

REGIONAL TRANSIT ISSUE PAPER

Agenda Item No.	Board Meeting Date	Open/Closed Session	Information/Action Item	Issue Date
20	07/23/12	Open	Action	06/26/12

Subject: Expressing Support for Consideration of a 2014 Election Ballot Measure to Provide Local Taxpayer Dedicated Funds for Public Transportation Operations, Projects and Services

ISSUE

Whether or not to adopt a resolution proclaiming/expressing support for a 2014 election ballot initiative to provide local dedicated transit funding.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Adopt Resolution No. 12-07-____, Expressing Support for Consideration of a 2014 Election Ballot Measure to Provide Local Taxpayer Dedicated Funds for Public Transportation Operations, Projects, and Services.

FISCAL IMPACT

None as a result of this action.

DISCUSSION

On August 10, 2009, the RT Board of Directors adopted TransitAction, RT's long-range Transit Master Plan. The TransitAction plan provides a vision of public transit infrastructure investments and enhanced public transit service options over a 30-year period for the Sacramento region. In order to achieve the transportation goals outlined in TransitAction, a significant, new and long term increase in available revenue is required.

RT staff sought to gather information on the acceptance of a potential local tax program allocating funding to accomplish the timely delivery of public transit improvements described in TransitAction by the communities within the RT service area. Through RT's competitive procurement solicitation process, Smith, Watts & Martinez, LLC was selected as the consultant team, based on their staff's strength and combined team experience lead by DJ Smith; the team included Mark Watts and Juanita Martinez of Smith, Watts & Martinez, LLC; David Townsend and Jeff Raimundo of Townsend, Raimundo, Besler & Usher; Tim Youmans of Economic & Planning Systems; Jan Matthews of Data Research Inc.; and Jim Moore of J. Moore Methods, Inc.

Over a nine-month period beginning in September 2011, the consultant team coordinated with RT staff to review and discuss revenue projections, construction cost scenarios, opinion/focus group research, and public information outreach recommendations for consideration of a City/County transportation expenditure plan.

Approved:

Presented:

Final 7/16/12

General Manager/CEO

Senior Community and Government Affairs Officer

J:\Board Meeting Documents\2012\July 23, 2012\Dedicated Transit Tax.doc

REGIONAL TRANSIT ISSUE PAPER

Agenda Item No.	Board Meeting Date	Open/Closed Session	Information/Action Item	Issue Date
20	07/23/12	Open	Action	06/26/12

Subject: Expressing Support for Consideration of a 2014 Election Ballot Measure to Provide Local Taxpayer Dedicated Funds for Public Transportation Operations, Projects and Services

An overview of the consultant team's conclusions (Attachment A) will be presented by DJ Smith (Smith, Watts & Martinez, LLC), which addresses the consultant team's enclosed final report (Attachment B) recommending that the District work collaboratively with the California Department of Transportation, Sacramento Transportation Authority, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, County of Sacramento, and all the cities in Sacramento County in pursuing a 2014 election ballot initiative for the development of a dedicated public transit funding plan to meet the revenue requirements in the TransitAction plan and other local transportation needs.

RT Staff recommends that the RT Board of Directors approve the attached resolution in support of dedicated transit funding to provide and secure an additional dependable flow of public transit/transportation funding for the District.

Sacramento Regional Transit
Dedicated Transit Funding Plan
Final Report

**Presentation to the
Sacramento RT Board**

July 23, 2012

I. Goals and Objectives for Dedicated Transit Funding Plan

II. Consultant Team

- A. D.J. Smith, Mark Watts and Juanita Martinez – Smith, Watts & Martinez, LLC
- B. David Townsend and Jeff Raimundo – Townsend, Raimundo, Besler & Usher
- C. Tim Youmans and David Zehnder – Economic Planning & Systems, Inc.

III. Financial Considerations

- A. Revenue Projections – Accomplished by Tim Youmans, Economic & Planning Systems, Inc., with assistance from senior RT staff.
- B. Cost Considerations for Various TransitAction plan Scenarios - Tim Youmans
- C. Matching Revenues with TransitAction plan Program Elements/Project

IV. Summary of Preferred Option for Further Analysis/Voter Opinion Research

After a comprehensive search, research and consideration of several revenue options we kept coming back to the half-cent Countywide sales tax because:

- It was one of the few options that would give us a revenue stream adequate to finance enough benefits to impress voters.
- It could be “bonded” to access funding to bring benefits to voters years earlier than would otherwise be the case.
- The sales tax was familiar to voters for financing local transportation programs, and more politically and economically acceptable as the sales tax is largely on “disposable items”, not food, housing or medicine.

V. Sacramento County Transportation Voter Opinion Research Description

A. Voter Opinion Research Objectives

“To ascertain the openness of Sacramento County voters, at this time, to vote for an additional sales tax for new transportation construction operation and maintenance, with an emphasis on public transit investments.”

B. Description of Voter Focus Group Research – implemented by Jan Mathews, Data Research, Inc.

- Accomplished three voter focus group session in December 2011 and January 2012.
- One Group was drawn from City of Sacramento voters only.
- Two Groups were drawn from countywide voters.
- Voters were representative of a “highly likely voters” sample (voted in the last 2 elections), sex, party registration and age.
- Each of the sessions started at 6:00p.m. and ended at 8:00p.m.
- The Groups were facilitated by Jan Mathews based on a focus group “script” that was reviewed and commented on by the Consultant Team and RT senior management.
- The voter sample, script used in the sessions, the logistics of conducting the session and summary of results was accomplished by Jan Mathews.

C. Polling Description

The poll was conducted over the weekends of February 10 and 17, 2012.

It consisted of a 20-25 minute telephone survey of 800 respondents drawn exclusively from a sample of “highly likely voters” (actually voted in the last two elections) with a representative segment of Sacramento County voters based on sex, age, party registration and residence. The 800 sample was large enough to insure that we had an adequate size for each of the cities and the five supervisorial districts.

The poll questionnaire, sampling techniques, conduct of poll, compilation of poll results and conclusions were all accomplished by Jim Moore of J. Moore Methods of Sacramento

VI. Voter Opinion Research Results and Study Conclusions

A. Focus Group Research Results

1. In both the City of Sacramento and Countywide focus groups, “more potholes and overall road maintenance” were mentioned, without any prompting by facilitator as “things that you have noticed in your community that have gotten noticeably worse in recent years”.
2. City group gave public transit a “high” priority – (54% very high). Countywide groups gave transit a medium (33%) to low (33%) priority.
3. When asked “as the transit system exists today in Sacramento, do you think it offers a convenient lifestyle choice for all residents – or is it more of a social service for people who can’t afford car travel or can’t drive themselves?”, 93% of participants in both groups chose “social service”.
4. Open to the possibility of investing in the local transit service as a future need for more people, not just as a social service – voters said yes, BUT not right now. They particularly agreed by wide margins that there will be a “larger need for local public transit in the future to serve the aging population . (89%) and a “larger need for local public transit in the future as an alternative to continually rising gas prices”. (89%)

5. The Countywide sales tax ballot measure group supported the sales tax at 67% to 33% on the first ask.
 - They liked “taxpayer safeguards” such as transparent audits of R.T. performance on a tax.
 - They liked road maintenance, transit security, specific projects listed such as LRT to the airport.
 - They believe that if gasoline prices continue to rise, it could force them to personally use transit.
 - “As the baby boomers continue to age, more and more of our population will outlive their ability to drive themselves to essential services like shopping, health care, recreation and visiting family and friends. Do you think it is worthwhile investing in significantly more special transit services for seniors to help maintain a basic standard of living for seniors?” (66% agree)

6. All three focus groups opposed the idea of separating out the tax for just the City or just the RT District. The voters outside the City of Sacramento felt they would pay some of the tax, but get no benefits. The voters in the City felt they would be paying the tax, while “suburbanites” would enjoy benefits like LRT to the airport.
7. After strong arguments for and against the measure the vote went from 67% yes to 53% yes. In other words, a majority of voters were open to more investment in transportation, but they wanted to “wait and see” how elected officials will deal with serious budget problems, see how the economy improves, and of course, “can we trust them to spend the money the way that we, the voters, have been promised”?

B. Voter Opinion Poll Results

1. Transportation and transit as related to other high profile community issues are currently a lower priority than we have typically seen it. Not considered a “NOW” priority compared to the economy, jobs, crime and balancing local government budgets.
2. Dissatisfaction with local government officials is also lower than we have seen. This gets to the credibility issue, which is very important for a tax measure.
3. Initial Sales Tax Ballot Question: Shall Measure “A”, the Sacramento County Transportation Investment Plan, be implemented with a half-cent sales tax for 30 years to:
 - Construct light rail from downtown to the Sacramento airport;
 - Fill potholes and improve road safety;
 - Expand special transit services for seniors and disabled persons;
 - Improve bus services within and between cities;
 - Increase security and uniformed police officers on buses, light rail trains and stations;
 - Conduct annual independent audits to ensure funds are spend as mandated by voters.

To implement this program, would you vote “yes” or “no” on this measure?

SUPPORT.....64
OPPOSE.....31
NO OPINION....5

4. Specific Projects:

	HIGH	MED	LOW	NO OPIN
• fixing potholes and improving road safety.....	58	33	9	0
• expanding special transit services for seniors and disabled persons.....	47	38	13	2
• extending light rail to the Sacramento airport.....	39	28	33	0
• providing new commuter express bus services on major streets and freeways.....	33	37	28	2
• providing more park-and-ride lots at light rail train stations and bus stops.....	29	39	29	3
• increasing security and uniformed police officers on buses, trains and at transit stops.....	47	35	17	1
• improving lighting and making facilities more comfortable at bus and light rail stops.....	45	32	23	0
• Installing more security cameras on buses, trains and at bus stops and light rail stations.....	50	33	16	1
• constructing a new road connecting I-5, Highway 99 and Highway 50 between Elk Grove and Folsom.....	33	32	31	4
• requiring annual independent audits to ensure funds are spent as approved by voters.....	68	22	8	2

5. After hearing the project list in more detail, would you support or oppose increasing the Sacramento County sales tax by a half-cent for 30 years?

SUPPORT.....59
OPPOSE.....37
NO OPINION....4

C. Study Conclusions

1. The voters are not in the mood to increase taxes in the current economic climate to build future facilities like “LRT to the Airport”, but strongly support fixing problems (like road maintenance) that are immediate and will cost more to fix if they are left unaddressed. We would need to see numbers consistently in high sixties to recommend a ballot measure for a 2/3 vote.
2. Unlike almost all of our other voter research on transportation, the more specific we were, the less voters supported the tax increase.
3. Credibility of local elected officials is at a low ebb. We must see improvement if voters are to trust electeds with more dollars like another half-cent transportation sales tax.
4. Voters did feel they could “afford” to pay an additional tax, but not right now. Too much economic uncertainty, as well as trust issues at this time. This tells us that timing is a key issue and that we could come back later and receive a more positive response when they are ready to invest in the future once again.
5. Finally, it does not appear that a public transit only ballot measure would be successful. While the voters view transit as an important element in a comprehensive transportation plan, they want to see a balanced program, especially regarding their immediate concern about the deterioration of local roads.

VII. Plan Recommendations/Next Steps/Regional Transit Resolution

- A. Broaden the Outreach on the transit dedicated funding issue to include the Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA), County of Sacramento, all of the Cities in Sacramento County, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).
- B. Develop and Implement a targeted public Information program that targets major community and private sector interest groups, involving key STA/Public Works staff on transit/road maintenance needs.
- C. Immediately Begin Work on a “Consensus” RT, City/County Transportation Expenditure Plan funded by a wide range of funding, including, but limited to a new ½ cent sales tax and possibly development fees.
- D. Accomplish Legal Work on Legislation on Other Local Finance Options that Might be Considered in Future such as a Countywide development fee supporting Transit Capital and Operations needed to serve future growth, a sales tax “special district,” daily car rental fee at Sacramento Airport, a locally authorized VLF, etc.
- E. Draft Sacramento RT Resolution directing the Executive Director and staff accomplish to recommendations A - D above.



Regional Transit Attachment B

Dedicated Transit Funding Plan

Prepared for

Sacramento Regional Transit

District

Final Report

By

Smith, Watts & Martinez, LLC.

1111 L Street

Sacramento, Ca 95814

**Economic & Planning
Systems, Inc.**

2295 Gateway Oaks Dr, Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95833

**Townsend, Raimundo,
Besler & Usher**

1717 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Data Research, Inc.

