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The Board may take up any agenda item at any time, regardless of the order listed. Public comment will be taken on the item at the time that it is taken up by the Board. We ask that members of the public complete a request to speak form, submit it to the Clerk of the Board, and keep their remarks brief. If several persons wish to address the board on a single item, the chair may impose a time limit on individual remarks at the beginning of the discussion. Action may be taken on any item on this agenda.

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call: Directors Aguiar-Curry, Ashby, Buckland, Cabaldon, Cleveland, Crews, Davis, Duran, Frerichs, Griego, Hagen, Hanley, Hesch, Hodges, Jankovitz, Joiner, MacGlashan, Miklos, Peters, Rohan, Samaya, Sander, Serna, Slowey, Stallard, Veerkamp, West, Wheeler, Yuill, Vice-Chair Saylor, Chair Cohn, and Ex-Officio Member Benipal

Public Communications: Any person wishing to address the Board on any item not on the agenda may do so at this time. After ten minutes of testimony, any additional testimony will be heard following the action items.

Consent Calendar: ◄

1. Approve the Minutes of September 18, 2014, Regular and Special Board Meetings
2. Approve the Transportation Development Act Claim for the City of Rancho Cordova
3. Approve Reappointment of SACOG’s Representative to the Paratransit, Inc., Board of Directors
4. Approve SACOG Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan Update
5. Approve Submission of Grant Application for FTA Pilot Program for TOD Planning

Action: ◄


Workshop:

7. Special Presentations from the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority, the San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority, and the High Speed Rail Authority
Reports:

8. Chair’s Report
9. Board Members’ Reports
10. Chief Executive Officer’s Report

Adjournment: The next meeting of the SACOG Board will be held on Thursday, November 13, at 9:30 a.m. in the SACOG Board Room, 1415, L Street, Sacramento, CA.

Action Requested

Prepared by:       Approved by:
Mike McKeever    Steve Cohn
Chief Executive Officer    Chair

This agenda and attachments are available on SACOG’s website at www.sacog.org.

The Meridian Plaza is accessible to the disabled. If requested, this agenda, and documents in the agenda packet can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Federal Rules and Regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Persons seeking an alternative format should contact SACOG for further information. In addition, a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in a public meeting should contact SACOG by phone at 916-321-9000, e-mail (sacog@sacog.org) or in person as soon as possible and preferably at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Parking is available at 15th and K Streets.
October 9, 2014

Approve Minutes of the September 18, 2014, Board Meetings

Issue: The SACOG Board of Directors met on September 18, 2014, for a regular and a special SACOG Board meeting.

Recommendation: Approve the minutes of the meetings as submitted.

Discussion: Attached are the Draft Action Minutes of the September 18, 2014, regular and special SACOG Board meetings.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:gg

Attachment
Sacramento Area Council of Governments  
Draft Action Minutes

The SACOG Board of Directors met in regular session on September 18, 2014 at 9:30 a.m. in the SACOG Board Chambers located at 1415 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Call to Order: Chair Cohn called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m.

Present: Directors Aguiar-Curry, Buckland, Cabaldon, Cleveland, Crews, Duran, Frerichs, Griego*, Hagen, Hesch, Jankovitz, Joiner, MacGlashan, Miklos, Peters, Rohan, Samayoa, Sander, Slowey, Stallard, West, Wheeler, Yuill, Vice-Chair Saylor, and Chair Cohn.

*arrived as noted below

Absent: Directors Ashby, Davis, Hanley, Hodges, Serna, and Veerkamp

Public Communications: No one appeared to speak during Public Communications.

Consent Calendar: It was moved, seconded (Joiner/Rohan) and passed by unanimous vote that the following Consent items be approved:

1. Approve Minutes of August 21, 2014, Board Meeting
2. Approve the Transportation Development Act Claims for the City of Woodland and the Sacramento Regional Transit District
3. Approve 2015/18 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, Amendment #4 to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy 2035, and Air Quality Conformity Analysis
4. Approve 2015 Delivery Plan Process
5. Approve Rural-Urban Connections Strategy Delta Case Study
6. Approval Overall Work Program Fiscal Year 2014-15 Amendment #1
7. Approve SACOG Salutes Award Program
8. Approve Amendment to Contract with URS for Downtown/Riverfront Transit Study
9. Approve U.S. Department of Transportation Requirement for Transit Representation in Metropolitan Planning Organization Structure

Director Griego arrived following the consent items.

Adjourned SACOG Regular Board Meeting, convened Special SACOG Board Meeting at 9:36 a.m.

Adjourned Special SACOG Board Meeting and reconvened Regular SACOG Board Meeting at 9:40 a.m.
Action:

10. Six-County Regional Active Transportation Program Funding Recommendations (Ms. DeVere-Oki)
    Renee DeVere-Oki, SACOG staff, presented the staff report. It was moved, seconded (Miklos/Griego), and passed by unanimous vote that:

    THE BOARD APPROVE THE REGIONAL ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (ATP) PROJECT LIST, AUTHORIZE THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO DEVELOP ATP TRANSMITTAL DOCUMENTATION AND SUBMIT THE PROGRAM TO THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (CTC), AND DIRECT STAFF TO PREPARE THE REQUIRED METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (MTIP) AMENDMENTS.

    Kirk Trost, SACOG staff, presented the staff report. It was moved, seconded (Frerichs/Griego) and passed by unanimous vote that:

    THE BOARD APPROVE THE SUBMISSION OF COMMENTS TO USDOT ON THIS RULEMAKING.

Reports:

12. Chair’s Report: Chair Cohn provided his report.

13. Board Members: Board members reported on current local issues.

14. Chief Executive Officer’s Report: Mike McKeever gave his report to the board.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 11:09 a.m.

Approved by:

_________________________  __________________________
Steve Cohn  Mike McKeever
Chair  Chief Executive Officer
Sacramento Area Council of Governments  
Special Meeting Action Minutes  

The SACOG Board of Directors met in special session on September 18, 2014, at 9:30 a.m. in the SACOG Board Chambers located at 1415 L Street, Sacramento, CA  95814.

Call To Order:  Chair Cohn called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.

Present:  Directors Aguiar-Curry, Buckland, Cabaldon, Cleveland, Crews, Duran, Frerichs, Griego*, Hagen, Hesch, Jankovitz, Joiner, MacGlashan, Miklos, Peters, Rohan, Samayoa, Sander, Slowey, Stallard, West, Wheeler, Yuill, Vice-Chair Saylor, and Chair Cohn.

Absent:  Directors Ashby, Davis, Hanley, Hodges, Serna, and Veerkamp

Public Communications:  No one appeared to speak.

Action:

1. Plug-In Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan Implementation Opportunity:  Raef Porter, SACOG staff, presented the staff report. It was moved, seconded (Cabaldon/Miklos) and passed by unanimous vote that:

   THE BOARD ALLOW SACOG TO APPLY TO THE CEC ALTERNATIVE AND RENEWABLE FUEL AND VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM (PON-14-603) TO IMPLEMENT SACOG’S ADOPTED PEV READINESS PLAN, AND IF AWARDED, ALLOW THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH THE CEC.

Adjournment:  The meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m.

Approved By:  

______________________   ________________________  
Steve Cohn     Mike McKeever  
Chair        Chief Executive Officer  

Attest:  

October 9, 2014

Approve the Transportation Development Act Claim for City of Rancho Cordova

Issue:  The Transportation Development Act (TDA) authorizes eligible cities, counties, and transit operators to receive TDA funds for transportation purposes and street and road projects. The TDA funds are made available from sales tax receipts.

Recommendation:  Staff recommends that the Board approve this summary resolution of the TDA claim listed below.

1.  City of Rancho Cordova for $345,000  Resolution No. 53 – 2014

Committee Action/Discussion:  Current Board policy calls for routine TDA allocations to cities, counties, and transit operators to come directly to the Board without review by a committee. These funds will be used as authorized by law for various purposes and in the amounts shown on the attached resolutions. The claims have been reviewed by staff and found to be in compliance with the TDA and are consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Short-Range Transit Plans.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer
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Attachment

Key Staff:  Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
Gary Taylor, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6279
Barbara VaughanBechtold, Associate Planner, (916) 340-6226

cc:  Elizabeth Sparkman, Senior Engineer, City of Rancho Cordova
     Linda McLeod, County of Sacramento
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

RESOLUTION NO. 53 – 2014

APPROVING THE CITY OF RANCHO CORDOVA’S TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT CLAIM FOR FY 2004-05 THROUGH FY 2011/12 FOR A TOTAL AMOUNT OF $345,000

WHEREAS, the City of Rancho Cordova has submitted a claim for Local Transportation Funds of $345,000 under the provisions of the Transportation Development Act for the amounts and purposes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Transportation Fund</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Year of Funds</th>
<th>Amounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article 3 – Section 99234</td>
<td>Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Impr Project--Rancho Cordova Elementary School</td>
<td>FY 2004/05</td>
<td>$54,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 3 – Section 99234</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>FY 2005/06</td>
<td>$60,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 3 – Section 99234</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>FY 2006/07</td>
<td>$46,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 3 – Section 99234</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>FY 2007/08</td>
<td>$38,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 3 – Section 99234</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>FY 2008/09</td>
<td>$39,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 3 – Section 99234</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>FY 2009/10</td>
<td>$32,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 3 – Section 99234</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>FY 2010/11</td>
<td>$34,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 3 – Section 99234</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>FY 2011/12</td>
<td>$37,629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>345,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHEREAS, such claim is consistent with State Law, with Guidelines adopted by the Board and with the approved apportionments; and

WHEREAS, the Board Resolution No. 14-2014 on February 20, 2014 found that there are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the Sacramento Regional Transit District, including the City of Rancho Cordova.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board hereby approves the request for Local Transportation Funds for FY 2004-05 through FY 2011-12 for a total claim amount of $345,000 and authorizes the forwarding of funds to the City of Rancho Cordova in proportion to funds received from the State.
PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 16th day of October 2014 by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

______________________________  ________________________________
Steve Cohn                      Mike McKeever
Chair                           Chief Executive Officer
SACOG Board of Directors

October 9, 2014

Approve Reappointment of SACOG’s Representative to the Paratransit, Inc., Board of Directors

**Issue:** As specified under the terms of the Four-Party Agreement, SACOG appoints one representative to the Paratransit, Inc., Board of Directors. SACOG’s current representative, Frances Gracechild, has requested that SACOG reappoint her to another term, and her request is supported by Paratransit, Inc. (PI) and SACOG staff.

**Recommendation:** The Transportation Committee unanimously recommends that the Board reappoint Frances Gracechild to the PI Board of Directors for a three-year term, January 1, 2015 – December 31, 2017.

**Committee Action/Discussion:** A Four-Party Agreement between the City of Sacramento, the County of Sacramento, Sacramento Regional Transit District, and SACOG provides Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds to PI. The funds are used to provide transportation services to elderly and disabled residents in Sacramento County. The Four-Party Agreement specifies that SACOG has one appointed position to the nine-member PI Board of Directors.

In 2008, SACOG staff administered the advertising solicitation and application process as directed by the SACOG Board in compliance with the requirements of the Maddy Act. One application was received, and Frances Gracechild, Executive Director of Resources for Independent Living (RIL), was appointed in September 2008 by the SACOG Board as the SACOG representative to the PI Board. In December 2011, Ms. Gracechild was reappointed as the SACOG representative to the PI Board for a second three-year term.

SACOG staff has found Ms. Gracechild to be an effective SACOG representative on the PI Board over the last three years. With her years of executive experience at RIL and a long resume of work and community involvement, staff feels Ms. Gracechild will continue to be a good representative for SACOG on the PI Board. Ms. Gracechild has also stated that she would like to continue being the SACOG representative on the PI Board. RIL is also a partner with SACOG in helping people with disabilities participate in regional transportation planning processes.

