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 make an annual unmet transit needs finding for the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) and for jurisdictions eligible to use TDA funds. Jurisdictions outside of the SRTD are permitted to use TDA funds on streets and roads projects, if they have filled all transit requests that meet SACOG’s adopted definitions of “unmet transit need” and “reasonable to meet.”

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

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

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

It is the responsibility of the SACOG Board to annually 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 streets and roads projects. The public transit operators and jurisdictions and their respective proposed findings are listed in the attached resolutions and summarized on the summary sheet (Attachment B) as well.

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 2013-14 (described in Attachment A). As part of the process, transit service requests were identified during public hearings (five were held in the fall of 2012) and through the transportation planning process. These requests were evaluated as to whether they meet SACOG’s adopted definitions (see attachments). The Social Service Transportation Advisory
Council (SSTAC) for each county has participated in the analysis with staff and concurs with staff recommendations.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer
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Attachments:
A – Unmet Transit Needs Findings Process
B – Social Service Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) Unmet Transit Needs Findings Summary
C – Sacramento/Sacramento Regional Transit District Comments and SSTAC Findings
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

Resolutions:
Citrus Heights
Davis
Elk Grove
Folsom
Galt
Isleton
Live Oak
Marysville
Rancho Cordova
Sacramento Regional Transit District
Unincorporated Sacramento County
Unincorporated Sutter County
Unincorporated Yolo County
Unincorporated Yuba County
West Sacramento
Wheatland
Winters
Woodland
Yuba City

Key Staff:  Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
Barbara VaughanBechtold, Associate Planner, (916) 340-6226
Christine O’Rourke, Assistant Planner, (916) 340-6262
Victoria S. Cacciatore, Transportation Planner, (916) 340-6315
SACOG Unmet Transit Needs Finding Process

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

1. Unmet Transit Needs Finding Process Requirements

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

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

   The Social Service Transportation Advisory Council - Each county’s SSTAC participates in the identification of unmet transit needs and the determination whether those needs are reasonable to meet. They preside, along with a SACOG Board member, at unmet transit need public hearings in each county. The composition of the SSTAC is set forth in statute and consists of representatives of (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); and, representatives of the Consolidated Transportation Service Agency (CTSA), including a transit operator (2). Because of the presence of urbanized areas within the rural counties in the region, SACOG also seeks the participation of at least one transit rider who is a commuter in order to obtain input on commuter needs.

b. Identify transit needs, which have been considered as part of the transportation planning process.

c. Members of the SSTAC and at least one representative of the SACOG Board of Directors conduct public hearings in each county to receive public comments regarding unmet transit needs. A total of six to eleven hearings are held yearly within the four counties.

d. SACOG staff and SSTAC members meet to identify potential unmet transit needs and conduct analysis of comments using Board adopted definitions of “unmet transit needs” and reasonable to meet.” (See the following section) An important consideration of whether a need is reasonable to meet is the ability of an operator to maintain the required farebox recovery ratio under the TDA statutes. SACOG staff prepares an analysis of unmet transit needs including those identified in the last short range transit plan update to determine whether they are reasonable to meet, and makes a recommendation for SSTAC consideration.
SACOG staff and the SSTAC meet to discuss staff analysis and recommendations. The SSTAC can formulate its own recommendation to the SACOG Board, if it is different than that of the staff recommendations. Typically, both the SSTAC and the SACOG staff present to the Board a joint recommendation.

e. The SACOG Board receives, during a regularly scheduled Board meeting, reports from staff on the public hearing results and the joint recommendation. The entire SACOG Board then holds a final public hearing to receive any additional testimony regarding transit needs that may be reasonable to meet. The Board then makes one of the following three possible findings (one for each county and the Sacramento Regional Transit District):

   1) there are no unmet transit needs, or
   2) there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, or
   3) there are unmet transit needs, including transit needs that are reasonable to meet.

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

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

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

a. **Unmet Transit Needs** - A request must identify:

1. The **size, location and socio-economic** characteristics of identifiable **groups** likely to be dependent on transit (including, but not limited to elderly, disabled, and low income persons, including individuals eligible for paratransit and other special transportation services pursuant to the federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990), **trip purposes** (such as medical, nutrition, shopping, business, social, school and work) and **geographic boundaries** and/or major origin and destination points.

2. The **adequacy** of **existing** public transportation services and specialized transportation **services**, including privately and publicly provided services, in meeting the identified demand.

3. An analysis of the **potential** alternative public transportation and specialized transportation **services** that would **meet** all or part of the **demand**.
b. Reasonable to Meet

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

1. **Community Acceptance** - There needs to be demonstrated interest of citizens in the new or additional transit service.

2. **Equity** - The proposed new or additional service will benefit, either the general public (i.e., transit dependent or disadvantaged) or the elderly population and persons with disabilities.

3. **Potential Ridership** - The proposed transit service will maintain new service ridership performance standards established for the transit operator in the Short Range Transit Plan. Ridership performance standards can include passengers per hour and passengers per mile.