1127 11th St., Suite 1050
Sacramento, CA 95814

J. Moore Methods, Inc.

1127 11th St., Suite 1050
Sacramento, CA 95814

May 2012

Table of Contents

- I. Goals and Objectives for Dedicated Transit Funding Plan – Pages 4-5
- II. Financial Considerations – Pages 6-14
 - A. Revenue Projections
 - B. Cost Considerations for Various TransitAction Plan Scenarios
 - C. Matching Revenues with TransitAction Plan Program Elements/Projects
- III. Summary of Preferred Options for Further Analysis/Voter Opinion Research – Pages 15-19
- IV. Sacramento County Transportation Voter Opinion Research Program – Pages 20-22
 - A. Voter Opinion Research Objectives
 - B. Voter Focus Group Research – Jan Mathews, Data Research, Inc.
 - 1. Description of Focus Group Methodology
 - 2. Discussion Guides Utilized/Profiles of Voters Participating
 - C. Voter Opinion Poll Research – Jim Moore, J. Moore Methods, Inc.
 - 1. Description of Poll Methodology
 - 2. Poll Questionnaire
- V. Voter Opinion Research Results and Study Conclusions – Pages 23-28
 - A. Voter Opinion Research Results
 - B. Study Conclusions
- VI. Plan Recommendations/Next Steps – Pages 29-33
 - A. Broaden the Outreach on the transit dedicated funding issue to include the Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA), County of Sacramento, all of the Cities in Sacramento County, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).
 - B. Develop and Implement a targeted Public Information Program that targets major community and private sector interest groups, involving key STA/Public Works staff on transit/road maintenance needs.
 - C. Immediately Begin Work on a “Consensus” RT, City/County Transportation Expenditure Plan funded by a wide range of funding, including, but limited to a new ½ cent sales tax and possibly development fees.
 - D. Accomplish Legal Work on Legislation on Other Local Finance Options that Might be Considered in Future such as a Countywide development fee supporting

Transit Capital and Operations needed to serve future growth, a sales tax “special district,” daily car rental fee at Sacramento Airport, a locally authorized VLF, etc.

- E. Draft Sacramento RT Resolution directing the General Manager/CEO and staff accomplish to recommendations A - D above.

Appendix A. - Sacramento Regional Transit District: TransitAction Plan Funding Options— Preliminary Calculations

Appendix B. - Discussion Guides and Informational Handouts - (Attachments)

Appendix C. - Demographic/Political/Economic/Career Make Up of Focus Group Participants

Chapter I

Goals and Objectives for Dedicated Transit Funding Plan

Goals and Objectives Dedicated Transit Funding Plan

“...to assist the Sacramento Regional Transit District in developing a plan for a dedicated transit funding source(s)....” *

*Introduction Section, A. RT Overview, page 2, RFP No. 2011057, July 2011.

Chapter II

Financial Considerations

Financial Considerations

Background

The Sacramento Regional Transit District's (RT) 2009 TransitAction plan laid the groundwork for a financing strategy to pay for the increased capital and operation costs associated with implementation of the plan's element. The funding strategy included a mix of federal, state, and local funding sources. The TransitAction plan highlighted the following potential new local revenue sources:

- Fares
- Sales Tax
- Regional Gas Tax
- Vehicle Levy
- Parking Charges
- Special Tax
- Rental Car Tax
- Hotel Tax
- Developer Charges and Access Fee

The current review of funding sources focused on those sources that provided the ability to fund the major elements of RT's service proposed in the TransitAction plan. Some of these other revenue sources could be considered to supplement the core revenue sources in the future. These are the key revenues sources evaluated:

- Sales Tax
- Property Tax Override
- Vehicle License Fee (VLF) Increase

Sales Tax Increase

A transit dedicated sales tax election requires 2/3 voter approval because the tax increase is for limited transportation purposes and is therefore considered a special tax. The sales tax was evaluated at different rates and covering different geographical areas.

Sales tax rate increases: ¼ percent and ½ percent

Geographic areas: Sacramento County, RT Service Area, and City of Sacramento

Property Tax Override

A property tax override election requires 2/3 voter approval, and property tax overrides are authorized to pay debt service only on General Obligation bonds (GO bonds); GO bonds are authorized to fund only capital improvements. Thus, if a property tax override was approved for transit capital improvements, an additional funding source would be needed to fund the increased operating expenses.

Revenues from a 0.01-percent increase in property taxes were estimated for the entirety of Sacramento County. Additional increments of property revenues are simple to estimate by factoring up proportionately to the 0.01-percent results.

Vehicle License Fee Increase

During the course of the study effort, the State considered possible legislation to authorize local option elections for an increase in VLF. Revenues from VLF increases of ½ percent and 1 percent were estimated.

During the course of the study, it appeared that the possibility of approval of the proposed legislation for a local VLF in the near term was diminishing. However, various statewide transportation interest groups are now actively researching a potential 1% VLF for transportation funding that may appear on a future statewide ballot measure, which would require a simple majority vote.

Revenue Projections

Table 1 shows the annual revenue projections for the sales tax increases, property tax override, and VLF increase. Calculations for the sales tax and VLF were made for 2011 and 2020 to reflect the increased population growth in the region. Property tax override revenues in the future were not estimated because it is far more speculative to estimate both population growth and property value increases. All revenue projections are estimated in 2011 dollar with no adjustment for inflation. Capital and operating costs are stated in 2011 dollars for consistency later in this report. Detailed calculations on these revenues sources can be found in **Appendix A**.

In reviewing the sales tax estimates, the smaller the area of taxation, the smaller the tax base. The countywide sales tax increase produces the greatest amount of funding. A sales tax increase in the RT service area would produce 75 percent of the revenue at the same tax level, and a sales tax increase in the City of Sacramento would produce only about 50 percent of the revenue.

The property tax override can be implemented only on a countywide or citywide basis. A property tax override just in the City of Sacramento was not calculated but would likely produce about 50 percent of the revenue that a tax countywide would.

Because a local option VLF increase requires new legislation, it is not clear which local entities could authorize such a fee increase. As a result, no smaller geographic zones were calculated.

Table 1
Sacramento RT TransitAction Plan Funding Options
Summary of Funding Options

Item	Most Recent Year	2020
SCENARIO 1: SALES TAX INCREASE		
	<u>2011</u>	
Sacramento County		
1/4 cent increase	\$42,900,000	\$48,910,000
1/2 cent increase	\$85,800,000	\$97,820,000
RT Service Area		
1/4 cent increase	\$32,270,000	\$36,790,000
1/2 cent increase	\$64,540,000	\$73,580,000
City of Sacramento		
1/4 cent increase	\$22,950,000	\$26,160,000
1/2 cent increase	\$45,900,000	\$52,330,000
SCENARIO 2: VLF INCREASE		
	<u>2010</u>	
Sacramento County		
1/2% increase	\$57,900,000	\$66,900,000
1% increase	\$115,700,000	\$133,900,000
SCENARIO 3: PROPERTY TAX OVERRIDE		
	<u>2009</u>	
Sacramento County: 0.01% Override		
Annual Revenues	\$12,800,000	NA
Construction Proceeds from GO Bond	\$171,000,000	NA

Revenue Sources Evaluated in the Focus Groups and Voter Survey

After the initial research was conducted on the possible funding source, RT staff and the consultant team determined the sales tax option was the best option. These are the key reasons behind this decision:

- Historical precedence in the use of local option sales tax increases for transit.
- Flexibility with the use of the funding for both capital and operations.
- Likely success in an election because the public is used to funding public transit with sales tax revenue.

Matching Revenues with TransitAction Plan Program Elements

Funding Scenarios

RT staff prepared a series of funding scenarios based on the amount of revenue generated from a tax increase, and whether or not RT used bond financing to accelerate the timing of the service improvements.

These are the sales tax revenue scenarios:

- ¼-percent sales tax increase
- ½-percent sales tax increase

These are the service implementation scenarios:

- Pay-as-you-go scenarios—in these scenarios, service-level improvements were made when there was available revenue to fund the projects without borrowing. In these scenarios, service improvements were delayed until funding was in place. However, because there was no interest on debt, more funding was available to provide service.
- Bond financing scenarios—in these scenarios, RT would finance the improvements through sales tax revenue bonds. As a result, service-level improvements would be implemented soon, but there would be less overall improvements to the system because much of the tax revenues would be necessary to pay debt service.

Availability of Revenue from a Sales Tax Increase

RT recognizes that any voter approval of a countywide broad-based funding mechanism for transportation improvements and services would require participation of other service providers. A revenue-sharing formula would need to be worked out between the service providers as part of the ballot measure.

Measure A, approved in 2004, provided approximately 38 percent of the ½-percent sales tax to RT. Sales tax revenues also were distributed to all other cities and Sacramento County based on the revenue-sharing structure built into Measure A.

In the two sales tax funding scenarios, RT assumed it would receive approximately 75 percent of the available revenues, with roughly 25 percent allocated to other transportation projects, including road maintenance, road construction, and transit projects not in RT’s service area. While the share of funding received by RT in these funding scenarios is significantly higher than the 2004 Measure A election, these levels of new revenues are necessary for RT to deliver key elements of its TransitAction plan.

RT assumed the following revenues stated in 2011 dollars from a countywide sales tax:

	Annual Sales Tax Revenues in 2011\$		
	<u>RT</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
¼-percent Sales Tax	\$32 M	\$11 M	\$43 M
½-percent Sales Tax	\$64 M	\$22 M	\$86 M

Projects Funded by Funding Scenario

RT’s TransitAction plan includes a broad range of projects to substantially increase transit services in the Sacramento Region. The range of major projects includes these:

Light Rail Transit Expansion—Green Line to Airport—A 12.8-mile Light Rail Transit (LRT) line from Downtown Sacramento to the River District (construction underway), continuing north across the American River to the Natomas communities, and extending to the Sacramento International Airport. LRT operates partially in mixed-flow traffic, mostly in exclusive right of way, and uses “European Tram”-type vehicles. Trains come every 15 minutes, from early morning to late evening.

Streetcar Projects—Streetcar projects in Downtown Sacramento and Rancho Cordova (similar to a Portland-type of streetcar project).

Hi-Bus (Enhanced Bus, Express Bus, or Bus Rapid Transit)—Bus transit with high frequency—10 minutes or fewer on main arterials; high capacity—more vehicles and seats; high quality vehicles and stops providing fast, reliable, and direct trips. At intersections and congestion points, transit priority measures speed journey time. Operates from early morning to late evening on the arterials noted.

Maintenance Facilities—Bus and Light Rail maintenance facilities required by and strategically located in the region to serve expanded services.

Other TransitAction Systemwide Services—Expansion of transit services throughout the region to provide a minimum of 15-minute service from early morning to late evening. In addition to these major systemwide improvements, transit expenditures would likely include these:

- Improved and expanded special transit services for the growing populations of senior and disabled citizens.
- Additional security cameras and law enforcement officers on transit vehicles and at bus stops and LRT stations, including more patrolling of the surrounding neighborhoods.
- Annual audits by an independent auditor to ensure all voter mandates are enforced.

Table 2 shows the major improvements that would be funded by each of the funding scenarios and shows the estimated year in which the transit project would start service.

**Table 2
Project Funding Scenarios**

Major Transit Projects	Scenario 1 1/2 Percent Sales Tax		Scenario 2 1/4 Percent Sales Tax	
	Pay-As You Go	Accelerated with Bonds	Pay-As You Go	Accelerated with Bonds
(other system improvements are included in each scenario)				
Light Rail				
South Line to Cosumnes River College	2015	2015	2015	2015
Green Line to the Airport				
Phase 1-To Richards	2012	2012	2012	2012
Phase 2-Richards to N. Natomas	2018	2017	2021	2017
Phase 3-N. Natomas to SMF	2022	2019	2031	not feasible
Streetcar	2024	2030	not feasible	not feasible
Hi-Bus (Includes Vehicles)				
Watt Ave	2023	2015	2031	2015
Stockton Blvd	2025	2016	2033	
Sunrise Blvd	2031	2017	2034	2021
Florin Rd	2026			
El Camino Ave	2027			
Marconi Ave	2028			
Arden Way	2029			
S Watt Ave	2030			
Maintenance Facilities				
Complete 2nd Bus Maintenance Facility	2019	2015	2023	2015
Second Light Rail Maintenance Facility	2018	2017	2022	2017
Other Growth in Systemwide Operations per Transit Action	2024	2026	2034	2026

Additional Funding Options

None of the funding scenarios described above completely fund the comprehensive transit program identified in the TransitAction plan. Additional funding sources will need to be identified.

RT needs to continue maximizing the amount of Federal and State funding it receives. Receipt of Federal and State funding requires a match of locally generated funds for both operations and capital.

In addition to seeking voter approval of a broad-based tax, such as the sales tax increases discussed above, RT should implement development impact fees and taxes/assessments from new development on a comprehensive basis to pay for capital improvements and operating costs.

RT presently participates in several development impact fee programs that have been implemented by the cities and Sacramento County. These programs have been developed project-by-project and are administered by the responsible land use agency. RT should consider adopting a development impact fee on a comprehensive basis. This is particularly important with implementation of the Sacramento Area Council of Government (SACOG)'s Blueprint land use program, which encourages a significant amount of in-fill development and discourages Greenfield development in the future.

