation proposal fail.

Recommendation

It is recommended City Council authorize the C/CAG representatives to support the continuation of Measure A with the following modifications:

1. Increase the 20% local transportation funding to 25%.
2. Eliminate \$24 million of funding for the feasibility study for further extension of BART into San Mateo County.
3. Eliminate \$24 million of funding for passenger terminal facilities for the Water Transit Authority service to South San Francisco and Redwood City. These development-based projects should not be funded through Measure A.
4. Eliminate all development based projects. These projects should be funded by local developer fees, not Measure A Continuation funds.

Attachments

Attachment A – Summary of the Draft Reauthorized Measure A Expenditure Plan

Attachment B – Memo from C/CAG Representatives

Alternatives

1. Authorization for the C/CAG Representative to support the continuation of Measure A in accordance with the TAC recommendations.
2. No actions.

Respectfully submitted,

Raymond E. Davis, III, P.E., PTOE
Director of Public Works

Jere A. Kersnar
City Manager