SACOG staff and PI endorse and recommend the reappointment of Ms. Gracechild as the SACOG representative on the PI Board. Attached is a copy of Ms. Gracechild’s letter requesting reappointment.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:BVB:gg
Attachment

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
Sharon Sprowls, Senior Program Specialist, (916) 340-6235
Barbara VaughanBechtold, Associate Planner, (916) 340-6226
Mike McKeever, CEO
SACOG
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA
95814

Dear Mr. McKeever,

I am writing to you to signify my interest in continuing as SACOG’s representative on the Paratransit, Inc.’s Board of Directors. I have served as SACOG’s representative since your first authorizing vote on September 18, 2008.

In my work capacity as Executive Director of Resources for Independent Living, Inc. (RIL) I have a continuing interest and obligation to advocate and give input to transportation planning at the local, State and Federal level. Serving on the Paratransit Board allows me excellent access to deliver on that obligation. As SACOG’s appointee I have gained a valuable perspective that enriches and expands my disability inclusion issues. I have found that my concerns regarding disability transit access share common ground with other transit dependent populations (seniors, youth/students, and low-income communities).

Our work at RIL includes community organizing to encourage our consumers to participate in regional planning processes at SACOG, Regional Transit, and Paratransit. During my last SACOG appointment term I completed 3 units with a grade of A as a community scholar at the University of California Davis campus in the Graduate Program of Community Development. The area of focus was on transportation and Title VI equity issues.

Emerging issues at Paratransit at this time include: (1) Active participation with Regional Transit’s outreach efforts for updating their strategic plan and (2) Negotiations which will conclude with Clean Energy for Construction of the Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) fueling station and the fueling agreement. It is our understanding that Paratransit will be the first CNG station in our region to offer renewable CNG on a consistent basis.

My current term as your appointee expires on December 31, 2014. I would be honored to receive your appointment again. If I can answer any questions from your staff/board please contact me at francesg@ril-sacramento.org or you may call or text me at (916) 837-1657 (cell).

My sincere appreciation for SACOG’s support of my work during the last 5+ years.

Regards,

Frances Gracechild
RIL Executive Director

Cc: S Sprangels
Approve SACOG Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan Update

**Issue:** Should the Board approve the SACOG Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan (Coordinated Plan) Update and the submission of the Plan Update to the appropriate state and federal agencies?

**Recommendation:** The Transportation Committee unanimously recommends that the Board approve by resolution the SACOG Coordinated Plan Update and the submission of the Plan Update to the appropriate state and federal agencies.

**Committee Action/Discussion:** SACOG has completed an update of the SACOG Coordinated Plan. The first SACOG Coordinated Plan was approved in July 2007 to comply with the requirements of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). SACOG must now update the Coordinated Plan to reflect the passage of the federal transportation legislation Moving Ahead for Progress in the Twenty-First Century (MAP-21) and recent guidance from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

The Coordinated Plan is required in order for the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to accept applications, select projects, and distribute funding under the FTA Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program (Section 5310). Selected projects and strategies must be included in a locally developed coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan.

The final SACOG Coordinated Plan Update will be submitted to Caltrans and FTA to allow the regional public transit and specialized transportation providers to apply for FTA 5310 funds to serve seniors and persons with disabilities.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:BVB:gg

Attachments

Key Staff:  Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
            Sharon Sprowls, Senior Program Specialist, (916) 340-6235
            Azadeh Doherty, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6221
            Barbara VaughanBechtold, Associate Planner, (916) 340-6226
RESOLUTION NO. 50 – 2014

APPROVING SACOG PUBLIC TRANSIT AND HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION COORDINATED PLAN

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization and the Regional Transportation Planning Agency responsible for transportation planning in the Sacramento region; and

WHEREAS, SACOG is responsible for preparing and adopting the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) and the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP); and

WHEREAS, SACOG is responsible for developing a coordinated public transit/human services transportation plan that must generally include all regional FTA Section 5310 – Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities projects and strategies; and

WHEREAS, SACOG has reviewed and followed the federal transportation legislation Moving Ahead for Progress in the Twenty-First Century (MAP-21), the July, 11, 2013, and June 6, 2014, Federal Registers, and FTA Circular C 9070.1G that reflect the FTA required elements of a coordinated plan; and

WHEREAS, SACOG has completed the SACOG Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan for the six counties it serves including the rural, small urbanized and large urbanized areas; and

WHEREAS, SACOG will submit the SACOG Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan to the appropriate State of California and U.S. Federal agencies;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that SACOG certifies that:

1. SACOG has completed the regional SACOG Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan as required by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the Twenty-First Century (MAP-21);

2. FTA 5310 Projects funded will be generally included in the SACOG Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan;

3. Projects funded will be included in the MTIP; and
4. The projects funded will be consistent with SACOG's MTP/SCS.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 16th day of October 2014, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

_____________________________   _____________________________
Steve Cohn      Mike McKeever
Chair       Chief Executive Officer
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**Executive Summary**

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments recognizes an increasing need to plan for and address the mobility needs of the growing regional population. While there is currently a range of transportation services available to people with lower incomes, seniors and persons with disabilities in the Region, gaps in service remain due to geography, limitations in fixed-route and demand-responsive services, program/funding constraints, eligibility limitations, knowledge and training. According to Department of Finance projections, the number of people age 55 or older in the Sacramento Region will increase by approximately 580,000, or 153%, between 2000 and 2030. In particular, there is a growing population of the frail elderly who experience mobility difficulties but are not considered to be ADA-eligible, who do not consider themselves disabled, and who are often aging in place in rural and suburban areas, making obtaining the transportation services they need more difficult.

The Sacramento Region is facing significant growth in its population, including the populations of seniors, growth in the working-age population, and growth in the working-age population with severe disabilities. This growth is taking place in both more urbanized Sacramento County, and the less urbanized portions of the Region where transportation alternatives are limited. This poses not only a challenge for those who are not able to drive, especially those who have few family or income resources to afford alternatives, but also for all communities who will be called upon to provide expanded transportation services to meet residents’ needs.

The SACOG Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan is intended to show how human service agencies can work together with transportation providers to address the transportation needs of people with disabilities, seniors, and people with limited incomes. The SACOG Coordinated Plan is meant to broaden the dialogue and support further collaboration between public transportation providers, human service agencies, and others to link people with the transportation services that they need. The description of transportation services and the connections and relationships represented in this report are drawn from discussions with transportation and human services staff, stakeholder interviews, public input, public hearings and workshops.

A Coordinated Plan is required under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) of July 2012. As suggested by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) the plan offers an overview of what transit services are available, where there are gaps in those services, and includes potential solutions to close those service gaps. With the Updated SACOG Coordinated Plan in place, federal funds specifically directed toward services to lower income persons, seniors and people with disabilities will remain available to the SACOG Region’s transit operators. The types of services provided with these funds must be included in the SACOG Coordinated Plan.
CHAPTER 1: COORDINATED PLAN AND METHODOLOGY

State and Federal Requirements for Coordination

The California State Transportation Development Act (TDA) is administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) within the State of CA Business Transportation and Housing Agency, and provides two major sources for the funding of public transportation in California through regional planning and programming agencies such as the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). The TDA funds a wide variety of transportation programs, including planning and program activities, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, community transit/special needs transport services, public transportation, and bus and rail projects. The TDA requires that transit operators coordinate their services, so that transit services are not duplicative and use the limited funds available in the most efficient way possible.

The Federal Transit Administration has defined coordination of transportation services as, “... a process in which two or more organizations interact to jointly accomplish their transportation objectives.” (US DOT, FTA, Planning Guidelines for Coordinated State and Local Specialized Transportation Services (WA, D.C. FTA, 2004)). The SACOG Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan, hereby known as the Coordinated Plan, is a direct result of the 2004 Executive Order: Human Service Transportation Coordination furthered by federal and state directives and the Executive Order calls for human service agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services and providers of transportation funded through the Federal Transit Administration to:

- Promote interagency cooperation and minimize duplication and overlap of services;
- Determine the most appropriate, cost-effective transportation services within existing resources; and
- Improve the availability of transportation services to the people who need them.

The federal directive, as prescribed by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) transportation authorization bill, requires that projects selected for funding under the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program come from a locally developed coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan.

For a description of potential funding sources, refer to the funding resources section of the appendices.

Plan Objectives and Development

The SACOG Coordinated Plan follows the July 11, 2013, and June 6, 2014, Federal Register and FTA Circular C 9070.1G guidance regarding the FTA proposed elements of a coordinated plan:

- An assessment of available services that identifies current providers (public, private, and nonprofit);
An assessment of transportation needs for individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes. This assessment may be based on the experiences and perceptions of the planning partners or on more sophisticated data collection efforts, and gaps in service;

Strategies and/or activities to address the identified gaps and achieve efficiencies in service delivery; and

Relative priorities for implementation based on resources, time, and feasibility for implementing specific strategies/activities identified.

The SACOG Coordinated Plan reviews public and private transportation providers and the human service agencies, both public and not-for-profit, that utilize the transportation services. The Plan also analyzes community/volunteer based transportation providers and the services they provide.

The SACOG Coordinated Plan mainly affects the distribution of FTA Section 5310 funding. Agencies and organizations can do a variety things with Section 5310 funds. Section 5310 projects should assist individuals with disabilities with transportation. The Section 5310 Program gives capital grants to non-profit agencies and public transit providers of transportation services to seniors and persons with disabilities. Also, the projects can be public transportation services that go beyond those required by the ADA, projects that increase access to and use of fixed route public transport by individuals with disabilities (decreasing use of ADA complementary services), and public transportation alternatives that assist people with disabilities.

**Relationship of this Plan to Regional Planning**

The SACOG Coordinated Plan is anchored to the following regional planning documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SACOG Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan (June 2007) Amended 3-9-09, 1-5-12 and Sept. 2014</td>
<td>As part of MAP-21, SACOG must develop a Coordinated Plan to serve the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program (Section 5310)</td>
<td>The SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS our RTP) was adopted on April 19, 2012. The MTP/SCS includes an analysis of public and special needs transit services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG Public Participation Plan (August 2013)</td>
<td>Federal transportation regulations require metropolitan planning organizations such as SACOG to adopt a plan to provide the public with opportunities to be involved in the transportation planning process.</td>
<td>The SACOG Coordinated Plan uses the Public Participation Plan methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 SACOG Lifeline Transit Study</td>
<td>Built upon the Coordinated Plan to examine more specifically the public transportation needs of low-income and other transit-dependent residents of the SACOG region.</td>
<td>Focused on low-income and transit dependent population needs, including those of low-income transit-dependent seniors and people with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Senior and Disabled Mobility Study</td>
<td>SACOG identified the need to address more intensely the mobility needs of the rapidly growing population of seniors and persons with disabilities in the Sacramento Region.</td>
<td>The work done and information gathered for the Senior and Disabled Study is used in SACOG’s Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 SACOG Region JARC Plan Update</td>
<td>Regional Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) Transportation Plan to address regional transportation barriers faced by CalWorks clients and other low income individuals. The goal of the plan is to improve access for these populations to employment and related activities.</td>
<td>The work done and information gathered for the SACOG JARC Plan was used in SACOG’s Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology and Public Involvement

Much of the information presented in the SACOG Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan (Coordinated Plan) comes from the Lifeline Transit Study (2011), the SACOG Senior and Disabled Mobility Study (2007), and the SACOG Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) Plan/Update (2003).

The Senior and Disabled Mobility Study and Lifeline Transit Study received input from a technical advisory committee made up of public transit, specialized/paratransit transit service providers, human service providers, and representatives of advocate organizations for seniors and persons with disabilities. The JARC Plan advisory committee was made up of transit operators and county human service agency staff.