RT also should work with the cities and Sacramento County to implement special tax and assessment districts in new development areas to assist in funding transit operations, particularly in areas that do not generate significant levels of transit ridership, until the projects reach buildout and the higher density of the projects are constructed.

Finally, we recommend that RT begin serious discussions as soon as possible with the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors and County executive staff regarding early implementation of one or more finance options for Sacramento Airport's contribution to the LRT extension to the airport. These finance options, such as a per day rental car surcharge, property tax assessment or airline ticket surcharge may require long lead times to implement.

Chapter III

Summary of Preferred Options for further Analysis/Voter Opinion Research

Summary of Preferred Options for Further Analysis/Voter Opinion Research

Background

This summary is a distillation of several hours of our “Roundtable Discussions”, involving the General Manager of Sacramento RT Mike Wiley, key senior RT management staff, and our entire consulting team, DJ Smith, Mark Watts and Juanita Martinez from Smith, Watts & Martinez LLC, David Townsend and Jeff Raimundo from Townsend, Raimundo, Besler & Usher, and Tim Youmans from Economic & Planning Systems, Inc. Through an iterative process, involving additional technical, planning, financial, legal and political information at each step of the discussion, we were able to come to some early conclusions regarding the best long term dedicated funding options for Sacramento RT. Each step of the way, we kept in mind how we could move progressively to fund implementation of RT’s adopted “TransitAction plan”.

In our initial discussions we considered to one extent or another:

- The perceived availability of private sector, local, state and federal to match funds generated by a new dedicated transit funding source of revenue.
- Every potential alternative for consideration of a new 2/3-voter-approved local sales tax dedicated to support RT’s capital and operating program, including but not limited to:
 - ½ cent sales tax for 10, 20 and 30 years.
 - ¼ cent sales tax for 10, 20 and 30 years.
 - Sales tax implemented either countywide, only in the RT District, only in the City of Sacramento, or in a new state-authorized “special district” with a specially crafted boundary for taxation and benefits.
- Potential new fees or assessments on new development, including changes in state law to allow transit capital and on-going operating costs to be paid for in areas of Sacramento County desiring new transit services.
- Imposition of vehicle registration fees now authorized in state law for support of local transportation programs (several California counties have activated such fees already).

- Imposition of local “vehicle license fee” or VLF that would equal ½ % or 1% of the vehicle of the vehicle paid at registration once a year to the DMV.
- Use of a currently state authorized “local option”, voter approved gas tax for capital support that could be put on the ballot by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, also requiring a 2/3 vote for approval.
- Implementation of a per day fee on all car rentals at Sacramento International Airport for use in constructing and operating the LRT line and station on airport property to serve airport travel.
- Potential use of design/build methodology for expediting and saving money for new construction on the LRT line to the airport. Saved money is just as valuable as dedicated money and could bring project benefits to the public earlier.

Each of these options was considered through the “critical lens” of our Roundtable group reality as follows:

1. Financial Realty – how much revenue is projected to be raised by each option, how does the revenue “match” other private, local, state and federal revenues likely to be available, are the benefits that each option “affords” RT likely to be significant enough to obtain the support of the local community, local policy makers, and if necessary, local voters.
2. Political Realty – acceptability by voters, special interest groups, and local elected policy makers. Is it possible for RT to get additional resources when local road maintenance and paratransit need additional resources as well? Can we pass new state legislation giving RT additional flexibility, if needed for various options?
3. Project Delivery Realty- how quickly could RT expedite the major capital projects like LRT to the airport – with or without use of federal funds? We know use of any federal funds greatly complicates and extends project delivery timing. Are there project delivery methods that could expedite project delivery like design/build?

Preferred Revenue/Program Elements

After a great deal of discussion and consideration of program and project options and associated costs, as well as revenue options and projections, the “Roundtable” group settled on the following options for further refinement, study, and eventually detailed voter opinion research. These options are meant to be considered as a single comprehensive set of dedicated revenue sources that will all be needed to play a role in funding the TransitAction plan over time.

Option I – Sales Tax

A ½ cent dedicated transportation sales tax for 30 years that would fund only three program elements:

1. The capital costs to build the “Green Line” extension from the Downtown intermodal terminal station to the Sacramento International Airport on an expedited basis.
2. A new program of city street and county road safety and maintenance to immediately begin the work to fill the potholes, rehabilitate bridges, and fix safety problems as well as keep local roads in good repair over the next 30 years.
3. Continuing expansion of paratransit services to ensure older seniors and disabled that can’t drive a car have transportation options in the future particularly as Sacramento County’s older senior population (people over 75 years of age) increases at an accelerating rate.

Option II – Development Fees

A Countywide fee on all new development that would provide new capital and a small on-going stream for transit operations in newly developing areas of Sacramento County. The fee would be used to leverage state and federal funds, and would be legally required to be spent by RT in the newly developing areas where the fees are raised and on a specified program cooperatively developed by RT, the local government jurisdiction in the areas, and the private development community creating the new industrial, commercial and residential development to be assessed.

The concept would be that transit facilities and services be considered as an integral part of local government approval of new developments, as well as environmental mitigation for such projects. The Countywide fee would require local governments to adapt a “minimum” fee for transit capital and on-going operations, but local governments and developers who meet or decide to exceed the minimum fees would receive “environmental mitigation credits” as a part of their required California Environmental Quality Act certifications.

In consideration of the exceedingly bad development market for all new development in Sacramento County at the present time, we would recommend that this new developer fee program not become operational until new building permits issued in the County equal 50% of a pre-recession three year rolling average worked out with the direct involvement of the development industry.

Option III – Airport Rental Car Fee

It was agreed that we would provide further consideration of a per day “airport transit fee”, on all vehicles rented at Sacramento Airport as follows:

A per day fee on all vehicle rentals at Sacramento International Airport dedicated solely for the construction and operation of the LRT extension and airport station located on airport property to serve the airport. These fees would need to be implemented by Sacramento County. The consultant team anticipates this would obviously be based on future discussions and agreement with airport management and the Board of Supervisors, but these types of fees on airport users are common place throughout the United States and should be seriously considered.

The “Roundtable” agreed that these three recommended options would be further researched, studied, and that the option requiring voter approval be moved forward for detailed voter opinion research work. The voter opinion research work authorized by Sacramento RT initially consisted of two voter focus groups. If the “Roundtable” found that the focus group results were positive enough, it was decided that we would then pursue a detailed, baseline poll on a sales tax measure.

Chapter IV

Sacramento County Transportation Voter Opinion Research Program

Sacramento County Transportation Voter Opinion

Research Program

Description of Voter Focus Group Research

As we approved the initial voter focus group sessions our research objectives were:

1. Listen to voter attitudes toward local government leaders who would be in charge of managing any new sales tax funds.
2. Listen to voters discuss what cutbacks in government services caused by the recession have meant to them – what were their priorities for overall funding relative to transit versus other major public services such as police, fire protection and education.
3. Listen to voter attitudes about Sacramento RT's services generally, as well as how they felt about the basic project and program elements of the TransitAction plan. We especially wanted to see if we got significantly different results from the 2004 sales tax extension polling and a poll conducted by Transit Marketing LLC/ CJI Research Corporation for Sacramento RT in October/November 2006.
4. Test voter acceptance of a new ½ sales tax for transportation and listen to their views on why they might support or oppose a sales tax at this time.

The focus group research was conducted by Jan Matthews of Data Research, Inc, a very experienced focus group facilitator and voter research person, who we have used extensively over the last ten years on transportation sales tax measure feasibility studies. Her ability to “open up” voters to frankly talk about their feelings about government, taxes, public transit and transportation generally greatly assists our effort to understand true voter sentiments, but also how best to talk about our specific transportation issues/solutions.

The focus groups were conducted in the City of Sacramento on December 13, 2011 and January 24, 2012. They consisted of 15 highly likely, experienced voters, and generally representing the appropriate mix of sexes, party registration, age, and incomes that could be expected to actually vote in a General Election in Sacramento County in 2012. We are attaching in Appendix C, the actual make up of each focus group session.

The sessions were conducted by Jan Matthews as “facilitator” and utilized “Discussion Guides” and informational handouts that are attached in Appendix B. The Discussion Guides were discussed and vetted by our entire “Roundtable” group for use in each session.

We will go into a detailed discussion of the focus group results in Chapter IV, but our Roundtable consensus was that focus group results were positive enough to merit progressing to doing a detailed baseline voter opinion poll.

Description Voter Opinion Research Poll

The poll was conducted, based on a separate procurement process, by Jim Moore of J. Moore Methods Inc. Mr. Moore has done over 60 polls in 18 different counties to determine the feasibility/viability of local sales tax measures for transportation purposes over the last 15 years. He is known for his total integrity and straight forward approach to any tax issue involving the voters. Mr. Moore is currently doing the polling for Governor Jerry Brown's revenue measures to be on the November 2012 General Election ballot.

The poll was a 800 sample size conducted by telephone based on a representative sample of highly likely voters throughout Sacramento County. The large sample size enabled the research to capture a large enough size to consider individual results by County supervisor districts, and the individual cities of Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Folsom, and Rancho Cordova as well as the City of Sacramento. The poll was conducted over the weekends of February 3 and 10, 2012.

Chapter V.

Voter Opinion Research Results and Study **Conclusions**

Voter Opinion Research Results and Study

Conclusions

The following are highlights of both the, two voter focus group sessions, and the poll conducted as a part of this research effort:

Self Interest in Transportation

A key variable in deciding voter intensity on transportation issues in how many likely voters actually commute to work and how long are their commutes. In Sacramento County, 54% of likely voters either do not commute (23%) or commute less than 15 minutes (31%) each day. This trend is continuing to go up as a larger proportion of the voters continue to retire, more voters are working at home or unemployed at the present time. About 14% of likely voters use LRT, RT buses or paratransit services “at least twice a week”, still a minor subset of likely voters. As regards their direct interest in the LRT extension to the airport, only 13% of likely voters go the Sacramento Airport at least once a month to leave or pick up passengers.

Countywide, City of Sacramento or just Sacramento RT District?

In both the focus groups and in the polling we did not see a significant difference in voter attitudes toward the tax increase or transportation priorities, in terms of Countywide, City of Sacramento, or RT District voters. In fact, in the focus groups, there was a marked opposition in terms of voters not wanting to be “left out or be put in” a smaller geographic area than the County as a whole. The voters that may be left “out” wanted the same “benefits”, and the voters that were left “in” didn’t want to pay for benefits that others in the County would enjoy.

Obviously, the much lower revenue generated by any tax imposed in a sub-area of the County is a big reason to not go to a sub-area election, but voters really felt that everyone in the County should be “in the boat together”, as far as who pays and who benefits from a transportation sales tax program.

Attitudes Regarding Local Government Performance

In the 25 years we have polled the “performance” of local government officials, we have never seen numbers as low as we have seen in numerous recent statewide polls and recently conducted local transportation sales tax polls (most recently in late 2011 in San Luis Obispo and Ventura Counties). Sacramento County is no exception. Only 32% of likely voters are

satisfied with performance of the Board of Supervisors and 42% satisfied with their city governments. Sacramento RT rated 44%. We believe the recent fiscal scandals in the City of Bell, as well as the constant drumbeat of information on the generous rules and costs of local pension programs has made the voters doubtful about elected policy makers protecting their taxpayer interests.

The agreement of voters to increase taxes for any public purpose is fundamentally based on their perception of the credibility of the elected officials who will be responsible for spending the taxpayer's money. These low numbers on performance indicate a serious perception of "non-performance" that can't be positive in any effort to go before the voters for more money.

Intensity of the Priority Toward Public Transit or the Transportation Issue

In past years, Sacramento County voters put relieving traffic congestion as a very high local priority, believing that Sacramento RT service improvements, especially LRT extensions, would help traffic congestion. They have been increasingly supportive of local road maintenance as well. Now, relieving traffic congestion is a relatively low priority (40% gave it a "high priority") versus improving the local economy (87%), improving schools (69%), balancing local government budgets (75%), and reducing crime and gang activity (81%).

When we drilled down more deeply on the transportation issue, only "maintaining streets, roads and filling potholes" received a "high priority" score over 50% intensity at 60%. "Relieving traffic congestion" (36%), "extending light rail train services" (38%) and "improving local and regional bus services" (32%) simply showed no voter intensity. This was our first strong signal that a public transit only expenditure plan for an added sales tax may not be feasible.

