



# SAN JOAQUIN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

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

**Special Meeting**  
**for Tuesday, June 21, 2016**  
**10:00 A.M.**

**Teleconference Number: 1-650-479-3208**  
**Participant Code: 808 342 348**

*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.*

## **PARKING:**

For your convenience, parking is available at the COG Regional Center. There is additional parking available at Public Parking Lot K, located on American Street, just south of Weber Avenue. Additional meter parking is available on Weber Avenue.

## **A G E N D A**

1. Call to Order / Introductions / Roll Call
2. Minutes: June 9, 2016
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. 2016-17 Local Transportation Fund Apportionment Options – Dial **ACTION**
5. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for FY 2016-17  
(No Staff Report) **ACTION**
6. Other Matters of Business
7. Next Scheduled Meeting is Thursday, August 11, 2016 at 10:00 a.m.

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)  
San Joaquin Council of Governments  
555 E Weber Ave.  
Stockton, CA 95202**

**Thursday, June 9, 2016**

**MINUTES**

**1. Call Meeting to Order/Introductions:**

Charles Swimley called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. and introductions were made.

**Committee Members Present:**

Charles Swimley	City of Lodi
Michael King	City of Lathrop
Greg Showerman	City of Manteca
James Pease	City of Ripon
Zabih Zaca	City of Tracy
Josh Swearingen	Caltrans, District 10
Steven Martinez	Caltrans, District 10
Cindy Erdman	City of Stockton
Miguel Mendoza	City of Stockton
Wes Johnson	City of Stockton
Eric Alvarez	City of Stockton
Dave Mendoza	San Joaquin County
Firoz Vohra	San Joaquin County
Nate Knodt	SJRTD
Dero In	SJRTD
Max Vargas	SJRTD

**Committee Members Not Present:**

Dominique Romo	City of Escalon (via telephone)
Robert Armijo	City of Tracy
Paula Fernandez	City of Lodi
Lyman Chang	City of Lodi
John Andoh	City of Escalon
James Pease	City of Ripon
Dameon Flores	City of Lathrop
Todd Greenwood	City of Stockton
Mike McDowell	City of Stockton
David Stagnaro	City of Stockton
James Wong	City of Stockton
Karla Cervantes	City of Stockton
Ed Lovell	City of Tracy
Dorothy Kam	City of Lodi
Juan Villanueva	Port of Stockton

Georgia Lantberger	City of Manteca
Tracie Madison	City of Manteca
Phil Carlson	City of Escalon
Kevin Werner	City of Ripon
Nabil Hasan	Caltrans, District 10
Parminder Singh	Caltrans, District 10
Tom Dumas	Caltrans, District 10
Mahmoud Sagga	San Joaquin County
Mike Selling	San Joaquin County
John Cadrett	SJVAPCD
Ian Turner	Stockton Metropolitan Airport
Ronald Elliott	Stockton Metropolitan Airport
Harry Mavrogenes	Stockton Metropolitan Airport
George Lorente	SJRTD
Dero Ia	SJRTD
Gary Taylor	SJRRC
Bob Schiffler	SJRRC
Shelehia Mesner	SJRRC
Brian Schimdt	SJRRC

**SJCOG Staff Present:**

Andrew T. Chesley	Executive Director
Diane Nguyen	Deputy Director
David Ripperda	Assistant Regional Planner
Jonathan Spencer	Assistant Regional Planner
Rosemary Romero	Administrative Clerk II

**2. Meeting minutes from May 12, 2016:**

It was moved/seconded (**Vohra/ Mendoza**) to approve the minutes from May 12, 2016. Motion passed.

**3. Public Presentation:**

None.

