



City of Ceres • City of Hughson • City of Modesto • City of Newman • City of Oakdale • City of Patterson
City of Riverbank • City of Turlock • City of Waterford • County of Stanislaus

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)

MARCH 6, 2013•WEDNESDAY•6:00 PM

STANCOG BOARD ROOM

1111 I STREET, SUITE 308

MODESTO, CA

Committee Agendas and Minutes: Committee agendas, minutes and copies of items to be considered by the StanCOG Committees are available at least 72 hours prior to the meeting at the StanCOG offices located at 1111 "I" Street, Suite 308, Modesto, CA during normal business hours. The documents are also available on StanCOG's website at www.stancog.org/committees.shtm.

Materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted to the Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection at the address listed above during normal business hours. These documents are also available on StanCOG's website, subject to staff's ability to post the documents before the meeting.

Public Comment Period: Matters under the jurisdiction of the Committee, and not on the posted agenda, may be addressed by the general public at the beginning of the regular agenda and any off-agenda matters before the Committee for consideration. However, California law prohibits the Committee from taking action on any matter which is not on the posted agenda unless it is determined to be an emergency by the Committee. Any member of the public wishing to address the Committee during the "Public Comment" period will be limited to 5 minutes unless the Chair of the Committee grants a longer period of time. At a Special Meeting, members of the public may address the Board on any item on the Agenda at the time the item is considered by the Board.

Public Participation on a Matter on the Agenda: Please step to the podium at the time the agenda item is announced by the Chairperson. In order to ensure that interested parties have an opportunity to speak, any person addressing the Committee will be limited to a maximum of 5 minutes unless the Chair of the Committee grants a longer period of time.

Reasonable Accommodations: This Agenda shall be made available upon request in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. § 12132) and the Ralph M. Brown Act (California Government Code § 54954.2). Persons requesting a disability related modification or accommodation in order to participate in the meeting should contact Cindy Malekos at (209) 525-4600 during regular business hours at least 72 hours prior to the time of the meeting to enable StanCOG to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

Notice Regarding Non-English Speakers: StanCOG Committee meetings are conducted in English and translations to other languages is not provided. Anyone wishing to address the Committee is advised to have an interpreter or to contact Cindy Malekos at (209) 525-4600 during regular business hours at least 72 hours prior to the time of the meeting so that StanCOG can provide an interpreter.

Aviso con Respecto a Personas que no Hablan el Idioma de Inglés: Las reuniones del los Comités del Consejo de Gobiernos de Stanislaus son conducidas en Inglés y traducciones a otros idiomas no son disponibles. Cualquier persona que desea dirigirse al Comité se le aconseja que traiga su propio intérprete o llame a Cindy Malekos al (209) 525-4600 durante horas de oficina regulares o a lo menos 72 horas antes de la reunión del Consejo de Gobiernos de Stanislaus, para proporcionarle con un intérprete.

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

These matters may be presented only by interested persons in the audience. Discussion is limited to five minutes or at the discretion of the Chair.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approval of Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Minutes of 2/6/13

5. PRESENTATION

A. Valley Vision Stanislaus

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS-None

7. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. State Route (SR) 132 West Update

B. Potential Development of a Transportation Expenditure Plan Framework for the Stanislaus Region

8. INFORMATION ITEMS

The following items are for information only.