Need for "Star" Projects

In all successful local sales tax efforts to get a 2/3 vote, the expenditure plan, based on a clear voter understanding of the need, must meet the need "head on" with a set of projects and programs that the voters agree will substantially solve the identified problem. When we tested very specific projects and programs, other than "fixing potholes and road safety" at 58% high priority, all other projects or programs were as follows in descending order:

1. Installing more security cameras on buses, trains and at bus stops and light rail stations 50%

2. Expanding special transit services for seniors and disabled persons
47%
3. Increasing security and uniformed police officers on buses, trains and at transit stops
47%
4. Improving lighting and making facilities more comfortable at bus and light rail stops
45%
5. Extending light rail to the Sacramento airport
39%
6. Constructing a new road connecting I-5, Highway 99 and Highway 50 between Elk Grove and Folsom
33%
7. Providing new commuter express bus services on major streets and freeways
33%
8. Providing more park-and-ride lots at light rail train stations and bus stops
29%

It is now clear that traffic congestion may not be the important reason for supporting improvement of our public transit systems in the future. Lowering dependence on and the high price of fossil fuels, improving air quality and lowering greenhouse gases, and the overall aging of our population may be our best arguments for more public transit services. We will know our answer as the economy improves and we see if peak hour highway congestion resumes as it was prior to the onset of the recession in 2008. It was also clear that voters believe that airport users, not simply general taxpayers, should pay a much larger role in financing improved access to Sacramento Airport, such as the LRT extension to the airport.

Finally, to underline the credibility of government issue, “requiring annual independent audits to ensure funds are spent as approved by voters” outpolled potholes with a 68% high priority rating of things voters wanted to see in the ballot measure.

Affordability of a ½ Cent Sales Tax Increase

When asked “Could you afford increasing your local sales tax by one half cent?” The answer was 69% yes/can afford, 28% no/can’t afford and only 3% no opinion. This was one of the few positive answers we received, given the current condition of the economy of Sacramento County. It gives us some optimism that a 2/3 vote may be possible in the future, if voters are convinced of the overall need, believe the expenditure plan deals with the needs, and if they feel positive about the credibility of the elected officials, managing the program.

Model Ballot Question Results

Similar to the sales tax measure approved by Sacramento County voters in 2004, the consultant group crafted a “model” ballot question that was refined in the focus group sessions, and then used in the baseline poll as follows:

“Shall Measure “A ”, the Sacramento County Transportation Investment Plan, be implemented with a half-cent sales tax for 30 years to:

- Construct light rail from downtown to the Sacramento airport;
- Fill potholes and improve road safety;
- Expand special transit services for seniors and disabled persons;
- Improve bus services within and between cities;
- Increase security and uniformed police officers on buses, light rail trains and stations;
- Conduct annual independent audits to ensure funds are spent as mandated by voters

To implement this program, would you vote “yes” or “no” on this measure?

SUPPORT.....	64%
OPPOSE.....	31%
NO OPINION.....	5%

Reflecting the difficulty of winning 2/3 support for tax increases, the more information voters received as they progressed on the poll questionnaire, the lower the sales tax support became! This phenomenon was experienced in both focus group sessions and in the poll.

The consultant team’s best explanation was the fundamental impact of the economy that is still quite bad in Sacramento County, with talk of more state and local government worker layoffs. Voters today are willing to listen to long term needs, but only willing to pay for critically needed maintenance, not needed improvements like LRT extensions AT THIS TIME! We believe they will open up to transit improvements later on, after the economy improves.

At the end of the questionnaire, after a great deal more information, the sales tax result ended up at 53% approval. While starting at 64%, as the voters thought more about the issue, the more questions and reasons they had for not supporting it. Clearly, more information on the need is needed if a 2/3 vote is to be registered on a ½ cent sales tax measure in the future.

Voters Believe Local Road Maintenance is An Essential Part of a Sales Tax Measure

It is very clear to us in the voter focus groups and as well as the poll results that local road maintenance (“fixing the potholes”) must be a part of any voter approved sales tax measure to have a good chance at obtaining a 2/3 vote in Sacramento County. In the focus groups, whenever we asked voters what government services do they notice being cut because of the recession, the voters, totally uninformed and on their own, almost always mentioned “potholes” along with other services like schools, libraries, etc.

The voters in focus groups were quite aware that public transit also requires well maintained roads as do motorists. They were also aware that letting the roads go unrepaired would cost everyone more in the long run, and therefore, fixing potholes was a more immediate need.

Study Conclusions

Based on several quantitative and non-quantitative considerations, consultant team and senior RT staff could not recommend that Sacramento RT move forward with the effort necessary to put a ½ cent transportation sales tax on the ballot in the 2012 election cycle. The reasons for this conclusion involve many of the key voter opinion research results discussed in Chapter V that are pretty definitive that the time for a measure is not 2012.

In addition, in discussing a potential measure for 2012, the Roundtable simply felt that there was not adequate time to develop a consensus sales tax program, accomplish meaningful public education and community outreach on such a program once developed, and then accomplish the approval process required by state law to qualify a measure for the November 2012 General Election.

We then collectively discussed the “next steps” to assist in keeping the dedicated funding issue in front of voters, policy makers and transportation professionals in Sacramento County. The following set of recommendations in Chapter VI were the result.

Chapter VI.

Plan Recommendations/Next Steps

Plan Recommendations/Next Steps

Broad Outreach Effort

Broaden the Outreach on the transit dedicated funding issue to include the Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA), County of Sacramento, all of the Cities in Sacramento County, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

Consultant team to also work with RT to set a series of private individual meetings and group meetings as appropriate with key senior executives from each of the above organizations to brief them on results of the dedicated funding study, voter opinion research and solicit their input on “next steps” for 2014.

The consultants would also highly recommend a series of meetings with General Manager Wiley and individual RT Board members to brief them in more detail on our study efforts and solicit their views and input on “next steps”. Eventually, the meetings would be broadened to include Mayor Kevin Johnson, and other key elected leaders in the County such as Congress Member Doris Matsui.

Public Information Program

Develop and Implement a targeted public information program that focuses on major community and private sector interest groups, involving a “speaker’s tour” of key RT, STA and Public Works staff on transit/road maintenance needs. This program may also be broadened to include registered voters in Sacramento County regarding local transportation needs.

Consensus Expenditure Plan

Immediately begin work on a “Consensus” RT, City/County Transportation Expenditure Plan funded by a wide range of funding, including, but limited to a new ½ cent sales tax and possibly development fees, and airport vehicle rental transit fees. This work would be done in cooperation with the STA, SACOG, city and county transportation managers.

Further Legal/Programmatic Work

Accomplish legal work on legislative or other local finance options that might be considered in future such as a Countywide development fee supporting transit capital and operations needed to serve future growth, a sales tax “special district”, daily car rental fee at Sacramento Airport, etc. The RT executive team has made it clear that while an additional ½ cent sales tax would be a major focus going forward, we should continue to research as many other options as possible to get RT flexibility, if a new local sales tax does not prove viable in the future.

The consultant team, working with Sacramento RT senior staff would begin work on all the above recommendations simultaneously, as directed by the Sacramento RT Board of Directors as discussed in the proposed Board resolution on the following page. RT staff and consultants would also periodically report back to the Board of Directors pursuant to the draft resolution.

Proposed Draft Resolution for **consideration for adaptation** **by the Sacramento Regional** **Transit District Board of** **Directors**

Sacramento Regional Transit District: Dedicated Transit Funding **Resolution**

Whereas, Sacramento RT has had to endure serious budget cutbacks in recent years given less state and federal funding, as well as lower sales tax revenues caused by the long and deep economic recession impacting Sacramento County's current ½ cent transportation sales tax and;

Whereas, the TransitAction plan adopted on August 10, 2009 by the Sacramento RT Board, especially given the economic recession, still requires a significant, new and long term increase in available revenue to implement the financial cost of the TransitAction plan, and;

Whereas, the RT Board authorized the General Manager to pursue development of a "Dedicated Transit Funding Plan" to meet the revenue requirements in the adopted RT TransitAction plan, and;

Whereas, the General Manager/CEO through a competitive solicitation selected the consultant team managed by DJ Smith and including Mark Watts and Juanita Martinez of the firm of Smith, Watts and Martinez, LLC, David Townsend and Jeff Raimundo of Townsend, Raimundo, Besler & Usher, Tim Youmans of Economic & Planning Systems, Jan Matthews of Data Research Inc., and Jim Moore of J. Moore Methods Inc., and;

Whereas, the consultant team has produced a Final Report with recommendations on actions needed to move toward a “Dedicated Transit Funding Plan”, and;

Now, therefore, in response to the Final Report received by the Board on Dedicated Transit Funding, the Board of Directors hereby authorizes and directs the General Manager and CEO to:

1. Broaden the outreach on the transit dedicated funding issue to include the Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA), County of Sacramento, all of the Cities in Sacramento County, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).
2. Develop and implement a comprehensive public information program that targets major community and private sector interest groups, involving key RT, STA, and local public works staff on transit/road maintenance needs. The public information program may also involve direct communication with Sacramento County voters regarding transportation needs.
3. Immediately begin work on a “Consensus” RT, City/County Transportation Expenditure Plan in cooperation with the STA, funded by a wide range of possible funding options, but focusing primarily on a new ½ cent sales tax.
4. Continue to accomplish legal work on legislative or other local finance options that might be considered in future such as a Countywide development fee supporting transit capital and operations needed to serve future growth, a sales tax “special district”, a state implemented VLF or other revenue increases to finance implementation of SB 375 (Steinberg) on climate change, and daily car rental fee at Sacramento Airport.
5. Accomplish other research and appropriate community outreach to decide if these actions are prudent and should be pursued over the course of the next 12 – 18 months.

Further, the General Manager/CEO shall report progress on action items 1-4 above on at least a quarterly basis to the RT Board.

Adopted: _____ Date

Sacramento Regional Transit Board of Directors

Appendix A.

Sacramento Regional Transit: TransitAction Plan Funding Options— Preliminary Calculations

Appendix A.

Sacramento Regional Transit: TransitAction Plan Funding Options— Preliminary Calculations

List of Tables

- Table 1 Summary of Funding Options
- Table 2 Scenario 1: Increase Sales Taxes
- Table 3 Scenario 2: Increase VLF
- Table 4 Scenario 3: Property Tax Override
- Table A-1 Sales Tax Estimate: Sub Areas
- Table A-2 Supporting VLF Calculations: Sacramento County

Table 1
Sacramento RT TransitAction Plan Funding Options
Summary of Funding Options

Item	Most Recent Year	2020
SCENARIO 1: SALES TAX INCREASE 2011		
Sacramento County		
1/4 cent increase	\$42,900,000	\$48,910,000
1/2 cent increase	\$85,800,000	\$97,820,000
RT Service Area		
1/4 cent increase	\$32,270,000	\$36,790,000
1/2 cent increase	\$64,540,000	\$73,580,000
City of Sacramento		
1/4 cent increase	\$22,950,000	\$26,160,000
1/2 cent increase	\$45,900,000	\$52,330,000
SCENARIO 2: VLF INCREASE 2010		
Sacramento County		
1/2% increase	\$57,900,000	\$66,900,000
1% increase	\$115,700,000	\$133,900,000
SCENARIO 3: PROPERTY TAX OVERRIDE 2009		
Sacramento County: 0.01% Override		
Annual Revenues	\$12,800,000	NA
Construction Proceeds from GO Bond	\$171,000,000	NA

"summary"

Table 2
Sacramento RT TransitAction Plan Funding Options
Scenario 1: Increase Sales Tax

Item	Projected Revenues 1			
	2011	2020	2030	2040
SACRAMENTO COUNTY				
1/4 Cent Increase	\$42,900,000	\$48,910,000	\$56,580,000	\$65,450,000
1/2 Cent Increase	\$85,800,000	\$97,820,000	\$113,160,000	
	\$130,910,000			
RT SERVICE AREA [2]				
	[3]			
1/4 Cent Increase	\$32,270,000	\$36,790,000	\$42,560,000	\$49,230,000
1/2 Cent Increase	\$64,540,000	\$73,580,000	\$85,120,000	\$98,470,000
CITY OF SACRAMENTO [2]				
1/4 Cent Increase	\$22,950,000	\$26,160,000	\$30,260,000	\$35,010,000
1/2 Cent Increase	\$45,900,000	\$52,330,000	\$60,540,000	\$70,030,000

sales_tax"

Source: Sacramento Regional Transit, California State Board of Equalization, and EPS.

[1] Revenue projections are tied to projected population growth of 1.47 percent annually. See table below.

SACOG Population Forecast (MTP 2035): Sac. County	
2005	1,283,234
2035	1,986,543
Avg Ann. Growth Rate	1.47%

Projected Revenues [1]

[2] Includes City of Sacramento, Rancho Cordova, Citrus Heights and unincorporated Sacramento County. See Table A-2 for supporting sales tax calculations.

[3] RT Service Area sales estimated for 2011 by applying SACOG avg annual population growth rate between 2005 and 2035 to 2009 Taxable Sales.