SACOG’s Public Transit and Human Service Transportation Coordinated Plan for the six county region, includes the urbanized areas of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo counties as well as the small urban/rural areas. The Federal Register recommendations from the FTA on the coordinated plan state that regional planning agencies should focus on obtaining input on human services/specialized transportation needs from two main stakeholder/transit user groups: seniors and persons with disabilities. SACOG worked to obtain input from stakeholders through several processes.

Unmet Transit Needs Process

The California Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires that the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) hold Unmet Transit Needs hearings to obtain transit needs requests from transit users/stakeholders in the RTPA area. SACOG is the RTPA for four counties Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties. SACOG holds 6 Unmet Transit Needs hearings each year in the jurisdictions in the four RTPA counties. Input has been collected from the public on Human Services transportation and coordination in the six-county region as part of the planning process required to meet MAP-21 requirements. Human services transportation was defined as dial-a-ride/paratransit, non-emergency medical transportation, community/volunteer transportation etc. Coordinated Plan input, as well as input received from previous Unmet Transit Needs hearings, has been used to identify gaps in human services/special needs transportation services.

Coordinated Plan Hearings and Other Outreach

In Placer and El Dorado counties, two separate RTPAs, the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) and the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) respectively, conduct the Unmet Transit Needs hearing process in those counties. In the urbanized areas outside of the SACOG RTPA area in Placer and El Dorado counties, input was collected separately on the Coordinated Plan. PCTPA and EDCTC also provided previous Unmet Transit Needs comments.

SACOG has also shared the Coordinated Plan information with various community groups.

Stakeholder Meetings and Interviews

In addition to the unmet transit needs process and other outreach, this Coordinated Plan uses input received as part of the Senior and Disabled Mobility Study. From April to June 2005, SACOG, with
assistance from consulting firm Odyssey, conducted over 100 outreach calls and six workshops, and in November 2006 a region-wide working session, to help inform the Study. The purpose of the phoning, workshops and working session were to hear directly from people in each of the six counties in the region, including service providers, older community residents and those with disabilities, about the barriers to mobility that seniors and persons with disabilities face, key locations people want or need to reach, and local preferences for transportation-related improvements that would help people travel more easily to their destinations. Also, SACOG accepted comment via phone, regular mail, fax and email.

**Plan Availability – Use and Ongoing Refinement**

The SACOG Coordinated Plan was first put out for public review in June 2007 after receiving input from the Board of Directors.

SACOG made one minor amendment to the SACOG Coordinated Plan in January 2012 prior to the adoption of the most recent SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy that was adopted in fiscal year 2012-2013. SACOG will continue to make amendments to the Coordinated Plan as needed to keep the information presented as up-to-date as possible.

This document fulfills all of the FTA requirements for a Coordinated Plan. The SACOG Coordinated Plan will be used for on-going service planning related to human services/special needs transportation services in the SACOG region. The information from the Plan will also be used to evaluate applications for FTA Section 5310 funds from the region’s transportation operators, as well as other regional transportation planning efforts.
All urbanized areas of the six-county SACOG region are served by “fixed-route” transit services, i.e., those that run on regular routes and fixed schedules.

The ADA also made it mandatory for providers of fixed-route transit services to offer comparable demand-responsive services to those who could not use fixed-route services. Demand-responsive services, or transportation services for which the passenger calls in advance for a pick-up, have been provided for many years in the Sacramento region, some exclusively to those with disabilities and others providing service to seniors and/or the general public. The demand-responsive transportation services operated by public transit operators are used by significant numbers of seniors and persons with disabilities. For example, in 2011, Paratransit Inc. reported that it served 795,926 passengers.¹

Public transportation services are also supplemented in many parts of the SACOG region with transportation services provided by local agencies and community-based organizations.

The following sections summarize current transportation services available in each county in the region.

**El Dorado County**

El Dorado County is one of the fastest growing counties in the region. It includes the historic city of Placerville, the county seat, communities such as Cameron Park and El Dorado Hills with their expanding residential developments, and older more rural communities such as Camino – home to Apple Hill – and Pollock Pines. The Coordinated Plan does not examine South Lake Tahoe as it is not part of the SACOG Region.

**Fixed-Route Service**

El Dorado Transit provides all public transit services in the county, including:

- Four fixed routes buses serving Placerville (east/west), Pollock Pines (east/west), Cameron Park and Diamond Springs.
- 11 morning commuter buses to downtown Sacramento and 12 return buses, plus a reverse commute route from downtown Sacramento to Placerville
- A connector to the Iron Point Light Rail Station and Kaiser clinic in Folsom.

¹ Annual performance data provided in Paratransit, Inc. FY 2011-12 State Controller’s Report
Demand-Responsive Service

El Dorado Transit also provides:

- Dial-A-Ride services for seniors and persons with disabilities, and the general public subject to restrictions
- ADA Complementary Paratransit service in Placerville
- Daily service to the Placerville Senior Center
- SAC-MED, shared-ride transportation on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The service takes senior, disabled and general public passengers with a reservation from five pick-up points in El Dorado County to non-emergency medical appointments in Folsom, Sacramento and Roseville.
- Once-a-week pre-scheduled demand response service to the community of Grizzly Flat.

Based on El Dorado County Unmet Transit Needs findings El Dorado Transit also plans to implement the following program:

El Dorado Hills Taxi Voucher Program Demonstration Project

The proposed taxi voucher program will provide on-demand, subsidized taxi service within the El Dorado Hills Community Service District area of Western El Dorado County (see map). The service shall be provided to eligible senior and disabled residents, as specified by El Dorado Transit, of the El Dorado Hills Community. For the purposes of this agreement, a senior is defined as a person age sixty (60) or older. FTA 5310 funds may be requested in the future to support this program.

Proposed Services

- Taxi services will be available seven (7) days a week between 7 AM and 10 PM
- Taxi services will be provided within the El Dorado Hills Community Service District
- Passengers must register one-time with El Dorado Transit to verify eligibility
- Proposed one-way passenger fare of $3.00
- Eligible passengers will purchase vouchers to give to the taxi operator for $3. Vouchers are required or passenger would be required to pay full fare
- Vouchers will be available for purchase at the El Dorado Transit Office; by mail and at various local businesses and community agencies
- Passengers may travel on the taxi beyond the El Dorado Hills Community Service District at the sole expense of the passenger
  - For Example: If a passenger books a taxi ride to Folsom through the El Dorado Transit program, the passenger will be responsible for providing the taxi operator the El Dorado Transit voucher and the actual fare from the El Dorado Hills Community Service District boundary to the destination in Folsom.
• Eligible participants may call any contracted taxi vendor for a trip

• Taxi operator will arrive to pick-up eligible passengers within forty-five (45) minutes of a reservations call, unless otherwise specified by the passenger at the time of the reservation request

• Customer Usage of the Program: El Dorado Transit reserves the right to modify program criteria and protocols. The following protocols will be in effect at the beginning of the Agreement term:
  o Minimum prior notice required to request a ride: None
  o Monthly maximum number of one-way rides per rider: Ten (10)
  o Passenger one-way pre-paid fare is $3.00

• Eligible passengers may bring guests at no extra cost, based on available seating, as long as the guests board and alight at the same origin and destinations as the eligible passenger

**Supplemental/Human Services Transportation**

El Dorado County offers a Senior Shuttle, which provides transportation with an advance reservation to seniors 60+ for weekly grocery shopping trips, and monthly outings to a senior nutrition site for lunch. The service is not wheelchair accessible.

**Placer County**

Another fast growing county in the region, Placer County includes the city of Auburn, the county seat; Roseville, considered a regional retail and job center, and its neighbor, Rocklin; the city of Lincoln, home along with Roseville to a large Sun City senior community; and other smaller communities such as Granite Bay, Loomis, Colfax, Foresthill and other more rural areas. The Coordinated Plan does not include communities in the Lake Tahoe area since they are not part of the SACOG region.

**Fixed-Route Service**

• The City of Roseville offers 14 fixed routes in Roseville, along with seven morning commuter buses to downtown Sacramento, and six evening returns.

• The City of Auburn operates two fixed routes in Auburn on weekdays, and one on Saturdays.

• The City of Lincoln operates two fixed routes within the city on weekdays.

• Placer County Transit offers five intercity fixed routes, making connections between Auburn, Sacramento Light Rail, Lincoln, Rocklin, Newcastle, Penryn, Loomis, Sierra College, Colfax, Alta, and Roseville.
**Demand-Responsive Service**

Roseville Transit offers city Dial-a-Ride service, including same-day and general public service subject to availability.

Lincoln Transit offers Dial-a-Ride service to seniors, persons with disabilities and the general public. It serves passengers anywhere within City limits plus the Thunder Valley Casino twice daily on request.

Placer County Transit offers Dial-a-Ride services for Granite Bay, Loomis, Rocklin, and along Highway 49.

The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) has designated the Western Placer Consolidated Transportation Service Agency (WPCTSA) as the Consolidated Transportation Service Agency serving western Placer County. The WPCTSA is a joint powers agency with the power to provide and coordinate social service transportation for the western portion of Placer County, including services for the elderly and individuals with disabilities. WPCTSA services went into effect in January 2009.

WPCTSA programs are intended to provide transportation services for Placer County residents who are not able to use conventional public transit services operating within western Placer County. Each program responds to a unique transportation need not otherwise currently met or met well within a prescribed service area. WPCTSA currently collaborates with Seniors First, Inc., a local non-profit organization, to fund various programs.

**WPCTSA Transportation Services**

The WPCTSA designated the City of Roseville as the lead agency to establish and operate the regional Transit Ambassador Program. The program educates new passengers in becoming familiar with western Placer County transit services and provides assistance to passengers at transit transfer points.

The WPCTSA currently collaborates with Seniors First, Inc., a local non-profit organization, to provide two additional programs:

1. **Health Express Non-Emergency Medical Transportation**
   Seniors First provides a non-emergency medical transportation service known as “Health Express.”

2. **My Rides Program**
   The My Rides Program maintains the former Door-to-Door Rides program that has provided volunteer transportation service for more than 40 years to eligible Placer County residents. The My Rides Program expands the service area countywide to include a mileage reimbursement program for individuals and First 5 families with children, prenatal through five years old, who are unable to use conventional public transit services to and from medical-related appointments, public services, and essential needs destinations. The My Rides Program also provides a voucher for individuals who cannot otherwise afford the costs associated with an occasional and necessary trip to medical-related appointments.
The WPCTSA also purchases retired (surplus) dial-a-ride vehicles from Placer transit operators and sells these vehicles to local non-profit social service organizations for a nominal amount for use to transport elderly and/or disabled clients.

Through a separate MOU, the City of Roseville also operates the South Placer Transit Call Center. The Call Center serves as a centralized “one stop” resource that provides alternative transportation information to the public and books demand-response trips for participating South Placer County transit operators and/or private/non-profit providers of transportation services.

Based on the WPCTSA Short Range Transit Plan, the WPCTSA also plans to implement the following programs:

- **Public Transit Demand Response CTSA Non-Emergency Medical Trip reimbursement** – WPCTSA is pursuing a system of reimbursement of CTSA NEMT trips allocated by the Call Center to Public Dial-a-Ride services, using existing unused DAR capacity to provide some NEMT trips above and beyond required complementary ADA paratransit trips.
- **Bus Pass Subsidy Program** – This program would distribute bus passes to those least able to afford them.
- **Capital Non-Profit Vehicle Replacement Program** – This program would allow WPCTSA to purchase used, road-worthy surplus vehicles from local non-profit agencies.
- **Capital Bus Stop/Access/Community Enhancement** – WPCTSA will conduct a bus stop inventory on accessibility and prioritize support to specific bus stop or path-of-access improvements that will demonstrably benefit the target populations, using PTMISEA and TSSSDRA funds.
- **Capital NEMT Vehicle Tracking and Upgrade Program** – This program, administered by WPCTSA and Seniors First, will enable the Call Center to use specialized software to locate NEMT vehicles and manage usage and capacity through the installation of tracking devices.