A. Policy Board Minutes of 1/16/13

B. Management and Finance Committee Minutes of 1/3/13

C. Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) Minutes of 1/2/13

D. Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Steering Committee Minutes of 1/2/13

9. CALTRANS REPORT

10. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

11. MEMBER REPORTS

12. ADJOURNMENT

Next Scheduled Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting:

April 3, 2013 (Wednesday) @ 6:00 pm

StanCOG Board Room

1111 I Street, Suite 308

Modesto, CA 95354



CONSENT CALENDAR



*City of Ceres • City of Hughson • City of Modesto • City of Newman • City of Oakdale • City of Patterson
City of Riverbank • City of Turlock • City of Waterford • County of Stanislaus*

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) MEETING
StanCOG Board Room
1111 I Street, Suite 308
Modesto, CA**

**Minutes of February 6, 2013 (Wednesday)
6:00 pm**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Scott Calkins, Bill Axtell, Stephen Bonrepos (arrived during Item 4),
Chris Esther, Terhesa Gamboa, Joe Hollstein

ALSO PRESENT: Carla Alviso, Vince Canales, Mike Costa, Cindy Malekos, Rosa Park
(StanCOG); Rhett Calkins, Yamilet Valladolid (Members of the public)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Scott Calkins called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2. ROLL CALL

Cindy Malekos took the opportunity to introduce a guest, Yamilet Valladolid. She stated that Yamilet was in attendance to learn more about the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and to potentially become a CAC member. Yamilet Valladolid stated that she was the site director for El Concilio which is a non-profit agency that provides a variety of social services to citizens of both Stanislaus and San Joaquin County.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Motion to Approve Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Minutes of 1/2/13**
- B. Approval of Management and Finance Committee Minutes of 1/3/13 (*by Management and Finance Committee only on 2/7/13*)**
- C. Motion to Recommend Policy Board Adopt Resolution 12-25 to Approve FY 2012/13 Local Transportation Fund Claim for Other Purposes: City of Newman**
- D. Motion to Recommend Policy Board Adopt Resolution 12-26 to Approve FY 2012/13 Local Transportation Fund Claim for Other Purposes: City of Oakdale**

E. Motion to Recommend Policy Board Adopt Resolution 12-27 to Adopt Amendment #3 to the 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) – Type 3 Formal Amendment

This item was pulled by Scott Calkins, who asked for clarification. Rosa Park explained that the purpose of Amendment #3 to the 2013 FTIP was to make changes to some of the transportation projects. The changes were requested by the agencies for various reasons. In order for the agencies not to lose their funds, an amendment to the FTIP was made.

***By Motion (Joe Hollstein/Stephen Bonrepos)** and a unanimous vote, the Citizens Advisory Committee recommend that the Policy Board approve item E of the Consent Calendar

F. Motion to Recommend Policy Board Adopt Resolution 12-30 to Approve the Distribution of FY 2012/13 Proposition 1B – California Transit Security Grant Program – California Transit Assistance Fund (CTSGBP-CTAF) Allocation

***By Motion (Chris Esther/Terhesa Gamboa)**, and a unanimous vote, the Citizens Advisory Committee recommend that the Policy Board approve items A, C, D and F of the Consent Calendar

5. PRESENTATIONS - None

6. PUBLIC HEARINGS - None

7. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. Motion to Recommend Policy Board Adopt Resolution 12-28 to Allocate FY 2013/14 State Transit Assistance Funds (STA), Based on the Allocation Provided by the State Controller, and Local Transportation Funds (LTF) Based on the Apportionment Provided by the County Auditor-Controller (at Management and Finance Committee meeting only on February 7, 2013)

It was noted that this item would be addressed at the February 7th Management and Finance Committee meeting.

B. Motion to Recommend Policy Board Adopt Resolution 12-29 to Amend the StanCOG Transit Cost Sharing Procedures Document

Mike Costa stated that this item incorporated the final language changes into the Transit Cost Sharing Procedures document relevant to the amendments that were adopted by the Policy Board at their December 2012 meeting. He briefly highlighted the major changes that were being proposed for the document and asked for questions. Member Joe Hollstein went through the concerns that he had regarding the changes. A discussion took place and Rosa Park stated that the Management and Finance Sub-Committee had gone through the document page by page and many of the same concerns that member Hollstein spoke of, had been brought up and discussed at length.