Table 3
Sacramento RT TransitAction Plan Funding Options
Scenario 2: Increase VLF

Item	2010	2020	2030	2040
Statewide Average Value per Vehicle				
Average VLF Paid per Vehicle [1]	\$115			
VLF Rate [2]	1.15%			
Average Value per Vehicle \$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	
Projected Vehicles Subject to VLF: Sacramento County				
Base Year Vehicles Subject to VLF [3]	1,157,341	1,157,341	1,157,341	1,157,341
Projected New Vehicles Subject to VLF [4] 242,872	-	181,489	209,949	
Total Vehicles Subject to VLF 1,400,213	1,157,341	1,338,830	1,367,290	
Incremental 1/2% Increase in VLF: Sacramento County				
Per Vehicle (\$)	\$50	\$50	\$50	\$50
Gross New Revenues (Rounded) \$70,000,000	\$57,900,000	\$66,900,000	\$68,400,000	
Incremental 1% Increase in VLF: Sacramento County				
Per Vehicle (\$)	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100
Gross New Revenues (Rounded) \$140,000,000	\$115,700,000	\$133,900,000	\$136,700,000	

"VLF"

[1] From DMV Statistics for Publication, 2010. Reflects an average of trucks, autos, motorcycles, and trailers.

[2] The 2010 VLF rate was 1.15%. For 2011, the VLF rate has changed to 0.65%

[3] From DMV Forecasting Unit. Reflects 2010 calendar year figure.

[4] Associated with projected population growth, as forecasted by SACOG 2035 MTP. See Appendix Table A-2.

Table 4
Sacramento RT Transit Action Plan Funding Options
Scenario 3: Property Tax Override

Item	2009 Total Assessed Value	.01% Property Tax Override		.025% Property Tax Override		.05% Property Tax Override	
		Property Tax Revenues 0.0100%	Construction Proceeds from GO Bond	Property Tax Revenues 0.0250%	Construction Proceeds from GO Bond	Property Tax Revenues 0.0500%	Construction Proceeds from GO Bond
Sacramento County	\$128,023,447,000	\$12,800,000	\$171,000,000	\$32,010,000	\$429,000,000	\$64,010,000	\$857,000,000
							<i>"prop_tax"</i>
	Interest Rate	5%					
	Term	25	Years				
	Issue Costs	5%					

Notes: The initial data are from the <http://www.boe.ca.gov/>

* ATR: Statistical Reports on Property Tax Collected per County, 2005-2006 Secured Tax Data

Table A-1
Sacramento RT TransitAction Plan Funding Options
Sales Tax Estimate (2011): Sub Areas

Item	Amount	2009
<u>RT SERVICE AREA</u>		
Taxable Sales: 2009		
Sacramento County Total	\$16,563,853,000	\$82,819,265.000
<i>Minus Elk Grove</i>	(<i>\$1,296,072,000</i>)	
<i>Minus Folsom</i>	(<i>\$1,227,668,000</i>)	
<i>Minus Isleton</i>	(<i>\$8,129,000</i>)	
<i>Minus Galt</i>	(<i>\$114,728,000</i>)	
Subtotal RT Service Area	\$13,917,256,000	
Estimated Taxable Sales: 2011		
Growth Rate 2009-2010 [1]	-11.26%	
Estimated Taxable Sales 2010	\$12,350,172,974	
Growth Rate 2010-2011 [1]	4.52%	
Estimated Taxable Sales 2011	\$12,908,400,000	
Estimated Sales Tax Revenues: 2011		
<i>Sales Tax (1%)</i>	<i>\$129,080,000</i>	
<i>Sales Tax (1/2%)</i>	<i>\$64,540,000</i>	
<u>CITY OF SACRAMENTO</u>		
Estimated Taxable Sales: 2011		
Taxable Sales: 2009	\$4,949,165,000	
Growth Rate 2009-2010 [1]	-11.26%	
Estimated Taxable Sales 2010	\$4,391,890,000	
Growth Rate 2010-2011 [1]	4.52%	
Estimated Taxable Sales 2011	\$4,590,400,000	
Estimated Sales Tax Revenues: 2011		
<i>Sales Tax (1%)</i>	<i>\$45,900,000</i>	
<i>Sales Tax (1/2%)</i>	<i>\$22,950,000</i>	
	<i>"RT_salestax"</i>	

Source: State Board of Equalization, 2009 Annual Sales Tax Report,
Sacramento Transit Authority (STA), EPS.

[1] Growth rates mirror changes in STA sales tax revenue.

Table A-2
Sacramento RT TransitAction Plan Funding Options
Supporting VLF Calculations: Sacramento County

Item	Total
Assumptions (2010 Sacramento County)	
Vehicles Subject to VLF	1,157,341
Population	1,445,327
Vehicles per Person	0.80
Population Forecast (Sacramento County) [1]	
2005	1,283,234
2035	1,986,543
Avg Ann. Growth Rate	1.47%
New Population (Sac County)	
	<u>Total</u>
2020	1,671,976
2030	1,934,168
2040	2,237,475
Net New Population (Sac County)	
2010-2020	226,649
2020-2030	262,192
2030-2040	303,307
Net New Vehicles Subject to VLF (Sac County)	
2010-2020	181,489
2020-2030	209,949
2030-2040	242,872

"VLF_support"

Source: SACOG, California Department of Motor Vehicles.

[1] Table 2 of SACOG Adopted MTP 2035 (Appendix D) forecasts 1,986,543 people. The 2010 update forecasts 1.8-1.9 million between 2010 and 2035. This estimate relies on the 2008 report.

Appendix B.

Appendix B./Attachments

Voter Focus Group Research Discussion Guides and Information Handouts

Discussion Guide
Sacramento – Transit Tax
Group 2 – Sacramento County excluding City of Sacramento Likely Voters
Wednesday 14 December 2011 – 6:00 p.m.

Introduction to respondents:

- ◆ Moderator introduction/role
- ◆ Two-way mirror, observers viewing the discussion
- ◆ Audio/video taping for permanent record
- ◆ Participation – combination of dials & discussion
- ◆ Not a consensus group
- ◆ Hold all comments during dial tests / we'll discuss after

1. Demographics

I'll start off by asking you to answer a few of the same demographic questions you were asked when we invited you to attend the discussion this evening—we will practice using the dials to record your demographic information.

[1.1] What is your gender?

- 1=Male
- 2=Female

[1.2] What is your age group?

- 1=25-29
- 2=30-39
- 3=40-49
- 4=50-59
- 5=60-65

[1.3] With which political party are you registered to vote?

- 1=Democrat
- 2=Republican
- 3=Other/neither democrat nor republican

[1.4] Which best describes your political outlook?

- 1=conservative
- 2=moderate
- 3=liberal

[1.5] How would you describe your ethnicity?

- 1=African American
- 2=Asian
- 3=Caucasian
- 4=Hispanic
- 5=Other

[1.6] What is your current employment status?

- 1=employed full-time
- 2=employed part-time
- 3=unemployed
- 4=student
- 5=retired

[1.7] If you commute to work, how do you MOST OFTEN travel?

- 1=carpool
- 2=bus
- 3=light rail
- 4=train
- 5=drive freeways
- 6=drive local streets and roads
- 7=don't commute to work

[1.8] About how long, on average, does it take you to commute to work each day, one-way?

- 1=30 minutes or less
- 2=31-60 minutes
- 3=61-90 minutes
- 4=91-120 minutes
- 5=more than 120 minutes
- 6=don't commute to work

[1.9] What is the approximate total annual income range of your household?

- 1=less than \$30,000
- 2=\$30,000 to \$59,999
- 3=\$60,000 to \$89,999
- 4=\$90,000 or more

[1.10] How long have you lived in Sacramento County?

- 1=less than 10 years
- 2=10-20 years
- 3=more than 20 years

[1.11] Do you own or rent your home?

- 1=own
- 2=rent
- 3=other

2. Voters' views on job performance of local elected leaders.

Our first topic of discussion this evening is your view of your local elected leaders.

[2.3] How would you rate the job performance of Mayor Kevin Johnson, overall?

- 1=excellent
- 2=good
- 3=fair
- 4=poor

*Why excellent/good?
Why fair/poor?*

[2.6] How would you rate the job performance of the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors?

- 1=excellent
- 2=good
- 3=fair
- 4=poor

*Why excellent/good?
Why fair/poor?*

[2.7] What improvements have you seen in Sacramento over the last 5-6 years?

[2.8] What has worsened in Sacramento over the last 5-6 years?

3. Voters' views on spending priorities for public transit in comparison to other important services?

Next I want to discuss your views on spending priorities for local services. In the current economy, many important services for Sacramento are competing for available tax dollars. Important services are currently facing funding shortages, including law enforcement, fire protection, transportation, public transit, schools, libraries, and parks. I would like to get your views on how you would prioritize spending for these important services.

Handout: Funding Priorities for Local Public Services

[3.1] What priority would you give to funding for law enforcement?

- 1=very high
- 2=high
- 3=medium
- 4=low

[3.2] What priority would you give to funding for fire protection?

1=very high
2=high
3=medium
4=low

[3.3] What priority would you give to funding for City Streets and County Roads?

1=very high
2=high
3=medium
4=low

[3.4] What priority would you give to funding for public transit?

1=very high
2=high
3=medium
4=low

[3.5] What priority would you give to funding for schools?

1=very high
2=high
3=medium
4=low

[3.6] What priority would you give to funding for libraries?

1=very high
2=high
3=medium
4=low

[3.7] What priority would you give to funding for regional parks, including the American River Parkway?

- 1=very high
- 2=high
- 3=medium
- 4=low

[3.8] Are there other important public services in Sacramento you would prioritize higher those on the list?

4. Voters' views on spending priorities for public transit in comparison to other transportation funding categories.

Next let's focus on transportation funding. Transportation services are divided into several categories by function. I would like to get your views on how you would prioritize spending for transportation funding.

Handout: Funding Priorities for Transportation Services

[4.1] What priority would you give to funding for local public transit bus and light rail service?

- 1=very high
- 2=high
- 3=medium
- 4=low

[4.2] What priority would you give to funding for intercity Amtrak rail passenger services between Sacramento and the Bay Area?

- 1=very high
- 2=high
- 3=medium
- 4=low

[4.3] What priority would you give to funding for high speed rail services between Northern and Southern California?

- 1=very high
- 2=high
- 3=medium
- 4=low

[4.4] What priority would you give to funding for local City street and County road maintenance and rehabilitation?

- 1=very high
- 2=high
- 3=medium
- 4=low

[4.5] What priority would you give to funding for State highway maintenance and rehabilitation?

- 1=very high
- 2=high
- 3=medium
- 4=low

[4.6] What priority would you give to funding for new State highway traffic congestion relief improvements?

- 1=very high
- 2=high
- 3=medium
- 4=low

[4.7] What priority would you give to funding for paratransit services for elderly and disabled persons who can't drive themselves?

- 1=very high
- 2=high
- 3=medium
- 4=low

[4.8] What priority would you give to funding for improved neighborhood bus services in your community?

- 1=very high
- 2=high
- 3=medium
- 4=low

[4.9] What priority would you give to funding for local on-demand shuttle bus service?

- 1=very high
- 2=high
- 3=medium
- 4=low

[4.10] What priority would you give to funding for high-capacity, high-frequency express bus service on major thoroughfares?

- 1=very high
- 2=high
- 3=medium
- 4=low

5. Voters' views of public transit, now and in the future.

Now let's focus on local public transit.

[5.1] How often do you use local public transit?

- 1=at least once per week
- 2=at least once per month
- 3=occasionally
- 4=never

If used: What do you use local public transit for?

[5.2] Have you ever ridden a local Regional Transit bus?

1=yes

2=no

[5.3] Have you ever ridden light rail locally?

1=yes

2=no

[5.4] One measure of the value of a public transit system is whether it offers a convenient lifestyle choice for all residents, rather than just being a social service for people who can't afford car travel or can't drive themselves. As the transit system exists today in Sacramento, do you think it offers a convenient lifestyle choice for all residents—or is it more of a social service for people who can't afford car travel or can't drive themselves?

1=convenient lifestyle choice

2=social service

[5.5] What is working well in the public transit system, as it exists today in Sacramento.

[5.6] What isn't working well? What are the problems?

[5.7] What would it take to get you to use public transit? Or use it more often?

[5.6] Sacramento's public transit system could be upgraded and improved to make it a real transportation choice that is frequent, clean, safe, convenient, reliable, efficient and affordable for all residents-- like successful systems in other major cities, such as Portland, San Francisco, San Diego and Denver. Do you think it would be worth the investment to make these improvements?

1=yes/strongly

2=yes/somewhat

3=no

Why yes?

Why no?

[5.7] Are public transit improvements worth the investment as a way to decrease greenhouse gases?

- 1=yes/strongly
- 2=yes/somewhat
- 3=no

Why yes?

Why no?

[5.8] Do you see a larger need for very localized local public transit serving neighborhoods in the future?

- 1=yes/strongly
- 2=yes/somewhat
- 3=no

Why yes?

Why no?

[5.9] Do you see a larger need for local public transit in the future to serve the aging population, as folks live longer and will not be able to drive themselves for as long as they live?