4. **Cost Effectiveness** - The proposed new or additional transit service will not affect the ability of the overall system to meet the state mandated farebox recovery ratio requirement after a two-year exemption period, if the service is eligible for the exemption. If the exemption is not used, the service must meet minimum farebox return requirements as stated in the TDA statutes or established by SACOG.
<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>Wednesday, October 24, 2012</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. There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the Unincorporated Areas of the County of Sutter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 17 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 5 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Oak</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>Number of Service Related Comments: 1 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Wednesday, October 24, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Marysville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Heights</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>Monday, October 29, 2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Elk Grove.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far Oaks/Orangevale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 61 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom</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>Monday, October 15, 2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Galt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 8 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 1 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTD</td>
<td>Saturday, October 20, 2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>There are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Isleton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 9 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>Wednesday, October 17, 2012</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>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 16 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento</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>Number of Service Related Comments: 5 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Service Related Comments: 2 Number of Unmet Needs Reasonable to Meet: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2013-2014 Social Service Transportation Advisory Council Unmet Transit Needs Findings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Elk Grove</th>
<th>Not An Unmet Transit Need</th>
<th>Unmet Transit Need</th>
<th>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide bus service to/near Seasons at Laguna Ridge Senior (55+) Apartment Community. Seasons is located at the intersection of Bilby and Bruceville Roads in Elk Grove, near a new Wal-Mart that will be a community destination.</td>
<td>Weekend e-tran bus service will be analyzed as part of the upcoming Elk Grove/e-tran Short Range Transit Plan. <strong>This is an unmet transit need that is reasonable to meet.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>e-tran should provide more connecting bus service on weekends, including service from outside Elk Grove back into Elk Grove.</td>
<td>Service in the area of Bruceville and Bilby roads will be analyzed as part of the upcoming Elk Grove/e-tran Short Range Transit Plan. <strong>This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>More attention needs to be paid to the transportation needs of disabled and elderly Elk Grove residents, as well as more marketing done for the specialized transit services that are available.</td>
<td>Specialized transit/paratransit services will be analyzed as part of the upcoming Elk Grove/e-tran Short Range Transit Plan. The City of Elk Grove has a Disabled Advisory Committee that reviews public transit issues. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Are e-tran service maps able to be read by a screen reader?</td>
<td>e-tran staff responded by stating that they would work with the person commenting to make sure they got them the map in a format that could be read by their screen reader. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Los Rios Community College campuses need to be better connected by transit, in particular e-tran service to Cosumnes River College should be more frequent and run later.</td>
<td>e-tran staff responded stating that the e-tran route 157 does serve the CRC campus in the evening (until 6 PM) and that RT light rail is expected to start serving the campus in 2015. <strong>This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a standard formula for how ridership and routing is determined, and who measures service performance and decides how resources are distributed?</td>
<td>e-tran staff responded that they are hoping to use new fare boxes as a tool to help evaluate each route’s effectiveness. However, sometimes transit grants are specific, such as Job Access Reverse Commute funding. e-tran tries to balance commute service with local service for transit-dependent riders. The City must also consider federal Title VI civil rights requirements. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Where does e-tran connect with Amtrak bus services in Elk Grove?</td>
<td>The e-tran route 157 (M-F) and the Weekend Shuttle (Sat-Sun) connect with the Amtrak bus at Laguna Blvd. and Harbor Point Drive in Elk Grove. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>The e-tran routes 70 &amp; 71 don’t allow for a full day of work at the Franchise Tax Board.</td>
<td>The e-tran routes 70 &amp; 71 do allow for a full 8+ hour workday at the Franchise Tax Board. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does e-tran plan to provide any weekend service between Bradshw and Sheldon roads and CRC, or anything along Watt Ave. into Elk Grove?</td>
<td>The e-tran service runs nearby on Waterman and Bond roads. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is too little service on the e-tran weekend circulator, and that this will be especially problematic when light rail services CRC.</td>
<td>Weekend e-tran bus service will be analyzed as part of the upcoming Elk Grove/e-tran Short Range Transit Plan. <strong>This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need that is Reasonable to Meet</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Elk Grove cont.</td>
<td>RT and e-tran could provide joint service with a route from Bruceville to Sheldon roads to Power Inn Road to 65th Street that would allow access to the 65th St. light rail station and CRC students access to CSUS.</td>
<td>e-tran riders can currently transfer to RT to access both RT's light rail and CSUS. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Heritage Park Charter School is moving onto Elk Grove-Florin Road approximately one mile north of Calvine Road. A majority of the students are Elk Grove residents and there is currently no bus service to the new location. Could e-tran provide service to the new location?</td>
<td>The e-tran routes 154 and 162 currently have bus stops approximately 1 mile from the Heritage Park Charter School's new location. The City of Elk Grove can work with the school to assist students with finding safe routes to school. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Will there be a commuter bus available from Folsom to the new Elk Grove Corrections building?</td>
<td>Commuters coming from Folsom to the CDRC building in Elk Grove can ride light rail to the Butterfield light rail station and catch the e-tran route 91 or into downtown Sacramento and catch the e-tran route 90. Both routes serve the CDRC buildings in Elk Grove. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Currently, an e-tran monthly pass cannot be used by someone transferring to Yolobus to get to the Sacramento International Airport.</td>
<td>With the coming implementation of the Connect Card universal/regional transit fare card e-tran staff responded that they would like to iron out equitable transfer agreements with all regional transit operators. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>An unannounced &quot;secret-rider&quot; program should be standard practice on e-tran, e-van and Paratransit, Inc. to make sure the services are operating as they should.</td>
<td>e-tran staff noted that they have done this in the past with fixed route service to assess performance. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>e-tran should upgrade to bus bike racks that can accommodate three bicycles on each bus.</td>
<td>e-tran is working to have racks that accommodate three bicycles on the new buses that will be ordered. The current e-tran buses cannot accommodate bike racks that can hold 3 bicycles. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Elk Grove needs to work on ways to make bicycling more appealing and safer, which would solve much of the &quot;last mile&quot; issues that prevent many people from riding the bus.</td>
<td>The City of Elk Grove continues to work on improving the bicycling infrastructure in Elk Grove. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Are there any plans for an additional run on the e-tran route 53 in the morning as almost all of the runs are packed?</td>
<td>e-tran is currently analyzing ridership to find the most impacted runs on the route 53 and providing &quot;shadow&quot; or secondary buses at those times. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The drivers on the route 53 6:05 AM run frequently have to turn people away at the last two stops, which is problematic as this is the only service on White Rock Road.</td>
<td>Another e-tran route 53 arrives after the 6:05 AM one within 15 minutes. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Why did e-tran cut the 156 on weekend, since without it people can't get to Sacramento in a reasonable amount of time on the weekends?</td>
<td>e-tran staff responded that in comparison to other e-tran routes, the 156 had low performance. The e-tran Weekend Shuttle runs hourly on Saturday and Sunday and allows riders to transfer to a variety of RT routes at the CRC transfer center. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Is there the possibility of reinstating the route 156?</td>
<td>Weekend e-tran bus service, including service into Sacramento, will be analyzed as part of the upcoming Elk Grove/e-tran Short Range Transit Plan. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Elk Grove cont.</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</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>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Can the hours on the latest e-tran route 53 be extended so riders could get further south in Elk Grove in the evening?</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>This comment is too vague to effectively analyze. There is currently existing bus service that travels to the far south in Elk Grove. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuts to the e-tran #52 have led to the 6 AM run being extremely overcrowded.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No passengers are being left behind on the route 52. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>The e-tran route 154 should run once an hour from 9:30 AM to 2:30 PM, rather than once every 2 hours after 10:30 AM.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The e-tran route 162 mirrors much of the service on the route 154 effectively providing hourly service along the route 154 from 9:30 AM to 2:30 PM when the route 154 runs only once every 2 hours. After 2:30 PM the route 154 runs hourly. All e-tran bus routes are being analyzed as part of the Elk Grove SRTP. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add more stops and scheduled times to the e-tran reverse commute routes that service the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) in Elk Grove.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The route 91 currently exists to provide reverse commute service to the CDCR facility in Elk Grove. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Move the route 91 stop from the Butterfield LRT stop to the Sunrise or Hazel stops to make using the reverse commute service more feasible for those who live in Citrus Heights, Fair Oaks, Folsom, and El Dorado Hills etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Those wishing to get to the e-tran route 91 stop at the Butterfield light rail stop can take the many RT bus routes and/or light rail to the Butterfield route 91 stop or use the existing RT park and ride lots. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Do commute surveys at the CDCR office in Elk Grove as more staff move to that location in Spring of 2013.</td>
<td></td>
<td>e-tran/City of Elk Grove transit staff are currently making themselves available at the CDCR Elk Grove facility for one-on-one assistance to help those who wish to take transit to work to plan their trips. More surveying will likely be done once the &quot;new&quot; CDCR location is fully occupied in late 2013. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buses on the e-tran route 52 are constantly braking down, and are overloaded.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The e-tran route 52 is heavily used, but all maintenance issues on the buses have been resolved. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>The amount of service on the route 52 needs to be increased and/or significantly more &quot;shadow&quot; service needs to be run.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The e-tran route 52 is heavily used, and &quot;shadow&quot; buses are used as necessary based on ridership. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>The route 53 buses are overcrowded and service needs to be increased to serve the number of workers needing to travel to downtown Sacramento.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This, and all e-tran bus routes, are being looked at as part of the Elk Grove/e-tran SRTP. e-tran is currently analyzing ridership to find the most impacted run on the route 53 and providing &quot;shadow&quot; or secondary buses at those times. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>The route 59 bus should adjust its schedule leaving Sacramento to 4:55 PM as the walk from the Amtrak station has become much longer due to the track realignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>e-tran hopes that changes for the Intermodal Station at the Amtrak station will allow access to other bus operators, outside of Amtrak and RT buses. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>The e-tran routes 59 and/or 60 drop commuters in downtown Sacramento before 6:30 AM, but those same commuters cannot get a bus back home until after 3:30 PM forcing them to wait an additional 1/2 hour after they finish work to go home. The schedule should be shifted to pick up downtown 15-20 minutes earlier.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The e-tran routes 59 and 60 allow for a full 8 hour workday. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>The route 59 schedule should be extended until 6:25 PM so that workers who work later/flexible schedules can get home.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other e-tran routes are available after 6:25 PM, as well as transfers from RT to e-tran local fixed routes are also available later in the evening. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Elk Grove cont.</td>
<td>There should be an e-tran route on the weekend that allows riders to get to downtown Sacramento more easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add a clockwise direction to the e-tran route 162.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>With over 1500 CDCR employees moving to Elk Grove there needs to be a bus from San Joaquin County/Stockton to Elk Grove, or at least a stop in Elk Grove.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>A new bus route is needed to serve the Stonelake neighborhood to get children there to Pinkerton Middle School and Cosumnes Oak High School.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Are there plans for any other reverse commute bus service to the new CDCR Elk Grove facility from locations outside of downtown Sacramento?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>A bus is needed that runs along Elk Grove Blvd. to Waterman.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Either e-tran or CDCR need to provide bus or shuttle service to/from downtown Sacramento throughout the day to make taking transit a viable option for more employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>Could the e-tran route 160 run 1/2 hourly service that serves Albiani Middle School and Pleasant Grove High School during the morning and afternoon school start and finish times?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extend the nearest bus line to serve the Seasons at Laguna Ridge Senior Apartment Community. There is an existing bus stop at this location as e-tran provided service prior to recent reductions in service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>The e-tran route 57 needs more runs added in the morning and evening as three is not enough.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Elk Grove cont.</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</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>44</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Elk Grove cont.</td>
<td>It is a conflict of interest to have the contractor that provides the e-tran buses to hire the drivers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Buses breakdown frequently due to an apparent lack of maintenance by the contractor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will e-tran consider accepting the Roseville Transit Commuter pass for a free transfer to the e-tran buses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change e-tran route schedules to better align with the RT bus lines/light rails that they connect with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e-tran routes 53 and 66 do not start running early enough in the morning to accommodate early work start times (many workers start work as early as 6 AM).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Every day there are large number of people standing on the e-tran commute buses, which means there should be more buses running.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e-tran should update the SacRT schedule information on their website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e-tran commuter routes should have later departure times to accommodate working</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The e-tran route 90 schedule should be adjusted to allow for more time for commuters connecting to Amtrak to get to their train e.g. a 5:15 PM drop off 5 blocks from the Amtrak station is not enough time to make a 5:25 PM train.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple complaints have been filed against an e-tran driver with no resolution or contact from e-tran customer service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</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>54</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Elk Grove cont.</td>
<td>The e-tran customer service line frequently goes unanswered during &quot;regular&quot; business hours.</td>
<td>The e-tran contract operator, MV, runs the customer service for e-tran and e-van. City of Elk Grove transit staff will work with MV to improve customer service for e-tran and e-van. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>e-tran customer service representatives are frequently rude and argumentative.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The e-tran contract operator, MV, runs the customer service for e-tran and e-van. City of Elk Grove transit staff will work with MV to improve customer service for e-tran and e-van. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>All commuter routes should either run on holidays or not, as it is confusing to patrons to figure out which buses might be running when.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. e-tran bus schedules clearly show which routes, commuter and fixed, run on holidays and which do not. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>e-tran customer service staff need to call people back if they leave a message on the customer service line as directed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The e-tran contract operator, MV, runs the customer service for e-tran and e-van. City of Elk Grove transit staff will work with MV to improve customer service for e-tran and e-van. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>e-tran customer service staff need more training on trip planning as most don't appear to know the e-tran system or the local area very well.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The e-tran contract operator, MV, runs the customer service for e-tran and e-van. City of Elk Grove transit staff will work with MV to improve customer service for e-tran and e-van. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td>e-tran should implement a lower/reduced cost bus pass for college/trade school students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>Run all e-tran routes on their regular schedules on holidays using smaller vehicles if necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>When contacting e-tran customer service users are prompted to leave messages that are not returned.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The e-tran contract operator, MV, runs the customer service for e-tran and e-van. City of Elk Grove transit staff will work with MV to improve customer service for e-tran and e-van. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</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>62</td>
<td>Service Galt</td>
<td>SCT/Link Highway 99 service should run later into the evening to allow users to take night classes at Cosumnes River College.</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Later evening service on the SCT/Link Highway 99 service will be reviewed as part of the next SRTP. There currently is not demonstrated demand for this service. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>SCT/Link Highway 99 service could fill a service gap if some night and weekend service was offered.</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Later evening service on the SCT/Link Highway 99 service will be reviewed as part of the next SRTP. There currently is not demonstrated demand for this service. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Can on transfer from the SCT/Link to the Amtrak San Joaquin bus/rail service?</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>SCT/Link riders can transfer to San Joaquin bus/rail service at the Lodi transit center. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>There is value in a one-seat transit ride connecting south Sacramento County to Roseville and Auburn.</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>It is currently possible to travel from south Sacramento County (Galt) by transferring to Amtrak, RT and Roseville Transit in downtown Sacramento. <strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>The Galt to Sacramento Express line provides great service for working people.</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td><strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>The Galt to Sacramento Express midday service makes it more convenient for people to use transit even if they need to leave early due to an appointment or illness.</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td><strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>The SCT/Link Highway 99 express is a great service that is convenient with drivers that take care or their passengers.</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td><strong>This is not an unmet transit need.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Hourly service is needed on the Highway 99 SCT/Link service on the weekends to allow people to go shopping and do other errands they cannot do in their community.</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>SCT/Link ran Saturday service on the Highway 99 corridor for 2 years and was not able to meet the required fare box ratio. SCT/Link also currently runs a medical appointment shuttle to the south Sacramento medical offices on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Saturday service on the Highway 99 corridor will be reviewed as part of the next SRTP. There currently is not demonstrated demand for this service. <strong>This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Needs Comments</td>
<td>Attachment C</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>70</strong></td>
<td>Unincorporated Sacramento County</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</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>No comments were received regarding unmet transit needs for Unincorporated Sacramento County outside of the SRTD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>SRTD (incl. portions of Unincorporated Sacramento County)</td>
<td>Unincorporated Sacramento County</td>
<td>The routes 30 and 51 are frequently overloaded and many times pass up passengers who use assistive devices like scooters and wheelchairs because of a lack of tie down positions.</td>
<td>The route 51 comes every 12 minutes and the route 30 comes every 15 minutes. Occasionally a rider will have to wait for the next bus, but the wait time is reasonable considering the high frequency of these two RT routes. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT route #6 should provide service on Saturday as it serves many regional destinations and neighborhood needs in the Land Park and South Land Park areas.</td>
<td>The route 6 had Saturday service ridership previously that matched or exceeded RT's current acceptable/viable boardings per hour requirements from Transit Renewal. This is an unmet transit need that is reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT route #6 should provide service on Sunday as it serves many regional destinations and neighborhood needs in the Land Park and South Land Park areas.</td>
<td>The route 6 had Sunday service ridership of only 9 boardings per hour, and would not meet RT's current acceptable/viable route requirements from Transit Renewal. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The RT route 61 should run on weekends (Saturday and Sunday).</td>
<td>The route 61 had weekend service ridership of only 10 boardings per hour, and would not meet RT's current acceptable/viable route requirements from Transit Renewal. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The route 62 should continue running on Saturday and add Sunday service.</td>
<td>The route 62 had Sunday service ridership of only 10 boardings per hour, and would not meet RT's current acceptable/viable route requirements from Transit Renewal. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A majority of graveyard/third shift workers are not able to use public transit to get to and/or from work.</td>
<td>Graveyard/third shift workers may have to arrive at work early and/or stay late but it is possible to get to many worksites in the RT service area using the RT buses and light rail. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A regional bus system is needed that starts running at 4 AM and runs until at least midnight is needed to accommodate all needs.</td>
<td>RT has many bus routes as well as light rail that start running before 5 AM and run until near midnight. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Later service on the Folsom light rail line is needed seven days a week, and should run at least as late as the RT buses do (until 10-11 PM).</td>
<td>There currently is no demonstrated demand for the requested service. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT riders should be allowed on buses whose final destination is the RT Garage downtown, which would lessen &quot;dead heading&quot; and increase fare revenue.</td>
<td>Riders who wish to can ride on RT buses heading to the garage. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT bus service is needed that serves as closely as possible the college and trade school campuses in the North Natomas area, which run from 6:30 AM to 10:30 PM Monday - Friday.</td>
<td>RT is currently looking at providing service in the North Natomas area that would serve many of the colleges and trade schools located in the area. Current service only runs M-F until 7 PM. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT bus service on the West side of I-5 in North Natomas.</td>
<td>RT currently runs the Flyer, a commute shuttle, that serves the west side of I-5 in North Natomas. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There should be a bus that runs along Elk Grove-Florin Road north of Calvine, possibly to Florin Mall, as this neighborhood is in need of public transit service.</td>
<td>There currently is no demonstrated demand for the requested service. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bring the RT route 22 back to Arden Way north of Watt Avenue and Fair Oaks Blvd.</td>
<td>There was not sufficient ridership levels to support the route 22 in its previous operations east of Watt Avenue and Fair Oaks Blvd. based on boardings per hour requirements from Transit Renewal. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</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>SRTD cont. (incl. portions of Unincorporated Sacramento County)</td>
<td>The Sacramento Employment and Training Agency (SETA) and Resources for Independent Living Council (RFILC) Sacramento have reported difficulties in placing their many clients who do not have access to a personal vehicle in jobs. In particular in jobs where the hours are different from a traditional work schedule or intermittent and not served by transit.</td>
<td></td>
<td>For SETA and RFILC clients there is the option of arriving at a worksite early and staying late in order to be able to use transit/paratransit where it is available. There is also the option of becoming part of and/or starting a vanpool to a worksite where public transit/paratransit is not an option. SACOG offers a vanpool subsidy program that can assist vanpools for a year with the costs of starting and maintaining a vanpool. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>The RT route 62 does not have any stops between 2nd Avenue and McClatchy High School when traveling southbound.</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is not currently a safe place to stop on Freeport Blvd. between 2nd Avenue and McClatchy High School heading southbound. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discounted sales of monthly passes either directly to college/trade school students or to colleges/trade schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td>RT currently does not do bulk/discounted sales of it's monthly passes to colleges/trade schools. This is an operational comment. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The RT phone trip planner should have the inbound/outbound question deleted because each stop is numbered and the system should know if it is outbound or inbound.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. This comment will be shared with the RT IT staff that maintain the phone trip planner. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More bus benches are needed in the Del Paso Heights area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both of the Sacramento Social Security Offices need to be better served by transit, with neither location having direct or even reasonable walking distance transit service.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Both of these Social Security Offices are located in Sacramento County and only have sidewalks available on one side of the street, thereby preventing buses from stopping closer to these locations. Once a sidewalk is installed on both sides of the adjacent streets buses could stop closer to these locations. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With an increase in the senior and potentially disabled populations on the horizon more thought should be given to how those who use non-folding assistive devices will be accommodated on public transit vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-folding assistive mobility devices can be accommodated in existing RT buses and light rail. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The changes to the bus routes in the Del Paso Heights area have caused the buses that are still running to be overcrowded and frequently late.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This comment is not specific enough to analyze effectively (specific bus routes, times, and days are not included). This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently priority seating areas on buses and light rail are full of able bodies passengers and there is no recourse for passengers with disabilities as drivers/operators cannot force passengers already seated in that area to move.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signage in RT vehicles indicates that priority seating should be yielded for passengers with disabilities. It is not RT policy to have operators force passengers to move. This is no an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Older RT light rail cars do not have dedicated positions for bicycles and newer cars have only 4 positions. More bicycle positions are needed, and all RT light rail cars, old and new, need bike racks installed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>RT planning staff will bring this issue to the attention of the operations division. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>SRTD cont. (incl. portions of Unincorporated Sacramento County)</td>
<td>High floor RT light rail cars are difficult to access due to the steep and shallow stairs. All light rail cars should be low floor and have access for all at every door, and not just via a ramp at the first car.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The front car of every RT light rail train is accessible to anyone with impaired mobility, and is accessible under the ADA. RT plans on purchasing low floor light rail cars in the future when funds become available. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Paratransit, Inc.</td>
<td>Cross jurisdictional travel is difficult for those who must use Paratransit. In particular regularly scheduled travel for jobs or appointments between Sacramento County and Placer County are very challenging and forced transfers make the trips extremely inconvenient.</td>
<td>Though it may sometimes be inconvenient it is possible for paratransit users to travel across jurisdictional boundaries by transferring from one paratransit system to another. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</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</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Later evening hours on Yolobus services that connect to RT.</td>
<td>Yolobus did not cut back most of its night service when RT did, hence, there is little to reinstate. There are two departures from downtown Sacramento on the Yolobus route 42 A/B at 10:05 PM and 10:35 PM. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reinstatement of weekend service on Yolobus route 41.</td>
<td>The route 40 serves all of the same stops/location as the route 41 and runs on weekends. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increase frequency, every 30 minutes, during the &quot;peak&quot; travel times on the 42 A/B to alleviate overcrowding.</td>
<td>Half hourly service on the route 42 will be analyzed as part of the upcoming Yolo County Transportation District Short Range Transit Plan. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Double frequency of 42B and 42A service, as hourly service to/from the Sacramento International Airport is insufficient.</td>
<td>Half hourly service on the route 42 will be analyzed as part of the upcoming Yolo County Transportation District Short Range Transit Plan. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>More frequent service to the [Sacramento International] airport [on routes 42 A/B] would be expected for any city serious about providing public transit as an option.</td>
<td>Half hourly service on the route 42 will be analyzed as part of the upcoming Yolo County Transportation District Short Range Transit Plan. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Add route 42 A/B buses on the half hour, at least in the morning [8 AM] and 3:30 PM on to alleviate overcrowding from university/college students going to/from Davis and Woodland.</td>
<td>Half hourly service on the route 42 will be analyzed as part of the upcoming Yolo County Transportation District Short Range Transit Plan. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>More frequent service (every 1/2 hour) on the Yolobus route 42 A/B during the peak hours when passenger loads are heaviest.</td>
<td>Half hourly service on the route 42 will be analyzed as part of the upcoming Yolo County Transportation District Short Range Transit Plan. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Some route 45 Express buses should be re-routed through Davis and West Sacramento to pick up the slack on the route 42, as the #42 is frequently late causing missed connections.</td>
<td>SAME as above, except that shifting of route 45 buses from Woodland to the 42 is not an unmet transit need; rather, it is one person's suggested solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>The Yolobus route 240 schedule should be modified to make more timely connections with the route 35.</td>
<td>This comment is too vague to be effectively analyzed (no specific information on time of day, location, day(s) of the week are provided). This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>There is no overhang for Yolobus travelers at the Sacramento International Airport terminal B, requiring all Yolobus travelers to stand in the rain and hot sun while waiting and boarding the Yolobus there.</td>
<td>This is an operational issue. Changes to the route 35 that may allow it to run on schedule will be analyzed as part of the Yolo County Transportation District Short Range Transit Plan. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There is no down-lighting at the Yolobus stop at the Sacramento International Airport terminal B creating a potentially adverse safety situation.</td>
<td>This is an operational issue that has been resolved. There is now a bus shelter with lighting at the Yolobus stop at the Sacramento International Airport Terminal B. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Guarantee that passengers are able to complete their itineraries at any point in the 42 A/B loop.</td>
<td>This comment is too vague to be effectively analyzed (no specific information on time of day, location, day(s) of the week are provided). This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</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>15</td>
<td>A bench and shelter from the weather at the new [Sacramento International airport] terminal [B] might make the long wait a little more tolerable; the overhang that provides cover from the rain ends where the waiting area for the public bus begins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational issue that has been resolved. There is now a bus shelter with lighting at the Yolobus stop at the Sacramento International Airport Terminal B. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Yolo County (Unincorporated or Yolobus services operated outside of Yolo County) cont.</td>
<td>The 42A invariably runs late due to traffic and needier riders in Sac and West Sac. This becomes a major problem when the 42A reaches Woodland and most times many people cannot make their connecting ride. This is an operational issue. The 42 A/B runs late due to high ridership, multiple stops and the lengthy route. YCTD is looking at ways to improve on-time performance of routes 42 A and B. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many times, the other connecting buses leave County Fair Mall and do not wait for the 30 seconds or so it would take for the 42 to arrive. This is an operational issue. YCTD policy is to allow a connecting bus to hold up by up to 5 minutes if the driver knows that a connecting bus will be arriving during that timeframe. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yolobus should work to establish a smartphone enabled bus locator system. The present Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) system only works in a web browser and is very difficult to use on a mobile phone. It would be very helpful if both Unitrans and Yolobus could use the same smartphone app. Yolobus is developing a smartphone application. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Unitrans needs to be set-up to be convenient for the entire community (City of Davis) not just UCD students with Unitrans continuing the regular bus schedules during UCD finals, breaks and summer. This is an operational comment. Unitrans does serve a the community of the City of Davis, but does take into consideration when designing and operating Unitrans routes that a majority of the system riders are UC Davis students. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unitrans route L North East Davis runs on a loop, so that a rider catching it in that area has to do the whole North East loop before being able to get back into downtown Davis that takes so long that it is often more practical to walk than to take the route L into downtown Davis. This is an operational comment. The Unitrans route L was extended to serve two lower-income housing developments in the north eastern area of the City of Davis, which has increased ridership on the route. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
<td>It is difficult for people with mobility issues to walk to West Capitol Ave, to reach the nearest 42 A/B bus stop. Could a shuttle be provided to assist people in reaching the 42 A/B bus stops? Yolobus Special service is available for those riders who have mobility impairments or other qualify disabilities under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Yolobus Special service can be used by those who qualify to connect to fixed route bus services as well. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is difficult to get to areas outside of downtown Sacramento for shopping. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>More outreach is needed for the Unmet Transit Needs process. SACOG does as large a variety of outreach for the Unmet Transit Needs Process as the limited budget allows, and has continued to expand to use more and different outreach methods to reach as large a population as possible. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is there anyone on the Yolobus Board that must use transit (is transit dependent)? This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the best method to get senior transportation issues before local agencies that provide and plan for public transit and other transportation projects? This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</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>Winters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No comments were received regarding transit service in Winters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>A direct connection (bus) from Woodland to the Amtrak station in Davis is needed.</td>
<td>Yokobus riders can transfer to Unitrans, which has connecting buses to Amtrak, and Yolobus stops within 4 blocks of the Davis Amtrak Station. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buses coming from Davis (the route 42) are frequently 20+ minutes late and miss connections with local Woodland routes 210/211, which is particularly problematic when these connections are missed on the last buses of the night and forces riders to walk excessive distances in the dark.</td>
<td>This is an operational issue. The 42 A/B runs late due to high ridership, multiple stops and the lengthy route. YCTD is looking at ways to improve on-time performance of routes 42 A and B. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</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>1</td>
<td>Yuba and Sutter Counties</td>
<td>Bus service to the Plumas Lake area that would connect with Yuba City/Marysville/McGowan.</td>
<td>There is insufficient demonstrated demand for this service. Service to the Plumas Lake area will be further evaluated in the FY 2014 SRTP. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Service on routes that serve locations where youth gather should be provided later in the evening, and could possibly just be provided on certain days of the week.</td>
<td>There is insufficient demonstrated demand for this service. Later evening service will be further evaluated in the FY 2014 SRTP. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bus service should serve low-income areas and areas with high concentrations of seniors because those people often do not have other transportation options.</td>
<td>This comment is not specific enough to effectively analyze (no specific location, times, days of week are provided). This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>A weekend transit bus that will make two trips on Saturday to the Roseville Galleria Mall for weekend shoppers that don't want to drive. A bus could drop them off at 10AM and pick up at 4PM</td>
<td>Bus service on Saturday for recreational shopping service to Roseville is not an unmet transit need as it is non-essential. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have a few buses on Sundays even if the bus only runs for a few hours.</td>
<td>There is insufficient demonstrated demand for this service. Sunday service will be further evaluated in the FY 2014 SRTP. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Linking Arboga and Plumas Lake to the transit line would be most helpful in helping to eliminate people and children from walking on the railroad tracks, thus preventing deaths.</td>
<td>There is insufficient demonstrated demand for this service. Service to the Arboga/Plumas Lake area will be further evaluated in the FY 2014 SRTP. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Add a stop to Food Maxx in Linda, CA on the 4B route for people who choose not to shop at Wal-Mart.</td>
<td>This is an operational comment. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Add buses on the 4A and 4B route, running every ½ [hour], consistent with the other routes, because these buses are exceedingly full at times as they only run every hour and it makes for a longer day in transit, and missed connections to other routes.</td>
<td>This is an operational comment. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Add an additional route on Powerline Rd., in Olivehurst, with stops along Powerline Rd. at the junior high school, Opud, the Calvary Church shopping center, VFW building, and then crossing back over to Olivehurst Ave. to continue onto the regular route #3 or turn right from Powerline Rd. over the overpass then left onto Lindhurst Ave., along the freeway on the east side of Hwy 70, connecting with the route #6 bus, Edgewood, then continuing on to the Wal-Mart transfer station, a Food Maxx stop could be included on this additional route.</td>
<td>This is an operational comment. Existing service is sufficient. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Half hour headways on route 6 (Linda Shuttle) to aid transfers.</td>
<td>This is an operational comment. The service is not justified by ridership. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</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>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Driver smoke breaks, and smoking at bus stations in general, set a bad example for youth. Smoking should not be allowed at stops.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Operations, Yuba and Sutter Counties (Unincorporated area or regarding overall bus services that serve both counties) cont.</td>
<td>Route 4A is unreliable.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dial-A-Ride service is not well known and needs to be marketed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bus service to Olivehurst that would loop to Yuba City/Marysville.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. Route 4 in Olivehurst now connects with Route 1 for service to Yuba City. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Express bus routes for those going to Yuba College, Yuba City or Marysville campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adding an additional stop or 2 on Olivehurst Ave., in Olivehurst, CA, heading south after 9th St.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Have three position bicycle racks on all Yuba-Sutter Transit buses.</td>
<td>Keith Martin of Yuba-Sutter Transit replied that all fixed route buses have three bike positions and demand response vehicles have two bike positions Further investigation found two position racks on some fixed route buses, but there is now only one such bus and it will be converted to a three position rack ASAP. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Operations, Live Oak</td>
<td>Run more Live Oak bus service/routes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. The service is not justified by ridership. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Operations, Marysville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No comments were received pertaining to transit service issues solely in the City of Marysville.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Operations, Wheatland</td>
<td>Run more Wheatland bus service/routes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. The service is not justified by ridership. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Not An Unmet Transit Need</td>
<td>Unmet Transit Need</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>21</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Yuba City</td>
<td>There needs to be a bus to the Sutter campus. It would be utilized by students.</td>
<td>There is insufficient demonstrated demand for this service. Fixed route service to the Yuba College Sutter County Center will be further evaluated in the FY 2014 SRTP. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extend the route 2 to serve the Sutter Campus of Yuba Community College because currently the nearest bus stop is approximately 1 mile away.</td>
<td>There is insufficient demonstrated demand for this service. Fixed route service to the Yuba College Sutter County Center will be further evaluated in the FY 2014 SRTP. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add bus service to the Sutter Campus of Yuba College, as many students drop classes as they have no way to get to the Sutter Campus.</td>
<td>There is insufficient demonstrated demand for this service. Fixed route service to the Yuba College Sutter County Center will be further evaluated in the FY 2014 SRTP. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yuba City Unified high school students participate in co-enrollment opportunities with Yuba College. A bus stop at the new nearby Sutter campus is needed, and there is the potential for a Blue Sky grant to fund the service.</td>
<td>There is insufficient demonstrated demand for this service. Fixed route service to the Yuba College Sutter County Center will be further evaluated in the FY 2014 SRTP. This is an unmet transit need that is NOT reasonable to meet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Add a public transit stop, route #2, at the Social Security office on Percy Ave., in Yuba City, CA.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an operational comment. The service is not justified by ridership. This is not an unmet transit need.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The hearing was conducted by Gary Davis representing SACOG Board of Directors, with Sharon Sprowls and Barbara VaughanBechtold of SACOG staff, Ed Coviello, Raquel Chavarria and Kara Reddig from e-tran, and Tom Quigley representing the Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) and the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council.

