



## SACOG Board of Directors

Item #16-3-8  
Consent

March 10, 2016

### **Approve State Transit Assistance Allocation for Fiscal Year 2016/17**

**Issue:** Should the Board approve the Fiscal Year 2016/17 State Transit Assistance Allocation for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties?

**Recommendation:** The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee (GRPA) recommends that the Board approve the Allocation of State Transit Assistance for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties for Fiscal Year (FY) 2016/17.

**Committee Action/Discussion:** On February 17<sup>th</sup> of this year, the State Controller's Office (SCO) released the Department of Finance's estimated amount of State Transit Assistance (STA) as per the California Public Utilities Code (PUC). STA revenues are allocated to the region via Section 99313 and Section 99314 of the PUC. Section 99313 funds are allocated based on population. Section 99314 funds are allocated based on fare and other revenues reported by transit agencies to the SCO.

The STA allocation is funded through a portion of the sales tax on diesel fuel. These funds can only be used for transit purposes and are subject to variations in the price and usage of diesel fuel statewide. As there is often variation in the level of funding and the ability of operators to use the funds for operating purposes, transit operators are encouraged to use these funds for one-time capital expenditures.

The budgeted amount of STA revenue for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties for FY 2016-17 is \$7,531,583 of Section 99313 and \$3,888,280 of Section 99314 for a total of \$11,419,863 (Attachment A). The FY 2016-17 budgeted amount represents an approximate 16% decrease from the FY 2015-16 funding levels (Attachment B).

In a new development this year, the FY 2016-17 STA allocation only includes apportionments for the Section 99313 Population-based program due to changes in the Section 99314 Revenue-based program implemented by the SCO in January 2016.

At this time the SCO is providing the FY 2016-17 Revenue-based allocations only as regional totals. In past years, the Revenue-based allocations were apportioned to specific transit operators by the SCO. Pursuant to PUC 99314.3, the SCO is now requiring the RTPA to apportion Revenue-based funds to transit operators under its jurisdiction. For more information regarding changes to the STA Section 99314 Revenue-based program implemented by the SCO in January 2016, see Attachment C.

The recent action taken by the SCO does not affect the overall FY 2016-17 STA allocation for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties. The Section 99313 Population-based allocation will be apportioned as per existing statute. However, the FY 2016-17 Section 99314 Revenue-based allocation will be apportioned upon receipt of additional guidance from the SCO and in coordination with local transit operators.

In addition, SACOG staff is consulting with other RTPAs throughout the state regarding this issue. At the time of this report, all of the agencies contacted are awaiting further clarification from the SCO prior to apportioning the FY 2016-17 Revenue-based allocations. The only guidance provided by the SCO at this point is that the recent changes are not applicable to prior FYs STA 99314 apportionments. Staff will return to the Board as soon as possible to issue apportionments for the FY2016-17 Revenue-based program upon receipt of additional guidance from the SCO.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:AZ:ts  
Attachments

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Manager of Policy and Administration, (916) 340-6247  
Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
Azadeh Doherty, Senior Analyst, (916) 340-6279  
Anthony Zepeda, Associate Analyst, (916) 340-6220

**February 2016**  
**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS**  
**Regional Share of Statewide PUC Allocation: \$315,169,000**  
**ALLOCATION OF STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE FUNDS (STA)**  
**FY 2016-17**  
**PUBLIC UTILITY CODE SECTION 99313 & 99314**

Attachment A

JURISDICTION	POPULATION <sup>1/</sup>	POPULATION AS A % OF TOTAL	ALLOCATION PUC 99313 <sup>2/</sup>	ALLOCATION PUC 99314* <sup>2/</sup>	STA Total
<b>SACRAMENTO COUNTY</b>					
Unincorporated	573,313	30.98%	\$2,333,614	TBD	\$2,333,614
Citrus Heights	85,147	4.60%	\$346,583		\$346,583
Elk Grove	162,899	8.80%	\$663,064	TBD	\$663,064
Folsom	74,909	4.05%	\$304,910	TBD	\$304,910
Galt	24,607	1.33%	\$100,160		\$100,160
Isleton	820	0.04%	\$3,338		\$3,338
Rancho Cordova	69,112	3.74%	\$281,314	4/	\$281,314
Sacramento	480,105	25.95%	\$1,954,220	4/	\$1,954,220
Sacramento Regional Transit District	NA	NA	NA	TBD	\$0
<b>YOLO COUNTY</b>					
Unincorporated	26,885	1.45%	\$109,433		\$109,433
Davis	66,757	3.61%	\$271,728	TBD	\$271,728
West Sacramento	51,272	2.77%	\$208,698		\$208,698
Winters	6,954	0.38%	\$28,306		\$28,306
Woodland	57,525	3.11%	\$234,150		\$234,150
Yolo County Transportation District	NA	NA	NA	TBD	\$0
<b>SUTTER COUNTY</b>					
Unincorporated	21,039	1.14%	\$85,637	5/	\$85,637
Live Oak	8,546	0.46%	\$34,786	5/	\$34,786
Yuba City	66,363	3.59%	\$270,124	5/	\$270,124
<b>YUBA COUNTY</b>					
Unincorporated	58,588	3.17%	\$238,477	5/	\$238,477
Marysville	12,051	0.65%	\$49,052	5/	\$49,052
Wheatland	3,437	0.19%	\$13,993	5/	\$13,993
Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority	NA	NA	NA	TBD	\$0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,850,329</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$7,531,583</b>	<b>6/</b>	<b>\$3,888,280</b>