- 1=yes/strongly
- 2=yes/somewhat
- 3=no

Why yes?

Why no?

[5.10] Do you see a larger need for local public transit in the future, as an alternative to continually rising gas prices?

- 1=yes/strongly
- 2=yes/somewhat
- 3=no

Why yes?

Why no?

6. Initial support for proposed countywide half-cent transit sales tax measure.

Now let's focus on funding for public transit.

Local officials are considering placing a measure on the countywide ballot asking voters to approve a half-cent increase in the sales tax collected in Sacramento County, for 30 years, to provide funding to implement a Sacramento County Public Transit Improvement Plan in local communities and countywide.

Handout: Proposed Ballot Question – Sacramento County Half-Cent Transit Sales Tax

Handout: Visuals Packet

Take a few minutes to review this proposed ballot question, and then indicate whether you would support or oppose this proposal. And write a quick reason why you support or oppose.

[6.1] Would you support or oppose this proposal?

- 1=support strongly
- 2=support somewhat
- 3=oppose somewhat
- 4=oppose strongly

Why support?

Why oppose? Is the current state of the economy a main reason for your opposition? Is the affordability a main reason for your opposition?

[6.2] How long do you think it will take the economy to recover sufficiently for most county residents to feel comfortable supporting a local tax measure like this?

- 1=within 1 year
- 2=within 2 years
- 3=3 years
- 4=4 years
- 5=longer

[6.3] Which is your highest priority project on the list? (LIST AND TALLY AGREEMENT)

[6.4] Are there other transit improvements you would prioritize higher than the ones listed? Something you think would make your local transit system usable by more people, or make it more usable for you?

8. Voters' response to accountability measures and potential local benefits.

[8.1] Would you be more likely to support a local transit sales tax proposal if the measure included requiring annual independent audits to ensure funds are spent as voters intended, and an annual report to taxpayers on how the funds are being spent?

- 1=yes/great deal more likely to support
- 2=yes/somewhat more likely to support
- 3=less likely
- 4=would make no difference at all in whether I support

[8.2] Would you be more likely to support a local transit sales tax proposal if the measure included an independent taxpayer watchdog oversight committee monitoring how the sales tax funds are spent?

- 1=yes/great deal more likely to support
- 2=yes/somewhat more likely to support
- 3=less likely
- 4=would make no difference at all in whether I support

[8.3] Would you be more likely to support a local transit sales tax proposal knowing that 28,000 jobs would be created?

- 1=yes/great deal more likely to support
- 2=yes/somewhat more likely to support
- 3=less likely
- 4=would make no difference at all in whether I support

[8.4] Would you be more likely to support a local transit sales tax proposal knowing a measure like this will allow Sacramento to qualify for up to \$400 million dollars in federal matching funds, which will pay for 50% of these transit improvements, money that Sacramento would otherwise not receive?

1=yes/great deal more likely to support

2=yes/somewhat more likely to support

3=less likely

4=would make no difference at all in whether I support

9. Does timing of project delivery influence voter support for transit sales tax proposals?

Handout: Sacramento County Half-Cent Transit Sales Tax - Project Delivery With and Without Federal Funding

The list of projects included in the countywide half-cent sales tax plan we previously discussed ASSUMES receiving 50% matching funds from the Federal Government. Going through the application process for Federal matching funds delays completion of some of the major projects by at least 5 years. If Federal matching funds are not sought, the result would be fewer projects, but some remaining projects could be delivered years earlier. Take a look at the comparison in this chart.

[9.1] Having reviewed the differences in projects and project delivery dates, with and without federal matching funds, which option would you support?

1=countywide half-cent transit sales tax, including federal matching funds

2=countywide half-cent transit sales tax, without federal matching funds

3=neither

10. Final vote on transit sales tax.

[10.1] Now one last round of voting on the sales tax options. Take another look at the proposed ballot question for a Sacramento County half-cent transit sales tax. If this proposal was on the ballot, would you support or oppose it?

- 1=support strongly
- 2=support somewhat
- 3=oppose somewhat
- 4=oppose strongly

Why support?

Why oppose?

11. Voters' views on Vehicle License Fee to fund transportation in California in the future.

I have one more proposal to present to you, briefly, as a possible way to fund transportation in the future in California, statewide and locally.

The proposal is for a 1% increase in the vehicle license fee, which is collected when a vehicle is purchased, and then annually with the vehicle registration. The proposal would fund, by formula, state highways, local streets and roads, and public transit.

The VLF would be a stable funding source, dedicated to transportation purposes only.

It is fair because all vehicles would pay the VLF, including the increasing number of hybrid, electric and alternative-fuel vehicles, that do not now pay their fair share for maintenance of the state and local road systems.

The VLF is equitable because the money would be constitutionally dedicated, by formula, so that each geographic area of the state would be guaranteed a "fair share" of the funding. The formulas used for highway and transit are those already in use in state statute.

The VLF is financially equitable because the fee is based on the value of the vehicle. Taxpayers with smaller and older vehicles would pay significantly less than taxpayers with larger and more expensive vehicles.

The VLF is currently .65%. With the proposed 1% increase, the VLF would be increased to 1.65%--which is .0165. Here's how it breaks down: For every \$1000 in vehicle value, the annual fee would increase by \$10. So, the annual fee for a vehicle valued at \$5000 is currently \$32.50. With the proposed VLF increase, the vehicle valued at \$5000 would pay \$82.50—an increase of \$50. A vehicle valued at \$20,000 currently pays \$130—and with the increase would pay \$330—an increase of \$200. You've probably noticed when you register your vehicles, the value decreases every year, so the fee is highest on brand new vehicles, and decreases every year after that.

[11.1] What is your view? Would you support or oppose a proposal for a 1% increase in the vehicle license fee to provide a future source of funding, by formula, for California state highways, local streets and roads, and public transit?

- 1=support strongly
- 2=support somewhat
- 3=oppose somewhat
- 4=oppose strongly

Why support?

Why oppose?

Thank you very much for giving us your valuable time this evening to participate in our discussion. Please be sure to sign out with the receptionist on your way out.

First Name: _____

Funding Priorities for Local Public Services

V=Very High

H=High

M=Medium

L=Low

_____ Law enforcement

_____ Fire Protection

_____ City Streets and County Roads

_____ Public Transit

_____ Schools

_____ Libraries

_____ Regional Parks including the American River Parkway

First Name: _____

Funding Priorities for Transportation Services

V=Very High

H=High

M=Medium

L-Low

_____ Local public transit bus and light rail service

_____ Intercity Amtrak rail passenger services between Sacramento and the Bay Area

_____ High Speed rail services between Northern and Southern California

_____ Local City street and County road maintenance and rehabilitation

_____ State highway maintenance and rehabilitation

_____ New state highway traffic congestion relief improvements

_____ Paratransit services for elderly and disabled persons who can't drive themselves

_____ Improved neighborhood bus services in your community

_____ Local on-demand shuttle bus service

_____ High-capacity, high frequency express bus service on major thoroughfares

First Name: _____

Proposed Ballot Question – Sacramento County Half-Cent Transit Sales Tax

Shall Measure A, the Sacramento County Public Transit Improvement Plan, be implemented with a half-cent sales tax for 30 years to:

- Extend the Light Rail Transit “Airport Green Line” 7.6 miles from Downtown Sacramento to North Natomas (Phase 2);
- Extend the Light Rail Transit “Airport Green Line” 5.2 miles from North Natomas to Sacramento International Airport (Phase 3);
- Expand paratransit services throughout the County for seniors and disabled persons who can’t drive themselves;
- Maintain City streets and County roads and fix potholes;
- Implement Streetcar services in Downtown Sacramento;
- Implement Streetcar services in Rancho Cordova;
- Implement high-capacity/minimum 10 minute bus service on Watt Avenue, Stockton Boulevard, Sunrise, Florin, El Camino, Marconi and Arden;
- Expand bus services to provide minimum 15-minute service from early morning to late evening throughout the region;
- Expand transit security patrols;
- Improve safety and comfort for transit passengers countywide, (lighting, shelters, sidewalk extensions at bus stops, etc.);
- Improve local neighborhood bus service within the cities of Sacramento, Citrus Heights, Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove, Folsom and Galt.

Would you support or oppose this proposal?

- Support strongly
- Support somewhat
- Oppose somewhat
- Oppose strongly

Why?

First Name: _____

Proposed Ballot Question – City of Sacramento Half-Cent Transit Sales Tax

Shall Measure B, the City of Sacramento Public Transit Improvement Plan, be implemented with a half-cent sales tax for 30 years to:

- Extend the Light Rail Transit “Airport Green Line” 7.6 miles from Downtown Sacramento to North Natomas (Phase 2);
- Extend the Light Rail Transit “Airport Green Line” 5.2 miles from North Natomas to Sacramento International Airport (Phase 3);
- Expand paratransit services throughout the City for seniors and disabled persons who can’t drive themselves;
- Maintain Sacramento City streets and fix potholes;
- Expand bus services to provide minimum 15-minute service from early morning to late evening throughout the City;
- Expand transit security patrols;
- Improve safety and comfort for transit passengers citywide, (lighting, shelters, sidewalk extensions at bus stops, etc.);
- Improve local neighborhood bus service within the City of Sacramento.

Would you support or oppose this proposal?

- Support strongly
- Support somewhat
- Oppose somewhat
- Oppose strongly

Why?

First Name: _____

Sacramento County Half-Cent Transit Sales Tax
Project Delivery With and Without Federal Funding

<u>Projects</u>	Year of Opening	
	<u>With Fed \$\$</u>	<u>Without Fed \$\$</u>
Light Rail "Airport Green Line" Downtown to North Natomas (Phase 2)	2021	2017
Light Rail "Green Line" North Natomas to Airport (Phase 3)	2024	2025
Downtown Sacramento Streetcar Project	2021	2032
Rancho Cordova Streetcar Project	2025	2035
Hi-Bus Services (high capacity/10 minute minimum)		
Watt Avenue	2023	not funded
Stockton Boulevard	2027	not funded
Sunrise Boulevard	2029	not funded
Florin Road	2031	not funded
El Camino	2033	not funded
Marconi	2036	not funded
Arden	2037	not funded
Expanded Bus Service (15 minute) throughout region	2013	2013
System-wide passenger amenities and safety improvements	2013	2013

.

First Name: _____

Funding Priorities for Local Public Services

V=Very High

H=High

M=Medium

L=Low

_____ Law enforcement

_____ Fire Protection

_____ City Streets and County Roads

_____ Public Transit

_____ Schools

_____ Libraries

_____ Regional Parks including the American River Parkway

First Name: _____

Funding Priorities for Transportation Services

V=Very High

H=High

M=Medium

L-Low

_____ Local public transit bus and light rail service

_____ Intercity Amtrak rail passenger services between Sacramento and the Bay Area

_____ High Speed rail services between Northern and Southern California

_____ Local City street and County road maintenance and rehabilitation

_____ State highway maintenance and rehabilitation

_____ New state highway traffic congestion relief improvements

_____ Paratransit services for elderly and disabled persons who can't drive themselves

_____ Improved neighborhood bus services in your community

_____ Local on-demand shuttle bus service

_____ High-capacity, high frequency express bus service on major thoroughfares

First Name: _____

Proposed Ballot Question – Sacramento County Half-Cent Transit Sales Tax

Shall Measure A, the Sacramento County Public Transit Improvement Plan, be implemented with a half-cent sales tax for 30 years to:

- Extend the Light Rail Transit “Airport Green Line” 7.6 miles from Downtown Sacramento to North Natomas (Phase 2);
- Extend the Light Rail Transit “Airport Green Line” 5.2 miles from North Natomas to Sacramento International Airport (Phase 3);
- Expand paratransit services throughout the County for seniors and disabled persons who can’t drive themselves;
- Maintain City streets and County roads and fix potholes;
- Implement Streetcar services in Downtown Sacramento;
- Implement Streetcar services in Rancho Cordova;
- Implement high-capacity/minimum 10 minute bus service on Watt Avenue, Stockton Boulevard, Sunrise, Florin, El Camino, Marconi and Arden;
- Expand bus services to provide minimum 15-minute service from early morning to late evening throughout the region;
- Expand transit security patrols;
- Improve safety and comfort for transit passengers countywide, (lighting, shelters, sidewalk extensions at bus stops, etc.);
- Improve local neighborhood bus service within the cities of Sacramento, Citrus Heights, Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove, Folsom and Galt.

Would you support or oppose this proposal?

- Support strongly
- Support somewhat
- Oppose somewhat
- Oppose strongly

Why?