Director Davis and Ms. VaughanBechtold provided an overview of SACOG and the unmet transit needs hearing process. Mr. Coviello and Mr. Quigley gave brief overviews of their transit systems, including upcoming changes. Eighteen people testified at the hearing, and twenty pieces of correspondence were received. All Unmet Transit Needs comments are listed below.

Mr. Davis opened the hearing to public comment.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

1. Karen Berg, Elk Grove, CA

Ms. Berg runs the Seasons at Laguna Ridge Senior (55+) Apartment Community. Seasons is located at the intersection of Bilby and Bruceville Roads in Elk Grove. Seasons has 222 apartments, with approximately 30% of those occupied by couples. A majority of residents are 55 to 70 years old so are not the age 75+ required for e-van services. Current residents’ transportation needs far outpace the capacity of the one van the property has available. Seasons provides transportation four days per week but doesn’t take people to medical appointments, so some end up canceling their appointments if they cannot find transportation. There is an existing bus stop in front of the property where a bus used to stop prior to service reductions in Elk Grove. A new Wal-Mart is opening in the same area in 2013, which might provide an opportunity for bus service. Ms. Berg brought a signed petition encouraging service.

2. William Eipper, Elk Grove, CA

Mr. Eipper stated that many deaf people ride the bus. He also said that there is no current e-tran service from outside Elk Grove back into Elk Grove on the weekends, making it very hard to travel and isolating people who rely on public transit. He is hoping e-tran will provide more connecting bus service on weekends.

3. A person involved with the Resources for Independent Living

This person stated that more attention needs to be paid to the transportation needs of disabled and elderly residents, and the specialized services currently available need to be marketed better.
4. Ted Clark, a participant who is blind, Elk Grove, CA

A participant who is blind asked if the e-tran service maps available at the meeting were able to be read by a screen reader.

*E-tran staff responded by stating that they would work with the person commenting to make sure they got them the map in a format that could be read by their screen reader.*

5. Anonymous, Elk Grove, CA

This person commented that the other Los Rios community college campuses need to be better connected to each other by transit. In particular, he mentioned the transit connection to Cosumnes River College (CRC) being difficult and not running late enough.

*E-tran staff responded stating that the e-tran route 157 does serve the CRC campus in the evening and that RT light rail is expected to start serving the campus in 2015.*

6. John Pires, Elk Grove, CA

Mr. Pires asked if there is a standard formula for how ridership and routing is determined, and asked who measures service performance and how resources are decided.

*E-tran staff responded that they are hoping to use new fare boxes as a tool to help evaluate each route’s effectiveness. However, sometimes transit grants are specific, such as Job Access Reverse Commute funding. E-tran tries to balance commute service with local service for transit-dependent riders. The City must also consider federal Title VI civil rights requirements.*

7. Anonymous, Elk Grove, CA

Question on Amtrak bus facility and where it connects to the San Joaquin Amtrak train.

8. Veronica Bennett, Elk Grove, CA

This person is a new commuter to Franchise Tax Board. The routes 70 and 71 don’t allow a full day of work. When she called customer service, she reached a recording and left a message but no one called back. She called and was transferred to a Customer Service Supervisor and left a message, but also did not receive a call back.

9. Hector Chavez, Sacramento, CA

Mr. Chavez inquired about any weekend service between Bradshaw and Sheldon and CRC, also anything along Watt Ave. into Elk Grove.
10. Mike Barnbaum, Sacramento, CA

Mr. Barnbaum noted that changes were made to SCT/Link service that allow a connection to Elk Grove on request. He stated that an unmet transit need is that the Hwy 99 service does not run in the evenings for night classes at CRC. Additionally, he stated that SCT/Link night and weekend service would provide a major fulfillment of a service gap. He stated that this will be more important when the South Line light rail service is open. He noted the value of a one-seat ride connecting south Sacramento County to Roseville and Auburn. He also wondered about an SCT/Link transfer to the San Joaquin Amtrak.

Additionally, he noted that there is too little service on the e-tran weekend circulator, and that this would especially be true when light rail services CRC. He also suggested that more service on Power Inn Road could be a potential joint e-tran/RT route. A route from Bruceville to Sheldon to Power Inn Road to 65th Street would allow access to the 65th St. light rail station and CRC students’ access to CSUS.

He asked when would be the soonest timeframe for any major service changes.

*E-tran staff responded that any recommendations will likely be made in late spring 2013.*

11. Rosalie, Elk Grove, CA

This person noted that the Heritage Park Charter School has 209 K-12 students with 150 7th through 12th graders. The school now has students who walk and bike. The school is moving to 8065 Elk Grove-Florin, one mile north of Calvine Road. Most of the students are Elk Grove residents. Currently there are no RT bus serves in the area where the school is re-locating to.

12. Anonymous, Elk Grove, CA

This person will be traveling from Folsom to the new Elk Grove Corrections building. Will there be a commuter bus?

13. Paul Philly

The e-tran pass cannot be used on Yolobus to the airport.

