Approve 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, as the four-county Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), make annual unmet transit needs findings 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 street and road projects if they have filled all transit requests that meet SACOG’s adopted definitions of “unmet transit need” and “reasonable to meet.”

**Recommendation:** The Transportation Committee unanimously recommends that the Board: (1) approve the minutes of the five previously held public hearings on unmet transit needs in Sacramento County, including the SRTD and cities therein, and in Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties and the cities therein (see Attachments F-H), and of the public hearing held on January 29, 2015, before the SACOG Board of Directors (Attachment I); and (2) adopt the attached resolutions regarding unmet transit needs in each county, cities therein, and the SRTD.

**Committee Action/Discussion:** The Transportation Committee discussion focused on the current SACOG Unmet Transit Needs (UTN) Process and Definitions in terms of comprehensiveness, potential expansion and improvements. The Committee was concerned that the current SACOG UTN Process and Definitions of "unmet transit need" and "reasonable to meet" were not broad enough, and should take into account public transit operational and maintenance issues along with the required issue of transit services. In particular, the Committee was concerned that there were operational issues brought up during the UTN Process regarding transit system reliability, safety and stop/station maintenance that are not addressed through the current Process and Definitions, beyond being shared with the applicable transit operators. The Committee also acknowledged that the SACOG UTN Process and Definitions can only go so far toward addressing operational issues, as they only affect one source of transit funding, State TDA Local Transportation Funds. The Committee conveyed their view that the UTN Process needs to balance the delivery of stable transit services and funding with other operational concerns that affect the use and public perception of public transit in the four-county area. SACOG staff plans to confer with Caltrans staff who oversee TDA regulations and the four-county area's transit operators. Staff will return to the Board later this year with recommendations for updating the Unmet Transit Needs Process and Definitions that could improve the focus on the long term stability and viability of RTPA-area transit systems.

**FY 2015-16 Unmet Transit Needs Background and Findings:** 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 be used for transit service. However, jurisdictions located outside of the SRTD may use their LTF apportionments for street and road 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 annually to make one of the following findings for each of the four counties and the cities therein and the SRTD: (1) there are no unmet transit needs; (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. These findings must be made prior to approving TDA claims for street and road projects.

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 2015-16 (described in Attachment A). As part of the process, transit service requests were identified during public hearings (five were held in Fall 2014 and one before the SACOG Board in January 2015) and through the transportation planning process. These requests were evaluated as to whether they meet SACOG’s adopted definitions (in Attachment A). The Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) for each county participated in the analysis with staff and concurs with staff recommendations.

The public transit operators and jurisdictions and their respective proposed findings are listed in the attached resolutions and summarized in Attachment B. Attachments C, D, and E provide more detail on comments and findings for each of the four counties.
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Chief Executive Officer
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D – Yolo County Comments and SSTAC Findings
E – Yuba/Sutter County Comments and SSTAC Findings
F – Sacramento County and Sacramento Regional Transit District Minutes
G – Yolo County Minutes
H – Sutter County and Yuba County Minutes
I – SACOG Board Minutes
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SACOG Unmet Transit Needs Finding Process

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) is a state law that provides funding for public transportation from a portion of sales taxes 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. TDA revenues can be used for street and road projects in some jurisdictions after “reasonable to meet” transit services have been provided.

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 (SSTAC) 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 of whether those needs are reasonable to meet. The Advisory Council presides, 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 (numbers in parentheses 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); representatives of the transit operator(s) (2); and, representatives of the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) (2). In the 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 six hearings are held yearly within the four counties.

d. SACOG staff and SSTAC members meet to identify potential unmet transit needs, and conduct an analysis of comments using Board-adopted definitions of “unmet transit needs” and reasonable to meet.” (See the following section.) An important consideration for whether a need is reasonable to meet is the ability of an operator to maintain the required fare box recovery ratio under the TDA statutes. SACOG staff prepares an analysis of unmet transit needs, including those identified in the most current short range transit plan for each operator, to determine whether they are reasonable to meet, and makes a recommendation for SSTAC consideration.
SACOG staff and the SSTAC meet to discuss the staff analysis and recommendations. The SSTAC is allowed to formulate an independent recommendation to the SACOG Board. However, the SSTAC and SACOG staff generally present a joint recommendation.

