



S A C O G

## SACOG Board of Directors

Item #09-4-8  
Action

April 8, 2009

### **Conduct Public Hearing and Approve Minutes and Adopt Resolutions on Unmet Transit Needs Findings for Sacramento Regional Transit District, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties, and the Cities Therein**

**Issue:** The Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires that SACOG make an annual unmet transit needs finding for the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) and for jurisdictions eligible to use TDA funds. Jurisdictions outside of the SRTD are permitted to use TDA funds on streets and roads projects, if transit requests that meet SACOG-adopted definitions of unmet needs that are reasonable to meet have been met. Staff has carried out the mandated unmet transit needs findings process for FY 2009-10.

**Recommendation:** The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board: (1) hold a final public hearing on unmet transit needs in the SRTD, including the City of Citrus Heights, as well as Sacramento County, the City of Elk Grove, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties, and the cities therein; (2) approve the minutes of the 14 previously held public hearings (see attachments) on unmet transit needs in the SRTD, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties, and the cities therein; and (3) adopt the attached resolutions regarding unmet transit needs in each county, the cities therein, and the SRTD.

**Committee Action/Discussion:** State TDA statute established a Local Transportation Fund (LTF) for each county. LTF revenues are derived from 1/4 cent of the state retail sales tax and are returned to each county according to the amount of tax collected. LTF funds are apportioned to jurisdictions within each county on a population basis.

In Sacramento County, the LTF apportioned to jurisdictions located within the SRTD may only use it for transit service. However, jurisdictions located outside of the SRTD may use their LTF apportionments for streets and roads projects, provided they have no transit requests that meet SACOG's adopted definition of unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet.

It is the responsibility of the SACOG Board to annually make one of the following findings for the SRTD and each jurisdiction outside of the SRTD: (1) There are no unmet transit needs; (2) there are unmet transit needs; or (3) there are unmet transit needs, including transit needs, that are reasonable to meet. These findings must be made prior to approving TDA claims. The public transit operators and jurisdictions and their respective proposed findings are listed in the attached resolutions.

TDA statutes require that SACOG follow a specific process in making an unmet transit needs finding for each jurisdiction. Staff has carried out this process for FY 2009-10 (described in Attachment A). As part of the process, transit service requests were identified from public hearings (14 were held in the fall of 2008) and through the transportation planning process, and evaluated as to whether they meet SACOG adopted definitions (see Attachment B). The Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) for each county has participated in the analysis with staff and concurs with staff recommendations.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Executive Director

MM:EC:gg  
Attachments

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Planning, (916) 340-6276  
James E. Brown, Principal Program Expert, (916) 340-6221  
Barbara VaughanBechtold, Associate Planner, (916) 340-6226  
Edward Coviello, Assistant Planner, (916) 340-6223



## SACOG Unmet Transit Needs Finding Process

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) is a state law, which provides funding for public transportation from a portion of sales tax collected from each county. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments has TDA administration responsibilities for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties. The annual Unmet Transit Needs Finding process as described below is required by TDA law to identify transit needs and to determine whether remaining TDA funds after transit expenses can be used for streets and roads projects in some jurisdictions.

### 1. Unmet Transit Needs Finding Process Requirements

TDA statutes require that SACOG follow a specific process in making an unmet transit needs finding for each jurisdiction in the region. The process includes the following actions:

- a. Establish a Social Service Transportation Advisory Council for each County to participate in the unmet transit needs finding process.

The Social Service Transportation Advisory Council - Each county's SSTAC participates in the identification of unmet transit needs and the determination whether those needs are reasonable to meet. They preside, along with a SACOG Board member, at unmet transit need public hearings in each county. The composition of the SSTAC is set forth in statute and consists of representatives of (number in parenthesis denote number of required representatives): potential transit users who are 60 years of age or older (1); physically disabled (1); social service providers for seniors, including a transportation provider (2); social service provider for persons of limited means (1); and, representatives of the CTSA, including a transit operator (2). Because of the presence of urbanized areas within the rural counties in the region, SACOG also seeks the participation of at least one transit rider who is a commuter in order to obtain input on commuter needs.

- b. Identify transit needs, which have been considered as part of the transportation planning process.
- c. Members of the SSTAC and at least one representative of the SACOG Board of Directors conduct public hearings in each county to receive public comments regarding unmet transit needs. A total of nine to eleven hearings are held yearly within the four counties.
- d. SACOG staff and SSTAC members meet identify potential unmet transit needs. Conduct analysis of comments using Board adopted definitions of "unmet transit needs" and reasonable to meet." (See the following section) An important consideration of whether a need is reasonable to meet is the ability of an operator to maintain the required farebox recovery ratio under the TDA statutes. SACOG staff prepares an analysis of unmet transit needs including those identified in the last short range transit plan update to determine whether they are reasonable to meet, and makes a recommendation for SSTAC consideration.

SACOG staff and the SSTAC meet to discuss staff analysis and recommendations. The SSTAC can formulate its own recommendation to the SACOG Board, if it is different than that of the staff recommendations. Typically, both the SSTAC and the SACOG staff present to the Board a joint recommendation.

- e. The SACOG Board receives, during a regularly scheduled Board meeting, reports from staff on the public hearing results and the joint recommendation. The entire SACOG Board then holds a final public hearing to receive any additional testimony regarding transit needs that may be reasonable to meet. The Board then makes one of the following three possible findings (one for each county and the Sacramento Regional Transit District):
  - 1) There are no unmet transit needs, or
  - 2) There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, or
  - 3) There are unmet transit needs, including transit needs that are reasonable to meet.

If it is found that there are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, then those transit needs must be met before any TDA funds can be released for streets and roads projects.

## 2. Definitions of “Unmet Transit Needs” and “Reasonable to Meet”

TDA regulations require SACOG to adopt definitions of "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet" to guide staff analysis as to whether an identified need is an "unmet transit need that is reasonable to meet". On January 20, 1994, the Board adopted the following definitions:

- a. Unmet Transit Needs - A request must identify:
  - 1) The **size, location and socio-economic** characteristics of identifiable **groups** likely to be dependent on transit (including, but not limited to elderly, disabled, and low income persons, including individuals eligible for paratransit and other special transportation services pursuant to the federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990), **trip purposes** (such as medical, nutrition, shopping, business, social, school and work) and **geographic boundaries** and/or major origin and destination points.
  - 2) The **adequacy** of **existing** public transportation services and specialized transportation **services**, including privately and publicly provided services, in meeting the identified demand.
  - 3) An analysis of the **potential** alternative public transportation and specialized transportation **services** that would **meet** all or part of the **demand**.

b. Reasonable to Meet

An unmet transit need that meets the definition above and meets **all** of the following criteria shall be considered reasonable to meet:

- 1) **Community Acceptance**—There needs to be demonstrated interest of citizens in the new or additional transit service.
- 2) **Equity**—The proposed new or additional service will benefit, either the general public ( i.e., transit dependent or disadvantaged) or the elderly population and persons with disabilities.
- 3) **Potential Ridership**—The proposed transit service will maintain new service ridership performance standards established for the transit operator in the Short Range Transit Plan. Ridership performance standards can include passengers per hour and passengers per mile.
- 4) **Cost Effectiveness**—The proposed new or additional transit service will not affect the ability of the overall system to meet the state mandated farebox recovery ratio requirement after a two-year exemption period, if the service is eligible for the exemption. If the exemption is not used, the service must meet minimum farebox return requirements as stated in the TDA statutes or established by SACOG.

## 2009-2010 Social Service Transportation Advisory Council Unmet Transit Needs Findings

Location	Hearing Date	Hearing Time	SSTAC Findings
Yuba/Sutter			There are <b>no</b> unmet transit needs in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Yuba. There are <b>no</b> unmet transit needs in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Sutter.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 1</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
Marysville	16-Dec	2:00 p.m.	There are <b>no</b> unmet transit needs in the City of Marysville.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 2</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
Yuba City	15-Dec	6:00 p.m.	There are unmet transit needs in the City of Yuba City.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 4</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
Live Oak	NA		There are <b>no</b> unmet transit needs in the City of Live Oak.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 0</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
Wheatland	NA		There are <b>no</b> unmet transit needs in the City of Wheatland.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 0</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
Sacramento			There <b>are</b> unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Sacramento including the communities of Fair Oaks and Orangevale.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 3</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 2</b>
Citrus Heights	14-Oct	6:00 p.m.	There <b>are</b> unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Citrus Heights.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 3</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 3</b>
Elk Grove	13-Oct	6:00 p.m.	There are <b>no</b> unmet transit needs in the City of Elk Grove.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 1</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
Fair Oaks/Orangevale	20-Nov	6:00 p.m.	(Included in Unincorporated Sacramento County Findings)
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 0</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
Folsom	29-Oct	5:30-7:00 p.m.	There are unmet transit needs in the City of Folsom.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 2</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
Galt	6-Nov	5:30 p.m.	There are unmet transit needs in the City of Galt.

## 2009-2010 Social Service Transportation Advisory Council Unmet Transit Needs Findings

Location	Hearing Date	Hearing Time	SSTAC Findings
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 2</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
Rancho Cordova	18-Nov	6:00 p.m.	There <b>are</b> unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Rancho Cordova
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 0</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
Isleton	21-Oct	2:00 p.m.	There are <b>no</b> unmet transit needs in the City of Isleton.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 0</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
SRTD	3-Nov	6:00 p.m.	There <b>are</b> unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the Sacramento Regional Transit District, including the city of Citrus Heights and the City of Rancho Cordova
			<b>Number of Folsom Light Rail Service Related Comments: 1</b> <b>Number of Folsom Light Rail Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 5</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 5</b>
Yolo			There are unmet transit needs in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Yolo.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 0</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
Davis	3-Dec	6:00 p.m.	There are unmet transit needs in the City of Davis.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 7</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
West Sacramento	2-Dec	6:00 p.m.	There are unmet transit needs in the City of West Sacramento.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 6</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
Winters	11-Dec	2:00 p.m.	There are <b>no</b> unmet transit needs in the City of Winters.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 0</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>
Woodland	10-Dec	6:00 p.m.	There are unmet transit needs in the City of Woodland.
			<b>Number of Service Related Comments: 4</b> <b>Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</b>

**2008 Unmet Transit Needs Hearings Schedule**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Time</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Address</b>
<b>Yuba/Sutter</b>				
Marysville	Tuesday, December 16	2pm	Yuba County Government Center, Conf. Room 2	915 8th Street, Marysville, CA 95901
Yuba City	Monday, December 15	6pm	Council Chambers	1201 Civic Center Blvd, Yuba City, CA 95933
Live Oak- <b>POSTPONED</b>	<b>N/A</b>			
Wheatland- <b>POSTPONED</b>	<b>N/A</b>		Community Center	101 C Street, Wheatland, CA 95692
<b>Sacramento</b>				
Citrus Heights	Oct 14, Tuesday	6pm	Council Chambers	6237 Fountain Square Drive, Citrus Heights, CA 95621
Elk Grove	Oct 13, Monday	6pm	Council Chambers	8400 Laguna Palms Way, Elk Grove, CA 95758
Folsom	Oct 29, Wednesday	5:30pm	Chamber of Commerce, Ambassador Room	200 Wool Street, Folsom, CA 95630
Galt	Thursday, November 6	5:30pm	Council Chambers	380 Civic Drive, Galt, CA 95632
Isleton	Tuesday, October 21	2pm	Community Center	208 Jackson Extension, Isleton, CA 95641
SRTD	Monday, November 3	6pm	RT Board Room	1400 29th Street, Sacramento, CA 95816
Rancho Cordova	Nov 18, Tuesday	6pm	City Hall, American River North Room	2729 Prospect Park Drive, Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
Fair Oaks/Orangevale	Thursday, November 20	6pm	Dep. of Neighborhood Services	5229-B Hazel Avenue Fair Oaks, CA 95628
<b>Yolo</b>				
Davis	Wednesday December 3	6pm	Council Chambers	23 Russell Blvd., Davis, CA 95616
West Sacramento	Tuesday, December 2	6pm	Council Chambers	1110 W Capitol Avenue, West Sacramento, CA 95691
Winters	Dec. 11, Thursday	2pm	Council Chambers	318 1st Street, Winters, CA 95694
Woodland	Dec. 10, Wednesday	6pm	Woodland Library, Leake Room	250 1st Street, Woodland, CA 95695