*E-tran staff responded that they would like to iron out equitable transfer agreements.*

14. Denise Clark, Elk Grove

Ms. Clark asked if there is any unannounced “mystery shopper”-type process to test the transit process to shore up the things that work or don’t work, and whether there is a report of results. She suggested this be standard practice, also for e-van and Paratransit, Inc. to make sure they are running as advertised.
E-tran staff noted that they have done this in the past with fixed route service to assess performance.

15. Mark, Elk Grove, CA

The person who commented is a commuter. He likes the bike racks on the front but feels that 3-bike racks would be helpful, to provide more certainty that bike space will be available.

With regard to light rail at CRC, he noted that many people care about the time to get downtown, and if it would take an extra 20-30 minutes, it would not be worth it to many people to use light rail.

16. Jeff Doll, Elk Grove, CA

Mr. Doll is a commuter. He sees bikes as a good solution to the last mile problem. He noted that a lot of major cities have found ideas to help improve the infrastructure for bicycles, most just with a line on the street, but ways to make biking safer and more attractive.

17. Linda Hedberg

Sometimes there is standing room only on route 53 on I-5. It’s dangerous if the driver needs to slam on their brakes. Lots of workers are elderly or disabled. Is there any plan for an additional bus? The route 53 is crowded except the middle run. The Route 53 after 6:05 AM, the drivers sometimes turn people away at the last two stops. Only bus into White Rock.

She also asked why e-tran cut the 156 on weekends. Without, people can’t get to Sacramento on weekends.

*E-tran staff responded that in comparison to other e-tran routes, the 156 had low performance.*

18. Anonymous, Elk Grove, CA

This person asked if there is any talk of returning the 156. The cuts to Route 52 have meant that the middle route at 6 am leaving Harbor Point is way overcrowded. It’s less of an issue in the evening. He usually takes the next to last 52, but asked if it is possible to extend evening hours on the 53 because otherwise people can’t get further south in the evening.

Open House comments:

For elder housing 55+ at Big Horn and Laguna and large senior apartment complex near the Nugget Market, service should be available.

Pastor Eipper was interested to learn that the weekend shuttle stops near to his church where many deaf persons attend. He took route schedules. He and his companion were also interested in the suggestion that, to communicate better with drivers, deaf persons could write or print out a
card telling the driver where they want to go and asking the driver to let them know when they have reached the correct stop, since they cannot hear stop announcements.

Route 52 – would like to see the return of a bus to the regular schedule rather than a shadow bus at the same time.

Suggested making the bus more child-friendly.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

1. Anonymous, Elk Grove, CA

The commenter currently takes four buses (including one e-tran bus) to get to cosmetology school. When she attempted to purchase a student bus pass on the 6:05 AM e-tran route 159 on 10-22-12, she was denied, though she had purchased this type of pass previously. The commenter relies on public transportation to get to school and cannot afford a full price bus pass. She would like to see e-tran implement a lower cost bus pass for college/trade school students.

2. Robert Tracy, Sacramento, CA

Mr. Tracy lives near Elk Grove-Florin Road and Calvine. He would like to see routes that currently either do not run on holidays or run reduced schedules on holidays to run their regular schedule on those holidays using smaller vehicles if necessary.

The route 154 needs to run once an hour from 9:30 AM to 2:30 PM rather than once every two hours after 10:30 AM.

All commuter buses should either run on holidays (e.g., the route 57) or not (route 71).

E-tran customer service personnel need to call back if a message is left on the customer service line as the voice mail message says they will. Also, the customer service people need more training to assist with trip planning as many don't seem to know the local transit systems or area very well.

3. Johnny Hui, Sacramento, CA

Our management (CDCR) has advised us to submit requests (suggestions) to your office for consideration for the change of the current commute routes. Here are some suggestions.

- Add schedules to the routes.
- Add stops to the routes.
- For Route 91, move end stop to Sunrise Light rail or Hazel stations. I know for fact that we have quite a few staff up here living in Fair Oaks, Carmichael, Citrus Heights, Orangevale, Folsom, El Dorado Hills, etc. The marginal benefit of taking the commute route is dramatically diminished when staff from these areas has to drive a long distance to get to
Butterfield while fighting with the usual Hwy 50 traffic. It does not seem to be worth to drive a long way to get a bus which would take another 50 minutes to get to the office.

• Suggest to do commute surveys as more workers start moving down to Elk Grove.

Thank you so much for your consideration.
Johnny

4. Jasvinder (Jass) Kaur, Elk Grove, CA

As a 10-year resident of City of Elk Grove, I have seen the city grow, as well as its public transportation needs. As you requested feedback and assistance with accessing the problem, along with suggestions – following is my input based on my personal experience, as well an analysis of the problem while also offering recommendations.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to provide feedback. Please keep me informed on how the concerns of the residents in the City of Elk Grove will be addressed.

Problem with Route 52:
(As previously noted in my communication on 10/12/2012)
This is regarding the unacceptable bus service on route 52 for the past two week.
The buses are constantly broken and over-packed.
This is not only a safety concern but also quality and a compliance concern.
If immediate action is not taken to run enough buses, including running shadow and increasing service, I will report this matter to the respective regulatory local and state entities.

Analysis:
1. Following is the Route 52 Schedule:
   a. Northbound:
      1) First bus start at 5:20
      2) Second bus starts at 5:35 (15 minutes from previous bus)
      3) Third bus starts at 6:00 (25 minutes from previous bus)*
      4) Fourth bus starts at 6:30 (30 minutes from previous bus)*
      5) Fifth bus starts at 6:45 (15 minutes from previous bus)*
      6) Sixth bus starts at 7:00 (15 minutes from previous bus)
      7) Seventh bus starts at 7:15 (15 minutes from previous bus)
      8) Eighth and last bus starts at 7:30 (15 minutes from previous bus)

   b. Southbound:
      1) First bus start at 3:35
      2) Second bus starts at 4:05 (30 minutes from previous bus)*
      3) Third bus starts at 4:35 (30 minutes from previous bus)*
      4) Fourth bus starts at 4:50 (15 minutes from previous bus)*
      5) Fifth bus starts at 5:05 (15 minutes from previous bus)*
      6) Sixth bus starts at 5:20 (15 minutes from previous bus)*
      7) Seventh bus starts at 5:35 (15 minutes from previous bus)*
      8) Eighth and last bus starts at 5:50 (15 minutes from previous bus)
2. Routes identified with an asterisk (*) are routes that I have ridden and experienced problems with.

Recommendations:

1. Increase service on Route 52 as following:
   a. Northbound:
      1) First bus starts at 5:20
      2) Second bus starts at 5:35 (15 minutes from previous bus)
      3) Third bus starts at 6:00 (25 minutes from previous bus)* Change: Increase service to every 15 minutes
      4) Fourth bus starts at 6:30 (30 minutes from previous bus)* Change: Increase service to every 15 minutes
      5) Fifth bus starts at 6:45 (15 minutes from previous bus)* Change: Using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow
      6) Sixth bus starts at 7:00 (15 minutes from previous bus) Change: Using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow
      7) Seventh bus starts at 7:15 (15 minutes from previous bus) Change: Using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow
      8) Eighth and last bus starts at 7:30 (15 minutes from previous bus) Change: Using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow
      9) Add buses: Leaving Elk Grove 7:45; 8:00, 8:15, and 8:30, including using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow
   
   b. Southbound:
      1) First bus start at 3:35
      2) Second bus starts at 4:05 (30 minutes from previous bus)* Change: Using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow
      3) Third bus starts at 4:35 (30 minutes from previous bus)* Change: Using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow
      4) Fourth bus starts at 4:50 (15 minutes from previous bus)* Change: Using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow
      5) Fifth bus starts at 5:05 (15 minutes from previous bus)* Change: Using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow
6) Sixth bus starts at 5:20 (15 minutes from previous bus)* Change: Using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow

7) Seventh bus starts at 5:35 (15 minutes from previous bus)* Change: Using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow

8) Eighth and last bus starts at 5:50 (15 minutes from previous bus) Change: Using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow

9) Add buses: Leaving Sacramento 6:05; 6:20, 6:35, 6:50, and 7:05 including using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow

Additionally, I also see problems with Route 53:
First and foremost, the limited bus route does not support the number of professionals that commute into downtown Sacramento.
The buses are constantly over-packed.
This is not only a safety concern but also quality and a compliance concern.

Analysis:

1. Following is the Route 53 Schedule:
   a. Northbound:
      1) First bus starts at 5:25
      2) Second bus starts at 5:45 (20 minutes from previous bus)
      3) Third bus starts at 6:00 (15 minutes from previous bus)*
   
      b. Southbound:
      1) First bus start at 3:30
      2) Second bus starts at 4:00 (30 minutes from previous bus)*
      3) Third bus starts at 4:35 (35 minutes from previous bus)*

2. Routes identified with an asterisk (*) are routes that I have ridden and experienced problems with.

Recommendations

1. Increase service on Route 53 as following:

2. Following is the Route 53 Schedule:
   a. Northbound:
      1) First bus start at 5:25
      2) Second bus starts at 5:45 (20 minutes from previous bus) Change: Increase service to every 15 minutes
      3) Third bus starts at 6:00 (15 minutes from previous bus)*
4) Add buses: Leaving Elk Grove 6:15; 6:30, 6:45, 7:00, 7:15; 7:30, 7:45, 8:00, 8:15, and 8:30 including using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow, as necessary

b. Southbound:
1) First bus start at 3:30
2) Second bus starts at 4:00 (30 minutes from previous bus)* Change: Increase service to every 15 minutes
3) Third bus starts at 4:35 (35 minutes from previous bus)* Change: Using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow
4) Add buses: Leaving Sacramento 4:45; 5:00, 5:15, 6:15, 6:30, 6:45, 7:00, 7:15, 7:15, 7:30, including using a model used by RT on Route 51, increase service to every 12 minutes and/or add guaranteed shadow

Thank you, kindly.
Dr. Jasvinder (Jazz) Kaur

5. Will Bourdeau, Elk Grove, CA

SACOG,

I am a daily Amtrak and e-tran rider. I would like to see the e-tran 59 bus that leaves Sacramento at 4:50 PM moved back 5 minutes to 4:55 PM because the walk to the train has become longer due to the rail realignment.

Thanks,
Will Bourdeau

6. Amanda Pace, Elk Grove, CA

Hello,

I had a comment on unmet transit needs for Elk Grove’s e-tran. I take e-tran routes 59 and/or 60 and I do not like the fact that my morning bus drops me off at work before 6:30 AM and yet I cannot catch a bus home until 3:30 PM. I am waiting outside in the hot weather or rain for thirty minutes. I have spoken with fellow passengers and many of them are disgruntled that after working eight hours we can’t get home, thirty minutes is a long wait for a bus. We would like to see an earlier bus route be added to the schedule, 15-20 minutes earlier than it is now.

Thank you for taking this into consideration.
Amanda Pace
7. Sonia Fuentes, Elk Grove, CA

I would like to comment about transportation in Elk Grove. I consider it good transport especially the bus # 59 which is what my family and I have to take, is punctual, but sometimes you have to wait a bit but it's normal. The only thing is that I would like to extend until later afternoon hours, as it is until 6:25 PM and on the weekends because we have no public transport available to travel outside of Elk Grove. It wouldn't necessarily need to be a big bus, but could be a small one.

Thank you very much and we hope that at least one extension in the schedule until later could be considered.

Sonia

8. William Long, Elk Grove, CA

Add a clockwise direction to the e-tran route 162.

9. Wayne Herin, Stockton, CA

I would like to address the need for a bus that runs from Stockton to the new State buildings at 9272 Laguna in Elk Grove. Currently, there is the San Joaquin Commuter bus that runs from Stockton to downtown Sacramento. With over 1500 people moving their work location from downtown Sacramento to the 9272 / 9260 Laguna in Elk Grove location, I think this warrants a bus that will go to this address from Stockton.

Thank you for hearing my concern.

10. Kristina Kahl, Elk Grove, CA

To Whom It May Concern,
I am writing to request a new route for your Elk Grove Service. As you may know, the Elk Grove Unified School District recently changed the school boundaries so that groups of students will need transportation to new schools. Our family lives in the Stonelake neighborhood (off I-5 and Elk Grove Blvd). I have one high school student who takes the 151 to Franklin, but my middle school student is now being sent to Pinkerton Middle School, by the auto mall. Unfortunately, there is not a good bus route that will take my middle schooler from Stonelake to Pinkerton. Starting this year, all of the kids in the Stonelake neighborhood who graduate from Elliott Ranch Elementary will be going on to Pinkerton, and then Cosumnes Oaks High School. We would really love it if you could create a new route to service our neighborhood and take the kids directly to Pinkerton/Cosumnes Oaks. I know there are several other busy parents who would prefer sending their kids on the bus rather than having to drive them.

Sincerely,
Kristina Kahl
11. Nancy Wold, Sacramento, CA

I am not able to attend your open house but I am encouraged that you are conducting this type of event.

I live in the South Land Park area of Sacramento and will be moving with California Correctional Health Care Services in March to the facility in Elk Grove. I don’t see that there is any easy way to use mass transit from my location to that location. Additionally, several of my staff live in the Carmichael or Citrus Heights area. Is there consideration being made for those staff who don’t live downtown on the traditional light rail path?

Thanks for your consideration.
Nancy Wold

12. Nora Hyer, Sacramento, CA

This will echo requests you have received from my co-workers:

Beginning sometime in March or April 2013, I will be working on Laguna Springs Road.

I live off Northrop at Watt Avenue and would like to use public transportation to get to work.

Nora Hyer

13. Carol McElheney, Elk Grove, CA

I will not be able to attend the workshop Monday evening because I cannot drive due to poor eyesight. My husband, who usually takes me places, works at that time, and other odd hours, including weekends.

When I first lost my eyesight due to a stroke, I investigated Elk Grove paratransit [e-van] and found it to be too expensive and too limited. It only took passengers places within the city limits. I can use regular buses, as I am not physically challenged, but I would like transportation to church on Sundays. A friend at church has used paratransit [e-van] in the past, but has found it to be late getting her there on time, and late or early picking her up, so she often either misses communion or has to wait for her ride after most others have left church. She finally stopped coming because the service was so bad. This factored greatly in my decision to not sign up for the service.

I would use the bus more if it were available on weekends, especially Sundays so I could ride it to my church (St Mary’s, on Calvine Road & Elk Grove-Florin Road). I can walk from Elk Grove-Florin if the bus were to run up and down EGF.

I live near Emerald Oak & Elk Grove Blvd and need to shop at the Waterman Bel Air now that the Elk Grove Blvd Bel Air closed. I usually wait until my husband is off to shop, but
occasionally I need to pick up a prescription, and it would be nice if there was a bus that ran up and down Elk Grove Blvd to Waterman.