e. During a regularly scheduled Board meeting, the SACOG Board receives reports from staff on the public hearing results and the joint recommendation. The SACOG Board holds a final public hearing to receive any additional testimony regarding transit needs that may be reasonable to meet. Finally, the Board 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 determined 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 street and road 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 fare box 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 fare box return requirements as stated in the TDA statutes or established by SACOG.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hearing Date</th>
<th>Hearing Time</th>
<th>SSTAC Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yuba/Sutter</td>
<td>Tuesday, October 28, 2014</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Yuba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Sutter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 6 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Marysville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 0 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Yuba City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 0 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Oak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Live Oak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 1 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs in the City of Wheatland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 0 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Sacramento outside of the SRTD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 0 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Citrus Heights (as part of the SRTD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 0 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>Thursday, October 23, 2014</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>There are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Elk Grove.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 11 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Oaks/Orangevale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Included in the SRTD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 0 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Folsom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 1 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>Thursday, October 16, 2014</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>There are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Galt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 12 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Rancho Cordova (as part of the SRTD).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 2 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs in the City of Isleton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 0 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTD</td>
<td>Monday, October 27, 2014</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>There are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the Sacramento Regional Transit District, including the cities of Citrus Heights and Rancho Cordova, as well as portions of Unincorporated Sacramento County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Folsom Light Rail Service Related Comments: 1 Number of Folsom Light Rail Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 30 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>Wednesday, October 29, 2014</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Yolo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 5 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Davis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 10 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of West Sacramento.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 2 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs in the City of Winters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 1 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Woodland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 2 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>More bus feeder service to light rail is needed.</td>
<td>This comment is too vague to effectively analyze. The e-tran route 156 currently provides direct bus service between Elk Grove and the Meadowview light rail station Monday - Friday. On weekends riders can transfer from e-tran's Weekend Shuttle route to the RT route 56 to travel to the Meadowview LRT station. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maintain bus service on holidays when state workers are not off.</td>
<td>This comment is specifically regarding the Columbus Day holiday. All e-tran routes will run on regular weekday schedules on days, including holidays that the State of California does not observe. This is an unmet transit need that is reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Provide more service by Calvine Road to downtown Sacramento. With only 3 runs in the morning and afternoon, it takes 2 hours to travel from Sacramento.</td>
<td>E-tran staff provided information on the Emergency Ride Home Program for travel back to Elk Grove in the middle of the day. E-tran currently does not have a sufficient number of vehicles to provide any additional services, and would have to reduce/remove other services to provide for this request. This is an unmet transit need that is not reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide more e-tran bus service especially for Route 162.</td>
<td>Staff agreed that the Calvine area needs more service coverage and mentioned that internal discussions about potential route modifications for Route 162 have taken place. The City of Elk Grove will be reviewing all of its transit services as part of a Caltrans-grant funded Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA). This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bus service is needed to accommodate schools, especially those off of Calvine Road. There's not enough time between getting off the bus and heading to school.</td>
<td>Mayor Davis explained that federal guidelines do not allow public transit agencies to provide exclusive school bus service and this is a tough concern to satisfy. E-tran staff explained that several routes are designed to service schools in the area but are open to the general public including students. Staff expressed being open to looking at the schedule on Route 154 to mitigate any timing (school bell schedule) issues. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>All e-tran and RT bus trips from Cosumnes River College (CRC) to the Meadowview light rail station should stop once RT light rail service to CRC begins.</td>
<td>This comment is too vague to effectively analyze as it does not provide specific bus routes or service days/times. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>If CRC to Meadowview bus services end, a new &quot;Route 165&quot; is needed from Franklin to Apple and Laguna. Currently served by RT route 65.</td>
<td>Service would only be needed to satisfy a potential service gap on Franklin Blvd if RT’s proposal of eliminating service in Elk Grove through Route 65 were to be approved. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is not Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Create a daily route from CRC to the Outlet Collection (by Kammerer/Grant Line Roads near Hwy 99) to serve employees during work hours.</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>The Outlet Mall service will be included as part of the Comprehensive Operational Analysis due to begin next year. The mall is not slated to open until 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Service Elk Grove</td>
<td>Commuter service in the afternoon and evening needs to be more flexible and accommodate trips back to Elk Grove from 7th &amp; K Streets (the future location of Entertainment Sports Complex).</td>
<td>E-tran does not service any major sports complex in the Sacramento region. The agency feels that a robust service connection to light rail at CRC should satisfy some of this need. RT light rail service to CRC is slated to begin in September 2015, and the ESC is slated to open in the fall of 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Add a bus route or bus rapid transit on the South East Connector to Folsom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Extend Route 66 or 52 to drop off and pick up riders around 15th and Capitol. Bus routes across Highway 99 are too far of a walking distance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Operations Elk Grove</td>
<td>Overcrowding on e-tran commuter buses in the mornings between 7:00 - 8:30 AM on Route 52 and 53.</td>
<td>E-tran bus services already serve the area of downtown Sacramento and City of Elk Grove referenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excited for South Line rail extension to CRC but more jobs &amp; housing are needed to accommodate high-density development along the route.</td>
<td>This comment will be forwarded to the appropriate jurisdictional planning departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Why don't buses have the same drivers?</td>
<td>Jean Foletta provided clarification and explained what may be causing the different driver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Bus Alerts&quot; do not arrive until after the bus doesn't show up at its scheduled time.</td>
<td>E-tran staff explained this was an ongoing issue with the contractor and would continue to monitor the situation. Asked to be notified if the issue arises again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is not Reasonable to Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>RT does not accept Elk Grove bus passes (no reciprocity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overcrowding on e-tran commuter buses, particularly on Route 52 and Route 53. In some instances, this has caused people to fall. More commuter buses are needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earlier departure time (before 4:50 pm) for route 66 from downtown.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>The same bus driver for Route 160 around 3:00 never arrives on time (always more than 15 minutes late). This disrupts timing of transfer and travel time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Folsom</td>
<td>Once the Entertainment Sports Complex is completed, there should be ongoing late night RT light rail service (similar to Folsom Live) and extended hours and service for Folsom Stage Line to match the light rail expansion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>The medical facilities shuttle is offered only on Thursdays and Fridays which often means delaying visits to a healthcare provider until one of the service days.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>Coordinate with RT to add one or two late trips back to Galt from CRC since SCT/LINK services will eventually connect with CRC RT light rail service which is expected to run to/from CRC until almost 12:00 AM. The last trip from Galt leaves at 6:45 PM currently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>Provide service to the soccer stadium at Bonney Field at Cal Expo.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>Provide more (commuter/express) days of service, running until 6:30-7 PM to allow people more job and educational opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>Provide some service that runs seven days a week as ESC events would likely happen all days of the week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>Expand reverse commute (Sacramento to Galt) services, later evening commute services and one or two midday runs to provide commuters security for mid-day travel if needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>Make rural area/Clay Station (near Wilton) services available at least two to three days a week and expand service hours until 6:30 PM (like the rest of dial-a-ride services).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>Provide service that runs seven days a week as ESC events would likely happen all days of the week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>Expand reverse commute (Sacramento to Galt) services, later evening commute services and one or two midday runs to provide commuters security for mid-day travel if needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>Make rural area/Clay Station (near Wilton) services available at least two to three days a week and expand service hours until 6:30 PM (like the rest of dial-a-ride services).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>Provide more (commuter/express) days of service, running until 6:30-7 PM to allow people more job and educational opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>The lack of Highway 99 Express/SCT/Link intercity services on weekends prevents individuals who do not own a car or cannot drive from employment and educational opportunities outside of Galt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reconsider bus options for elderly patients that have to travel from Isleton/Galt to Elk Grove using multiple bus transfers for medical appointments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase service hours, especially in the evening, and service days to more than once per week to/from Clay Station area of Sacramento.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>SCT/Link drivers have been very courteous and willing to assist those who needed help getting their shopping to their door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCT/Link drivers are doing a good job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What can be done to bring some kind of private transportation/taxi services to Galt, especially when other public transportation options are not available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bus service only travels as far as Alta Mesa Road and Twin Cities Road despite service information materials stating that service covers Clay Station Road and Twin Cities Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why is there a cut-off at 4pm for dial-a-ride services despite service information material showing they are available from 6:30 AM - 6:30 PM?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why doesn't the bus come out to Clay Station Road and Twin Cities Road as advertised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where can information be obtained on how to purchase an SCT/Link Galt-Sacramento Commuter Express monthly pass?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A single regional pass or transfer agreement between RT and SCT/Link is needed to allow transfers between the two transit agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is not Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>SRTD (incl. portions of Unincorporated Sacramento County)</td>
<td>Remstate Route 22 service on Arden Way to serve the grocery and shopping areas on Eastern Avenue.</td>
<td>This is an unmet transit need that is not reasonable to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Provide 1/2 hourly service for Route 23 to better serve CSUS and middle school students.</td>
<td>Add late night service on light rail.</td>
<td>This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Add late night service on all commuter/local bus routes.</td>
<td>Restore Sunday/Holiday service to match Saturday service on the blue and gold light rail lines in anticipation of the ESC.</td>
<td>This is an unmet transit need that is reasonable to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an unmet transit need that is reasonable to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No service changes have been approved at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an unmet transit need that is not reasonable to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an unmet transit need that is reasonable to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This extension of service is part of the long range plans for the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This RT routes 67 and 68 provide bus service to the Arden Fair Mall from midtown/downtown Sacramento 7 days per week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an unmet transit need that is not reasonable to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>SRTD (incl. portions of Unincorporated Sacramento County)</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is not Reasonable to Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>Create a bus line that runs along Folsom to fill gap between Butterfield and Mather stations and improve safety for those who currently walk along the route to the Rancho Cordova Public Library.</td>
<td>The RT route 28 will be extended to serve both the Butterfield light rail station and the Rancho Cordova public library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extend the route 28 to serve the Butterfield light rail station and the Rancho Cordova public library.</td>
<td>The RT route 28 will be extended to serve both the Butterfield light rail station and the Rancho Cordova public library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Add a bus route along 47th Avenue to better connect the area to the light rail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Run bus Routes 5 and 65 earlier on weekdays (every half hour) to connect with earlier light rail trains.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Run buses from Valley Hi and Franklin on weekends from 9am to 6pm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Increase frequency of buses for Route 67 to every 15 minutes on weekdays &amp; every 30 minutes on weekends.</td>
<td>Add more morning/evening runs for Route 67.</td>
<td>More service may be added to the Saturday morning/evening RT route 67.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Add a stop at 7th &amp; D on the Green Line light rail to better connect Alkali Flat and Downtown Sac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Provide bus/shuttle service from Power Inn Station to Social Security offices by Folsom Blvd to serve the disabled, elderly, and others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Provide transit service to residential area adjacent (southwest) to McClellan Business Park to serve a large population of disabled, seniors, and low income in the neighborhood.</td>
<td>There is a large area here that is far (1+ miles) from any transit services and according to the Census has a high proportion of low income residents, as well as seniors and those with disabilities. The RT Neighborhood Ride route 18 formerly served this area, but was discontinued due to low ridership.</td>
<td>This is an unmet transit need that is not reasonable to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Make adjustments/additions to Route 29 towards Sacramento to alleviate overcrowding and to accommodate higher demand during peak hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unmet Needs Comments
Attachment C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Not An Unmet Transit Need</th>
<th>Unmet Transit Need that is not Reasonable to Meet</th>
<th>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>SRTD cont. (incl. portions of Unincorporated Sacramento County)</td>
<td>Reinstate bus service to reach Arden Way and Fair Oaks Blvd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an unmet transit need that is not reasonable to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase frequency of Route 67 to every 15 minutes on weekdays between 6 AM - 6PM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase frequency of Route 67 on weekends to every 1/2 hour from 7AM-7PM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add Sunday service to the Route 11 that serves North Natomas and the current Arena area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an unmet transit need that is reasonable to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add weekend service to the Route 13 that serves North Natomas and the current Arena area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an unmet transit need that is not reasonable to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Line light rail trains need to leave the Watt/I-80 station earlier (1/2 hour or more) on weekday mornings to allow riders that must transfer to arrive in time for early work shifts that start at 6 AM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an unmet transit need that is reasonable to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Operations SRTD (incl. portions of Unincorporated Sacramento County)</td>
<td>Appreciates that RT's general manager rides the system occasionally to gauge rider needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>RT made a mistake to not include a stop on Light Rail at Leaves and Fishes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paying cash to ride the bus is inconvenient; hurry up with the Connect Card please.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>RT text alerts are very helpful but a Windows phone app would be nice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add transfers to incentivize ridership as fares are too expensive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 82, headed towards the 65th Street light rail station from CSUS stop at 10:25 AM is always late by 4-5 minutes. This disrupts transfers to the light rail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limit the number of passengers, particularly those with extra belongings (e.g. strollers, trolleys), allowed to stand on RT buses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add bike racks to RT buses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All RT buses currently have bike racks that can accommodate two bicycles per bus. In early 2015 all RT buses will be retrofitted with bicycle racks that can carry three bikes per bus. Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>79</strong> Operations</td>
<td>SRTD cont. (incl. portions of Unincorporated Sacramento County)</td>
<td>Add a bus stop bench just north of the intersection with Sunset along Route 23.</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is not Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td>RT is too costly for low-income and immigrant &amp; refugee communities, especially without transfers available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td>Require passengers to fold up carts and strollers when boarding RT system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td>RT monthly passes and fares are too expensive especially when there are no transfers and with wages being so low in Sacramento.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>83</strong> Service</td>
<td>Paratransit, Inc.</td>
<td>Encourage suburban transit operators that serve downtown Sacramento to consider working with the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) to provide connecting services to SRTD’s light rail stations as a way to provide more efficient transit service as it being suggested as part of the current City of Sacramento Downtown Transportation Study.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A majority of “suburban” operators that serve downtown Sacramento already serve various SRTD light rail stops. The City of Sacramento Downtown Transportation Study has not yet been completed and no preferred recommendations or scenarios have been published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>84</strong> Service</td>
<td>Paratransit, Inc.</td>
<td>Provide a direct route (i.e., no transfers) from the City of Sacramento to Roseville (Placer County) to serve riders traveling to Roseville for medical and retail services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current service exists for ADA-eligible passengers, however, the service requires transfers. The City of Roseville and Sacramento County are within two different service areas and operate separate ADA services. These services do coordinate to facilitate the transfer of passengers, however current funding does not provide for direct trips. Paratransit, Inc. receives TDA funding and Measure A funding to provide services within Sacramento County. Roseville Transit (run by City of Roseville) receives separate funding to provide services within their city boundaries. Paratransit, Inc. will continue to coordinate with Roseville Transit for passengers needing to reach downtown Sacramento.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>85</strong> Service</td>
<td>Paratransit, Inc.</td>
<td>Provide paratransit services from the City of Sacramento that do not require a transfer to the cities of Elk Grove, Roseville and West Sacramento to provide better access to medical and retail services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current service exists for ADA-eligible passengers, however, the service requires transfers. The cities of Elk Grove, Roseville and West Sacramento are in different service areas from the City/County of Sacramento and operate separate ADA services. These services do coordinate to facilitate the transfer of passengers, however current funding does not provide for direct trips. Paratransit, Inc. receives TDA funding and Measure A funding to provide services within Sacramento County. E-tran/e-van (Elk Grove Transit), Roseville Transit (run by City of Roseville), Yolobus/Yolobus Special receive separate funding to provide services within their service areas. Paratransit, Inc. will continue to coordinate with other paratransit providers for passengers needing to reach destinations outside the City/County of Sacramento.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is not Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Sacramento County (Unincorporated area or regarding overall transit services that the County and the jurisdictions within)</td>
