



SAN JOAQUIN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE/INTERAGENCY TRANSIT COMMITTEE

SJCOG Conference Room

555 E. Weber Avenue, Stockton, CA 95202

Monday, March 4, 2019

3:00 P.M.

Teleconference Number: 1-650-479-3208

Participant Code: 808 082 971

Attention Callers: Please mute the call unless speaking.

A G E N D A

1. Call to Order / Introductions / Roll Call
2. Minutes: February 4, 2019
3. Public Comments
4. **STAFF ITEMS FOR ITC:**
 - A. **Action:** Low Carbon Transit Operations Program FY 18/19 Funding -Niblock
5. **STAFF ITEMS FOR SSTAC:**

No Items
6. Other Matters of Business

Meeting Adjourned to Monday, April 1, 2019 at 3:00 p.m.

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.

AGENDA ITEM 2



**INTERAGENCY TRANSIT COMMITTEE (ITC) / SOCIAL SERVICES
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY MEETING (SSTAC)**

**San Joaquin Council of Governments
555 E Weber Avenue, Stockton, CA 95202
Monday, February 4, 2019**

MINUTES

1. Call Meeting to Order/Introductions

The ITC/SSTAC meeting was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by Michelle Prince. Introductions were made.

Committee Members Present

John Andoh	City of Escalon
Georgia Lantsberger	City of Lodi
Julia Tyack	City of Lodi
Juan Portillo	City of Manteca
Ed Lovell	City of Tracy
Joni Bauer	Community Center for the Blind and the Visually Impaired
Armando Valerio	Public Health Services
Jordan Peterson	San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission
George Lorente	San Joaquin Regional Transit District
Toan Tran	San Joaquin Regional Transit District

Committee Members Not Present

Michael King	City of Lathrop
James Pease	City of Ripon
Kevin Werner	City of Ripon
Brian Schmidt	San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission
Karl Knodt	San Joaquin Regional Transit District
Robert Balderama	State Council on Development Disabilities
Deborah Gurley	Transit User 60 Years or Older
Wilma Murray	Valley Mountain Regional Center

SJCOG Staff Present

Andrew Chesley	Executive Director
Rob Cunningham	Senior Regional Planner
Ryan Niblock	Senior Regional Planner
Joel Campos	Assistant Regional Planner
Michelle Prince	Assistant Regional Planner
Melissa Ablang	Administrative Clerk II

Others Present

Colleen Richter	Caltrans
Jim Allison	Caltrans
Kyle Gradinger	Caltrans
Jayne Pramod	City of Tracy
Donna DeMartino	San Joaquin Regional Transit District
Mike Thompson	San Joaquin Regional Transit District

2. Minutes from January 7, 2019

It was moved/seconded (Lovell/Lantsberger) to approve the minutes from January 7, 2019. Motion

passed unanimously by voice vote.

3. **Public Comments**

None.

4. **STAFF ITEMS FOR ITC:**

A. Update on Proposed Modifications to Draft Paper on Potential of Local Transportation Fund Policy Change Regarding Public Transit and Road and Street Claims

Andy Chesley announced that comments were made at the committees and the SJCOG Board during the month of January. He summarized the options and stated there was some support for option two by the Board; however, they want RTD to feel safer. Rail felt the same. The Management & Finance committee asked for an option five that would not result in a negative impact because, potentially, there would not be enough money for the jurisdictions. The cities that would be most affected are the smaller cities. Therefore, there will be more discussions to find an option that the Board would feel more comfortable adopting and COG staff is dedicated to finding an option. Preference is to do something more policy based. COG will release the LTF apportionment sometime and would like to present something prior to that since there will be a request for more funding due to an extension to Sacramento.

*John Andoh left the meeting during this discussion.

This item was for discussion only. No action was taken.

B. California Integrated Travel Plan

Rob Cunningham introduced Jim Allison, Colleen Richter and Kyle Gradinger. They will be presenting what the state is doing for the California Integrated Ticketing Study.

Mr. Allison stated they wanted to take the opportunity to debrief the committee on what they're doing.