**Sacramento County**

As the largest in the region in terms of population, Sacramento County also has a larger number of transportation providers.

**Fixed-Route Service**

The Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) operates three light rail lines and 77 fixed-route bus services in its 418-square-mile service area, with construction underway for an extension of the South light rail line to Cosumnes River College.

South County Transit (SCT/Link) operates service in the southernmost part of Sacramento County. SCT/Link offers general public dial-a-ride service in Galt, as well as limited service to other communities in the Delta, an express route along Highway 99 connecting Lodi, Galt, Elk Grove and Sacramento, and the Sacramento Commuter connecting Galt and downtown Sacramento.

e-tran is the City of Elk Grove’s transit service. It offers nine local bus routes within Elk Grove, including a weekend shuttle service. e-tran also offers nine commuter routes to Sacramento, including
connections to the Meadowview and Butterfield light rail stations, and to SCT/Link’s Highway 99 service, as well as two reverse commute routes from Sacramento to Elk Grove.

Folsom Stage Line offers two local fixed routes Monday through Friday, including connections to the Iron Point and Glenn light rail stations, downtown, Folsom Lake College, Intel, Kaiser, and retail centers.

**Demand-Responsive Service**

Paratransit, Inc. has a collaborative agreement with SRTD to provide complementary ADA paratransit service within ¾ of a mile of active light rail stops and bus routes within SRTD’s service boundary in Sacramento County. As the designated CTSA for Sacramento County (excluding the southernmost portion of the county), Paratransit, Inc. also provides non-ADA service directly and through community partners. They operate over 150 vehicles. Paratransit, Inc. provides trip planning and services to 11 community partners, ranging from United Cerebral Palsy to Elk Grove Adult Community Training. Their maintenance shop provides services to 40 other agencies in the Sacramento region. Paratransit offers mobility training for county residents on using SRTD buses and light rail, and to residents of certain SACOG region communities.

SCT/Link provides general public Dial-a-Ride service within Galt. SCT/Link also provides service once a week for the general public between Galt and Southeast Sacramento County, and twice a week for seniors and persons with disabilities between Galt and medical facilities in Sacramento.

e-van provides Dial-a-Ride service to Elk Grove residents who are 75+ or qualify for ADA. e-van operates within Elk Grove, and also provides service to medical and other destinations within urbanized Sacramento County.

Folsom Stage provides Dial-a-Ride service within Folsom city limits for persons with disabilities and those 55 and over.

**Supplemental/Human Services Transportation**

Other transportation providers in Sacramento County include the following:

- The American Cancer Society’s Road to Recovery program provides transportation to ambulatory cancer patients without other alternatives to reach cancer-related treatment and medical appointments.
- ACC Rides Transportation Services provides transportation to all seniors while targeting underserved Southeast Asian elders and seniors with physical/cognitive limitations. Riders reside in nine zip codes: 95814, 95818, 95820, 95822, 95823, 95824, 95828, 95831, and 95832. ACC Rides included the Delta Region in 2014 encompassing part of Hood Franklin, Courtland, Locke, and Walnut Grove. Transportation services include bringing riders to doctor’s appointments, to go shopping, attend lunch at selected Meals on Wheels by ACC “All Seasons Café” sites, and other personal errands.
- Cordova Senior Center operates two vans that bring seniors to the center for activities.
- For a donation, Galt Concilio offers Galt seniors and persons with disabilities van or car transportation, provided by volunteer drivers with a week’s notice, to medical appointments in Galt, Lodi, Stockton and Sacramento.
• The Society for the Blind offers transportation for those attending classes at its midtown location, as well as for its senior retreat program and Senior Impact Program.

• Stanford Settlement offers transportation to and from the Sister Jeanne Felion Senior Center for lunch using 15-passenger vans, plus door-to-door car transportation and escort for seniors to doctor’s appointments using volunteers. To be eligible, seniors must live in zip codes 95815, 95833, 95834, or parts of 95836, 95837 or 95838, and request medical escort at least 3-4 days in advance.

• United Cerebral Palsy offers weekday fixed route, door-to-door service for people with developmental disabilities to various community educational and vocational programs throughout the Greater Sacramento area.

• United Christian Center’s Health Reach program is a free service running two vehicles on weekdays to transport seniors and persons with disabilities in South Sacramento to medical appointments.

**Yolo County**

Besides its cities of Winters Woodland, Davis – home to UC Davis – and West Sacramento, Yolo County includes numerous smaller communities such as Madison and Esparto and more outlying rural areas like the Capay Valley.

**Fixed-Route Service**

The Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD) operates YOLOBUS, which offers local fixed routes within Woodland and West Sacramento and intercity routes serving Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, Woodland, downtown Sacramento, Sacramento International Airport, Capay, Dunningan, Esparto, Madison, Yolo, Knights Landing, Vacaville, and Cache Creek Casino.

Unitrans provides fixed-route transit service in the city of Davis for UCD students and the general public. UC Davis operates a UCD Med Center and UC Berkeley Shuttle.

**Demand-Responsive Service**

YCTD also operates the following curb-to-curb Dial-a-Ride services:

• Local service for persons with disabilities in Woodland;

• Local service and to medical appointments in Sacramento for West Sacramento seniors and persons with disabilities;

• Intercity service between the communities of Winters, Woodland, Davis, West Sacramento, Sacramento International Airport and downtown Sacramento.

Davis Community Transit operates origin-to-destination Dial-a-Ride service for persons with disabilities within the City of Davis.
**Supplemental/Human Services Transportation**

Other Yolo County transportation providers include:

- United Christian Centers in West Sacramento, which transports disabled adults to the local adult day health care program, and takes West Sacramento, Woodland, and Davis clients to the John H. Jones Clinic for substance abuse or medical treatment.

- Woodland Community Care Car, operating two vans driven by volunteers within Woodland to take ambulatory seniors to and from medical, dental and legal appointments, beauty or barber shops, visits to a spouse or relative in a hospital or nursing home, shopping, banking, Social Security, the Senior Center, Employment and Social Services Department, library and post office. The vans also take passengers to the Woodland Senior Center for their lunch program.

- Yolo Adult Day Health Center in Woodland, which operates four vans/mini-vans to bring clients to their program.

- Yolo County Veterans Service Office which uses two vans driven by volunteers to take local veterans to medical appointments at Veterans’ hospitals at Mather, McClellan, Martinez, Mare Island, and occasionally San Francisco.

**Yuba and Sutter Counties**

Yuba and Sutter Counties are home to two larger cities, Marysville and Yuba City, and two large unincorporated urban communities, Linda and Olivehurst, as well as two small cities, Live Oak and Wheatland, and numerous unincorporated rural areas. There has been abundant development on the city fringes and in outlying rural communities over the last ten years, with a large population of commuters to jobs in Sacramento, Placer and Yuba Counties and beyond.

**Fixed-Route Service**

Yuba-Sutter Transit offers six fixed routes serving Yuba City, Marysville, Yuba College, Olivehurst and Linda, and commuter and midday service to downtown Sacramento, including six morning and evening schedules on Highway 99, three morning and evening schedules using Highway 70, and three midday schedules. Service is generally offered from 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. Monday – Friday and from 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on Saturdays. There is no service on Sundays or major holidays.

Yuba-Sutter Transit also offers three rural route-deviation services providing scheduled access to the Yuba City / Marysville urban area from the Cities of Live Oak and Wheatland and selected Yuba County foothill communities. Each of these services offer two round trips on either two or three weekdays only.

**Demand-Responsive Service**

Yuba-Sutter Transit provides Dial-a-Ride service to seniors and persons with disabilities, and the general public in the evenings, within the Yuba City, Marysville, Linda and Olivehurst urban area.
Service is operated from 6:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m. Monday – Friday and from 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on Saturdays. There is no service on Sundays or major holidays.

**Supplemental/Human Services Transportation**

- The American Cancer Society offers its “Road to Recovery” transportation service to ambulatory cancer patients in Yuba and Sutter Counties for cancer-related appointments.
- PRIDE Industries provides worksite transportation for adult program participants with disabilities within the Yuba City/Marysville urban area and Live Oak utilizing three vans.
- Easter Seals adult day services have two buses to help transport program participants within the community as needed.

Various private companies including Heart-to-Heart, L.O.R. Transportation and Merit Med-Trans provide MediCal-subsidized, non-emergency medical trips within the area.
The following Chapter outlines the needs for public and human services transportation services and coordination identified as part of this Plan. Demographic projections indicate growth in the populations most likely to require public transportation assistance: seniors, persons with disabilities, and low-income households. Stakeholder input also identified issues with existing transportation services that affect mobility, and indicated region-wide and county-specific needs for expanded services and coordination.

Senior Population Change
Population projections have been developed by the California Department of Finance (DoF). DoF projections are from a regional economic model which makes assumptions about future levels of migration into each county.

According to DoF projections, the number of people age 75 or older in the Sacramento region, and who are the most likely to need transportation assistance, will nearly triple between 2010 and 2040, increasing to 381,000. As shown in Table 1 below, in each of the six counties, growth for each age cohort (55+, 65+ and 75+) is expected to increase as a proportion of the regional total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180,921</td>
<td>203,095</td>
<td>234,485</td>
<td>263,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>75,208</td>
<td>85,499</td>
<td>92,289</td>
<td>93,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>41,918</td>
<td>58,492</td>
<td>62,484</td>
<td>62,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>15,376</td>
<td>26,515</td>
<td>36,465</td>
<td>36,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Pop 55+</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Pop 65+</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Pop 75+</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350,275</td>
<td>391,682</td>
<td>442,505</td>
<td>501,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>98,003</td>
<td>129,369</td>
<td>157,572</td>
<td>180,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>53,668</td>
<td>74,971</td>
<td>105,097</td>
<td>127,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>24,525</td>
<td>32,573</td>
<td>50,766</td>
<td>73,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Pop 55+</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Pop 65+</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Pop 75+</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,420,434</td>
<td>1,543,522</td>
<td>1,708,114</td>
<td>1,913,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>316,539</td>
<td>421,743</td>
<td>509,437</td>
<td>613,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>159,380</td>
<td>230,044</td>
<td>322,785</td>
<td>391,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>75,496</td>
<td>89,975</td>
<td>145,875</td>
<td>212,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Pop 55+</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Pop 65+</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Total Pop 75+</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By the year 2040, the six-county region is projected to have 33% of the population aged 55 and over. DoF currently projects that the number of older adults will increase both numerically and as a percentage share of the population in each of the six counties over the study period. However, this growth will not be even.

The most dramatic graying percentage-wise will continue to occur in outlying counties which presently have lower median ages. According to DoF’s maps, percentage growth rates for those age 65+ will be greatest in Yolo and Yuba Counties, while percentage growth rates for those age 75+ will be greatest in Placer and Yuba Counties. The most urbanized county, Sacramento, will see more moderate growth rates.

Nonetheless, the largest absolute growth will take place in Sacramento County, to over 391,000 residents aged 65+ by 2040. This compares with Placer County with about 127,000, or about a third of Sacramento County’s older adult population, and El Dorado County at about 62,000 aged 65+, or about 16 percent of Sacramento’s older population. (Without the South Lake Tahoe area, these county projections would be slightly reduced.)
Persons with Disabilities: Population Change

The Census Bureau defined a disability in the 2010 Census as a long-lasting physical, mental, or emotional condition. A disabling condition can make it difficult for a person to undertake everyday activities such as walking, climbing stairs, dressing, bathing, learning, or remembering, and can prevent a person from being able to go outside the home alone, to travel independently, or to work at a job or business.