***By Motion (Chris Esther/Bill Axtell)** and a unanimous vote, the Citizens Advisory Committee recommend that the Policy Board adopt Resolution 12-29 to amend the StanCOG Transit Cost Sharing Procedures Document

8. INFORMATION ITEMS

The following items were provided for information only.

A. Policy Board Minutes of 12/12/12

B. Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) Minutes of 11/27/12

C. Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Steering Committee Minutes of 11/27/12

D. Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Minutes of 11/6/12

E. 2013 FTIP Monthly Project Status Report FFY 2012/13

Scott Calkins asked for clarification on this report. Rosa Park explained that this item was a monthly status report that helps keep track of the current projects. She also mentioned that StanCOG staff would be meeting with the Public Works agencies to go over their projects and discuss any issues they may be having.

F. Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Schedule of Actual Receipts

G. Valley Vision Stanislaus Update

H. Administrative Modification #2 to the 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP) – Type 1 Administrative Modification

Scott Calkins wanted to know what triggered this modification to the FTIP. Rosa Park stated that the agencies requested the various project changes that were listed in the staff report, and the modification was made to protect the funds.

I. StanCOG Quarterly E-Newsletter

J. 108 Signs and Route Directions (*at Citizens Advisory Committee meeting only on 2/6/13*)

At the January 2nd CAC meeting, Stephen Bonrepos brought up some concerns he had regarding State Route (SR) 108 signage problems, which could cause misdirection of traffic and possible congestion. As a follow up, Charles Turner briefly went over the signage concerns and stated that he had contacted Caltrans regarding the problem. He had received a response back from them saying they were looking into it, and said he would contact Caltrans weekly to stay on top of it. Charles Turner also mentioned that there was a possibility that Caltrans may be considering abandoning SR 108 through the City of Modesto, picking it up on Kiernan and tying it in with SR 219, which would be part of the North County Corridor alignment.

9. CALTRANS REPORT – None

10. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

Carlos Yamzon was not in attendance. Rosa Park stated that StanCOG was in the process of doing their Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Valley Vision Stanislaus (VVS) outreach. She said the workshops had been well received and very good input had been provided by the public as well as city officials. She said all of the data had not been compiled yet, but when completed, it would be posted on the Valley Vision Stanislaus website at: valleyvisionstanislaus.com.

11. MEMBER'S REPORT

Joe Hollstein brought up the fact that there had been many newspaper articles regarding bringing the ACE train to Modesto. He said it would be nice to have, but there was no funding to pay for it. A brief discussion followed.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Scott Calkins adjourned the meeting at 6:54 pm.

Next Regularly Scheduled Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting:

March 6, 2013 (Wednesday) @ 6:00 pm

StanCOG Board Room

1111 I Street, Suite 308

Modesto, CA 95354

Minutes Prepared By:



Carla Alviso, Administrative Clerk III



DISCUSSION & ACTION ITEMS



Item 7A

*City of Ceres • City of Hughson • City of Modesto • City of Newman • City of Oakdale • City of Patterson
City of Riverbank • City of Turlock • City of Waterford • County of Stanislaus*

TO: Citizens Advisory Committee

Staff Report
Discussion

FROM: Carlos P. Yamzon, Executive Director

DATE: February 28, 2013

SUBJECT: State Route (SR) 132 West Update

Discussion

As of the date of the public posting of the Citizens Advisory Committee agenda (February 28, 2013), there was no new information to report regarding the SR 132W project.



Item 7B

*City of Ceres • City of Hughson • City of Modesto • City of Newman • City of Oakdale • City of Patterson
City of Riverbank • City of Turlock • City of Waterford • County of Stanislaus*

TO: Citizens Advisory Committee **Staff Report**
Discussion

FROM: Carlos P. Yamzon, Executive Director

DATE: February 27, 2013

SUBJECT: Potential Development of a Transportation Expenditure Plan Framework for the Stanislaus Region

Background

At the December 12, 2012 Policy Board meeting, the Members discussed the potential of bringing back a transportation sales tax for the Stanislaus County region. The Chair instructed staff to bring back information for a discussion/action item to be considered formally by the Policy Board.