<td>2035 MTP/SCS falls far short of meeting Sacramento's unmet transit needs and should actually be put on a fast track towards being completed no less than 10 years ahead of 2035 and SACOG and all of the regional transit agencies need to aggressively pursue the means necessary to accomplish this.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-transit service or operations related comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. These types of comments are forwarded to the appropriate agencies. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Attachment D</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Not Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Service</td>
<td>Yolo County (Unincorporated or Yolobus services operated outside of Yolo County)</td>
<td>Add more service to/from Knights Landing to Woodland and Davis in order to serve the elderly, youth, and UC Davis students who need it, respectively, for medical appointments, afterschool programs, and volunteer work at the Knight's Landing clinic.</td>
<td>The demand for this service needs to be researched. The current YCTD route 216 offers morning and afternoon trips between Knights Landing and Woodland Monday, Wednesday and Friday, as well as the second Saturday of each month. Connections to Davis can be made by transferring to the route 42 A/B. The current services do not provide services during the afterschool time frame (after 3 PM) or for the Knights Landing Health Clinic that is open the first and third Sunday of each month. This is an unmet transit need that is not reasonable to meet at this time.</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>More data is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UC Davis tutors (25-30) traveling to/from Knight's Landing on weekdays from Monday-Thursday, 3:30-6:30 PM. Many of the undergraduate tutors do not have access to a personal vehicle, as students residing in UCD residence halls are not allowed to bring/park vehicles on campus.</td>
<td>The demand for this service needs to be researched to determine if this is a general public transit request as required under the TDA for LTF funding to be used, or if it is a request for charter services that do not qualify for funding under the TDA - LTF. The current YCTD route 216 offers morning and afternoon trips between Knights Landing and Woodland Monday, Wednesday and Friday, as well as the second Saturday of each month. Connections to Davis can be made by transferring to the route 42 A/B. The current services do not provide services during the afterschool time frame (after 3 PM). This is an unmet transit need that is not reasonable to meet at this time.</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>More data is needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inquiry on getting UC Davis students to and from Knights Landing to tutor school kids in a reading program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100 percent of those who responded to an informal survey said that transportation to Davis and Woodland from Knights Landing on Wed, Thursday, and Friday from 9AM-2PM would help them. Reasons given included grocery shopping and paying for bills.</td>
<td>The current YCTD route 216 offers service between Knights Landing and Woodland with an outbound trip at 9:30 AM and an inbound trip at 2:30 PM on Monday, Wednesday and Friday. Connections to Davis can be made via the YCTD route 42 A/B. This is an unmet transit need that is not reasonable to meet at this time.</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>More data is needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Yolobus commuter/express service should provide more options for riders to stay in Sacramento and for getting a ride home later in the evening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Not Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Operations Yolo County (Unincorporated or general Yolobus/Yolobus Special services)</td>
<td>Prefer the minivans over the passenger buses for paratransit because the existing buses are too high from the ground and using the lifts are scary for riders.</td>
<td>In order to maintain a standardized accessible fleet, including back-up vehicles, Davis Community Transit and YCTD have fleets of cutaway buses that are fully interchangeable. This allows the operators to maintain their services even if back-up vehicles are put into active service. Davis Community Transit is currently researching low-floor cutaway buses that could remedy some of the lift height issues mentioned in this comment.</td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fixed route service does not provide enough shelter with covers from the weather.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific stop locations are considered for shelters based on ridership levels.</td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assistance needed for the blind to help them navigate to and from their destinations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disabled riders who are registered can bring a personal care attendant with them who rides for free.</td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>People in wheelchairs often have to use streets because of debris on the sidewalk.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This comment will be shared with the public works departments of jurisdictions within Yolo County.</td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Larger, newer buses are needed to replace old uncomfortable buses on Yolobus.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This comment will be shared with the public works departments of jurisdictions within Yolo County.</td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Round curbs cause wheelchairs to high center (get stuck).</td>
<td></td>
<td>This comment will be shared with the public works departments of jurisdictions within Yolo County.</td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tie-downs on paratransit passenger buses are directly underneath air conditioning and heating vents, making it uncomfortable for riders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>More bike racks needed, rider often gets stuck in Davis because he is unable to bring bike aboard.</td>
<td></td>
<td>At this point it is not possible to have more than three bike station racks on buses.</td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA) &amp; other organizations have been working with the Transportation Department on rural transportation issues (e.g., Knights Landing) and have produced a study and final report on the transportation needs of counties/communities including Yolo, Winters and Woodland; therefore, the UTN comment is not necessarily needed. Further information on the study can be provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SACOG and YCTD have requested a copy of the survey/study referenced and have not yet received a copy.</td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Yolo County (Unincorporated or general Yolobus Special services)</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Not Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yolobus commuter/express service</td>
<td>Do not remove “flip seats” as they provide much needed access for ambulatory passengers with packages and foldable mobility devices.</td>
<td>YCTD is currently working on a solution to restore some of the seating caused by the removal of the front “flip seats” from service due to safety concerns.</td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Non-ambulatory riders should be required to use seatbelts to restrain themselves in their wheelchairs as a safety precaution.</td>
<td>This requirement would violate the ADA. Public transit providers cannot require wheelchair riders to be belted down into their mobility devices.</td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>New buses should include extension speakers for the middle and rear of the bus so that riders can hear announcements better.</td>
<td>There are multiple speakers in each bus.</td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Buses need a place to put shopping carts.</td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Bus service between Davis and Downtown Sacramento takes too long.</td>
<td>This comment is too vague to effectively analyze. There are multiple YCTD Express bus routes that run during the M-F peak morning and evening hours that have a travel time of approximately 30 minutes. The YCTD route 42 A/B is available during the midday and evenings M-F.</td>
<td>This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The Yolobus commuter/express service should provide more options for riders to stay in Sacramento and for getting a ride home later in the evening.</td>
<td>The routes 42 A/B provide bus service between Sacramento and the cities of Davis and Woodland during the midday and late into the evening.</td>
<td>This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Provide &quot;OWL&quot; (night) service for Yolobus 42A between Davis and Sacramento to serve UC students.</td>
<td>There is currently no demonstrated demand for late night Yolobus 42 A/B service, including those services provided between Davis and Sacramento. Unitrans is considering running fixed route &quot;OWL&quot; type service within Davis.</td>
<td>This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Route 42A and B are overcrowded.</td>
<td>Standees are allowed on the routes 42 A and B. There are some crowded routes between the Woodland Mall and the UC Davis campus, but much of that early morning/early evening crowding has been reduced with the addition of the route 242.</td>
<td>This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Route 42A and B should run every thirty minutes from 9 AM - 5 PM.</td>
<td>It would cost approximately $4 million per year to double the 42 A/B service to every thirty minutes. In the YCTD SRTP phasing of increased frequency on the 42 A/B is considered to determine if there is demand for such service.</td>
<td>This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Not Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>More express buses are needed between Davis and downtown Sacramento in addition to the existing 42 A and B service.</td>
<td>There are currently four YCTD express bus routes that serve Davis to downtown, as well as an additional two express routes that serve Davis to Sacramento riders needing reverse commute and later evening (after 6 PM) services. These express services are offered in addition to the YCTD route 42 A/B that serves both Davis and Sacramento between approximately 6 AM and 11:30 PM Monday through Friday. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yolobus route 43 (Davis Express) is frequently standing room only; more buses/times should be added to the route.</td>
<td>Standees are generally allowed on the route 43, and care will be taken in the future to assure that only vehicles that allow the possibility of standees are used on this route. In addition, YCTD hopes to recover some seats as we upgrade the tie-down areas. YCTD has also added more grab straps for standees to use. More data will be collected to determine the extent of the standee situation. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not enough seats on Route 43, especially in the afternoon from Sacramento to Davis.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Additional express buses/runs are needed on Route 43 towards downtown Sacramento to deal with routine overcrowding.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A new bus stop is needed at westbound Covell Blvd. at Denali (routes served: Unitrans P Line</td>
<td>Yolobus 220, 220C, 230, 231, 232). Currently, there is a nearly one mile stretch between bus stops (Sutter Davis Hospital and Lake at Covell).</td>
<td>There are engineering issues with this location. Unitrans worked with the City of Davis in early 2014 to assess installing a bus stop at this location. Installation of a bus stop was found to be infeasible due to the location being near a drainage canal, pavement thickness/condition, and the layout of the nearby intersection and relatively high speed of traffic (45 MPH); a bus pullout would be required for a stop to be placed at this location. Further research will be done on the cost of reconstructing this area to accommodate a bus pullout and/or redesigning the intersection to make a bus stop at this location feasible. This is an unmet transit need that is not reasonable to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>The Unitrans bus schedule needs to be better coordinated with Davis City school bell times.</td>
<td>Unitrans service is available to all Davis secondary schools prior to the start of classes and from the schools after the end of classes. Unitrans may be able to adjust its service and/or work with the schools to improve the timing to be more convenient for students and staff, but this is an operational issue. Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
<td>Once the Sacramento Entertainment Sports Complex opens, Route 42 A&amp;B need to run every 30 minutes throughout the day until 11 to 11:30 PM.</td>
<td>It would cost approximately $4 million per year to double the 42 A/B service to every thirty minutes. In the YCTD SRTP phasing of increased frequency on the 42 A/B is considered to determine if there is demand for such service. There currently is no demand for ESC related transit services as the facility is not set to open until the fall/winter of 2016. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiries about continuing a community shuttle in West Sacramento that the current non-profit may stop operating.</td>
<td>The current provider has established an agreement with the City of West Sacramento to continue providing the Senior Center and Senior grocery/shopping shuttles. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs Comments</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Not Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Operations West Sacramento</td>
<td>Restore bus connectivity around West Sacramento's Transit Center, so that Yolobus route 35 syncs up for a timed transfer to route 240.</td>
<td>This is an operational matter. Bus service cannot be designed so that all buses can meet and connect with a timed transfer at the West Sacramento Transit Center. *Note - YCTD is considering starting a shuttle between the West Sacramento Transit Center and downtown Sacramento as a prelude to the Street Car. Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>The West Sacramento Transit Center receives a lot of foot traffic so a USPS (drop) mailbox should be placed there.</td>
<td>This is not a transit need comment. Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sale of sugary, including juice, and caffeinated beverages should not be allowed at transfer center (by West Sacramento Community Center) as their consumption on buses is generally prohibited.</td>
<td>This is not a transit need comment. Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Yolobus should serve people of West Sacramento, not business interests that want the streetcar; that money should go towards expanding bus service.</td>
<td>This is not a transit need comment. Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yolobus route 240 needs to run 10 minutes earlier to allow better connections with the Yolobus route 35 and reduce wait times for buses in Sacramento.</td>
<td>There are multiple options for routes that serve downtown Sacramento and connect with route 35 at the West Sacramento Transit Center. YCTD routes 40 &amp; 41 serve downtown Sacramento, allow a timed transfer with the route 35 at the West Sacramento Transit Center. Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Routes 40 and 41 need to operate later into the evening.</td>
<td>The routes 40 and 41 operate from 5:40 AM to 10:30 PM M-F, 7:40 AM to 7 PM Saturday, and 8:40 AM to 5:30 PM Sunday. Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Shelters and benches with weather protection are needed at the following route 240 stops: Social Security Office 825 Riverside Parkway, Payless Shoe Source 771 Ikea Court, and Reed Avenue, eastbound from Ikea Court to Harbor Blvd.</td>
<td>YCTD staff will contact the West Sacramento Social Security Office regarding funding a bus shelter/bench at that location. The rest of these stop locations do not have sufficient ridership or space for a bus shelter or bench. Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>YCTD bus drivers are frequently leaving the West Sacramento Transit Center as riders are running for the bus, and buses are frequently departing early (1 or 2 minutes prior to their scheduled departure time).</td>
<td>YCTD buses should not be leaving stops prior to their scheduled departure times. YCTD will work with their contractor to remind drivers not to leave stops prior to the scheduled departure time. Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Details and Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Service Winters</td>
<td>Solano Transportation Authority is interested in service from the City of Winters to Solano Community College in Vacaville. Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet: The YCTD route 220 (Davis, Winters, Vacaville) currently offers a connection three times a day at the Vacaville Transportation Center to the Vacaville City Coach route 4 that serves the Solano Community College Campus in Vacaville. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Service Woodland</td>
<td>Yolo County Court system has made an inquiry about some employee shuttle-related service to the new County courthouse, which will be completed in spring 2015. This request seems to be focused on an employee only shuttle, which could make it a charter and thus ineligible to use TDA - LTF. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>County of Yolo, Woodland, and Woodland Community College</td>
<td>County of Yolo, Woodland, and Woodland Community College are exploring ways to provide transportation to Probation's Day Reporting Center and jail facilities. Some suggestions include a shuttle operated by Probation or a reconfiguration of an existing local route. The topic remains sensitive because of safety concerns for students at/on the bus, related to jail releases or Day Reporting Center (DRC) clients. This service needs to be researched to determine if there is demand for this service. YCTD has been in talks with the County, City of Woodland and Woodland Community College. One issue is whether an existing public transit route should be reconfigured to serve the Justice Center, or if the Center should be running its own shuttle. This matter will also be addressed as part of the upcoming Woodland transit study. The current DRC is located approximately 1/2 mile from the nearest bus stop at Woodland Community College (Yolobus routes 212 &amp; 214). If the County ran its own shuttle, exclusive to Day Reporting Center and inmates that are released, it may not be considered eligible for TDA - LTF funds. If YCTD served that location as part of a public bus route, TDA - LTF funds could be used for this purpose. This is an unmet transit need that is not reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Yuba County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural bus routes services in Yuba-Sutter counties are unattractive and insufficient for those who need the services primarily for work and school because they do not run frequently enough in the day and throughout the week. A fixed-route schedule between Live Oak and Yuba City/Marysville with daily trips should be implemented.</td>
<td>Route 6 is the least productive (lowest ridership) of the six bus routes that Yuba-Sutter Transit operates. This bus route will be further evaluated as part of the Yuba-Sutter Transit SRTP that is currently underway. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Service</strong>&lt;br&gt;Yuba and Sutter Counties (Unincorporated areas or regarding overall bus services that serve both counties)&lt;br&gt;Make Dial-A-Ride more available for individuals that aren't part of groups.</td>
<td>Not an Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Not Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dial-A-Ride services will be further evaluated as part of the Yuba-Sutter Transit SRTP that is currently underway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Extend service hours in light of a large increase in the number of retail/shopping outlets that are open late in the evening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yuba-Sutter Transit service hours will be further evaluated as part of the Yuba-Sutter Transit SRTP that is currently underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Consider establishing an affordable transit service between Yuba-Sutter and Chico, California to serve commuting students and workers from Yuba-Sutter; only commercial transportation is available currently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is no demonstrated demand for these services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Operations</strong>&lt;br&gt;Yuba and Sutter Counties (Unincorporated area or regarding overall bus services that serve both counties)&lt;br&gt;Some bus stops are not safe for people using wheelchairs and scooters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Martin responded that much of Yuba-Sutter Transit's services operate in areas without &quot;complete streets.&quot; Yuba-Sutter Transit continues to work on &quot;complete streets&quot; and bus stop accessibility issues with responsible partner agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>People frequently refuse to move out of wheelchair spots for those who need them. Can drivers require people to move from these spots?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Martin responded that drivers cannot make people move. Yuba-Sutter Transit drivers are trained to ask people to move from seats in the wheelchair tie-down areas. He said if Ms. Collins or others have a driver that does not ask people in the seats to move to contact Yuba-Sutter Transit and let them know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Will people have to switch to the Connect Card, and will Yuba-Sutter accept cash and other fare media after the Connect Card is rolled out in 2015?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Martin responded that Yuba-Sutter Transit will not require riders to switch to using the Connect Card for fare payment. Yuba-Sutter Transit will continue to accept cash and non-discounted paper tickets. The Connect Card is expected to be available at various retail outlets when it is rolled out next year, and will be reloadable using cash, check, or credit card.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Install music in the shelters to combat criminal activity and vandalism issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Standing room only buses seem dangerous especially for those traveling on the highway at higher speeds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Standees are allowable and do happen on some routes at peak travel times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>What can be done about inebriated riders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Martin responded that drivers assess all riders for safety purposes, and they will radio the police department and deny boarding if they feel someone is a safety issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Not Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Yuba and Sutter Counties (Unincorporated area or regarding overall bus services that serve both counties) cont.</td>
<td>&quot;Complete Streets&quot; are needed by the Olivetree Senior Apartments on 7th avenue. There are no sidewalks in the area.</td>
<td>Keith Martin responded that much of Yuba-Sutter Transit's services operate in areas without &quot;complete streets&quot; (sidewalks, curb cuts etc.). Yuba-Sutter Transit continues to work on &quot;complete streets&quot; and bus stop accessibility issues with responsible partner agencies. Non-transit related comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. These types of comments are forwarded to the appropriate jurisdictions. This is not an unmet Transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessible taxi services are needed to assist people on holidays and Sundays for those who use Dial-A-Ride Monday through Saturday.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Martin responded that it is difficult to get a provider for accessible taxi services. The most common way to get these types of services in a particular area is to create a taxi regulation at the policy level that requires that taxi companies have at least one accessible vehicle available during their hours of service. Non-transit related comments are not analyzed as part of the unmet transit needs process. These types of comments are forwarded to the appropriate jurisdictions. This is not an unmet Transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC HEARING
IN THE CITY OF ELK GROVE
MINUTES