Mr. Gradinger thanked the committee for giving them the opportunity to present their findings. He stated some colleagues went to various countries to see what they've done with integrated ticketing and to identify a set of recommended practices for California. The state is interested in a one-stop shop making public transportation easier and helping the counties leverage dollars smartly by scaling out and by cutting through some of the processes and building some uniformity on how payments are made. There is a strong consensus that there is a roll for the state to play in to drive ridership and lower cost.

Mr. Allison announced the state has the option to start working with the county on a pilot basis and that there must be a common payment and trip planning core, so they can communicate across the state. The state will be organizing the core standards, finding out the gaps, bringing the costs of collection down, and certifying apps. However, it is important for the state to stay in its lane due to standards. He summarized steps and stated they need to be compliant with GTFS (General Transit Feed Specification) standard. In addition, APIs will be built into the system and vendor rules will be created, which will evolve so that other features can be added. The idea is to make fares cheaper by recognizing a constant user, which will be recognized by the app.

Ms. Richter stated the rules (like business rules) will be behind the scene to govern uniformity. Goal is to have everyone who comes to our state to easily take transit and increase ridership across the country. They are looking for pilot projects to do in each jurisdiction and to get everyone to a place of GTFS standard. Feedback was requested.

Julia Tyack stated she believes tracking ridership will be an issue, and Mr. Allison stated the rules will include sharing data.

Mr. Cunningham asked if the ridership will be tracked through the app, and Mr. Allison said that the quality of the data will vary depending on the roll out in the area. Mr. Gradinger said they don't have the details of that yet, but they will streamline how that data is collected.

Ms. Tyack said that rural operators have less staff, so they would need the assistance. Ms. Richter stated this program was thought of to provide funding and assistance if an agency needs it.

Mr. Cunningham asked if there will be a future grant program that the state may develop. Mr. Allison stated they do have some funding to kick off some pilots. Mr. Gradinger confirmed that there will be many funding opportunities.

Ed Lovell asked what is it that they need from the jurisdictions to move everything quicker along. Mr. Allison said the gateway payment option would be the earliest thing to use, but the agencies need to be compliant with GTFS standard and they're not sure how long that may take. Ms. Richter and Mr. Gradinger indicated the consultants start that discussion next week. They need transit agencies to be able to identify gaps as the state is developing the standards, so they can collaborate.

Ms. Richter asked the committee what the aspirations are for the study. Mr. Cunningham said COG got the grant to study this and staff thought an RFP would benefit. However, since no responsive proposals were submitted, they thought meeting with the state and doing a study with the cities would be more beneficial.

Ms. Richter stated they want to help provide a scope for the agencies.

Mr. Allison stated there are many vendors that would be able to create this app; however, there are standards that need to be addressed. They would need to be in different languages.

Joel Campos asked if multiple apps will work together on the user end. Mr. Allison said you may need to sign in to multiple apps if they are being used, but that may not be the case. They will explore that option. Ms. Richter stated she will have their payments experts explore that further.

Mr. Campos said that he believes jurisdictions will have different apps causing confusion for riders. Mr. Allison confirmed the apps will talk to each other. Mr. Gradinger stated there will be nationwide and local passes. Passes will be with the city but will take you to another city across the nation with federal railway, which will provide incentives minimizing costs. The system will recognize the user. Ms. Richter added that the consultants want to make this easier on the users.

Donna DeMartino thanked the group for coming down and mentioned that a colleague has brought up a clipper card because it has solved some issues, but not all. Therefore, they're ultimately looking for assistance with integrated payment system and travel planning.

Mr. Allison stated they can assign some specialists to come out and find gaps to get everyone on the same level. The GTFS standards will be brought up to the same level.

This item was for information only. No action was taken.

C. Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan Discussion

Ryan Niblock announced that they're a year and half away from deadline and summarized the exemptions. He asked RTD if they're running a hundred vehicles during peak.

Mr. Lorente stated he believes they're under.

Mr. Niblock said John Andoh asked if SJCOG is interested in taking on a county-wide effort on this and he said that he prefers not to.

Georgia Lantsberger stated Caltrans felt the same way.

Mr. Niblock asked how everyone felt responding to Caltrans' request. Ms. Lantsberger stated the agencies had to respond by default.