In the 2000 Sacramento Area Household Travel Survey, respondents were asked if they had a disability that limited their ability to go outside their home. Overall, 5% of people who responded reported a disability that limited their mobility. As was expected, the average number of personal trips made by persons with a disability (2.1) was lower compared to persons without a disability (3.8).\(^2\)

A “severely disabled” custom category has been created by SACOG that consists of only those persons whose disabilities make self-care and independent living more difficult. This custom category was created to more accurately represent the population who require some type of assistance, are frequently reliant on public transportation, and would most likely be dependent on demand-responsive or human services transportation.

Table A “Severely disabled population in 2010 with projections to 2040” in the Appendix provides projections of this “severely disabled” population in 10-year increments from 2010-2040. In the absence of more certainty on future disability rates, county-level disability rates have been held constant at 2010 levels to try to account for potential offsetting increases and decreases for different age groups. The 2010 disability rate was applied to DoF county projections to project out the population with severe disabilities at the end of each 10-year increment.

What is striking is that the “severely disabled” population is projected to increase by 74% between the year 2010 and 2040, to over 272,000 people in the Region due to overall population growth. Those currently aged 31-50, a group that according to studies may be showing higher disability rates, will be ages 55-74 by 2040.

In all counties, the percentage of severely disabled among those 18-64 exceeded the percentage of severely disabled seniors 65+.

Location of Population Growth

Dispersion of the senior population has occurred in the Sacramento region. Over the 30-year period from 1970-2000, Census data shows that, as population spread out from central Sacramento, so did a portion of the senior population. Maps 1 thru 4 in the Appendix illustrate that outlying counties have had increasingly larger concentrations of seniors living in areas that are suburban, semi-rural and rural. Suburban differences are notable in the Sacramento region. Growth in the older population cohorts has been increasing in newer outlying suburbs, such as El Dorado Hills, that have few public transit options and rely extensively on autos for transportation.

\(^2\) SACOG, SACOG Household Travel Survey, 1999.
A portion of the growth in the population age 65 and older will continue to occur in newer suburban areas in the outlying SACOG counties that currently have only basic or no access to transit services. More urbanized Sacramento County is also projected to have a large number of senior residents.

**Lower Income Population**

A portion of seniors are also low-income, with limited resources to afford to pay for transportation or other services. Table B in the Appendix identifies low-income seniors by age group. Regionwide in 2010, about 11.5% of all households headed by those 65+ fell below the federal poverty line. Yolo and Sutter Counties had the highest percentage of low-income seniors households headed by someone 65 and older, while El Dorado County had the lowest.

A portion of the working-age population with disabilities also faces limited income. Table C in the appendix shows that of the approximately 285,000 people falling below the federal poverty line in the Region, about 98,800 or 35% have some form of disability. Of the disabled population that is in poverty, 37% are working-age (18-64) compared with 11% who are 65+. Specific income data is not available to refine this analysis further for those in SACOG’s “custom category” with severe disabilities.

Table C and D show that the proportion of the working age population in the region who were below the federal poverty line in 2009 and 2010 was between 4 to 12 percent. This group is more likely to be transit dependent to reach work and training opportunities. In Table E, the correlation between vehicle ownership/availability and income is clear, with between 11.5 to 23% of households whose income is below $25,000 per year not having a personal vehicle available to them, compared with only 1.5 to 7.5% of households with an income higher than $25,000 per year. In total, more than 113,000 households do not have a vehicle available to get to necessary destinations such as work, grocery shopping, medical appointments, etc.

Poverty is an issue throughout the SACOG region. Many think of the urban areas of the region as having the highest levels of poverty. In fact a much larger proportion of the population affected by poverty are in the suburban and rural areas of the region as can be seen in Maps 5 through 9. This illustrates that the need for access to reliable, affordable and relatively convenient public transportation throughout the SACOG region. As the federal poverty line is seen by many as extremely low, the above maps may understate those with difficulty affording transportation services.

Even assuming disability rates remain constant, sheer population growth, especially among senior age cohorts, suggests a significant increase in the population eligible for demand-responsive services. In 2010, approximately 12% of the total regional population qualified, and since most local demand-responsive systems serve seniors over a specified age regardless of disability, by 2040 that percentage is likely to increase even more.

Consideration needs to be given to how to identify and target seniors, lower income persons and persons with disabilities who have the fewest resources for transportation support. More data will also be needed to project the need for ADA/special transportation services for those with severe disabilities among working-age and senior populations.
Common Destinations

The following are common destinations identified by stakeholders across the region:

Medical Services

- Kaiser Permanente facilities in Folsom, Sacramento (Morse Ave., Point West, South Sacramento), Roseville (Riverside, Eureka Rd., Park Lane Pharmacy), and Lincoln
- UCD Medical Center in Sacramento and UC Davis clinics
- Sutter and Dignity medical facilities/Mather Veterans Administration hospital
- County health clinics
- County/outpatient mental health clinics
- Other local hospitals and clinics (e.g., Auburn Faith, Dewitt Clinic, Woodland Memorial, MedClinics, urgent care clinics)
- Medical complexes/doctor’s offices surrounding hospitals
- Dialysis centers
- Specialized services like wheelchair repair centers in Sacramento and Roseville
- Adult day health care

Education/Employment

- Services/centers for people with various disabilities – e.g. programs for blind/visually impaired, deaf/hearing impaired, those with developmental disabilities, independent living programs, disability training programs, adult day programs
- One-stop centers
- CalWORKS
- Employment Development Department
- Department of Rehabilitation
- Adult education programs
- Colleges and universities
- Access to school buses

Government Services

- Federal, state, county offices
- Social Security offices
- Public libraries
- Legal services
- County Social Services
- Post Office
Shopping/Errands

- Grocery stores
- Pharmacies
- Big box stores like K-Mart, Wal-Mart, Target, Home Depot
- Downtown areas
- Shopping malls – traditional and outlets
- Banks
- Pet stores/veterinary clinics

Social/Recreational Opportunities

- Senior centers
- Religious congregations
- Movie and other theaters
- Gyms/athletic clubs
- Community pools
- Community centers
- Sports arenas
- Nature centers/lakes/rivers
- Fairs and special community events

Connections for Longer Distance Travel

- Sacramento International Airport
- Amtrak Stations
- Greyhound bus stations
Unmet Needs and Gaps

Stakeholders have identified a variety of gaps and issues with existing transportation services that limit mobility on the part of seniors, persons with disabilities, and those with low incomes.

Non-Emergency Medical Transportation

Reaching medical appointments was considered one of the greatest unmet needs for those who must rely on public transit or demand-responsive services. Issues identified with existing transportation services include:

- Those needing to reach medical facilities in another city or county can encounter difficulties trying to cross geographic boundaries, especially where eligibility requirements differ.
- Most demand-responsive services require advance reservations, making it difficult to reach a doctor for a same-day appointment because of an illness or emergency.
- It is hard to predict how long a medical appointment will last, so it is difficult to schedule a timely pick-up.
- Waits for pick-up can be long and generally difficult for someone in ill health.
- Transit agency demand-responsive programs, which are all curb-to-curb, require clients to wait outside for a pick-up, and if they are late it can be a particular hardship for someone who is frail or ill, especially in hot, cold, or wet weather.
- Some people are too frail to utilize curb-to-curb service, and require greater assistance to and from the vehicle.
- Seniors with dementia can be too confused to successfully reach an appointment without escort.
- Van transportation itself can exacerbate certain medical conditions.
- Demand for demand-responsive services especially by dialysis clients keeps growing, decreasing capacity for other users.
- Schedules are not always coordinated between agencies on route connections to reach medical centers.

Odyssey undertook a study to examine connections between communities to major medical facilities and key destinations in Sacramento County.

For those able to access the initial route in their home community, in some cases intercity travel options are very good, with agencies providing direct service without transfers or waiting. These included: both Auburn and Lincoln to the Roseville Galleria, Lincoln to Roseville Kaiser, and El Dorado to Folsom Kaiser and Folsom Lake College.

Unfortunately, many other trips are not easy for transit-dependent patients, requiring long trips, significant wait times and multiple transfers. For example, consulting transit agency websites for current routes and schedules:
• For someone trying to reach Kaiser Roseville from Auburn, the trip requires 2 hours and 3 transfers.
• Elk Grove to Kaiser South takes 1-1.5 hours with at least one transfer.
• Yuba City to Kaiser Morse takes up to 2.5 hours and 3 transfers, with half the time spent waiting for transfers and is only available Monday through Friday.
• Outside of Tuesdays and Thursdays when SAC-MED is available, depending on the time of day, traveling from El Dorado County to Mercy Folsom can take up to 3 hours and up to two transfers, with a potential hour wait for the transfer.
• Davis to Kaiser South takes 2.5 hours and at least two transfers, with almost one third of the time spent waiting.
• Auburn to Pride Industries in Roseville is difficult trip on public transit – routing can take up to 3 hours and three transfers.

These findings bear out the difficulties reported by stakeholders with travel across city/county boundaries, even to key destinations.

**Demand-Responsive Service**

Concerns extended to demand-responsive service generally. Stakeholders identified the following as issues with Paratransit/Dial-a-Ride systems region wide that inhibit mobility:

• Requirements for advance scheduling
• Insufficient service in terms of hours, capacity, and geographic areas served
• Long waits for pick-ups
• Difficulty of intercity connections
• Curb-to-curb service that is insufficient for those who need additional help to/from the vehicle or to carry packages.

**Fixed-Route Transit**

For seniors, persons with disabilities, and low-income families who can or do use fixed-route transit, besides the concerns raised above, stakeholders across the region also identified these issues:

• Insufficient service, especially midday, evenings, weekends, holidays, and in more rural areas
• Lack of fixed-route transit near where people live and serving their destinations
• Ride times that are long, especially if there is a need to transfer
• Bus stops that are far from destinations and/or have poor physical access
• Cost, especially with fare increases and transfers
• Drivers not following rules and training concerning riders who are seniors or have disabilities
• Insufficient transit information reaching the public.
• Lack of system integration across the geographic boundaries of providers, resulting in poor timing and schedule coordination, difficulty for riders to connect for intercity travel, and/or requiring multiple transfers.

Maps 5-9 developed by SACOG show current transit services overlaid on areas in the SACOG Region that are more heavily populated by households with lower incomes. Certain locations in the region appear to have sections that are less well served by transit, despite the concentration of lower income families. This kind of mapping can be a useful tool for identifying and planning transit services for areas that are potentially underserved.

County Issues

County-specific issues were also identified through stakeholder interviews, workshops and unmet needs hearings, as listed below:

El Dorado County

• Many people live outside the Dial-a-Ride boundary and so do not qualify for service.
• Taxi service is expensive.
• There are no supplementary volunteer programs.
• Dial-a-Ride subscription service is full with a waiting list, making it hard for working people to rely on the service as it is first-come, first-served for those without a subscription.

Placer County

• Intercity travel is difficult from Auburn, Lincoln and other outlying towns to Roseville for jobs, shopping, programs such as PRIDE, and medical services, and across county lines to destinations in Sacramento County.
• Small print size is difficult to read in transit information
• There are limits on shopping bags/packages
• Sun City senior communities in Roseville or Lincoln do not provide transportation services for residents who, as they age, are no longer able to drive, relying instead on resident volunteers. Most volunteer-provided services cannot transport people who use wheelchairs because of issues with disabled users’ limited ability to transfer from a wheelchair to a vehicle.
• Clients with similar profiles may or may not qualify for transportation services because of eligibility requirements.
• Some contracting agencies don’t permit CTSA to carry other programs’ clients even when going to the same destination.
• Placer County Transit schedules do not necessarily coordinate with the light rail schedule at Watt/I-80.