	Not An Unmet Need	Unmet Need	Unmet Need that is Reasonable to Meet	Comments
<b>Service</b>				
<b>Sacramento County</b>				
<b>Elk Grove</b>	Service to the Elizabeth Pinkerton Middle School			e-tran service is provided with the need for a 3 to 4 block walk to reach the school. The service operates during school hours. The area has new sidewalks as well.
<b>Folsom</b>		Weekend service for Folsom Stage Lines to match the Light Rail Schedule		
		Light Rail service to 10:30 P.M.		
<b>Galt</b>		Saturday service on Route 99		
	Service to a mobile home park at 820 North Lincoln Way			
<b>Unincorporated Sacramento County</b>		More frequent service to the Herald area. Four letters were received and seven persons were in attendance at the hearing. The letters were specifically received from the Keesee's Guest home on Walkerville Road in Sacramento County		
<b>SRTD (incl. portions of Unincorporated Sacramento County)</b>			Route 25 needs Sunday and holiday service	
			Route 22 should operate its full length during the <i>weekends</i>	
		Light rail service to Folsom should operate until 10:30 P.M.		
			Route 21 serves Louis Orlando on some runs but not all	
			Route 6 should operate on Sunday and holiday service	
			Route 11 should operate weekend service	
<b>Service</b>				
<b>Yolo County</b>				
<b>Davis</b>		Increase number of trips on the Yolobus route #220 and add Sunday service.		Yolobus responded that there currently isn't a high demand for this service and demand would need to increase for additional service to be considered

	Not An Unmet Need	Unmet Need	Unmet Need that is Reasonable to Meet	Comments
	Service to the Kaiser Medical Facility in Vacaville (set to open in 2009)			Yolobus has obtained funding through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Freedom program to provide paratransit service that goes beyond what is required under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), so an ADA qualified person could use the existing paratransit service to go to the Kaiser medical facility in Vacaville pending continuing funds for this program
	There is a need for better transit connections across jurisdictional boundaries.			Yolobus currently has very good connections across jurisdictional boundaries and is currently the only public transit provider that serves the Sacramento International Airport.
		Unitrans service ends too early on Fridays and Saturdays.		Unitrans responded at the hearing that there currently isn't high demand for Unitrans services at that time and there is also a concern that they would not be able to get enough drivers who are willing to work during those time periods (all Unitrans drivers are UCD students). The P, Q, and G Unitrans routes operate on Saturday, along with Yolobus service, and there is also the UniRide dial-a-ride service offered on Sunday that runs until 9pm and Yolobus service as well.
		Yolobus service directly to the Amtrak Station in Davis.		That this option can be explored, though it would necessitate 5-7 minutes of running time to be cut from other areas of Davis thereby taking away service on a route (#42) that is heavily used by lower income people as their only means of transport. There is currently a bus stop within three blocks at 5 <sup>th</sup> and F Streets approximately 3/10ths of a mile away
	More frequent Express Yolobus runs to remedy overcrowded buses (re: routes #43 and #232).			The issue at hand wasn't how frequently the buses came (every 30 minutes as opposed to every 15 minutes) but rather the overcrowding/standees on the Express Yolobus service. He mentioned that Yolobus will soon be taking delivery of MCI buses that will be used on the Express routes and will seat 57 passengers, which is a substantial increase from the currently available number of seats.

	Not An Unmet Need	Unmet Need	Unmet Need that is Reasonable to Meet	Comments
	Provide Express/peak period service between Davis and the Sacramento International Airport.			That there is current YoloBus service to the Sacramento International Airport, therefore this request is no an unmet transit need. In fact, YoloBus is the only public transit operator in the region that serves the Sacramento International Airport. In addition, the Unmet Transit Needs process was created to make sure that transit services are available where they are needed though said transit services may not always be an convenient enough for the taste of all users
<b>West Sacramento</b>	Is it possible to get to the Davis Kaiser facility from West Sacramento?			One can use the YoloBus route #42 and connect with Unitrans M-F to reach the Davis Kaiser (this facility is only open M-F
	Beginning in January 2009 West Sacramento's new high school on Jefferson Blvd. and Linden Road, which will increase demand in this area on the YoloBus route #35.			Schedule modifications have been made to the route #35 to allow students to ride the YoloBus and get to school on-time
		Expand YoloBus route #39 services during the midday.		There currently is not sufficient demand for this service, but it may be considered in future years and is in the most recent short range transit plan
		The YoloBus route #241 should become an all day route with at least bi-hourly service due to the relocation of the CA State Dept. of Water Resources to the Port of Sacramento area, also in the area is the USPS sorting center (operating 24 hours per day		YoloBus has been in contact with the DWR regarding providing some midday service for their employees but would need the agency to provide funding for such service as they would likely be the only users of this type of service
		Extend the YoloBus route #35 to Southport Parkway at Ramco Street, a distance of 4/5ths of a mile, to better serve the many businesses along this route with possible route deviations.		YoloBus would consider adding a stop and extending the route #35 pending additional funding from the area businesses. He did not think route deviation would be possible using the large vehicles that currently service this route
<b>Woodland</b>		Provide Express YoloBus service to the Spring Lake Development west of Highway 113 and south of E. Gibson Road.		YoloBus has in its short range transit plan service to/from this area once the development is 75% built out. Currently there is not enough density to make transit service feasible
	Add buses to the YoloBus Express routes #43 & #45 to decrease overcrowding.			That buses have been added to those routes and that they are overcrowded as well, possibly due to riders preferring the new departure times
		Run local Woodland buses later so that they can connect with the later route #42 runs.		There is not currently demand for local Woodland buses to run later, but if there were in the future YoloBus could consider have later local bus service.

	Not An Unmet Need	Unmet Need	Unmet Need that is Reasonable to Meet	Comments
	Provide service to the Rite Aid distribution facility at Beamer Road and County Road 102.			That there currently isn't enough potential ridership in that area to support the necessary farebox recovery ratio. Service that was run out to the area in the past and was discontinued due to low ridership and lack of sufficient farebox revenue.
<b>Service</b>				
<b>Yuba and Sutter Counties</b>		Service to District 10		Service to the district had been provided in the past with little ridership. He cited land use concerns and demographics that include a higher income subdivision that is not likely to produce strong ridership
<b>Marysville</b>		Fixed route service to the Beale AFB Commissary.		The land use, jobs and lack of civilian employees at Beale make it difficult to justify regular service to the facility
		Service to Beale AFB for the civilian workforce.		The land use, jobs and lack of civilian employees at Beale make it difficult to justify regular service to the facility
<b>Yuba City</b>	Operations of bus service later into the evening. Current fixed route service ends at 6:30 PM.			Dial – a – ride service operates until 9:30 PM and is open to the general public. The dial – a – ride service handles about 25 to 30 passenger per night from 6:30 until 9:30 PM for the Yuba City and Marysville areas including Olive Hurst
		Operation of Sunday fixed route service.		The latest Short Range Transit Plan calls for consideration of Sunday service in the FY 2014-2015 time frame. He cited weak demand for Sunday service that would make it difficult to meet the farebox recovery ratio required by the Transportation Development Act
		Saturday service to Sacramento.		there is not enough demand for Saturday service and there would be problems meeting the fare box recovery ratio of 20%
	Service to the Sacramento International Airport.			Service to the airport is unlikely to generate sufficient ridership and that the Yolo County Transportation District currently provides service to the airport by Route 42

## UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS COMMENTS – SACRAMENTO COUNTY

Please note that only Service related comments are considered as part of the Unmet Transit Needs Process. All comments are forwarded on to the appropriate transit operator(s).

**City of Citrus Heights:** comments regarding transit services in the City of Citrus Heights have been listed under the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) as the public transit provider for the City.

**City of Elk Grove:** There are no Unmet Transit Needs the City of Elk Grove.

### Service related comments –

- Service to the Elizabeth Pinkerton Middle School (e-tran service is provided with the need for a 3 to 4 block walk to reach the school. The service operates during school hours. The area has new sidewalks as well). (*This is not an unmet need*).

### Operations related comments –

- A suggestion was brought up that using diesel hybrid buses similar to Lodi and Stockton might be a good idea.
- Frequency of bus operations to Downtown Sacramento.
- Poor reliability of older buses operating in the system.
- When bus trips are canceled, a replacement bus is not sent.
- How will passenger know when a bus is canceled?
- Direct midday service to Downtown Sacramento.
- Safety of vehicle conditions.
- Air Conditioning reliability concerns.
- Safe handling of vehicles by the drivers.
- Riders standing on Sacramento commuter routes.
- More frequent service.

**City of Folsom:** (any comments regarding light rail service to/from the City of Folsom have been listed under the SRTD). **There are Unmet Transit Needs in the City of Folsom.**

### Service related comments –

- Weekend service for Folsom Stage Lines to match the Light Rail Schedule (*this is an Unmet Transit Need that is Not Reasonable to meet*).
- Light Rail service to 10:30 P.M. (*this is an Unmet Transit Need that is Not Reasonable to meet*).

### Operations related comments –

- Extend SRTD Route 24 to Folsom station.

- Develop a bi-directional SRTD Route 24.

**City of Galt: There are Unmet Transit Needs in the City of Galt.**

Service related comments –

- Saturday service on Route 99 (*this is an Unmet Transit Need that is Not Reasonable to meet*).
- Service to a mobile home park at 820 North Lincoln Way (*this need has been met with the new dial-a-ride service*).

Operations related comments –

- Fare increases under the new dial-a-ride service and the potential negative impacts on transit riders.
- Why are fixed routes being terminated when we just went to fixed route a few years ago?
- Comments asking to keep fixed route services.
- Fixed Route 4 times should match school bell times.
- Concerns about the impact of the new dial-a-ride on school children who use the fixed routes.
- A rider would like lower fares and not an increase.
- Parking for the Route 99 commuter service.
- Route 99 service to City Hall
- Concerns about the procedures to use the new service
- Will there be transfers between the Route 99 service and the fixed route?
- Can passenger aides ride buses for free?
- Will a passenger be able to reserve a dial-a-ride in less than 24 hours advance?
- Senior citizens ability to pay for the new and increased fares.
- Commuter service to downtown Sacramento using the Stockton RTD bus.
- Under the old fixed route system, a request was made to have the buses timed to better serve River Oaks Elementary School bell times.
- A citizen would like the Route 99 service extended to serve Raley's and City Hall with the ability to pick up locally and drop off locally for a \$1 dollar fare.
- A petition from the Comfrey Senior Apartments and the Hudson Bay residents addressed concerns about increased fares with the new dial-a-ride services. Seventy Nine persons signed the petition.

**City of Isleton: There are no Unmet Transit Needs in the City of Isleton.**

Service related comments – none

Operations related comments –

- The Delta Service often operates late.

**City of Rancho Cordova: There are Unmet Transit Needs in the City of Rancho Cordova that are reasonable to meet.**

Service related comments – none

Operations related comments –

- Once the proposed Rancho Cordova shuttle service is initiated, the schedule should be placed in the RT Schedule Book.
- Concerns were raised about the ability of a 40' bus to turn around in the Anatolia area.

**City of Sacramento:** comments regarding transit services in the City of Sacramento have been listed under the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) as the public transit provider for the City.

**Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD): There are Unmet Transit Needs in the Sacramento Regional Transit District that are reasonable to meet.**

Comments regarding RT services to the Unincorporated Sacramento County areas of Fair Oaks/Orangevale etc. are contained in the **Unincorporated Sacramento County** section.

Service related comments –

Folsom light rail related comments:

- Light rail service to Folsom should operate until 10:30 P.M. (*this is an Unmet Transit Need that is Not Reasonable to meet*).

Other transit service related comments:

- Route 21 serves Louis Orlando on some runs but not all (*this is an unmet need that is reasonable to meet*).
- Route 25 needs Sunday and holiday service (*this is an unmet need that is reasonable to meet*).
- Route 22 should operate its full length during the weekends (*this is an unmet need that is reasonable to meet*).
- Route 6 should operate on Sunday and holiday service (*this is an unmet need that is reasonable to meet*).
- Route 11 should operate weekend service (*this is an unmet need that is reasonable to meet*).