***Other matters of business was discussed out of order.

Mr. Niblock announced that KERN COG invited everyone to a transit conference later in February.

Mr. Niblock announced that he will have the State of Good Repair final apportionments ready to send out for the jurisdictions with the addition of another line to the apportionments at the request of the CFO, unless the members had anything else to add.

This item was for discussion only. No action was taken.

5. **STAFF ITEMS FOR SSTAC:**

A. Update on FY 19/20 Unmet Transit Needs and Formation of SSTAC Subcommittee

Michelle Prince stated they did public hearings across the county (with an estimated 104 comments included in the staff report), participated in public outreach with Public Health, did surveys at Parking Day, did a scan code, and worked with various agencies and attended various meetings. Joni Bauer created a braille survey to assist anyone that is visually impaired to read up on unmet transit needs. She requested volunteers to review all comments submitted.

George Lorente, Joni Bauer, Juan Portillo, Ed Lovell, Armando Valerio, Julia Tyack, and Georgia Lantsberger all volunteered.

Mr. Cunningham stated he would ask John Andoh if he would like to volunteer.

This item was for discussion only. No action was needed.

6. **Other Matters of Business**

A. Intercity and Interregional Transit in San Joaquin County (Ongoing Discussion-Request by John Andoh)

It was announced that this item would be discussed next meeting since it was requested by John Andoh.

Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss, the SSTAC/ITC meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m. The next meeting will adjourn to Monday, March 4, 2019 at 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM **4A**



March 2019
ITC

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Low Carbon Transit Operations Program
FY 18/19 Funding Distribution

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Develop funding recommendation for Low Carbon Transit Operations Program Funding for Fiscal Year 2018/19

SUMMARY:

The Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) is one of several programs funded as part of the State of California budget (by Senate Bill 852 and Senate Bill 862) which have a goal of reduced greenhouse gas emissions and achievement of other benefits. For fiscal year (FY) 2018/2019, a total of \$1,401,255 in LCTOP funding was awarded to the San Joaquin County region via PUC 99313 distribution formula, for dispersal by SJCOG.

SJCOG staff requests a discussion of project and funding possibilities through the Interagency Transit Committee. Based on the results of this discussion, a funding recommendation should be formed.

BACKGROUND:

LCTOP is one of several programs that are part of the Transit, Affordable Housing, and Sustainable Communities Program established by the California Legislature in 2014 with Senate Bill 862 (SB 862). SB 862 established LCTOP as a noncompetitive, formulaic program, with 5% of annual auction proceeds being continually appropriated at the beginning of 2015. LCTOP funds are distributed based on prior use of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds where 50% of the funds are designated to regional entities and the other 50% for transit operators. LCTOP was created to provide operating and capital assistance to transit agencies with the goal of reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and improving mobility, with an emphasis on serving Disadvantaged Communities (DAC). For agencies whose service area includes a DAC, at least 50% of the total monies received shall be expended on projects that provide a direct, meaningful and assured benefit to DAC(s).

For FY 18/19, a total of \$1,401,255 was awarded to the San Joaquin County region via PUC 99313 distribution formula, for dispersal by SJCOG. Eligible uses of these funds include:

1. Expenditures that directly enhance or expand transit service by supporting new or expanded bus or rail services, new or expanded water-borne transit, or expanded

intermodal transit facilities, and may include equipment acquisition, fueling, and maintenance, and other costs to operate those services or facilities.

2. Operational expenditures that increase transit mode share.
3. Expenditures related to the purchase of zero-emission buses, including electric buses, and the installation of the necessary equipment and infrastructure to operate and support zero-emission buses.

Caltrans, in coordination with the Air Resources Board, shall determine the eligibility of the proposed project based on the documentation provided by the recipient transit agency to ensure compliance with the guidelines. Caltrans will then notify the State Controller of approved expenditures for each transit agency, and the amount of the allocation for each agency determined to be available at the time of approval.