Sacramento County

• Transfers are sometimes across the street and/or very tight, and if a bus is missed there can be a long wait for the next one given infrequent schedules.
• Riders may not know to ask drivers to communicate when there is a potential to miss a key transfer.
• Seniors have fears of getting lost, of safety at transit stops, and of using transit at hours when many teenagers are present.
• Bus drivers are unable to enforce priority seating for elderly and disabled persons.
• Incorrect information is sometimes provided by customer service agents.
• There is a lack of notice about stop location changes, route diversions, closures, road construction barriers, and the like.
• There is no braille signage at bus stops for the blind/visually impaired.
• No system or Transportation Management Association is available to help organize accessible taxi services or shuttles in neighborhoods.
• Individuals are sometimes denied a ride on Paratransit due to lack of next-day or same-day space.
• Light rail to/from Folsom does not run late enough to accommodate nontraditional work shifts or college students taking evening classes in Folsom or Sacramento.

Yolo County

• There is a lack of mobility training for passengers who could be encouraged to use fixed route buses instead of demand-responsive service.
• Dial-a-Ride vehicles are insufficient at peak travel times;
• There is inadequate gap service for wheelchair users and in smaller communities, especially for emergencies and unplanned situations.
• Need more accessible taxies.
• Insufficient service is available for low-income residents of the Yolo housing authority development in Winters to reach employment within and outside Yolo County.
• Drivers not always communicating sufficiently with blind/visually impaired clients that have arrived or that bus is full.
Yuba and Sutter Counties

- There is no fixed-route service on Sundays or holidays
- Buses still have steep steps that can be hard to climb.
- There is insufficient information and training on using the transit system.
- There are some who live outside the Dial-a-Ride boundary in Sutter County and so do not qualify for service.
- It can cost $40-50 to use taxi service.
CHAPTER 4: STRATEGIES AND/OR ACTIVITIES TO ADDRESS IDENTIFIED GAPS AND ACHIEVE EFFICIENCIES IN SERVICE DELIVERY

Coordination

Regionally, SACOG administers the 511 system (www.sacregion511.org), a clearinghouse for transportation information in the six-county SACOG region. The 511 website, phone system, and smart phone application allow users to obtain information on transportation within the region, as well as travel information from the adjoining regions (San Francisco Bay Area, etc.). The region has helped a majority of the fixed route transit operators get their service information into the Google automated transit trip planning system, which allows users to plan trips and receive itineraries, whether for short neighborhood trips or long regional trips from county to county.

The SACOG regional transit operators coordinate their services in a variety of ways. A majority of the fixed route transit providers operate inter-jurisdictional trips for commute purposes, as well as for everyday travel needs of their customers. Some of the region’s operators have multiple-agency dispatching and scheduling for demand responsive services. Some of the transit providers also share their maintenance facilities with other smaller, not-for-profit and specialized transportation providers.

The SACOG Transit Coordinating Committee (TCC) brings together area transit operators to coordinate their operations, capital and maintenance functions. The TCC coordinates transit studies and systems on a regional basis, disseminates federal, state and local transit information, reviews and comments on the MTP/SCS and the MTIP, gives input into SACOG's Overall Work Program, and provides a forum for the region’s transit operators to discuss transit plans and issues. TCC members come together each year to program funds for their systems’ operations and maintenance needs, as well as for capital bus replacement and expansion.

Current and Future Efforts to Improve Coordination

SACOG in partnership with the region’s fixed route transit operators, has implemented an automated trip planning (ATP) system using the Google Transit tool. The Google Transit tool allows transit riders to plan regional trips using multiple operators. The itinerary provided by the Google Transit tool includes approximate walking distances, transit travel times, and fares. Eventually, the ATP will be linked to the Sacramento Region 511 traveler information system that SACOG administers.

One of the main issues that stakeholders conveyed was the difficulty in making cross-jurisdictional trips. Many of these trips were for medical appointments. The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) initiated a study on coordination and/or consolidation of the various demand-responsive services offered in Placer County, as a majority of the transit operators now provide some form of demand-responsive transit service of their own and a CTSA operates there as well. This study resulted in the creation of the Western Placer CTSA, which now works with non-profit organizations that provide demand-responsive services and non-emergency medical transportation to residents that aren’t served by the existing fixed route transit operators’ demand-responsive services.
SACOG is in the process of implementing with eight of the region’s transit operators a single fare medium called the Connect Card. A majority of the fixed route transit operators in the SACOG region will be participating in the Connect Card once implemented in 2015. In the future, demand-response operators may also participate in the Connect Card, and the technology could also be expanded to allow the use of smart phones for payment in addition to the Connect Card. The Connect Card will increase the ability for seamless travel on the regional transit network and facilitate multi-jurisdictional transit trips.

SACOG also worked to identify environmental justice issues throughout the region with the Lifeline Transit Study. These issues include lack of transit services to certain areas where populations of lower income persons are high, as well as transit challenges faced by seniors who live in suburban ‘senior communities’ that have limited or no access to public transportation. SACOG brought together representative stakeholders to give their input on environmental justice related transportation problems that they and those in their communities face.

SACOG sees Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordination as an on-going process, to be considered on a regular basis. SACOG will continue to make use of the existing Social Service Transportation Advisory Councils (SSTAC) that advise the SACOG board on the state-required Unmet Transit Needs process to give input on Coordinated Transit/Human Services Transportation issues. The SSTACs are made up of potential transit users who are 60 years of age or older; physically disabled; social service providers for seniors, including a transportation provider; a social service provider for persons of limited means; and representatives of the CTSA (Consolidated Transportation Services Agency), including a transit operator(s).

**Recommendations for Additional Coordination Efforts and Improvements**

Many recommendations emerged from the interviews, public workshops, Senior and Disabled Mobility Study Technical Advisory Committee and the Lifeline Transit Study. Recommendations follow particularly for efforts to improve coordination and community partnerships, and for low-cost efforts by transit agencies, human service transportation providers, local governments, community-based organizations, and other to improve mobility for seniors and persons with disabilities and/or low-incomes.

**Planning and Funding**

1. Work with SACOG on funding resources to expand the availability of fixed-route, demand-responsive and shuttle services.

2. Incorporate issues and recommendations raised in this Plan, SACOG’s Senior and Disabled Mobility Study, and Lifeline Transit Study into local transit operator studies, such as Short-Range Transit Plans.

3. Continue to coordinate with SACOG and the county human services departments on mapping that overlays current transit routes with lower income and environmental justice communities, and review transit routes and frequencies of service in those areas for service revisions/ expansions to better meet local needs.
**Fixed-Route Transit Connections and Service**

4. Review and consider schedule revisions to improve fixed-route connections across geographic boundaries to key destinations, such as major medical facilities.

5. Develop a process by which transit agencies routinely provide notice to other transit providers in the region of service cuts, revisions, route changes or expansions under consideration, so that impacts on intercity connections can be considered up front in the planning process on the part of all affected agencies.

6. Seek funding support for local shuttle services from retailers and medical providers, in partnership with transit agencies and/or social service providers. Work with large medical facilities, dialysis clinics, local governments, transportation management associations, and/or community-based organizations on public/private partnerships to provide transportation services to medical appointments and/or major retail centers. Work with businesses to provide discounts/incentives to use public transit.

**Transit Stops**

7. Develop community partnerships to implement safety improvements at key bus stops and light rail stations. Sacramento Regional Transit has already begun working with city/county law enforcement, the business community, educational institutions and others on light rail station safety improvements. Continue and expand such efforts.

8. Work with local governments to increase crossing times at key intersections using federal guidelines for the pace of older and disabled persons, and improve intersections and sidewalks for safe travel to and from key transit stops. Work with local governments and property owners/managers on accessible paths of travel through large parking lots at key destinations.

9. Develop volunteer bus stop audit teams composed largely of seniors and/or persons with disabilities to audit conditions at stops and stations. Develop an Adopt-a-Stop or bus stop enhancement program to encourage private and nonprofit organizations to help maintain and beautify bus stops and add amenities.

**Demand-Responsive Service**

10. Seek funding to offer more door-to-door assistance.

11. Improve coordination between demand-responsive service providers, and seamlessness of the system for the user, regardless of which program a client is eligible for, e.g., a one-stop application form or call-in system even if the user is being served by multiple carriers.

12. Review opportunities with other demand-responsive and nonprofit providers to utilize existing vehicles for multiple program clients, possibly with assistance from SACOG’s Social Services Transportation Advisory Councils. The State’s Mobility Action Program will also be looking at program and funding requirements that limit transportation systems’ efficient use of vehicles in serving clients across different programs.
13. Work with facilities and local governments to obtain priority parking for Dial-a-Ride vehicles at common destinations.

14. Work with hospitals and clinics to offer on-site escort services for patients using curb-to-curb transportation services but needing more assistance to reach doctor’s offices.

**Information and Training**

15. Improve passenger notice on changes to routes, stops, construction delays, Dial-a-Ride pick-up changes, etc.

16. Increase and reinforce driver training concerning rules and practices for transporting seniors and persons with various forms of disability.

17. Educate more people about the complex issues around aging and mobility. Better publicize the effects of housing choices on senior and disabled mobility, and the public and personal costs of individual choices to locate away from transportation and other services. Develop partnerships with Realtors®, visitors’ bureaus, and other sources of information for those seeking housing in an area to help inform potential senior buyers and renters and their families of transportation and other services that are or are not available in the area, to encourage more informed choices.

18. Increase outreach and education on alternatives to driving and availability of mobility training programs. Increase publicity on public transit services. Improve the readability of transit schedules, including producing large print versions. Publicize the availability of ride-sharing and matching programs.

19. Establish mobility training programs in all jurisdictions to make transit and alternatives to driving more accessible and user-friendly to seniors and persons with disabilities, including those who may never have utilized it before. Develop transit ambassador/buddy programs to provide personal assistance to seniors and persons with disabilities who are learning to use fixed-route transit.

20. Partner with blindness organizations to expand and promote cane travel training for people who are blind/visually impaired in independent mobility and how to access fixed-route transit.

**Local Government Policies**

21. Work with local governments on policies requiring developers to pay for bus shelters and transit stop amenities.

22. Work with local governments to require developers of “active” senior communities to provide transportation or to contribute funds to mitigate the costs of local transportation services that will be needed as residents age, through development agreements, developer fees, or other mechanisms.
New Programs

23. Collaborate on a program of “transit scrip” to enable seniors and low-income persons with disabilities to reach fixed-route transit services via a connection by taxi, volunteer driver, or community organization. Work with CBOs to become scrip recipients for services and/or distribution mechanisms to populations needing the most financial assistance for transportation connections.

24. Catalyze shared driver cooperatives, in which a full-time driver provides service to a regular group of seniors and/or persons with disabilities who share the monthly cost of the driver and receive personalized transportation service when desired.

25. Increase availability of regulated, accessible, subsidized local and intercity taxi services.

26. Establish a community-coordinated volunteer driver program.

The following are also specific strategies and activities, sorted by cost, that were recommended in each county to improve mobility for low-income populations, seniors and those with disabilities.

El Dorado County

Lower Cost Strategies/Activities

- Strengthen design review to enable better transit access in new developments.
- Offer increased information on transit options
- Provide assistance with climbing bus stairs if “kneeling” buses are not physically feasible for certain areas.
- Provide more mobility training on using fixed route transit and alternatives to driving.

Higher-cost options

- Improve pedestrian crossings, especially near Prospector Plaza and at Highway 50 and Spring Street.
- Provide community shuttles to connect riders to bus stops on fixed routes
- Develop a community-coordinated volunteer program to fill transportation gaps
- Expand demand-responsive service
- Expand the Senior Center Shuttle’s service area.
**Placer County**

**Lower Cost Strategies/Activities**

- Improve coordination of local fixed-route services
- Improve transit stops
- Improve Dial-a-Ride dispatching to insure correct and timely pick-ups at home and destinations.
- Increase driver sensitivity training.
- Make more available information on alternatives to driving through the DMV, community locations and the media.