Operations related comments –

- Route 93 should have coordination with Placer County transit service to Roseville and elsewhere in the county.
- A phone number suggestion for RT's customer service number should be BUS-RAIL (287 – 7245).
- A suggestion was made to move paratransit passengers closer to fixed route service to reduce the work load on the paratransit services.
- Bus shelter design should be improved to reduce the impact to the sun and rain.
- The new buses are noisy and leaky with loose rivets.
- Route 87 and 22 service headways are too long.
- Service to the new Kaiser hospital in Roseville
- A lack of coordination between transit services in the region.
- Service design gets passengers to and from Downtown Sacramento well, but does not work well getting people around the suburban ring.
- Lower the price of daily passes and remove the transfer system.
- Create a method for obtaining passes online.
- More bike racks are needed.
- More general public dial-a-ride service is needed.
- Seats on the mini high platforms for the light rail.
- Have new buses be designed to handle baby strollers and portable shopping carts.
- Concern about using one LRV on the South Line during the weekend and crowding occurring at night time hours as well as passenger security problems.

**Unincorporated Sacramento County: There are Unmet Transit Needs in the Unincorporated Sacramento County that are reasonable to meet.**

Service related comments –

- More frequent service to the Herald area. Four letters were received and seven persons were in attendance at the hearing. The letters were specifically received from the Keesee's Guest home on Walkerville Road in Sacramento County (*this is an Unmet Transit Need that is not reasonable to meet*).

Other Unincorporated area SRTD service related comments:

- Route 25 needs Sunday and holiday *service (this is an unmet need that is reasonable to meet)*.
- Route 22 should operate its full length during the *weekends (this is an unmet need that is reasonable to meet)*.

Operations related comments –

- The Delta Service often operates late.
- Route 93 should have coordination with Placer County transit service to Roseville and elsewhere in the county.
- Route 87 and 22 service headways are too long.

## UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS COMMENTS – YOLO COUNTY

Please note that only Service related comments are considered as part of the Unmet Transit Needs Process. All comments are forwarded on to the appropriate transit operator(s).

### **Yolo County:**

**Finding – There are no Unmet Transit Needs in unincorporated area of Yolo County.**

### **City of Davis:**

**Finding – There are Unmet Transit Needs in the City of Davis.**

### Service related comments -

- Increase number of trips on the Yolobus route #220 and add Sunday service. (*Terry Bassett of Yolobus responded that there currently isn't a high demand for this service and demand would need to increase for additional service to be considered*). This is an Unmet Transit Need.
- Service to the Kaiser Medical Facility in Vacaville (set to open in 2009). (*Mr. Bassett replied that Yolobus has obtained funding through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Freedom program to provide paratransit service that goes beyond what is required under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), so an ADA qualified person could use the existing paratransit service to go to the Kaiser medical facility in Vacaville pending continuing funds for this program*). This is not an Unmet Transit Need.
- There is a need for better transit connections across jurisdictional boundaries. (*Yolobus currently has very good connections across jurisdictional boundaries and is currently the only public transit provider that serves the Sacramento International Airport*). This is not an Unmet Transit Need.
- Unitrans service ends too early on Fridays and Saturdays. (*Anthony Palmere responded at the hearing that there currently isn't high demand for Unitrans services at that time and there is also a concern that they would not be able to get enough drivers who are willing to work during those time periods (all Unitrans drivers are UCD students). The P, Q, and G Unitrans routes operate on Saturday, along with Yolobus service, and there is also the UniRide dial-a-ride service offered on Sunday that runs until 9pm and Yolobus service as well*). This is an Unmet Transit Need.
- Yolobus service directly to the Amtrak Station in Davis. (*Mr. Bassett stated that this option can be explored, though it would necessitate 5-7 minutes of running time to be cut from other areas of Davis thereby taking away service on a route (#42) that is heavily used by lower income people as their only means of transport. There is currently a bus stop within three blocks at 5<sup>th</sup> and F Streets approximately 3/10ths of a mile away*). This is an Unmet Transit Need. Please note that the Yolobus #42 will no longer enter the park-n-ride lot off of Mace Blvd., but instead will pick up and drop off passengers on Mace Blvd. thereby allowing it to keep on schedule.
- More frequent Express Yolobus runs to remedy overcrowded buses (re: routes #43 and #232). (*Mr. Bassett responded by stating that the issue at hand wasn't how frequently the buses came (every 30 minutes as opposed to every 15 minutes) but rather the*

*overcrowding/standees on the Express Yolobus service. He mentioned that Yolobus will soon be taking delivery of MCI buses that will be used on the Express routes and will seat 57 passengers, which is a substantial increase from the currently available number of seats.) This is not an Unmet Transit Need.*

- Provide Express/peak period service between Davis and the Sacramento International Airport. *(Mr. Bassett replied that there is current Yolobus service to the Sacramento International Airport, therefore this request is no an unmet transit need. In fact, Yolobus is the only public transit operator in the region that serves the Sacramento International Airport. In addition, the Unmet Transit Needs process was created to make sure that transit services are available where they are needed though said transit services may not always be an convenient enough for the taste of all users.) This is not an Unmet Transit Need.*

#### Operations related comments –

- The Yolobus route #44 does not stop at West Capitol Ave. and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street in West Sacramento. *(Mr. Bassett explained that there is currently no safe place to stop at this time and there is a bus stop nearby that can be used. There may be a stop placed closer by once 3<sup>rd</sup> Street is brought up to grade level and pending an agreement with the City of West Sacramento to place a bus stop at that location).*
- Why is there no Mondavi Center stop? *(There currently isn't demand for a transit stop at the Mondavi Center, since it is only used sporadically. Transit users qualified under the ADA can use Davis Community Transit or YoloSpecial to get to and from the Mondavi Center. A shuttle route for events is possible and would need to be funded by the Mondavi Center).*

#### **City of West Sacramento:**

#### **Finding – There are Unmet Transit Needs in the City of West Sacramento.**

#### Service related comments –

- Increase paratransit services if fixed route services are reduced in West Sacramento. *(Mr. Bassett replied that there are no large scale service reductions planned for the City of West Sacramento. Additionally, paratransit services would continue to operate in West Sacramento regardless of reductions in fixed route services.)*
- Is it possible to get to the Davis Kaiser facility from West Sacramento? *(Mr. Reitz responded at the hearing that one can use the Yolobus route #42 and connect with Unitrans M-F to reach the Davis Kaiser (this facility is only open M-F)). This is not an Unmet Transit Need.*
- Beginning in January 2009 West Sacramento's new high school on Jefferson Blvd. and Linden Road, which will increase demand in this area on the Yolobus route #35. *(Schedule modifications have been made to the route #35 to allow students to ride the Yolobus and get to school on-time). This is not an Unmet Need.*
- Expand Yolobus route #39 services during the midday. *(There currently is not sufficient demand for this service, but it may be considered in future years and is in the most recent short range transit plan). This is an Unmet Transit Need.*

- The Yolobus route #241 should become an all day route with at least bi-hourly service due to the relocation of the CA State Dept. of Water Resources to the Port of Sacramento area, also in the area is the USPS sorting center (operating 24 hours per day). *(Yolobus has been in contact with the DWR regarding providing some midday service for their employees but would need the agency to provide funding for such service as they would likely be the only users of this type of service.) This is an Unmet Transit Need.*
- Extend the Yolobus route #35 to Southport Parkway at Ramco Street, a distance of 4/5ths of a mile, to better serve the many businesses along this route with possible route deviations. *(Mr. Bassett replied that Yolobus would consider adding a stop and extending the route #35 pending additional funding from the area businesses. He did not think route deviation would be possible using the large vehicles that currently service this route). This is an Unmet Transit Need.*

#### Operations related comments –

- What is the status of the West Sacramento Street Car project? *(Mr. Erik Reitz of Yolobus informed the hearing attendants that the CEQA review documents for the project were out for public review until January 2009).*
- Have promotional ‘free fare’ type efforts similar to SF’s MUNI. *(Mr. Villegas (Council Member City of West Sacramento) responded at the hearing that ‘Spare the Air’ days are ‘free fare’ days and are used as a promotional effort by Yolobus and the region’s transit operators to get more people to try transit and improve air quality. Mr. Reitz of YCTD also said that Yolobus is working with the West Sacramento School District to promote discounted student passes to students and their families and making these passes available at the schools.)*
- Status of a bus stop on Sacramento Avenue at Jefferson Blvd. *(Mr. Bassett replied that though technically possible to place a stop in this location it would not be safe since there are no roadside improvements (sidewalk etc.). In addition there is currently no development along this stretch of roadway so a stop would not serve any residents or businesses.)*
- Advertise the benefits of using public transit on highway/roadway information signs during rush hours. *(This is a possible use for highway/roadway information signs only when they are not in use for public and highway/roadway safety messages, though it is not an Unmet Transit Need).*
- Advise paratransit users about ‘personal responsibility’ and assist them in moving closer to fixed route transit to reduce the strain on complimentary paratransit services. *(This issue was brought up in the SACOG Senior and Disabled Mobility Study. As it stands people, regardless of physical ability, have the freedom to choose where they live including aging in place in their often suburban and rural homes that are not near fixed route transit services. This is not an Unmet Transit Need.)*
- Have signs on YCTD routes display service days such as M-F only or Mon-Saturday etc. *(Mr. Bassett replied that it is not feasible to display days of service for all routes and all location due to space constraints and the sheer number of signs. There are Yolobus stops that do have abbreviated route schedules and days of service posted at some high use stops.)*
- Replace former wooden benches with metal ones as sidewalks are widened sufficiently for benches, bus shelters, ADA access. *(Mr. Bassett responded that Yolobus will work with the City of West Sacramento to replace the benches and install shelters and ADA access improvements as needed.)*

- Redesign future bus shelters so that they take full advantage of air flow while still providing protection from the elements. *(This is not an Unmet Transit Need.)*
- Do not allow smoking within 25 feet of bus shelters. *(This is not an Unmet Transit Need.)*

**City of Woodland:**

**Finding – There are Unmet Transit Needs in the City of Woodland.**

Service related comments –

- Provide Express Yolobus service to the Spring Lake Development west of Highway 113 and south of E. Gibson Road. *(Mr. Bassett replied that Yolobus has in its short range transit plan service to/from this area once the development is 75% built out. Currently there is not enough density to make transit service feasible.) This is an Unmet Transit Need.*
- Add buses to the Yolobus Express routes #43 & #45 to decrease overcrowding. *(Mr. Reitz replied at the hearing that buses have been added to those routes and that they are overcrowded as well, possibly due to riders preferring the new departure times.) This is not an Unmet Transit Need.*
- Run local Woodland buses later so that they can connect with the later route #42 runs. *(Mr. Bassett replied that there is not currently demand for local Woodland buses to run later, but if there were in the future Yolobus could consider have later local bus service.) This is an Unmet Transit Need.*
- Provide service to the Rite Aid distribution facility at Beamer Road and County Road 102. *(Mr. Bassett replied that there currently isn't enough potential ridership in that area to support the necessary farebox recovery ratio. Service that was run out to the area in the past and was discontinued due to low ridership and lack of sufficient farebox revenue.) This is not an Unmet Transit Need.*

Operations related comments –

- Have buses take County Road 102/Poleline Road instead of state highway 113. *(Mr. Bassett responded by stating that this is not the route used for a number of reasons including the safety of the two land county road vs. a divided highway, also using County Road 102 would essentially cut of the services provided west of highway 113 where a much higher density of business and housing exist.)*
- Reinstate the 'Route 46' proposal that would split Woodland into north and south sections. *(This plan has been put off because there is not sufficient density in Woodland to support this type of geographic split). This is not an Unmet Transit Need.*

**City of Winters:** There were no comments regarding transit service in the City of Winters.

**Finding – There are no Unmet Transit Needs in the City of Winters.**

## UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS COMMENTS – YUBA AND SUTTER COUNTIES

Please note that only Service related comments are considered as part of the Unmet Transit Needs Process. All comments are forwarded on to the appropriate transit operator(s).