October 23, 2014 – 6:00 P.M.

The hearing was conducted by Gary Davis representing the SACOG Board of Directors, with Gary Taylor of SACOG staff, Jean Foletta, Raquel Chavarria and Mike Costa of e-tran, Rosemary Covington of Sacramento Regional Transit (RT), Tiffani Fink of Paratransit, Inc. and Tim Swank representing the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council.

Director Davis provided an overview of SACOG and expressed the need for the South Line Light Rail to be extended from Cosumnes River College (service to CRC opening September 2015) to downtown Elk Grove. He said this would create efficiencies and Phase III needs to extend to the mall (Outlet Collection) near Kammerer/Grant Line Road and Highway 99. Mr. Taylor gave an overview of the unmet transit needs hearing process.

Ms. Foletta reviewed e-tran/e-van service and updated attendees on the Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) the City will be undertaking in early 2015. The COA will assist staff with modifying routes and schedules to be more user-friendly to the public and also to complement the Light Rail extension scheduled to open in September 2015. Four people not on the hearing panel attended the Unmet Transit Needs hearing, and three items of correspondence were received. All Unmet Transit Needs comments are listed below.

Director Davis opened the hearing to public comment.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY

1. Alfreda Abdul-Ahad, Elk Grove, CA

Ms. Abdul-Ahad requested more bus feeder service to light rail.

She expressed her concern that crowding on the e-tran commuter buses is getting bad – especially on Route 52 and Route 53 in the mornings between 7:00 and 8:30 AM.

Ms. Abdul-Ahad was also concerned about maintaining bus service on holidays when state workers are not on holiday.

*e-tran staff told her that this is being changed for next year. Ms. Abdul-Ahad was happy with the change.*

She asked Jean Foletta (e-tran’s Transit System Manager) why the buses never have the same drivers.

*Ms. Foletta provided clarification and explained what may be causing the different driver issues.*
Ms. Abdul-Ahad expressed her frustration that the “Bus Alerts” often do not arrive until after the bus doesn’t show up at the scheduled time.

*e-tran staff explained that this was an ongoing issue with the contract operator but that e-tran was continuing to stay on top of it. They also asked that if the issue arises again to let them know so that they can monitor the situation.*

2. Lynn Wheat, Elk Grove, CA

Ms. Lynn Wheat expressed her excitement for the South Line light rail extension to Cosumnes River College (CRC). She reminded the group that during the development of the SACOG Regional Blueprint for regional transportation planning the Plan described light rail extending into downtown Elk Grove.

She expressed her understanding that light rail needs higher density to meet the thresholds for federal funding and encouraged the City to improve the jobs-housing balance and to plan for high density development along the light rail proposed alignment. “We need to help people get off the roads.”

3. Carlita Ferguson, Elk Grove, CA

Ms. Ferguson lives near Calvine Road and requested more service into downtown in the morning and the afternoon. With only three runs in the morning and the afternoon, she said it took her two hours to get back to her car from Sacramento.

*e-trans staff provided information to her on the Emergency Ride Home Program in case she needs to get back to Elk Grove in the middle of the day.*

Ms. Ferguson also expressed the need for more e-tran bus service – especially the route 162.

Ms. Ferguson said she generally takes light rail to Florin Road then takes the RT bus into Sacramento. She was concerned that RT does not accept Elk Grove bus passes (no reciprocity).

She also said that the e-tran bus system needs to accommodate more service to the schools and was especially concerned with the need for more service to the schools off of Calvine Road. She used the example of her daughter only having two minutes to get to class after getting off of the bus near her school.

*Mayor Davis explained that federal guidelines do not allow Public Transit agencies to provide exclusive bus service and that this is a tough concern to satisfy. e-tran staff explained that several routes are designed to service schools in the area, but that they are open to the general public including students. Staff also agreed that the Calvine area probably needs more service coverage and as such there had been some internal discussion about potential route modifications for route 162. Staff expressed being open to looking at the schedule on route 154 to mitigate the timing issue in the morning in getting to school.*
4. Mike Barnbaum, Sacramento, CA

On September 6, 2015 all e-tran and RT bus trips from Cosumnes River College (CRC) to Meadowview should stop [with the start of RT light rail service to CRC]. These cost savings can be used as follows:

Mr. Barnbaum commented that if the CRC to Meadowview bus services end that there will be a need to provide a new “Route 165” from Franklin to Apple and Laguna. This alignment is currently served by the RT route 65.

e-tran staff clarified that this service would only be needed to satisfy a potential service gap on Franklin Blvd. if RT’s proposal of eliminating service in Elk Grove through route 65 were to be approved.

Mr. Barnbaum also suggested that a route be created from CRC to the Outlet Collection (Kammerer/Grant Line roads near Hwy 99) that runs seven days a week. This route is mainly to serve employees at the Outlet Collection so they have transportation to and from work during the hours of the day that they need it.

e-tran staff stated that the Outlet Mall service will be included as part of the Comprehensive Operational Analysis due to begin next year. The Outlet Collection/Mall is not slated to open until 2016.

Mr. Barnbaum recommended that the commuter service stay the same in the morning, but during the afternoon and evening the commuter service needs to be more flexible and provide ways to return to Elk Grove from 7th St & K St in Sacramento (the future location of the Entertainment Sports Complex currently under construction).

e-tran staff responded that e-tran currently does not service any major sports complex in the Sacramento Region. The agency feels that a robust service connection to light Rail at CRC should satisfy some of this need.

Mr. Barnbaum recommended either a bus route or bus rapid transit on the South East Connector.

Mr. Barnbaum suggested that the RT light rail service to/from Folsom should provide late night service for those trips from the Entertainment Sports Complex, when completed, in downtown Sacramento. This service should have similar hours and frequency as the service provided for Folsom Live (most recently Saturday, Sept 20, 2014), but should be on-going. As part of this extension of light rail service hours the Folsom Stage Line should also operate the same hours and frequency as the light rail to provide connections from the Folsom light rail stations to residences.
CORRESPONDENCE

1. Laura Gore, Elk Grove, CA

I live near Laguna and Bruceville in Elk Grove and work at 15th and Capitol in downtown Sacramento. The [e-tran] buses that pick up within walking distance of my house do not drop off near my work. However, there are buses that do drop off near my work only they are across HWY 99 and too far to walk. I know that there are a large group of us (1/4 to 1/2 of a bus) that get off the bus at my work stop and a good number of those live on my side of 99. Would it be possible to extend route 66 or 52 to have them drop off/pick up around 15th and Capitol?

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to ask my question,

Laura Gore

2. Alfreda Abdul-Ahad, Elk Grove, CA

I ride the e-tran to and from work each day. Over the last few months, the 52 (6:35 AM) and 53 are jam packed each way. It is as if the transit company hasn't noticed that Elk Grove has a lot more people. There is a real need to have additional commuter buses. Maybe have the commuter routes running more frequently especially the 52 (4:15 PM), 53, and 66 [from downtown Sacramento]. People have fallen on the overcrowded buses when there is a sudden stop, and there are 20 people crammed in the aisles. Also, after working all day, it would be nice to have a seat on the ride home.

It would be nice also to have the 66 leave downtown earlier than 4:50 PM.

3. Alex Mahoney, Elk Grove, CA

Every day I take two busses to school and three to get home. The other four buses are generally always on time or a little bit late, but not much of a problem. But every day I am in constant worry over the e-tran route 160 that runs around 3 PM of "will this bus get here 10 or 20 minutes late". It [the 160] is always more than 15 minutes late and yesterday it was to the point of stopping at my stop when it was supposed to be on the complete other side of the road, causing me to have to sit at my transfer stop for an hour and a half for a bus that will take me home. I was absolutely furious because it’s always the same driver, and it has been like this for months. I am completely sick of it and others I have talked to on the bus are too. I believe this man is not fit to be on this route, because it is obviously way too much for him to be even slightly on time. Thank you for your time, and I sincerely wish for this issue to be resolved.
October 16, 2014 – 2:00 P.M.

The hearing was called to order at 2:00PM. The hearing was conducted by Mark Crews representing the SACOG Board of Directors, with Barbara VaughanBechtold of SACOG staff, Timothy Swank representing the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (Sacramento County SSTAC), Tiffani Fink representing Paratransit, Inc. and the Sacramento County SSTAC, Rosemary Covington representing Sacramento Regional Transit (RT) and the Sacramento County SSTAC, and Becky Egleston representing South County Transit Link (SCT/Link).

Director Mark Crews and Ms. VaughanBechtold provided a brief overview of SACOG and the unmet transit needs hearing process. Five people not on the hearing panel attended the Unmet Transit Needs hearing, and three items of correspondence were received. All Unmet Transit Needs comments are below.

Ms. Egleston described the existing SCT/Link transit services.

Director Crews opened the public hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY

1. Ruth Enos, Galt, CA

Ms. Enos has had difficulty getting to medical appointments on Laguna Blvd. in Elk Grove. She appreciates the medical facilities shuttle that is offered on Thursdays and Fridays, but that frequently means waiting to see a healthcare provider until one of the services days.

Ms. Enos also mentioned that people frequently have to wait long periods of time for the dial-a-ride service during the morning and evening hours when local schools begin and end their school day. She suggested that an additional vehicle should be added during those times to serve non-students.

2. Ursula Pomiba, Galt, CA

Ms. Pomiba complimented the SCT/Link drivers for their courteousness and their willingness to assist those who needed it in getting their shopping to their door.

Ms. Pomiba had a difficult situation arise where her son was taken to the UC Davis Medical Center in Sacramento because of a health emergency. She was contacted by the hospital around 10 PM at night and told that they didn’t expect her son to survive and that she should come right away. Unfortunately there is no private transportation/taxi provider in the City of Galt, and Ms. Pomiba was not able to get to the hospital before her son passed away. She would like to know
what could be done to get some kind of private transportation/taxi service to service the City, especially when other public transportation options are not available.

3. Mike Barnbaum, Sacramento, CA

Mr. Barnbaum attended the Galt Unmet Transit Needs hearing representing the grassroots organization Here We Ride. This group advocates for and educates on public transit options to/from the downtown Sacramento Entertainment Sports Complex (ESC) slated to open at the end of 2016.

Mr. Barnbaum gave testimony that later evening SCT/Link service was needed that connected Cosumnes River College (CRC) to Galt to allow transit-dependent Galt residents/students to work and attend evening/night classes. He also stated that RT light rail service to CRC is scheduled to begin in September 2015.

Mr. Barnbaum suggested that SCT/Link services that would eventually connect with the September 2015 CRC RT light rail service should run later, as light rail is expected to run to/from CRC until almost 12:00 AM. Currently the last trip to Galt from CRC leaves at 6:45 PM. He suggested that SCT/Link should coordinate with RT to determine one or two late trips back to Galt.

Mr. Barnbaum also commented on the lack of seven-day-per-week transit service outside of Galt. Currently intercity service is only available for Galt and South Sacramento County transit users Monday through Friday. Mr. Barnbaum suggested that since ESC events would likely happen seven days per week that SCT/Link should provide some intercity services seven days a week.

Mr. Barnbaum also suggested that the SCT/Link commuter services should be expanded to include reverse commute (Sacramento to Galt) services, later evening (6-7 PM) commute services, as well as one or two midday runs to allow commuters to feel secure that they could get home during the day should the need arise. He also suggested the possibility of serving the current soccer stadium at Bonney Field at Cal Expo.

4. Dan Robledo, Clay Station, CA

Mr. Robledo complimented the SCT/Link drivers saying they do a good job. He stated that the bus currently will only come out as far as Alta Mesa Road and Twin Cities Road, even though the SCT/Link service information materials state that the service goes all the way out to the area around Clay Station Road and Twin Cities Road. Mr. Robledo also wanted to know why he has been told there is a 4:00 PM cut-off for these services even though the service information materials show that dial-a-ride services are available from 6:30 AM to 6:30 PM Monday through Friday, and the services to this more rural area are only available on Tuesday but are not available until 6:30 PM. Mr. Robledo would like to see the rural area/Clay Station services made available at least two to three days per week and run as late as the rest of the dial-a-ride services (until 6:30 PM).
5. Salud Martinez, Clay Station, CA

Ms. Martinez lives in the Clay Station area and currently walks three miles to get to Twin Cities Road and Alta Mesa Road where the bus picks up. She has been riding the bus for thirteen years. She would like to know why the bus doesn’t come all the way out to Clay Station Road and Twin Cities Road as advertised. She understands that the dial-a-ride is a shared ride, but some days she has been on the bus one and a half hours with a three mile walk (approximately one hour) after that. Ms. Martinez would like to see more days of service to allow people more opportunities to access jobs and educational opportunities. She would also like the bus to run later, until 6:30 or 7:00 PM, on the day(s) it does run.

6. Alan Hirch, Davis, CA

Mr. Hirch thinks RT made a mistake when they decided not to have a stop on Light Rail at Loaves and Fishes. (This comment will be included in the Sacramento County Unmet Transit Needs Comments summary.)

