

**SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
BOARD MEETING
April 8, 2019**

ROLL CALL: Roll Call was taken at 5:30 p.m. **PRESENT:** Directors Budge, Harris, Howell, Hume, Miller and Chair Kennedy. Director Nottoli arrived at 5:36. Director Hansen arrived at 6:27. **Absent:** Directors Jennings, Schenirer and Serna.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Motion: Approval of the Action Summary of March 25, 2019
2. Resolution: Authorizing the Execution of the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) Project(s) and Certifications and Assurances, and Submittal of Project Nominations and Allocation Requests to Caltrans, for Fiscal Year 2017/18 and 2018/19 Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (D. Goldman/B. Bernegger)
3. Resolution: Approving the Fifth Amendment to the Fiscal Year 2018/19 Budget (D. Goldman/B. Bernegger)

ACTION: APPROVED - Director Harris moved; Director Budge seconded approval of the consent calendar as written. Motion was carried by voice vote. Absent: Directors Hansen, Jennings, Nottoli, Schenirer and Serna.

INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

4. Gold Standard Award for Security, U.S. Department of Homeland Security (H. Li)

ACTION: NONE – Henry Li introduced the members of the Department of Homeland Security in attendance. Mr. Sid Hanna, Federal Security Director, presented SacRT will the Gold Standard Award for Security.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARING

PUBLIC ADDRESSES BOARD ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Speakers:

Mike Barnbaum – Mr. Barnbaum provided information on the upcoming California Transit Association’s Legislative Conference scheduled for May 22 and provided information on the Transportation Development Act.

Hadell Helen Hadid – Ms. Hadid asked SacRT to provide more bus shelters.

Jeffery Tardaguila – Mr. Tardaguila indicated that he had made a request to have Elk Grove make regular bus routes stops in Sacramento. Mr. Tardaguila thanked staff for fixing most of the electronic bulletin boards as well as a thank you for having someone attend a transportation meeting panel discussion taking place tonight. Mr. Tardaguila hopes that SacRT and Paratransit will have a joint session. Mr. Tardaguila does not believe that SacRT should have a full time representative on SACOG.

NEW BUSINESS

5. Resolution: Authorizing Staff to Release the Sacramento Regional Transit District Preliminary FY 2020 Operating and Capital Budgets and Set Notice of a Public Hearing for May 13, 2019 (B. Bernegger)

Mr. Bernegger provided an update of the draft preliminary Fiscal Year 2020 budget. The budget is \$190 million approximately: 83% to operations and 17% administrative. The capital budget is \$262 million and focuses on the light rail modernization project, CNG bus replacements, and debt service payment.

Director Howell noted that placing a slide in the presentation regarding the potential future Measure A is premature because the Sacramento Transportation Authority Board has not decided whether it will go forward to another Measure A. Director Howell suggested that staff look at the additional state and federal money that is now going to be diverted to SacRT from Folsom, Elk Grove and Citrus Heights.

Chair Kennedy suggested that staff no show Slide 4 in the context of the budget, but it when SacRT is having discussions with STA.

ACTION: APPROVED - Director Howell moved; Director Hume seconded approval of the item as written. Motion was carried by voice vote. Absent: Directors Hansen, Jennings, Schenirer and Serna.

6. Information: Update on the Sacramento Area Council of Government’s (SACOG) Green Means Go Pilot-Program (D. Goldman/B. Bernegger)

Mr. Bernegger provided the Board with information on the proposed SACOG pilot program in its early stages. The proposed plan targets funding to help the region meet higher greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction percentages. The plan assumes receipts of \$400 million over 4 years, and not formula based. Transit agencies cannot directly

apply, and the funding uses a green zone approach. SacRT has some concerns with the early concept, which are: will the proposed funding jeopardize SacRT's existing funding, will this funding make existing projects less competitive, and could some of this new money be used for its non-public transit operations that would further increase road traffic or not provide significant improvements to GHG. Staff is encouraging language that would spell out that the funding would not impact the existing transit funding.

Director Nottoli wants to know how within this program that it would benefit SacRT. Mr. Bernegger indicated that there is a lot of new technology to move people around, and staff wants to focus on using money for capital needs including replacing the second round of buses. Director Nottoli asked for clarification that transit agencies could not apply directly. Mr. Bernegger indicated that there are about 20 jurisdictions that could apply directly, and SacRT would have to apply with those jurisdictions. SacRT could not be the direct recipient of those funds. Director Nottoli wants assurances that SacRT is not hurting themselves by applying with other jurisdictions or losing out on other funding.

Director Howell asked which peer agencies were used for comparison. Mr. Bernegger indicated that it was MTC and SCAG. Director Howell suggested that the comparison agencies be more comparable to SacRT. Director Howell wanted to know if there have been any discussion with other member agencies about the split of transportation fees and whether or not transportation fees associated with new development, and what percentage of that might go directly toward transit.