In previous years, SJCOG has calculated what a split of regional funds would look like, based on ridership. However, given the relatively small amount of funding available, the administrative requirements of the program, and the requirement that projects demonstrate an air quality improvement, most operators have elected not to pursue LCTOP funds. For the purpose of discussion, a distribution of FY 18/19 PUC 99313 funds by ridership is provided below:

Table 1: Potential FY 18/19 LCTOP Funding Distribution – Option A

Claimant	Total Ridership (FY 16/17)	Ridership Percentage (FY 16/17)	FY 18/19 Apportionment PUC 99313	FY 18/19 Apportionment PUC 99314	Total Claimant Apportionment
SJRTD	3,561,732	64.1%	\$898,404	\$126,843	\$1,025,247
Lodi	305,475	5.5%	\$77,052	\$5,333	\$82,385
Manteca	64,106	1.2%	\$16,170	\$1,615	\$17,785
Tracy	167,484	3.0%	\$42,246	\$2,211	\$44,457
Ripon	533	0.01%	\$134	\$456	\$590
Escalon	2,137	0.04%	\$539	\$719	\$1,258
SJRRRC	1,453,820 ⁽¹⁾	26.2%	\$366,709	\$200,105	\$566,814
TOTAL	5,555,287	100.0%	\$1,401,255	\$337,282	\$1,738,537

Note: Ridership includes both boarding and alighting at stations in San Joaquin County only.

Should operators elect not to pursue LCTOP funds, the Interagency Transit Committee may consider awarding funds only to the regional transit providers. This distribution is shown below:

Table 2: Potential FY 18/19 LCTOP Funding Distribution – Option B

Claimant	Total Ridership (FY 16/17)	Ridership Percentage (FY 16/17)	FY 18/19 Apportionment PUC 99313	FY 18/19 Apportionment PUC 99314	Total Claimant Apportionment
SJRTD	3,561,732	71.0%	\$995,084	\$126,843	\$1,121,927
SJRRRC	1,453,820 ⁽¹⁾	29.0%	\$406,171	\$200,105	\$606,276
TOTAL	5,015,552	100.0%	\$1,401,255	\$326,948	\$1,728,203

Note: Ridership includes both boarding and alighting at stations in San Joaquin County only.

RECOMMENDATION:

SJCOG staff requests a discussion of project and funding possibilities through the Interagency Transit Committee. Based on the results of this discussion, a funding recommendation should be formed.

FISCAL IMPACT:

A funding recommendation would assign \$1,401,255 in PUC 99313 LCTOP to transit operators in San Joaquin County.

Attachments:

1. LCTOP Allocation Letter

Prepared by: Ryan Niblock, Senior Regional Planner



BETTY T. YEE
California State Controller

January 31, 2019

County Auditors
Transportation Planning Agencies
County Transportation Commissions
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System

SUBJECT: Low Carbon Transit Operations Program.

Pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 39719(b)(1)(B), the State Controller's Office shall allocate five percent of the annual proceeds from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund to the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program. The allocation is made according to the requirements of the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program and pursuant to the distribution formula in sections 99312(b) or (c), 99313, and 99314 of the Public Utilities Code. Enclosed is a schedule that provides the amounts available for the Fiscal Year 2018-19 Low Carbon Transit Operations Program.

Please contact John Bodolay by telephone at (916) 323-2154 or by email at jbodolay@sco.ca.gov with any questions or for additional information.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By

DEBRA MORTON, Manager
Local Apportionments Section

Enclosures

STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE
LOW CARBON TRANSIT OPERATIONS PROGRAM
ELIGIBLE ALLOCATION FISCAL YEAR 2018-2019 SUMMARY