**Higher-cost options**

- Develop more shuttle services: within shopping centers, to medical centers and other key services, and to special/community events from senior residences.
- Increase door-to-door assistance.
- Increase availability of accessible, subsidized, local and intercity taxi services.

**Sacramento County**

**Lower Cost Strategies/Activities**

- Include greater emphasis on universal design and transit-oriented development in city and county planning processes.
- Require any project listed in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan to demonstrate that the project will work for all possible users.
- Develop guidelines and funding criteria that support better design for high speed roads and pedestrian and bicycle access, including such items as resting places in route to bus stops.
- Increase public participation through greater public outreach and information on transportation and planning meetings, including those of SACOG.
- Form a SACOG ADA committee to insure senior and disabled concerns are heard and incorporated.
- Increase sensitivity and ADA communication, training, supervision, and accountability for drivers and customer service staff.
- Develop customer appreciation systems to recognize good drivers.
- Provide more management support for drivers to remove problem riders.
Higher cost options

- Increase funding for transit.
- Focus transit funds on more frequent midday, evening, weekend, and Neighborhood Ride service.
- Improve bus stop amenities such as shelters and benches
- Increase low-floor buses
- Undertake upgrades to wheelchair restraints
- Expand usage of real-time transit information technology.
- Provide incentive pay to recognize good drivers.
- Undertake safety improvements at bus stops and on buses, especially downtown, including improved lighting and visibility at stops.
- Offer smaller vehicle and jitney services.
- Expand demand-responsive and community/volunteer transportation programs.
- Offer more taxis that are regulated, insured, supervised, offer a variety of passenger payment options and accessible vehicles, and include discounts/sliding scales/subsidies for low-income seniors/persons with disabilities.
- Look at distance-based pricing.
- Look at priority for rides based on medical need.

Yolo County

Lower Cost Strategies/Activities

- Enforce driver stop announcements.
- Provide sensitivity training for all drivers on smooth driving of large buses or Dial-a-Ride vehicles, and including simulations to understand varied impairments.
- Develop a centralized list, managed by a transportation broker or coordinator, of groups or agencies with accessible vehicles who could transport disabled persons during unplanned situations, such as an illness at work or a vehicle break-down.
- Provide more information and training on using alternatives to driving, including transit buddies.

Higher-cost options

- Increase bus service, including nights and weekends
- Develop supplemental, subsidized, accessible (ramp-equipped) taxi service.
- Expand demand-responsive service hours and wheelchair space.
- Provide greater same-day flexibility for adding riders seeking destinations similar to those with advance reservations.
- Develop shuttles to high-demand destinations

**Yuba and Sutter Counties**

**Lower Cost Strategies/Activities**

- Provide more complete travel planning information.
- Provide more mobility training.

**Higher-cost options**

- Provide more frequent and Sunday bus service.
- Provide shuttles to key shopping and service locations.
- Develop a local volunteer driving program.
Conclusion

SACOG has produced this Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan to provide data, information and recommendations that SACOG, local governments, service providers, community-based organizations and leaders, advocates, and community residents can use to begin to address the needs for mobility and transportation options among the Region’s population of seniors, those with low incomes, and with mobility-impairing disabilities.

Through the Coordinated Plan, SACOG has identified a significant need to address mobility issues for seniors, persons with disabilities and those with lower incomes in the Sacramento Region and many possible strategies for doing so. Some of these solutions are simple and inexpensive, some are more costly, and some require significant coordination and funding to implement.

In the future, SACOG will be encouraging next steps by stakeholders throughout the Region in prioritizing, planning, and seeking to implement appropriate solutions in each county throughout the region.

SACOG produced this Plan to fulfill the requirements of MAP-21, but also to focus increased attention on the Region’s increasing populations of seniors and persons with disabilities, as well as the population of people with low incomes, and on the growing demand for transportation programs and services. SACOG expects that this Coordinated Plan and future updates will support the partnerships needed to begin planning strategies now to facilitate regional mobility over the years to come.
Appendix A
Potential Funding Sources
In its 2003 report, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) identified 62 federal programs as having the greatest extent or potential for being used in partnership with Federal Transit Administration programs for serving “transportation disadvantaged” populations. In 2011, GAO revisited this question, and identified 80 such programs in that year’s report and testimony to Congress. On the following pages is a table summarizing salient information about these programs as of FY 2010, plus a dozen others, including the following elements:

- Agency and program name, and web site for additional program information
- Outlays of federal funds in FY 2010, as reported by the Office of Management and Budget, and the amount of federal funds spent specifically on transportation in FY 2009, if known, as reported by GAO.
- Indications as to primary target populations (key: “D” = individuals with disabilities, "E" = elderly persons, “L” = low-income persons or households, “V” = veterans, “Y” = children or youth)
- Indication as to whether the program has a planning mechanism at either a state or metropolitan level
- Indication as to whether the program’s funds can be used for mobility management activities as defined at 49 USC 5302(3)(K)
- Indication as to whether the program’s funds can be used to support call centers or one-call services
- Indication as to whether the program’s funds can be used to purchase transit fares, vouchers, or similar media
- Indication as to whether the program’s funds can be used to help purchase vans, buses or other vehicles

In reviewing and updating this table, these points emerge:

- The GAO 2003 methodology may not be perfect (for instance, it excludes a few agencies and programs, such as Indian Health Service, Indian Reservation Roads and other FHWA programs, that have documented histories of coordinated transit-human services partnerships), but has become a widely referenced basis of discussion.
- Most of the programs identified in 2003 by GAO are still in place (four have dropped, the United We Ride initiative identified two programs that have been added, and the 2011 GAO study identified 18 additional programs which have been added to this inventory).
- Aside from FTA programs, all others are restricted in the populations to be served, such as: persons at poverty or in low-income households (9 programs), youth and children
(9 programs), clientele of specific public health programs (7 programs), persons with disabilities (6 programs), veterans (4 programs), elderly individuals (3 programs), Native Americans (3 programs), and adult job-seekers (3 programs).

- Most of these programs are administered by states, with varying degrees of decision-making at the local level. Some programs have planning structures that could, in theory, mesh with DOT statewide transportation planning (18 programs, not including DOT programs), and only 3 non-DOT programs have planning structures that could theoretically mesh with DOT metropolitan planning processes and DOT coordinated human services transportation plans.

- Mobility management activities are at least theoretically allowable under 40 of these programs.

- The establishment and provision of “one-call” coordinated service delivery is allowable under 34 of these programs.

- Transit passes, vouchers, or other forms of fare payment are allowed uses of 35 of these programs’ federal funds.

- Vehicles or other transit-related capital assets can be purchased with 18 of these programs’ federal funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency &amp; Program</th>
<th>FY2010 Funding (transportation amount, if known)</th>
<th>Primary Target Population</th>
<th>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</th>
<th>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</th>
<th>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</th>
<th>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</th>
<th>Can Transit Fares/ Vouchers be Purchased?</th>
<th>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Nutrition Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAP Employment and Training Program (formerly Food Stamp Employment and Training Program) <a href="http://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/rules/Memo/Support/employment-training.htm">http://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/rules/Memo/Support/employment-training.htm</a></td>
<td>$344m</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State nutrition agencies may receive grants from USDA to provide employment and training services for participants in their Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (formerly known as “Food Stamps”). Transportation services connected with participants’ job search, job training and job retention can be eligible uses of these funds, at a state's discretion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunger-Free Communities <a href="http://www.fns.usda.gov/outreach/grants/hfc_grants.htm">http://www.fns.usda.gov/outreach/grants/hfc_grants.htm</a></td>
<td>$5m</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hunger-Free Communities grants are a one-time opportunity for funds aimed at helping communities increase food access by promoting coordination and partnerships between public, private and non-profit partners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Rural Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Loans and Grants <a href="http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/HCF_CF.html">http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/HCF_CF.html</a> Community Facilities Programs provide loans and grants and loan guarantees for water and environmental projects, as well as community</td>
<td>$400m (in lending authority)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
facilities projects. Community facilities projects develop essential community facilities for public use in rural areas and may include hospitals, fire protection, safety, as well as many other community-based initiatives, including rural transit facilities.

### DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

#### Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

**21st Century Community Learning Centers**

http://www2.ed.gov/programs/21stcclc/index.html

This program supports the creation of community learning centers that provide academic enrichment opportunities during non-school hours for children, particularly students who attend high-poverty and low-performing schools. The program helps students meet state and local student standards in core academic subjects, such as reading and math; offers students a broad array of enrichment activities that can complement their regular academic programs, including transportation services related to these activities; and offers literacy and other educational services to the families of participating children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Primary Target Population</th>
<th>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</th>
<th>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</th>
<th>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</th>
<th>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</th>
<th>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</th>
<th>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.2b</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Office of Innovation and Improvement

**Voluntary Public School Choice**

http://www2.ed.gov/programs/choice/index.html

This program supports efforts to establish or expand intradistrict, interdistrict, and open enrollment public school choice programs to provide parents, particularly parents whose children attend low-performing public schools, with expanded education options. Programs and projects assisted are required to use a portion of the grant funds to provide the students selected to participate in the program with transportation services, or the cost of transportation, to and from the public elementary schools and secondary schools, including charter schools, which the students choose to attend under the program. The nature of how funds may be spent on transportation services will hinge, in large part, on each state’s unique requirements concerning school bus transportation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Primary Target Population</th>
<th>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</th>
<th>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</th>
<th>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</th>
<th>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</th>
<th>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</th>
<th>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$26m</td>
<td>States, local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

**Special Education Grants**

(assistance for Education of All Children with Disabilities)

**Special Education Pre-School Grants**

**Special Education Grants for Infants and Families**

http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/osers/osep/programs.html