**CORRESPONDENCE**

1. La Verne Roelen, Sacramento, CA

Ms. Roelen works for the California Department of Managed Healthcare located in downtown Sacramento. Ms. Roelen purchases transit passes for employees. She found it difficult to get information on where she could purchase an SCT/Link Galt-Sacramento Commuter Express monthly pass.

*SACOG staff provided Ms. Roelen contact information for SCT/Link.*

2. Adam Ender, Galt, CA

Mr. Ender would like to know why the Highway 99 Express/SCT/Link won’t accept an RT monthly pass. He thinks a single regional pass or transfer agreement needs to be made between SCT/Link and RT etc. Mr. Ender stated that most other RT connecting agencies accepts the RT pass (e-tran, Folsom Stage Link and Yolobus).

Mr. Ender also commented that the Highway 99 Express/SCT/Link services that leave Galt (intercity) do not operate on the weekends and inhibit the ability of those who cannot/do not want to own or operate a private vehicle from finding employment or obtaining education outside of Galt.

3. Anonymous, Clay Station, CA

The caller said there was a need for more than once per week service to/from the Clay Station area of Sacramento County. The caller also stated that the bus needs to run for more of the day, especially later into the evening.
4. Phyllis Pena, Galt, CA

Hello,

My name is Phyllis Pena and I am a Supervising Public Health Nurse with Adult Protective Services. I was surprised to learn that if you live in Isleton or Galt and are elderly with no support and no transportation, and dementia you will need to take 3 buses at the very least, to arrive at an Elk Grove doctor appointment. How can this be? I understand that South County no longer offers this service, but what about this patient? It’s impossible to assist the elderly. Please reconsider their options.

Perplexed,

Phyllis Pena, RN, BSN, PHN
Supervising Public Health Nurse
Adult Protective Services
October 27, 2014 – 2:00 P.M.

The hearing was conducted by Roberta MacGlashan representing the SACOG Board of Directors, Azadeh Doherty, staff at SACOG, James Drake of the Sacramento Regional Transit District, Raquel Chavarria of e-tran, Kent Gary of Folsom Stage Line, Tiffani Fink of Paratransit, Inc., and Janine Brown of the Sacramento County DHHS, also representing the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council.

Ms. Doherty provided an overview of SACOG and the unmet transit needs hearing process. Mr. Drake, Ms. Chavarria, Mr. Gary and Ms. Fink gave brief overviews of their transit services and upcoming changes. Mark Snaer of the Sacramento County DHHS gave an overview of their Senior Companions Program. Four people testified at the hearing; and 19 items of correspondence were received. All Unmet Transit Needs comments are listed below.

Director MacGlashan opened the hearing to public comment.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY

1. Mary Jane, Sacramento, CA

   Reinstate Route 22 service on a portion of Arden Way to serve the Whole Foods Market. Additionally, the Route 22 service was used by a number of employees at a Walgreens on Arden/Eastern. The route 34 needs ½ hourly service to better serve the CSUS and middle school students that use it.

2. Mike Barnbaum, Sacramento, CA

   Mr. Barnbaum had multiple comments:

   Add late night service on light rail and all commuter/local bus routes that serve the Downtown Entertainment Sports Complex area to support the schedule of the future events at this facility. Bus routes included would be 2, 3 Exp., 6, 7 Exp., 29 Exp., 109 Exp., 11, 30, 38, 62, 86 and 88, as well as the blue and gold light rail lines.

   Restore Sunday/Holiday service to match the Saturday service on the blue and gold light rail lines (ESC related).

   Create a route “165” between Apple and Franklin on Laguna to replace the proposed cut-back on the route 65.
Provide late night service on routes 67 and 68 to serve the Republic FC at Cal Expo/Bonney Field.

Provide weekend early morning route 23 bus service outbound from the Arden Del Paso light rail station.

Eliminate the route 22 and instead cover the area with routes 23 and 29 to provide the area all day/evening service.

Provide bus service by rerouting #82 to serve the Kaiser Hospital and Blood Source on Morse Avenue.

3. Mike Mattos, Rocklin, CA

Mr. Mattos suggested extending light rail service to Roseville/Rocklin.

4. Angie Woodward, Sacramento, CA

Ms. Woodward requested direct service to Arden Fair Mall from midtown Sacramento.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

1) Regina Harris, Sacramento, CA

RE: Comments, Bus/Light Rail Service

Like most riders here in Sacramento, I appreciate having a reliable and easy to access transit service.

Mine is not a complaint but more of a request. There is a large gap between the Butterfield and Mather Field light rail stations. The Rancho Cordova Public Library is located along this gap. Each Saturday they host a breakfast for seniors. It gives us an opportunity to gather together, especially those of us who don’t get out much due to health or other constraints.

Each day many of us, of all ages, must walk along this route on Folsom Blvd. to attend this and other events at the library. I personally have risked falling down along the unpaved way, or being hit by vehicles that don’t see me.

I volunteered at this library one summer and enjoyed it very much. But I live in Rosemont and due to health concerns I could not walk the above mentioned path to get there.

May we have a bus line that runs along Folsom from Bradshaw to maybe Mather?

I appreciate Regional Transit’s general manager riding the system from time to time to get a feel for the needs of riders. He must be a very special person. Please extend my gratitude.
Thank you for considering my request.

Respectfully, Regina Harris

2) Terri Hellerich, Sacramento, CA

It would be very helpful to me if the 67 bus ran a bit earlier and a bit later and more often (every 15 minutes during the weekdays, and every 30 minutes during the weekends).

Also, the 47th Avenue light rail station has no bus route. I would really love it if there was a bus that ran along 47th Avenue. I would like to be able to shop on Stockton Blvd. without having to go downtown or to Florin Mall to transfer to the 51. If there was a bus from the 47th Avenue Light rail that ran all along 47th Avenue then I could get to the light rail without walking through a dangerous industrial area. Right now I have to walk all the way from 47th and MLK to the light rail, and it is really far because I have disabilities. I have lived all over the United States and have never seen a light rail stop that didn't have a bus serving it until I moved to Sacramento last month.

It just seems really weird that many of the light rail stops don't have bus connections. I feel like my neighborhood would really benefit from better public transit. Many of the people here are lower income and they need improved service to better themselves.

I really LIKE the Sacramento RT text alerts with the bus stop numbers on the signs. It is really helpful. I use a Windows Phone 8.1 and the mobile website is okay, but I would like to see an app for Windows Phone.

Thank you.

Terri Hellerich

3) Maureen Whitehurst, Sacramento, CA

I catch buses on either Valley Hi or Franklin. Bus routes 5 and 65 need to start running earlier in the morning during the weekdays to connect to earlier running light rail trains. Buses should run on the half hour during the week and not hourly. This should be a standard for all lines in Sacramento. There should be buses running from Valley Hi and Franklin on the weekends at a minimum between 9am to 6pm, even if the buses run hourly.

Thank you for your consideration of these suggestions.

Maureen Whitehurst

4) Lynda Harrison, Sacramento, CA

With regard to your request for comments from the traveling public, I would like to suggest that consideration is given to limiting the number of passengers, particularly those with shopping
trolleys, strollers, etc., allowed to stand on RT buses. I was traveling home on a #23 bus a couple of nights ago which was like a "sardine special". It was extremely difficult to access the door to step off the bus when it arrived at my stop. This is a totally ridiculous situation and one which potentially could be a safety hazard.

Lynda Harrison

5) Gavin Baker, Sacramento, CA

I find it inconvenient and expensive to pay for transit on Sacramento RT. It's inconvenient to have to carry $2.50 in cash in order to ride the bus. Please hurry with the smart card!

It's also expensive, especially with the lack of transfers. For instance, say my wife and I want to go to dinner -- at $2.50 each, that's $5 one-way. I could take Lyft for $6 or $7 to most places midtown, and that would be a private car from door to door. If I could load the money on a smart card, it would be more painless. And if there were transfers so the return trip within 2 or 3 hours is free, then it'd be competitive.

I would like to see better transit connections between Alkali Flat and downtown/midtown Sacramento. Maybe a new light rail stop would help. Currently, it's 1 mile between the Richards and 7th & I stations on the Green Line rail line. Adding a stop at, say, 7th & D would be a considerably more convenient connection to the neighborhood.

Gavin Baker

6) Rachel Lomas, Sacramento, CA

The Social Security Administration offices off of Folsom Blvd. houses our area’s main branch to which most our Social Security needs are met. The light rail (Power Inn Station) only goes so far then you have to walk the rest of the way. There used to be a bus system on this route that met SSA users’ needs. When the current Social Security office was built the direct bus route no longer existed, and we are talking a majority of those needing access to the SSA office being elderly and disabled alike. I have seen an 82 to 87 year old lady walking to the light rail sweating as though she was going to have a heart attack. It was very sad to see. I also am totally disabled and that is a long walk for me. If we can just get small bus/shuttle to the SSA office that would help. Please listen I am afraid one day someone might not make the light rail. If that does not work for RT why not extend the 61 bus through that route for it to run every half an hour. I see it waiting for a turnaround (layover) nearby for that route to start.

7) Jeremy Lansing, Sacramento, CA

I have ridden this bus, RT route 82, multiple times and it is consistently 4-5 minutes late. This consistent lateness makes every person late to catch the light rail resulting in them having to wait 15-30 minutes depending on the time of day. Specifically I’m referring to the route 82 bus heading toward University and 65th streets (65th Street light rail station), which is supposed to leave the CSUS administration building stop at 10:25 AM.
8) Gary Collier, Sacramento, CA

With the discontinuation of first The Neighborhood Ride (TNR) route 17 and then the TNR route 18, the residential area directly adjacent to the McClellan Business Park has no regular transit service available within approximately 1 mile. The route 85, the McClellan Park shuttle, between the Business Park and the Roseville Road light rail station runs through the adjacent neighborhood but does not have stops outside the Park. There needs to be transit service available in this neighborhood as there are large numbers or people without access to personal vehicles (low income, seniors and people with disabilities).

Paratransit, Inc. services don't go to Roseville (City of), so riders must transfer which can add as much as an hour to an already long journey from Sacramento County to reach the myriad of medical and retail services in Roseville. There needs to be a way to for Paratransit, Inc. qualified riders to get from Sacramento to Roseville seamlessly without forcing a transfer, especially for those trying to access medical services.

9) William Leppo, Sacramento, CA

I take the RT route 86 to downtown Sacramento each day and connect with the Yolobus route 42 to Woodland. I use my bicycle for the first/last mile of this trip and find that all the bicycle positions on the bus are frequently full during the morning and evening commutes. Though Yolobus already has 3 position bike racks on their buses I would like to see 3 position bike racks on all RT buses as well.

William Leppo

10) Dave Woodward, Roseville, CA

Dear Sacramento Regional Transit,

As I've commuted southbound on San Juan Boulevard each morning at about 7:15 a.m. for the last couple of years, I often see a mom and two small girls as well as recently a special needs male sitting on the sidewalk waiting for the route 23 bus just north of the intersection with Sunset. Do you have any plans to install a bus stop/bench at this location?

Dave Woodward

11) Chong Vang, Sacramento, CA

I personally do not use the public transportation (Sacramento RT), but my employer Asian Resources Inc. provides social services to the low-income and limited English speaking your, immigrant and refugee communities in Sacramento. Our clients gave feedback that they want to use RT more, but the daily cost (especially considering the lack of transfers available) is over the range that they can afford.

Chong Vang, Program Coordinator
12) April Dearbaugh, Carmichael, CA

My name is April Dearbaugh and I started riding the #29 (second morning run and first evening run) in June of this year (2014). At first I was pleasantly surprised at the ease of taking RT to and from work. I ride from Fair Oaks Blvd and California to the last stop at 7th and O St. The bus is always on time (with the exception of the week it was early and I missed it twice) and most of the drivers are great.

However, over the past few weeks it has gotten progressively over crowded; this morning to the point it was ridiculous and highly unsafe. I was sitting on the driver's side, isle seat, in the middle of the bus. People were standing everywhere. I was hit twice in the face by a backpack and spent most of my ride with a man's crotch 3" from my face. That is unacceptable. We have had people holding up the bus at various stops ranting because there were already two bikes in the front and they had already been passed up by the first and only other bus because, that too, was over capacity. Please, either add more runs during peak hours or undo whatever changes you have recently made that affect this route. No one should have to pay for the experience I had this morning (Thursday, October 9, 2014).