Finally, on occasion I need to travel downtown, to Sacramento. I understand there will be connections to Light Rail at CRC. That will be good. When I tried to make connections to use transit to visit the State Fair, I found it would take me 3 hours to get there! I did manage to bypass the Elk Grove system by getting a ride downtown with a friend, thus cutting the time to about 20 minutes.

I wish Elk Grove had stayed with RT. RT has a region-wide system.

Thank you,
Carol McElheney

14. Kimberley Lucas, Berkeley, CA

Thanks for the opportunity to share the impact that the move from downtown Sacramento to Elk Grove has had on me and I'm sure hundreds of other employees. Unfortunately I can't come in person in the evening on Oct 29 as I have over a three hour commute and need to get home.

The CCHCS move to Elk Grove never should have happened; especially given we are a state agency. State employees are strongly encouraged to use public transportation and reasonable options were not put in place in spite of all of the surveys and feedback we gave prior to this move. Whether it's provided by Elk Grove or CCHCS or by both, we need buses or shuttles that run throughout the day and that take a reasonable amount of time to get back and forth from downtown Sacramento. It shouldn't take an hour and twenty minutes to two hours taking light rail plus two buses to travel fifteen miles!

No matter where you're commuting from, unless you live in or south of Elk Grove, you have to go through downtown Sacramento to get there. For the majority of CCHCS employees who prefer public transportation or for whom public transportation is the only option, this means light rail from Sacramento followed by two buses -- a minimum one hour and twenty minute trip in the morning. If someone needed to come in late due to a doctor's appointment, the trip turns into two hours. Having a doctor's appointment in the middle of the day would necessitate taking the entire day off since at least four hours would be spent in transit.

I and many others rode Amtrak to downtown Sacramento before this move and now that just isn't an option. The token reverse commute e-tran bus is not something I can use because even if I take the earliest train that leaves Berkeley at 5:44 am I cannot make the latest bus which leaves at 7:50 am. Therefore, if I want to continue to take public transportation, I have to instead take the light rail followed by two buses, bringing my total commute time just to get to work in the morning to about three and a half hours. I don't even want to think about how long it would take to get home.
Many employees have found other work because of this issue. I have lost two of my co-workers in our tiny unit due to this move and the lack of reasonable transit. I have been forced back onto the freeway in my old car and am looking for another job myself.

Kim Lucas

15. Sam R., Elk Grove, CA

I'm moving back to Elk Grove from Rancho Cordova in early December. My concern is e-tran bus 160 offers only hourly service. My daughter attends Albiani Middle school and will attend Pleasant Grove soon. We will be moving to residence near Elk Grove-Florin and Bond Road about 2 miles from school. We'll be residents of Elk Grove for many many years.

Would you please consider changing the hourly west bound to arrive at Bond and Bradshaw 30 minutes after the hour instead of current 2:49 PM, 3:59, 4:59 etc.? Or add one westbound stop arrives 3:26 PM? School gets out around 3:00 PM for Albiani, 3:11 PM for PG high.

Thanks for your consideration.

Sam R, parent
Elk Grove, CA

16. Monica Treat, Elk Grove, CA

This email is being sent to express the dire need to extend the current City bus line to the Seasons at Laguna Ridge Senior Apartment Community in Elk Grove. Several of our residents can no longer drive or have access to a vehicle. This restricts their freedom making it difficult to schedule appointments and live independently.

With the new Wal-Mart opening in the near future, extending the current bus line 1 or 2 stops will increase customer support and allow our residents 1 stop shopping at their convenience. Due to prior bus lines operating this line, there exists a current bus stop in place in front of the community.

Please support our plea for this accommodation.

Sincerely,
Monica Treat (Please reference attached petition)

17. Beth Snyder, Elk Grove, CA

Hi,

I was going to try to come to tonight’s open house, but I won’t be able to make it, so I am e-mailing my concerns instead.
1) Over the past year, I have had direct confrontations with a rude driver who has made it clear that she doesn’t like me. I have filed 2 complaints about her, and have yet to hear back on any decisions made regarding the status of my complaints. As I understand it, I am not the only person who has complained about this particular driver, yet she still works for E-Tran.

2) The customer-service line isn’t always answered during regular business hours.

3) The customer service staff are frequently rude and sometimes argumentative. Once when I called in to report that a bus had failed to stop, the customer service representative told me she failed to see the problem since 6 more buses were scheduled to run for the remainder of the evening (as if I had all night to wait). When I left a message on the supervisor’s voice mail system complaining, I didn’t hear back.

4) The #57 needs to have more drivers and buses added in the morning and evening; 3 is simply not enough.

5) There should be a bus that covers the stretch of Elk Grove-Florin Road north of Calvine Road, perhaps one that connects to Florin Mall. This is a neighborhood that is in dire need of regular public transportation.

6) It is a conflict of interest that the contractor who supplies the buses also hires the drivers.

7) The buses frequently break down because the contractor fails to perform regular maintenance on them.

Thanks for your attention in these matters.

Regards,
Beth Snyder

18. Joanne De La Torre, Roseville, CA

Good afternoon,

I am sorry I am unable to attend the Unmet Transit Needs meeting today at the Elk Grove City Council. I live in Roseville and use Amtrak to commute, and it would be inconvenient to travel to Elk Grove for the meeting. I appreciate the opportunity to express my concerns via e-mail.

Needless to say, my office’s relocation to Elk Grove, scheduled for January 2013, is going to have a dramatic impact on my commute. I am interested in utilizing E-tran’s Route 90, implemented to transport Amtrak Capitol Corridor commuters to the new location at Laguna Springs, but am concerned that the timetable is not realistic. For example E-tran Route 90 is scheduled to arrive at 7th and G at 5:15 in the afternoon. The Amtrak station is located at 4th and I St. The train to Roseville departs the Amtrak station promptly at 5:25 PM. I am concerned there is not enough time to make that connection. The next departure to Roseville isn’t until 6:50 PM so missing the first train would be a huge inconvenience.

Has there been any feedback from commuters using this route? Are they making the connection to Amtrak on time?

I am also inquiring if E-tran has considered accepting the Roseville Transit Commuter Monthly pass to transfer to Route 90 for free as they are doing for Sacramento RT riders. That would
give me another option (and maybe better) for commuting to Elk Grove, as the E-tran timetable coincides with Roseville Transit’s arrivals and departures into and out of Sacramento, but I do not want to have to pay additional fare to board the E-Tran bus.

Thank you.
Joanne De La Torre

19. Nina Stevens, Elk Grove, CA

I was unable to attend last night’s e-tran meeting, but would like to comment. I live in Elk Grove and work downtown. The commuter route is perfect when I can make it. The reason I cannot always make the bus is that I am also a working parent. Unfortunately, the very last bus leaving Elk Grove is at my Park and Ride at 7:45 AM. Our elementary school starts at 8:10 AM and the middle school at 8:30 AM. Neither allows an early drop off that would allow me to get to the bus on time. So I am left to either leave them unattended near their school or miss the bus. Neither are good options.

It seems that e-tran could support working parents by having one or two more options that leave town a little later. I don’t believe there is any school in elk grove that begins early enough for any parent to take their kid to school and there is no commuter route that leaves later.

Nina Stevens

20. Corina Meloche, Elk Grove, CA

I would like to provide comments regarding Elk Grove’s Transit Plan. I hope it is not too late as the open house was last night.

Being that I only use e-tran for commuting to work in downtown Sacramento, my input is limited to that service. More specifically, I live very close to the southwest corner of Elk Grove & Bruceville (just behind the Kohl’s shopping center) and work near 10th & I Streets downtown, next door to City Hall. My work schedule was 6:00am - 2:30pm, but I had to change it due to the lack of corresponding bus service.

Routes don’t accommodate early work schedules, and the Franklin area (the neighborhood between Franklin & Bruceville Roads, and south of Elk Grove Blvd.) doesn’t appear to be well-served, although I can really only speak for the section that I live in. As I mentioned, I used to work 6:00am - 2:30pm. I could walk to bus stops on Routes 53 and 66, however the times are too late (Route 66) or the downtown stops are too far from my job (Route 53 only takes me as far as 8th & N or 10th & N, from which points I would have to walk several blocks or wait for the Sac RT light rail to take me the rest of the way to work).

The buses are crowded and almost every day several people are standing during the freeway commute. While I can appreciate using space to its maximum capacity, this seems to indicate a need for additional buses. It is also possible that expanding the running times of these routes (starting earlier and running later) would spread the bus-riding population out more. I would not
be comfortable standing on these routes and so I make the extra effort to board the bus before all the seats are taken.

It seems that many people use e-tran to commute to Sacramento. That being the case, it would be beneficial to align route times with those of Sac RT, for the routes that connect with RT. When Sac RT made changes to its Blue Line light rail route, e-tran did not make corresponding adjustments. Even worse, e-tran still has not updated the Sac RT times on the Route 156 schedule on its website. While I understand that e-tran may not always be able to make the corresponding route changes, at least having the correct information on its website would be helpful.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on e-tran service.
Corina Meloche
The hearing was called to order at 2:00PM. The hearing was conducted by Barbara Payne representing the SACOG Board of Directors, with Victoria S. Cacciatore of SACOG staff, Dan Klinker from Sacramento County DOT and representing the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council, Steven Winkler representing the City of Galt, and Kimberlie Hollingsworth representing South County Transit Link (SCT/Link).

Director Barbara Payne and Ms. Cacciatore provided an overview of SACOG and the unmet transit needs hearing process. Ms. Cacciatore answered audience questions about criteria for determining whether an unmet transit need was “reasonable to meet”. Three people not on the hearing panel attended the Unmet Transit Needs hearing; no public testimony was given; and three emails of correspondence were received.

Ms. Hollingsworth and Mr. Klinker described the existing SCT/Link transit services and answered questions about the services for Galt, Isleton, and unincorporated areas of Sacramento County. Ms. Hollingsworth clarified that passengers are encouraged to call in at least 24 hours in advance to reserve a ride on the Dial-a-Ride service in Galt, but that SCT/Link will work to accommodate later requests too. Mr. Klinker provided information on how to access destinations such as the Sacramento International Airport and the Sacramento Amtrak station by using SCT/Link to connect with other transit systems.

Director Barbara Payne opened the hearing to public comment. No formal public comment was submitted and

Mr. Winkler announced that SCT/Link would be receiving three new buses in the next three to six months. Mr. Winkler and Mr. Klinker also shared that City of Galt and Sacramento County are analyzing the potential value of a fueling station for the buses in Galt through a management analysis that will conclude next year.

Ms. Cacciatore provided a synopsis of the three emails of correspondence received. Mr. Klinker announced that SCT/Link will be updating their Short Range Transit Plan within a year and will conduct public hearings as part of the update.

Director Barbara Payne adjourned the meeting at 2:40PM.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

None.
CORRESPONDENCE

1. Delores Thornburg, Galt, CA

I am thrilled with the new Galt to Sacramento Express line. I've been hoping for just this thing for years and it has finally happened. It started with about 13 people and now we are up to a full bus load. It works with my work schedule perfectly. I catch it at 6:30 am and 4:45 pm. It’s a stress free ride not having to worry about traffic or accidents. It also runs mid-day which is great if you have to leave early or get sick during the day. The drivers are courteous and very concerned about passenger safety. As word of mouth travels, more and more people are riding. This route is the perfect route for working people with very few stops and pretty much a straight shot to where you need to go.

Delores Thornburg

2. Mary Ann Canning, Galt, CA

I want to tell you about the SCT/LINK buses. I have ridden this for about a year. The 99 express and the drivers have been very good to me. They have excellent service. The schedule is flexible and works for me to get to work and get home. I now am taking the new commuter bus system and this has been a god scent to me. The driver’s John and Skip are very good drivers and they take care of their passengers. They are very friendly and care about us as people. The need for this commuter bus is very high because we don’t have any option from any other bus system to have the comfort or the conveniences of one or two stop commute. It is so nice that they are the only bus system that has a mid-day pick-up in the noon hours for people who are sick or have doctors, dentist or business that they need to take care of in the afternoon. I use it to go to doctors and dentist appointment. I don’t drive to Sacramento that often. It has made my live very easy to commute to work in the Sacramento area. I would like to see the noon bus pickup being kept for the people who use it the most. I think it was a great idea, whoever can up with it to offer it to the people in Galt. I only wish that others would do the same. With the economy being what it is today and the price of gas, I look forward to using the Galt commuter bus as long as I would in Sacramento. I think your bus system is great and all the drivers that you have are great. You should give them praise for taking care of their commuters and tell them that we appreciate them for their kindness and safety.

Thank You, South County Transit
Mary Ann Canning

3. Mike Barnbaum, Sacramento, CA

Dear Stakeholder of Sacramento South County Transit Services:

I want to provide electronic testimony for the Unmet Transit Needs Hearing for Monday 15 October 2012. Due to the passing of my Grandmother on Wednesday 10 October 2012 and the corresponding funeral service on Sunday 14 October 2012, I will be unavailable to personally appear because I will be making Northbound Travel on the Amtrak San Joaquin Train back to
Sacramento the date of the meeting. In the meantime, I would like my testimony that will be provided before you today - Monday 15 October 2012 - to be read aloud to those in attendance so that everyone in the same room hears what my testimony and analysis is. Thank you very much for your understanding in this situation. Should you need to speak with me personally, I will be in attendance at the Davis Unmet Transit Needs Hearing on Wednesday the 17th of October, as well as the Elk Grove Unmet Transit Needs Hearing on Monday the 29th of October. You may also talk to me personally at the October 22nd Meeting of the Sacramento Regional Transit District board of Directors. Until then, let's get to the testimony at hand.

South County Transit Unmet Transit Needs for Highway 99 Service: Weeknight and Weekend Service

In September 2015, or there about, Sacramento Regional Transit is poised to hold the Grand Opening Event of the Blue Line Extension to Cosumnes River College. In September 2012, Regional Transit extended night service on the existing Blue Line to Meadowview of which the last weekday train leaves at 11:59 P.M. and the last Saturday train leaves at 11:44 P.M. heading all the way back to the Northern Terminus at Watt Avenue and Interstate 80 in the Sacramento County Unincorporated Community of North Highlands. Once the extension to Cosumnes River College occurs and is in revenue service, Regional Transit will need to demonstrate to the Federal Transit Administration - projected ridership numbers. This is where Transit Agencies like the South County Transit Highway 99 Service and Placer County Transit come into play a key role as their riders and RT Light Rail Riders become riders of the other’s transit system. This, however, cannot happen without each other agreeing and funding transit service hours into the evening and on weekends.