First Name: _____

Sacramento County Half-Cent Transit Sales Tax
Project Delivery With and Without Federal Funding

<u>Projects</u>	Year of Opening	
	<u>With</u> <u>Fed \$\$</u>	<u>Without</u> <u>Fed \$\$</u>
Light Rail "Airport Green Line" Downtown to North Natomas (Phase 2)	2021	2017
Light Rail "Green Line" North Natomas to Airport (Phase 3)	2024	2025
Downtown Sacramento Streetcar Project	2021	2032
Rancho Cordova Streetcar Project	2025	2035
Hi-Bus Services (high capacity/10 minute minimum)		
Watt Avenue	2023	not funded
Stockton Boulevard	2027	not funded
Sunrise Boulevard	2029	not funded
Florin Road	2031	not funded
El Camino	2033	not funded
Marconi	2036	not funded
Arden	2037	not funded
Expanded Bus Service (15 minute) throughout region	2013	2013
System-wide passenger amenities and safety improvements	2013	2013

.

Discussion Guide
Sacramento County – Half-Cent Transit Tax
Group 3 – Sacramento County Active Voters
Tuesday 24 January 2012 – 6:00 p.m.

Introduction to respondents:

- ◆ Turn off mobile devices
- ◆ Moderator introduction/role
- ◆ Two-way mirror, observers viewing the discussion
- ◆ Audio/video taping for permanent record
- ◆ Participation – combination of dials & discussion
- ◆ Not a consensus group
- ◆ Hold all comments during dial tests / we'll discuss after

1. Initial support for proposed Sacramento County Half-Cent Transportation Sales Tax.

Local officials are considering placing a measure on the countywide ballot asking voters to approve a half-cent increase in the sales tax collected in Sacramento County, to provide funding to implement a Sacramento County Transportation Investment Program.

Handout: Proposed Ballot Question – Sacramento County Half-Cent Transportation Sales Tax

Take a few minutes to read the proposed ballot question, and then indicate whether you would vote yes or no on this proposal. And write a quick reason for your vote. (Describe how to use dials—tally vote)

[1.1] Did you vote yes or no on this proposal?

1=yes

2=no

Why yes?

Why no?

Are there any changes that could be made to the proposal that might change your mind to vote yes or increase your support for the ballot measure?

2. Demographics

Now I'll ask you to answer a few of the same demographic questions you were asked when we invited you to attend the discussion this evening, and record your answers with the dials.

[2.1] What is your gender?

1=Male

2=Female

[2.2] What is your age group?

1=25-29

2=30-39

3=40-49

4=50-59

5=60-65

[2.3] With which political party are you registered to vote?

1=Democrat

2=Republican

3=Other/neither democrat nor republican

[2.4] Which best describes your political outlook?

- 1=conservative
- 2=moderate
- 3=liberal

[2.5] How would you describe your ethnicity?

- 1=African American
- 2=Asian
- 3=Caucasian
- 4=Hispanic
- 5=Other

[2.6] What is your current employment status?

- 1=employed full-time
- 2=employed part-time
- 3=unemployed
- 4=student
- 5=retired

[2.7] If you commute to work, how do you MOST OFTEN travel?

- 1=carpool
- 2=bus
- 3=light rail
- 4=train
- 5=drive freeways
- 6=drive local streets and roads
- 7=don't commute to work

[2.8] What is the approximate total annual income range of your household?

- 1=less than \$30,000
- 2=\$30,000 to \$59,999
- 3=\$60,000 to \$89,999
- 4=\$90,000 or more

[2.9] How long have you lived in Sacramento County?

- 1=less than 10 years
- 2=10-20 years
- 3=more than 20 years

[2.10] Do you own or rent your home?

- 1=own
- 2=rent
- 3=other

3. Voters' views on each element of the ballot question.

Now let's take another look at the ballot question you voted on earlier. I want to get your views on each element in the ballot question.

[3.1] Let's focus on the title and introductory paragraph: "Ballot Question – Sacramento County Half-Cent Transportation Sales Tax. Shall the voters of Sacramento County by adoption of a one-half cent sales tax for no more than thirty years approve a transportation investment program to:". Do you have a favorable or unfavorable response to this part of the ballot question?

- 1=very favorable
- 2=somewhat favorable
- 3=somewhat unfavorable
- 4=very unfavorable
- 5=no opinion

Why favorable?

Why unfavorable?

Can you suggest any changes that might increase your support for the ballot measure?

[3.2] Item #1: “Construct the next phase of light rail transit (LRT) from downtown Sacramento to the Sacramento Airport, with construction to begin within three years.” Do you have a favorable or unfavorable response to this part of the ballot question?

- 1=very favorable
- 2=somewhat favorable
- 3=somewhat unfavorable
- 4=very unfavorable
- 5=no opinion

Why favorable?

Why unfavorable?

Can you suggest any changes that might increase your support for the ballot measure?

[3.3] Item #2: “Fill potholes on city streets and county roads, rehabilitate aging roads and bridges and require each local jurisdiction to set local priorities for street & road maintenance.” Do you have a favorable or unfavorable response to this part of the ballot question?

- 1=very favorable
- 2=somewhat favorable
- 3=somewhat unfavorable
- 4=very unfavorable
- 5=no opinion

Why favorable?

Why unfavorable?

Can you suggest any changes that might increase your support for the ballot measure?

[3.4] Item #3: “Improve and expand special transit services for our growing populations of senior and disabled citizens.” Do you have a favorable or unfavorable response to this part of the ballot question?

- 1=very favorable
- 2=somewhat favorable
- 3=somewhat unfavorable
- 4=very unfavorable
- 5=no opinion

Why favorable?
Why unfavorable?

Can you suggest any changes that might increase your support for the ballot measure?

[3.5] Item #4: “Implement a new program of express, commuter bus services along I-5, I-80, Routes 50 and 99, and major arterials including Watt Avenue, Florin Road, Stockton Boulevard, Hazel Avenue, Greenback Lane, and Sunrise Boulevard between Watt Avenue and Florin Road, that compliments the LRT system.” Do you have a favorable or unfavorable response to this part of the ballot question?

- 1=very favorable
- 2=somewhat favorable
- 3=somewhat unfavorable
- 4=very unfavorable
- 5=no opinion

Why favorable?
Why unfavorable?

Can you suggest any changes that might increase your support for the ballot measure?

[3.6] Item #5: “Fund additional security cameras and law enforcement officers on transit vehicles and at bus stops and light rail transit stations, including more patrolling of the surrounding neighborhoods.” Do you have a favorable or unfavorable response to this part of the ballot question?

- 1=very favorable
- 2=somewhat favorable
- 3=somewhat unfavorable
- 4=very unfavorable
- 5=no opinion

Why favorable?
Why unfavorable?

Can you suggest any changes that might increase your support for the ballot measure?

[3.7] Item #6: “Require that the entire program be audited annually by an independent auditor to insure all voter mandates are enforced, and funds are used only for the purposes intended by the voters.” Do you have a favorable or unfavorable response to this part of the ballot question?

- 1=very favorable
- 2=somewhat favorable
- 3=somewhat unfavorable
- 4=very unfavorable
- 5=no opinion

Why favorable?

Why unfavorable?

Can you suggest any changes that might increase your support for the ballot measure?

4. Voters’ views of projects/amenities that could be added to the measure.

Measures like this one need two-thirds support of voters countywide to be passed into law. Voters will generally only support a tax increase like this if they feel the money will be spent on worthwhile improvements.

[4.1] Amenities could be added to improve the bus and light rail experience, including more electronic message signs, covered bus stops, sidewalks, lighting and comfortable waiting areas. Would you be more likely to support the proposed half-cent transportation sales tax measure if these amenities were spelled out in the ballot question?

- 1=yes/a great deal more likely
- 2=yes/somewhat more likely
- 3=no/less likely
- 4=would make no difference in my vote

[4.2] Partial funding, \$130 million dollars, is already designated for building a new high-capacity connector road between Highway 50 in Folsom and Highway 99 and Interstate 5 in Elk Grove, to ease congestion on Highway 50 through Sacramento. Additional funding of \$70-\$80 million dollars is needed to complete the entire road, connecting the Prairie City interchange on Highway 50 in Folsom to the Grantline Road Interchange on Highway 99, and to Interstate 5 at Kammerer Road in Elk Grove. Would you be more likely to support the proposed half-cent transportation sales tax

measure if it included \$70-\$80 million dollars to complete the new high-capacity connector road?

- 1=yes/a great deal more likely
- 2=yes/somewhat more likely
- 3=no/less likely
- 4=would make no difference in my vote

[4.3] Do you have any suggestions for other major projects to include in the funding plan that might have countywide appeal?

5. Voters' views of current security measures and proposed additional security measures.

[5.1] Let's talk about security for Sacramento's transit system. What is your own personal impression of the safety and security of using public transit in Sacramento? How confident are you that enough security measures are in place to make using public transit, light rail and buses, a safe alternative to car travel, for yourself or your family and friends?

- 1=very confident/adequate security
- 2=somewhat confident/some security but not enough
- 3=not confident/inadequate security

[5.2] Let me tell you about the Sacramento Regional Transit District Security Budget for 2012. Sacramento RTD contracts with local law enforcement agencies and private security companies to provide security for the transit system. In 2012, the budget for security personnel is \$5.7 million dollars, which pays salaries for a total of 61 security personnel. This includes 24 sworn officers and 37 private security guards. Here's how it breaks down: \$2.4 million dollars to Sacramento Police Department for 1 lieutenant, 2 sergeants, and 15 officers—total of 18 sworn officers; \$2.3 million dollars to Sacramento County Sheriff for 1 sergeant and 5 deputies—total of 6 sworn officers. Total budget for 24 sworn officers is \$4.7 million dollars. The budget for private security is \$1 million dollars for 37 security guards. Sacramento Regional Transit District has more security cameras in operation than any other agency in the County.

Is the security I just described, currently being provided on the local transit system, more than what you thought coming into the discussion, less, or about what you thought it was?

- 1=great deal more than I thought
- 2=somewhat more
- 3=about what I thought it would be

[5.3] What did you find most surprising about the security budget?

[5.4] Having heard more about the current security provisions, I'll ask you again, how confident are you that enough security measures are in place to make using public transit, light rail and buses, a safe alternative to car travel, for yourself or your family and friends?

- 1=very confident/adequate security
- 2=somewhat confident/some security but not enough
- 3=not confident/inadequate security

[5.5] The proposed half-cent sales tax measure includes \$5 million dollars for additional security cameras and law enforcement officers. Do you think investing in more security cameras and dedicated funding for more law enforcement on Sacramento light rail transit, and buses, and in neighborhoods surrounding rail stations and bus stops would significantly increase the number of people willing to consider public transit as a real option to driving their vehicles?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

6. Voters' questions or concerns about the ballot measure.

As I mentioned, measures like this one need two-thirds support of voters countywide to be passed into law. Information about the measure will need to be communicated to the voters prior to the election.

[6.1] Do you have any questions or concerns you would want addressed to help YOU feel more comfortable supporting this ballot measure, or that you think might be important to other voters in deciding whether to support the ballot measure?

7. Voters' response to arguments in favor of the transportation sales tax measure.

Now I'd like to get your responses to some points in favor of the proposed transportation sales tax measure.

[7.1] As gasoline prices have continued to rise in recent years, do you think it is worthwhile investing NOW so Sacramento will have a better transit system in place for use by people who eventually can't afford car travel?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

[7.2] As the "baby boomers" continue to age, more and more of our population will outlive their ability to drive themselves to essential services like shopping and health care, and for recreation and visiting family and friends. Do you think it is worthwhile investing in significantly more special transit services for seniors to help maintain a basic standard of living for seniors?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

[7.3] Do you think investing in providing better transit choices to help people get out of their cars is essential if we want to lower the amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and improve our climate change situation?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

[7.4] Do you think the provision requiring annual independent public audits of all expenditures will help voters feel confident that, if the measure passes, the money will be spent on what they voted for in this measure?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

[7.5] Our local city streets and county roads that were constructed in the 50's, 60's and 70's are rapidly aging, and we're seeing more and more potholes each year as we get further behind on maintenance. Do you think requiring all local governments, as a part of this measure, to maintain professional road pavement and management programs that prioritize fixing the worst roads first is a good idea?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

[7.6] Professionally-based research makes clear that investing now in routine road maintenance—filling potholes and new pavement overlays—can extend the useful life of a road to 30 to 40 years. Failing to do routine maintenance means the road will need to be reconstructed at 2 or 3 times the cost years earlier. In spite of the struggling economy, do you think it is worthwhile investing in maintaining and preserving our transportation system now, to avoid doubling and tripling of the costs if we put it off until later?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

[7.7] Do you think California’s overall economy relies on a good transportation system that is well maintained, and that a failing transportation system will make our economic recovery that much harder to achieve?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

[7.8] Given the struggling economy, and “baby boomer’s” reaching retirement age, more and more people are needing to stretch their dollars further. Do you think it is worthwhile investing in upgrading and improving Sacramento’s public transit system to make it a real option for people to choose instead of car travel?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

*Why yes?
Why no?*

[7.9] As Sacramento's public transit system exists today, it is more of a social service for people who can't drive or can't afford to drive. Do you think it is worthwhile investing now to begin upgrading and improving our public transit system to make it a frequent, reliable, safe, affordable option for all residents, like those offered in other major cities in the US and abroad?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

*Why yes?
Why no?*

[7.10] As the State Capital of California, many people visit Sacramento. Do you think it is worthwhile investing in upgrading and improving our streets, roads and public transit system to make Sacramento more of a world class City?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

*Why yes?
Why no?*

[7.11] If we invest now in completing light rail service between downtown Sacramento and the Sacramento Airport, do you think we'll recoup a healthy return on our investment from increased tourism in downtown Sacramento and throughout the County?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?
Why no?