**Sutter County: There are no Unmet Transit Needs in unincorporated area of Sutter County.**

**Yuba City: There are Unmet Transit Needs in the City of Yuba City.**

### Service related comments -

- Operations of bus service later into the evening. Current fixed route service ends at 6:30 PM. *(Keith Martin replied that dial – a – ride service operates until 9:30 PM and is open to the general public. The dial – a – ride service handles about 25 to 30 passenger per night from 6:30 until 9:30 PM for the Yuba City and Marysville areas including Olive Hurst). This is not an Unmet Transit Need.*
- Operation of Sunday fixed route service. *(Mr. Martin replied that the latest Short Range Transit Plan calls for consideration of Sunday service in the FY 2014-2015 time frame. He cited weak demand for Sunday service that would make it difficult to meet the farebox recovery ratio required by the Transportation Development Act). This in not an Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet.*
- Saturday service to Sacramento. *(Mr. Martin responded that there is not enough demand for Saturday service and there would be problems meeting the fare box recovery ratio of 20%). This in not an Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet.*
- Service to the Sacramento International Airport. *(Mr. Martin replied that service to the airport is unlikely to generate sufficient ridership and that the Yolo County Transportation District currently provides service to the airport by Route 42). This in not an Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet.*

### Operations related comments –

- The Food Max grocery store does not have a bus stop at the store and riders must walk to the bus stop nearby. *(Mr. Martin explained that there is a bus stop nearby that can be used. He cannot allow buses to transit through the parking area for safety reasons).*
- The Route 1 is often late and is standing room only. *(Mr. Martin responded that full buses are often late because of the additional time required to board and disembark passengers).*
- Better service to Mervyns. *(Service to Mervyns is already provided by routes 1 and 4).*
- Five dollar monthly passes for seniors. *(Mr. Martin replied that dial-a-ride services generally do not have monthly passes due to the fiscal difficulties of offering a discounted pass to riders).*
- More buses for dial-a-ride service. *(Mr. Martin replied that there are no plans to increase dial-a-ride services. However, as fixed route service improves, some dial-a-ride passengers may switch to fixed route services).*

**Yuba County: There are no Unmet Transit Needs in unincorporated area of Yuba County.**

Service related comments –

- Service to district 10. (*Mr. Martin replied that service to the district had been provided in the past with little ridership. He cited land use concerns and demographics that include a higher income subdivision that is not likely to produce strong ridership). This in not an Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet.*

**City of Marysville: There are no Unmet Transit Needs in the City of Marysville.**

Service related comments –

- Fixed route service to the Beale AFB Commissary. (*Keith Martin replied that the land use, jobs and lack of civilian employees at Beale make it difficult to justify regular service to the facility). This in not an Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet.*
- Service to Beale AFB for the civilian workforce. (*Keith Martin replied that the land use, jobs and lack of civilian employees at Beale make it difficult to justify regular service to the facility). This in not an Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet.*

Other comments – N/A

**PUBLIC HEARING ON TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE CITY OF CITRUS HEIGHTS  
INCLUDING SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT SERVICES  
MINUTES**

**OCTOBER 14, 2008 – 6:00 P.M.  
CITRUS HEIGHTS COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
6237 FOUNTAIN SQUARE DRIVE, CITRUS HEIGHTS**

The meeting was conducted by James Shelby of the SACOG Board, Ed Coviello, SACOG Staff, and Mark Bennett representing the Sacramento Regional Transit District and the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council.

Three people attended the Citrus Heights hearing and one attendee gave testimony pertaining to transit services. Correspondence for the Sacramento Regional Transit District can be found in the SRTD meeting minutes. Mr. Ed Coviello described the unmet transit needs process. Mr. Mark Bennett gave a presentation on current RT services.

Mr. Shelby opened the hearing at 6:00 p.m. He introduced members of the hearing panel and explained that SACOG is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides funds for transportation purposes throughout the SACOG region.

Mr. Coviello also explained that after the hearing, the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) will meet to assist SACOG staff in analyzing the hearing testimony based on criteria adopted by the Board of Directors and further explained the SSTAC membership makeup.

Mr. Bennett gave a brief overview of SRTD services.

Mr. Shelby opened the public hearing.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**1. Mike Barnbaum, Sacramento, CA**

Mr. Barnbaum had multiple comments:

- a. Mr. Barnbaum stated that the Route 93 should have coordination with Placer County transit service to Roseville and elsewhere in the county.
- b. Route 21 serves Louis Orlando on some runs but not all. He would like to see all runs operate to Louis Orlando.
- c. Route 25 needs Sunday and holiday service.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

Correspondence for the Sacramento Regional Transit District can be found in the SRTD meeting minutes.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE CITY OF ELK GROVE  
MINUTES**

**OCTOBER 13, 2008 – 6:00 P.M.  
ELK GROVE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

Conducted by Jim Cooper of the SACOG Board of Directors, Barbara VaughanBechtold, SACOG staff, and Raquel Chavarria of e-TRAN and also representing the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council; additionally, James Drake from Regional Transit was in attendance. One person testified at the hearing. Correspondence was received from four people. Ms. Barbara VaughanBechtold described the unmet transit needs process. Ms. Raquel Chavarria gave a presentation on current service in Elk Grove. Mr. Drake gave an overview of Regional Transit's Services.

Mr. Cooper opened the hearing at 6:00 p.m. He introduced members of the hearing panel and explained that SACOG is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides funds for transportation purposes throughout the SACOG region.

Ms. VaughanBechtold then explained that after the hearing the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) will meet to assist SACOG staff in analyzing the hearing testimony based on criteria adopted by the Board of Directors and further explained the SSTAC membership makeup.

Mr. Cooper opened the public hearing.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**1. Jeff Doll, Sacramento CA**

- a. Mr. Doll asked about the status of the rebuilt hybrid gasoline buses and the possibility of using diesel hybrid buses like those used in Stockton and Lodi.
- b. He also expressed his concern regarding light rail being extended to Elk Grove. He is concerned that there will be an increase in homeless and others coming to Elk Grove on the light rail.
- c. He stated that a bike / Pedestrian trail would be a safer route to Sacramento from Elk Grove.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

**1. Rosa M. Salazar**

Hello:

My name is Rosa, and I am a daily rider to downtown Sacramento from my home in Elk Grove.

Right now there is only one bus every 30 minutes to Downtown. Many times, the trips are cancelled for reasons of mechanical failure. This new Administration does not send a replacement bus, but cancels the trip. I just wonder, for people who are at the bus stop just waiting, not carrying their computers along, nor watching them, the notice is not received at all, which makes the waiting completely in vain. This has been going on for about two years.

When RT used to service Elk Grove in the 1990's, they just rendered trips to Elk Grove from Downtown during rush hours, with the exception of Line 56, which operated the whole day. Now, we do have a service for rush hour only. Local busses run back and forth to the Laguna area, but do not go Downtown at every hour, which discourages the use of public transportation.

The need for a more consistent service is clear. There are not stable lines which can operate all day long on a constant basis, only during rush hour. I imagine that Regional Transit provided rush hour only transportation because they were catering several cities; however, Elk Grove E-tran only caters Elk Grove, and there is no reason for only providing rush hour only trips to Sacramento.

Please take care of our needs and provide a reliable service, which encourages to use more public transit than cars with confidence.

Thank you so much,

Rosa M. Salazar

## **2. Dan Leggett**

I am interested in a bus route that travels the length of Big Horn Blvd in Elk Grove. My son attends the new Elizabeth Pinkerton Middle School at the south end of Big Horn and we (as well as several other families) live near Big Horn and Franklin. A bus route that is synced with the School start and stop times would be very useful.

Thank you  
Dan Leggett

## **3. Kate Hancock**

Hello

I am a fairly new rider of the Elk Grove E-Tran, I have been riding 5 days a week since July 1st. In hearing about the request for feedback I thought I would email my observations. The buses are very old and unreliable. Not only are they falling apart on the inside (no a/c is the biggest complaint) they are breaking down frequently leaving riders to have to find other forms of transportation unexpectedly from the side of the road. I ride the 3<sup>rd</sup> #58 in the evening on a daily basis and the current driver (Louie) is very friendly but does not know how to drive. He breaks way too hard for no apparent reason - constantly. You actually feel beat up when you get off the bus. Lastly, they need more buses on route 58, both in the morning and the evening. There are always riders having to stand all the way from Calvine

to downtown every morning (a.m 2<sup>nd</sup> #58) because the bus is to full and intermittently on the way home it is standing room only (p.m 3<sup>rd</sup> #58).

Thanks  
Kate

#### **4. Angie Suy**

I have been taking E-Tran for the last 4 years. The thing that I'm not too happy about is that E-Tran bus is or always late most of the time either in the morning or afternoon. There needs to be more time frames for all the bus like every 15-30 minutes. Sometime there are no seats left when I get on. Sometime the bus breaks down and they don't have enough bus to come pick us up in a timely manner. I want to know if there is a note that the bus driver can write to me when I'm late to work. In the summertime, there's no air conditioner on some of the bus.

Angie E. Suy  
Staff Services Analyst, DARS  
Dept. of Corrections and Rehabilitation

#### **5. Rochelle Tilton, Sacramento**

During construction of Stockton Blvd., Route 60 had a temporary stop on Power Inn next to Lowes. Route 58 also stopped at this location. Now that Stockton Blvd. is completed, neither Route 60 nor Route 58 stops next to Lowes. I am requesting that the Route 58 bus stop move from its current location south of Geneva Point to the location closer to Lowes for safety reasons. The current bus stop is extremely dark and has only one street light which is blocked by trees that align the street. It is in a very dark and unsafe location and we frequently encounter pedestrians that make us feel uneasy. Ridership would increase if the location were closer to Lowes where there are numerous street lights particularly during the fall and winter months. This has been discussed by all of us that currently board the bus at this location.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE COMMUNITIES OF FAIR OAKS &  
ORANGEVALE AND THE SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT  
MINUTES**

**NOVEMBER 20, 2008 – 6:00 P.M.  
DEPARTMENT OF NIEGHBOORHOOD SERVICES  
5229-B HAZEL AVENUE, FAIR OAKS**

Conducted by Roberta MacGlashan of the SACOG Board, Barbara VaughanBechtold and Ed Coviello, SACOG staff, and Mark Bennett representing the Sacramento Regional Transit District and Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council

None of the three people in attendance testified at the hearing. Ms. Barbara VaughanBechtold described the unmet transit needs process. Mr. Bennett gave a presentation on current RT service.

Ms. MacGlashan opened the hearing at 6:00 p.m. She introduced members of the hearing panel and explained that SACOG is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides funds for transportation purposes throughout the SACOG region.

Ms. VaughanBechtold also explained that after the hearing the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) will meet to assist SACOG staff in analyzing the hearing testimony based on criteria adopted by the Board of Directors and further explained the SSTAC membership makeup.

Ms. Bennett gave a brief overview of SRTD services.

Ms. MacGlashan opened the public hearing.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**Fair Oaks Hearing**

There was not public testimony at this meeting.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

Correspondence for services in the Sacramento Regional Transit District can be found in the SRTD meeting minutes.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE CITY OF FOLSOM INCLUDING  
SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT LIGHT RAIL SERVICE  
MINUTES**

**OCTOBER 29, 2008 – 5:30 P.M.  
FOLSOM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE  
200 WOOL STREET, FOLSOM**

Conducted by Steve Miklos of the SACOG Board, Barbara VaughanBechtold and Ed Coviello, SACOG staff, Mark Bennett representing the Sacramento Regional Transit District, and Kent Gary representing the Folsom Stage Line and the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council.

Three people attended the Folsom hearing and one attendee gave testimony pertaining to transit services. Correspondence was received from two people. Mr. Ed Coviello described the unmet transit needs process. Mr. Mark Bennett gave a presentation on current RT service and Kent Gary gave a presentation on Folsom Stage Line services.

Mr. Miklos opened the hearing at 6:00 p.m. He introduced members of the hearing panel and explained that SACOG is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides funds for transportation purposes throughout the SACOG region.

