SAN JOAQUIN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SJCOG Conference Room
555 E. Weber Avenue, Stockton, CA 95202

Thursday, June 11, 2020
10:00 A.M.

https://sjcog.zoom.us/j/97576682294

Teleconference Number: 1-669-900-6833
Meeting ID: 975 7668 2294

Note: If you don't have access to a smart device or a computer with a webcam & a mic, you can dial in using the teleconference number and meeting ID above.

Attention Callers: Please mute the call unless speaking

NOTICE
Coronavirus COVID-19

In accordance with Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-33-20, The San Joaquin Council of Governments and staff will be participating in this meeting via teleconference. In the interest of maintaining appropriate social distancing, members of the public may participate in the meeting electronically using the Zoom link, and shall have the right to observe and offer public comment at the appropriate time during this meeting. To be recognized to speak, please use the “raise hand” or chat feature in Zoom.

We have also provided a call-in number, as identified on this Agenda, and encourage you to attend by telephone. To be recognized to speak, press *9 which will signal the moderator.

The San Joaquin Council of Governments is in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and will make all reasonable accommodations for the disabled to participate in employment, programs and facilities. Persons requiring assistance or auxiliary aid in order to participate should contact Rebecca Calija at (209) 235-0600 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order / Introductions / Roll Call
2. Minutes: May 14, 2020
3. Public Presentation
   At this time, the public may address the Technical Advisory Committee on any non-agendized item that is within the subject matter of this agency. If a member of the public wishes to speak on an agenda item he or she is invited to address the Technical Advisory Committee at the time the item is up for consideration. A five-minute maximum time limit for a speaker will apply to all “items from the audience”. The determination of whether an item is within the subject matter of the Committee is a discretionary decision to be made by the chair of the Technical Advisory Committee.
4. Technical Items: B through E are available for action by the committee. The left hand column identifies only recommendations from staff.

Action A. Consent Calendar Items: F through J

Action B. FY 2020-21 Election of Chair and Vice Chair (No Staff Report)

Information C. COVID-19 Sales Tax Impact Update (Dial)

Action D. Draft 2020 Federal Legislative Platform (Nguyen)

Discussion E. Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act Transit Funding (Niblock)

CONSENT CALENDAR

Action F. Final FY 20/21 Unmet Transit Needs Report (Goldlist)

Action G. Final 2019 Measure K Strategic Plan (Ripperda)

Action H. 2020 Regional Congestion Mitigation Program (RCMP) Monitoring and Conformance Report (Yokoyama)

Action I. 2020 MAP-21 Performance Report (Yokoyama)

Action J. Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) Capital Project List Amendments (Kohaya)

5. Other Matters of Business

6. Meeting Adjourned to Thursday, July 9, 2020 at 10:00 a.m.
AGENDA ITEM 2
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
San Joaquin Council of Governments • 555 E. Weber Avenue • Stockton, CA 95202

Thursday, May 14, 2020

MINUTES

Present

Member Name

Jurisdiction

Present

Member Name

Jurisdiction

Alex Chetley
SJC

John Ando
City of Escalon

Dave Mendoza
SJC

George Lorente
SJRTD

X Eric Alvarez
City of Stockton

Juan G. Villanueva
Port of Stockton

X Wes Johnson
City of Stockton

Steven Martinez
Caltrans D-10

X Miguel Mendoza
City of Stockton

Josh Swearingen
Caltrans D-10

X Georgia Graham
City of Lodi

Nicholas Fung
Caltrans D-10

Charles Swimley
City of Lodi

X Jordan Peterson
SJRRRC

X Juan Portillo
City of Manteca

John Cadrett
SJVAPCD

X Koosun Kim
City of Manteca

Russell Stark
Stk. Metro Airport

X Zabih Zaca
City of Tracy

X Ed Lovell
City of Tracy

Elizabeth Quilici
City of Ripon

Michael King
City of Lathrop

Alternates/Others: Kimberly Gayle, RTD; Lyman Chang, City of Lodi; Anju Pillai, City of Tracy; Jay Davidson, City of Lathrop; Dodgie Vidad, City of Stockton; Najee Zarif, San Joaquin County.

SJCOG Staff: Andrew Chesley, Executive Director; Steve Dial, CFO/Deputy Executive Director; Diane Nguyen, Deputy Director; Ryan Niblock, Senior Regional Planner; Tim Kohaya, Senior Regional Planner; Christine Corrales, Associate Regional Planner; Travis Yokoyama, Associate Regional Planner; David Ripperda, Associate Regional Planner; Hailey Lang, Associate Regional Planner; Ashley Goldlist, Assistant Regional Planner; Katy Castro, Administrative Clerk II.

1. Call Meeting to Order/Introductions:
   George Lorente called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. and roll call was called.

2. Meeting Minutes from March 12, 2020:
   It was moved/seconded (Graham/Peterson) to approve the meeting minutes from March 12, 2020, with the changes. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3. Public Presentation:
   None.

4. Technical Items for Discussion and Action: B through G

   A. Consent Calendar:

   H. Annual Adjustment of the Regional Transportation Impact Fee:
   Najee Zarif asked if there is an opportunity to defer the fee increase due to the current economy.
Andrew Chesley stated the Regional Transportation Impact fee is part of an agreement with all the cities and the county. To make a change on the agreement it requires all parties to agree to the change and sign off. SJCOG staff will continue to follow the agreement.

It was moved/seconded (Johnson/Chang) to approve the consent calendar. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

B. Update on Sales Tax – Verbal Report:
Steve Dial gave an update. He stated due to the current situation it is hard to forecast because SJCOG does not know yet where the bottom of the downturn is, or how long it will last. The modeling assumes a 50% reduction for May and June to close out this fiscal year with a nearly 7% decrease in fiscal year revenues or $4.3 million in FY 19-20. He continues to state that he carries 50% forward to July, August, and September, then decrease the shortfall to 25% for the next three months and then flat for the remainder of the FY.

George Lorente asked if the June payment is the last for fiscal year 2020. Steve Dial stated that for accounting purposes SJCOG would wait until August to get the final June sales.

This item was for discussion only.

C. Draft 2019 Measure K Strategic Plan:
David Ripperda stated, in January 2020, the SJCOG Board approved keeping the Measure K Renewal revenue estimate at $2.6 billion. While the COVID-19 crisis has had a drastic impact on sales tax revenues, it is currently difficult to quantify the magnitude of the economic impacts. Therefore, SJCOG staff proceeded with the Draft 2019 Strategic Plan using the $2.6 billion estimate. This estimate will be reevaluated during Fiscal Year 2020/21 as part of the 2021 Strategic Plan update.

Najee Zarif asked if there is any thought on how SJCOG will deal with the shortfall. David Ripperda stated that it would take collaboration from each agency. He continues to state that depending on what cash flow is available, SJCOG staff will be looking at shovel ready projects.

This item was for discussion only.

D. 2020 Measure K Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Amendment:
David Ripperda stated SJCOG Board would consider this request to amend the Measure K Expenditure Plan at a public hearing on May 28, 2020. If the Board approves the amendment request, SJCOG staff will notify all cities in San Joaquin and the County of San Joaquin of the Board’s action.

It was moved/seconded (Zaca/Zarif) to recommend to the SJCOG Board that they amend the Measure K Renewal Ordinance to revise the Regional Congestion Management Plan language as shown in Attachment B. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.
E. **Draft Fiscal Year 20/21 Unmet Transit Needs Report:**
Ashely Goldlist reported that this year’s assessment included nine public hearings, an online survey posted on SJCOG’s website, and paper submissions, producing a total of 107 comments on transit service from specific individuals. After review of all comments with the Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee, SJCOG found no unmet transit needs to be recommended to be found reasonable to meet.

This item was for discussion only.

F. **2022 RTP/SCS Briefing: Refining a Regional Approach to Housing:**
Christine Corrales presented this item. Ms. Corrales discussed the AB101 housing and homelessness budget trailer bill. AB 101 requires that the San Joaquin Valley Regional Transportation Planning Agency have a working group to direct how REAP funds are used.

Andrew Chesley commented on the Valley Link meeting and the state’s shortfall on housing.

This item was for discussion only.

G. **Federal Fiscal Year 2019/20 Delivery of Federal Funding:**
Ryan Niblock announced that funding available for projects cannot be guaranteed later in the spring and summer as funding made available to the rest of the state. All Requests for Authorization (RFA) must be submitted to Caltrans District 10 no later than July 1, 2020, or they will not be processed until the next federal fiscal year in November 2020.

This item was for discussion only.

5. **Other Matters of Business:**
Diane Nguyen stated the TAC meeting in June would be via Zoom. She continues to state that the election of a new chair and vice-chair will be on the June agenda.

6. **Adjournment:**
There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:56 a.m. to Thursday, June 11, 2020, at 10:00 a.m.
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: COVID-19 Sales Tax Impact Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Information

SUMMARY:

Last month staff presented the attached PowerPoint presentation to the San Joaquin Council of Governments Board of Directors. This presentation displays the most current information available to us regarding the impacts of COVID-19 on the two sales tax programs for which SJCOG is responsible: Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and Measure K.

COVID-19 Sales Tax Impact Update 5-28-2020

The presentation provides the assumptions used to make a revenue forecast for both the LTF and Measure K. In terms of relevant data, it is very early to be able to make a more definitive forecast. The next piece of information will come June 19th when the California Department of Tax and Fee administration releases data on sales from the month of April. And, ultimately, it likely will not be until we receive information on May and June sales in July and August before a more definitive forecast can be provided.

If you have any questions regarding the presentation, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Prepared by: Steve Dial, Deputy Executive Director/CFO
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Draft 2020 Federal Legislative Platform

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the Federal Legislative Platform and include these positions as part of the San Joaquin One Voice® Program

DISCUSSION:

SUMMARY:

SJCOG annually develops a set of principles and policy positions to support SJCOG’s work in linking transportation, housing, and air quality. This comes forwards as the Federal Legislative Platform. The platform represents a foundation for key issues that are anticipated to be considered during the course of the legislative session. Once formally adopted, the legislative platform will guide staff’s analysis and recommendations on pending legislative and regulatory items in the upcoming session and will be used in the SJCOG One Voice® effort.

Having these issues and priorities identified will further help SJCOG navigate the ever-changing political landscape in Washington and ensure the region continues to take advantage of opportunities for funding and engagement with our policymakers at the Federal level. It is
particularly timely to have a Federal Legislative Platform due to the expiration of the FAST Act on September 30, 2020.

BACKGROUND:

Since 2000, SJCOG has retained a federal legislative advocacy firm to assist the agency in policy development and appropriations requests, including funding requests for several regional transportation projects as part of federal transportation reauthorization bills. The current legislative consultant, CJ Lake, has also kept SJCOG staff abreast of transportation, housing, energy, and air quality related developments in Washington and has assisted in communicating SJCOG’s positions on different planning-related issues or specific legislation.

SJCOG has worked with CJ Lake to develop the draft legislative platform in Attachment A. This platform adds to last year’s platform. The draft platform highlights the position of SJCOG on important issues and provides general direction to staff and SJCOG’s legislative advocates as they prepare for a “virtual” San Joaquin One Voice® trip in September and when working with our partner agencies or SJCOG’s state association, CALCOG.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approving these positions so they can be utilized to represent the region’s interests in Washington DC. This platform will be used in the San Joaquin One Voice® program which is anticipated in September 2020 as a smaller scale virtual “trip”.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

ATTACHMENTS:

A. Draft Federal Legislative Platform

Prepared by:  Diane Nguyen, Deputy Director
2019 Federal Legislative Platform – continue the following positions:

**Aviation**

- Support flexibility with respect to the Airport Improvement Program (AIP), a federal grant program that provides funding to airports to help improve safety and efficiency.

- Support language that would address the 2014 FAA rule regarding voter approved general sales taxes. San Joaquin County, like many other self-help counties, has an airport and the County receives funds raised on the sales tax associated with the sale of aviation fuel. The 2014 FAA rule changed the definition of "local taxes on aviation fuel" to apply to all sales taxes rather than specific excise taxes on aviation fuel. This change diverts funding away from projects outlined in local sales tax measures.

**Automated and Connected Vehicles**

- The integration of AVs and Connected Vehicles into the nation's transportation system should not come at the expense of local autonomy. Regional organizations (such as Councils of Governments) should have the opportunity to guide the testing and adoption of AVs that makes the most sense for their community and region.
Support additional focus on how regional organizations can facilitate the regional sharing, storage, and use of data.

**Economic Incentives for Job Growth**

- Promote the inclusion of transportation and other types of infrastructure funding in any federal proposal for an economic stimulus package.
- Support economic development incentives for hard hit areas to take the place of the former Enterprise Zone.
- Opportunity Zones -- the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 authorized the designation of Opportunity Zones to spur investment in distressed communities throughout the U.S. by offering tax incentives for investments in those areas. Each governor nominated local areas within their state for these designations, and the U.S. Treasury reviewed these areas and designated a total of 8,761 zones. San Joaquin County has 20 within the County. We will want to support final regulations that allow local governments to determine the types of development eligible for Opportunity Zone investments.
- Support the introduction of empowerment zone legislation.

**Transportation Funding**

- Support stabilizing and increasing transportation infrastructure funding sources to avoid the bankruptcy of the federal highway and transit trust funds. Could include:
  - Support to increase and index the gas tax to inflation.
  - Explore innovative funding mechanisms, such as a pay-by-the-mile user fee and public private partnerships.
  - Expand access to Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) loans.
  - Remove procedural obstacles that impede expenditure of authorized federal funding.
  - Support the return of directed federal funding for transportation priorities.
➢ Support the continuation of, and increased investment in, federal discretionary grant opportunities such as the Infrastructure for Rebuilding America (INFRA) and Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) programs. Expand the INFRA program to include both competitive and formula-based awards.

Mobility

➢ Engage on issues related to transit technology/clean corridor tracking/new technology/platooning
➢ Explore opportunities for Federal grants to fund various transportation priorities, including transit and bikeways

Regional Transportation Plan

➢ Support efforts to change the adoption cycle for the Regional Transportation Plan from the current four-year requirement to a flexible timeframe (6-10 years).

Project Streamlining

➢ Support legislation and/or administrative reforms to streamline the federal and state government’s project delivery process and to eliminate unnecessary and/or duplicative requirements (CEQA/NEPA)
Potential Policy Additions to the Federal Legislative Platform

Infrastructure Package/Surface Transportation Reauthorization

General

- Support no limitation on years of operations funding for Vanpools, Public-Private Partnerships on Employee Shuttles, and MicroTransit (first and last mile).