**4. Technical Items: B through C**

**A. Consent Calendar Item: D through E (Informational Items Only)**

**B. FY 16/17 Local Transportation Fund Apportionment**

Mr. Swimley informed the committee members that an email was sent out yesterday afternoon (Wednesday, June 8, 2016) to all TAC members informing them of a proposed Special Technical Advisory Meeting on Tuesday, June 21, 2016. Mr. Swimley mentioned that the email also included a draft staff report in regard to the Local Transportation Fund topic. Mr. Swimley introduced Mr. Chesley to speak to the committee; Mr. Chesley apologized for not having an LTF proposal for the group ready to review at today's meeting, and mentioned he is not expecting the committee

to act on the item based on the proposal that was sent out the prior evening, but did ask that they review what was sent out, and encouraged the members to reach out to SJCOG staff if they have any questions regarding the email. Mr. Chesley mentioned that RTD and the Regional Rail Commission received the proposals and draft staff report on Monday, and mentioned there were no new ideas, but it was packaged differently than what has been talked about in the past, and Mr. Chesley is expecting for the agencies to take the week to review it and possibly provide some comments. Mr. Chesley noted that he did not want to give the impression that the Rail Commission and/or RTD have bought into the proposals, and is hoping to have a complete discussion at the upcoming Special TAC meeting on June 21. Mr. Chesley told the committee that the Management & Finance and the Citizen's Advisory Committees meet next week and stated that something must also be mailed out to them today, which will be the same email that was sent to all TAC members, and is expecting to have discussions with the various committees leading up to the Board Meeting. Mr. Chesley informed the committee that there is an effort to put together a meeting between the three entities (SJCOG, RTD, and the Rail Commission) to talk about possible ways to compromise on the matter, but warned that what may be a compromise between the three agencies, may not be to the local jurisdictions. Mr. Chesley stated that it is his intention to have an action by the Board at June's Board meeting, but there may not be one, or it may be different than what is presented. Mr. Chesley reminded the members to contact either himself, Ms. Diane Nguyen, or Mr. Steve Dial of SJCOG should they have any questions or concerns in regard to the LTF topic. Mr. Swimley confirmed that the meeting time and date for the special TAC meeting on Tuesday, June 21, 2016 at 10:00 a.m. worked for all members.

### **C. 2016 Measure K Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Amendment**

Mr. Ripperda reported that the topic was discussed at the May Board meeting as well as the committee meetings, where all were advised that San Joaquin County is requesting an amendment to the Measure K Expenditure Plan to alter the list of their Regional Arterial projects. Mr. Ripperda told the members that the City of Lodi expressed some concerns about the deletion of the Turner Road Improvements Project at the Management & Finance and SJCOG Board meetings. Mr. Ripperda stated there have been a few new developments in results of the ongoing discussions between the City of Lodi and San Joaquin County; Mr. Swimley said that the City of Lodi feels there should be additional discussion prior to removing projects from the expenditure plan, and stated they have had conversations with San Joaquin County staff in which Mr. Swimley extended his appreciation for their cooperation and agreeing to remove the deletion from their request. Mr. Swimley said that initially they were expecting General Mills to move out of the area, but since then have had a new tenant move in and they are expecting the business to continue to grow, and have more traffic in the future. Mr. Ripperda told the committee that at this time, SJCOG staff is making the recommendation is to add the Grant Line Road Project into Measure K, reduce the scope of the Jack Tone Road Widening Project, but not take any action on the Turner Road Widening Project.

It was moved/seconded (**Vohra/ Swimley**) to add the Grant Line Road Project into Measure K, reduce the scope of the Jack Tone Road Widening Project, but not take any action on the Turner Road Widening Project. Motion passed.

## **CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **D. 2017 Active Transportation Program Cycle 3 Regional Call for Projects**

### **E. Regional Transit Systems Plan Update**

**5. Other Matters of Business:**

None.

**6. Adjournment:**

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 a.m. to a Special Technical Advisory Committee Meeting on Tuesday, June 21, 2016 at 10:00 a.m.

## STAFF REPORT

**SUBJECT:** 2016/17 Local Transportation Apportionment Options

**RECOMMENDATION:** Motion to Approve Base Scenario Plus Consolidated Transit Service Agency Scenario

### DISCUSSION:

The apportionment of the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) among the local jurisdictions for 2015/2016 and 2016/17 has not been easy. The request by the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission for a substantial increase in LTF apportionment from roughly \$700,000 to \$4,000,000.

The following is the latest effort by San Joaquin COG staff to craft a proposal that would meet the needs of the Rail Commission, the Regional Transit District and the member agencies. As has been apparent, there is not a clear win-win solution. The attached scenarios are meant to fairly balance the effects of the Rail Commission request. As of this writing though, buy-in from the Regional Rail Commission staff and the Regional Transit District staff has not been achieved.