<u>Regional Entity</u>	<u>PUC 99313 Fiscal Year 2018-19 Eligible Allocation</u>	<u>PUC 99314 Fiscal Year 2018-19 Eligible Allocation</u>	<u>Total Fiscal Year 2018-19 Eligible Allocation</u>
	A	B	C= (A + B)
Metropolitan Transportation Commission	\$ 14,354,475	\$ 39,704,139	\$ 54,058,614
Sacramento Area Council of Governments	3,550,924	1,323,835	4,874,759
San Diego Association of Governments	1,780,676	465,869	2,246,545
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System	4,382,965	1,865,119	6,248,084
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	192,120	8,389	200,509
Alpine County Transportation Commission	2,131	88	2,219
Amador County Transportation Commission	70,352	13,230	83,582
Butte County Association of Governments	420,372	23,207	443,579
Calaveras County Local Transportation Commission	83,396	1,313	84,709
Colusa County Local Transportation Commission	40,811	1,844	42,655
Del Norte County Local Transportation Commission	50,272	2,899	53,171
El Dorado County Local Transportation Commission	309,525	22,197	331,722
Fresno County Council of Governments	1,860,159	357,316	2,217,475
Glenn County Local Transportation Commission	53,181	1,394	54,575
Humboldt County Association of Governments	251,170	54,054	305,224
Imperial County Transportation Commission	352,046	38,119	390,165
Inyo County Local Transportation Commission	34,308	0	34,308
Kern Council of Governments	1,672,841	105,543	1,778,384
Kings County Association of Governments	280,091	12,797	292,888
Lake County/City Council of Governments	120,192	7,455	127,647
Lassen County Local Transportation Commission	57,087	2,270	59,357
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	18,992,070	24,248,664	43,240,734
Madera County Local Transportation Commission	293,447	2,354	295,801
Mariposa County Local Transportation Commission	33,481	1,081	34,562
Mendocino Council of Governments	164,918	15,173	180,091
Merced County Association of Governments	517,064	30,881	547,945
Modoc County Local Transportation Commission	17,752	1,669	19,421
Mono County Local Transportation Commission	25,527	37,088	62,615
Transportation Agency for Monterey County	818,655	269,586	1,088,241
Nevada County Local Transportation Commission	183,120	8,471	191,591
Orange County Transportation Authority	5,948,759	1,866,304	7,815,063
Placer County Transportation Planning Agency	565,683	106,714	672,397
Plumas County Local Transportation Commission	36,517	2,591	39,108
Riverside County Transportation Commission	4,461,805	725,555	5,187,360
Council of San Benito County Governments	105,431	2,184	107,615
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority	4,016,693	748,068	4,764,761
San Joaquin Council of Governments	1,401,255	337,282	1,738,537
San Luis Obispo Area Council of Governments	517,293	31,844	549,137
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments	837,448	214,899	1,052,347
Santa Cruz County Transportation Commission	511,315	427,786	939,101
Shasta Regional Transportation Agency	329,232	18,977	348,209
Sierra County Local Transportation Commission	5,923	431	6,354
Siskiyou County Local Transportation Commission	82,390	2,430	84,820
Stanislaus Council of Governments	1,026,131	54,530	1,080,661
Tehama County Transportation Commission	118,268	2,619	120,887
Trinity County Transportation Commission	25,181	1,153	26,334
Tulare County Association of Governments	878,774	93,370	972,144
Tuolumne County Transportation Council	101,094	3,576	104,670
Ventura County Transportation Commission	1,586,543	254,505	1,841,048
State Totals	\$ 73,520,863	\$ 73,520,862	\$ 147,041,725

STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE
LOW CARBON TRANSIT OPERATIONS PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 2018-2019 PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2018-19 Eligible Allocation</u>
Altamont Corridor Express*		
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency	\$ NA	\$ 56,855
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	NA	43,919
San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission	NA	200,044
Regional Entity Totals	0	300,818
Metropolitan Transportation Commission		
Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco**	1,922,701,386	26,366,085
Central Contra Costa Transit Authority	11,776,890	161,497
City of Dixon	107,734	1,477
Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority	5,512,937	75,599
City of Fairfield	3,574,163	49,013
Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District	127,650,347	1,750,475
Livermore-Amador Valley Transit Authority	5,211,206	71,461
Marin County Transit District	21,602,639	296,238
Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency	1,674,384	22,961
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board	127,623,810	1,750,111
City of Petaluma	632,515	8,674
City of Rio Vista	35,498	487
San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA)	30,770,489	421,957
San Mateo County Transit District	125,228,491	1,717,264
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority	456,606,000	6,261,458
City of Santa Rosa	2,596,440	35,605
Solano County Transit (SOLTRANS)	5,606,531	76,883
County of Sonoma	3,488,169	47,833
Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit District	26,186,190	359,092
City of Union City	1,686,347	23,125
City of Vacaville	406,623	5,576
Western Contra Costa Transit Authority	7,328,372	100,494
Regional Entity Subtotals	2,888,007,161	39,603,365
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency - Corresponding to ACE*	NA	56,855
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority - Corresponding to ACE*	NA	43,919
Regional Entity Totals	2,888,007,161	39,704,139
Sacramento Area Council of Governments		
City of Davis (Unitrans)	3,353,129	45,982
City of Elk Grove	1,680,981	23,051
City of Folsom	618,040	8,475
County of Sacramento	1,148,895	15,755
Sacramento Regional Transit System	83,685,695	1,147,585
Yolo County Transportation District	4,638,784	63,612
Yuba Sutter Transit Authority	1,412,866	19,375
Regional Entity Totals	96,538,390	1,323,835
San Diego Association of Governments		
North County Transit District	33,972,698	465,869