Thank you for your time,

April Dearbaugh

13) Nancy Wallace, Sacramento, CA

Hello,

I believe that we need the return of a bus that goes all the way down Arden Way like the RT route 29 does. Citizens in this area have no other transit that goes to the end of Arden Way and along Fair Oaks Blvd in the Arden/Arcade area.

Also, there is a need to have drivers require passengers fold down their carts & strollers when boarding the RT bus/train systems. I believed this is a rule but it does not seem to be adhered to consistently by the drivers.

14) Maxine Messenger, Sacramento, CA

She would like the 67 to run more frequently M-F between 6 AM and 6 PM every 15 minutes and every half hour until service ends in the evening. She also wanted the 67 to run more frequently on the weekend every 1/2 hour from 7 AM - 7 PM and every hour until it stops for the night.

15) Anonymous Caller

With wages being so low in Sacramento why does a monthly RT pass cost $100, which is more than a monthly pass costs in the SF Bay Area? Why are there no longer transfers in the RT area.
$2.50 for each leg of a trip is too much. These high costs for transit won't get people in Sacramento to stop driving and get out of their cars and onto transit.

16) Dean Taise, Sacramento, CA

Hello RT:

I am emailing you to see if more service to and from Folsom after 7:00 pm will be considered and done. I have heard that this may be under consideration.

This would be a valued service for the many people that work in the Folsom area and community. It also provides others from around Sacramento to visit Historic Folsom, The Outlets, and other services there and still have the option to have light rail available to leave after 7:00 pm.

I had an incident where I had gotten off work from the Palladio Center after 10:00 pm and riding my bike back to Rancho Cordova met a father and his young son walking along Folsom Blvd just past the closed Mine Shaft building. By now, it was after 11:00. (The father thought service ran later like in all the other areas). They had spent time together in Folsom and had gone to a movie at the theaters across the Outlet. They had gotten out of the movies around 9 or so. But with no light rail, a cell phone that wasn't working, they were walking back to Rancho. It was chilly and the young son, about 9 years old was tired. Offered my cell but didn't want to bother calling anyone after 11:00. I knew they were not going to even make the last one out of the Sunrise Station even if they ran to it, which they couldn't. Sure, he should have checked schedules but here is just one situation where for those without vehicle transportation, having light rail to and from Folsom after 7:00 pm would be of terrific service. Let alone other people who want to shop/visit Folsom and also for employees that get off after 7:00 from the Outlets and elsewhere in the area.

I too after getting off work later from the Palladio sometimes wished I could catch light rail from your Iron Point Station after 7:00.

I am sure for budgetary reasons, service is limited to only 7:00 pm, but two cars at the usual 30 minute intervals would provide a real blessing to the many patrons and I am sure businesses in Folsom to have the service extended there.

Even more so now with the Christmas and Holiday Season that can benefit the community, people, businesses alike.

Thank you for your considerations. I, others would appreciate it!

Dean Taise
17) Edward Hernandez, Sacramento CA

Mr. Hernandez works at the current Entertainment and Sports Arena in North Natomas. Mr. Hernandez uses RT routes 11 & 13 to get to work for Arena events held Monday through Friday, but finds it difficult to get to events on weekend, in particular Sundays when there is no bus service to the Arena area available. He would like to see Sunday service on the route 11 and weekend (Saturday and Sunday) service on the route 13.

18) Mr. Robinson, Sacramento CA

Mr. Robinson takes the earliest RT Blue line light rail train from Watt Avenue (4:51 AM) to connect to the Gold line to get to a 6 AM shift at the Franchise Tax Board. He would like to see an earlier train from the Watt/I-80 light rail station that would allow him to arrive at work on time but not late, which he frequently is since the light rail currently gets him to work on minutes before his shift starts.

19) Jeff Doll

To whom it may concern,

My comments on the Sacramento Metro Areas unmet transit needs are as follows:

My biggest concern is that the initiatives as outlined in the 2035 MTP will either be met later than 2035 or not at all. I recently asked Sac RT CEO Mike Wiley regarding the streetcar plans that are within the 2035 MTP that show a route along the south part of downtown Sac, into east Sac and up to the Cal Expo area. He implied that this plan was entirely "conceptual" and that without approval from Sac RT, such a plan would never see the light of day. I ask you this: what is the point of having the 2035 MTP if the CEO of the major transit organization is not even willing to work towards actually implementing what is in that plan? I firmly believe that the 2035 MTP falls far short of meeting Sacramento's unmet transit needs and should actually be put on a fast track towards being completed no less than 10 years ahead of 2035 and that SACOG and all of the regional transit agencies need to aggressively pursue the means necessary to accomplish this. Public transportation will be increasingly important, especially as the millennial generation has shown less interest in automotive transport and more interest in public transportation. The metro area that has the best public transit infrastructure is the metro area that will attract the most millennial dollars. If Sacramento can't aggressively pursue public transit (and bicycle infrastructure) then Sacramento will lose out on the up and coming generation that is also the generation with the highest population and the highest earning power.

And no, more buses are not the answer. The 2035 MTP calls for "HiBus" routes in specific corridors. However, the definition of "HiBus" is far too broad. This needs to be changed to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and they MUST have their own dedicated rights of way and a high frequency of operation (no more than every 15 mins regardless of current budget status). This is about the only rational use of buses for anything other than rural bus routes where building out rail would be difficult. Moreover, BRT should serve as an interim solution until a more practical solution is able to be implemented (once ridership increases to a tipping point). That solution is, of course, streetcars or trams.
Lastly, the mentality of transit planners needs to change. Currently, transit planners think of public transit as a "commuter alternative." This MUST STOP! Transit planners need to start thinking of public transit (and walking, and cycling) as a bonafide mode of transportation. It is used for getting things done, whether it's getting to work, going to the store, running errands or visiting friends/relatives. It is time for transit planners to stop treating public transit as a charity to the poor and disabled and as a legitimate mode of transportation for everybody!

Thank you,

Jeff Doll
TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC HEARING IN
YOLO COUNTY, INCLUDING THE CITIES OF DAVIS,
WEST SACRAMENTO, WINTERS, AND WOODLAND
MINUTES

October 29, 2014 – 6:00 P.M.
DAVIS CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
23 RUSSELL BLVD., DAVIS

Conducted by Lucas Frerichs of the SACOG Board; Gary Taylor, SACOG staff; Terry Bassett, representing the Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD); Teri Sheets representing Unitrans; and James Haven representing Davis Community Transit (DCT) and the Yolo County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC).

Four people testified at the hearing and eleven items of correspondence were received.

Mr. Frerichs 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. Taylor explained that after the hearing, the Yolo County 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. Bassett provided an overview of the services provided by YCTD, highlighted recent service changes and upcoming planning efforts in which the agency is engaged. Ms. Sheets summarized the services provided by Unitrans. Mr. Haven summarized the services provided by DCT.

Mr. Frerichs opened the public hearing comment period.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY

1. William A. Lowell, West Sacramento, CA

Mr. Lowell made the following comments:

- New buses should include extension speakers for the middle and the rear of the bus. It is hard to hear stop and other announcements when many passengers are talking.
- Do not remove the “flip seats” as they provide much needed access for ambulatory passengers with packages and foldable mobility devices.
- Non-ambulatory riders should be required to use seatbelts to restrain them in their wheelchairs. Wheelchairs are secured but not the riders sitting in the secured wheelchairs.
- Buses need a place to put shopping carts and such.
- The Yolobus route 240 needs to run 10 minutes earlier to allow better connections and reduce the wait for buses in Sacramento.
• Sale of sugary, including juice, and caffeinated beverages should not be allowed at the transfer center as their consumption on buses is generally prohibited.

Mr. Lowell also submitted correspondence that is included below.

2. Pamela Walker, Davis, CA

Ms. Walker made the following comments after having her concerns about getting a return ride home on DCT:

She had three main concerns: the paratransit system, sidewalk travel, and bus stops.

Regarding the paratransit system, Ms. Walker does not like the 16-passenger buses. She prefers minivans. The existing buses are too high from the ground. Also, the tie-downs are directly underneath the air conditioning and heating vents and the climate control at that location is very uncomfortable. Using the lifts on the current vehicles is scary. Many riders prefer to struggle up the two steps.

Regarding sidewalk travel, Ms. Walker does not like the round curbs because they cause the wheelchairs to high center (get stuck). There needs to be assistance for the blind to help them navigate to and from their destinations. People in wheelchairs often have to use the streets because of debris on the sidewalks.

Ms. Walker stated that “Davis is wonderful if you are on two wheels, but if you are on four wheels, not so much.”

Regarding bus stops, Ms. Walker says the fixed route service does not provide enough shelters with covers from the weather.

3. Alan Hirch, Davis, CA

Mr. Hirch commented that the (Unitrans) bus schedule needs to be better coordinated with Davis City school bell times.

He also suggested that the Yolobus route 43 (Davis Express) is frequently standing room only and more buses/times should be added to this route.

Mr. Hirch would also like to see Yolobus implement a rider notification system that would notify riders if buses are running late.

Regarding streetcars, Mr. Hirch feels that Yolobus needs to better serve the people of West Sacramento, not the business interests who want the streetcar. He thinks it doesn’t make sense to spend such a large amount of money on a streetcar project, and that the funds would be better spent on expanding bus service in West Sacramento/to Sacramento.
He also stated that he thinks RT made a mistake when they decided not to have a stop on Light Rail at Loaves and Fishes. (This comment will be included in the Sacramento County Unmet Transit Needs Comments summary.)

4. Mike Barnbaum, Sacramento, CA

Mr. Barnbaum made the following comments:

- Route 42 A&B: Hourly service is not frequent enough. When the downtown Sacramento Entertainment Sports Complex opens, this route needs to run every 30 minutes throughout the day until 11:00 to 11:30 PM at night.
- Route 40 and Route 41 need to operate later into the evening.
- The Yolobus commuter/express service for the afternoon should provide more options for the riders to stay in Sacramento and get a ride home later in the evening.

CORRESPONDENCE

1. William Lowell, West Sacramento, CA

Mr. Lowell made the following comments:

- For the next two years of so, while the Sacramento Kings’ Stadium is being built, we should restore connectivity at West Sacramento’s Transit Center – especially for Yolobus route 35 – where riders like myself must wait 50-55 minutes half the time because the eastbound Yolobus route 240 runs too late if we want to shop locally. One solution could be to begin the route 240 10 minutes earlier.
- Review Yolobus’ new policy/signage of “seat does not fold down” on front wheelchair seats. With this change many riders with walkers and shopping carts must now wait longer for the next bus, often an hour. This often discourages local shopping by those on both sides of the river; thus lower sales tax revenue. Note: Sacramento Regional Transit did not disable their front folding seats. Solution: Restore folding seats on Yolobus.
- Since not all scooter/wheelchair riders have or use seatbelts to secure themselves, it seems ridiculous to so firmly secure scooters/wheelchairs to the floor without securing the scooter/wheelchair user in their device. In case of a sudden stop said scooter/wheelchair user can still be thrown forward and possibly be injured. Solution: Add longer seat belts to secure scooter/wheelchair users in their device and require use by all for better safety.
- Shelters/benches are need at the following route 240 stop locations – a) Social Security Office 825 Riverside Parkway, b) Payless Shoe Source 771 Ikea Court and c) Reed Avenue, eastbound from Ikea Court to Harbor Blvd. Seating with weather protection would be very helpful at these stops.
- Inside the West Sacramento Community Center, 1075 West Capitol Avenue – The City should find a new operator for the snack bar (previously operated by La Bou Bakery and Cafes), preferably like Taco Bell or Blimpies, since both offer SoBeLean/from Pepsi, containing neither sugar, caffeine nor grapefruit juice.
Since the West Sacramento Transit Center/Community Center – across from the West Sacramento City Hall/Civic Center – has so much foot traffic and U.S. Postal minivans come by about three times per day, why not ask that a U.S. Postal drop/mailbox be established/serviced there daily? It would also be helpful to locate such a drop/mailbox somewhere in West Sacramento’s Riverpoint Marketplace (Walmart/IKEA) shopping center.

Thank you, SACOG, Yolobus and other staff for your considerations.

William A. Lowell

2. Greg Justice, Sacramento, CA

Dear SACOG,

I write in response to your “Unmet Needs” solicitation, and present an idea I have had for a while. Simply put, it is running the Yolobus 42 all-night, between Davis and downtown Sacramento. This would be especially appreciated for westbound trips, as the last 42A to Davis departs downtown Sacramento at 10:30 PM on weekdays, and 8:30 PM on weekends. Further, the last Amtrak train to Davis from the Sacramento Amtrak Station departs at 9:10 PM, and it $9.00, as opposed to Yolobus’ $2.00 local fare.