**It is anticipated that this proposal will go before a special meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee on Tuesday June 21. This proposal is expected to be before the Management and Finance Committee on Wednesday June 15. The proposal is expected to be before the Executive Committee on Friday June 17.**

The attached proposals are under review by both the Rail Commission staff and the Regional Transit District staff and it is expected that changes will be requested. While none of the provisions in these proposals are new, the packaging of them is different than has been previously shared.

All the scenarios do the following:

- They propose a two year phase in of the Rail Commission request.
- They have a component that defers Rail Commission LTF payments for their Measure K loans. (This deferment restructures the loans to forgive interest payments and defer payment of principal.)
- At the end of two years they fix the Regional Rail Commission's percentage of LTF at 11.5% after administration, transportation planning and Bicycle/Pedestrian apportionments.
- At the end of two years the Measure K loan deferment amount continues into the future.

The scenarios are all based on 2016/17 dollars. There is no assumption for growth built into the scenarios though it is highly likely that the apportionment estimate for 2017/18 will grow by 2% to 4%. There is no change in the scenarios for population changes in 2017/18. There will definitely be population changes based on the Department of Finance estimates, but those will not be available for some time.

There are a number of funding sources that may or may not see some change as a result of the Regional Transit Systems Plan that will be discussed this summer and acted upon before the end of 2016. We have not included those in any of the scenarios as they are too speculative at this time. These would be Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) and the State Transit Assistance (STA) Fund. The Transit District received \$800,000 in LCTOP in 2016, which was a substantial increase over 2015's \$222,000. However, there are large uncertainties with this state fund. The most recent sale of Cap and Trade credits was a big disappointment. The State Transit Assistance Fund provided SJRTD with \$3,377,000 last year, but this is a fund that has been going down in terms of revenue growth. SJRTD already gets 80% of the funds so any changes in policy will have a relatively small impact on the District's revenue. For these reasons they have not been included in the scenarios.

There is a discussion after the scenarios about the County of San Joaquin and the San Joaquin Regional Transit District revisiting their agreement regarding service in the unincorporated area and the split of LTF apportioned by that agreement to the County of San Joaquin. The District has argued that it serves 100% of the unincorporated area, but only receives 76% of the funding for that area. While the District may have some legitimate concern over this, the agreement was entered voluntarily by both parties, and SJCOG staff would urge that the County of San Joaquin and the San Joaquin Regional Transit District enter into talks as to whether and how that agreement could be restructured.

The scenarios on pages 5, 6 and 7 are meant to be cumulative. That is, the succeeding scenario adds onto the previous scenario. This is not absolutely necessary, but SJCOG staff has structured it this way to present a set of scenarios that could achieve the minimum objectives outlined by the Transit District. The Rail Commission's status does not change from scenario to scenario. The status of each of the cities and the County of San Joaquin does change resulting in a drop of roughly 5% in the scenario on page 6, and then another 5% in the scenario on page 7 from the Base Scenario.

### **SJCOG Staff Recommendation**

SJCOG staff is recommending the Base Scenario Plus CTSA. SJRTD as the Consolidated Transit Service Agency has immense resources for dispatching, maintenance, coordinated purchasing and the best transit expertise in the region. This should not impinge upon the policy or management of individual transit entities, but provides an excellent opportunity for paratransit cost savings and coordination. The designation of a CTSA also comes with a 5% apportionment off the top which is not immaterial to this discussion. The CTSA has been talked about for years and admittedly there has been some hesitancy on the part of local transit staff. However, it is more common than not to have a CTSA in a region and the Transit District is the best qualified.

The Base Scenario Plus CTSA, Plus Intercity Transit has merits as well, but from SJCOG staff's perspective the workings of this may be more complex than can be handled in a short time frame. This might be better discussed in the context of the Regional Transit Systems Plan. There is time to do that based upon our lay out of the scenario which wouldn't kick in until the second year (FY 2017/18) so this may still end up being a viable option to pursue, but later on after our work on the Regional Transit Systems Plan.