[7.12] Do you think it is worth investing in completing the Green Line light rail service from downtown Sacramento to the airport, which will open up direct access to the airport from major areas of the County: from Downtown Sacramento and North Natomas, as well as areas adjacent to the Gold Line between Downtown Sacramento and Folsom, and the Blue Line going South to Cosumnes River College and North to Watt/I-80?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?
Why no?

8. Support for proposed Sacramento County Half-Cent Transportation Sales Tax after “support” points.

Take another look at the proposed ballot question you voted on earlier, and then turn your page over and, at the top of the page, write in either yes or no to indicate how you would vote at this point. And then write down a quick reason why. (Tally vote)

[8.1] Did you vote yes or no on this proposal?

- 1=yes
- 2=no

Why yes?
Why no?

9. Voters’ response to arguments against the transportation sales tax measure.

Now I’d like to get your response to some points against the proposed transportation sales tax measure.

[9.1] Do you think voters should reject this measure, regardless of whether they like the idea of making some of these improvements, because elected officials in Sacramento County can't be trusted to implement a new transportation funding program like this in a responsible manner?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

[9.2] Do you think voters should reject this measure because, even though it claims to guarantee the funds will only be used for transportation, elected officials always find a way to divert tax money for their own purposes?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

[9.3] Do you think voters should reject this measure because Sacramento County already has a half-cent sales tax for transportation, and that should be enough to get by in these hard economic times?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

[9.4] Do you think voters should reject this measure because now is not the time to spend money on new transit services, while people are already struggling with the bad economy?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

[9.5] Do you think voters should reject this measure because, even though transportation is important, there is not enough money to fund everything, and other services, like schools, police and fire protection are higher priorities?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

[9.6] Do you think voters should reject this measure because too much of the money, 67%, is going to public transit, and too few people ride public transit now, and Sacramento is too spread out for public transit to ever be a viable option to replace car travel?

- 1=yes/agree strongly
- 2=yes/agree somewhat
- 3=no/disagree somewhat
- 4=no/disagree strongly

Why yes?

Why no?

10. Support for proposed Sacramento County Half-Cent Transportation Sales Tax after “oppose” points.

*Take another look at the proposed ballot question you voted on earlier, and then turn your page over and, below your last vote and reason, write in either yes or no to indicate how you would vote at this point. And then write down a quick reason why.
(Tally vote)*

[10.1] Did you vote yes or no on this proposal?

1=yes

2=no

Why yes? (TALLY AGREEMENT)

Why no? (TALLY AGREEMENT)

Thank you very much for giving us your valuable time this evening to participate in our discussion. Please be sure to sign out with the receptionist on your way out.

First Name: _____

Ballot Question – Sacramento County Half-Cent Transportation Sales Tax

Shall the voters of Sacramento County by adoption of a one-half cent sales tax for no more than thirty years approve a transportation investment program to:

1. Construct the next phase of light rail transit (LRT) from downtown Sacramento to the Sacramento Airport, with construction to begin within three years.
2. Fill potholes on city streets and county roads, rehabilitate aging roads and bridges and require each local jurisdiction to set local priorities for street & road maintenance.
3. Improve and expand special transit services for our growing populations of senior and disabled citizens.
4. Implement a new program of express, commuter bus services along I-5, I-80, Routes 50 and 99, and major arterials including Watt Avenue, Florin Road, Stockton Boulevard, Hazel Avenue, Greenback Lane, and Sunrise Boulevard between Watt Avenue and Florin Road, that compliments the LRT system.
5. Fund additional security cameras and law enforcement officers on transit vehicles and at bus stops and light rail transit stations, including more patrolling of the surrounding neighborhoods.
6. Require that the entire program be audited annually by an independent auditor to insure all voter mandates are enforced, and funds are used only for the purposes intended by the voters.

Would you vote yes or no on this proposal?

- yes
 no

Why?

Appendix C.

Focus Group Participant Voter Profiles

Appendix C.

DATE: Tuesday, December 13th

TIME: 6:00 pm

LENGTH: 2 hours

Focus Group 1

Party	Gender	Age	Ethnicity	use local public trans	Occupation	Retired?	Current or Most recent Employer	Zip	HH\$	Marital	Kids -18 at home	political outlook	Own Rent	Issue
Dem	F	30-39	Cau	1 x month	Homemaker	No	Food Sever - Crawdad's	95816	\$30-60K	M	Y	Lib	Rent	Lack of employment
Rep	F	50-59	Cau	Occasionally	Substitute Teacher	No	Sac City USD	95817	Less \$30K	D	Y	Mod	Own	Budget cuts
Dem	F	25-29	Cau	Never	Teacher	No	School District	95818	\$90K+	S	N	Lib	Own	Development
Rep	F	50-59	Cau	Never	Realtor	No	Coldwell Banker	95819	\$90K+	M	N	Con	Own	Budget
Dem	F	40-49	Asian	Never	Unemployed	No	Landmark Health	95821	\$30-60K	M	N	Mod	Rent	Lack of Jobs
Other	M	40-49	Asian	1 x week	Health Care	No	VSP	95823	\$30-60K	M	Y	Con	Own	Control of money
Rep	M	60-65	Cau	Never	Manufacturer-safety equip	No	Self Employed	95828	\$60-90K	M	N	Mod	Own	Jobs
Dem	F	30-39	Hisp	2 x week	Non-profit	No	US Census	95824	Less \$30K	S	N	Lib	Rent	Education
Dem	M	60-65	Cau	2 x week	Auto Mechanic	Yes	Autobody	95822	Less \$30K	S	N	Mod	Rent	Economy and jobs
Dem	M	40-49	AA	Occasionally	Retail Clerk	No	Good Will	95826	\$30-60K	S	Y	Mod	Own	Rent Control
Other	M	60-65	Cau	1 x month	Security	Yes	Securitas	95825	Less \$30K	S	N	Mod	Rent	Building Arena
Rep	M	40-49	Cau	Never	Manager	No	Govern Group	95826	\$90K+	M	Y	Mod	Own	Jobs/Unemployment
Dem	F	50-59	Cau	Occasionally	Environmental Scientist	No	State of Calif.	95814	\$60-90K	M	N	Lib	Own	Downtown Business

DATE: Tuesday, Jan 24th

TIME: 6:00 pm

Focus Group 2

Party	Gender	Age	Ethnicity	use local public trans	Retired	Present or Current Occupation	Most recent Employer	City & Zip	HH\$	Marital	Kids - 18 at home	political outlook	Own Rent
Other	M	36	Cau	1 x mo	No	Retail Customer Service	R.E.I Rec. Equip	95670	\$30-60K	S	Y	Mod	Rent
Dem	M	36	Asian	Occasionally	No	Banker	Golden 1	95758	\$90K+	M	Y	Mod	Own
Dem	F	39	AA	Occasionally	No	Catering	Gold Land Ent.	95843	\$60-90K	M	Y	Mod	Own
Dem	F	49	AA	Never	No	Tutor	Sac College	95660	Less \$30K	S	N	Lib	Own
Dem	M	49	Hisp	Occasionally	Yes	Stock clerk	Capitol Tire & Break	95628	\$30-60K	S	Y	Mod	Rent
Ind	F	59	Cau	Occasionally	Yes	Teacher	Dept of Correction	95630	\$90K+	W	N	Mod	Own
Ind	F	42	Cau	Never	No	Homemaker	ManPower (Previous)	95864	\$60-90K	M	Y	Mod	Own
Dem	F	62	Cau	Never	No	Graphic Artist	Self employed	95608	\$60-90K	M	Y	Mod	Own
Rep	F	54	Hisp	Occasionally	Yes	Clerical	Franchise Board	95815	Less \$30K	S	N	Lib	Rent
Dem	M	64	Cau	1 x mo	Yes	Info tech support (most recent)	Immigration Dept.	95818	\$90K+	D	N	Lib	Own
Rep	M	63	Cau	Occasionally	Yes	Representative	Sac Dept of Justice	95816	\$30-60K	M	N	Con	Own
Rep	F	57	Cau	Never	No	Nurse	Kaiser	95819	\$90K+	D	N	Mod	Own
Rep	F	55	Cau	Never	No	Office Manager	AllState Agent	95822	\$60-90K	M	N	Con	Own
Dem	M	27	Cau	1 x wk	No	Enviromental Scientist	CA Env. Protection Agy	95818	\$60-90K	S	N	Lib	Own
Rep	M	40	Cau	1 x wk	No	Computer Tech	ACK web	95843	\$30-60K	M	Y	Con	Own

RESOLUTION NO. 12-07-_____

Adopted by the Board of Directors of the Sacramento Regional Transit District on this date:

July 23, 2012

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR CONSIDERATION OF A 2014 ELECTION BALLOT MEASURE TO PROVIDE LOCAL TAXPAYER DEDICATED FUNDS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION OPERATIONS, PROJECTS, AND SERVICES.

WHEREAS, public transportation is essential to the Sacramento region's economic growth and stability; and

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) with RT served more than 32 million passengers in Fiscal Year 2009, 31.5 million passengers in Fiscal Year 2010, and 26.2 million passengers in Fiscal Year 2011; and

WHEREAS, the continued investment in public transit operations and capital improvement projects creates long-lasting positive impacts on the Sacramento region and RT's public transit riders; and

WHEREAS, in recent years, RT has experienced unprecedented budget shortfalls in state public transit funding, endured serious budget cutbacks given less state and federal funding, as well as lower sales tax revenues caused by the long and deep economic recession impacting Sacramento County's current ½ cent transportation sales tax; and

WHEREAS, insufficient funding has severely curtailed the District's plans to expand transit service to the public and reduce the increasing demands on already congested highways, which degrade the Sacramento region's air quality; and

WHEREAS, the RT Board of Directors adopted TransitAction, RT's long-range Transit Master Plan, that provides the vision for the next 30 years of public transit infrastructure investments and enhanced public transit service options for the Sacramento region to achieve future transportation goals; and

WHEREAS, the TransitAction plan adopted on August 10, 2009 by the RT Board of Directors requires a significant, new and long term increase in available revenue to implement the financial cost of the TransitAction plan, and;

WHEREAS, TransitAction offers alternative transportation choices and considers the long term utilization of local dedicated transit funding as a vital revenue source to provide the appropriate public transit integration to reduce traffic congestion by increasing the Sacramento region's bus and light rail ridership; and

WHEREAS, the lack of reliable, predictable funding support makes accomplishment of these goals unsustainable.

WHEREAS, the RT Board authorized the General Manager/CEO to pursue development of a “Dedicated Transit Funding Plan” to meet the revenue requirements in the adopted RT TransitAction plan, and;

WHEREAS, a consultant team has produced a final report with recommendations on actions needed to move toward a Dedicated Transit Funding Plan.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT AS FOLLOWS:

THAT, the Sacramento Regional Transit District Board of Directors in response to the final report hereby express its support for consideration of a local ballot initiative for dedicated transit funding, and authorizes and directs the General Manager/CEO to:

1. Broaden the outreach on the transit dedicated funding issue to include the Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA), County of Sacramento, all of the Cities in Sacramento County, Sacramento Area Council of Governments, and the California Department of Transportation.
2. Develop and implement a comprehensive public information program to inform major community and private sector interest groups, involving key RT, STA, and local public works staff on transit/road maintenance needs. The public information program may also involve direct communication with Sacramento County residents regarding transportation needs.
3. Immediately begin work on a “Consensus” RT, City/County Transportation Expenditure Plan in cooperation with the STA, funded by a wide range of possible funding options, including but not limited to a new ½ cent sales tax.
4. Continue legal work on legislative or other local finance options that might be considered in the future, such as a Countywide development fee supporting transit capital and operations needed to serve future growth, a sales tax “special district”, a locally authorized Vehicle License Fee, a state implemented Vehicle License Fee or other revenue increases to finance implementation of SB 375 (Steinberg) on climate change, and daily car rental fee at the Sacramento International Airport.
5. Accomplish other research and appropriate community outreach to decide if these actions are prudent and should be pursued over the course of the next 12 – 18 months.

6. Further, the General Manager/CEO shall report progress on action items 1-5 above on at least a quarterly basis to the RT Board.

BONNIE PANNELL, Chair

A T T E S T:

MICHAEL R. WILEY, Secretary

By: _____
Cindy Brooks, Assistant Secretary