* The estimated available amounts to the member agencies of Altamont Corridor Express are included with their corresponding transportation planning agency.

** The estimated available amounts for Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, and the City of San Francisco are combined.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE
LOW CARBON TRANSIT OPERATIONS PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 2018-2019 PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

P14

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2018-19 Eligible Allocation</u>
San Diego Metropolitan Transit System		
San Diego MTS	35,421,645	485,739
San Diego Transit Corporation	55,911,739	766,720
San Diego Trolley, Inc.	44,677,168	612,660
Regional Entity Totals	136,010,552	1,865,119
Southern California Regional Rail Authority***		
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	NA	1,589,853
Orange County Transportation Authority	NA	704,087
Riverside County Transportation Commission	NA	338,527
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority	NA	349,529
Ventura County Transportation Commission	NA	161,248
Regional Entity Totals	0	3,143,244
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency		
Tahoe Transportation District	611,743	8,389
Alpine County Transportation Commission		
County of Alpine	6,405	88
Amador County Transportation Commission		
Amador Regional Transit System	964,773	13,230
Butte County Association of Governments		
Butte Regional Transit	1,672,658	22,937
City of Gridley - Specialized Service	19,669	270
Regional Entity Totals	1,692,327	23,207
Calaveras County Local Transportation Commission		
County of Calaveras	95,736	1,313
Colusa County Local Transportation Commission		
County of Colusa	134,485	1,844
Del Norte County Local Transportation Commission		
Redwood Coast Transit Authority	211,415	2,899
El Dorado County Local Transportation Commission		
El Dorado County Transit Authority	1,618,665	22,197

*** The estimated available amounts to the member agencies of Southern California Regional Rail Authority are included with their corresponding transportation planning agency.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE
LOW CARBON TRANSIT OPERATIONS PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 2018-2019 PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2018-19 Eligible Allocation</u>
Fresno County Council of Governments		
City of Clovis	1,602,042	21,969
City of Fresno	22,984,844	315,192
Fresno County Rural Transit Agency	1,469,792	20,155
Regional Entity Totals	26,056,678	357,316
Glenn County Local Transportation Commission		
County of Glenn	101,636	1,394
Humboldt County Association of Governments		
City of Arcata	245,498	3,367
City of Blue Lake	0	0
City of Eureka	668,155	9,162
City of Fortuna - Specialized Service	26,278	360
Humboldt Transit Authority	3,001,863	41,165
Regional Entity Totals	3,941,794	54,054
Imperial County Transportation Commission		
Imperial County Transportation Commission (ICTC)	2,742,059	37,602
Quechan Indian Tribe	37,678	517
Regional Entity Totals	2,779,737	38,119
Inyo County Local Transportation Commission	None	None
Kern Council of Governments		
City of Arvin	54,160	743
City of California City	22,791	313
City of Delano	171,562	2,353
Golden Empire Transit District	5,216,607	71,534
County of Kern	1,265,929	17,360
City of McFarland	16,480	226
City of Ridgecrest	372,125	5,103
City of Shafter	57,040	782
City of Taft	354,385	4,860
City of Tehachapi	23,960	329
City of Wasco	141,482	1,940
Regional Entity Totals	7,696,521	105,543
Kings County Association of Governments		
City of Corcoran	90,008	1,234
Kings County Area Public Transit Agency	843,214	11,563
Regional Entity Totals	933,222	12,797
Lake County/City Council of Governments		
Lake Transit Authority	543,639	7,455
Lassen County Local Transportation Commission		
County of Lassen	165,544	2,270