Mr. Coviello also explained that after the hearing the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) will meet to assist SACOG staff in analyzing the hearing testimony based on criteria adopted by the Board of Directors, and further explained the SSTAC membership makeup.

Mr. Bennett gave a brief overview of SRTD service and Mr. Gary a brief overview of Folsom Stage Line services.

Mr. Miklos opened the public hearing.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**Folsom Hearing**

**1. Mike Barnbaum, Sacramento, CA**

Mr. Barnbaum had multiple comments:

- a. Regional Transit Mobility Advisory Council works to improve transit service for seniors and the disabled.
- b. Folsom Stage Line needs weekend service to match the Folsom Light Rail schedule and to increase the market for light rail ridership on the weekends beyond the walking distance to the stations. Specifically, Route 10 and add dial-a-ride service on the weekend as well.

- c. Increase LRT service to 10:30 PM incrementally over a number to years.
- d. Route 24 should be extended to the Historic Folsom Station. This would reduce a transfer required by Route 24 passengers to reach the Folsom Station.
- e. Route 24 should also be a bi-directional loop to enhance service quality.
- f. There should be Sunday service on Route 24.

### **SUMMARY OF CORESPONDANCE**

None received for the City of Folsom.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE CITY OF GALT  
MINUTES**

**NOVEMBER 6, 2008 – 5:30 P.M.  
GALT CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

The meeting was conducted by Edward Coviello and Gary Taylor, SACOG staff, and Darryl Clare representing the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Board of Directors. Barbara Payne of the Galt City Council and alternate SACOG Board member was present as well.

Mr. Clare opened the hearing at 5:35 p.m. He introduced members of the hearing panel and explained that SACOG is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides funds for transportation purposes throughout the SACOG region.

Mr. Coviello of SACOG explained the unmet transit needs process.

Mr. Gary Taylor of SACOG explained the South County Transit present transit service and explained the upcoming service changes that are planned starting December 1, 2008.

Mr. Clare then opened the public hearing.

**Staff Present:**

Darryl Clare  
Barbara Payne  
Edward Coviello  
Gary Taylor

Public present can be found on the attached attendance sheet.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**1. Marilyn Blausett, Galt**

Ms. Blausett had concerns about the amount of seniors who use the service from the senior center. She also asked what the fare difference is between the fixed route and dial-a-ride under the new service plan.

Mr. Taylor replied that Galt needs to attain a 20% fare box recovery ratio and that increased fares will help the service meet those needs. He also outlined the fare increases that will go into effect December 1, 2008.

Ms. Blausett expressed her concerns about the scope of the fare increases and cited that many riders will be lost because of the size of the fare increase.

Dave Stores from the newly hired transit service contractor explained that more buses will be available to make the dial-a-ride work.

Ms. Blausett asked how much the Route 99 service is and asked why the service changes were contemplated in the first place. Why change?

Mr. Taylor replied that the fixed route service was not effective and the land uses in Galt do not support a sustainable fixed route service.

An unidentified meeting attendee commented that ridership will be lost with the new service.

Marilyn also asked about Measure A funds and if they are used to support the transit services.

## **2. Mattie Shepherd, Galt**

Ms. Shepherd noted that the fixed routes were mandated and asked why are going back to dial-a-ride? She also asked about service to medical facilities in Lodi.

Mr. Taylor noted that the 1995 SRTP recommended two fixed routes.

Mr. Stores gave an overview of the new service to include procedures for getting a ride through the new system and explaining that the Kaiser service will not change.

## **3. Mindy Eubanks, Galt**

With the fixed routes, the ridership has been increasing.

Mr. Taylor noted that ADA service is required with fixed routes and this increases costs drastically.

## **4. Jesus Contreras, Herald CA**

Mr. Contreras asked if transit will go to Harold more frequently. He noted that service is only on Tuesday. He presented a list of persons who would like to see the service increased to the location. There were a total of seven persons who were also representing his concerns at the meeting.

## **5. Mel Pummill, Galt**

Mr. Pummill had several points he wanted to make. They are:

- Too expensive
- He does not drive and needs the service
- Fixed route works well
- Uses a day pass
- Please keep the route at twin cities
- He has no other way of transportation

## **6. Leo Duclos, Galt**

Mr. Duclos commented on Route 4 operations and explained that the routes three and four are really the same. He also said that the schedules do not match with the school bell times and students have to wait for 45 minutes. He is concerned about the new service and the impacts it will have on the school service currently in place.

Mr. Duclos asked if his ten ride tickets he purchased will still be valid when the service changes on December 1<sup>st</sup>. He asked how he will get to his doctor in Lodi and South Sacramento.

The transit operator noted that he will get cash back for the ten ride tickets.

## **7. Tommy Jean Hartol**

The fares will be increasing costs by \$36.00 per month for the riders. We need lower fares.

## **8. Donald Smith, Galt**

Mr. Smith asked how he can get to the Highway 99 route if there is no fixed route connection. He noted that he has to drive his car to reach the highway 99 service and that the fares for dial-a-ride should be lowered. He asked if there will be Saturday service on the route 99 service.

Mr. Taylor noted that there is increased Route 99 service proposed in the current SRTP.

## **9. Denise Thompson, Galt**

Denise had several points to comment on.

- Her son depends upon the route 3 and 4 for after school activities.
- Will he have to call 24 hours in advance to schedule a ride?
- Can passenger aides ride the buses for free?
- Will there be a transfer between dial-a-ride and the Highway 99 service?

Mr. Taylor replied that the aides will ride for free and that there are currently no transfers planned between dial-a-ride and the Highway 99 service.

## **10. An unknown meeting member**

The member asked how long her grand daughter will have to wait for a connection to Route 99 when returning home from Sacramento. The grand daughter will need shorter notice time than the 24 hours planned under the new service.

## **11. Al Baldwin, Galt**

Mr. Baldwin is concerned about senior citizens and their ability to afford the new fare increases. He also is worried that if a fare box recovery ratio of 20% is not met, will fares be raised?

He pointed out that Galt has an increasing senior population and they are often on fixed incomes.

## **12. Tabettha Willion, Herald CA**

Tabetha detailed several points.

- Commuter options to downtown Sacramento
- She drives to catch the e-tran bus because it is simpler than using the Highway 99
- Is service to Downtown Sacramento being explored through the use of the Stockton commuter bus service to Sacramento

Mr. Clare responded that it has been explored in the past, but that there were not enough riders interested. He also noted that state employees might be a good starting point to see how many people are interested in the service.

Mr. Taylor concluded that part of the SRTP includes commuter service options.

Mr. Clare noted that advertising for a new service should be expanded along with other marketing efforts.

Mr. Clare closed the meeting at 6:56 PM.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

### **1. Barbara Payne, GALT**

I just received this input yesterday and wanted to pass it on regarding the unmet transit needs in Galt. A citizen, who happens to be in a wheel chair, suggested that since you are keeping the 99 Route as a fixed route that you pick up at Raley's and for \$1 drop off at the City Hall, 380 Civic Dr. that could be used for downtown shopping and flea market shopping. Please give these suggestions consideration. Thank you, Barbara Payne, Galt City Council and SACOG alternate.

Building a bright  
future for all learners



**Galt Joint Union Elementary School District**

1018 C Street, Suite 210 • Galt, CA 95632  
209-744-4545 • 209-744-4553 FAX

November 6, 2008

Barbara Payne  
Galt City Council  
380 Civic Drive  
Galt, CA 95632

Dear Councilmember Payne,

I have summarized transportation needs expressed by three principals in the Galt Joint Union Elementary School District. I appreciate these transit needs coming forward in the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) meeting in Galt.

Sincerely,

Karen Schauer Ed.D.  
District Superintendent

Marengo Ranch Elementary School

This school does not have a regular SCT "TRACS" Bus stop. Students must pay the Dial -a- Ride rate of \$3.00 instead of the bus stop rate of \$1.00.

Valley Oaks Elementary School

Parents feel the cost of "TRACS" is too expensive at \$3.00 each way. In addition, the location of the stop is a safety concern because it is across the street from the school.

River Oaks Elementary School

The dismissal time for school is 2:30 p.m. The pick-up time from TRACS is 3:00 p.m. Public transportation coordinated with school dismissal time would be more safe and effective.

---

Karen Schauer, District Superintendent • James Bauler, Assistant Superintendent  
Robert Nacario, Director of Educational Services • Judy Bullard, Director of Curriculum • Debbie Schmidt, Director of Business

BOARD OF TRUSTEES: Donna Fluty ~ Robert Ellis ~ Ervin Hatzenbuehler ~ Susan Richardson ~ Tina Skinner

**2. Douglas M Pickett, Galt**

We have four mobile home parks in our AREA and no bus stop. No scheduled bus service. We badly need it! I am at 820 North Lincoln way At Pringle and Lincoln way and there are three other mobile home parks here. These four parks house several hundred people. Please give serious consideration to providing scheduled bus service.

**3. Comments and petition from the Comfrey Senior Apartments** on service changes. There are 91 signatures attached to the comments below. The signatures are not show to protect privacy. Signatures are kept on record by SACOG staff.

Comfrey Senior Apartments and Hudson Bay Residents  
Located at 975 and 1003 Lake Park Avenue, Galt, CA.  
attended the hearing November 6, 2008 to express our  
concerns of hearing the plans to change our transit service.  
We all are aware of the tough economic times we are facing,  
but cutting the services of seniors, families who depend on  
the service will be very difficult getting to medical, shopping  
that we had become to rely on. The signatures are merely  
for support of our residents who need the bus service .  
For: Sacramento Area Council of Governments  
1415 L Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA. 95614  
Attention: Ed Coviello

4. Letters featuring multiple comments from the Keese Guest Home in Galt

10-17-08

DEAR SOUTH COUNTY TRANSIT,

I LIVE AT THE KEESE GUEST HOME ON WALKERVILLE ROAD. AS YOU KNOW, THE TRAX BUS COMES TO OUR HOME ON TUESDAYS. UNFORTUNATELY, I CANNOT WALK TO THE END OF THE STREET TO CATCH THE BUS ON OTHER DAYS. PLEASE INCREASE YOUR HOME SERVICE TO INCLUDE OTHER DAYS.

THANK YOU,

Jo Ann M. Johns

10-19-08

DEAR SOUTH COUNTY TRANSIT:

I LIVE AT KEESE'S ON WALKERVILLE ROAD. AT PRESENT, THE TRAX BUS COMES TO OUR HOUSE ON TUESDAY ONLY. AS I AM DISABLED BOTH PHYSICALLY & MENTALLY, I CANNOT WAIT FOR A LONG PERIOD OF TIME STANDING WAITING ON THE BUSY ROAD AT WALKERVILLE AND ACTA MESA. IN ADDITION, I CANNOT CARRY MY HEAVY GOODS FROM THE INTERSECTION TO HOME DUE TO MY BAD BACK.

THIS IS MY FIRST YEAR OF RIDING THE BUS, AND I WOULD GO MORE OFTEN IF THE BUS WOULD INCREASE ITS SERVICE TO MY HOME.

Donne Manteynew

10-16-08

DEAR SOUTH COUNTY TRANSIT,

I LIVE AT KEESEE'S GUEST HOME ON WALKERVILLE ROAD. ON TUESDAYS THE BUS COMES TO OUR HOUSE. ON OTHER DAYS, HOWEVER, THE BUS COMES TO THE CORNER OF WALKERVILLE & ALTA MESA. DUE TO A FOOT INJURY, I CANNOT WALK DOWN THE CORNER. IF YOU COULD SEE YOUR WAY TO COME TO OUR HOUSE EACH DAY, I WOULD GLADLY USE IT ON OTHER DAYS. I APPRECIATE YOUR SERVICE, AND AM LOOKING FORWARD TO INCREASED SERVICE.