- Support funding programs for Low or No Emissions bus transit vehicle replacement and expansion and related infrastructure.

- Support funding levels responsive to the adverse impacts to Local Streets and Road budgets due to COVID-19 impacts. Public agencies are experienced significant reductions in Local Transportation Funds, Local Transportation Sales Tax Measures, and Local Development Impact Fees. Increased funding levels will be needed to continue the delivery of transportation projects.

Modifications to Federal Matching Funds/Share Requirements

- **Local Match Modifications** - Request a waiver of local share/match for all ongoing transportation projects. Full federal participation eliminates the risk of uncertain locally-generated revenues subject to major reductions due to COVID-19, and will provide confidence to contractors that they will be paid, and to the public that the project will be built. It will minimize the risk of projects being shelved, providing the stimulus vitally needed for economic recovery.

- **Increased FHWA Share** - Request Congress increase FHWA share to 90% due to COVID-19, authorizing the COVID-19/national pandemic emergency as an eligible reason for assistance, mirroring the 23 USC §125 Emergency Relief program for disaster response.
- **Local Share Delays** - Request a delay in requirements to provide local share for a certain time period, similar to the payroll tax provision in the CARES Act.

- **Project Reclassification** - Reclassify projects sources of federal funds (classify projects as Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) or another program) to circumvent local share/match requirements.

### Modify Surface Transportation Block Grant Utilization

- Utilize the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) (23 U.S.C. §133) under the federal-aid highway program and public transportation program for stimulus spending. Distribute this funding using existing formulas and sub-allocation procedures under 23 U.S.C. §133.

- Remove local match requirements so federal funds can cover 100% of a project’s costs. Allow funds provided in a stimulus bill to be used as the local share funds for any program, including the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality, and Metropolitan Planning. Allowing new funds to be used to match other program funds would help ensure speedier project delivery.

### Congestion Management and Air Quality Program

- Support new program and (and additional funds) to explicitly include replacement of essential nontransit vehicles (example, police cars, garbage trucks and sewer trucks) which can demonstrate air pollution reductions with conversion.

### Trade Corridor/ Goods Movement

- Support strategic investments to improve goods movement for agricultural supply chain and manufacturing logistics throughout San Joaquin County.

- Support new funding and planning opportunities to support electric vehicle infrastructure and programs for both private vehicles and public transit fleets.
➢ Support additional funding opportunities for managed lanes, particularly in corridors which serve as gateways between regions.

➢ Support funding specific to rehabilitation or operational improvements to STAA routes.

➢ Support funding focused specific to bridge rehabilitation and replacement in trade corridors.

**Work From Home/ Telework**

➢ Support planning research & funding to MPOs for planning studies on regional teleworking policies, ordinances and measures to improve air quality.

➢ Support funding to capital programs for the development of telework and broadband network implementation strategies to reduce VMT.
AGENDA ITEM 4E
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act Transit Funding

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion

SUMMARY:

The Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, signed on March 27, 2020, provides $2 trillion in federal funding through a number of programs to address issues as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Public transit will receive $25 billion through the CARES Act. Specifically, within San Joaquin County, the following has been made available to urbanized areas (UZA):

- Stockton UZA – $33,734,638
- Lodi UZA – $5,532,640
- Manteca UZA – $6,830,739
- Tracy UZA – $7,101,511
- California has been apportioned $94,976,667 for rural transit providers. Caltrans is responsible for distributing these funds to regions.

Funding will be provided at a 100-percent federal share, with no local match required – to support capital, operating, and other expenses generally eligible under those programs to prevent, prepare for, and respond to COVID-19. FTA will permit Urbanized Area Formula Program or Formula Grants for Rural Areas Program funding to be used for COVID-19-related public transportation capital or operating expenses at an 80 percent federal share, regardless of whether operating expenses generally are an eligible expense for a recipient. Eligible activities include emergency protective measures to eliminate or lessen threats to public health and safety, such as performing enhanced cleaning/sanitizing of rolling stock, stations, bus shelters, etc.; placing hand sanitizer dispensers in high traffic areas; and providing personal protective equipment as appropriate. Operating expenses incurred beginning on January 20, 2020 for all rural and urban recipients, even those in large urban areas, are also eligible, including operating expenses to maintain transit services as well as paying for administrative leave for transit personnel due to reduced operations during an emergency. Funds are available until expended. There is no lapse date to obligate funds available under the CARES Act.

Split and/or sub allocation letters must be updated to include funds made available under the CARES Act. SJCOG staff held meetings with transit operators to discuss needs and priority criteria, and to seek agreement on strategy to split funds. SJCOG staff has worked with RTD, ACE, Lodi, Manteca, Tracy, and Ripon to identify appropriate split of Stockton UZA, Lodi UZA, Manteca UZA, and Tracy UZA funds. Specifically, the split of funding is as follows:
- RTD – $16,257,304 from the Stockton UZA
- ACE – $17,477,334 from the Stockton UZA
- Lodi – $5,532,640 from the Lodi UZA
- Manteca – $6,830,739 from the Manteca UZA
- Tracy – $7,101,511 from the Tracy UZA

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Discussion.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None at this time.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

None.

Prepared by Ryan Niblock, Senior Regional Planner
AGENDA ITEM 4F
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Final FY 20/21 Unmet Transit Needs Report

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve Final FY 20/21 Unmet Transit Needs Report

SUMMARY:

Each year, pursuant to state law, the Transportation Development Act (TDA), as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) must identify any unmet transit needs that may exist in San Joaquin County. If needs are found, SJCOG must determine whether those needs are reasonable to meet. SJCOG must ensure that reasonable needs are met before TDA funds are allocated to local jurisdictions for non-transit purposes.

The unmet transit needs assessment requires SJCOG to meet the following requirements:

• Ensure that several factors have been considered in the planning process, including:
  1. Size and location of groups likely to be dependent on transit,
  2. Adequacy of existing services and potential alternative services
  3. Service improvements that could meet all or part of the travel demand.
• Hold a public hearing to receive testimony on unmet needs.
• Determine definitions for "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet."
• Adopt a finding regarding unmet transit needs and allocate funds to address those needs, if necessary, before street and road TDA allocations.

This year’s assessment included nine public hearings, an online survey posted on SJCOG’s website, and paper submissions, producing a total of 107 comments on transit service from specific individuals. After review of all comments with the Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee, SJCOG found no unmet transit needs recommended be found reasonable to meet. The report is available on SJCOG’s website: https://www.sjcog.org/UTN.

Comments on the report will be accepted through June 22, 2020. The SJCOG Board is expected to take action on the final report at its regularly scheduled June meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:

Vote to approve the Final FY 20/21 Unmet Transit Needs Report.
BACKGROUND:

At the request of the SSTAC, SJCOG formed a subcommittee to review the adopted definitions of “unmet transit need” and “reasonable to meet”. The updated definitions as proposed by the subcommittee and adopted by the Board in February 2018, are as follows:

Unmet Transit Needs are defined as transportation services not currently provided to those residents who use or would use public transportation regularly, if available, to meet their life expectations.
An unmet transit need that meets the definition above and meets all the following criteria shall be considered **reasonable to meet**:

**Community Acceptance**

There should be a demonstrated interest of citizens in the new or additional transit service (i.e. multiple comments, petitions, etc.).

**Equity**

The proposed new or additional service will benefit the general public, residents who use or would use public transportation regularly, the senior population, and persons with disabilities; including assessments based on Title VI or other similar information where available.

**Potential Ridership**

The proposed transit service will meet new service ridership performance measures of the implementing agency or agencies, as defined by the implementing agency or agencies in concurrence with the Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee (SSTAC).
Within the definition, an unmet transit need cannot be found unreasonable solely based upon economic feasibility.
Operational, Educational, and Non-Specific Comments on Transit Service

The annual Unmet Transit Needs process provides a broad opportunity for the public to provide input on transit services in San Joaquin County. As a result, comments are often submitted that do not meet the definition of unmet transit needs provided above. These comments generally fall in the following categories:

Although these comments cannot be considered unmet transit needs and thus are not evaluated as to whether they are “reasonable to meet,” they still provide valuable input on transit service. SJCOG forwards all comments to the relevant transit operators, who consider them when developing service improvements or providing educational materials to the public.
DISCUSSION:

Public Input

This year’s Unmet Transit Needs process included an extended public outreach process using new techniques to gain public input. These efforts were intended to promote multiple opportunities for members of the public to communicate their unmet transit needs (e.g., SJCOG website, survey, social media, phone). Examples of this effort include:

- Nine public hearings held throughout San Joaquin County, including at least one hearing in each jurisdiction
- Attending community events and reaching out to local organizations
- An online survey was posted on the SJCOG website and e-blasted to interested parties

The various community outreach efforts produced a total of 107 comments on transit service.

Analysis of Comments Received

SJCOG convened a UTN Review Subcommittee consisting of seven members of the SSTAC (including RTD, other transit operators, and social service providers). Most comments were deemed to fall into the Operational, Educational, or Non-Specific categories defined above, and as such were not considered unmet transit needs. These comments will be forwarded to the appropriate transit operators for consideration in service planning.

Findings

Based on the analysis described above, SJCOG recommends the following Unmet Transit Needs Findings for FY 20/21:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Unmet Need, determined Not Reasonable to Meet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Loop route from Generations Center to City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>Service to/from City Council meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>Service to Micke Grove Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>Increased service connecting Stockton and Lodi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>Service connecting 711 Cross St and 1400 Tenth St in Lodi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Transportation to Micke Grove on weekends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Increased weekend service to San Joaquin RTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Increased weekend service to Sherwood Mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Service from Feather River Drive to Pacific and Alpine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Service from Feather River Drive to Pershing and Alpine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Additional night service on Route 23, and other routes to Lodi at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Service at Morehead trailer park on Chrisman Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Service from Mountain House to Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Service from Mountain House to El Concilio in Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Service to Safeway Depo Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Route connecting Tracy and Manteca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Service from Tracy to Blackhawk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Mountain House to 11th Street Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td>Route connecting Lathrop to Manteca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td>Route connecting Tracy and Manteca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENTS

None.

*Report prepared by Ryan Niblock, Senior Regional Planner*
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Final 2019 Measure K Strategic Plan

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend to the SJCOG Board that they adopt the 2019 Measure K Strategic Plan

SUMMARY:

The Measure K Strategic Plan serves as the guiding document for the delivery of Measure K (Renewal) projects and programs. In January 2020, the SJCOG Board approved keeping the Measure K Renewal revenue estimate at the level previously adopted in the 2017 Strategic Plan update, $2.6 billion.

While the COVID-19 crisis has had a drastic impact on sales tax revenues it is currently difficult to quantify the magnitude of the economic impacts. Therefore, SJCOG staff proceeded with the Draft 2019 Strategic Plan using the $2.6 billion estimate. This estimate will be reevaluated during Fiscal Year 2020/21 as part of the 2021 Strategic Plan update.

The Draft 2019 Strategic Plan document was provided for public review online on May 6. No comments on the draft plan were received from any members of the public, local agencies, or transit operators. The final document is available at: https://www.sjcog.org/302/Plans-Publications.

RECOMMENDATION:

SJCOG staff recommend that the TAC recommend to the SJCOG Board that they adopt the 2019 Measure K Strategic Plan.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None at this time. There will be direct fiscal impacts from the adoption of the Measure K Strategic Plan which will set Measure K allocations for eligible projects through Fiscal Year 2030/31.

BACKGROUND:

Measure K is the half-cent sales tax dedicated to transportation projects in San Joaquin County. With its original passage in November 1990, Measure K began laying the groundwork for funding for a system of improved highways and local streets, new passenger rail service, regional and inter-regional bus routes, new bicycle facilities, and railroad crossings.
**Measure K Renewal**: On November 7, 2006, San Joaquin County voters decided to extend Measure K for an additional 30 years.

The categorical allocations of Measure K Renewal (hereafter referred simply as Measure K) include Local Street Repairs and roadway Safety (35%), Congestion Relief projects (32.5%), Railroad Crossing Safety Projects (2.5%), and Passenger Rail, Bus, and Bicycles (30%), which includes subcategories for Rail Transit, Bus Transit, Bus Rapid Transit, and Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to Schools improvements.

The renewal of Measure K was initially estimated to generate $3 billion, but current estimates as of January 2020 are at $2.6 billion, representing a $370 million decrease.

The Measure K Strategic Plan serves as the guiding document for the delivery of Measure K (Renewal) projects and programs. The Strategic Plan functions as a Measure K capital improvement program (CIP) for all eligible categories approved by San Joaquin voters. Its financial plan describes the long-term revenue forecast, capital funding requirements, borrowing needs and the associated debt service costs of the program. The current version of the Plan, the *2017 Measure K Strategic Plan*, provides a twenty-year outlook of Measure K projects through Fiscal Year 2030/31. Pursuant to the Measure K Renewal Expenditure Plan, a Strategic Plan is to be updated every two years:

SJCOG will prepare a Strategic Plan every two years. The Strategic Plan will be the master document for delivery of the Expenditure Plan projects and can be amended at any time. The purposes of the Strategic Plan are as follows:

- Defines the scope, cost, and schedule of each project
- Identifies accomplishments and critical issues
- Lists a set of amendments to these projects
- Details the revenue projections and possible financing tools needed to deliver the Expenditure Plan
- Gathers into one document the policies and procedures of the Expenditure Plan
- Serves as an annual budget

The San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) is the administrator of the Measure K half-cent sales tax program. Due to the decrease in revenue from the Great Recession and the COVID-19 crisis, not all Measure K projects identified in the Expenditure Plan can be funded in the 30-year life of the sales tax program. The region will need to delve into difficult policy decisions and make hard choices on what Measure K projects can be funded. This means Measure K expenditures, project priorities, and policies will be re-examined and possibly new policies developed to create a financially constrained plan that balances project delivery within funding limitations.
2019 Measure K Strategic Plan

Throughout spring 2020, SJCOG staff met with all local agencies and transit operators to discuss the implications of the Measure K financial picture and how to prioritize projects. Staff worked with project sponsors to finalize the scope, cost, and schedule of all Measure K projects. In January 2020, the SJCOG Board approved keeping the Measure K Renewal revenue estimate at the level previously adopted in the 2017 Strategic Plan update, $2.6 billion.

While the COVID-19 crisis has had a drastic impact on sales tax revenues it is currently difficult to quantify the magnitude of the economic impacts. Therefore, SJCOG staff proceeded with the Draft 2019 Strategic Plan using the $2.6 billion estimate. This estimate will be reevaluated during Fiscal Year 2020/21 as part of the 2021 Strategic Plan update.