The following information included in this staff report was presented to the StanCOG Policy Board at their January 16th and February 20th meetings. The Policy Board has directed staff to engage the Management and Finance Committee to begin discussions on a Transportation Expenditure Plan in the event that a decision is made to collectively pursue a Transportation Sales Tax for Stanislaus County. This information is provided as the catalyst for this discussion.

Discussion

The 2011 Stanislaus Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) indicates that the San Joaquin Valley's population will nearly double to 7.9 million by the year 2040. The Stanislaus Region will be a part of this growth trend and the increased demand on our transportation network will continue to deteriorate the mobility and safety of the traveling public, impact the air quality and overall quality of life in the region. Many of the Region's existing roadways are already in a state of disrepair, because of the shortage of maintenance and rehabilitation funds. Improvements are needed to expand major traffic corridors, but these projects require a significant influx of transportation funding beyond projected availability of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and other federal funds.

The Stanislaus Region is not alone in this predicament and like other counties in the state needs a reliable, independent and stable transportation fund source to address its current and future transportation needs. One such source is a ½ cent transportation sales tax.

This staff report focuses on four Discussion items:

- A. Background and Summary of Activities of the 2008 ½ Cent Sales Tax presented to the electorate as Measure S**
- B. Timeline for a new Tax Measure**
- C. Current Legislative Information**
- D. Current Polling Information**

A. Background of the Stanislaus Region's 2008 ½ Cent Transportation Sales Tax presented to the electorate as Measure S

On November 4, 2008 California voters participated in a historic Presidential and General election. In Stanislaus County, the election concluded the many work activities that produced a County-wide, Consensus-based Transportation Financial Expenditure Plan that was presented to the Electorate as Measure S.

As a recap of the process, at the **January 9, 2008 Policy Board meeting**, staff was directed to proceed with the development of a framework for a 2008 Transportation Financial Expenditure Plan for Stanislaus County. This framework was developed with the assistance of StanCOG's then Technical Advisory Committee (now Management and Finance Committee), which is composed of the City Managers from each of the nine Cities and the County Chief Executive Officer.

The framework was completed and approved by each of the nine City Councils and the County Board of Supervisors prior to the **February 13, 2008 StanCOG Policy Board meeting**. With this consensus, the Policy Board adopted a proposed framework at its February 13th meeting.

A Final Draft of the 2008 Financial Expenditure Plan was developed in conjunction with the Management and Finance Committee. The circulation and approval of the document from all nine Cities and the County Board of Supervisors was obtained prior to the July 9th StanCOG Policy Board meeting. The consultant firm of ESA Community Development was hired to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the document, and the local firm of Martino Graphic Design was hired to create and conduct an Outreach Program to provide information to the public. **The Policy Board certified the PEIR and adopted the 2008 Transportation Sales Tax Ordinance on July 9, 2008.**

The Ordinance established the "Local Transportation Improvement Plan" and provided for the imposition of the one-half of one percent retail transactions and use tax by the Stanislaus County Transportation Authority (StanCOG) for local transportation purposes for a period of 20 years. The first reading of the Ordinance occurred at the June 11, 2008 Policy Board meeting as required under Government Code Section 25131. All Policy Board approved revisions requested at the June 11th meeting were incorporated in the final version of Ordinance. Exhibit A of the Ordinance is the 2008 Transportation Financial Expenditure Plan which was presented to the electorate.

2008 Expenditure Plan Summary

	<u>Revenue</u> <u>(%)</u>	<u>Approx. 2008 Dollars</u> <u>(\$)</u>
1. Local Traffic Improvement & Road Maintenance Program (formula based distribution to 9 Cities and County)	50%	\$350 million
2. Regional Capital Corridors (3) (will require local, state and federal funds match)	49%	\$343 million
3. Program Administration	1%	\$7 million
TOTAL	100%	\$700 million

B. Timeline - Possible Next Steps to develop a new ½ Cent Transportation Expenditure Plan Framework

Based on the timeline for the previous Transportation Expenditure Plan, a similar schedule could be developed, as follows:

1-2 Months:

- A. Draft a Financial Expenditure Plan developed in conjunction with the Management and Finance Committee;
- B. Create a budget for the development and outreach of a new Transportation Expenditure Plan;
- C. Prepare a milestone schedule to complete all public sector work.
 - 1. StanCOG staff, working with the Management and Finance Committee, would establish representatives from each of the Local Agencies to assist in developing a framework for a new Transportation Financial Expenditure Plan (Expenditure Plan), forming the Expenditure Plan Development Committee (EPDC).
 - 2. The EPDC would develop a framework to prepare the new Expenditure Plan and determine a timeline to begin public involvement and assist StanCOG staff in determining an appropriate fund source to pay for Expenditure Plan activities.

The Expenditure Plan activities may include:

- Consultant fees to conduct polling activities.
- Staff time to re-write the Expenditure Plan based on EPDC input.
- Consultant fees to update the corresponding Environmental Impact Report.
- Consultant fees to provide public education and outreach services.
- Staff time to gain Local Jurisdiction and Board of Supervisors concurrence of the new Expenditure Plan.

3. Findings would be presented to the StanCOG Policy Board at an Expenditure Plan Workshop(s). The Workshop(s) would be public meetings designed for public input and feedback.
4. The Executive Director summarizes the Expenditure Plan framework comments obtained from the workshop(s) and makes recommendations to StanCOG's Advisory Committees.
5. The Executive Director, with concurrence from the Advisory Committees, recommends to the StanCOG Policy Board a framework, timeline and development fund for the new Expenditure Plan.

4 -6 Months:

1. Obtain approval of the document from all nine Cities and the County Board of Supervisors.
2. Hire a consultant to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the document.
3. Hire a consultant to create and conduct an Outreach Program to provide information to the public.
4. Prepare a Transportation Sales Tax Ordinance establishing a "Local Transportation Improvement Plan" providing for the imposition of the one-half of one percent retail transactions and use tax by the Stanislaus County Transportation Authority (StanCOG) for local transportation purposes for a period of 20 years.
5. Provide for the first reading of the Ordinance at a StanCOG Policy Board meeting as required under Government Code Section 25131.
6. Provide for a final version of the Ordinance with all Policy Board approved revisions. Exhibit A of the Ordinance will be the Transportation Financial Expenditure Plan which will be presented to the electorate.

C. Legislative Information

Under existing law, a proposed ½ cent sales tax would require a 66.67% majority approval in order to pass. The Stanislaus County Recorder's office indicated the 2006 Sales Tax Program received a 57.92% voter approval and the 2008 Tax Expenditure Plan received a 66.42% voter approval.

Two bills have been introduced in the Senate in the last few weeks (Attachments). They do not state (as ACA 23 did), that the passage of the constitutional amendment could be done concurrently on the same ballot as the vote on the tax measure.

Senate Constitutional Amendment (SCA) 4

AUTHOR: Liu (D)

TITLE: Local Government Transportation Project: Voter Approval

INTRODUCED: 12/03/2012

DISPOSITION: Pending

LOCATION: SENATE

SUMMARY: Proposes an amendment to the Constitution to provide that the imposition, extension, or increase of a special tax by a local government for the purpose of providing funding for local transportation projects requires the approval of a specified percentage of voters voting on the proposition.

Senate Constitutional Amendment (SCA) 8

AUTHOR: Corbett (D)

TITLE: Transportation Projects: Special Taxes: Voter Approval

INTRODUCED: 12/14/2012

DISPOSITION: Pending

LOCATION: SENATE

SUMMARY: Provides that the imposition, extension, or increase of a special tax by a local government for the purpose of providing funding for transportation projects requires the approval of 55% of its voters voting on the proposition.

The California State Legislature would need to approve placing a constitutional amendment on the ballot to lower the threshold to 55%, which requires a 2/3 - 66.67% super majority to pass. Two-thirds of the membership of each chamber of the California State Legislature must propose an amendment, which then goes on a statewide ballot to be ratified or rejected by the state electorate. Once it is passed by the legislature, it is eligible to be placed on the next eligible ballot (General Elections for amendments/initiatives).

If the state legislature approved the lower threshold (55%), through a constitutional amendment, this would then need to be approved through a statewide initiative (50%+1). There is a United State General Election on Tuesday, November 5, 2013 but the next California General Election is not until November 4, 2014.

The California Electorate would then need to pass the bill/constitutional amendment to lower the threshold to 55%. This requires a majority of statewide voters to pass the amendment - 50%+1. Ratified amendments take affect the day after the election.

It is unclear at this time if a local sales tax measure could run concurrently with the statewide threshold vote. When the question was asked, the California Secretary of State Department staff was reluctant to answer this question at this time. This is likely an issue that will need to either

be resolved in the final bill or through state/county offices once the bill is approved. At this point, the Initiative to lower the tax vote threshold does not yet appear to be on any radar, either the Secretary of State Department or the Attorney General's office, so the timing for this Initiative is unclear.

Accordingly, in research by staff, there are 5 steps required in order to get an initiative on the ballot:

1. Write initiative measure.
2. Request title and summary from State.
3. Format of petitions--making sure the signature petition is correct per the state requirements.
4. Circulate the petition and gather signature--must receive enough signatures, 131 days before the election, around June 27, 2014.
5. Submit signatures. The state will then verify the signatures and deem the initiative 'qualified' for the ballot.

D. Current Polling Information

In a tele-conference meeting on January 29th convened by California Transportation Commissioner (CTC) Jim Earp, the initial results of polling by the California Alliance for Jobs were presented. The survey tested voter opinion, statewide for a variety of mechanisms to increase transportation funding, including lowering the voter threshold for local transportation measures. The initial and ultimate results can provide a baseline from which future discussions can continue. The full results will probably be available within the next three weeks. Mr. Earp will provide a more detailed analysis at the CalCOG Regional Issues Forum in Monterey on April 4th and 5th, 2013.

California Alliance for Jobs **Statewide polling results on transportation taxes and fees**

Methodology

- The polling was conducted over December 2012 and January 2013.
- 600 surveys were taken regarding voter attitudes for the 2014 election (gubernatorial); and an additional 200 surveys were conducted based on 2016 (presidential).
- The poll considered several transportation fee/tax options, including 55 percent voter threshold, raising Vehicle License Fees (VLF) and raising gasoline tax.
- Initial questions measured the degree to which transportation is considered a priority worthy of additional public investment relative to other issues. Other questions focused
- In on support for specific tax/fee mechanisms.

Overview

- Voters believe they are paying enough in taxes right now.
- Motivation for not supporting a tax or fee increase is less about affordability and more about a lack of faith in how the money would be administered.
- Seventy-three percent expressed concern about how new taxes would be used.
- Repairing and improving transportation infrastructure is no longer considered a top priority.
- No transportation tax or fee mechanism surveyed came close to 60 percent support, which is considered the bellwether of a viable alternative in the polling realm.
- Balancing the state budget is no longer the No. 1 concern for state voters.
-

Preliminary Specific Findings

- Forty-eight percent of those polled say the gas tax is already too high.
- Forty-eight percent also say sales taxes rates are “just about right.”
- Fifty-four percent say maintaining streets and roads is a priority but only 43 percent classify it as a “high priority.”
- Forty-three percent would favor a 55 percent threshold for transportation in 2014; 45 percent would oppose.
- Forty-five percent would favor a 55 percent threshold for transportation in 2016.
- Public safety is the top priority for which people would support a local measure at 55 percent, with 53 percent listing it as the No. 1 priority.
- Transportation, including road maintenance, follows education and libraries to land fourth or fifth on the list of priorities with a 46-46 percent split of those who would favor a 55 percent local tax and those who would oppose it.
- Fifty-nine percent would support having an expenditure list as part of the ballot measure on all local measures, regards of whether the initiative is billed as a specific or general tax.
- Only 47 percent of respondents say they would be more inclined to vote for a local sales tax measure at 55 percent that used an eight-year sunset clause.

Information from the California Transportation Foundation (CTF) Transportation Forum January 29, 2013

The following are my notes on the **Transportation Sales Tax 2012- Lessons Learned Session**.

Alameda County (Alameda County Transportation Commission)

Tax Measure Renewal – (Failed) Issues and Lessons Learned

- Polling hovered in the 63%-69%
- Perpetuity was an issue
- Competing tax measures on the ballot was an issue – 20+ miscellaneous state sales tax measures – Make the case for voters by jurisdiction
- 120,000 people who voted for President Obama did not vote for the measure – Presidential election has a different set of challenges
- Needed \$2.00 per voter for campaign in a presidential election – Raise enough money
- A 2/3 Measure requires excellence - Start early

**Los Angeles County (Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority – LA Metro)
Tax Measure Renewal – (Failed) Issues and Lessons Learned**

- 18% of voters would vote no on any tax
- Most voters spend little or no time on Measures
- Voters concerned on accountability
- 60% of voters thought the Measure was about High Speed Rail
- A third of the voters thought the Measure would be detrimental
- 70% of the voters voted No on the LA Metro Measure and Yes on the Governor's Measure
- Post Polling – Most of the voters thought the voter threshold was 50% now

Local Polling

Mr. Bill Bassitt, CEO for the Stanislaus Economic Development and Work Force Alliance, provided information to the Executive Committee on an economic survey of several thousand businesses they perform every year that will be completed shortly. Most specifically, was a question in the survey regarding concerns on the economy that out of 600 respondents, 216 businesses, only 7 responded that roads (transportation) was a concern.



INFORMATION ITEMS



Item 8A

*City of Ceres • City of Hughson • City of Modesto • City of Newman • City of Oakdale • City of Patterson
City of Riverbank • City of Turlock • City of Waterford • County of Stanislaus*

POLICY BOARD MEETING

**StanCOG Board Room
1111 I Street, Suite 308
Modesto, CA**

**Minutes of January 16, 2013 (Wednesday)
6:00 pm**

PRESENT: Chair Charlie Goeken (City of Waterford), Vice-Chair Luis Molina (arrived during Item 8A) (City of Patterson); Bret Durosette (City of Ceres); Dave Geer, Joe Muratore (City of Modesto); Michael Brennan (City of Oakdale); Richard O'Brien (City of Riverbank); Forrest White (City of Turlock); Jim DeMartini, Terry Withrow (Stanislaus County)

ALSO PRESENT: Ken Baxter (Caltrans, District 10); Rod Attebery (Neumiller and Beardslee); Vince Canales, Jeanette Fabela, Jaylen French, Cindy Malekos, Rosa Park, Carlos Yamzon (StanCOG); Mary Jackson, Scott Calkins, Rhett Calkins, Terhesa Gamboa (Members of the Public)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Charlie Goeken called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. ROLL CALL

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS-None

5. CONSENT CALLENDAR

- A. Motion to Approve Policy Board Minutes of 12/12/12**
- B. Motion to Adopt Resolution 12-18 to Approve FY 2012/13 Local Transportation Fund Claim for Other Purposes: City of Hughson**
- C. Motion to Adopt Resolution 12-19 to Approve FY 2012/13 Local Transportation Fund Claim for Other Purposes: City of Patterson**