THANK YOU,

ROBSON STONE

*Robly Stone*

10-16-08

DEAR SOUTH COUNTY TRANSIT,

I LIVE AT KEESEE'S GUEST HOME, 12161 WALKERVILLE ROAD. I APPRECIATE YOUR HOME SERVICE ON TUESDAYS. IT ALLOWS ME TO GO INTO GALT WITH NO PROBLEMS. UNFORTUNATELY, I CANNOT WALK FROM HOME TO THE CORNER OF WALKERVILLE & ALTA MESA, SO I AM LIMITED TO GOING ON THE BUS ON TUESDAYS ONLY. I WOULD CERTAINLY RIDE ON OTHER DAYS IF THE BUS WOULD COME HERE ON OTHER DAYS. SOMETIMES I NEED TO BE IN TOWN ON DAYS OTHER THAN TUESDAYS, BUT AS THINGS ARE NOW, I CANNOT BECAUSE OF MY LEGS.

AGAIN, I APPRECIATE YOUR SERVICE AND BOG YOU TO INCREASE YOUR SERVICE TO US.

SINCERELY,

RONALD C. GRAVES

KEESEE'S GUEST HOME

**PUBLIC HEARING ON TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE CITY OF ISLETON  
MINUTES**

**OCTOBER 21, 2008 – 2:00 P.M.  
ISLETON CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

The meeting was conducted by Gene Resler of the SACOG Board of Directors and Barbara VaughanBechtold, SACOG staff.

Two persons testified at the hearing. No correspondence was received. Ms. Barbara VaughanBechtold described the unmet transit needs process.

Mr. Resler opened the hearing at 2:00 p.m. He explained that SACOG is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides funds for transportation purposes throughout the SACOG region.

Ms. VaughanBechtold explained that after the hearing the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) will meet to assist SACOG staff in analyzing the hearing testimony based on criteria adopted by the Board of Directors and further explained the SSTAC membership makeup.

The attendance sheet is attached.

Mr. Resler opened the public hearing.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**1. Van Martin, Isleton CA**

Mr. Martin stated that the route that operates to Isleton is often late.

**2. Jeff Kohlhepp, Delta Breeze Representative, Lodi, CA**

Solano paratransit clients are causing delays on the deviated fixed route Rio Vista Delta Breeze service.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

None.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE CITY OF MARYSVILLE  
MINUTES**

**DECEMBER 16, 2008 – 2 P.M.  
YUBA COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER, MARYSVILLE**

The meeting was conducted by Edward Coviello, SACOG staff, and Claudia Hollis representing the Sutter/Yuba County Joint Social Service Transportation Advisory Council. Also in attendance was Keith Martin of representing the Yuba-Sutter Transit District.

Minutes from the Marysville Transportation Development Act Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing for FY 2009-10.

Public attendance was taken through an attendance sheet attached.

**Staff Present:**

Claudia Hollis  
Keith Martin  
Edward Coviello

The meeting started at 2:05 PM with opening remarks from Edward Coviello.

Edward Coviello then read the purpose of the hearing and the methods of how comments will be accepted. He also defined unmet transit needs.

Keith Martin of Yuba-Sutter Transit explained his systems service and planned service changes including the addition of low floor buses and new commuter park and rides.

Mr. Coviello then opened the meeting to public comments.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**1. Mr. Darrell Clayton, Marysville**

Mr. Clayton expressed his concerns with the service at the Food Max grocery store and the fact that it does not have a bus stop at the store, He indicated that service could be brought to the store through some changes to the routes serving the area.

Mr. Clayton also indicated his experiences with Route 1 and its reliability problems. He also would like better service to Mervyns. He also expressed concerns that portable food carts are not always accepted by the bus operators for boarding passengers. He explained that there are items that he gets at Food Max that he cannot get elsewhere.

## **2. Ms. Irene Broome, Marysville**

Ms. Broome of the Yuba County Senior Center in Marysville asked if seniors can be eligible for a five dollar monthly pass.

She indicated that maybe more seniors would ride if the fares were cheaper. Some seniors are using ten ride tickets.

Mr. Keith Martin outlined that the Feather River Air District currently subsidizes the \$15 per month student passes through a grant. He does not expect that the grant could be expanded to fund seniors. However, he suggested talking to the Air District to see if they would fund such a program.

Mr. Martin further explained the Yuba-Sutter pass system

Ms. Broome asked about passes for dial-a-ride.

Mr. Martin indicated that there is not a pass system for dial-a-ride because of the cost to operate it. He explained that dial-a-ride gets about 3 passengers per hour and fixed route averages about 20 riders per hour.

An unknown member at the hearing asked if there would be any more buses to be used for dial-a-ride.

Mr. Martin – there are no plans to expand the dial-a-ride service. However, as fixed route improves he is expecting more riders will use fixed routes.

The unknown member explained that this would work if they are close to fixed routes.

Mr. Martin replied that not all dial-a-ride users will switch.

The unknown member asked when the new buses will be arriving.

Mr. Martin replied that they will start arriving tomorrow.

The unknown member asked if they are planning to expand the service area.

Mr. Martin replied that almost all of the urbanized area around Yuba City and Marysville is within a short walk of fixed route transit service. He also explained that once outside of the urbanized area, the population densities become very low. This makes fixed route service difficult to sustain.

The unknown member asked if all fixed routes will have half-hour service.

Mr. Martin answered that most routes will not go to half hour service. He did indicate that Route 4 may see increased service.

The unknown member asked about downtown Sacramento services.

Mr. Martin explained that there are 21 trips to Sacramento during weekdays.

The unknown member asked about connecting transit services between the rural routes and the commuter services.

Ms. Broome asked about services to Caltrans District 10.

Mr. Martin expressed that service to district 10 has been provided in the past via the foothill routes and the service has been eliminated.

Mr. Clayton explained that Route 1 often has standing room only.

Mr. Martin replied that school students make up a large portion of the ridership.

Ms. Broome asked about bus service to Sacramento

Mr. Clayton asked about service to Beale AFB.

Mr. Martin explained that the land use at Beale does not support transit operations.

Ms. Broome asked about service to the airport.

Mr. Martin replied that passengers can connect to Yolo Bus Route 42 in Sacramento to get to the airport.

Mr. Coviello asked if there were any further comments.

Seeing no additional comments, Mr. Coviello closed the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

Correspondence for Marysville can be found in the Yuba City Hearing minutes.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA  
MINUTES**

**NOVEMBER 18, 2007 – 6:00 P.M.  
RANCHO CORDOVA – CITY HALL AMERICAN RIVER NORTH ROOM**

The meeting was conducted by Linda Budge representing the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Board of Directors.

Ms. Budge opened the hearing at 6:00 p.m. She introduced members of the hearing panel and explained that SACOG is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides funds for transportation purposes throughout the SACOG region.

Mr. Coviello of SACOG explained the unmet transit needs process.

Mr. Bennett explained the Sacramento Regional Transit District's present transit service and explained some of the past efforts. He also outlined some possible future efforts with the service.

Ms. Budge then opened the public hearing. Seeing no requests to speak, Ms. Budge closed the hearing at 6:01 PM.

**Staff Present:**

SACOG Director Linda Budge  
Mark Bennett, Sacramento Regional Transit District  
Barbara VaughanBechtold, SACOG  
Edward Coviello, SACOG  
Troy Holt, City of Rancho Cordova  
Cyrus Abhar, City of Rancho Cordova  
Cindy Jorgenson

Public present can be found on the attached attendance sheet.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

There was no public testimony at the meeting. However, staff discussed the proposed shuttle service to RT Light Rail and the need to place this in RT's schedule book once initiated. The topic of the shuttle service sparked a discussion of the ability of a 40' coach to turn around in the Anatolia area. Mark Bennett of RT stated that it cannot be done with the current roadway width.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence for Rancho Cordova.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT  
MINUTES**

**NOVEMBER 3, 2008 – 6:00 P.M.  
SRTD BOARD ROOM  
1400 29<sup>TH</sup> STREET, SACRAMENTO**

The Meeting was conducted by Roberta MacGlashan of the SACOG Board, Edward Coviello and Barbara VaughanBechtold, SACOG staff, and James Drake representing the Sacramento Regional Transit District.

Five people attended the Folsom hearing and four attendees gave testimony pertaining to transit services. Correspondence was received from 33 people, with correspondence concerning RT services in the cities of Citrus Heights and Folsom & the communities of Fair Oaks and Orangevale included in the minutes of those hearings. In addition multiple members of the public have attended Sacramento Regional Transit District and SACOG board meeting demanding better bus service for the Fair Oaks and Orangevale areas. Mr. Ed Coviello described the unmet transit needs process. Mr. James Drake gave a presentation on current RT service.

Ms, MacGlashan opened the hearing at 6:00 p.m. She introduced members of the hearing panel and explained that SACOG is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides funds for transportation purposes throughout the SACOG region.

Mr. Coviello also explained that after the hearing the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) will meet to assist SACOG staff in analyzing the hearing testimony based on criteria adopted by the Board of Directors and further explained the SSTAC membership makeup.

Mr. Drake gave a brief overview of SRTD services.

Ms. MacGlashan opened the public hearing.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**1. Mike Barnbaum, Sacramento, CA**

Mr. Barnbaum had multiple comments:

- a. Route 22. Mr. Barnbaum would like to see the route operate on its full length during weekends. He would like to see the route operate all the way to Fair Oaks Blvd. on the weekends.
- b. Route 6. Restore the Sunday and holiday service.
- c. Route 11. Weekend service needs to be implemented.
- d. The Sunrise and Douglas area needs more weekend service on Sundays and holidays.
- e. He suggested using a new customer service phone number of BUS – RAIL (287-7245).

## **2. William Lowell, West Sacramento CA**

- a. Mr. Lowell would like to see efforts to help passenger who use paratransit services to move closer to fixed routes to reduce the demand on paratransit and to reduce the cost for those riders.
- b. He also sees a need for better bus shelter designs to protect passengers from the sun and rain. Current bus shelter designs do not always adhere to the environments of their locations.
- c. A point was made that buses are noisy and leak water during inclement weather. Mr. Lowell highlighted the point that the new buses delivered are prone to these problems.

## **3. Jeffery Taraguila, Sacramento CA**

- a. Mr. Taraguila had concerns about Routes 87, 22 and the lack of Sunday and Holiday service and long headways of about an hour during off peak times.
- b. He also noted that there is service to the Kaiser Hospital in Sacramento via the Route 20; however, there is no service to the new Kaiser Hospital in Roseville.
- c. He pointed out that there is a lack of coordination between transit services in the region.
- d. Mr. Taraguila noted that LRT service to Roseville has a better impact than LRT to the Sacramento Airport.
- e. He explained that the current transit service design gets passengers to and from Sacramento fairly well. However, it does not allow passenger to travel for daily tasks where they often live. It provides commuter service but not life services.

## **4. Ann Manisap, Sacramento CA**

Ms. Manisap's husband was recently paralyzed and cannot drive. She has been taking care of him and will soon run out of leave time to continue to do this. She applied for Paratransit Inc.'s service and was accepted. But, Paratransit Inc claims that they cannot provide service to her address.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

### **1. Johnny Karnofsky – Yahoo e-mail**

As a regular transit rider (I usually take 1 or 2 buses 5 days a week); that carries a bicycle to ride home at the end of the day; here is what I would like to see:

- 1) ELIMINATE transfers and lower the price of day passes. You will sell more day passes this way. OCTA also had transfers, but eliminated them in favor of day passes some 10 years ago. Also, make these day passes the SAME as what you would get from the rail machine or if they were actually purchased from an outlet.
- 2) Create a way to obtain monthly passes, or prepaid fares ONLINE. OCTA has a deal where you can get 2 free day passes when you order 10.

3) Some routes have issues when someone needs to use the bus and has a bicycle, but the bike racks are full. There should be a way to install a 2nd rack for 2 bikes on the rear of the bike and install an indicator light on the dash for the operator to know that the rear rack is in use. Place a sign above the front window to tell riders that they must inform the operator that they are removing a bike from either rack. This will allow up to 4 bikes on a bus at any given time without the operator having to allow one on board the bus.

## **2. Kim King, North Natomas**

Hello,

I am a new resident of North Natomas. I did not check out the transit transportation system before I moved in. Had I, I wouldn't of bought in this area. I have children that need to take the bus to school, due to NO school bus either in this area. With NO school bus or transit bus my children have to ride their bike 5 miles to school and 5 miles back, to the designated school in our area. This is really a hardship. I worry about them going that far in the morning and afternoons, as well as, in the rain. What is being done to improve the transit situation in this area. There is only one bus, #11 and it stops near there school, bus guess what, not anywhere remotely close to our home. I can't believe this area was so horribly missed from the economic development plan for this area.

