

BOARD COMPOSITION & VOTING STRUCTURE

Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

January 24, 2022

Agenda

- Background
 - Board Composition
 - Authority
- Legislative Timeline
- Comparable Transit Agencies
- Transit Revenue Considerations
- Board Discussion
- Next Steps

Board Member Composition- Summary

- AB 1196 (Cooley) took effect January 1, 2022 and changed the Board voting structure from weighted voting to one member, one vote;
- County of Sacramento – Under weighted voting, the County of Sacramento had 32 votes and the City of Sacramento has 28 votes. Now the County now has 3 votes and the City has 4 votes, reducing the County’s voting strength.
- City of Elk Grove – During annexation discussions Elk Grove requested that SacRT analyze the Board composition and consider actions to change the Board composition to increase Elk Grove’s seats from one to two.

Authority for Board Structure

- 50 years ago, California Public Utilities Code Sections 102100.1-102107 established the Board's composition;
- Cal. PUC Sec. 102100.2 grants the City of Sacramento 4 seats on the Board and the County of Sacramento 3 seats on the Board;
- Cal. PUC Sec. 102100.3 grants each additional jurisdiction on the Board, one seat each
- Two options for changing the structure:
 1. Per Cal. PUC Sec 102100.5 – the voting entity to voluntarily appoint fewer members
 2. Per Cal. PUC Sec. 102100.7, the Board may agree to reallocate seats based on the **gross cost of service** within each jurisdiction's boundaries **without regard to revenues**. 15 years ago, the Board disregarded the gross cost of service method because it **exacerbates** the inequity among the jurisdictions.

Legislative Timeline to Modify Board Composition

- **January 21:** Assemblymember Ken Cooley submitted SacRT bill *clean-up* language to the Office of Legislative Counsel (this will be the vehicle for any future provisions)
- **Feb 18:** Last day for bills to be introduced. Staff will inform and advise Ad Hoc of tracking and support passage through committees.
- **June - July:** Provisions needed to make changes before summer recess and August 1st return for the legislature. SacRT and Cooley staff would need 2-3 days to have language vetted and approved by Legislative Counsel, and to inform pending committee.
- **August 25:** Last day to amend bills on the floor.
- **August 31:** Last day for each house to pass bills.
- **September 30:** Last day for Gov to sign/veto. Provisions start 2023.

Slide 5

JB1

Key instructions to adhoc:

Asm. Cooley would like to ensure no opposition with the jurisdictions within SacRT.

Jofil Borja, 1/20/2022

Board Structure of Comparable Transit Agencies

- Staff focused on 3 transit agencies with similar board structures to SacRT: LA Metro, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, and Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD).
- All three agencies have statutory boards that are appointed, not elected and all are multijurisdictional, like SacRT.
- Most other peer agencies have either elected boards and/or are not multijurisdictional. (e.g, BART, AC Transit, San Joaquin Regional Transit, Muni)
- LA Metro has a 14 Member appointed Board with 5 members appointed by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, 3 members appointed by the Mayor of the City of Los Angeles, 5 Members appointed by the Los Angeles County City Selection Committee, and one member appointed by Caltrans (Nonvoting). Appointees of the LA County City Selection Committee are City Council Members from other cities within LA Metro's service area. Representation is based on population.

Board Structure of Comparable Transit Agencies

(Continued)

- Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District has a 13-member board, with 11 appointed elected officials and 2 nonvoting ex officio members. Seat apportionment is based on population and is reapportioned per statute “whenever the County elections official advises the Board that the latest official census indicates a need for reapportionment.” (Cal. PUC Sec. 98100)
- SCMTD’s current Board seat allocation has 5 Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors, 2 City of Santa Cruz appointees, 1 City of Capitola Appointee, 1 City of Scotts Valley Appointee, 2 City of Watsonville Appointees, one ex-officio appointee from UC Santa Cruz, and one ex-officio appointee from Cabrillo College.

Board Structure of Comparable Transit Agencies

(Continued)

- Yolo County Transportation District has a 5-member board established by statute in Cal PUC Sec. 60008
- One member is appointed by the Yolo County Board of Supervisors, one member by the City of Davis, one member by the City of West Sacramento, one member by the City of Woodland and one member by the City of Winters. The Board also has two ex-officio nonvoting members, one from UC Davis and one from Caltrans. Each voting member has an alternate per statute.

Transit Revenue by Jurisdiction

Below are the major factors used in the calculation:

- The PUC is specific as to which revenues are included:
 - Annual allocation of Federal Funds (5307, 5337, JARC, and CMAQ funds)
 - Budgeted TDA allocation (LTF and STA funds) by jurisdiction
 - Contracted Service (Rancho Cordovan and Causeway Connection)
- The PUC calculation does not include:
 - Competitive Grants, Fares, Measure A, Other revenues
- The current population figures for the Sacramento Area by district
- Sources of revenue and population data – SACOG and Sac County

Voting Share Population

Fiscal Year 2022 Schedule of Weighted Voting Distribution

Base Values*

Federal Financial Information

Code Section:			
102205(b)(6)	<u>FY 21 Federal Funds Available in the Sacramento MSA¹</u>	40,451,196	1. Federal Funds are draft only and subject to change based on SACOG's approval of the apportionments prior to final budget adoption.
102205(b)(7)	<u>Allocation of Federal Funds to jurisdictions other than RT</u>	3,291,917	
102205(b)(8)	<u>FY 21 Federal Funds Available for use in RT Service Area:</u>	37,159,279	

Jurisdiction Specific Values

	<u>City of Sacramento</u>	<u>County of Sacramento</u>	<u>Rancho Cordova</u>	<u>Citrus Heights</u>	<u>Folsom</u>	<u>Elk Grove</u>	<u>Totals:</u>
102205(b)(10) <u>Population:**</u>	510,931	593,801	78,381	87,811	81,610	176,154	1,528,688
<u>Proportionate Population:</u>	33.42%	38.84%	5.13%	5.74%	5.34%	11.52%	100%
<u>Member:</u>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
102100.2, 102100.3	4	3	1	1	1	1	11

Voting Share Revenues

		<u>Jurisdiction Specific Values</u>						
		<u>City of Sacramento</u>	<u>County of Sacramento</u>	<u>Rancho Cordova</u>	<u>Citrus Heights</u>	<u>Folsom</u>	<u>Elk Grove</u>	<u>Totals:</u>
102105.1(d)(2)(D)	<u>Federal Funds Attributed to Entity (Total Federal Funding x Share of Population):</u>	12,418,631	14,432,664	1,906,271	2,132,943	1,984,306	4,280,749	37,155,564
102105.1(d)(2)(A), 102205(b)(3)	<u>FY 22 State TDA Funds Made Available to RT:</u>	26,316,911	30,615,004	4,037,230	4,522,948	4,223,158	8,755,004	78,470,255
102105.1(d)(2)(B), 102205(b)(4)	<u>FY 21 Funds Provided Under Contract:</u>	115,000	-	450,000	0	0	0	565,000
102105.1(d)(2)(C), 102205(b)(5)	<u>FY 21 Other Local Funds</u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
102105.1(d)(2)	<u>Total Financial Contribution:</u>	38,850,542	45,047,668	6,393,501	6,655,891	6,207,464	13,035,753	116,190,819
102105.1(d)(2)	<u>Proportionate Financial Contribution:</u>	33.44%	38.77%	5.50%	5.73%	5.34%	11.22%	100%

Board Discussion