It should be reiterated that none of these scenarios have been endorsed by the Regional Rail Commission or the Regional Transit District staff as of this writing. They are proposals developed by SJCOG staff after meeting over time with the General Manager of RTD, the Executive Director of SJRRC, a number of Board members and managers/administrators from member agencies, a review of practices from other agencies, discussions with legal counsel, and peers from other regional agencies. It is possible that SJRTD and SJRRC staff may have comments that modify one or more of these scenarios and this discussion.

If you have questions prior to the next meeting, please contact Andrew Chesley or Steve Dial.

## **PROPOSALS FOR RESOLVING THE LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUND DILEMMA**

The attached proposals are meant to resolve the dilemma created by the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission's request for an additional \$4 million in LTF, and its impact on the San Joaquin Regional Transit District's funding.

The Rail Commission has requested that whatever results from the Board's action on their request, that the following be met:

Future allocations be equal to 11.5% of LTF after Administration, Planning and Bike/Ped. are accounted for.

That \$783,236 of Measure K loan repayment be forgiven on an annual basis.

The Transit District has requested that they be funded at \$15.1 million a year or greater. This is what the Transit District believes it would have received had the Rail Commission's request remained at approximately \$700,000.

The District's minimum request is \$14.7 million a year (not to be lowered) in subsequent years.

The following charts are in 2016/17 dollars. They do not reflect any growth in sales tax revenues. This allows for a better comparison from year to year, but SJCOG staff does believe that a growth of 4% per years is a reasonable expectation.

Any funding amounts beyond FY 16/17 are for illustrative purposes. They will be modified in January of 2017 to reflect Department of Finance estimates for population for each jurisdiction.

The first three scenarios are designed to be additive, and, when taken together to meet the request of the two transit providers.

The "Other Options" are viable alternatives that can be taken separately or in combination with the three outlined proposals.

At this time SJCOG staff is prepared to fully support the Base Scenario and the Base Scenario Plus CTSA.

BASE SCENARIO

Two Year Transition. Second year reflects apportionments and allocations into the future.

Rail Commission approximately \$3.8 million each year through a combination of LTF and Measure K Loan Deferral

	2016-17		2017-18	
Revenue Estimate	27,689,000		27,689,000	
Admin.	267,000		227,000	
COG Planning	830,670		801,597	
Bike and Ped	531,827		533,208	
SJRRC	2,200,000		3,004,627	(11.5%)
Available for		Bike/Ped		Bike/Ped
Area Apportionment	23,859,503		23,122,568	
SJRTD	14,265,597		13,824,983	
Lathrop	675,224	15,044	654,369	15,090
Lodi	2,113,952	47,098	2,048,660	47,242
Manteca	2,447,985	54,540	2,372,375	54,707
Tracy	2,827,351	63,047	2,740,024	63,185
Ripon	493,892	11,030	478,637	11,037
Escalon	245,753	5,479	238,162	5,492
S.J. County	792,135	108,671	767,669	108,934
Stockton		226,918		227,520
SJRRC Loan Deferment	1,583,326		783,326	

BASE SCENARIO PLUS CONSOLIDATED TRANSIT SERVICE AGENCY (5%)

Two Year Transition. Second year reflects apportionments and allocations into the future.

Rail Commission approximately \$3.8 million each year through a combination of LTF and Measure K Loan Deferral

SJRTD named CTSA with an off the top allocation per Transportation Development Act

	2016-17		2017-18	
Revenue Estimate	27,689,000		27,689,000	
Admin.	267,000		227,000	
COG Planning	830,670		801,597	
Bike and Ped	531,827		533,208	
SJRRC	2,200,000		3,004,627	(11.5%)
CTSA	1,192,975		1,156,128	
Available for		Bike/Ped		Bike/Ped
Area Apportionment	22,666,528		21,966,440	
SJRTD	13,552,317		13,133,734	
Lathrop	641,463	15,044	621,650	15,090
Lodi	2,008,254	47,098	1,946,227	47,242
Manteca	2,325,586	54,540	2,253,757	54,707
Tracy	2,685,984	63,047	2,603,023	63,185
Ripon	469,197	11,030	454,705	11,037
Escalon	233,465	5,479	226,254	5,492
S.J. County	752,529	108,671	729,286	108,934
Stockton		226,918		227,520
SJRRC Loan Deferment	1,583,326		783,236	
Total SJRTD	14,745,292		14,289,862	

BASE SCENARIO PLUS CTSA (5%) PLUS INTERCITY CONTRIBUTION (5%)

Two Year Transition. Second year reflects apportionments and allocations into the future.