In April 2020, SJCOG’s financial consultant PFM completed a cash flow analysis of the Measure K Capital Program based upon existing and future anticipated debt service and revenue as shown in Figure 1. The cash flow analysis indicated that only approximately $74.5 million would be available to program to new Congestion Relief projects between Fiscal Year 2020/21 and Fiscal Year 2030/31. SJCOG developed a Strategic Plan programming scenario based upon this cash flow analysis and several underlying policies and assumptions.

Prepared by: David Ripperda, Associate Regional Planner
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: 2020 Regional Congestion Management Program (RCMP) Monitoring and Conformance Report

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the 2020 RCMP Monitoring Report & find all the jurisdictions conform to the requirements of RCMP

DISCUSSION:

SUMMARY:

SJCOG is required by state and federal law to monitor all elements of the Regional Congestion Management Program (RCMP) and to ensure that the county and cities are conforming to the RCMP. Conformance findings are a requisite step for local agency eligibility for Section 2105 state gas tax subvention funds made available by Proposition 111, Federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, state Regional Improvement Improvement Plan (RTIP) funds, and local Measure K funds.

The RCMP Monitoring and Conformance Report includes: 1) a determination of consistency with RCMP traffic level of service (LOS) standards, and 2) implementation of the RCMP land-use analysis program for mitigation of impacts of local land-use decisions on the RCMP network. SJCOG conducted the LOS technical analysis for committee review and found that all jurisdictions are meeting LOS standards. SJCOG staff has also requested information on the implementation of identified mitigation measures as part of the Land Use Analysis Program.

SJCOG staff has found San Joaquin County and the cities of Escalon, Lathrop, Lodi, Ripon, Stockton, and Tracy in conformance with the requirements of the RCMP.

The draft 2020 RCMP Monitoring and Conformance Report is available at: www.sjcog.org/RCMP.

As SJCOG staff is in the process of opting out of State Congestion Management Program (SCMP), SJCOG is bond by state and federal law. To date, the Cities of Escalon, Manteca, and Ripon have passed resolutions that opted their jurisdictions out of SCMP.
RECOMMENDATION:

SJCOG staff recommends the SJCOG Board of Directors adopt the 2020 RCMP Monitoring Report and find all jurisdictions conform with all the requirements of RCMP.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Not impact to SJCOG OWP. This report is included as part of our OWP element 801.04 (Congestion Management Program/System).

BACKGROUND:

Federal Legislative Requirements

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requires metropolitan areas exceeding a population of 200,000 to implement a Congestion Management Process, defined as “a systematic and regionally-accepted approach for managing congestion that provides accurate, up-to-date information on transportation system performance and assesses alternative strategies for congestion management that meet state and local needs.”¹ This requirement was first introduced by the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 and was refined in subsequent transportation bills, including the most recent Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act of 2015.

State Legislative Requirements

In 1990, California voters approved legislation to increase transportation funding through an additional fuel tax (Proposition 111). With the passage of Proposition 111, urbanized counties were required to prepare, adopt, implement, and biennially update a Congestion Management Program. The state’s primary focus is to monitor the impacts of growth on the regional transportation network and establish strategies to avoid and/or respond to segments of the network that are failing. Proposition 111 provides Section 2105 state gas tax subvention funds for cities and counties to implement their CMP as shown in Table 1.

San Joaquin County Measure K

The region’s local Measure K Renewal Ordinance, approved by voters in 2006, required SJCOG to establish and begin implementing the Regional CMP (RCMP) by January 1, 2008.

RCMP Monitoring and Conformance Report

SJCOG is required by state and federal law to monitor all elements of the RCMP and to ensure that the county and cities are conforming to the RCMP. Compliance findings are a requisite step for local agency eligibility for Section 2105 state gas tax subvention funds made available by Proposition 111, Federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, state Regional Improvement Improvement Plan (RTIP) funds, and local Measure K funds. The compliance monitoring includes a biennial monitoring and conformance report and a program update, including a technical analysis of current Level of Service (LOS) on the RCMP Network and documentation of compliance with the requirements of the RCMP Land Use Analysis Program.

Discussion:

RCMP Technical Analysis Results

SJCOG’s adopted RCMP standard is LOS D. LOS E/F are deemed deficient and may require intersection and/or roadway improvements to increase the LOS rating to LOS D. The tables, below, illustrate the results of LOS analysis before exemption process. LOS analysis found a total of 18 basic freeway segments and 17 two-lane highway segments deficient during AM peak period. A total of 30 basic freeway segments and 15 two-lane highway segments were found deficient during PM peak period. In addition, a total of 17 intersections during AM peak period and 16 intersections of PM peak period along with 10 urbans street segments were found deficient. It should be noted that one segment and one intersection lies at the edge of two jurisdictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-99</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-205</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-132</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escalon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>2*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 segment is between the County and City of Tracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 intersection lies between the County and City of Stockton

The LOS analysis found that after applying exemptions allowed under state law, including deducting interregional trips, accounting for construction impacts and planned improvements, accounting for programmed transportation projects that would relieve congestion, and exempting facilities that operated below the established LOS standard when the CMP was established.
(“grandfathered” facilities), all roadways and intersections in San Joaquin County meet the LOS standard except for:

- SR-99 between SR-4 east and SR-26 west
- Byron Road between Lammers Road and County Line

It is at SJCOG’s discretion to determine the non-conformance of a jurisdiction and require a deficiency report if a roadway or intersection was found deficient. SJCOG found jurisdictions to be in conformance with the RCMP and no deficiency plan is requested at this time. It can be noted that neither of these segments were found to be deficient based on the monitoring cycle of 2016.

**Merge/Diverge Analysis**

A merge /diverge analysis was introduced to this report as an informational item. City of Manteca expressed a concern that the 2016 RCMP Monitoring Report did not show SR-120 segment between Airport Way and SR-99 deficient before exemptions for interregional trips during the November 2016 TAC Meeting. As a result, this additional layer of analysis was added.

The scope of the merge/diverge analysis included SR-120 between I-5 & SR-99 and specific corridors along SR-99 and I-5 chosen based on their LOS rating. However, six segments lacked the current Caltrans turning movement data to perform a merge/diverge analysis. Two segments were along SR-120; including 1) SR-120 between I-5 and Guthmiller Road and 2) SR-120 between Main Street and SR-99.

There are five merge/diverge locations during AM peak commute period and eight during PM peak commute period with a rating of LOS E of F. In these occurrences, average speed was deemed “unstable” due the high density of passenger cars per mile per lane. There are four occurrences on I-5, 7 on SR-99, and two on SR-120.
Merge/Diverge Deficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Ramp Type</th>
<th>Freeway Section Type</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Louise Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lathrop Road</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monte Diablo Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Harney Lane</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherokee Lane</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Diverge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turner Road</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mokelumne River</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodbridge Road</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Airport Way</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union Avenue</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RCMP Land Use Analysis Program**

The RCMP is required to contain a program to analyze the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions on the regional transportation system. To comply with this state mandate, SJCOG and its members have integrated a “regional layer” of review within the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process to analyze impacts of development projects to the CMP transportation system. The RCMP Monitoring and Conformance Report must document each local agency’s performance over the previous two years to comply with the RCMP, including but not limited to the following:

- Implementation progress of mitigation measures identified as part of the RCMP Land Use Analysis Program.
- Compliance with the CEQA mitigation monitoring requirements for RCMP impacts.

SJCOG staff analyzed development projects that local agencies approved between 2010 and 2019 for which SJCOG staff had provided comments relating to the RCMP. A map and summary of the project’s status and its mitigation measures is in Appendix B of the 2019 Monitoring and Conformance Report.

**NEXT STEPS:**

SJCOG staff will process with opting out of State Congestion Management Program.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

A. 2018 RCMP Roadway Network

B. San Joaquin County RCMP 2020 Monitoring and Conformance Report Executive Summary
Prepared by: Travis Yokoyama, Associate Regional Planner
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As the designated Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for San Joaquin County, the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) is responsible for updating County’s Regional Congestion Management Program (RCMP) and monitoring its implementation. Pursuant to Section 65089.3 of the California Government Code, SJCOG must determine if each City and the County is conforming to the following RCMP requirements:

- Consistency with the RCMP LOS standards;
- Implementation of the RCMP Land Use Analysis Program to mitigate impacts to RCMP designated roadways and intersections from local land use decisions;
- Progress towards implementing the RCMP Regional Deficiency Plan action list as identified in SJCOG’s Regional TDM Plan (August, 2010).

In addition to the above state requirements governing congestion management compliance, this RCMP Monitoring and Conformance Assessment Report also serves to track and report the following:

- Monitoring of SJCOG’s RCMP performance measures;
- Compliance with the SJCOG’s Measure K renewal requirements to implement a state compliant Congestion Management Program;
- Compliance with the federal FAST Act required congestion management process.

This report provides a snapshot of the “state of congestion” on the County’s designated RCMP roadway network including segments, intersections, multi-modal corridors, bicycle network and transit network. To inform this assessment, SJCOG performed a comprehensive data collection effort in 2018. Where congestion problems are identified, this monitoring process establishes the need for development of RCMP deficiency plans to remedy such locations. However, State statutes require that the CMA first examine if vehicle trips outside the control of local land use decisions are the cause of the deficiency. The primary RCMP trip exemption types applicable to San Joaquin County include: interregional trips (trips that do not originate in San Joaquin County); and, trip diversion associated with construction related activity. Two additional factors that obviate the need for development of deficiency plans include: improvements associated with the deficient facility are already programmed in SJCOG’s Federal Transportation Improvement Program; and/or, the deficient facility was identified as RCMP exempt per

---

1 The federal Congestion Management Process requires an increased multimodal travel demand management (TDM) and system management emphasis at both the local and regional level to comply. Noncompliance with any of these directives can have local and regional funding implications.

2 State statutes requires local agencies to prepare RCMP Deficiency Plans specific to the deficient facilities that identify capital improvements that will either directly remedy the capacity deficiency or provide multi-modal system-wide benefits to circulation and air quality. Unlike the direct fix approach, a system-wide deficiency plan CIP list must receive concurrence from the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District before it can be approved by the local agency and SJCOG (Section 65089.4(c)(3).
state statute in the 1992 RCMP (i.e., program initiation) because they were already operating at LOS E or F. Pre-existing deficient segments at the time of program initiation are deemed “grandfathered.”

Table 1: "Grandfathered" Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS Standard of “E”</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Segment Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SR-26</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>SR-99 to Cardinal Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-88</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Brandt Rd. to Sierra Drive (through Lockeford)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-99</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Cherokee Rd. to Wilson Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-205</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>MacArthur Drive to I-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March Lane</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>West Lane to Pacific Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-4</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>SR-99 to .66 mi. east of Wilson Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-4</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>.66 mi. east of Wilson Way to Navy Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOS Standard of “F”</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Segment Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-205</td>
<td>Escalon</td>
<td>Alameda Co. line to Tracy Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-120</td>
<td>Escalon</td>
<td>Escalon-Bellota Rd. to east of Mitchell Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-120</td>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td>Yosemite Ave. undercrossing to SR-99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SJCOG 2007 RCMP Policy Document

If SJCOG determines that a local jurisdiction is not conforming to the requirements of the RCMP, the agency will have 90 days to correct any issues of non-conformance. If the local agency fails to resolve these issues, SJCOG is required to notify the State Controller, who shall then withhold all apportionments of Section 2105 gas tax subvention funds to the nonconforming jurisdiction until the issue of nonconformance is resolved. If the local jurisdiction has not resolved the issue of nonconformance after 12 months, the State Controller must allocate the withheld gas tax apportionment to SJCOG who is then required to spend the apportionment on regionally significant projects identified in the RCMP’s Capital Improvement Program or improvements identified in adopted deficiency plans (i.e., SJCOG Regional Deficiency Plan, August 2010). In addition, the Metropolitan Planning Organization (SJCOG) shall not program federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) or Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for any project in the nonconforming jurisdiction unless it is considered a regionally significant project or is identified in an adopted deficiency plan.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The 2020 conformance findings indicate that all jurisdictions in San Joaquin County are currently conforming to the RCMP. SJCOG is deferring the need for the San Joaquin County to prepare RCMP Deficiency Plans for one deficient RCMP local arterial segment at this time to allow another monitoring round to confirm these findings. As monitoring continues, greater documentation of local agency compliance with the RCMP LUAP is anticipated. A summary of the monitoring results is provided below.
RCMP Intersections were established by SJCOG with input from its member agencies, focusing primarily on state highway ramp termini and state/local arterial intersections of regional importance. A total of 108 intersections are currently designated as RCMP intersections. A total of 93 intersections were analyzed in 2020. Based on 2018 AM/PM intersection turn movement counts, the Highway Capacity Manual operational method was applied to determine intersection operations. Results indicate that all intersections operate at acceptable LOS during both weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours, with the exception of 13 intersections that were determined to be operating at LOS E or F. These 13 intersections were then subject to an Exemption Analysis to determine if the intersection could be exempted from the observed LOS deficiency due to interregional trips, optimized signal timing, construction impacts, programmed improvements, and/or “grandfathered” segments. These exemptions are described further in Section 3.4 of this report. A summary of these RCMP intersection results are provided in Table 2.

### Table 2. Intersection Deficiency Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>No Exemption</th>
<th>With Interregional Exemption</th>
<th>Interregional + Optimized Signal Timing</th>
<th>Exemption Type or Deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AM Peak Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Matthews Road &amp; I-5 NB</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>99 Frontage (s/o Eight Mile Road) &amp; Hwy 99 NB Ramps</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>McHenry Avenue &amp; E River Road</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>319.0</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Yosemite Avenue &amp; French Camp Road</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Jack Tone Road &amp; Mariposa Avenue</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lathrop Road &amp; I-5 NB Ramps</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>126.7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Thornton Rd &amp; Lower Sacramento Road</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Corral Hollow Road &amp; Linne Rd</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>147.3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Mountain House Parkway &amp; I-580 WB Ramps</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PM Peak Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Matthews Road &amp; I-5 NB</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>186.1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>McHenry Avenue &amp; E River Road</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>299.7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Vernalis Road &amp; SR-132/ Vernalis Road</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>126.5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Yosemite Avenue &amp; French Camp Road</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>347.8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Hutchins Street &amp; Harney Lane</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Jack Tone Rd &amp; River Rd</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Austin Road &amp; French Camp Road</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Basic Freeway Segments

Based on the most recent published volumes by Caltrans (2017), portions of I-5, SR-99, SR-120, SR-4 and I-205 were determined to be operating at LOS E or F during the a.m. or p.m. peak hours. After accounting for locally generated trips (interregional trip exemption), only one segment of SR-99 would operate at LOS E or worse. Staff deferred the request for a RCMP Deficiency Plan from SJCOG, “the responsible party,” at this time. A summary of these results are provided in Table 3.

Table 3. Freeway Deficiency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>AM LOS</th>
<th>PM LOS</th>
<th>AM II/IX* Share</th>
<th>PM II/IX* Share</th>
<th>Exemption Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jct. Rte. 205 West</td>
<td>Jct. Rte. 120 East</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>B B Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop Road</td>
<td>French Camp Overcrossing</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>A B Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Camp Overcrossing</td>
<td>Mathews Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>B B Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews Road</td>
<td>French Camp Turnpike</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>B B Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Camp Turnpike</td>
<td>Eighth St</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>B C Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth St.</td>
<td>Jct. Rte. 4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>B C Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Club Boulevard</td>
<td>Plymouth Rd/Ryde Ave</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>A C Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March Lane</td>
<td>Benjamin Holt Drive</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>A C Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Holt Drive</td>
<td>Hammer Lane</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>A D Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>AM LOS</th>
<th>PM LOS</th>
<th>AM II/IX* Share</th>
<th>PM II/IX* Share</th>
<th>Exemption Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus County Line</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>A A Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Milgeo Avenue</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>A A Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milgeo Avenue</td>
<td>Jacktone Road</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>A A Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacktone Road</td>
<td>South Jct. Rte. 120</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>A A Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Jct. Rte. 120</td>
<td>N. Jct. Rte. 120</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>A A Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariposa Rd</td>
<td>Jct. Rte. 4 East</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>B A Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jct. Rte. 4 East</td>
<td>Jct. Rte. 26 West</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>F B Deficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jct. Rte. 26 West</td>
<td>Jct. Rte. 4 West</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>C B Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jct. Rte. 88 Northeast</td>
<td>Cherokee Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>B C Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherokee Road</td>
<td>Wilson Way</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>B C Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Way</td>
<td>Hammer Lane</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>B C Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lodi Interchange</td>
<td>Lodi, Jct. Rte. 12 West</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>B C Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>AM LOS</th>
<th>PM LOS</th>
<th>AM II/IX* Share</th>
<th>PM II/IX* Share</th>
<th>Exemption Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jct. Rte. 5</td>
<td>Yosemite Ave Undercrossing</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>C D Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite Ave Undercrossing</td>
<td>Airport Way</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>B A Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>AM LOS</th>
<th>PM LOS</th>
<th>AM II/IX* Share</th>
<th>PM II/IX* Share</th>
<th>Exemption Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Line</td>
<td>Patterson Pass Road</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>A A Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson Pass Road</td>
<td>Old Route 50</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>A A Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Route 50</td>
<td>Mac Arthur Drive</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>A A Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac Arthur Drive</td>
<td>Jct. Rte. 5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>A A Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>AM LOS</td>
<td>PM LOS</td>
<td>AM II/IX* Share</td>
<td>PM II/IX* Share</td>
<td>Exemption Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southbound / Westbound Segments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jct. Rte. 205 West</td>
<td>Jct. Rte. 120 East</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>B C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Camp Overcrossing</td>
<td>Mathews Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathews Road</td>
<td>French Camp Turnpike</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Camp Turnpike</td>
<td>Eighth St</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>B C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Street</td>
<td>Jct. Rte. 4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>B C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus County Line</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Milgeo Avenue</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>B D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milgeo Avenue</td>
<td>Jack Tone Road</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>B D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Tone Road</td>
<td>South Jct. Rte. 120</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>A D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jct. Rte. 26 West</td>
<td>Jct. Rte. 4 West</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>A C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jct. Rte. 26 East</td>
<td>Jct. Rte. 88 Northeast</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>B D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jct. Rte. 88 Northeast</td>
<td>Cherokee Road</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Way</td>
<td>Hammer Lane</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lodi Interchange</td>
<td>Lodi, Jct. Rte. 12 West</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>B B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi, Turner Road</td>
<td>Woodbridge Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>B A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Line</td>
<td>Patterson Pass Road</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>B A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson Pass Road</td>
<td>Old Route 50</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>B A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Route 50</td>
<td>Mac Arthur Drive</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>B B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mac Arthur Drive</td>
<td>Jct. Rte. 5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>B C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*II stands for Internal to Internal, or trips that both originate and end within San Joaquin County, while IX stands for Internal to External, or trips that originate in San Joaquin County, but end elsewhere.
**Merge / Diverge Analysis**

A merge /diverge analysis was introduced to this report as an informational item. At the November 2016 TAC Meeting, City of Manteca expressed a concern that the 2016 RCMP Monitoring Report did not show SR-120 segment between Airport Way and SR-99 deficient before exemptions for interregional trips. This additional layer of analysis was added as a result.

Merge / diverge analysis assesses the average speed, capacity (passenger cars per mile per lane), and LOS in select freeway interchanges during AM and PM peak commute periods. Segments analyzed included SR-99 near middle to northern San Joaquin County, I-5 near City of Lathrop and Stockton, and all of SR-120. It is important to note that the merge/diverge analysis could not performed at the following interchanges due to a lack of current Caltrans and turning movement data:

- I-5 & Pershing Avenue
- I-5 & Fremont Street
- SR-99 & Armstrong Road
- SR-99 & Harney Lane
- SR-120 & Guthmiller Rd
- SR-120 & Main Street

The results found 13 merge/diverge locations rated LOS E or F, 5 during AM peak commute period and 8 during PM peak commute period. The majority of locations with unfavorable conditions (i.e. LOS E or F) in the merge/diverge analysis lied along segments rated LOS D or better in the standard RCMP LOS analysis. For example, the eastbound merge at SR-120 and Airport Way was rated LOS F while SR-120 between Airport Way and Main Street received a LOS D rating during PM peak period. Eastbound merge at SR-120 and Union Road also received LOS F rating while the same above segment receiving LOS D rating during PM peak period.

As an informational analysis, LOS ratings of E or F in the merge/diverge analysis are not classified as RCMP deficiencies and do not trigger the need for a Deficiency Plan. However, SJCOG and member agencies may still program state, federal, and local funds to remedy the congestion in the area.
Table 4: Deficient Merge/Diverge Basic Freeway Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Ramp Type</th>
<th>Freeway Section Type</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Peak Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Louise Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lathrop Road</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monte Diablo Avenue</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Harney Lane</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cherokee Lane</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Diverge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turner Road</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mokelumne River</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>Weave</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Airport Way</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union Avenue</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>On</td>
<td>Merge</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-Lane Highway Segments

State Route 132 (SR 132) from Interstate 580 (I-580) to I-5 is the only multi-lane highway segment evaluated for RCMP monitoring purposes. Based on a traffic operational analysis, the multi-lane highway segments of SR 132 currently operate at LOS A during both a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Two-Lane Highway Segments

Based on 2017 published volumes by Caltrans, portions of SR-4, SR-12, SR-26, SR-88, SR-120 and SR-132 were determined to be operating at LOS E or F during the a.m. or p.m. peak hours. After accounting for locally generated trips (interregional trip exemption), all two-lane highway segments perform at LOS D or better. A summary of these results is provided in Table 5.

Table 5. Two-lane Segment Deficiency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>AM/PM Exemption</th>
<th>AM/PM Share</th>
<th>Exemption Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa/San Joaquin Co Line</td>
<td>Tracy Boulevard</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>25% 38% C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Boulevard</td>
<td>Inland Drive</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>30% 43% C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland Drive</td>
<td>Maybeck Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>31% 43% C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybeck Road</td>
<td>Roberts Island Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>28% 41% C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts Island Road</td>
<td>Fresno Avenue</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>33% 46% D D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County Line</td>
<td>Glasscock/Tower Parkway</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>29% 33% C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasscock/Tower Parkway</td>
<td>Guard Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>38% 41% C C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard Road</td>
<td>Jct. Rte. 5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>40% 43% D D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jct. I-5</td>
<td>Thornton Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>53% 58% D D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornton Road</td>
<td>Lower Sacramento Road</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>47% 57% D D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arterial Street Segments

Based on a traffic operational analysis, portions of seven arterial street segments currently operate at LOS E or F. These include: Eight Mile Road; SR-4/Farmington Road; Byron Road; SR-12/Kettleman Lane, Airport Way, SR-120/Yosemite Avenue; SR-120; and Arch Airport Road. After accounting for locally generated trips (interregional trip exemption), five segments operate at LOS D or better and five segments operate at LOS F. Of the segments with LOS F rating, four segments were programmed in SJCOG’s Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy. One deficient segment was not programmed; however, staff will not request a RCMP Deficiency Plan from San Joaquin County, “the responsible party,” at this time. This segment was not found deficient in 2016 Monitoring Report. A summary of these results is provided in Table 6.

Table 6. Local Arterial Deficiency Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>No Exemption LOS</th>
<th>AM II/IX Share</th>
<th>PM II/IX Share</th>
<th>AVG II/IX Share</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Exemption Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eight Mile Road</td>
<td>Lower Sacramento Road</td>
<td>Hwy. 99</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-4/Farmington Road</td>
<td>S. Jct. Rte. 99</td>
<td>Walker Lane</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Road</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>Lammers Road</td>
<td>County/Tracy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>RCMP Deficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-120</td>
<td>Main Street of Escalon</td>
<td>David Avenue of Escalon</td>
<td>Escalon</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-12/Kettleman Lane</td>
<td>South Hutchins Street</td>
<td>Hwy. 99</td>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Regional Congestion Management Program**

**Executive Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>No Exemption LOS</th>
<th>AM II/IX Share</th>
<th>PM II/IX Share</th>
<th>AVG II/IX Share</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Exemption Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport Way</td>
<td>Lathrop Road</td>
<td>SR-120</td>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-120 /Yosemite Avenue</td>
<td>Fremont Street</td>
<td>Hwy. 99</td>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Airport Road</td>
<td>Highway 99</td>
<td>Airport Way</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight Mile Road</td>
<td>Trinity Parkway</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Interregional Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight Mile Road</td>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Thornton Road</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Programmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jurisdiction: Reflects location – not owner/operator (e.g., SR-12/88 is owned/operated by Caltrans but traverses through the County’s jurisdiction)

**RCMP Regional Deficiency Plan**

As applicable, local agency conformance with the following RCMP Deficiency Plan requirements is also tracked:

- Complying with the RCMP Monitoring Program traffic count sharing responsibilities;
- Local adoption and SJCOG approval of RCMP Deficiency Plans within 12 months of the RCMP deficiency finding by SJCOG (as applicable); and,
- Progress made in the implementation of previously adopted Deficiency Plan CIP improvement projects.

The only RCMP Deficiency Plan adopted in San Joaquin County was the RCMP Regional Deficiency Plan (August, 2010) prepared by SJCOG in coordination with all its member agencies. This Regional Deficiency Plan identified I-5 between French Camp to Charter Way as deficient. The following CIP projects were identified in the SJCOG Regional Deficiency Plan:

**Short-term Improvements:**

Park-and-Ride Lot Implementation:

- I-5 and Hammer Lane in Stockton: $1,200,000
- I-5 and Eighth Mile Road in Stockton: $1,200,000
- Stanislaus County locations along the I-5 and SR-99 corridors (2 lots): $2,400,000
- Expansion of Lots (I-5 and Ben Holt Drive) & (Kelley Dr. in Stockton): $950,000 (add 80 spaces total)
- Expansion of Lot (Junction of I-5 and SR-12) – **Implemented** $400,000 (add 40 spaces total)
Long-term Improvement:

- Widen I-5 from 6-8 lanes to add an HOV lane in each direction (French Camp to Charter Way): $64,000,000\(^3\)

Widening I-5 to accommodate an HOV lane in each direction will provide the requisite capacity to remedy this deficiency. This project is identified in the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan and is a Measure K Renewal Project, but as of today is not programmed in the FTIP.

The I-5 North Stockton Improvement Project that widens the I-5 between Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard/Charter Way and Hammer Lane from 6 to 8 lanes to add HOV lanes was completed in 2016. This relieves some congestion north of the deficient facility but does not fully remedy the issue.

All jurisdictions have complied with the RCMP LUAP and RCMP Deficiency Plan requirements. The following improvements to program implementation are recommended however:

- Both SJCOG and its member agencies need to better inform the transportation and environmental consulting community of the RCMP LUAP requirements.
- Both SJCOG and its member agencies need to improve traffic count data sharing/transmittal and better inform the transportation and environmental consulting community of the RCMP traffic count database.
- Local agencies need to more proactively consider funding opportunities for RCMP facility improvements identified as CEQA mitigation during state/federal discretionary funding cycles as well as priorities for local RTIF funding.
- SJCOG and its member agencies need to more proactively pursue opportunities to fund improvements identified in the RCMP Regional Deficiency Plan (SJCOG, 2010).

RCMP Multimodal Corridors

SJCOG, in coordination with its member agencies, has designated twelve roadways as RCMP multimodal corridors. These corridors were selected based on their “Complete Street” functionality and are generally located in “downtown” areas that are characterized by higher than average numbers of shared roadway users (pedestrians, bicyclists, transit passengers, and motorists). For more information, please refer to Appendix A.

\(^3\) Note: Cost estimate was current as of publication of 2010 SJCOG Regional Deficiency Plan. Cost estimate for this project in the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan was $97,880,000.
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STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: 2020 MAP-21 Performance Report

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Adopt the 2020 MAP-21 Performance Report

SUMMARY:

Beginning in 2018, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are required to report on federal performance measures that pertain to Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, or MAP-21. The 2012 adoption of MAP-21, a federal funding source, came with a performance- and outcome-based program, known as “Performance-Based Planning and Programming (PBPP).” The objective was to invest in projects that will make progress toward the achievement of the national goals for transportation. The most recent federal transportation bill, Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act of 2016 (FAST Act), carries forward the same performance management framework. This performance report includes federal performance measures that are thematically split into three groupings under the rubric of “Performance Management” (PM).

- PM 1: Roadway Safety
- PM 2: Transportation Asset Management
- PM 3: System Reliability, Freight, Congestion, and Air Quality

Introduced to our committees and the board in January 2018, these performance measures will be reported annually as required by MAP-21. Caltrans has not released any additional instructions or information outside of the state targets; thus, staff has applied our “best practices” methodology (based off Caltrans’ methodology) to report on MAP-21 performance measures for San Joaquin County. This performance report is the first of many annual reports. As Caltrans’ guidelines become more clear, “best practices” methodology may be updated and additional information may be included in future performance reports.

The first report was adopted in August 2019. This report found a new informational source for bridge conditions along the National Highway System.
Below summarizes the findings of the 2020 Performance Report. Note: Staff is unable to access relevant post-2016 PM2 pavement conditions at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE MEASURES</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM 1 – Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatalities</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of serious injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized fatalities</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized serious injuries</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM 2 – Transportation Asset Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Interstate pavements in Good condition</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Interstate pavements in Poor condition</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Good condition</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of non-Interstate NHS pavements in Poor condition</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of NHS bridges in Good condition</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of NHS bridges in Poor condition</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PM 3 – Traffic Congestion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate NHS</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Interstate System Mileage Providing Reliable Truck Travel Time (Truck Travel Time Reliability Index)</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emissions Reductions by Applicable Pollutants under the CMAQ Program</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) (kg/day)</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>16.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Oxide (CO) (kg/day)</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrous Oxide (NOX) (kg/day)</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>16.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter (PM)10 (kg/day)</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter (PM)2.5 (kg/day)</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION:**

SJCOG staff recommends the SJCOG Board of Directors adopt the 2020 Performance Report.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

No impact to 19/20 SJCOG OWP. This activity is budgeted in OWP Element 1301.01 (Performance-Based Planning and Programming).
BACKGROUND:

In 2012, MAP-21 was adopted and established “PBPP,” with the objective to invest in projects that will make progress toward the achievement of the national goals of transportation. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) established the final Federal Rule(s) on expected performance measures reported by the State Department of Transportation (i.e. Caltrans) and MPOs. This performance measure was split into three groups, under the rubric of “Performance Management” (PM).

- PM 1 – Safety
- PM 2 – Transportation Asset Management
- PM 3 – System Reliability, Freight, Congestion, and Air Quality

New federal and state requirements provide emphasis meeting MAP-21’s objective by requiring the identification of short-term targets and standardization of specific performance measures so that MPOs within each state, as well as state DOTs across the country, can be directly compared. Caltrans held workshops and meetings with MPOs in preparation of statewide targets and standardizing the methodology of performance measures. MPOs were asked to support the statewide targets or produce their own region-specific target. SJCOG staff supported the statewide targets.

PM 1 – Safety

PM 1 addresses traffic safety along with the roadway system, including the number of fatalities, number of serious injuries, rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (100M VMT), rate of serious injuries per 100M VMT, and number of non-motorized fatalities & serious injuries. In cooperation with the Office of Traffic Safety, Caltrans generated Strategic Highway Safety Plan and Strategic Management Plan that set the guidelines to establish statewide targets for PM 1 performance measures. Caltrans releases their statewide target annually.

Caltrans referenced the following data sources while determining their targets for PM 1 performance measures: Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS), Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), and Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS). HPMS supplies the 100M VMT. FARS supplies the fatalities. SWITRS supplies serious injuries and a number of non-motorized fatalities & serious injuries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2019 Target (5-Yr. Rolling Avg.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>3,445.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Fatalities (per 100M VMT)</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>12,688.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100M VMT)</td>
<td>3.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries</td>
<td>3,949.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2019 Target (5-Yr. Rolling Avg.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>3,445.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Fatalities (per 100M VMT)</td>
<td>0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>12,688.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100M VMT)</td>
<td>3.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries</td>
<td>3,949.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PM 2 – Transportation Asset Management

PM 2 addresses the condition of the existing national highway system (NHS), including percent of interstate highway system (IHS) of NHS in “Good” condition, percent of interstate highway system (IHS) of NHS in “Poor” condition, percent of non-IHS NHS pavement in “Good” condition, percent of non-IHS NHS pavement in “Poor” condition, percent of NHS bridges in “Good” condition, and percent of NHS bridges in “Poor” condition. Good condition is defined as, “suggests no major investment is needed.” Poor condition is defined as, “suggests major reconstruction investment is needed. Caltrans released their 2-year and 4-year statewide PM 1 targets on May 21, 2018. The review period for 2-year statewide targets are from 1/1/18 to 12/31/19 and from 1/1/2020 to 12/31/2021 for 4-year statewide targets.

SJCOG staff located a new bridge condition database, in lieu, of missing bridge data from Caltrans’ website. Federal Highway Administration’s LTBP Infobridge provides bridge conditions along NHS since 1993.

Updated pavement conditions were unobtainable from Caltrans, thus, 2016 pavement conditions were referenced.

PM 3 – System Reliability, Freight, Congestion, and Air Quality

PM 3 addresses travel reliability for motorists along NHS and goods movement (referring to the movement of freight by truck), as well as emissions reduction due to congestion mitigation and air quality improvement (CMAQ) program. PM 3 performance measures include the percent of a percent of reliable person-miles traveled on NHS, percentage of interstate system mileage provide reliable truck travel time, total emissions reduced by 5 applicable pollutants under CMAQ program, annual hours of peak-hour excessive delay per capita, and percent of non-single occupancy vehicle (SOV) travel. Caltrans released their 2-year and 4-year statewide PM 3 targets in 2018.

FHWA published their final rule that repeals the performance measure that assesses the percentage change in tailpipe carbon dioxide emissions on NHS. In addition, SJCOG is exempt from reporting on annual hours of peak-hour excessive delay per capita and percent of non-SOV travel due to no urbanized area in San Joaquin County meeting the 1 million population threshold.

Caltrans released an interactive website, https://npmrds.iteris-pems.com, for MPOs to access monthly statistics on travel reliability for motorists and goods movement. SJCOG referred to CMAQ program manager for pollutant reduction-related performance measure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2017 Baseline Data</th>
<th>2-year Target</th>
<th>4-year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>65.1% (+0.5%)</td>
<td>65.6% (+1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>74.0% (+1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Interstate System Mileage Providing Reliable Truck Travel Time</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.68 (-0.01)</td>
<td>1.67 (-0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emissions Reductions by Applicable Pollutants under the CMAQ Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC (kg/day)</td>
<td>951.83</td>
<td>961.35 (+1%)</td>
<td>970.87 (+2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO (kg/day)</td>
<td>6,863.26</td>
<td>6,931.90 (+1%)</td>
<td>7,000.54 (+2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx (kg/day)</td>
<td>1,753.36</td>
<td>1,770.89 (+1%)</td>
<td>1,788.43 (+2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10 (kg/day)</td>
<td>2,431.21</td>
<td>2,455.52 (+1%)</td>
<td>2,479.83 (+2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5 (kg/day)</td>
<td>904.25</td>
<td>913.29 (+1%)</td>
<td>922.34 (+2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEXT STEPS:**

SJCOG staff anticipates the following tasks during the next fiscal year.
- Follow and apply Caltrans’ updates on PM 1 - 3
- Generate the next performance report

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. 2020 Transportation Performance Report

*Prepared by: Travis Yokoyama, Associate Regional Planner*
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### FINDING SUMMARY

#### PM 1 - Roadway Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Metrics</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Fatality Rate Per 100 Million VMT</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Serious Injury Rate Per 100 Million VMT</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Injuries</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PM 2 – Transportation Asset Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Metrics</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Conditions along Interstate of NHS (“Good”)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Conditions along Interstate of NHS (“Poor”)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Conditions along Non-Interstate of NHS (“Good”)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Conditions along Non-Interstate of NHS (“Poor”)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PM 3 – System Reliability, Freight, Congestion, and Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Metrics</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Reliability along Interstate on NHS</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Reliability along Non-Interstate on NHS</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Reliability</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Performance Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROG/VOC</th>
<th>19.32</th>
<th>24.34</th>
<th>16.31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>16.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM-10</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM-2.5</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT
Monitoring our regional roadway system is important for the overall goal of addressing reliability, safety, pavement and bridges maintenance, goods movement, and environmental issues in San Joaquin County. The Federal Government signed Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century act (MAP 21) into law in 2012, requiring the State Department of Transportation (e.g. Caltrans) to establish performance measures targets to achieve national transportation goals.\(^1\) This report supplies the most current conditions for each performance measure.

Federal Requirements
MAP-21 established the “Performance Based Planning & Programming (PBPP)”, a performance- and outcome-based program with the objective of investing in projects that will help achieve the national goals for transportation. Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act of 2016 (FAST Act) carries forward the same performance management framework. The Performance Based Planning framework is closely related to performance measurement and target-setting work that has been part of SJCOG’s work program for many years, including the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Regional Congestion Management Program (RCMP), and Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF). Caltrans has identified a new requirement for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to include Performance Based Planning as a separate work element in the Overall Work Program (OWP), which SJCOG included for FY 19/20.\(^2\)

Performance Measure (PM)
Beginning in 2018, State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and MPOs is required to implement the Federal performance measures. These Federal performance measures are thematically split into under the rubric of “Performance Management” (PM):

- PM 1: Roadway Safety
- PM 2: Transportation Asset Management
- PM 3: System Reliability, Freight, Congestion, and Air Quality

For each set of performance measures, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has issued a Final Federal Rule identifying the performance metrics that State DOTs and MPOs are responsible to assess. The State DOTs (e.g. Caltrans) are directly responsible to submit performance targets and periodic reports on progress to those targets to Federal agencies on an annual basis. The first year of required target setting for the three performance measure categories (PM 1-3) is 2018, and FHWA will review each state DOT’s annual performance in relation to their 2018 targets.

Caltrans Performance Management (PM) Targets
Caltrans established multiple workshops and/or advisory committees via in person on phone with MPOs during the development of statewide PM targets. MPOs, such as SJCOG, are required to establish targets for the same performance measures on all public roads in the MPO planning area within 180 days after the state establishes each target. The MPO may elect to support the statewide targets, establish numerical targets specific to their region, or use a combination of both approaches.\(^2\) SJCOG elected to support the statewide target rather than establishing a region-specific numerical target for PM 1 through 3.

These performance measures serve as indicators for each PM and are updated on an annual basis, but at present time are not intended to set targets. SJCOG reported the region’s performance through the performance measures of each PM and is not required to directly assess their contribution to statewide targets of each performance measure.

---

1 U.S. Department of Transportation’s Federal Highway Administration, [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/)
2 Caltrans Target Reporting Forms PM1, PM2, & PM3
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM
San Joaquin County’s Transportation system supports personal vehicles, freight trucks, buses, trains, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

Regional Roadway Network
San Joaquin County’s regional roadway includes three interstate freeways (I-205, I-580, and I-5), six state routes (SR-4, SR-12, SR-33, SR-88, SR-99, SR-120, and SR-132), and numerous local roadways. San Joaquin County residents and goods are transported along this regional roadway network to access within and neighboring counties. Neighboring counties can access San Joaquin or adjacent county along this regional roadway network. Sacramento County accesses the San Francisco Bay Area, particularly Alameda and Santa Clara County, or vice versa along I-5, SR-99, SR-120, and/or I-205. Central Valley accesses Sacramento County along SR-99 or I-5. Central Valley, particularly Stanislaus and Merced Counties, accesses San Francisco Bay Area along SR-99, SR-120, I-580, I-5, and I-205.

Transit
Bus and rail service operate in San Joaquin County. Rail service is provided by Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) and bus service is provided by various providers. Most jurisdictions maintain their own bus service.

- Tracer serves City of Tracy
- Grapeline serves City of Lodi
- Manteca Transit serves City of Manteca
- E-Trans serves City of Escalon
- Blossom Express serves City of Ripon

Regional Transit District (RTD) serves primarily City of Stockton and San Joaquin County while also operating in Cities of Lodi, Lathrop, Tracy, and Ripon.

Transit access is also available from/to areas outside of San Joaquin County; including RTD’s bus service and ACE’s rail service to/from Alameda and Santa Clara County, bus service to/from Stanislaus County via Blossom Express and Modesto Area Express (MAX), and bus/rail service to/from various areas outside of San Joaquin County via Amtrak or Greyhound. Please see the Reference Section for each transit provider’s link.

Rideshare, like Uber or Lyft, are available in or out of San Joaquin County. RTD funds 50% (up to $5.00) of your Uber ride if starting or ending outside of RTD’s service area or at specific transit centers between 4AM & 10AM and 4PM & 10PM. In addition, RTD started an on-demand service, called “Van Go,” which transports up to 4 people anywhere within a set zone between 6AM to 6PM Monday through Friday and 6AM to 10PM Saturday & Sunday. “Van Go” program has a set fee for one-way trips and unlimited trips daily, with a transfer to a RTD fixed route being free.

Bicycle Facilities
As of 2018, there are approximately 282 miles of bicycle lanes in San Joaquin County; including bicycle paths (Class 1), bicycle lanes (Class 2), and shared lane (Class 3). An additional 875 miles of bicycle lanes are planned in the future.

3 San Joaquin Regional Transit District, http://sanjoaquinrtd.com/rtdgo/
4 San Joaquin Regional Transit District, http://sanjoaquinrtd.com/vango/
Goods Movement
Goods movement is vital for economic vitality and growth in San Joaquin County. Goods can be moved along existing roadway system via trucks, along waterways via boats, and along railroad system via train.

Roadway System – Trucks can travel along any roadway/highway, deemed part of Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA) route.

Waterways – Boats can travel along waterways between San Francisco Bay Area and Port of Stockton, northwest of SR-4 and west of I-5. Port of Stockton has millions of square feet of warehousing and has the capability to load or unload Panamax-sized vessels.

Rail System – Trains can travel along rail system, owned by Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) and Union Pacific (UP). Rail system can transport goods outside San Joaquin County and even California to designations, like New Jersey or Georgia.

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY DEMOGRAPHICS
Current and historical population and employment numbers, along with current commute patterns, illustrate the existing conditions and may better foresee future transportation infrastructure projects in San Joaquin County.

Population / Employment
Current data estimates San Joaquin County’s population was 760,310 and employment was 253,099 in 2018. Population increased 99,425 from 2006 due to the increasing numbers of new births along with new residents from outside of San Joaquin County and United States. Since July 2013, more people have been entering rather than leaving San Joaquin County, especially from out of county or state.

Employment increased 31,360 between 2006 to 2018. San Joaquin County experienced reduced employment numbers between 2008 to 2011, which aligns with the unemployment rate. Unemployment increased since 2006 and spiked at 16.5% in 2010, where unemployment gradually continued to decrease over the years.

Commute Patterns
San Joaquin County residents primarily drove alone (80.01%) or carpooled (12.68%) to work. The remainder worked from home (3.60%), walked/biked (1.56%), used public transit (1.59%), or took taxi/other (0.56%).
Number of commute trips to work by driving alone, riding train, and working from home increased while walking, bicycling, riding the bus, carpooling, and taxi/other decrease from 2006 to 2018. Train ridership encountered the highest increase with 138.5%, followed 19.1% increase in working from home and 18.9% increase in driving alone. Bicycling reduced 37.8%, followed by a 18% reduction in walking, 5.1% reduction in bus ridership, 4.2% reduction in carpooling, and 2.1 reduction in tax/other.
PM 1 - ROADWAY SAFETY
PM 1 - ROADWAY SAFETY

Caltrans established statewide performance targets in accordance with FHWA’s Safety Performance Management Final Rule as an implementation of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). These statewide targets address fatalities and serious injuries of motorize and non-motorized accidents on roads in San Joaquin County (Table 1).

These performance targets are the result of Safety Performance Management Workshops in 2017 and 2018 between Caltrans and MPOs, where MPOs supplied feedback to Caltrans on PM 1 targets. The results of March 13, 2018 workshop selected a scenario that aligns 2015-2019 Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) and helps California reach zero fatalities by 2050 with 2016 as a starting point. 2020-2024 SHSP is in development and should instill the same “zero deaths by 2050” goal.

Caltrans, with help from Office of Traffic Safety, established and reported three performance measures (i.e. number of fatalities, number of serious injuries, and rate of fatalities) to National Highway Safety Administration. In addition, rate of serious injuries and number of non-motorized serious injuries and fatalities were reported to Federal Highway Administration on August 31, 2018.

**SJCOG PM 1 Compliance**

SJCOG simulated Caltrans’ methodology by accessing the data sources, found in Caltrans’ 2019 California Performance Management (PM1) Safety MPO Target Reporting Template, to report the most comparable stats for San Joaquin County. The three data sources include Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS), Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), and Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS). It should be noted that there was no mention of FARS data being part of the methodology for non-motorized serious injuries and fatalities in Safety Performance Management Targets for 2019, resulting in SWITRS data being used for fatalities in lieu of FARS data.

**Table 2: PM 1 Data Source**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Agency 1</th>
<th>Database 1</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Agency 2</th>
<th>Database 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Fatalities</td>
<td>California Highway Patrol</td>
<td>SWITRS</td>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Fatalities (per 100M VMT)</td>
<td>Highway Traffic Safety Administration</td>
<td>FARS</td>
<td>Rate of Fatalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
<td>HPMS</td>
<td>Rate of Fatalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100M VMT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of Serious Injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities &amp; Serious Injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2019 California Performance Management (PM1) Safety MPO Target Reporting Template

**Findings**

Aligning with the statewide goal of reaching zero fatalities by 2050, 2016 was selected at the starting point for this analysis. 2018 was the most current observation year reported by all data sources at this time.

There were 107 fatalities, 419 serious injuries, and 95 non-motorized serious injuries and fatalities. Of 95 non-motorized accidents, 57 were serious injuries and 38 were fatalities. Fatality rate (per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT)) was 1.57 and serious injury rate (per 100 million VMT) was 6.17.
Compared with 2016, there were 11 less fatalities, 127 more serious injuries, and 20 more non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries.

**Importance Of SJCOG Contribution**

The increase in serious injuries and non-motorized fatalities/serious injuries supports the need for SJCOG establishing safety-related policies and programs, along with improved communication and coordination with stakeholders.

2018 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) for San Joaquin County established one safety-related policy that includes two strategies.

- **Strategy #9** – Facilitate projects that reduce the number of and severity of traffic incidents
- **Strategy #10** – Encourage and support projects that increase safety and security.⁶

These strategies are captured in SJCOG’s Active Transportation program, Alternative Transportation program, and many other programs. In addition, SJCOG funding of various alternative transportation projects, like active transportation project funding.

---

⁶ SJCOG RTP/SCS Executive Summary, [https://www.sjcog.org/DocumentCenter/View/3778/Final-Executive-Summary](https://www.sjcog.org/DocumentCenter/View/3778/Final-Executive-Summary)
**Number of Fatalities**

Number of fatalities were accounted annually by FARS. In 2018, the five-year rolling average was 104 fatalities with 107 observed during the same year. The five-year rolling average includes two years of decreasing fatalities and three years of increasing fatalities. *Figure 6: Historical Number of Fatalities (2005 -2018)* illustrates annual fatalities in blue and five-year rolling average in orange. The number of fatalities decreased by 9 since 2017.

*Figure 6: Historical Number of Fatalities (2005 -2018)*

![Figure 6: Historical Number of Fatalities (2005 -2018)](image)

*Source: Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS)*

**Annual Fatality Rate (per 100 million VMT)**

Annual fatality rate accounted for the number of fatalities per 100 million miles driven. In 2018, the rolling average was 1.57 of 1.57 annual fatality rate per 100 million VMT (AFR/100M) observed during the same year. AFR/100M was calculated by dividing the number of fatalities by VMT. Number of fatalities can vary yearly while VMT steadily increases over the years. AFR/100M reduced by 0.14 since 2017.

*Figure 7: Fatality Rate per 100 Million VMT (2005 -2018)*

![Figure 7: Fatality Rate per 100 Million VMT (2005 -2018)](image)

*Source: Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS)*
Number of Serious Injuries

Number of serious injuries were accounted for annually by SWITRS. In 2018, the rolling average was 310 of 419 serious injuries observed during the same year. The number of serious injuries increased by 66 since 2017.

**Figure 8: Historical Number of Serious Injuries (2005 -2018)**

![Historical Number of Serious Injuries (2005 -2018)](image)

**Source:** Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS)

Annual Serious Injury Rate (per 100 million VMT)

Annual serious injury rate accounted for the number of fatalities per 100 million miles driven. In 2018, the rolling average was 4.64 of 6.17 annual serious injury rate per 100 million VMT (ASIR/100M) observed during the same year. AFT/100M was calculated by dividing the number of fatalities by VMT. Number of fatalities can vary yearly while VMT steadily increases over the years. AFT/100M increased by 0.97 since 2017.

**Figure 9: Historical Serious Injuries per 100 Million VMT (2005 -2018)**

![Historical Serious Injuries per 100 Million VMT (2005 -2018)](image)

**Source:** Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS), Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS)
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Injuries

Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries were accounted for annually by SWITRS. In 2018, the rolling average was 77 of 95 non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries; of which 57 was serious injuries and 38 were fatalities, observed during the same year. The number of non-motorized fatalities increased by 8 and number of non-motorized serious injuries decreased by 7 since 2017.

Figure 10: Historical Number of Bicycle and Pedestrian Fatalities and Injuries (2005 - 2018)

Source: Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS)
PM 2 – Transportation Asset Management
PM 2 – TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT (TAM)

Caltrans’ Transportation Asset Management Plan (TAMP) established national performance measures for pavement and bridges with statewide targets in accordance with Federal Regulation (23 U.S.C. 150). 10 years of data are assessed, from 2017/18 to 2027/28, with 2-year (Table 3) & 4-year targets to determine its progress toward 10-year goal. The availability of Senate Bill 1 (SB1) and local measure funding is anticipated to improve current pavement and bridge conditions along National Highway System (NHS) per Caltran’s TAMP. NHS includes interstates and other roadways of national importance to mobility, defense, and economy.

Table 3: Caltrans Adopted TAM Performance Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Current 2016 (Pavement) / 2017 (Bridge)</th>
<th>2-Year Target (1/1/18 – 12/31/19)</th>
<th>4-Year Target (1/1/20 – 12/31/21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interstate</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges on NHS</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2018 Caltrans Target Setting Methodology for PM2 – National Highway System Pavement & Bridge Targets, 5/21/18 Caltrans Statewide PM2 Target Letter

Caltrans held a workshop with MPOs to introduce a preliminary methodology for establishing 10-year NHS pavement and bridge targets in August 2017. A follow-up letter requested MPOs select a target methodology in September 2017. Caltrans accessed 2017 State Highway System Management Plan (SHSMP) deterioration rates and unit costs from 2016 Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment as factors in determining the targets, based on level of available funding.

5/21/18 PM2 Caltrans statewide target letter included current pavement conditions (2016) and bridge conditions (2017) with 2-year targets (1/1/18-12/31/19) and 4-year targets (1/1/20-12/31/21).

Rating System Explained

Pavement and bridge conditions are rated either a “Good,” “Fair,” or “Poor.” “Good” suggests no need for major investment and “Poor” suggests the need for major reconstruction investment. Pavement conditions are measured by 1) International Roughness Index (inches/mil), 2) Cracking (%), 3) Rutting (inches), and 4) Faulting (inches) (Figure 11).

Bridge conditions rates the 0 to 9 the conditions of deck, superstructure, substructure, and culvert. 0-4 are rated “Poor” and 7-9 are rated “Good.”

For more information on rating system, please refer to March 29, 2018 Webinar for PM2 on http://www.dot.ca.gov/assetmgmt/pm2.html.

8 Caltrans’ 2018 PM2 Pavement and Bridge Target Setting Methodology
SJCOG PM 2 Compliance
Caltrans’ Transportation Asset Management website, http://www.dot.ca.gov/assetmgmt/pm2.html, provided the guidance on pavement and bridge measures. Pavement data was unavailable online and had to be requested from Caltrans. Caltrans provided “2016_NHS_CA_2” dataset for pavement conditions. Bridge data was found online, under “Local Agency Bridge Inventory List” for 2018.

In 2019/20, SJCOG staff was unable to access updated versions of previously collected pavement and bridge data. Caltrans was contacted for an updated pavement condition dataset, but could not provide one. SJCOG staff decided to defer updating pavement conditions for a year and use 2016 Caltrans dataset. In addition, SJCOG staff found the Local Bridge Inventory List was removed from Caltrans’ website. SJCOG staff found Federal Highway Administration’s LTBP InfoBridge database an acceptable replacement. This database includes bridge conditions (i.e., Good, Fair, Poor) between 1993 and 2018.

Findings
As dictated by the Caltrans statewide 2018 target letter, 2016 was selected as the starting point for this analysis. Pavement data was only available for 2016 and only available from Caltrans staff. Through a new bridge database, SJCOG can report from 2016 to 2018 conditions. A comparative assessment for pavement conditions may be performed in the next performance report.

Pavement Conditions
Caltrans “2016_NHS_CA_2” was augmented to separate interstate from the remainder of NHS on-file. Only interstates in San Joaquin County include I-5, I-205, and I-580. The results found 33% of pavement conditions along NHS to be “Good,” 61% “Fair,” and 7% “Poor.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Metric</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of pavement conditions along non-interstate NHS, 31% was found “Good,” 62% “Fair,” and 7% “Poor” in 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Metric</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bridge Condition
LTBP InfoBridge database was filtered to NHS. Appendix C illustrates bridge conditions in San Joaquin County between 1993 and 2018. In 2016, there were a total of 264 bridges in San Joaquin County: 69% in “Good” condition, 27% in “Fair” condition, and 4% in “Poor” condition. In 2018, the total bridge numbers increased to 282, with a decrease in “Good” condition bridges (51%) and increase in “Fair” (37%) and “Poor” (12%) condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal Highway Administration’s LTBP InfoBridge

Importance Of SJCOG Contribution
Bridge conditions worsened between 2016 and 2018, with a 18% decrease in “Good” condition bridges and 8% increase in “Poor” condition. Pavement conditions were unavailable for 2018; however, there were concerns on the 7% interstate and 7% non-interstate highways in “Poor” condition in 2016. Thus; SJCOG established
policies for the purpose maintaining San Joaquin County growing inventory of bridges and highways.

RTP/SCS for San Joaquin County established one transportation asset management-related policy that includes one strategy.

**Strategy #13 – Support the Continued Maintenance and Preservation of the Existing Transportation System.**

This strategy is captured in a number of SJCOG administered funding sources, like SB 1 and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).
PM 3 - System Reliability, Freight, Congestion, and Air Quality
PM 3 - SYSTEM RELIABILITY, FREIGHT, CONGESTION, and AIR QUALITY

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) set a final ruling that establishes “performance measures for the performance of Interstate and Non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS), freight movement on Interstate system to carry out on the National Highway Freight Program (NHFP), and traffic congestion and on-road mobile sources emissions for the purpose of carrying out the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) program.”

Table 6: Caltrans PM3 Performance Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Current Conditions (2017)</th>
<th>2-Year Target</th>
<th>4-Year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Reliable Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Interstate System Mileage Providing Reliable Truck Travel Time (Truck Travel Time Reliability Index)</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Emissions Reductions by Applicable Pollutants under the CMAQ Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOC (kg/day)</td>
<td>951.83</td>
<td>961.35</td>
<td>970.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO (kg/day)</td>
<td>6,863.26</td>
<td>6,931.90</td>
<td>7,000.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx (kg/day)</td>
<td>1,753.36</td>
<td>1,770.89</td>
<td>1,788.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10 (kg/day)</td>
<td>2,431.21</td>
<td>2,455.52</td>
<td>2,479.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM2.5 (kg/day)</td>
<td>904.25</td>
<td>913.29</td>
<td>922.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three performance measures are not in this report due to:

In 2018, The Greenhouse Gas performance metric that analyzes submit the percentage change in tailpipe carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions was repealed.

There are no urbanized area in San Joaquin County that meets the 1 million resident threshold, requiring the reporting of:

1) Annual hours of peak-hour excessive delay per capita
2) Percent of non-single occupancy vehicle (SOV) travel

Table 6: Caltrans PM3 Performance Targets

Source: Caltrans 2019 Target Reporting Form Performance Management (PM3) System Performance/Freight/CMAQ Targets

These targets are the result of Performance Measure (PM) 3 Technical Advisory Group meetings and webcast workshops in 2017 and 2018 with Caltrans and MPOs, resulting in the establishing the 2-year and 4-year PM3 performance targets along with current conditions (2017).

Truck Travel Time Reliability Index Explained

Under the federal final rule, FHWA preserved the level of travel time reliability (LOTTR) for freight trucks. In addition, FHWA set the truck travel time reliability threshold at 1.50, which signifies truck travel times below 1.50 are deemed reliable. 1.50 truck travel time reliability occurs when the travel time exceeds 50% of expected travel during non-commute (i.e. 7-9 AM, 4-6 PM) times. For more information, please refer to [https://www.federalregister.gov](https://www.federalregister.gov), under “national-performance-management-measures-assessing-performance-of-the-national-highway-system.”

SJCOG PM 3 Compliance

Caltrans established a website ([https://npmrds.iteris-pems.com/npmrds/](https://npmrds.iteris-pems.com/npmrds/)) for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) to access monthly reliability percentages for commuters and freight truck drivers. The average of monthly reliability percentages between January and December generated the annual reliability percentage.

CMAQ pollution reduction statistics account for the categories within the target. These statistics are provided by CMAQ program manager at SJCOG, found in [https://fhwaapps.fhwa.dot.gov/cmaq_pub/search](https://fhwaapps.fhwa.dot.gov/cmaq_pub/search).

Findings

As dictated in 2018 Caltrans PM3 Targeting Form, 2017 was selected as the starting point for this analysis. 2019 was the most current observation year reported by all data sources at this time.

---
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### Table 7: PM3 Travel and Freight Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Reliability</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Interstate Reliability</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Reliability</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://npmrds.ritis.org](https://npmrds.ritis.org)

**Travel Reliability: Interstate NHS**

Travel reliability along interstate of NHS was 89.6% in 2019, with January being the most reliable month and September being the most unreliable month.

**Figure 13: 2019 Interstate Travel Time Reliability (Annual/Monthly)**

Source: [https://npmrds.ritis.org](https://npmrds.ritis.org)

Travel reliability along interstate of NHS was 91.6% in 2018, with three months (i.e. January, April, May) being the most reliable month and September being the most unreliable month.

2018 statistics were updated from 2019 annual report. January was most reliable month at 93.1%. September was the most unreliable month at 88.2%. Annual travel time reliability along interstate of NHS remained 91.6%.

**Figure 14: 2018 Interstate Travel Time Reliability (Annual/Monthly)**

Source: [https://npmrds.ritis.org](https://npmrds.ritis.org)

Travel reliability along interstate of NHS reduced between 2018 and 2019 in San Joaquin County. Strategies in the next section (i.e. Importance of SJCOG Contribution) support the need for improving travel reliability into 2020 and beyond.

**Travel Reliability: Non-Interstate NHS**

Travel reliability along non-interstate of NHS was 88.2% in 2019, with January being the most reliable month and August being the most unreliable month.

**Figure 15: 2019 Non-Interstate Travel Time Reliability (Annual/Monthly)**

Source: [https://npmrds.ritis.org](https://npmrds.ritis.org)

Travel reliability along non-interstate of NHS was 86.6% in 2018, with September being the most reliable month and May being the most unreliable month.

Note: In 2019, the 2018 travel reliability along non-interstate of NHS was 86.6%.

**Figure 16: 2018 Non-Interstate Travel Time Reliability (Annual/Monthly)**

Source: [https://npmrds.ritis.org](https://npmrds.ritis.org)

Annual travel reliability along non-interstate of NHS increased between 2018 and 2019 in San Joaquin County. SJCOG RTP/SCS supplied policies that support the improvement of travel reliability in San Joaquin County. Additional information about those strategies can be found in the next section (i.e. Importance of SJCOG Contribution).
Travel Reliability: Truck Travel Time (LOTTR)

Truck travel reliability was 1.56 in 2019, with January being the most reliable month and July being the most unreliable month.

Figure 17: 2019 Truck Travel Reliability (Annual/Monthly)

Source: https://npmrds.rtis.org

Truck travel reliability was 1.52 in 2018, with March being the most reliable month and January being the most unreliable month.

Figure 18: 2018 Truck Travel Reliability (Annual/Monthly)

Source: https://npmrds.rtis.org

Annual freight reliability decreased between 2018 and 2019 in San Joaquin County, warranting the need for investments into goods movement system. Additional information about strategies that improve the goods movement system can be found in the next section (i.e. Importance of SJCOG Contribution).

San Joaquin County, along with other counties within San Joaquin Valley, is one of nation’s largest agricultural producers. In addition, San Joaquin Valley plays a vital role in logistics for many companies in San Francisco Bay Area due to the “relatively inexpensive land and low cost labor, good access to the national retail and interstate highway networks, connections to major deepwater ports in Oakland, and proximity to major consumer markets.”

Pollution Reduction – CMAQ

SJCOG, as administrator of CMAQ program, funds transportation projects for the purpose of relieving traffic congestion and reducing car/truck emissions in San Joaquin County. SJCOG’s fiscal year starts July 1st and end June 30th.

There were 14 program/projects in 2018/19 fiscal year. SJCOG’s DIBs program, Travel Demand Management (TDM) program for San Joaquin and Merced County, received CMAQ funding. The remainder of the projects lie primarily within the City of Stockton. A complete summary of emission reductions, except Carbon Oxide (CO), was generated. Only a few jurisdictions reported CO emission reductions.

Table 8: Pollutant Emission Reduction thru CMAQ Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emission Reduction</th>
<th>FY 16/17</th>
<th>FY 17/18</th>
<th>FY 18/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG/VOC kg/day</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>16.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO kg/day</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx kg/day</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>16.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM - 10 kg/day</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM - 2.5 kg/day</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CO was reported by many of jurisdictions.

Total emission reductions thru CMAQ program reported a reduction of 16.31 kilograms per day (kg/day) in volatile organic compound (VOC), 0.25 kg/day in carbon oxide (CO), 16.86 kg/day in nitrous oxide (NOx), 8.90 kg/day in particulate matter (PM) 10, 6.77 kg/day in PM

2.5 in fiscal year 2018/19. Pollutant emission reductions reduced by 8.03 kg/day in VOC, 8.27 kg/day in CO, 6.05 kg/day in NOx, 1.03 kg/day in PM10, and 0.76 kg/day in PM2.5 since last fiscal year (2016/17).

Importance Of SJCOG Contribution
Annual travel reliability along interstates reducing by 2%, 0.04 increase for annual freight unreliability, and reduction in total emission reductions thru CMAQ supports the need for SJCOG establishing policies and programs, along with improved communication and coordination with stakeholders.

2018 RTP/SCS for San Joaquin County established multiple travel reliability and pollutant-related policies with multiple strategies:

**Strategy #3** – Improve Air Quality by Reducing Transportation-Related Emissions

**Strategy #4** – Improve Regional Transportation System Efficiency

**Strategy #8** – Improve Major Transportation Corridors to Minimize Impacts on Rural Roads

**Strategy #12** – Optimize Existing Transportation System Capacity through Available and/on Innovative Strategies

**Strategy #14** – Encourage System Efficiency with Transportation Improvements that Facilitate Improvements in the Jobs/Housing Balance

**Strategy #15** – Improvement Transportation Options Linking Residents to Employment Centers within and out of the County

**Strategy #16** – Improve Freight Access to Key Strategic Economic Centers

These strategies are applied to all projects that SJCOG reviews and supplies funding toward. For example, SR-120 and SR-99 interchange project has the ability to apply all the above strategies.

In relation to Goods Movement, SJCOG holds a multitude of private and public partnerships to be stay ahead of the growing demands of an everchanging goods movement industry. A couple examples of those partnerships includes SJCOG’s Goods Movement Task Force and West Coast Corridor Coalition.

In addition, SJCOG has partnered with other neighboring MPOs for the purpose of generating this “mega region,” which improves the chance of receiving funding from the state. SJCOG is part of two “mega regions.” First “mega region” consists of Sacramento Council of Governments (SACOG), SJCOG, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). Second “mega region’ consists of 8 counties of San Joaquin Valley; including SJCOG, Stanislaus COG, Kern COG, Tulare COG, Fresno COG, Kings County Association of Governments (KCAG), Madera County Transportation Commission (MCTC), and Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG).

San Joaquin Valley “Mega Region” produced the 2013 San Joaquin Valley Interregional Goods Movement Plan provides a priority list of highway capacity projects along with set a recommendation to prepare for MAP-21 actions; including:

| Table 9: Recommendation #1 of San Joaquin Valley Interregional Goods Movement Plan |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| **Provision**                | **Action**                  |
| Establishes National Freight Policy | Establishes a national freight policy, including establishing goals for national investment into freight infrastructure. |
| National Freight Strategic Plan | Calls for development of a National Freight Strategic Plan, that would assess the condition and performance of the national freight highway network. This requires the USDOT to identify highway bottlenecks, issues, and major trade corridors. |
| State Freight Advisory Committee and State Freight Plans | Encourages states to establish freight advisory committees, and develop state freight plans. |
| National Freight Network | Calls for the establishment of a National Freight Network. This network would consist of a primary network established by the FHWA, but also portions of the interstate system and critical rural freight corridors. |

Source: 2013 San Joaquin Valley Interregional Goods Movement Plan Executive Summary
Figure 21: 2018 Non-Interstate NHS in San Joaquin County

Figure 22: 2019 Non-Interstate NHS in San Joaquin County
Figure 23: 2018 Truck Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR)

Figure 24: 2019 Truck Travel Time Reliability (LOTTR)
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APPENDIX A – Safetrek Mapping – PM 1
University of California Berkeley established SafeTrec, or Safe Transportation Research and Education Center in 2000. SafeTrec’s emphasis is on 1) Data Analysis and Data Tools, 2) Technology for Road Safety, and 3) Policy Analysis and Community Outreach. SafeTrec’ Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) illustrates Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) data. TIMS allows the user to filter criteria, like collision severity, with some limitations. One important limitation is TIMS inability to filter more than three criteria of a specific type at one time.

TIMS Limitations: Unable to generate results when applying specific time frame(s) with another set of criteria. For instance, severe injuries along interstates, US highways, & state routes in San Joaquin County during weekdays between 15:00 – 17:59 and 6:00 – 8:59. This error will hopefully be corrected at the time of next performance report

Motorized SI collisions on weekdays along interstates, US highways, & state routes in San Joaquin County. Heat maps, illustrating the results of the above queries, are shown below. These heat maps illustrate the density of occurrences per each query. For instance, heat maps for 2018 serious injuries in San Joaquin County illustrate most collisions occurred in City of Stockton. Note: Heat maps do not include collisions where there was no indication of what the motor vehicle was involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severe Injuries Collisions in SJCOG</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe Injuries between a motor vehicle (MV) and non-pedestrian/bicyclist (NPB) in SJ County</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Injuries between a motor vehicle (MV) and non-pedestrian/bicyclist (NPB) along interstates, US highways, &amp; state routes (I-USH-SR) in SJ County</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Injuries between a motor vehicle (MV) and non-pedestrian/bicyclist (NPB) on weekdays along interstates, US highways, &amp; state routes (I-USH-SR) in SJ County</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between 2018 and 2019, there were no new SI collisions in San Joaquin County, 12 less SI collisions between a motor vehicle (MV) and non-pedestrian/bicyclist (NPB), 3 more SI collisions between a MV and NPB along interstates, US highways, & state routes (I-USH-SR), and 6 more SI collisions between MV and NPB on weekdays along I-USH-SR. Maps illustrate growing concentrations of SI collisions period that is observed through any scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severe Injuries in SJCOG</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe Injuries between a motor vehicle (MV) and pedestrian/bicyclist (PB) in SJ County</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Injuries between a motor vehicle (MV) and pedestrian/bicyclist (PB) on weekdays in SJ County</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between 2018 and 2019, there were no new SI collisions in San Joaquin County, 12 more SI collisions between a motor vehicle MV and PB in SJ County, and 12 more SI collisions between a motor vehicle (MV) and non-pedestrian/bicyclist (NPB) on weekdays in SJ County.

1 SafeTrek, [https://safetrec.berkeley.edu](https://safetrec.berkeley.edu/)
It should be noted that this analysis focus on severe injuries, not fatalities, for motorized collisions due to Caltrans’ dictating Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS) of National Highway Traffic Safety Administration was the source of fatality data for motorized collisions.
2018 (Jan. to Dec.) Serious Injuries in San Joaquin County (348 of 364 Mapped)

Locations Not Mapped:
1. 2nd St & Alley
2. SR-88 WB & Pezzi Rd
3. Byron Rd & Reeve Rd
4. I-5 NB & Calaveras River
5. I-5 SB & San Joaquin River
6. W Turner Rd & California St
7. I-5 NB & I-5 SB from El Dorado St O/C
8. Ray Rd & Peltier Rd
9. W Turner Rd & Woodhaven Ln
10. 11th St & Grantline Rd
11. Turner Rd & Harvest Crossing
12. W Heritage Dr & Curioso St
13. West Ln Frontage Rd & Stadium Dr
14. March Ln & Padley Ln
15. Wilson Wy & E St
16. Peltier Rd & Devries Rd

Selection Factors:
Collision Severity: 2 – Injury (Severe)

Motor Vehicle Involved with:
- A – Non-Collision
- B – Pedestrian
- C – Other Motor Vehicle
- D – Motor Vehicle on Other Roadway
- E – Parked Motor Vehicle
- F – Train
- H – Animal
- G – Bicycle
- I – Fixed Object
- J – Other Object

2019 (Jan. to Dec.) Serious Injuries in San Joaquin County (337 of 364)

Locations Not Mapped:
1. SB-99 SB & Waterloo Rd
2. W Mossdale Rd & W Mossdale Rd 800
3. I-580 EB & Valpico Rd
4. Lammers Rd & Tracy Blvd
5. SB-99 W Frontage Rd & SR-99 W Frontage Rd
6. Eight Mile Rd & SR-99 E Frontage Rd
7. SR-4 WB to I-5 NB & SR-4 WB
8. I-5 & SR-112
9. International Pkwy & Schulte Rd
10. Schulte Rd & Quality Lane
11. SR-88 & Piccolo Rd
12. Tradition St & Phelps St
13. E. River Rd & N. Ripon Rd
14. Byron Rd & Mountain House Pkwy
15. River Bend Dr & Marina Dr
16. I-5 SB & Louise Ave
17. 11th St & Kasson Rd
18. SB-99 SB & Jack Tone Rd
19. 11th St EB & I-5 NB
20. Byron Rd & Hasen Rd
21. E St & Finland Ave
22. Alpine Ave & E St
23. Wilson Wy & E St
24. Frontage Rd & Christian Life Wy
25. International Pkwy & Berkeley Rd
26. Thornton Rd & Barber Rd
27. I-5 SB & Alpine Ave

Selection Factors:
Collision Severity: 2 – Injury (Severe)

Motor Vehicle Involved with:
- A – Non-Collision
- B – Pedestrian
- C – Other Motor Vehicle
- D – Motor Vehicle on Other Roadway
- E – Parked Motor Vehicle
- F – Train
- H – Animal
- G – Bicycle
- I – Fixed Object
- J – Other Object
2018 (Jan. to Dec.) Motorized Serious Injuries in San Joaquin County (297 of 309 Mapped)

Selection Factors:
Collision Severity: 2 – Injury (Severe)

Locations NotMapped:
1. SR-88 WB & Pezzi Rd
2. Byron Rd & Reeve Rd
3. I-5 NB & Calaveras River
4. I-5 SB & San Joaquin River
5. W Truner Rd & California St
6. I-5 NB & I-5 SB from El Dorado St O/C
7. Ray Rd & Peltier Rd
8. W Turner Rd & Woodhaven Ln
9. 11th St & Grantline Rd
10. Turner Rd & Harvest Crossing
11. March Ln & Padley Ln
12. Peltier Rd & Devries Rd

2019 (Jan. to Dec.) Motorized Serious Injuries in San Joaquin County (273 of 297)

Selection Factors:
Collision Severity: 2 – Injury (Severe)

Locations NotMapped:
1. SB-99 SB & Waterloo Rd
2. W Mossdale Rd & W Mossdale Rd 800
3. I-580 EB & Valpico Rd
4. SB-99 W Frontage Rd & SR-99 W Frontage Rd
5. Eight Mile Rd & SR-99 E Frontage Rd
6. SR-4 WB to I-5 NB & SR-4 WB
7. I-5 & SR-112
8. International Pkwy & Schulte Rd
9. Schulte Rd & Quality Lane
10. Tradition St & Phelps St
11. E. River Rd & N. Ripon Rd
12. Byron Rd & Mountain House Pkwy
13. River Bend Dr & Marina Dr
14. I-5 SB & Louise Ave
15. 11th St & Kasson Rd
16. SB-99 SB & Jack Tone Rd
17. 11th St EB & I-5 NB
18. Byron Rd & Hasen Rd
19. E St & Finland Ave
20. Alpine Ave & E St
21. Frontage Rd & Christian Life Wy
22. International Pkwy & Berkeley Rd
23. Thornton Rd & Barber Rd
24. I-5 SB & Alpine Ave
2018 (Jan. to Dec.) Motorized Serious Injuries along Interstates, US Highways, and State Routes in San Joaquin County (136 of 140 Mapped)

Selection Factors:
- **Collision Severity:** 2 – Injury (Severe)
- **Road Type:** 1 – Interstate, 2 – US Highway, 3 – State Route, 6 – US Highway (Contract City), 7 – State Route (Contract City)

Locations Not Mapped:
1. SR-88 & Pezzi Rd
2. I-5 NB & Calaveras River
3. I-5 SB & San Joaquin River
4. I-5 NB & I-5 SB from El Dorado St O/C

2019 (Jan. to Dec.) Motorized Serious Injuries along Interstates, US Highways, and State Routes in San Joaquin County (136 of 143 Mapped)

Selection Factors:
- **Collision Severity:** 2 – Injury (Severe)
- **Road Type:** 1 – Interstate, 2 – US Highway, 3 – State Route, 6 – US Highway (Contract City), 7 – State Route (Contract City)

Locations Not Mapped:
1. SB-99 SB & Waterloo Rd
2. I-580 EB & Valpico Rd
3. SR-4 WB to I-5 NB & SR-4 WB
4. I-5 & SR-112
5. I-5 SB & Louise Ave
6. SB-99 SB & Jack Tone Rd
7. I-5 SB & Alpine Ave
2018 (Jan. to Dec.) Motorized Serious Injuries on Weekdays along Interstates, US Highways, and State Routes in San Joaquin County (86 of 88 Mapped)

Selection Factors:
Collison Severity: 2 – Injury (Severe)
Road Type: 1 – Interstate, 2 – US Highway, 3 – State Route, 6 – US Highway (Contract City), 7 – State Route (Contract City)
Day of Week: 1 – Monday, 2 – Tuesday, 3 – Wednesday, 4 – Thursday, 5 – Friday

Locations Not Mapped:
1. I-5 NB & Calaveras River
2. I-5 SB & San Joaquin River

2019 (Jan. to Dec.) Motorized Serious Injuries on Weekdays along Interstates, US Highways, and State Routes in San Joaquin County (90 of 94 Mapped)

Selection Factors:
Collison Severity: 2 – Injury (Severe)
Road Type: 1 – Interstate, 2 – US Highway, 3 – State Route, 6 – US Highway (Contract City), 7 – State Route (Contract City)
Day of Week: 1 – Monday, 2 – Tuesday, 3 – Wednesday, 4 – Thursday, 5 – Friday

Locations Not Mapped:
1. I-580 EB & Valpico Rd
2. SR-4 WB to I-5 NB & SR-4 WB
3. SB-99 SB & Jack Tone Rd
4. I-5 SB & Alpine Ave
2018 (Jan. to Dec.) Non-Motorized Serious Injuries in San Joaquin County (50 to 54 Mapped)

Selection Factors:
- Collision Severity: 2 – Injury (Severe)
- Motor Vehicle Involved with: B – Pedestrian, G – Bicycle

Locations Not Mapped:
1. 2nd St & Alley
2. W. Heritage Dr & Curioso St
3. West Ln Frontage Rd & Stadium Dr
4. Wilson Wy & E St

2019 (Jan. to Dec.) Non-Motorized Serious Injuries in San Joaquin County (64 of 67 Mapped)

Selection Factors:
- Collision Severity: 2 – Injury (Severe)
- Motor Vehicle Involved with: B – Pedestrian, G – Bicycle

Locations Not Mapped:
1. Wilson Wy & E St
2. Lammers Rd & Tracy Blvd
3. SR-88 & Piccoli Rd
2018 (Jan. to Dec.) Non-Motorized Serious Injuries on Weekdays in San Joaquin County (35 to 39 Mapped)

**Selection Factors:**
- **Collision Severity:** 2 – Injury (Severe)
- **Motor Vehicle Involved with:** B – Pedestrian, G – Bicycle
- **Day of Week:** 1 – Monday, 2 – Tuesday, 3 – Wednesday, 4 – Thursday, 5 – Friday

**Locations Not Mapped:**
1. Lammers Rd & Tracy Blvd

2019 (Jan. to Dec.) Non-Motorized Serious Injuries on Weekdays in San Joaquin County (50 of 51 Mapped)

**Selection Factors:**
- **Collision Severity:** 2 – Injury (Severe)
- **Motor Vehicle Involved with:** B – Pedestrian, G – Bicycle
- **Day of Week:** 1 – Monday, 2 – Tuesday, 3 – Wednesday, 4 – Thursday, 5 – Friday

**Locations Not Mapped:**
1. Lammers Rd & Tracy Blvd
APPENDIX B – California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment Overview
League of California Cities generated biennial California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment report(s). Started in 2008, these reports were meant to determine the funding needed to maintain the roadways and bridges over the next 10 years. This appendix summarizes the findings of 2018 report; in relation to:

- Average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for San Joaquin County
- San Joaquin County PCI in comparison to neighboring counties
- 10-year funding need for pavement and bridge in San Joaquin County
- Compare San Joaquin County’s 10-year funding need for pavement and bridge to neighboring counties
- Sufficiency Rating (SR) for San Joaquin County

For more information, please refer to http://www.savecaliforniastreets.org.

**Pavement**

Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is the rating system for pavement conditions, 0 being the worst condition and 100 being the best condition. A rating of 25 or less PCI requires reconstruction of street. A rating of 25 to 69 PCI requires a thin or thick overlay of hot mix asphalt (HMA). Lastly, a rating of 70 or over PCI means preventive measures were invoked to ensure the longevity of pavement. This report includes the average PCI for San Joaquin County and even each jurisdiction after 2014.

For more information, please refer to http://www.savecaliforniastreets.org/read-the-report/.

**Summary**

2018 California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment report indicates the average PCI for San Joaquin County was 70 in 2018; which means no action is needed. Neighboring counties require thin HMA overlay; including Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, and Stanislaus. Only Contra Costa County received a similar average PCI (71). Other than Stanislaus County (5,989 lane miles (LM)), San Joaquin County has the lowest number of LM of previously named counties at 6,773 LM. Sacramento County has the highest number of LM (11,041), followed by Alameda (8,088 LM) and Contra Costa (7,159 LM). These factors are accounted in the estimated funding needed to preserve the existing pavement conditions per County. San Joaquin County needs the least amount at approximately $1,226 million.

**Bridges**

Sufficiency Rating (SR) is the rating system for “bridge's fitness for the duty that it performs based on factors derived from multiple NBI data fields, including fields that describe its structural evaluation, functional obsolescence, and its
essentiality to the public. 100 is entirely sufficient bridge. 0 is entirely insufficient or deficient bridge.”

Structurally Deficient (SD) describes one or more defects at bridge deck, substructure, or superstructure. SR with SD may increase a bridge’s eligibility for rehabilitation or replacement.

**Bridge Replacement Eligibility** – SR less than 50 that is structurally or geometrically deficient

**Bridge Rehabilitation Eligibility** – SR between 50 and 80 that is structurally or geometrically deficient

For more information, please refer to [http://www.savecaliforniastreets.org/read-the-report/](http://www.savecaliforniastreets.org/read-the-report/).

**Summary**

2018 California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment report indicates the SR for San Joaquin County at 85 in 2018 and one of the highest of neighboring counties; including Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento, and Stanislaus. Next to Sacramento County (403 bridges), San Joaquin County has the highest number of bridges at 324. Alameda County has the lowest number of bridges at 205, followed by Stanislaus (247) and Contra Costa County (294). San Joaquin County has the lowest estimated funding needs in the next 10 years at $56 million. Alameda County is second lowest at $60 million. Stanislaus County is third lowest at $94 million, followed by Contra Costa ($118 million) and Sacramento ($201 million).

---

2 2018 California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment, page 56.
APPENDIX C – Federal Highway Administration’s LTBP Infobridge for San Joaquin County (1993 to 2018)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>GOOD</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance Measures for NHS (Includes Interstate) by Bridge Count**

- **NHS-Good**
- **NHS-Fair**
- **NHS-Poor**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>GOOD</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Performance Measures for NHS (Includes Interstate) by Percentage Bridge Count](image-url)
APPENDIX D – NPMRDS Monthly Travel Reliability Rates
Appendix D includes the raw data from Caltrans’ operated [https://npmrds.iteris-pems.com](https://npmrds.iteris-pems.com) that pertains specifically to SJCOG; including 1) Monthly travel reliability percentages along interstates of national highway system (NHS), 2) Monthly travel reliability percentages along non-interstates of national highway system (NHS), and 3) Monthly freight reliability (rated by level of travel time reliability (LOTTR)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months of Year</th>
<th>Interstate Reliability</th>
<th>Non-Interstate Reliability</th>
<th>Freight Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM 4J
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) Capital Project List Amendments

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve Amendments to 2017 RTIF

SUMMARY:

The Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) is a countywide, multi-jurisdictional capital improvement funding program. SJCOG has received a request from the City of Tracy for an amendment to the RTIF Program that will revise the project costs for the following two interchange projects that are on the Project List.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Gross Project Cost</th>
<th>RTIF Eligible Cost</th>
<th>Type of Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-205 @ International Parkway</td>
<td>City of Tracy</td>
<td>$52,900,000</td>
<td>$3,395,051</td>
<td>Update Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-580 @ International Parkway/Patterson Pass Road</td>
<td>City of Tracy</td>
<td>$48,150,000</td>
<td>$7,951,697</td>
<td>Update Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amendments to the RTIF are routine because the next major update will not be until 2022. The project costs of the interchanges are much higher since the plan adoption three years ago. This necessitated a recalculation to determine the maximum RTIF eligible costs for the two interchanges which could be eligible for RTIF collected by City of Tracy for projects within City of Tracy. The program’s objective is to offset the effects of development on the regional transportation network through an impact fee. These funds can be used with federal, state, and other local funding to make transportation improvements that increase regional mobility and reduce congestion. These amendments are described in greater detail below.

RECOMMENDATION:

SJCOG staff recommends the approval of the amendment to the 2017 RTIF.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This action will increase the RTIF-eligible project cost of the I-205/Mountain House Parkway interchange from $256,715 to $3,395,051, and the I-580/International Parkway/Patterson Road interchange from $1,486,298 to $7,951,697 allowing the City of Tracy to expend additional RTIF on the project.
This action will not affect the ongoing costs of administering the RTIF nor will it affect the fee rates assessed by member agencies on development projects.

**BACKGROUND:**

**Program Background**

The Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) program was established in October 2005, and was comprehensively updated in 2011 and 2017. A revised Operating Agreement was adopted April 2015 and fully executed during the 2015-2016 fiscal year.

The RTIF program’s objective is to generate funding from new development projects that impact the regional transportation network and integrate these funds with federal, state, and other local funding to make transportation improvements identified in the RTIF Program. It is a countywide, multi-jurisdictional capital improvement funding program.

The RTIF Program was comprehensively updated in April 2017. Since the adoption of the 2017 RTIF update, the SJCOG Board has approved an amendment to the RTIF in 2018 that revised the project costs for two projects and added four additional projects to the RTIF Capital Project List.

Each jurisdiction contributes into the RTIF program via residential and non-residential development permit fees. The RTIF program fee structure is set according to a nexus analysis that links the transportation impacts of new development projects to a “fair share” of project costs designed to mitigate those impacts. The fee is uniform across all participating agencies. Based on Section 3.2 from the RTIF Operating Agreement, the region-wide RTIF structure is annually adjusted by each Participating Agency at the beginning of each fiscal year (July 1) based on the Engineering News Record California Construction Code Index (CCCI).

**Update to I-205/Mountain House Parkway Interchange and I-580/International Parkway/Patterson Pass Road Interchange Project Costs**

The City of Tracy submitted a letter to SJCOG on April 18, 2019 requesting an amendment to the Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF) program to update the Gross Project Cost for the following two interchange projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTIF ID</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>EXISTING RTIF Gross Project Cost</th>
<th>EXISTING RTIF Eligible Cost</th>
<th>REQUESTED UPDATE RTIF Gross Project Cost</th>
<th>UPDATED RTIF Eligible Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I-205 @ Mountain House Parkway</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$256,715</td>
<td>$52,900,000</td>
<td>$3,395,051 (pending*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I-580 @ International Parkway/Patterson Pass Road</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$1,486,298</td>
<td>$48,150,000</td>
<td>$7,951,697 (pending*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes the figure is subject to approval by SJCOG Board at its June 2020 meeting.
Since the last RTIF update, the projects have been better defined and updated cost estimates have been prepared. The requested update to the Gross Project Cost will also update the RTIF Eligible Cost (defined as a percentage of the Gross Project Cost), allowing Tracy to commit additional funds on the projects and be better positioned to fulfill local match requirements for state and federal grant opportunities.

Based on the information provided, SJCOG completed a minor revision to the RTIF Nexus Analysis to increase the combined gross project cost for the two projects from $13,000,000 to $101,050,000, resulting in an increase in the RTIF-eligible project cost from $1,743,013 to $11,346,748.

As of December 31, 2019, the City of Tracy had an RTIF Fund Balance of $11,243,471.74 as reported in their Fiscal Year 2019/2020 Semi-Annual Report #1. In this report, the City of Tracy did not commit any RTIF funding to their projects. At their discretion, the City can commit their RTIF Fund Balance toward the RTIF Eligible Maximum Contribution of the two interchange projects.

 Prepared by:  Tim Kohaya, Senior Regional Planner