Currently, South County Transit does not operate on nights any night of the week as well as at any hour on weekends. This in and of itself is a major unmet transit need for the residents of the South County of Sacramento. Night and Weekend service would allow for Cosumnes River College Students the ability to both get to class and to get home on the South County Transit Highway 99 Service. Night service would also allow Amtrak San Joaquin Rail Corridor riders to connect to/from South County Transit at the Lodi Intermodal Station. There will be more to come on the San Joaquin Valley Rail Corridor due to the recent bill signing by Governor Brown on Saturday 29 September 2012 of AB 1779 (Galgianni) giving local and regional transit agencies along the corridor a greater say in what goes on - similar to the Capitol Corridor.

Weekend service (running at hourly headways like it does on weekdays) gives South County Transit Highway 99 Riders the ability to go shopping, get to medical appointments, visit friends and relatives, and creates independence without needing an automobile. Weekend service also benefits riders with disabilities who otherwise would feel like they are prisoners in their own homes.

I would propose for your consideration to resolve the above mentioned unmet transit needs and better prepare for the service hours of Blue Line to Cosumnes River College in September of 2015, that an additional four hours of weeknight service be made available such that the last buses end at Galt City Hall in each direction of service at 11:20 P.M. rather than the current 7:20 P.M. as it is today. My final thought would be regarding weekend service, and that would be to have a similar schedule for riders to access to on weekends like they would during the week.
mainly to keep the schedule simple and easy to understand and to make future light rail connections at Cosumnes River College here in the near future.

Mike Barnbaum
October 20, 2012 – 2:00 P.M.

The hearing was conducted by Barbara VaughanBechtold, SACOG staff, Tom Quigley of the Sacramento Regional Transit District, Kent Gary of the Folsom Stage Line and Janice LaBrado of Paratransit, Inc. also representing the Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council.

Ms. VaughanBechtold provided an overview of SACOG and the unmet transit needs hearing process. Ms. Covington, Mr. Gary and Ms. LaBrado gave brief overviews of their transit service and upcoming changes. One person testified at the hearing (an additional comment given regarding RT service at the Yolo County hearing has been included as well); and eight pieces of correspondence were received. All Unmet Transit Needs comments are listed below.

Ms. VaughanBechtold opened the hearing to public comment.

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

1. Leoma Lee, Sacramento, CA

Ms. Lee said that she has frequently has to wait over an hour to board the route 51 during the first two weeks of the month because of overloads (Ms. Lee uses an electric scooter) of disabled riders who use wheelchairs and non-folding walkers. She believes with the increase in the aging and disabled populations that there should be more wheelchair spaces available. The route 30 also has similar access problems. Ms. Lee says she has to leave at least two hours early whether she rides the 51 or Paratransit, Inc. because of the shared rides being inefficient.

2. Mike Barnbaum, Sacramento, CA

Mr. Barnbaum stated that the Land Park community in Sacramento doesn’t have adequate weekend service as the RT route 62 only runs on Saturday and there is no east/west service. He said that the RT route #6 should be considered for Sunday service as it serves a large number of regional destinations, and the route 61 should run on weekends (Saturday and Sunday).

Mr. Barnbaum also said that the two Sacramento Social Security Offices (College Greens/Marconi and Folsom Blvd.) need to be better served. Especially the office on Folsom Blvd. as it is the only office where new/replacement Social Security cards are issued.
CORRESPONDENCE

1. Patricia Valdez, Sacramento, CA

I cannot believe we had to wait until the 21st century to even be asked about our unmet transit needs. I still don't understand why light rail wasn't extended to the City of Folsom as it was originally designed to do. However, you certainly can't justify it now. With regard to present day issues, I've lived most of my life in Sacramento and have not had the luxury of being able to take a bus to my graveyard shift work at any time in my working career. I'm retirement age now and looking at not wanting to maintain a vehicle any longer, but that doesn't even seem to be an option in the capitol city.

I am humiliated when friends from other cities or countries come here and ask why our public transportation is so backward. And when I relate the facts of our light rail debacle (building one rail in order to blackmail the city to pay) they just think I'm exaggerating. I went to a Regional Transit community meeting one night in the 90's and had to get a ride home from the Mayor because while the last bus ran in time to get to the meeting there were no more buses to get home. I did notice the bored looks on the faces of the R.T. representatives in their three piece suits and Italian shoes, as they listened to the complaints of residents.

There are cities with greater populations than ours but our city is so spread out I simply don't understand why we are so far behind. I think it's shameful that the capitol city of a state with an economy larger than a lot of countries in the world doesn't provide public transportation after 9:30 p.m. California wants to address ecology and global warming yet it does not want to serve third shift workers probably the lowest paid and neediest segment of the population. Some of my more paranoid friends believe it's designed that way on purpose to keep "the people" oppressed and continue to fill the coffers of the Motor Vehicles Department. When I was young I thought the city [of Sacramento] hired city planners right out of college to save money and they just didn't know better. But now, I have to ask just what are you people thinking?

I only want to work part-time and if there is a job available in Elk Grove or some outlying area I can't take it because I cannot comfortably commit to being there on time or at all if I take a bus. We've seen car-pools and larger companies sending shuttles but that just underscores why no companies can base their offices here because the expense and reliability is compromised by our provincial attitude toward transportation. Even one of the better ideas that have come about like paratransit is being threatened by rating the disabled and not being available and on time. I've spoken to people who have had heat exhaustion waiting for the paratransit to pick them up at the assigned point. It's always seemed ironic to me that we have a space program that can send men to other planets but we can't get buses to get to work on time. I wonder about the Chamber of Commerce involving themselves in politics but not local transportation.

I was called to San Francisco once on an emergency, and I spent more time waiting for a bus to downtown to catch a Greyhound than I spent on the Greyhound that took me to San Francisco. And while I'm grateful to see we're getting light rail to the airport, I have to tell you I lost a minimum wage job at the airport because I couldn't get out of the airport for less than $7.00. That was in the prosperous '80's.
You ask for specific routes and lines to be addressed. I'm a little confused about that. The city has a twenty-year plan of development and it knows where the population is going to grow, that should tell you where the routes need to be. Why are you asking us, one more time, to do the work for you? You have the statistics at hand you are supposed to have a plan. Perhaps you should not develop areas that you are not prepared to service. As we come to terms with our dependence on oil, I hope we can depend on city and regional leaders to come down from their ivory towers and become aware of our needs so that we don't have to beg plead and demonstrate for what should be intelligently provided for us. And most specifically for me, a bus system that runs at least until midnight and begins about 4:00 a.m. so that I can work.

2. Peter Jordan, Long Beach/Folsom, CA

I was wondering if perhaps in near future there might be plans to offer later service to Iron Point for those of us who are "remote workers" for Intel flying into Sacramento International Airport on Sunday afternoon and evenings, then using Regional Transit to get to Folsom to work during the week and flying home on Friday evenings?

When flying into SMF we then ride the 42A/B Yolobus to get downtown to the 8th & O light rail station hoping to catch Gold Line before the last train East at 8:59 PM which gets to the end-of-the-line on Sundays at Sunrise at 9:39pm

As it is now we must pay a $30 cab rides from Sunrise to the Natoma Station area where many of us are living during the week in close proximity to Intel. It is most unfortunate that we are discriminated against when compared with the other Monday-Friday workers commuting on weekdays who are afforded expanded service to Historic Folsom, versus those of us who commute on Sundays.

Later service on Sundays out to Iron Point later than the last train at 6:29 PM from 8th & O would afford us a few more hours at home with family on weekends rather than having to fly closer to noon on Sundays in order to avoid a cab ride from Sunrise station.

Thank you,
Peter M. Jordan

3. Melvina Esqueda, Sacramento, CA

Ms. Esqueda stated that the bus routes that were changed in the Del Paso Heights area have caused her problems getting around to where she has to go. Especially to her doctor at Norwood and Harris. She cannot walk far due to health problems.

The buses are more crowded than ever at least 2/3rds of the time.

She also frequently uses a pull cart when she goes grocery shopping and many times has not been able to get on the bus for up to three rounds.
Also we need more bus benches in this area for those who are elderly or disabled. Good locations would be at Grand & Elm, Grand & Norwood, and Arcade & Marysville.

Thank you.

4. Andy, Sacramento, CA

When calling RT for trip planning/route questions the question about inbound/outbound should be deleted because the bus stops are numbered so the system should know if the route is inbound or outbound.

RT riders should be allowed on buses where the destination is the RT garage downtown, which would result in more fares for RT and less "dead heading".

5. Jose Ramos, Sacramento, CA

To whom this may concern,

I have been a regular public transit rider for that past 14 years. I started taking buses (61, 62, 67, 68, 30, 31, 81, 82, 87 and others less frequently). Then once the Meadowview bound train came into existence, I began to take the light rail system. Up until a couple of months ago, I felt comfortable with the services. However, recently I have run into a serious health problem for not just me, but all public transportation riders in the Sacramento area. Many individuals are not respecting the non-smoking signs posted at stations, under the weather roofs, but more importantly they are not respecting them in the light rail trains themselves. This is a closed environment, where many children are exposed to the dangers of second hand smoke. Children, who by the way, have not fully developed their lungs. Everyone on the train, including myself become at risk for increased Coronary Artery Disease (CAD). Not only that, but people with pre-existing heart conditions are at an increased risk of early mortality. My intention is not to scare who ever reads this, rather enlighten them on the severity of this matter. I have personally had to restrain myself at times from getting into an altercation with those individuals who smoke on the train. Not only that, I feel that many people are scared to stand up in the chance that they get attacked by these smokers.

I would like to share with you a situation I ran into about 2 months ago. I got off the Meadowview bound train, to be able to transfer to the Sunrise at 16th street. Right before I boarded the Sunrise train I noticed a man who had been smoking his cigarette outside. I tried to avoid him outdoors, but we were getting on the same train heading east bound. I kept a watchful eye to make sure he put out his cigarette before he boarded the train. To my surprise he did not. I then continued to monitor the situation on our way to the next stop. I smelled and saw that his cigarette was still lit. So I walked over to him and asked him very politely, "Sir can you please put out your cigarette?" He then looked at me and told me it was out. I told him "No it is not sir I can see and smell the smoke still coming from that cigarette." He then turned to me while seated and said "Get out of here fool, I didn't do anything to you, leave me alone." I then replied "Sir please have some respect for the other passengers on this train." He then turned to face forward and ignore me. I told him "Sir you see those signs posted in this train, they say NO SMOKING."
He continued to ignore me and there was no security or light rail personnel on the train, so out of frustration and restraint I jumped out of that train car and hopped onto the next one. Unfortunately leaving those people in that train car to continue his second hand smoke. This is just one example that has many good paying transit commuters, choosing alternative modes of transportation. In fact, a lot of smokers I see, don't even pay for a light rail ticket. They just look out for personnel and try to avoid them.

Looking back there was probably one more thing I could have done. I could have reported this to the light rail conductor. This most certainly would have caused a chain reaction that ultimately delayed the train and having others angry with me. There must be another efficient way to handle this situation.

It is no secret that this is becoming more of a prevalent problem in your trains. It is very convenient for me to take public transportation and I feel it helps financially, environmentally (one less vehicle causing pollution), and health by walking (well at least up until now). I don't believe in sacrificing one health component to improve another. I would appreciate a response to this matter or direction to an appropriate point of contact. As well as any advice you may have regarding these individuals who are harming others.

Thank You,
Jose Ramos

6. Steven Franklin, Carmen Meeks, Brett Daly and Natalie Kramer, Art Institute of CA, Sacramento, CA

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a staff member of The Art Institute of California – Sacramento, a campus of Argosy University. I understand that you are seeking recommendations for transit improvements, and I would like to provide input regarding public transportation needs in Natomas.

A comprehensive group of colleges in Natomas is working with North and South Natomas Transportation Management Associations to gain a better knowledge of what transit services are needed for college students in Natomas. In many cases, we have no transit which often makes it virtually impossible to recruit students, and then once recruited; retention rates are poor amongst transit-needy students once they realize that no public transportation option is available. Here is what is needed:

-Students that can access Natomas colleges by frequent, safe, logical public transportation from 6am to 10:30pm, Monday – Friday.
-Bus stops that are closer to college locations – this helps the perception of safety at night and early mornings when it is dark
-Bus access on the west side of Interstate 5
-Discounted sales of monthly passes.
The following colleges eagerly await your attention to their needs: University of Phoenix, The Art Institute of California - Sacramento, Universal Technical Institute, American River College, International Academy of Design and Technology and Le Cordon Bleu. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or the North and South Natomas TMAs.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on unmet transit needs.

7. Michelle Bell, Orangevale, CA

Hello: My name is Michelle Bell I live in Orangevale, but work in Folsom. I was wondering if this route can start early then 8:06 AM? I live by the stop of Kenneth & Greenback and if there was a stop an hour early that would work out for me. I work the hours of 8:00-5:00 PM so I miss this whole route. If this route can start any early that would be great.

Thank You,
Michelle Bell

8. Anonymous, Sacramento, CA

To whom it may concern,

I used to take bus 22 to Whole Foods in Sacramento. The eastern half of bus 22 was canceled two months ago. Bus 22 used to stop in front of Whole Foods. A couple of days ago I shopped at Whole Foods and walked 1.1 miles to El Camino to catch a bus from there. After walking for a few minutes, I started feeling a lot of pain in my back and neck from carrying heavy packages. I walked down Eastern Ave., which doesn't have a sidewalk, and which has very few street lights. I struggled to get past a house which has an unleashed dog, which didn't want me to walk by. Then I (barely) saw a dead squirrel. I had almost stepped on it and could have tripped over it. Then there was a car crash to the east of the area where I was waiting for a bus on El Camino. I walked past the crash to get to the next stop: I was concerned that the 23 bus might drive around the crash and not stop where I was waiting.

Also, a bus rider who knows a lot about what's going on behind the scenes, told me that the rich people who live in nice houses on the eastern end of Arden Way, have been trying for years to get the eastern half of route 22 canceled, because they don't like the sound of buses during the day. I asked a driver about that, and he said that it's true.

There other people who used to take bus 22 to shop at Whole Foods. On the last day of the eastern half of bus 22, I talked to a bagger who works at Bel Air who needs a bus to get to work. I talked to a man who was assisting a blind man on bus 22: they need bus 22. I heard about an 87 year old man who needed bus 22 to get everywhere. He had to move so that he would be close to a bus stop. I talked to a man who said that bus 22 was the only way he could get to a nursing home to visit his mother. I talked to a woman who needed bus 22 to get to her doctor's appointments. I talked to a Sac State student who lives near Arden & Eastern with his parents. I talked to people who worked near Arden & Eastern who had to quit their jobs. How about bringing bus 22 back to Arden Way? I would like a response.
We, the undersigned, are residents of Seasons at Laguna Ridge Senior Apartments who wish to petition the City of Elk Grove to extend a bus line that stops at our community. When the community was built, the city installed a bus stop at our location, but has yet to run a line to this stop.