Rail Commission approximately \$3.8 million each year through a combination of LTF and Measure K Loan Deferral

SJRTD named CTSA with an off the top allocation per Transportation Development Act

Each local jurisdiction contributes 5% of LTF apportionment for intercity bus service in 2017-18 and beyond

	2016-17		2017-18	
Revenue Estimate	27,689,000		27,689,000	
Admin.	267,000		227,000	
COG Planning	830,670		801,597	
Bike and Ped	531,827		533,208	
SJRRC	2,200,000		3,004,627 (11.5%)	
CTSA	1,192,975		1,156,128	
Available for		Bike/Ped		Bike/Ped
Area Apportionment	22,666,528		21,966,440	
SJRTD	13,552,317		13,133,734	
Lathrop	641,463	15,044	590,568	15,090
Lodi	2,008,254	47,098	1,848,916	47,242
Manteca	2,325,586	54,540	2,141,069	54,707
Tracy	2,685,984	63,047	2,472,872	63,185
Ripon	469,197	11,030	431,970	11,037
Escalon	233,465	5,479	214,941*	5,492
S.J. County	752,529	108,671	692,822*	108,934
Stockton		226,918		227,520
SJRRC Loan Deferment	1,583,326		783,236	
Total SJRTD	14,745,292		14,683,829	
			14,731,606*	

\*These jurisdictions have separate agreements with Transit District. The asterisked numbers are if we include them in the 5%.

## San Joaquin Regional Transit District and San Joaquin County Agreement

The San Joaquin Council of Governments staff recommends that the County of San Joaquin and the San Joaquin Regional Transit District engage in talks over updating the existing agreement for transit service provision in the unincorporated area of San Joaquin County.

The County and Transit District have a long agreement that splits the Local Transportation Fund Apportionment for the County's population share 76%-24% between the District and the County respectively. The agreement was forged when the County decided to no longer contract for public transit service to the unincorporated areas. The Transit District took that job per an agreement adopted by both policy bodies. While the percentages may seem a bit odd, they were the result of the County still having to pay for the Rail Commission's staffing which roughly translated to 24% of the County apportionment. There were several years when the County of San Joaquin did not submit a claim for road and street purposes because all their dollars were invested in public transit. When the Rail Commission became eligible for claiming LTF on their own in 2005, the County Public Works Department started claiming the 24% for road and street purposes, and has done so ever since.

The General Manager of the Transit District has approached SJCOG staff on numerous occasions indicating that the District should receive 100% of the County's unincorporated population amount since they serve 100% of the unincorporated area. SJCOG staff's response has been that the agreement is between the Transit District and the County of San Joaquin and that it is best to follow one of several courses of action:

1. Approach the County of San Joaquin about updating the agreement.
2. Annex the unincorporated area as outlined in SJRTD enabling legislation and the TDA
3. Get a legislative change to the Transportation Development Act

The 2016-17 year has an apportionment to the County of \$794,374. The Transit District General Manager has indicated to SJCOG staff that this is needed for service in the unincorporated area. SJCOG has not found an unmet transit need that is reasonable to meet, but that does not mean that the Transit District does not have a case to make. SJCOG staff would urge that the Transit District engage the County of San Joaquin in a discussion about updating the agreement and demonstrating the needs of the District in financially meeting their service requirements in the unincorporated area.

## State Transit Assistance Fund

The State Transit Assistance Fund is solely for public transit. It is divided into two fund distributions. The one that is largest and at issue here is the regional apportionment which is divided up based upon SJCOG policy. Due to changes in state law, that policy must be revisited. Presently, SJCOG distributes these funds among member agencies with transit programs based upon passenger ridership. As a result, the Transit District has about 80% of the funds and the Rail Commission about 11.5%. This fund is about \$4 million but has been slowly but steadily declining. SJCOG staff suggests that this policy relook take place within the context of the Regional Transit Systems Plan.