Given the nightlife and cultural resources in downtown Sacramento, I believe this would be a good investment. This would also me a money saver for potential commuters, as a taxi ride from downtown to Central Davis ranges from $46-53.00, a price most transit-dependent riders – especially students – may not be able to provide on a moment’s notice.

While it would be wonderful to have the proposed “Owl” service closing the evening/early-morning service gaps, initially, a testing phase could be implemented with solely 42 A departures (L & 13th) at 11:30 PM, 12:30 AM, 1:30 AM and 2:30 AM. I have enclosed a modified version of your current route 42 route map, reflecting the potential “Owl” service. The route would be identical to the current 42 route between downtown (L & 13th) and Davis’ last westbound bus stop (Covell Blvd. and Sycamore Ave.).

With regards to there being a UC campus on the route, there are many other transit systems that provide late-night and “Owl” service from a regional downtown to a university campus. These provides and downtowns include: SF MUNI – UCSF and downtown SF via route 5 (Owl); AC Transit – UC Berkeley and downtown Berkeley, Oakland and SF via routes F and 800 (Owl); Santa Barbara MTD – UCSB and downtown Santa Barbara via route 11; LA Metro – UCLA and downtown Los Angeles via routes 2 and 20 (both Owl); as well as, San Diego MTS – UCSD and downtown San Diego via route 30.

With regards to funding, since this proposed service would significantly serve UC Davis students, there could be discussion with Unitrans on shared costs (i.e., annual payment from Unitrans to YCTD), or even placing a transit fee increase before the associated student body.
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(While a fee increase on campus might be met with resistance, there is a history of the UCD student body approving respective transit fee increases.)

Please feel free to contact me for additional information and thank you for your time.

Respectfully, Greg Justice
3. Vera Sandronsky, Davis, CA

I live in Davis and ride the Yolobus route 43 express bus to downtown Sacramento. The 43 bus is routinely crowded with several people standing the entire ride.

I strongly believe that there need to be additional express buses/more runs on the 43 line.

Please confirm receipt of this email.

Vera Sandronsky

4. Kathryn Coke, Sacramento, CA

Bus service between Davis and downtown Sacramento is almost unusable. For starters, it takes a ridiculous amount of time. I don't usually have problems getting on 42A in the morning, but 42B's bike rack is almost always full when I need to get home, and the driver always (and generally quite rudely) tells me I have to leave my bike at Davis. This isn't a viable option for a person who rides their bike everywhere, including to and from the bus stop. Please add additional bike rack space, and consider making more express buses. I'm very, very tired of getting stuck in Davis all the time.

5. Alan Frank, Davis, CA

Hello,

I will not be able to be present at the meeting I saw posted, but I wanted to share with you my concerns with Yolobus:

1. Old uncomfortable busses----we need more of the larger newer busses.
2. Not enough seats on line 43 (Sacramento to Davis). Especially in the afternoon about 4:00 PM there are now about 15 or more people standing every day going back from Sacramento to Davis.

This is very unsafe and uncomfortable for everyone on the bus. I actually witnessed a young man who was standing near the front when the whole bus had many, many standing riders who slipped and fell onto an elderly woman sitting nearby. She was very upset and seemed hurt.

The fact that four seats are now no longer usable because of some other safety concern does not help. So, please provide the larger, more up-to-date busses for us, and if you need to add a bus to the afternoon line 43, it might help.

Thank you for listening to my concerns. We do appreciate the bus ride and the conscientious drivers are doing all they can.

Alan Frank
6. Majed Sayedi, Sacramento, CA

Hello I am a student attending the University of California Davis and greatly appreciate your request for feedback pertaining to unmet needs on the Yolo and Sacramento region buses. I rely on these forms of transit on a daily basis and have noticed that there has been a steady increase in people commuting on the bus. I have firsthand experience with route 42 A and B. Both routes are very crowded in the morning through the afternoon. There is barely any standing room left on these buses and I would recommend increasing the amount of times these routes are run. I know that there are budgetary constraints but I do believe that if these two routes were run every thirty minutes during peak hours--9 am to 5 pm-- then there would be a larger and more consistent base of riders who can cover the extra charge. Thank you for reading my thoughts and I hope that my feedback was insightful.

7. Natalia Deeb-Sossa, Davis, CA

Dear Mr. Bassett and Mr. Taylor,

Thank you for the opportunity to let you know about the transportation needs of the Knights Landing community.

I have been working with the community for over 5 years as an advocate.

The community has seen a lot of their social services closed down (teen center, park, migrant clinic, bank, etc.) and I have witnessed how the community itself has advocated for these services and rights to come back to their town.

Many community members have to travel to the Davis Community Health Clinic for their medical check-ups and exams, as well as to Woodland for groceries and to the pharmacy. I know that the transportation from Knights Landing to Woodland has now been increased to 3 days a week (Yolobus route 216), but especially for the elderly the transportation is inadequate, restrictive and very limited in terms of time.

The youth also have no access to afterschool programs in Woodland as they have to come back home on the only bus available to them. This is a great disservice to our youth, who would greatly benefit of the curricular and extra-curricular programs offered in their schools.

As you might know, 2 years ago we started the One Health Knights Landing clinic, which is open the first and third Sunday of every month. Many of the UC Davis student volunteers have to find ways to carpool as there is no bus to take them to Knights Landing on the days the clinic is open. Also, we have heard that patients from local labor camps have difficulty making it to the clinic for lack of transportation to the clinic.

At this time I am collecting the testimonies of the Knights Landing community members, so they themselves can express better their transportation needs.
What I can share with you briefly is the transportation needs of the tutors that serve the Knights Landing community. I am currently working with Janet Boulware and the parents, at their request to get a Knights Landing Bridge program started. The goal of the Bridge Program is to improve the academic achievement of low income students who are achieving below grade level. The local school district would partner with UC Davis students who would receive lower/upper division course credits and/or work study pay. Local students would be tutored/mentored by the UC Davis students, and would receive school snacks, homework/project supplies and computer access.

Most of our 30-40 UC Davis tutors (all undergraduates) do not own a car, so it is difficult for them to get to Knights Landing from Davis on weekdays for their tutoring/mentoring session (Monday through Thursday 4:30 – 6:30 PM). We also need to make sure they can get safely back to Davis.

Please do not hesitate to call me if there is any question I can answer. I will forward any unmet needs expressed by the Knights Landing community members.

In solidarity,

Natalia Deeb-Sossa

8. Juanita Ontiveros, Knights Landing, CA

Dear Mr. Bassett and Mr. Taylor,

For some time already, organizations like United Farm Workers (UFW), California Rural Legal Assistance (CRLA), California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation (CRLAF) and other organizations, whose main focus are Farm Work Families and the rural poor have been having discussions with the Transportation Department about meeting several transportation needs and issues in rural California. On anything that involves farm workers chances are we are already on it. As it the case with this issue (transportation to/from Knights Landing area). A couple of years ago a network of community organizations worker together with CRLAF and conducted a transportation needs survey/study in counties surrounding Sacramento County, including Yolo County and the communities of Winters, Woodland, Knights Landing, and other. A final report and finding were turned over to SACOG. Many, many residents were interviewed in all locations. They have all the feedback from the community. In Knights Landing the coordinator and the students worked with Lina of the Knights Landing Family Resource Center. There’s really no need to reinvent the wheel unless you need to hear the same information again from the community. Maybe like an update? If you’re interested in knowing more about the findings of the study please let me know and I’ll give you contact information for the coordinator that conducted that survey/study.
9. Other Unmet Transit Needs Comments from other agencies via Terry Bassett, YCTD:

There have been several inquiries that I think we need to put on the list –

- Solano Transportation Authority is interested in service from the City of Winters to Solano Community College in Vacaville.
- An inquiry has been made about getting UCD students to and from Knights Landing to tutor school kid in a reading program.
- The Yolo County Court system has made inquiries about some sort of shuttle related to the new County Courthouse, which will be completed in spring 2015.
- In West Sacramento, some inquiries were made about continuing a community shuttle that the current non-profit may stop operating.
- The County of Yolo, City of Woodland and Woodland Community College are exploring ways to provide transportation to Probation’s Day Reporting Center and the jail facilities. Some think a shuttle operated by Probation should be provided, while others suggest reconfiguring an existing local route will suffice. A sensitive issue related to either jail releases or Day Reporting Center (DRC) clients, some of whom currently wait for the bus at the community college and whether or not they pose a safety risk to the students either at the bus stop or on the bus.

10. Natalia Deeb-Sossa, Davis, CA

Here are the results of the survey: 100% of those who completed the survey answered:

Would transportation to Davis help you? (from Knights Landing)
YES!
Days: Wed, Thursday, Friday from 9 am to 2 PM

Would transportation to Woodland help you? (from Knights Landing)
YES!
Days: Wed, Thursday, Friday from 9 am to 2 PM

Reasons given (not asked): Help me buy food, pay bills

11. Heather Moses, West Sacramento, CA

Ms. Moses stated that YCTD bus drivers are frequently driving off from the West Sacramento Transit Center when they see people running for the bus, and that the buses are often pulling away from the stop early (1 or 2 minutes before the scheduled departure times). She most recently experience this when a YCTD route 240 bus left the Transit Center 2 minutes before the scheduled departure time when she and others were just walking up to the stop.
TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC HEARING IN
YUBA COUNTY AND SUTTER COUNTY, INCLUDING THE
CITIES OF MARYSVILLE AND YUBA CITY
MINUTES

October 28, 2014 – 2:00 P.M.

The hearing was conducted by Mary Jane Griego, representing the SACOG Board of Directors, with Barbara VaughanBechtold of SACOG staff, Claudia Hollis, Gayle Diemond and Sue Schaffer of the Joint Yuba-Sutter Social Service Transportation Advisory Council, and Keith Martin of Yuba-Sutter Transit.

Director Griego and Ms. VaughanBechtold provided an overview of SACOG and the unmet transit needs hearing process. Mr. Martin reviewed Yuba-Sutter Transit services and the upcoming SRTP update and the 2015 rollout of the Connect Card universal transit fare card. Four people not on the hearing panel attended the Unmet Transit Needs hearing. Three people testified at the hearing; correspondence was received from two individuals.

Director Griego opened the hearing for public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Joyce Collins, Marysville, CA

Ms. Collins would like to see more availability of Dial-A-Ride services for those that aren’t part of groups. She has frequently called two weeks ahead of a scheduled appointment and not been able to get a Dial-A-Ride appointment within a reasonable (1 hour) window of her appointment time.

She also commented that some of the bus stops are not safe for people using wheelchairs/scooters.

*Keith Martin responded that much of Yuba-Sutter Transit’s services operate in areas without “complete streets” (sidewalks, curb cuts etc.) Yuba-Sutter Transit continues to work on “complete streets” and bus stop accessibility issues with responsible partner agencies.*

Ms. Collins also commented that the local route 6 (Linda Shuttle) does not run frequently enough and should run more than once an hour.

Ms. Collins also asked a question regarding wheelchair positions on buses. She said that there are only two wheelchair positions on the local buses, and frequently people refuse to move out of the seat to make those wheelchair spots available. Can drivers require people to move from these spots?

*Keith Martin responded that drivers cannot make people move. The Yuba-Sutter Transit drivers are trained to ask people to move from seats in the wheelchair tie down areas. He said if Ms. Collins or others have a driver that does not ask people in the seats to move to contact Yuba-Sutter Transit and let them know.*
2. Gayle Diemond, Marysville, CA

Ms. Diemond asked if people will have to switch to the Connect Card and if Yuba-Sutter Transit would still accept cash and other fare media after the Connect Card universal transit fare card is rolled out in 2015.

Keith Martin responded that Yuba-Sutter Transit will not require riders to switch to using the Connect Card for fare payment. Yuba-Sutter Transit will continue to accept cash and non-discounted paper tickets. The Connect Card is expected to be available at various retail outlets when it is rolled out next year, and will be reloadable using cash, check, or credit card.

Ms. Diemond also requested expanded Yuba-Sutter Transit services and expanding the Dial-A-Ride boundaries to include (Reclamation) District 10 (directly north of Marysville). She believes there are a large number of seniors who would use the Dial-A-Ride services.

Keith Martin responded that for the Unmet Transit Needs Process we need to see/hear from numerous people in an area requesting service. Yuba-Sutter Transit has not recently put out a lot of “experimental” service because in the past it has been costly and unsuccessful. There are operating and capital costs associated with expanding services, and there usually aren’t enough people that ride to support expansions of services into low density rural areas. It continues to be a challenge when people move into a low density rural area with no transportation/transit services and then become transit-dependent due to disability.