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE
LOW CARBON TRANSIT OPERATIONS PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 2018-2019 PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2018-19 Eligible Allocation</u>
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority		
Antelope Valley Transit Authority	17,661,942	242,199
City of Arcadia	1,503,070	20,612
City of Claremont	536,755	7,361
City of Commerce	2,257,290	30,954
City of Culver City	12,371,573	169,652
Foothill Transit Zone	58,142,008	797,304
City of Gardena	13,126,661	180,006
City of La Mirada	731,706	10,034
Long Beach Public Transportation Company	53,395,698	732,217
City of Los Angeles	86,605,504	1,187,625
County of Los Angeles	25,318,527	347,194
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority	1,284,967,738	17,620,818
City of Montebello	17,241,955	236,440
City of Norwalk	7,822,560	107,271
City of Redondo Beach	2,677,120	36,711
City of Santa Clarita	19,254,675	264,040
City of Santa Monica	45,735,978	627,179
Southern California Regional Rail Authority***	229,215,711	NA
City of Torrance	3,003,977	41,194
Regional Entity Subtotals	1,881,570,448	22,658,811
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority - Corresponding to SCRRRA***	NA	1,589,853
Regional Entity Totals	1,881,570,448	24,248,664
Madera County Local Transportation Commission		
City of Chowchilla	29,015	398
City of Madera	107,090	1,469
County of Madera	35,527	487
Regional Entity Totals	171,632	2,354
Mariposa County Local Transportation Commission		
County of Mariposa	78,847	1,081
Mendocino Council of Governments		
Mendocino Transit Authority	1,106,473	15,173
Merced County Association of Governments		
Transit Joint Powers Authority of Merced County	1,601,512	21,962
Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System (YARTS)	650,442	8,919
Regional Entity Totals	2,251,954	30,881
Modoc County Local Transportation Commission		
Modoc Transportation Agency - Specialized Service	121,702	1,669
Mono County Local Transportation Commission		
Eastern Sierra Transit Authority	2,704,577	37,088
Transportation Agency for Monterey County		
Monterey-Salinas Transit	19,659,094	269,586

*** The estimated available amounts to the member agencies of Southern California Regional Rail Authority are included with their corresponding transportation planning agency.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE
LOW CARBON TRANSIT OPERATIONS PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 2018-2019 PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2018-19 Eligible Allocation</u>
Nevada County Local Transportation Commission		
County of Nevada	442,738	6,071
City of Truckee	175,020	2,400
Regional Entity Totals	<u>617,758</u>	<u>8,471</u>
Orange County Transportation Authority		
City of Laguna Beach	1,506,307	20,656
Orange County Transportation Authority	83,246,339	1,141,561
Regional Entity Subtotals	<u>84,752,646</u>	<u>1,162,217</u>
Orange County Transportation Authority - Corresponding to SCRRA***	NA	704,087
Regional Entity Totals	<u>84,752,646</u>	<u>1,866,304</u>
Placer County Transportation Planning Agency		
City of Auburn	67,408	924
County of Placer	6,410,020	87,901
City of Roseville	1,304,523	17,889
Regional Entity Totals	<u>7,781,951</u>	<u>106,714</u>
Plumas County Local Transportation Commission		
County of Plumas	106,864	1,465
County Service Area 12 - Specialized Service	82,081	1,126
Regional Entity Totals	<u>188,945</u>	<u>2,591</u>
Riverside County Transportation Commission		
City of Banning	156,338	2,144
City of Beaumont	224,665	3,081
City of Corona	450,444	6,177
Palo Verde Valley Transit Agency	132,998	1,824
City of Riverside - Specialized Service	359,643	4,932
Riverside Transit Agency	15,107,301	207,166
Sunline Transit Agency	11,791,965	161,704
Regional Entity Subtotals	<u>28,223,354</u>	<u>387,028</u>
Riverside County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to SCRRA***	NA	338,527
Regional Entity Totals	<u>28,223,354</u>	<u>725,555</u>
Council of San Benito County Governments		
San Benito County Local Transportation Authority	159,244	2,184
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority		
Morongo Basin Transit Authority	952,534	13,062
Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority	550,923	7,555
City of Needles	63,807	875
Omnitrans	21,459,134	294,270
Victor Valley Transit Authority	6,036,365	82,777
Regional Entity Subtotals	<u>29,062,763</u>	<u>398,539</u>
San Bernardino County Transportation Authority - Corresponding to SCRRA***	NA	349,529
Regional Entity Totals	<u>29,062,763</u>	<u>748,068</u>