Chair Kennedy wanted to know who made the decision to not have transit be able to apply directly. Mr. Corless explained that SACOG wants to see transit partner with other jurisdictions.

Speakers: Barbara Stanton James Corless Mike Barnbaum

Director Harris wanted to know if there is anything that SACOG could do to assure SacRT that it would not be competitive because it is not guaranteed that this would pit SacRT against SACOG for the same funds. Mr. Corless could not make that guarantee.

Director Nottoli wanted to know the time sensitivity on this request. Mr. Corless indicated that the budget cycle ends June 15, and the end of April/May is the critical time. Director Nottoli wanted to know if SacRT has had any conversations with either Senator Pan or Assembly Member Cooley's office. Mr. Li indicated that staff has not talked to both of them, but they would not be able to give a definite answer. Mr. Li indicated that he wanted to work with Mr. Corless to see if language could be inserted so as to not jeopardize future applications.

Director Hansen indicated that SacRT has moved to "greening the transportation sector that we have" but without the rail infrastructure being a priority like it was. Director

Hansen requested the definition of infill for this project, and what targets will be able to hit by implementing the strategy. Dr. Hansen indicated to Mr. Corless that he is not certain where SacRT fits into the project, and that the SacRT system is undervalued by people that SacRT relies on to understand SacRT's value. Director Hansen indicated that he needs to be better educated on his project, and that there is a lot of work that needs to be done at the policy level to understand what SACOG is trying to do.

Director Budge indicated that the City of Rancho Cordova adopted support for the project and identified the "green zone". The City of Rancho Cordova's discussion did not include a transit component, or discussion about SacRT. Director Budge wanted to know what thoughts have been given to the concept of partnerships. If transit agencies have to partner with local jurisdictions, then where is the mechanism for insuring that the local jurisdiction gets the benefit within their green zone. Mr. Corless indicated that SACOG would be happy to work with the partners to determine a split for the funds of monies that may be potentially awarded.

Director Howell asked staff to quantify what the GHG reduction is per bus/light rail vehicle, and then it would be easier for everyone to determine whether it is a good idea.

Director Hume stated that SacRT needs to keep their focus on the product we are already providing. Director Hume motioned to approve Option 1. Director Harris seconded the motion.

Chair Kennedy noted that he does not like the component of the "transit cannot apply directly". Infill and higher density is important to all around transit, but if you have a transit system that is sub-par, you will have people walking by the station. He does not find any reason to directly preclude SacRT. Creative partnerships should be encouraged between the jurisdictions, but precluding SacRT, he does not support.

Director Hansen made a substitute motion for Option 2. Director Nottoli seconded the motion. Director Hume asked for an amendment to the substitute motion to include Item #1 (Transit Can Apply Directly) under Option 2. Director Hansen did not accept the amendment to his substitute motion.

Director Budge agrees that Item 3 (any infill projects must allocate some funds to support transit needs) does not belong because some jurisdictions have transportation fees that have certain amounts going to transportation and certain amounts going to roads and transit. Director Budge does not want to burden home builders with an additional fee.

Chair Kennedy noted that we have a substitute motion on the floor to support Option 2. A vote was held on the substitute motion with the following results: Ayes: Director Hansen and Nottoli. Noes: Directors Budge, Harris, Howell, Hume, Miller and Chair Kennedy. Absent: Directors Jennings, Schenirer and Serna. Motion fails.

Director Hume indicated that he would be willing to amend his original motion to go from Option 1 to Option 2.1 which is: Show Letter of Support and include that transit can apply directly. Chair Kennedy seconded the amended motion. Ayes: Director Budge, Harris, Howell, Hume and Chair Kennedy. Noes: Directors Hansen, Miller and Nottoli. Absent: Directors Jennings, Schenirer and Serna. Motion passes.

Chair Kennedy indicated that staff now has their direction to be able to continue to work with SACOG on the issue and come back to the Board for approval.

Director Howell requested a better definition of exactly what infill means.

GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT

7. General Manager's Report
 - a. SacRT Meeting Calendar

Mr. Li deferred his General Manager's report.

REPORTS, IDEAS AND QUESTIONS FROM DIRECTORS, AND COMMUNICATIONS

8. San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority Meeting – March 22, 2019 (Hume)

No additional comments were provided by Director Hume.

CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC ADDRESSES BOARD ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA (If Necessary)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CLOSED SESSION ITEMS

RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION

CLOSED SESSION

RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION

CLOSED SESSION REPORT

ADJOURN

As there was no further business to be conducted, the meeting was adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

PATRICK KENNEDY, Chair

A T T E S T:

HENRY LI, Secretary

By: _____
Cindy Brooks, Assistant Secretary