A stop at this location would greatly improve the mobility of the residents and give us more freedom to get to local shopping and to medical appointments. We greatly appreciate you taking the time to review our request.
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Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Unmet Transit Needs
1415 L Street, #300
Sacramento, CA 958114

Unmet Transit Needs Team,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on SACOG's Unmet Transit Needs analysis. We understand that you are seeking recommendations for transit improvements and we are happy to provide our comments regarding public transportation needs in Natomas.

The North and South Natomas Transportation Management Associations are working with a comprehensive group of colleges in Natomas to gain a better knowledge of what transit services are needed for college students in Natomas. In many cases, we have no transit which often makes it virtually impossible to recruit students, and then once recruited; retention rates are poor amongst transit-needy students once they realize that no public transportation option is available. What do we need?

- Students that can access Natomas colleges by frequent, safe, logical public transportation from 6am to 10:30pm, Monday – Friday
- Bus stops that are closer to college locations – this helps the perception of safety at night and early mornings when it is dark
- Bus access on the west side of Interstate 5
- Discounted sales of monthly passes

The following colleges eagerly await your attention to their needs: University of Phoenix, Art Institute, Universal Technical Institute, American River College, International Academy of Design and Technology and Le Cordon Bleu. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to use our phone numbers provided below.

Sincerely,

Jason Vitaich  
Executive Director  
South Natomas TMA

Becky Heleck  
Executive Director  
North Natomas TMA
TRANSIT NEEDS PUBLIC HEARING/LIFELINE TRANASIT WORKSHOP IN YOLO COUNTY, INCLUDING THE CITIES OF DAVIS, WEST SACRAMENTO, WINTERS AND WOODLAND
MINUTES

October 17, 2012 – 6:00 P.M.
DAVIS COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Conducted by Don Saylor of the SACOG Board; Barbara VaughanBechtold, SACOG staff; Terry Bassett representing the Yolo County Transportation District; Anthony Palmere of Unitrans, Linda Alemania and James Haven of Davis Community Transit; and Mr. David Soto of the Area 4 Agency on Aging and Charlotte Dorsey representing the Yolo County Social Service Transportation Advisory Council.

Six people testified at the hearing. Seven items of correspondence were received. Ms. VaughanBechtold described the unmet transit needs process.

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

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

The Yolo County transit operators’ representatives gave brief descriptions of the services that they offer.

Mr. Saylor opened the public hearing.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC TESTIMONY

1. Mike Barnbaum, Sacramento, CA

Mr. Barnbaum informed the group about the expansion of Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) service hours in September, and mentioned that no additional connecting service in West Sacramento or downtown Sacramento (Yolobus routes 42 A/B) was added. Mr. Barnbaum would like to see later evening hours on Yolobus services that connect to RT, as well as reinstatement of weekend service on Yolobus route 51, and more frequent service (every ½ hour) on the Yolobus #42 A/B during the peak hours when passenger loads are heaviest.
2. William Lowell, West Sacramento, CA

Mr. Lowell commented that the Yolobus route 42 going from West Sacramento to Davis to Woodland was frequently late and caused missed connections to other routes. He thinks that some route 45 Express buses should be re-routed through Davis and West Sacramento to pick up the slack on the route 42. Mr. Lowell would also like the Yolobus route 240 to make timely connections with the route 35.

3. Beckie Challender, Woodland, CA

Ms. Challender lives in Woodland and works in Davis, near 5th and G Streets. She frequently rides the Yolobus route 42 and finds that a lot of the riders are UCD students (international students) or employees, and students at the Sacramento City College Davis campus. Ms. Challender finds that the morning and afternoon (peak period) 42 A buses are almost always overcrowded, with full bike racks, and are frequently late. She would like to see increased frequency, every 30 minutes, during the “peak” travel times on the 42 A/B. Ms. Challender said that she thinks the Yolobus drivers are fantastic and she finds the AVL (automatic vehicle location) information very helpful.

4. Karen Cebra, Davis, CA

Ms. Cebra said she supported what the previous speakers had said. She had some questions related to the relationship of the Unmet Transit Needs hearing relation to the City of Davis General Plan Transportation Element, and safety rules for bus passenger loads that were answered after the public hearing was over.

Ms. Cebra stated that she felt that since Unitrans isn’t overseen by the City and the schedules are all set to the UCD academic schedule that the non-student residents of the City of Davis are not well served by the system. She said that with the Unitrans bus schedules changing throughout the year going from ½ hour service during the school year to one-hour service May-September (summer) as well as different schedules during holiday breaks made the service very difficult for non-students to use (even with schedule changes being laid out in the schedules available on the buses and online). Ms. Cebra commented that Unitrans needs to be set-up to be convenient for the entire community not just UCD students.

She also said there was an issue with the Unitrans route L North East Davis loops coming back into downtown Davis that a rider catching it in that area has to do the whole North loop before being able to get back into downtown Davis, which takes so long that it is often more practical to walk than to take the route L into downtown Davis.

5. Joyce Miller, West Sacramento, CA

Ms. Miller commented that she has to walk approximately 5 blocks to the nearest bus stop for the 42 B. She also uses the Yolobus Special to get to medical appointments. She finds it difficult to get to Sacramento to shop. Ms. Miller would like to see more outreach for the Unmet Transit
Needs hearings. She also asked if there was anyone on the YCTD Board who must use transit/is transit dependent. She has noticed the service changes that have included new service to the Social Security Office, West Sacramento High School and IKEA/Wal-Mart.

6. Jim Brewer, West Sacramento, CA

Mr. Brewer asked what the best method was to get senior transportation issues before local agencies that provide and plan for public transit and other transportation projects (group attendance at meetings, petitions, etc.). Mr. Brewer’s question was addressed after the official public hearing portion of the meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE

1. Tamra L. Barker, Davis, CA

Ms. Barker submitted the following comments:

Dear Council,

I am a disabled veteran, and I travel in and out of the Sacramento airport approximately four times a month. I use the Yolobus to travel from/to my home in Davis to/from the Sacramento airport.

The Yolobus stop at the Sacramento airport, at the NEW terminal B, appears too suffered from sheer ignorance and avoidance of Yolobus travelers in the design of the Yolobus passenger waiting and boarding area at the new terminal.

1. There is NO overhang for Yolobus travelers, requiring all Yolobus travelers to stand in the rain while waiting and boarding the Yolobus.
2. There is NO down-lighting at the fixtures above the Yolobus stop, creating a potentially adverse safety situation.

Airport travelers who generate airport revenue by renting cars are provided with a well-lighted environment-protective-overhang at the rental car facility shuttle bus stop.

I would be happy to meet with any SACOG representative at the Yolobus stop at the Sacramento airport to point out the poor designs at this new terminal that adversely impact the airport travel experience for Yolobus passengers.

Respectfully,

Tamra L. Barker
Davis, CA

I have another HUGE complaint as it relates specifically to transit service.
Hourly service to/from the airport is insufficient, especially when the buses encounter other traffic delays on their routes.

The 42B service from the airport to Davis is particularly problematic. I relate two specific recent occurrences:

1. Approximately 4 wks. ago on a Friday afternoon, a 42B left Terminal B at approximately 1:20 PM, 5 minutes earlier than the schedule of 1:25 PM. I immediately called Yolobus, was told that this was the bus that was 55 minutes behind schedule, that was to have departed the airport at 12:25 PM, and that it did not have time to wait another 5 minutes to resume the schedule of the 1:25 PM. I was told to wait for the 1:25 PM bus. The 1:25 bus arrived at approximately 1:55 PM. I got on. At the Yolo Fair Mall transit bus stop, the bus driver told me to get off the bus, he had to go to lunch, and he was not going on to Davis. Because he was behind schedule, the regular bus had already departed the Yolo Fair Mall transit bus stop, and I enjoyed the opportunity of sitting out in the hot sun for 45 minutes for the next bus to Davis. I called the Yolobus office several times, requested them to send a driver out to drive the bus to Davis, enjoyed being hung up on by Yolobus staff. The bus driver even threatened to call the police if I refused to get off the bus. It was 100 degrees outside. The bus driver insisted I get off. He was not willing to have me wait inside the air conditioned bus. When I finally got off, he jerked his arm up in an "f---" you gesture.

Two weeks ago, the 1:25 PM 42B bus was also running late (Airport to Woodland to Davis). I called Yolobus, asked if when it eventually arrived, if it would be in time to make the connection at the Yolo Fair Mall transit bus stop. The person told me no. Rather than be dumped AGAIN at the Yolo Fair mall bus stop for the next bus, I paid $24 for Super Shuttle to take me home.

Two suggestions:
Double frequency of 42B and 42A service.
Guarantee that passengers are able to complete their itineraries at any point in the loop
NEVER again pick up a passenger at the airport who's going to Davis, and dump them off at the Yolobus mall where there are ZERO other transit options, and invite them to sit in the hot sun for an hour for the next bus.

Tamra L. Barker, MD
Disabled Veteran

2. Anonymous, Woodland, CA

Anonymous submitted the following comment:

Buses coming from Davis (the route 42) are frequently 20+ minutes late and miss connections with local Woodland routes 210/211, which is particularly problematic when these connections are missed on the last buses of the night and forces riders to walk excessive distances in the dark.
Shauna Manner, Portland, OR/Sacramento, CA

Ms. Manner submitted the following comment:

I am a regular transit rider in Portland Oregon but not in Sacramento because of safety, cost, schedule, and limitations on where transit goes. I do ride the Yolo Bus between the Sacramento airport and downtown Sacramento each week, but find it disappointing that the bus only runs once an hour. If a flight is timed such that your arrival narrowly misses the bus, it is a long time to wait before the next one comes. More frequent service to the airport would be expected for any city serious about providing public transit as an option. As a side note, a bench and shelter from the weather at the new terminal might make the long wait a little more tolerable; the overhang that provides cover from the rain ends where the waiting area for the public bus begins.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.
Shauna Manner

Rebecca Challender, Woodland, CA

I had heard that at a recent Yolobus council meeting, it was suggested that the 42 A and B routes might benefit from adding buses every half hour. When I emailed them to ask about it, they said it was a good idea but there were funding issues that would prohibit this.

This is the Yolo route that makes a circuit from downtown Sacramento through West Sac, Davis, Woodland and the airport. It serves a lot of people and improvements could be adjusted to serve the public even more.

1. The 42A invariably runs late due to traffic and needier riders in Sac and West Sac. This becomes a major problem when the 42A reaches Woodland and most times many people cannot make their connecting ride. This means a wait of one hour for those riders, creating even more disruption in their lives. I have seen many regular riders give up and purchase cars rather than continue to have this big chunk of time taken out of their day five times a week. Missing the 215 to Esparto and Cache Creek, for example, leaves you no options to get home, especially because there is a large gap in service in the early evening. Most times, the other buses leave County Fair Mall and do not wait for the 30 seconds or so it would take for the 42 to arrive.

2. The routes service 2 colleges and the buses are usually standing room only by the time they leave Davis for Woodland. Going the opposite way, the 8 am bus from Woodland to Davis usually has people standing from the back all the way to the driver. And they are packed in, not loosely.

3. Many of the riders on these routes are students and students have bicycles. With only three bike spots on each rack, riders have had to wait one hour for the next bus, race to the next stop to see if someone with a bike gets out and leaves space on the bike rack, or lock up their bike and leave it at the bus stop. Not an ideal situation. This happens quite a lot.

Most of these problems could be resolved by adding buses on the half hour, at least in the
morning and 3:30 pm on. I strongly urge you to consider this option. I am willing to answer questions you may have regarding this issue.

Thank you-
Rebecca Challender

5. Christine Green, Davis, CA

Ms. Green submitted the following comment:

We need a direct connection (bus) from Woodland to the Amtrak station in Davis.

6. Ira Bray, Davis, CA

Mr. Bray submitted the following comment:

Yolobus should work to establish a smartphone enabled bus locator system. Their present Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) system only works in a web browser and is very difficult to use on a mobile phone. It would be very helpful if both Unitrans and Yolobus could use the same smartphone app. The Unitrans NextBus system works very well from my experience.

With the increasing and very pervasive use of smartphones this improvement in service would have a very direct benefit to a large number of riders and is the most efficient way to provide service information.

Thank you.

Ira Bray
Davis, CA

7. Nancy Dyson, Davis, CA

Ms. Dyson submitted the following comments:

My 80 year old husband and I, his 71 year old wife, are well served by your transit offerings.

We live in Davis; my husband walks to town and catches one of the many busses home. On the weekends they come at hourly intervals; weekdays at half hourly. Both are fine and just require planning.

I use a cane so ride the paratransit bus for appointments at Kaiser/Morse Avenue. The service has worked just fine.

On the paratransit we can encounter delays, but that is to be expected when picking people up from appointments which may not run to the transit schedule. Our experience with the drivers is
that they are helpful and patient. I have also noticed that they are alert and evade erratic drivers, thereby avoiding accidents.

All in all we are very pleased with the service.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Nancy Dyson
Davis, CA
October 24, 2012 – 2:00 P.M.

The hearing was conducted by Mary Jane Griego, representing the SACOG Board of Directors, with Christine O’Rourke of SACOG staff, Claudia Hollis and Jane Stan of the Joint Yuba-Sutter Social Service Transportation Advisory Council, and Keith Martin of Yuba-Sutter Transit.

Director Griego and Ms. O’Rourke provided an overview of SACOG and the unmet transit needs hearing process. Thirteen people not on the hearing panel attended the Unmet Transit Needs hearing. Seven people testified at the hearing; correspondence was received from five individuals.

Director Griego opened the hearing for public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Rachel Teague, Marysville, CA

Ms. Teague requested half hour headways on Route 6 to allow for more convenient transfers.

2. Rick Trask, Marysville, CA

Mr. Trask, a student at Yuba College – Sutter campus, complimented Mr. Martin on his informative overview of Yuba-Sutter Transit service. He stated he is dependent on transit to get to classes at the new Sutter campus. He often takes his bike on the bus in order to bike from the bus stop to the campus, but feels there are safety issues on the roads connecting with the bus stop and campus. He would like to see a new bus stop at the Sutter campus and wonders if there can be some data collection that would justify the new stop based on student demand. He appreciates the bicycle accessibility on Yuba-Sutter Transit but stated he has seen people get left behind because there are not enough bike positions on buses. He requested that all buses have three bike positions.

Keith Martin of Yuba-Sutter Transit replied that all fixed route buses have three bike positions and demand response vehicles have two bike positions.