*** The estimated available amounts to the member agencies of Southern California Regional Rail Authority are included with their corresponding transportation planning agency

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE
LOW CARBON TRANSIT OPERATIONS PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 2018-2019 PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

P18

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2018-19 Eligible Allocation</u>
San Joaquin Council of Governments		
Altamont Corridor Express (ACE)*	21,936,599	NA
City of Escalon	52,421	719
City of Lodi	388,883	5,333
City of Manteca	117,760	1,615
City of Ripon	33,226	456
San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority	4,429	61
San Joaquin Regional Transit District	9,249,774	126,843
City of Tracy	161,209	2,211
Regional Entity Subtotals	31,944,301	137,238
San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission - Corresponding to ACE*	NA	200,044
Regional Entity Totals	31,944,301	337,282
San Luis Obispo Area Council of Governments		
City of Arroyo Grande - Specialized Service	0	0
City of Atascadero	42,800	587
City of Morro Bay	48,809	669
City of Pismo Beach - Specialized Service	0	0
City of San Luis Obispo Transit	721,384	9,892
San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority	1,358,259	18,626
South County Area Transit	150,950	2,070
Regional Entity Totals	2,322,202	31,844
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments		
City of Guadalupe	76,566	1,050
City of Lompoc	1,982,484	27,186
County of Santa Barbara	3,108	43
Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District	12,667,672	173,712
City of Santa Maria	843,464	11,566
City of Solvang	97,875	1,342
Regional Entity Totals	15,671,169	214,899
Santa Cruz County Transportation Commission		
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District	31,195,520	427,786
Shasta Regional Transportation Agency		
Redding Area Bus Authority	1,383,901	18,977
Sierra County Local Transportation Commission		
County of Sierra - Specialized Service	31,409	431
Siskiyou County Local Transportation Commission		
County of Siskiyou	177,193	2,430

* The estimated available amounts to the member agencies of Altamont Corridor Express are included with their corresponding transportation planning agency.

**STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE
LOW CARBON TRANSIT OPERATIONS PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR 2018-2019 PUC 99314 ALLOCATION DETAIL**

<u>Regional Entity and Operator(s)</u>	<u>Revenue Basis</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 2018-19 Eligible Allocation</u>
Stanislaus Council of Governments		
City of Ceres	60,925	835
City of Modesto	3,305,086	45,323
County of Stanislaus	559,730	7,676
City of Turlock	50,729	696
Regional Entity Totals	3,976,470	54,530
Tehama County Transportation Commission		
County of Tehama	191,016	2,619
Trinity County Transportation Commission		
County of Trinity	84,086	1,153
Tulare County Association of Governments		
City of Dinuba	238,592	3,272
City of Exeter	7,279	100
City of Porterville	813,111	11,150
City of Tulare	605,494	8,303
County of Tulare	1,130,012	15,496
City of Visalia	3,997,529	54,818
City of Woodlake	16,841	231
Regional Entity Totals	6,808,858	93,370
Tuolumne County Transportation Council		
County of Tuolumne	260,809	3,576
Ventura County Transportation Commission		
City of Camarillo	906,471	12,431
Gold Coast Transit	4,286,969	58,787
City of Moorpark	370,141	5,076
City of Simi Valley	541,598	7,427
City of Thousand Oaks	695,406	9,536
Regional Entity Subtotals	6,800,585	93,257
Ventura County Transportation Commission - Corresponding to SCRRA***	NA	161,248
Regional Entity Totals	6,800,585	254,505
 STATE TOTALS	\$ 5,361,382,030	\$ 73,520,862

*** The estimated available amounts to the member agencies of Southern California Regional Rail Authority are included with their corresponding transportation planning agency.