3. Gary Wren, Marysville, CA

Mr. Wren has been using Yuba-Sutter Transit for approximately 20 years. He has noticed that some bus stops seem to have criminal activity and vandalism issues. Mr. Wren would like to see music in the shelters to try and combat problems.

He also feels that standing room only buses seem dangerous especially those travelling on the highway at higher speeds.

Mr. Wren would like to see the hours of bus service extended beyond what exists currently in light of a large increase in the number of retail/shopping outlets that are open late in the evening.

Mr. Wren asked what can be done about inebriated riders?

Keith Martin responded that drivers assess all riders for safety purposes, and they will radio the police department and deny boarding if they feel someone is a safety issue.
4. Mary Jane Griego, Olivehurst, CA

Ms. Griego commented that Yuba-Sutter Transit should serve Olivetree Senior Apartments on 7th Ave because the senior citizens currently have to walk to Olivehurst Ave. She also commented that “complete streets” are needed in the same area because there are no sidewalks in the area.

Keith Martin responded that much of Yuba-Sutter Transit’s services operate in areas without “complete streets” (sidewalks, curb cuts etc.) Yuba-Sutter Transit continues to work on “complete streets” and bus stop accessibility issues with responsible partner agencies.

5. Claudia Hollis, Marysville, CA

Ms. Hollis commented on the need for accessible taxi services in the area to assist people on holidays and Sundays who use Dial-A-Ride Monday through Saturday.

Keith Martin responded that it is difficult to get a provider for accessible taxi services. The most common way to get these types of services in a particular area is to create a taxi regulation at the policy level that requires that taxi companies have at least one accessible vehicle available during their hours of service.

CORRESPONDENCE

1. Robert Tanner, Live Oak, CA

Dear SACOG staff:

I want to direct your attention to the inadequate levels for Rural Bus Routes in the Counties of Yuba and Sutter.

At present, the Yuba-Sutter Transit agency operates three Rural bus services, they are:

1) The Foothills Route in Yuba County between Marysville and the Sierra Foothills to the northeast.

2) The Wheatland Route in Yuba County between Marysville and Wheatland.

3) The Live Oak Route in Sutter County between Marysville and Yuba City and Live Oak.

At present the Live Oak Route and the Foothills Route run only three days a week and the Wheatland Route only runs twice a week.

Compare that to the Daily and Saturday service operating three trips to Gridley-Biggs from Oroville by Butte County. Another daily operation is a number of routes operated by Colusa County.

Operating a bus service of less than daily is not attracting patrons who would use the bus service to go to work or school. Work and school trips are usually the PRIMARY reason for the use of
bus service. Running any bus service less than five days does NOT help poor people get to jobs or school and actually fail their primary mission. Even though Yuba-Sutter Transit's urban fixed-route and Sacramento Commuter bus services are enjoying strong usage and growth rates, their rural services continue to struggle to survive. This needs to be corrected.

I have studied rural and suburban inter-city bus services in both Northern and Southern California. I actually have learned to route and schedule rural inter-city bus routes and have done so for the last 38 years. Proposals accepted have had good ridership results with several in Southern California and one in Sonoma County.

Using that experience, I have developed a single-bus route with a fixed-route schedule between Live Oak and Yuba City/Marysville with a choice of daily three trip, four trip or five trip schedule. (Five trips is the maximum I could schedule, using one bus, and I'm not recommending any more at this time.) The proposal is in the hands of Yuba-Sutter Transit staff and all five members of the Live Oak City council, including Dianne Hodges who sits on your board.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Mr. Robert B. Tanner

2. Sierra Pitock, Yuba City, CA

Dear Sacramento Area Council of Governments,

I am contacting you to request consideration for public transportation between the Yuba-Sutter Area and Chico, California. There is currently no affordable public transit between the two locations, only commercial transportation. I ask that the option of having these transit needs met is investigated before any of the Local Transportation Fund is used for other purposes, such as local street or road projects.

According to a US census, both Butte and Sutter County have 7,500 to 24,999 workers who commute to another county apart from the one in which they live. If there was affordable public transportation between the two counties, commuters would be able to travel at less personal cost. Traveling via public transit would also reduce the amount of private vehicles making the commute, and in turn lower emissions. Furthermore, commuting students who reside in the Yuba-Sutter area and rely on public transit would be able to consider University of Chico, to which they currently have no affordable way of transportation.

Many thanks for your hard and dedicated work, as well as for your time spent reading this message.

I look forward to your response, please feel free to contact me via e-mail or letter.

Warmest regards,

Sierra Pitock
TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC
FOR THE SACOG BOARD – REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY AREA
MINUTES

January 29, 2015 – 9:30 A.M.

The hearing was conducted by the SACOG Board of Directors and Barbara VaughanBechtold staff at SACOG.

Ms. VaughanBechtold provided a brief overview of SACOG’s responsibilities under the State of California Transportation Development Act and the corresponding unmet transit needs hearing process. One person testified at the hearing; and three (3) items of correspondence was received. All Unmet Transit Needs comments are listed below.

SACOG Board Chair Don Saylor opened the hearing to public comment, received comment and closed the public hearing.

Two SACOG Board members commented on the SACOG Unmet Transit Needs Process.

Director Cabaldon, representing the City of West Sacramento, said that the SACOG Unmet Transit Needs Process has improved over the years, but could be improved further. He suggested putting a focus on maintaining transit system stability, and making the region’s transit systems simpler and easier to understand for current riders and those who may consider riding.

Director Sander, representing the City of Rancho Cordova, made the comment that there needs to be a balance between public transit serving those who are transit dependent and those who are “choice” riders who are not solely dependent on transit. He stated that one of the items that makes transit more attractive to “choice” riders it safety or the perception of safety, as a “choice” rider is much more likely to choose transit if they perceive the transit system(s) to be safe to use.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY

1. Mike Barnbaum, Sacramento, CA

Mr. Barnbaum spoke representing his grassroots organization Ride Downtown 916. He stated that public transit needs to play a role in the opening of the downtown Sacramento Entertainment Sports Complex (ESC). He has gathered information on the current communication between the regional public transit providers and the ESC developers at the SACOG Transit Coordinating Committee meetings. He urged suburban transit agencies that operated commuter/limited services into downtown Sacramento to consider providing later evening return services (between 10 – 11:30 PM) for their users who may wish to stay in downtown Sacramento for an event at the ESC. Mr. Barnbaum also encouraged those same suburban operators to consider working with the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) to provide connecting services to SRTD’s light rail stations as a way to provide more efficient transit service as is being suggested as part of the current City of Sacramento Downtown Transportation Study.
CORRESPONDENCE

1. Paul Philley, Davis, CA

Bus Stop on Westbound Covell at Denali, Davis


This location sits across from two medical clinics (Woodland Davis and UCD Medical Clinic) and an apartment complex (Glacier Point). Currently, there is a 0.8 mile stretch between bus stops (Sutter Davis Hospital and Lake at Covell) that this stop would bifurcate. Trips typically involve additional transfers or cumbersome routing to be able to use the east-bound stops.

Remedy: Options include constructing the pad adjacent to the bike lane (blocking the bike lane during boarding and alighting), placing the pad adjacent to the roadway and routing the bike lane north of the pad (blocking the travel lane during boarding and alighting) or creating a bus pull-out to not impede any traffic.

City of Davis staff members have done preliminary analysis of placing a bus stop at this location and have found it to be infeasible due to the location of a drainage canal, pavement thickness/condition and location close to a major intersection with high speed traffic.

2. Anonymous, Rancho Cordova, CA

The RT route 28 should be extended to serve the Butterfield light rail station and the Rancho Cordova public library.

3. Carol Aragon, Sacramento, CA

Thank you for taking my comments. My doctors have wanted me to go for treatments at the Kaiser Roseville Hospital and Elk Grove medical offices. I am unable to get to these locations I am told without doing [paratransit] transfers. I do not want to be sitting in the dark waiting for a bus and/or in a strange location I know nothing about waiting for another bus to pick me up. I shop at Walmart to get groceries. I end up going to Rancho Cordova because the one on Truxel does not carry groceries and the one at Country Club Plaza Shopping Center is hard to get around in. To get downstairs one has to use the only elevator the store has which is usually crowded. This makes getting in and out almost impossible at times. The Walmart in West Sacramento is less than 15 minutes away yet I would again have to go downtown [via Paratransit, Inc.] and wait for another [Yolobus Special] bus to take me. The West Sacramento bus system does not run like ours. I am right off the Freeway. If Sacramento Paratransit, Inc. went into West Sacramento, Roseville and Elk Grove it would be so much easier, and quicker than spending all day trying to get there and back home.

Thank you again for your consideration.
Carol Aragon
FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET IN THE CITY OF CITRUS HEIGHTS AS PART OF 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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, which serves the City of Citrus Heights under contract, identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing on transit needs were held by SACOG for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 16, 2014, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 23, 2014, and the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 27, 2014, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Don Saylor      Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 for Yolo County at the Davis City Council of Chambers on October 29, 2014, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 that are reasonable to meet in the City of Davis.
PASSED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of February 2015 by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Don Saylor      Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 were held by SACOG for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 16, 2014, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 23, 2014, and the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 27, 2014, and before SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 Elk Grove.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

____________________________________  ______________________________________
Don Saylor                                  Mike McKeever
Chair                                       Chief Executive Officer
FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 were held by SACOG for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 16, 2014, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 23, 2014, and the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 27, 2014, and before SACOG Board of Directors January 29 2015; 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 that are reasonable to meet in the City of Folsom.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

________________________________________  ___________________________
Don Saylor      Mike McKeever
Chair          Chief Executive Officer
FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 were held by SACOG for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 16, 2014, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 23, 2014, and the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 27, 2014, and before SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 Galt.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Don Saylor      Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 14 – 2015

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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 were held by SACOG for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 16, 2014, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 23, 2014, and the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 27, 2014, and before SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Don Saylor      Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on October 28, 2014, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 that are reasonable to meet in the City of Live Oak.
PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Don Saylor  
Chair

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer
FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on October 28, 2014, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 that are reasonable to meet in the City of Marysville.
PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Don Saylor      Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET IN THE CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA AS PART OF 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 16, 2014, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 23, 2014, and the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 27, 2014, and before SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Don Saylor      Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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, a public hearing on transit needs were held by SACOG for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 16, 2014, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 23, 2014, and the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 27, 2014, and before SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 cities of Citrus Heights and Rancho Cordova, as well as portions of Unincorporated Sacramento County within the SRTD.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Don Saylor  
Chair  

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 19 – 2015

FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF SACRAMENTO COUNTY OUTSIDE OF 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 16, 2014, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 23, 2014, and the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 27, 2014, and before SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 that are reasonable to meet in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Sacramento outside of the Sacramento Regional Transit District.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Don Saylor
Chair

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer
FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on October 28, 2014, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 that are reasonable to meet in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Sutter.
PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Don Saylor
Chair

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer
FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 for Yolo County at the Davis City Council of Chambers on October 29, 2014, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 that are reasonable to meet in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Yolo.
PASSED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of February 2015 by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Don Saylor      Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 22 – 2015

FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET Transit NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET IN THE UNICORPORATED 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on October 28, 2014, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 that are reasonable to meet in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Yuba.
PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Don Saylor  Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 for Yolo County at the Davis City Council Chambers on October 29, 2014, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 that are reasonable to meet in the City of West Sacramento.
PASSED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of February 2015 by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_________________________________________  _____________________________
Don Saylor                              Mike McKeever
Chair                                   Chief Executive Officer
WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 Wheatland identified transit needs considered in its transportation planning process; and

WHEREAS, public hearings on transit needs were held by SACOG for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on October 28, 2014, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

____________________________________  _______________________________________
Don Saylor                          Mike McKeever
Chair                               Chief Executive Officer
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 25 – 2015

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
November 2013; 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/Sustainable
Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 for Yolo County at
the Davis City Council of Chambers on October 29, 2014, and before the SACOG Board of
Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 19th day of February 2015 by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Don Saylor      Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 26 – 2015

FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 for Yolo County at the Davis City Council Chambers on October 29, 2014, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 that are reasonable to meet in the City of Woodland.
PASSED AND ADOPTED this 19th day of February 2015 by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Don Saylor  
Chair

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer
FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET 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 November 2013; 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/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), 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 for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on October 28, 2014, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 29, 2015; 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 that are reasonable to meet in the City of Yuba City.
PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 19th day of February 2015, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Don Saylor      Mike McKeever
Chair          Chief Executive Officer