County of Sacramento Total	\$2,333,614
Rancho Cordova Total	\$281,314
Sacramento Total	\$1,954,220
Available to SRTD	\$4,443,133
Available to County of Sacramento	\$126,015
Available to Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority	\$692,069

% in RT District	Transfer to SRTD
94.6%	\$2,207,599
100.0%	\$281,314
100.0%	\$1,954,220

<b>Sacramento County</b>	<b>\$126,015</b>
--------------------------	------------------

- Sources: Report E-5, Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, 1/1/2015
- Entire amount must be used for transportation planning and mass transportation purposes.
- 94.6% is reserved for Sacramento Regional Transit District.
- 100% is reserved for Sacramento Regional Transit District.
- 100% is reserved for Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority.
- This is the total PUC Section 99313 Allocation to SACOG for the fiscal year

# TDA State Transit Assistance History

Attachment B

## PUC Section 99313 Historical Total Allocations

Jurisdiction	2016/17	2015/16	2014/15	2013/14
<b>SACRAMENTO COUNTY</b>				
Unincorporated	\$2,333,614	\$2,867,995	\$2,774,401	\$2,916,365
Citrus Heights	\$346,583	\$427,568	\$414,423	\$436,309
Elk Grove	\$663,064	\$812,655	\$781,599	\$811,110
Folsom	\$304,910	\$374,314	\$355,211	\$378,281
Galt	\$100,160	\$122,838	\$118,831	\$125,232
Isleton	\$3,338	\$4,122	\$4,004	\$4,213
Rancho Cordova	\$281,314	\$343,085	\$328,841	\$343,784
Sacramento	\$1,954,220	\$2,402,856	\$2,326,553	\$2,449,691
<b>SUTTER COUNTY</b>				
Unincorporated	\$85,637	\$109,112	\$106,469	\$111,926
Live Oak	\$34,786	\$42,891	\$40,983	\$42,897
Yuba City	\$270,124	\$332,151	\$323,505	\$339,660
<b>YOLO COUNTY</b>				
Unincorporated	\$109,433	\$124,851	\$123,750	\$131,619
Davis	\$271,728	\$337,102	\$326,600	\$338,370
West Sacramento	\$208,698	\$257,095	\$247,932	\$256,394
Winters	\$28,306	\$35,295	\$34,266	\$35,573
Woodland	\$234,150	\$289,396	\$279,613	\$289,444
<b>YUBA COUNTY</b>				
Unincorporated	\$238,477	\$292,987	\$283,485	\$296,705
Marysville	\$49,052	\$62,033	\$60,189	\$62,959
Wheatland	\$13,993	\$17,678	\$17,163	\$18,044
<b>Totals</b>	\$7,531,583 -18.63%	\$9,256,024 3.44%	\$8,947,818 -4.69%	\$9,388,576

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>2016/17*</b>	<b>2015/16</b>	<b>2014/15</b>	<b>2013/14</b>
<b>City of Elk Grove</b>	TBD	\$111,612	\$106,312	\$96,934
<b>City of Folsom</b>	TBD	\$22,127	\$25,109	\$44,561
<b>Sacramento Regional Transit District</b>	TBD	\$3,890,669	\$3,589,072	\$3,977,004
<b>Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority</b>	TBD	\$75,370	\$77,498	\$80,051
<b>City of Davis</b>	TBD	\$142,612	\$141,316	\$143,654
<b>Yolo County Transportation District</b>	TBD	\$203,485	\$140,588	\$213,026
<b>City of Folsom - Specialized Service</b>	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Paratransit Inc. CSTA - Specialized Service</b>	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>County of Sacramento</b>	TBD	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$3,888,280</b> -12.54%	<b>\$4,445,875</b> 8.97%	<b>\$4,079,895</b> -10.43%	<b>\$4,555,230</b>

\*Section 99314 Apportionment to be determined upon receipt of additional information and guidance received from the State Controller's Office

**Summary of SCO Revisions to the STA Section 99314 Revenue-based program:**

- a. Section 99314 allocations are now being provided to Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) as regional totals. In the past allocations, the Revenue-based funding estimates were apportioned by the SCO to specific transit operators. Pursuant to PUC 99314.3, the SCO is now requiring the RTPA to apportion Revenue-based funds to transit operators under its jurisdiction. There are no current processes in place for RTPAs to apportion Section 99314 Revenue-based STA allocations. State RTPAs are looking to the SCO for guidance on this matter.
  
- b. The SCO changed their method for calculating transit operator revenue. In the zero-sum transportation funding world, this has resulted in some regions (and specific transit operators) seeing an increase in their percentage of STA funds relative to the rest of the state while other regions are seeing a decrease. While the overall effect is minimal in smaller regions, transit operators and agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area and Los Angeles County are seeing significant changes in STA funding levels. RTPAs in these regions are not apportioning the FY 2016-17 funds until additional direction is provided by the SCO.
  
- c. The SCO has added additional transit operators in its calculation of the eligible Revenue-based allocation for each region in the state. The SCO added these additional transit entities without first establishing a clear and consistent criteria for their STA fund eligibility and possible level of apportionment. At this time, it is not clear if this will have an effect on how the FY 2016-17 Section 99314 Revenue-based allocation will be apportioned by RTPAs. It is expected that the SCO will provide guidance to RTPAs on this matter.