3. Barbara Forkey, Marysville, CA (on behalf of Brian Jukes, Yuba College)

Ms. Forkey, Outreach/Recruitment Specialist at Yuba College, read verbatim a letter submitted to SACOG by Brian Jukes, Interim Executive Dean-Sutter County Campus. Mr. Jukes’ letter is included below as Correspondence #1. In addition, Ms. Forkey stated that most students attending the Sutter campus live in four zip codes: 95953 – 130 students, 95901 – 157 students, 95993 – 542 students, and 95991 – 584 students. These four zip codes account for 1,413 students out of a total student body of 1,713 students. Ms. Forkey stated that starting this spring the Sutter
campus will offer late afternoon and evening classes on Mondays and Wednesdays. She recommended adding bus service to the Sutter campus, and stated that many students had to drop classes at the Sutter campus because they had no way to get there.

4. Rebecca Foss, Yuba City, CA

Ms. Foss, representing the REACH Coalition, provided the hearing panel with a handout of comments solicited from youth. Ms. Foss made the following comments:

   a. Requested more Live Oak/Wheatland routes
   b. Route 4A is unreliable
   c. Service on certain routes should run later into the evening, especially to locations that youth frequent. To start, late night service could be provided only on certain days and certain routes.
   d. Many people do not know about the Dial-a-Ride service or how to use it.
   e. Bus service should serve low-income areas and areas with high concentrations of seniors because those people often do not have other transportation options.
   f. There needs to be a bus to the Sutter campus. It would be utilized by students. Ms. Foss stated that her brother decided not to attend the Sutter campus because there is no transit service.
   g. Driver smoke breaks, and smoking at bus stations in general, set a bad example for youth. Smoking should not be allowed at stops.

5. Zorna Porter, Plumas Lake, CA

Ms. Porter stated that she has seen bus stop infrastructure around Plumas Lake that does not seem to be utilized. She requested bus service to the Plumas Lake area that would connect with Yuba City/Marysville/McGowan.

6. Nancy Aaberg, Yuba City, CA

Ms. Aaberg, Superintendent – Yuba City Unified, stated that high school students at Yuba City Unified schools, mainly living in zip codes 95991 and 95993, participate in co-enrollment opportunities with Yuba College. The Sutter campus is much closer and more convenient for students. She requested a bus stop at the new Sutter campus and stated that a Blue Sky grant (Pacific Power) could be pursued to fund the service.

7. Mary Jane Griego, Olivehurst, CA

Ms. Griego requested bus service to Olivehurst that would loop to Yuba City/Marysville.
CORRESPONDENCE

1. Brian Jukes, Marysville, CA

To whom it may concern:

Unfortunately, because I am required to meet with a College Accreditation Team next Wednesday during a site visit, I will not be able to attend the Unmet Transit Needs Hearing on October 24th in Marysville, California. I am distressed at missing this very important meeting because I am very concerned that the needs of those seeking transit to the Yuba College Sutter County Center will not be heard. I have, therefore, asked Barbara Forkey, our Yuba College Outreach Specialist, to represent us at the October 24th meeting.

Attached is a document that I’ve asked Ms. Forkey to present at that meeting, but I wanted to give it to you ahead of time. It is data I’ve been able to collect over the last few months to demonstrate the need for public transportation to the Yuba College Sutter County Center, currently operating 8 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. on Tuesdays and Thursdays and 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. The Center will be operational in the spring from 8 a.m. to 9 p.m. on Mondays and Wednesday and will be open from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays. We expect enrollment to increase significantly.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns. And I apologize for missing this very important meeting. It is one I definitely did not want to miss.

Sincerely,
Brian Jukes

2. James Seif

We are in great need of a highway around Marysville to relieve the congestion in downtown Marysville.

3. Calvin Hale, Yuba City, CA

Hello, my name is Calvin Hale and I am a Yuba College student and a Staff writer on the Yuba College Newspaper, the Prospector. I have two questions regarding the current bus situation for the Sutter county campus.

Q#1. When can Yuba College Students expect a bus route that will take them to the Sutter County campus?

currently the bus gets students about 1.3 miles away from the Sutter county campus

Q#2. What can the students do to help this process of getting a bus route that will drop students off closer to the campus?

Q#3. How will I know if my questions are being addressed if I cannot attend the Hearing?
4. Christine Michelson, Yuba City, CA

I love riding the bus whenever possible so that I may be able to avoid driving in the traffic. Here are some of my ideas

* A weekend transit bus that will make two trips on Saturday to the Roseville Galleria Mall for weekend shoppers that don’t want to drive. A bus could drop them off at 10AM and pick up at 4PM. Perfect for the Holiday shopping season.

* Express bus routes for those going to Yuba College, Yuba City or Marysville campus. Many times you’re riding the bus for almost an hour to get from Yuba City to Marysville campus.

* Have a few buses on Sundays even if the bus only runs for a few hours.

Thank you
Christine Michelson

5. Carmel Garcia, Olivehurst, CA

Good afternoon,

In determining unmet transit needs in Yuba County, please consider the following:

- Adding an additional stop or 2 on Olivehurst Ave., in Olivehurst, CA, heading south after 9th St. As a disabled person who lives a few blocks away from Olivehurst Ave., dial-a-ride is not always available on a daily basis as needed thus having to take public transportation as an alternative; the closest bus stops are 3 to 4 blocks away, quite challenging for a person with disabilities. In climacteric weather it is worse.

- Linking Arboga and Plumas Lake to the transit line would be most helpful in helping to eliminate people and children from walking on the railroad tracks, thus preventing deaths. This would also link the communities and spark bigger ridership.

- Adding a stop to Food Maxx in Linda, CA on the 4B route would be real helpful to people with disabilities who choose not to shop at Wal-Mart.

- I would like to see additional buses on the 4A and 4B route, running every 1/2 [hour], consistent with the other routes, I find these buses exceedingly full at times as they only run every hr. and it makes for a longer day in transit, missed connections to other routes, and of recent, for someone who has lots of doctors’ appointments in Sutter Co. I have to leave the city by 4:30p. to make my connections to Olivehurst; if I miss my connections, I'm subject to dial-a-ride and there availability to get me home. Recently this happened, and I got stuck in the wrong part of Linda you don't want to be in the dark, I missed the last 6p., route #3 bus heading south by 1 min., he
didn't see me apparently, heading towards the bus stop waving my arms, thus subject to calling dial-a-ride, the dispatcher then got the information wrong, and I waited nearly 45 mins. after a 6:45pm pick-up time, and then the bus driver was given the wrong information. Seeing the bus across a busy street, impossible to get his attention in the dark. I had to wait for him to turn around, which I hoped he would do and he did, thus in the dark hobbling, I nearly had to jump in front of the bus to get the driver's attention as he was still looking in the other direction for the passenger at the address given by the dispatcher.

-Route #3 bus driver, Ernie could be nicer to the disabled, by lowering the lift. Some of us don't always have an attendant with us, especially when the old buses are in use; the stairs are too narrow for assisted devices.

-Please strongly consider adding an additional route on Powerline Rd., in Olivehurst, stops along Powerline Rd. could be at the Jr. high, Opud, the Calvary Church shopping center, VFW bldg., and then crossing back over to Olivehurst Ave. to continue onto reg. route or turn right from Powerline Rd. over the overpass then left onto Lindhurst Ave.,(?!) heading north, along the freeway on the east side of Hwy 70, connecting with the route #6 bus, Edgewood, then continuing on to the Wal-Mart transfer station, you could get the Food Maxx stop in on this additional route. Just something to consider. I see many walking on these roads, they could be potential customers.

-In Sutter Co., a public transit stop at the Social Security office on Percy Ave., in Yuba City, CA would be nice. There is no guarantee of getting a dial-a-ride in the morning unless you are booked 2 weeks in advance, again being disabled, and walking long distances is quite often a challenge. The closest bus stop to the Social Security bldg. is about 4 blocks away, on Plumas Blvd. the No. 2 route.

All in all, I really enjoy the transit system and I encourage all to use. My last comment would be that I pray that all bus drivers continue to be compassionate towards the disabled and that they also encourage All riders to do the same. So many times I have seen young or healthy adults take the front seats while, I, myself and other disabled people are forced to seat in the back, just because we are not in a wheel chair does not mean we don't have physical disabilities that we struggle with. The driver seeing the disabled card alone should make sure the disabled party is seated properly.

Thank you for allowing the input.

Sincerely,
Carmel Garcia
Unmet Transit Needs Report: Sutter County Center

In a survey conducted at the end of September of approximately 400 current students at the Sutter County Center, just over 50% of them indicated that they would use a bus service if it were available.

If there were bus service to the Sutter County Center, would you use it?

- Yes; 183
- No; 180

The need for bus service among our current student body is actually greater than expected. We are, of course, surveying the wrong group. Obviously, our current students have some other means of transportation, albeit walking is that mode of transportation for many, or they wouldn’t be here. Yet over half of them say that they would use the bus if it were available. Imagine the hundreds of other potential students who are not attending the Sutter County Center because there is no bus service. These would use the bus to take classes at the new campus, but we cannot survey them.

A Yuba-Sutter Transit sponsored survey of Sutter County high school students, of Yuba College students currently using the transit system to attend the Marysville campus, and of other potential students would yield a much better picture of how highly valuable this service would be. We would likely see a very significant number of potential students who are interested, but who are prevented from attending classes at the Sutter County Center because there is no bus service. These would be new, additional customers for the Yuba-Sutter Transit.

When we conducted a similar survey on September 7th, among more than 50 Sutter County High School counselors and administrators from several different public and charter schools, 99% of them indicated that if there were bus service to the Sutter County Center, their students would benefit.
Unmet Transit Needs Report: Sutter County Center

If there were bus service to the Sutter County Center, would your students use it?

Among our current students, the most common general comment made at the end of our survey was about the lack of a transit support system. Here only a few of their comments:

1. I walk all of E. Onstott and it is **dangerous** from Pease Rd. to Campus. Please check into that!! Should have been taken care of during the building of Campus as well as a bus route.
2. I would like to get a bus to this campus soon.
3. There really needs to be a bus route that goes to this campus.
4. The bus service is a **huge** issue.
5. I had no idea there would not be Public Transportation available. I am dependent p/t upon a bicycle. I have found being a bicyclist or pedestrian very dangerous traveling Live Oak Blvd, parts of Pease, as well as the frontage Rd. The bend especially. As the seasons change, the conditions will get worse. Dial a ride is extremely unreliable as well as expensive.
6. We need busses.
7. It is very important that students have a way to get to their classes and achieve their goals.
8. We need a bus!!
9. I have a car BUT there are plenty of students who aren’t as fortunate as I am to have a car and a bus stop at the Sutter Campus would enable many more people to attend this campus.
10. We need a bus stop!
11. Having Bus transportation will allow more students to be enrolled in your classes.
12. We need a bus!
Unmet Transit Needs Report: Sutter County Center

13. I see a lot of people walking to school & there is very little room for them to walk without being in the way of the cars going by...
14. I assumed there would be transportation (public) to this campus. Very dangerous to walk or ride bicycle. Dial-a-ride totally unreliable & Expensive.
15. We need a bus service; there is no way to get to the college.
16. It’s a great campus. The bus service would be great for me and some of my friends.
17. The bus would really help me out thank you
18. I walk to the campus every morning despite the fact that there is a bus stop a block from my house, if there was a bus route I would use it. Bus Please.
19. **We sure need a Bus!!**
20. Walk is DANGEROUS!!!!!
21. We need bus service.
22. When the bus route will come?

Again, these are the comments from students who have already somehow figured out a way to attend their classes without public transportation. There are countless others whom we cannot survey because they cannot attend--but they would attend and would use the transit system, if it were only available.

The need is clear. The situation is dire. We have a bus stop already created at the Sutter County Center. All that is needed is a route to take students there. I implore you to meet this public need as soon as possible.
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 3 – 2013

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

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on March 2011; and

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

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

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Regional Transit District, 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 15, 2012, the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 20, 2012, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 29, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego                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 March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG for Yolo County at the Davis City Council Chambers on October 17, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013 by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

__________________________________  _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego   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 March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing on transit needs were held by SACOG for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 15, 2012, the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 20, 2012, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 29, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego    Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 6 – 2013

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 March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing on transit needs were held by SACOG for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 15, 2012, the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 20, 2012, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 29, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego              Mike McKeever
Chair                          Chief Executive Officer
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 7 – 2013

FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO 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 March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing on transit needs were held by SACOG for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 15, 2012, the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 20, 2012, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 29, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 Galt.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

________________________________________  _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego                     Mike McKeever
Chair                                 Chief Executive Officer
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 8 – 2013

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 March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing on transit needs were held by SACOG for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 15, 2012, the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 20, 2012, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 29, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

____________________________________  _____________________________  
Mary Jane Griego                Mike McKeever
Chair                         Chief Executive Officer
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 9 – 2013

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

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, public hearings on transit needs were held by SACOG for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on October 24, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; and

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

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

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

There are no unmet transit needs in the City of Live Oak.
PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Mary Jane Griego    Mike McKeever
Chair                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 March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, public hearings on transit needs were held by SACOG for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on October 24, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego    Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
FINDING THAT THERE ARE UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET IN THE CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing on transit needs were held by SACOG for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 15, 2012, the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 20, 2012, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 29, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego    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 March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing on transit needs were held by SACOG for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 15, 2012, the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 20, 2012, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 29, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego    Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
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 March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing on transit needs were held by SACOG for the City of Galt at the Galt City Council Chambers on October 15, 2012, the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) at the SRTD Auditorium on October 20, 2012, the City of Elk Grove at the Elk Grove City Council Chambers on October 29, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego    Mike McKeever
Chair       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 March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, public hearings on transit needs were held by SACOG for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on October 24, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego    Mike McKeever
Chair               Chief Executive Officer
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 15 – 2013

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 March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG for Yolo County at the Davis City Council Chambers on October 17, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013 by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Mary Jane Griego
Chair

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 16 – 2013

FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET IN THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF THE COUNTY OF YUBA

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, public hearings on transit needs were held by SACOG for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on October 24, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Mary Jane Griego
Chair

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer
FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS THAT ARE REASONABLE TO MEET IN THE CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG for Yolo County at the Davis City Council Chambers on October 17, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013 by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego    Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
FINDING THAT THERE ARE NO UNMET TRANSIT NEEDS IN
THE CITY OF WHEATLAND

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments has defined “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” in its Transportation Development Act Guidelines adopted on March 2011; and

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

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

WHEREAS, the City of 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 24, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego    Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 19 – 2013

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 March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG for Yolo County at the Davis City Council Chambers on October 17, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013 by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego    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 March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing on transit needs was held by SACOG for Yolo County at the Davis City Council Chambers on October 17, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013 by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Mary Jane Griego                Mike McKeever
Chair                            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 March 2011; and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, public hearings on transit needs were held by SACOG for Yuba and Sutter Counties at the Yuba County Government Center (Marysville) on October 24, 2012, and before the SACOG Board of Directors on January 17, 2013; 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 21st day of February 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Mary Jane Griego
Chair

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer