SAN JOAQUIN COUNCIL
OF
GOVERNMENTS

INTERAGENCY TRANSIT COMMITTEE
555 E. Weber Avenue, Stockton, CA 95202

Tuesday, June 9, 2020
3:00 PM

https://sjcog.zoom.us/j/97985659244

Teleconference Number: 1-669-900-6833
Participant Code: 979 8565 9244
Attention Callers: Please mute the call unless speaking

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.

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 to 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

2. Minutes: May 4, 2020  ACTION

3. Public Comment

5. Election of Chair and Vice Chair (No Staff Report)  

6. Transit Operator Open Forum:  
   A. Discussion on Ridership Trends (No Staff Report)  

7. Other Matters of Business  

8. Meeting Adjourned to Monday, July 6, 2020 at 1:30 p.m.
1. **Call Meeting to Order**
The ITC virtual meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m. by Ryan Niblock.

**Committee Members Present**
- John Andoh City of Escalon
- Jay Davidson City of Lathrop
- Georgia Graham City of Lodi
- Julia Tyack City of Lodi
- Juan Portillo City of Manteca
- Elizabeth Quilici City of Ripon
- Ed Lovell City of Tracy
- Jayne Pramod City of Tracy
- Jordan Peterson San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission
- George Lorente San Joaquin Regional Transit District
- Kimberly Gayle San Joaquin Regional Transit District

**SJCOG Staff Present**
- Diane Nguyen Deputy Director
- Ryan Niblock Senior Regional Planner
- Joel Campos Assistant Regional Planner
- Ashley Goldlist Assistant Regional Planner
- Melissa Ablang Administrative Clerk II

**Others Present**
- Dylan Casper San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission

2. **Minutes: March 2, 2020:**
   It was moved/seconded (Peterson/Graham) to approve the minutes of March 2, 2020. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3. **Public Comment:**
   None.

4. **Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act Transit Funding:**
   Ryan Niblock announced that $25 billion has been made available through the CARES Act for public transportation and apportionments to urbanized areas (UZA) have been issued. It is coming in the form of 5307 funds, although it is a mixture of 5307, 5340, and 5337. The rural amount was also made available to the state. Further, the funds that are made available through the CARES Act are available at 100% federal share without a local match required and there’s also no time limit on the obligation of the funds. However, funding would need to be tied back to the impacts of COVID-19. Staff has met with RTD regarding the use of the funds but has not met with the cities of Lodi, Manteca and Tracy yet, but it needs to happen because the jurisdictions need split letters to get the funds moving. Mr. Niblock asked the members if they have a preference on how the funds should be split and what their needs are relating to COVID-19.
Ms. Graham said Lodi is not sure how they will use their funds and asked whether anybody has any ideas. Transit is going to rebound very slowly, so Lodi’s transit operations contractor is taking proactive steps to gear up for that and they’re negotiating a one-year option on the contract that may include some of those terms.

Mr. Lovell said Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds are going to be reduced drastically so the funds can be used to stretch out those dollars.

Mr. Portillo stated the revenue for the transit center rental will be a lot less and all that money gets put into transit to pay for the subsidy. He is open to meeting with Ripon to see what projects they could use the funding for. Manteca also needs to get ready to have their own yard and get some infrastructure in place to go electric. Transit in Manteca has moved to the Community Development Department (CDD) so Johanna Herrera would like to be present for the meeting with COG regarding the split letters. Further, Manteca is spending funds on a lot of cleaning so operational costs will go up.

Mr. Niblock said it sounds like it will be operations across the board. He asked Mr. Andoh if he is aware of a CARES Act split of rural funds. Mr. Andoh indicated Caltrans issued a letter to all the rural operators with their amounts. Escalon is getting $20,000 and he thinks RTD is getting somewhere close to $1 million. They’ve only done 33% of it on the first round and will be doing additional rounds as they go down the line per the letter.

Mr. Niblock said staff would like to include those that serve UZAs in the meetings to get the split letters completed. He asked the members if there are any other discussions or impacts they’d like to share with the group.

Ms. Tyack indicated that CALACT is offering transit talks every Wednesday and they’re really helpful. One of the big priorities of this funding is to keep employees employed as opposed to having people go on unemployment.

Mr. Portillo said Manteca still has regular service although ridership is down about 75%.

Mr. Lorente said RTD’s ridership has dropped about 80% depending on the service you look at. As far as plans for the CARES Act, they’ve responded with efforts including cleaning and sanitizing buses, facilities and equipment as well as keeping a close eye on TDA funds. If there is any information the members would like to share with RTD, they’d like to incorporate it into their planning for the TDA. Further, there was an article that indicated it would take at least twelve months to recover from this and it seems like a fair assessment.

Mr. Niblock said he will be in touch with the members this week to get these meetings set up.

*Elizabeth Quilici, Jay Davidson, John Andoh and Kimberly Gayle joined the meeting during this discussion item.

This item was for discussion only.

5. **Draft FY 20/21 Unmet Transit Needs Report:**
Ryan Niblock announced there is a pre-release on the website and asked the members to take a look at it. The 30-day public comment period has not begun yet. It’s meant to go out for public review next week. Staff will be scheduling a SSTAC meeting so that can be kicked off.

Ms. Goldlist stated SJCOG and local and regional transit partners began public outreach in the fall of 2019 and received a total of 109 comments. Comments asked for additional service frequency, late night and weekend service, and to establish service between specific locations in and around the region. The SSTAC committee identified 17 unmet transit needs that were unreasonable to meet and did not meet the criteria.
Ms. Nguyen stated this is a draft report for discussion. Staff is looking to get feedback on the recommendation so this report can come back for action in June.

Mr. Andoh said the unmet needs that were unreasonable to meet were assigned to particular jurisdictions, but wouldn’t it be assigned to both jurisdictions impacted? Mr. Niblock agreed and said staff can make the edit.

Mr. Andoh indicated a comment asked for increased weekend service to San Joaquin RTC and asked whether it was referring to the bus yard. Mr. Niblock stated they meant downtown transit center.

Mr. Andoh said doesn’t Bear Creek High School have service on Route 566? Mr. Lorente said he would look it up.

Mr. Niblock said this was a comment that was discussed with the SSTAC working group, so he assumed there wasn’t any service available. He asked RTD staff to get back to him regarding whether it is being serviced.

This item was for discussion only.

6. **Other Matters of Business**

Mr. Lovell said Tracy is going to have to take the Masabi contract to the city council for approval due to a clause in the schedule. He asked the cities who were already on board if there was a way they didn’t have to get city council approval. The soonest he can get it to city council is May 19.

Ms. Tyack asked if Mr. Lovell has the exact section of the schedule where it refers to that. Mr. Lovell said he is just quoting back what the city attorney sent.

Ms. Tyack said Lodi’s city attorney also had issues with indemnification, but they realized it was covered in the master contract with SJCOG. Ms. Graham said she thought their issue had more to do with cyber liability insurance, which Masabi agreed to include. She does not see where the other insurance is an issue.

Mr. Andoh asked if the indemnification language has to be in there. Ms. Nguyen asked what specific part of the schedule is he referring to. Whatever the transit operator and Masabi agrees to is what is in the schedule. In terms of indemnity language, Section 12.1 indicates that SJCOG and its agents identified in schedules A-G were explicitly spelled out in the SJCOG/Masabi contract. In later clauses in the indemnity unlimited liability, there is additional referral to indemnified parties within the agreement and those indemnified parties include the authorized agents in the schedules.

Ms. Nguyen asked who is already signed off on the agreement and is actually securing signatures.

Ms. Quilici stated it will go to Ripon’s council meeting on May 12th.

Mr. Portillo said he wants to consult with the city attorney to look into Mr. Lovell’s inquiry regarding the clause in the schedule.

Mr. Lovell said, Section 5 under Operator Responsibilities, Masabi wants the operator to indemnify them against all these different things, which triggers the requirement to go to city council.

Mr. Andoh stated he asked if the language has to be there because he is currently negotiating with Masabi in Columbia and they took out the language. Ms. Nguyen indicated it was Masabi’s demand to add that language.

Mr. Lovell questioned why they wouldn’t take it out of everyone’s schedule if they took it out of Lodi’s. Mr. Andoh said you can tell them that you’re not going to do it and they will cooperate.
Ms. Graham stated she knows Ms. Nguyen was trying to use Lodi’s sample, after the revisions, for other agencies to use to avoid taking it to council but doesn’t know if Masabi was aware of that or if it just fell through the communication cracks. She informed the members that she can resend Lodi’s version of the schedule if they’d like to use it.

Ms. Nguyen indicated Masabi is trying to reach an agreement with everyone so whatever they agree on with Lodi is not specific to Lodi. Therefore, if the jurisdictions want to use Lodi’s, they absolutely can.

Ms. Nguyen asked where Lodi is at with the agreement. Ms. Graham indicated they just need to clean up the schedule by inserting Lodi’s name and then circulate it for signatures.

Ms. Nguyen asked if Mr. Peterson has an update from the Rail Commission. Mr. Peterson said he will follow up with Sarah Rasheed and get back with a status.

Ms. Nguyen said staff is looking to focus on getting these agreements executed in mid-May. The Rail Commission is extending their contract with Masabi so their agreement won’t be as detailed.

Ms. Nguyen asked Mr. Lorente if RTD is still working through finalizing their schedule. Mr. Lorente stated there is still one more item on reporting and then they should be able to circulate for signatures.

Ms. Nguyen stated it would be fantastic if everyone could target mid-May. Lodi’s version of the schedule has a lot of changes and was sent out Friday. Ms. Graham stated she just resent their version.

Mr. Lovell said he sent Lodi’s version to Tracy’s city attorney to try to expedite this.

Ms. Nguyen stated Mr. Andoh asked if this committee is interested in having a chair/vice chair. Second, he asked what the process would be to request agenda items to be added to the ITC agenda. She asked if Mr. Andoh wanted to add any comments. Mr. Andoh confirmed he didn’t have further comments.

The members expressed support in having a chair and vice chair.

Ms. Nguyen stated Mr. Niblock will add an action item to vote for chair and vice chair next meeting.

Mr. Niblock recommended that all members be in attendance.

Ms. Graham questioned if COG staff can be voted as chair or vice chair. Ms. Nguyen indicated COG staff are not voting members of the committee.

Ms. Nguyen stated that Mr. Andoh had proposed a couple of agenda items: 1) the consideration of changes to the LTF policy, and 2) the status on intercity transit. Staff would like to agendize items requested by members, but it may be more appropriate to add them to a new section called, Matters of Business from Operators. In addition, staff would like to receive requests in advance.

Ms. Graham said Lodi has an informal TAC meeting through CTSA and RTD sends out an agenda asking if they have any items to add. Is that something the committee can do more informally or is there a rule against the members adding an item to the agenda?

Mr. Andoh said his request is more for discussion to see if the committee will formulate any recommendations regarding intercity transit service and changes to the LTF policy since funds may be affected by COVID-19 for some agencies.

Ms. Graham asked whether Ms. Nguyen is concerned about the items proposed not being appropriate for discussion at ITC or whether they’re lacking backup. Ms. Nguyen stated any items solicited from
operators won’t include a comprehensive staff report from SJCOG, so she would like to build the distinction between the two. Then the item can be included on a future agenda so that there could be more information on that item. Further, the jurisdiction proposing the item could lead the item and be listed as the lead, so committee members know where it’s coming from.

Ms. Graham stated that’s fair, but she understands where Mr. Andoh is coming from. Sometimes members want to include an item just for discussion because it’s trending now, which doesn’t necessarily require a staff report until it is discussed. It’s a good way for everyone to share their ideas on current items.

Mr. Lovell said that maybe there can be a way to propose timely items just for discussion and without a staff report. In addition, whoever brings up that item will lead the item. Then the committee will see if the discussions require further action.

Ms. Nguyen stated Mr. Niblock will send out an email to all members in advance of the ITC meeting asking if there are items and materials (if any) to be added for discussion, which will be added under the name of the operator. She asked the members if that works for them and the members indicated that works for them.

Mr. Andoh asked if there are any updates on intercity bus. Ms. Nguyen stated she is aware that Ms. Gayle and Ms. Salazar are working on this. About a week ago, they were developing some internal recommendations based on comments from the operators. They are maintaining some existing services, deleting and refining some of the routes, then adding some new routes. Based on the new package, the funding shortfall of $600,000 was drastically reduced, but they felt it was something that could still be manageable. Staff will reach out to them for the next ITC meeting. However, Ms. Salazar and Ms. Gayle stated they want to meet with operators individually, which should happen soon.

Ms. Quilici asked where the jurisdictions are at with their performance objectives. Ms. Tyack stated Lodi submitted their performance objectives for a second review. They can send it out to everybody, but it would probably be good if they get their final comments.

Mr. Andoh asked if everyone is aware that the performance objectives aren’t due until December now.

7. 

**Adjournment**
There being no further business to discuss, the ITC meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m. The next meeting will adjourn to Monday, June 1, 2020 at 1:30 p.m.
AGENDA ITEM 4
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:

- Medical
- Dental
- Personal Business
- Recreation
- Social Services
- Education
- Employment
- Shopping

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>Lathrop</td>
<td>Route connecting Lathrop and Manteca</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