Can you please get back to me and let me know if this situation has been rectified.

Thank you.

## **3. Inna Tysoe, Sacramento, CA**

Whom It May Concern:

We only have one car and you have no idea how often I have looked at the vans marked Paratransit, Inc and wished that this airport shuttle like service was available to me. Seeing those shuttles made me jealous of the elderly and the disabled in our community.

On a more practical level, the smaller shuttles will mean more drivers and hence more jobs for our depressed area. They will mean that the mothers and fathers in the Sacramento Area will no longer have to be of shuttle service for their offspring: taking them from school to soccer practice, to ballet, to their friend's house, and back home again. And this isn't even mentioning the congestion benefits and the green benefits of having the desirable Paratransit, Inc. Clearly, Paratransit, Inc. is the public transportation service that fits very nicely with the suburban lifestyle of the Greater Sacramento Area.

Please give it a chance to truly succeed.

Thank you

#### **4. Joe Ann Peters**

It is bus line 11 Regional Transit. It stops running at 5-6 pm m-f it does not run at all on the weekend. I am in a wheelchair and would like to attend events on the weekend, but there is no available transportation, and paratransit does not usually have rides available.

The public transit system leaves a person in dire straights on the weekend; it is as if the community only rides M-F. We need transportation out here on the weekends as well. I would also be nice to have buses running longer M-F.

#### **5. Wey Wong**

Dear Sirs:

I don't what it takes to plead for necessary transit needs for seniors in my community. We are a 55 plus community and I am 77 years old with some physical limitations. I have contacted everyone but to no avail. All we ask for is an 1.5 miles extension of bus line 11 from Club Center Drive to Rose Arbor to no avail. I have tried everyone for 2 years - same result: no money. How dare we always get these spare the air request to use public transit when there is no such entity! Isn't there some way to end these ridiculous requests from you people? How about some action instead of words? I come from SF, the city that knows how and Sac is the capitol city? Surprise me with positive results from my request!

Dear Sirs:

For over two years I have been pleading STA to extend bus line 11 to go 1 extra mile to Rose Arbor so that 900 residents can have public transit to downtown - all to no avail! I have addressed this issue to many sources with the same "no can do" response. I am 77 with a bad back and am forced to drive if I want to go anywhere as there is NO PUBLIC TRANSIT available - contrast this to San Francisco from where I come. Forget about spare the air days! Why can't a simple modification be made to accommodate us? Give me a GOOD answer!

5. William Lowell, West Sacramento CA

Sacramento Area Council of  
Governments/SACOG  
1415 "L" Street, Suite 300  
Sacramento, CA 95814

November 3, 2008

Attn.: Ms. Barbara Vaughan-Bechtold  
RE: Unmet Regional Transit needs (11/3 mtg.)  
*1490-29 ST 6:00 P.M.*

Dear Ms. Vaughan-Bechtold: R.T.'s unmet public transit needs include:

- 1) Shelter improvements (e.g., 29<sup>th</sup> & N Sts.)...since this shelter appears to built by same company as one on 7<sup>th</sup> St. between K and L Sts., why can't the former - and others exactly like it - be built like the ~~former~~ <sup>LUTHER</sup>? Alternative: Upgrade the 29<sup>th</sup> & N - types by covering the upper-south and upper-west with SLANTED aluminum vents - like that at base of new housing...keeping rain out and allowing ventilation to continue. Do likewise with yellow/blue shelters, adding LARGER seating. Improve protection from HOT SUN AND RAIN by CHANGING ALL NON-CONFORMING SHELTERS SO THAT ALL SIDES/BACKS (FROM INSIDE) FACE NORTH OR EAST. (No more heavy screens on back side; e.g., e/b Florin Road at Luther Burbank High School.)
- 2) More mini-seats on light rail ramps.
- 3) When ordering new buses have them designed to be more accessible for small shopping carts & baby strollers: a) Modify last 2 lower seats on each side so that aisle seat flips up; b) Modify side-facing front flip-seats so that seat closest to front-facing flip seat flips separately, allowing greater seating/stroller/mini-cart flexibility.
- 4) Too often, on RT bus and Light Rail, entire front seats are used by young, healthy riders - which should be YIELDED to older, less healthy riders & moms with little ones. (On crowded bus, a scooter or wheelchair coming on causes me to get off....)
- 5) In light of recent fare hikes for Paratransit riders, why not encourage/assist them to re-locate closer to fixed route line, allowing them to pay only \$50/month, rather than \$100/month/Paratransit + twice the single bus ride + day or more call ahead.
- 6) How about more & STAGGERED wheel-chair/scooter seats on new busses?
- 7) New buses are too noisy: Rivets at base of windows break loose too often....

William A. Lowell *William A. Lowell*  
1537 Pennsylvania Ave.  
West Sacramento, CA 95691-3930  
(916) 371-9311; cell: 743-5525

6. Unknown person. Comment from E-mail

Is any one concern there - you have "1" car to serve the South area on the week end - most of you guys are at home or driving in your nice Autos - that 1 car can get packed at night - those young kids get into an argument or a fight and you are stuck. RT has 2 cars going to Folsom - riders are not pack in like a cattle car plus the passenger are few. Has this been brought up before? I don't think 1 Security man will stop a large gang of teens.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO  
MINUTES**

**DECEMBER 2, 2008 – 6:00 P.M.  
WEST SACRAMENTO CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

Conducted by Oscar Villegas of the SACOG Board of Directors, Edward Coviello, SACOG staff, and Erik Reitz representing the Yolo County Transportation District and the Yolo County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council

One person testified at the hearing. One item of correspondence was received

Mr. Villegas opened the hearing at 6:09 p.m. He introduced members of the hearing panel and explained that SACOG is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides funds for transportation purposes throughout the SACOG region. He also explained that West Sacramento does not spend any of its TDA money on streets and roads.

Ms. Coviello explained the unmet transit needs hearing process and purpose to the public. He also explained that comments in any form are being accepted until January 1, 2009. Mr. Reitz gave a presentation on current Yolo County Transportation District public transit service.

Mr. Villegas opened the hearing to public comment.

**Staff Present:**

Edward Coviello  
Oscar Villegas  
Erik Reitz  
Paul Nyugen

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**1. Mary Emma Olbrich, West Sacramento CA**

Ms. Olbrich asked about the West Sacramento Street Car project.

Mr. Reitz of YCTD informed her that the CEQA documents are in their 90 day public review period until January, 2009.

Ms. Olbrich suggested that some type of transit fare promotional efforts should be made similar to San Francisco's MUNI.

Director Villegas offered that there are spare the air transit days that act as a promotional effort to ride transit.

Mr. Reitz explained that YCTD is working with the West Sacramento School District to distribute bus passes to the students.

2. William Lowell, West Sacramento CA

Mr. Lowell had several comments including concerns about the Sacramento Ave bus stop and its status. He stated that it is over a mile to the next bus stop. He also displayed ideas relating to paratransit service and the need for increased capacity in this area if fixed route transit is reduced. He also suggested using advertising such as traffic jam billboards to highlight the positive effects of transit usage. He pointed out that RT should work with paratransit clients to work on moving them closer to fixed routes to reduce the demand on paratransit services and improve the lives of the passengers. He asked if stop signs on YCTD routes can display accurate route service days such as m-f or sat only.

3. Director Villegas asked if there is a possibility of studying service connections to the Davis Kaiser center from West Sacramento

Mr. Reitz stated that one can use the route 42 and connect with Unitrans on weekdays to reach the Kaiser building.

Director Villegas closed the meeting at 6:36 PM.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

There was one correspondence sent into SACOG during the comment period open until January 1, 2009.

**1. William Lowell, West Sacramento CA**

A copy of the letter is on the following page.

Sacramento Area Council of  
Governments/SACOG  
1415 "L" Street, Suite 300  
Sacramento, CA 95814

November 24, 2008

Attn.: Ms. Barbara VaughnBechtold  
RE: Unmet West Sac/YoloBus needs (12/2/08 mtg.,  
West Sac City Hall, 1100 W. Capitol Ave., 6:00 p.m.)

Dear Ms. VaughnBechtold:

- 1) Beginning early January, 2009 West Sac's new high school on Jefferson Boulevard and Linden Road/Southport area will open, creating a greater demand for our #35/peak #39 YoloBus services, justifying more runs such as : a) Doubling the part of #35 runs - between Linden Road and West Sac Transit Center (mini-shuttle), inside which we witness the building of: 1) Sac City College/West Sac branch; 2) New, expanded local library; 3) West Sac Community Center and 4) New West Sac Senior Center...transit-oriented construction (?) and b) Expanded #39 services, restoring some midday Jefferson Boulevard services;
- 2) Replace former wooden benches with Woodland-types (black metal) as sidewalks are widened sufficiently for benches, shelters and the disabled's scooters;
- 3) Reverse south- and west-facing shelters, affording much better protection from rain and hot afternoon summer sun;
- 4) Open up upper north and upper east sides of shelter on Merkley Ave. and replace with aluminum slanted vents...likewise in Woodland on Cottonwood, north of West Beamer Street. It becomes much TOO HOT in summer! Also, slanted vents and move bench eastward at 500 Jefferson Boulevard, to better protect from rain;
- 5) As in Davis and in Sacramento (R.T.), NO SMOKING WITHIN 25 FEET of benches/shelters should become policy of West Sac...and Woodland, too.
- 6) Since State Dept./Water Resources has signed 15-year lease for office space in/near Port of Sacramento Area, YoloBus' #241 range of service should become full-time, even if bi-hourly for non-peak time. With area's main postal center sorting mail 24 hours/day, etc., many jobs have been GOING BEGGING for decades while many jobless cannot get to/from jobs. Match jobless w/jobs - reduce crime, too;
- 7) Am disturbed to see riders jaywalk in front of buses...sometimes drivers behind slowed-down buses "hot-rod" it around buses, reminding me of 2 such fatalities;
- 8) Have noticed on sides of Sutter-Yuba buses that they use "re-recycled oil." Eh?

William A. Lowell  
1537 Pennsylvania Ave.



West Sacramento, CA 95691-3930  
(916) 371-9311; cell: 743-5525

**PUBLIC HEARING ON TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE CITY OF WINTERS  
MINUTES**

**THURSDAY DECEMBER 11, 2008 – 2:00 P.M.  
WINTERS COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

The meeting was conducted by Harold Anderson of the SACOG Board, Edward Coviello and Barbara VaughanBechtold, SACOG staff, and Erik Reitz and Paul Nygeun of the Yolo County Transportation District.

Ms. VaughanBechtold described the unmet transit needs process. Mr. Reitz gave a presentation on current service in Winters and the remaining Yolo Bus service area

Mr. Anderson opened the hearing at 2:15 p.m. He introduced members of the hearing panel and explained that SACOG is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides funds for transportation purposes throughout the SACOG region.

Ms. VaughanBechtold explained that after the hearing the Yolo County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) will meet to assist SACOG staff in analyzing the hearing testimony based on criteria adopted by the Board of Directors and further explained the SSTAC membership makeup.

Mr. Anderson opened the public hearing.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

There was no attendance at the meeting.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence received.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE CITY OF WOODLAND  
MINUTES**

**DECEMBER 10, 2008 – 6:00 P.M.  
WOODLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY – MEETING ROOM**

The meeting was conducted by Mr. Skip Davies of the SACOG Board of Directors. Edward Coviello was in attendance from SACOG staff, and Janice Phillips, Erik Reitz and Paul Nguyen representing the Yolo County Transportation District and the Yolo County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council.

Mr. Coviello explained that after the hearing the Yolo County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) will meet to assist SACOG staff in analyzing the hearing testimony based on criteria adopted by the Board of Directors and further explained the SSTAC membership makeup. Mr. Coviello described the unmet transit needs process.

Mr. Nguyen gave a presentation on current services.

Mr. Davies opened the hearing at 6:15 p.m. He introduced members of the hearing panel and explained that SACOG is responsible for administering the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides funds for transportation purposes throughout the SACOG region.

Mr. Davies opened the public hearing.

Three people testified at the hearing. No correspondence was received.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**1. Z. Chen and G. Hueng, Woodland CA**

The above residents of the Spring Lake development expressed their concerns for a lack of transit service to the new development. One of the above persons uses a car to reach a park and ride in Davis to work in Sacramento and the other person does not use the transit service nearest to their residence because the distance is too great to walk.

The two attendees asked if buses could take County Road 102 instead of State Route 113.

Mr. Reitz of YCTD responded that there is a circulation problem that is the reasoning for not using County Road 102 and he also indicated that the Spring Lake Development is less than 25% built.

One of the attendees asked if many of the homes are built, why not serve it?

Mr. Davies of the SACOG Board indicated that as the Spring Lake development grows, transit service may be a possibility.

One of the two persons responded that there are three to four hundred homes and that is enough for transit service. He also asked about the Route 45 express service and its problems with overcrowding. He noted that there are two buses that leave a stop at East Main Street and Matmor by the tractor supply at the same time. The attendees also asked if there are possibilities of adding buses to the Route 43 in Davis.

Mr. Reitz of YCTD explained that a third bus was recently added and it is now overcrowded as well.

## **2. Mike Barnbaum, Sacramento CA**

Mr. Barnbaum expressed concerns with that service to Woodland does not operate late enough to connect to Route 42A and 42B from the County Fair Mall. He explained that the local service in Woodland does not run late enough to connect to the regional services in the area.

Mr. Barnbaum also gave a detailed report on the need for transit service to the Rite Aid distribution facility on Beamer Road at County Road 102. He inquired if there is any chance to provide service to the Rite Aid distribution center?

Mr. Davies responded that the warehouse district is not a priority area for transit service. However, he stated that the SSTAC will look into the matter.

Mr. Barnbaum asked if the Route 46 proposal could be restored. He also asked if there are four or five trips with the Route 45.

Mr. Reitz responded that there are five trips.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

No Correspondence for Woodland has been received.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE CITY OF YUBA CITY  
MINUTES**

**DECEMBER 15, 2008 – 6 P.M.  
YUBA CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, YUBA CITY**

The meeting was conducted by Don Schrader of the SACOG Board of Directors. Present were Barbara VaughanBechtold, SACOG staff, and Keith Martin of the Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority.

Minutes from the Yuba City Transportation Development Act Unmet Transit Needs Public Hearing for FY 2009-2010

Public attendance was taken through an attendance sheet attached.

**Staff Present:**

Keith Martin  
Don Schrader  
Barbara VaughanBechtold

The meeting started at 6:00 p.m. with opening remarks from Don Schrader.

Barbara VaughanBechtold then read the purpose of the hearing and the methods of how comments will be accepted. She also defined unmet transit needs and explained that the meeting can be used to gather data for the Human Services Transportation Plan.

Keith Martin of Yuba-Sutter Transit explained his system's service and planned service changes in the future.

Mr. Schrader then opened the meeting to public comments.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

There was no public testimony received.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

**1. Lucky Owyang**

I am uncertain if I will be back in time for the needs meeting Tuesday afternoon, as I have been invited to a Christmas luncheon.

These are my comments based on things I hear while riding the Yuba Sutter bus system.

- (1) Operating later into the evening especially now that many riding the system are working multiple jobs in this poor economy. I see many bringing along a bicycle to ride home after

regular operating hours of the system. I hear some people on the bus say their hours have shortened and cut back. Some saying they are working three jobs.

- (2) Some type of Sunday service even if it is limited.
- (3) Saturday service to Sacramento even if it is only a few runs down and back to Sacramento

Additional comments submitted by Mr. Owyang during the FY 2008-2009 planning cycle:

Dear Keith,

Thank you so much for the July newsletter... it was thorough and comprehensive! Your drivers certainly can discuss each matter in the newsletter. I have heard much on the various fixed routes I ride. On the route one bus at 7:15 a.m. from Mervyns a passenger asked why there was not service to the commissary at Beale Air Force. My landlord The Bomb Day bomb master John Young has asked this and said he would and many of his fellow Beale Air Force Base co workers would ride a commuter bus to Beale Air Force Base. Just a thought... perhaps if there are going to be "Needs" meeting this year, this can be brought up. Perhaps another look at the idea of providing Saturday service to downtown Sacramento.

Thank you so much for the great service now~ I have been a Yuba Sutter senior pass carrying rider for one year now!

Dear Keith,

Lot of things have changed over the course of the last year. What with the quickly accelerating cost of fuel, many drivers have converted over to public transportation. Many of these drivers were die hard single person commuters previously. Your statistics show the numbers of driving public for having made the switch and moving over to the Yuba-Sutter Transit Sacramento commuter runs. Just last Thursday afternoon I witnessed three of your returning Sacramento commuter buses pull into the Government Center fully loaded around 5 p.m. Saturday service to Sacramento would be a good fit. Even many of your Yuba Sutter drivers would like to see this enacted. I talked to those waiting for the last Sacramento bus while I was waiting for my laundry to finish and many have of those waiting for the last 4:20 p.m. Sacramento bus mentioned they would like the ability to ride down and back on Saturday. A large percentage of Sacramento riders were bringing along small carry on luggage. They where doing so, in order, to stay over the weekend and ride back on Monday next week.

I am sure needs for service to Beale Air force Base and for Saturday Sacramento service can be measured with marketing surveys both at the base and of the retired military and off base personnel. I have a number of neighbors which are Beale personnel, both military and civilian. One of the riders voicing their opinion on the route asked the question, "Why can't there be service to Beale A.F.B. when there service is to Wheatland now?" Beyond security issues, can this possibly be feasible. Will messages with queries to our local Congressmen help to make the security issue workable for Beale A.F.B. service?

Hopefully this year the "Needs" meetings will have evening meetings where working people can attend and voice their individual needs and opinion...

Thank you so much!

Lucky

## **2. Dave Duggan**

Hello,

I have lived in Olivehurst since September of 1992 (16 years).

The McGowan park and ride and commuter service to Sacramento is the best thing that has happened to Olivehurst the entire time that I have been here. Especially with current gasoline prices - the timing of this service implementation is huge for me.

Question: Is there any possibility that bus service (including the Sacramento commuter) can be extended to weekends and perhaps evenings?

Congratulations on your excellent service and judgment.

Your board should be commended for providing such excellent and important service to our community. It will now be easier for me to commute to downtown Sacramento than it is for my relatives who live in Elk Grove. I never imagined that I would have public transportation to Sacramento from my house here in Olivehurst.



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 8 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE  
TO MEET IN THE CITY OF CITRUS HEIGHTS**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Citrus Heights identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG at the Citrus Heights City Council Chambers on October 14, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Citrus Heights.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 9 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE CITY OF DAVIS**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Davis identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG in the Davis City Council Chambers on December 3, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Yolo County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are unmet transit needs in the City of Davis.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 10 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
CITY OF ELK GROVE**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Elk Grove identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG in the City Council Chambers in Elk Grove on October 13, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are no unmet transit needs in the City of Elk Grove.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 11 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE CITY OF FOLSOM**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Folsom identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG in the Folsom Chamber of Commerce meeting room on October 29, 2009, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are unmet transit needs in the City of Folsom.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 12 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE CITY OF GALT**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Galt identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG at the Galt City Council Chambers on November 6, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are unmet transit needs in the City of Galt.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 13 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
CITY OF ISLETON**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Isleton identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG at the Isleton City Council Chambers on October 21, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are no unmet transit needs in the City of Isleton.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 14 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
CITY OF LIVE OAK**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Live Oak identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, public hearings on transit needs were held by SACOG at for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on December 16, 2008, at the Yuba City Council Chambers on December 16, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Joint Sutter-Yuba County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are no unmet transit needs in the City of Live Oak.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 15 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
CITY OF MARYSVILLE**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Marysville identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, public hearings on transit needs were held by SACOG at for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on December 16, 2008, at the Yuba City Council Chambers on December 15, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Joint Sutter-Yuba County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are no unmet transit needs in the City of Marysville.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 16 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE  
TO MEET IN THE CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Regional Transit District, of which the City of Rancho Cordova is a member, identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on transit needs were held by SACOG in the Rancho Cordova City Hall North Room on November 18, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16 , 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the Sacramento Regional Transit District, including the city of Rancho Cordova.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 17 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE  
TO MEET IN THE SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Regional Transit District identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, public hearings on transit needs were held by SACOG in the SACOG Board room on November 3, 2008, Citrus Heights on October 14, 2008, Elk Grove on October 13, 2008, Rancho Cordova on November 18, 2008, Fair Oaks on November 20, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the Sacramento Regional Transit District, including the city of Citrus Heights.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 18 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE  
TO MEET IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF SACRAMENTO COUNTY  
INCLUDING THE COMMUNITIES OF FAIR OAKS AND ORANGVALE**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the County of Sacramento identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on transit needs were held by SACOG in the SRTD Board Room on November 3, 2008, in Citrus Heights on October 14, 2008, in the City of Folsom on October 29, 2008, in the City of Elk Grove on October 13, 2008, in the City of Galt on November 6, 2008, in the City of Isleton on October 21, 2008, and at the Fair Oaks Sacramento County Department of Neighborhood Services on November 20, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Sacramento including the communities of Fair Oaks and Orangevale.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 19 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF THE COUNTY OF SUTTER**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the County of Sutter identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, public hearings on transit needs were held by SACOG at for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on December 16, 2008, at the Yuba City Council Chambers on December 15, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2008; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Joint Sutter-Yuba County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are no unmet transit needs in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Sutter.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 20 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF YOLO COUNTY**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the County of Yolo identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG at the Davis City Council Chambers on December 3, 2008 at the West Sacramento Civic Center on December 2, 2008, at the Winters City Council Chambers on December 11, 2008, and in the City Library in Woodland on December 10, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Yolo County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are no unmet transit needs in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Yolo.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 21 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF THE COUNTY OF YUBA**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the County of Yuba identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, public hearings on transit needs were held by SACOG at for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on December 16, 2008, at the Yuba City Council Chambers on December 15, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Joint Sutter-Yuba County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are no unmet transit needs in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Yuba.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 22 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of West Sacramento identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG at the West Sacramento Civic Center on December 2, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Yolo County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are unmet transit needs in the City of West Sacramento.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 23 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
CITY OF WHEATLAND**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Yuba City identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, public hearings on transit needs were held by SACOG at for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on December 16, 2008, at the Yuba City Council Chambers on December 16, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Joint Sutter-Yuba County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are no unmet transit needs in the City of Wheatland.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 24 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
CITY OF WINTERS**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Winters identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG at the Winters City Council Chambers on December 11, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Yolo County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are no unmet transit needs in the City of Winters.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 25 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
CITY OF WOODLAND**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Woodland identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG at the Woodland City Library on December 10, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Yolo County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are unmet transit needs in the City of Woodland.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director



**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
RESOLUTION NO. 26 – 2009**

**FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN THE  
CITY OF YUBA CITY**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on May 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, “unmet transit needs” are defined as “those needs identified as unmet transit needs and have been considered as part of the transportation planning process; i.e., in Short Range Transit Plans, special transit studies, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Complementary Paratransit Service Plans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), and that have not been implemented or funded”; and

**WHEREAS**, unmet transit needs that are “reasonable to meet” are defined as meeting the definition above and all of the following criteria: community acceptance, equity, potential ridership, and cost effectiveness; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Yuba City identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

**WHEREAS**, public hearings on transit needs were held by SACOG at for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on December 16, 2008, at the Yuba City Council Chambers on December 15, 2008, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on April 16, 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, transit needs considered in the transportation planning process and identified from the public hearing testimony have been analyzed to determine whether they are reasonable to meet using the SACOG adopted criteria, as detailed in the attached staff report; and

**WHEREAS**, the Joint Sutter-Yuba County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council participated in the identification of transit needs and concurs with the staff analysis and recommendation.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that:

There are unmet transit needs in the City of Yuba City.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED** this 16<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

HELEN THOMSON  
Chair

---

MIKE MCKEEVER  
Executive Director