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) supports a comprehensive array of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Primary Target Population</th>
<th>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</th>
<th>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</th>
<th>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</th>
<th>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</th>
<th>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</th>
<th>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$11.5b</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency &amp; Program</td>
<td>FY2010 Funding (4 transport amount, if known)</td>
<td>Primary Target Population</td>
<td>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</td>
<td>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</td>
<td>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</td>
<td>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</td>
<td>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Grants</td>
<td>$3.1b</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Projects for American Indians with Disabilities</td>
<td>$43m</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Tribes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</td>
<td>Administration for Children and Families</td>
<td>Social Services Block Grant</td>
<td>$1.7b</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency &amp; Program</td>
<td>FY2010 Funding</td>
<td>Primary Target Population</td>
<td>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</td>
<td>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</td>
<td>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</td>
<td>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</td>
<td>Can Transit Fares/ Vouchers be Purchased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation, that help individuals reduce welfare dependency, achieve economic self-sufficiency, or forestall unnecessary use of institutional care. Many states rely of this program to fill programmatic gaps that cannot be addressed through TANF (see below).</td>
<td>$2.1b</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care and Development Fund <a href="http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ccb/">http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ccb/</a></td>
<td>The CCDF program is authorized by the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act and Section 418 of the Social Security Act and assists low-income families in obtaining child care so that they can work or attend training and/or education activities. The program also improves the quality of child care and promotes coordination among early childhood development and afterschool programs.</td>
<td>$7.2b</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start <a href="http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ohs/">http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ohs/</a></td>
<td>Head Start is a program of comprehensive services for economically disadvantaged preschool children. Funds are distributed to tribes and local public and nonprofit agencies to provide child development and education services, as well as supportive services such as transportation. Head Start funds are used to provide transportation services, acquire vehicles and provide technical assistance to local Head Start centers.</td>
<td>$563m</td>
<td>other</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee and Entrant Assistance Programs <a href="http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/">http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/</a></td>
<td>This is a family of programs that distribute funds on reimbursement, formula and discretionary bases for cash medical assistance and social services to refugees. A leading program goal is to help refugees quickly achieve economic self-sufficiency. Transportation is supported when provided as a component of these services.</td>
<td>$130m</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Disabilities Basic Support and Advocacy Grants (State Councils on Developmental Disabilities and Protection and Advocacy Grants) <a href="http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/add/addprogram.html">http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/add/addprogr am.html</a></td>
<td>The Administration on Developmental Disabilities (ADD) provides formula-based grants to state agencies serving the developmentally disabled, and also awards discretionary grants for demonstrations and special projects that address the unique needs of persons with developmental disabilities. Among the activities supported through these various grants are employment-, training- and housing-related services. Transportation often figures into ADD-funded projects and services.</td>
<td>$16.5b</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency &amp; Program</td>
<td>FY2010 Funding (if transportation amount, if known)</td>
<td>Primary Target Population</td>
<td>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</td>
<td>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</td>
<td>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</td>
<td>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</td>
<td>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States receive these formula grants, known as TANF, to provide cash assistance,</td>
<td>port: $355.3m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work opportunities, and necessary support services for needy families with chil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dren. States may choose to spend some of their TANF funds on transportation and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related services needed by program beneficiaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services Block Grant</td>
<td>$700m</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under this family of programs, states and tribes receive funding to provide a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broad range of services for low-income persons. Most of the funds in this set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of programs are awarded as formula-based grants to states, which pass them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on to local community action programs. An important component of these</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community services programs is the Job Opportunities for Low-income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals (JOLI) program, through which the federal Office of Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services awards discretionary grants to local non-profits who are creating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment and business opportunities for welfare recipients and other low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income individuals. Transportation services are commonly provided in both the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block grant and JOLI programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Living Program for Older Homeless Youth</td>
<td>$39m</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/fysb/content/youthdivision/programs/tlpfactsheet.htm">http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/fysb/content/youthdivision/programs/tlpfactsheet.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Transitional Living Program provides competitive grants to support projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that provide long-term residential services to homeless youth ages 16-21. The</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services offered are designed to help young people who are homeless make a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful transition to self-sufficient living. Transitional living programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are required to provide youth with stable, safe living accommodations, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services – sometimes including transportation - that help them develop the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skills necessary to become independent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American Programs</td>
<td>$22m</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Tribes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://transition.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ana/programs">http://transition.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ana/programs</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Administration for Native Americans promotes social and economic self-sufficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in communities through its Social and Economic Development Services (SEDS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grants. These competitive financial assistance grants support locally determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projects designed to reduce or eliminate community problems and achieve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community goals, which can include strategies for addressing transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and mobility goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Employment Works (Tribal Work Grants)</td>
<td>$8m</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Tribes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/programs/new">http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/programs/new</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the Native Employment Works (NEW) program is to make work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities available to Native Americans. Allowable activities include</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| educational activities, training.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency &amp; Program</th>
<th>FY2010 Funding ($, transportation amount, if known)</th>
<th>Primary Target Populations</th>
<th>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</th>
<th>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</th>
<th>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</th>
<th>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</th>
<th>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</th>
<th>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chafee Foster Care Independence Program <a href="http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/programs_fund/state_tribal/jh_chafee.htm">http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/programs_fund/state_tribal/jh_chafee.htm</a></td>
<td>$140m</td>
<td>Y States Tribes</td>
<td>State Tribal</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration on Aging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Services and Senior Centers <a href="http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/AoA_Programs/HCCLTC/supportive_services/index.aspx">http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/AoA_Programs/HCCLTC/supportive_services/index.aspx</a></td>
<td>$368m</td>
<td>E States</td>
<td>State Metro</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for Native American Elders (Program for American Indian, Alaskan Native and Native Hawaiian Elders) <a href="http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/AoA_Programs/HCCLTC/Native_Americans/index.aspx">http://www.aoa.gov/AoARoot/AoA_Programs/HCCLTC/Native_Americans/index.aspx</a></td>
<td>$28m</td>
<td>E Tribes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities Putting Prevention to Work <a href="http://www.cdc.gov/communitiesputtingpreventionontowork/">http://www.cdc.gov/communitiesputtingpreventionontowork/</a></td>
<td>$5m</td>
<td>Other Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency &amp; Program</td>
<td>FY2010 Funding (includes transportation amount, if known)</td>
<td>Primary Target Population</td>
<td>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</td>
<td>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</td>
<td>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</td>
<td>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</td>
<td>Can Transit Fares/ Vouchers be Purchased?</td>
<td>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>$286.2b</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid is a state-federal partnership that ensures medical assistance to qualified low-income persons and persons with disabilities. States are mandated to provide certain categories of health care, and some choose to expand these benefits as appropriate for their beneficiary population. There is a federal mandate for states to arrange the provision of transportation when necessary for accessing health care, but each state may set their own guidelines, payment mechanisms, and participation guidelines for these transportation services. Over the past dozen years, federal legislation has expanded the scope of mandated Medicaid coverage: the 1999 Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act required a Medicaid safety net of continued health coverage and related services for qualified persons with disabilities who are entering the workforce. The 2010 Affordable Care Act requires states to extend Medicaid eligibility to all persons at or below 133 percent of the federal poverty line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Health Insurance Program (State Children's Health Insurance Program)</td>
<td>$10.7b</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States receive formula-based funds under this program to initiate and expand child health assistance for uninsured, low-income children. States may accomplish this goal either by providing health insurance benefits to eligible children, or by expanding the coverage of their Medicaid program (see above) to include these children under those benefits. In either case, state may choose to include transportation as a covered benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Resources and Services Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Centers Program (Community Health Centers)</td>
<td>$2.1b</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal funds are allocated to community-based health centers in medically underserved areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency &amp; Program</td>
<td>FY2010 Funding (4 transportation amount, if known)</td>
<td>Primary Target Population</td>
<td>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</td>
<td>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</td>
<td>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</td>
<td>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</td>
<td>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</td>
<td>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas, migrant and seasonal farmworker communities, public housing sites, and at locations provide medical care to homeless persons. Funds may be used to provide transportation services as necessary for the delivery of primary health care services. A few community health centers provide transportation services directly, and some others contract with other providers to meet their transportation needs.</td>
<td>$75.0m</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Health Access Program (Healthy Communities Access Program) <a href="http://www.hrsa.gov/statehealthaccess/index.htm">http://www.hrsa.gov/statehealthaccess/index.htm</a></td>
<td>$75.0m</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This program of competitive grants builds on existing models of health care service integration to help health care providers develop integrated, community-wide health systems that serve the uninsured and underinsured. Grants are designed to increase access to health care by eliminating fragmented service delivery, improving efficiencies among safety net providers, and by encouraging greater private sector investment. To the extent that participating networks choose to include transportation services as part of their funded health care “safety net,” such services can be supported with these funds.</td>
<td>$75.0m</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV Care (“Ryan White”) Formula Grants <a href="http://hab.hrsa.gov/">http://hab.hrsa.gov/</a></td>
<td>$2.3b</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized under the Ryan White AIDS CARE Act, these comprise a set of programs that help communities provide emergency assistance, comprehensive HIV/AIDS care, early intervention, dental services, education and outreach, training, and pediatric services to children with HIV/AIDS. Some of these funds are awarded on a formula basis to state public health agencies, others are awarded directly to health agencies in communities disproportionately affected by HIV/AIDS, and some funds are available for competitive, discretionary grants. In many communities, health agencies use a small portion of these funds to contract for, or reimburse, necessary transportation services.</td>
<td>$2.3b</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal and Child Health Block Grant (Maternal and Child Services Grants) <a href="http://mchb.hrsa.gov/programs/default.htm">http://mchb.hrsa.gov/programs/default.htm</a></td>
<td>$661m</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of these funds are distributed to states as formula-based block grants to help provide health services to mothers, infants and children. There are particular emphases on caring for children with special health care needs and children in low-income families. Some of these funds are reserved to help support competitive grants for special projects of regional or national significance. Both formula and discretionary grants’ funds may be used to support transportation that is part of these grants’ services.</td>
<td>$661m</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Health Program Grants</td>
<td>$107m</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency &amp; Program</td>
<td>FY2010 Funding (if transportation amount, if known)</td>
<td>Primary Target Population</td>
<td>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</td>
<td>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</td>
<td>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</td>
<td>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</td>
<td>Can Transit Fares/ Vouchers be Purchased?</td>
<td>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rural Health Care, Rural Health Network, and Small Health Care Provider Grants). <a href="http://www.hrsa.gov/ruralhealth/grants/index.html">http://www.hrsa.gov/ruralhealth/grants/index.html</a> Through this initiative, state offices of rural health receive funds for discretionary grants to rural hospitals that then form integrated networks to address community health needs, such as the formation of rural health maintenance organizations, co-located health and social services, telemedicine, or transportation services as needed for rural residents’ health care. A portion of these programs’ funds are reserved for federally awarded demonstration grants to expand or enhance the availability of health services in rural areas.</td>
<td>Transport: $187K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Start Initiative <a href="http://mchb.hrsa.gov/healthystart/phase1report/">http://mchb.hrsa.gov/healthystart/phase1report/</a> This initiative supports a community-oriented approach to reducing infant mortality. A total of 94 Healthy Start communities have been designated to demonstrate this program. There are no funds for replication or for additional sites. Transportation services that help link pregnant women and new mothers to necessary health care and related services are provided in some of the initiative’s locations.</td>
<td>$105m</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Health Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Indian Health Program <a href="http://www.ihs.gov/nonmedicalprograms/urban/UIHP.asp">http://www.ihs.gov/nonmedicalprograms/urban/UIHP.asp</a> The Indian Health Service addresses the health care needs of urban American Indian and Alaska Native populations by funding 34 urban Indian health organizations operating at 41 sites located in cities throughout the United States. These health organizations engage in a variety of activities, ranging from the provision of outreach and referral services to the delivery of comprehensive ambulatory health care. Services currently include medical services, dental services, community services, alcohol and drug abuse prevention, education and treatment, AIDS and sexually transmitted disease education and prevention services, mental health services, nutrition education and counseling services, pharmacy services, health education, optometry services, social services (including transportation), and home health care.</td>
<td>$43m</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health Representatives <a href="http://www.ihs.gov/NonMedicalPrograms/chr/">http://www.ihs.gov/NonMedicalPrograms/chr/</a> The Indian Health Service typically does not provide direct transportation services. Instead, it relies on its network of Community Health Representatives (CHR) to provide not only health outreach and health promotion services, but also to provide transportation as needed for American Indians and Alaska Natives to access the medical services at IHS facilities.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>IHS-employed CHR</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency &amp; Program</td>
<td>FY2010 Funding (Transportation amount, if known)</td>
<td>Primary Target Population</td>
<td>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</td>
<td>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</td>
<td>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</td>
<td>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</td>
<td>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</td>
<td>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Diabetes Program for Indians</strong>&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; <a href="http://www.ihs.gov/MedicalPrograms/Diabetes/index.cfm?module=programsSDP">http://www.ihs.gov/MedicalPrograms/Diabetes/index.cfm?module=programsSDP</a></td>
<td>$112m&lt;br&gt;Transport: $359K</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>IHS facilities and programs</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a program to treat and prevent diabetes among American Indians and Alaska Natives. Grants are provided on a discretionary basis to IHS, tribal and urban Indian Health programs to provide community-based diabetes treatment and prevention services, including the transportation aspects of diabetes countermeasures such as physical fitness and access to nutrition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Mental Health Services Block Grant</strong>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; <a href="http://www.samhsa.gov/about/cmhs.aspx">http://www.samhsa.gov/about/cmhs.aspx</a></td>
<td>$400m</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community Mental Health Services Block Grant is a formula grant awarded to states and territories to improve access (including transportation, if necessary) to community-based health care delivery systems for adults with serious mental illnesses and children with serious emotional disturbances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grants</strong>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; <a href="http://www.samhsa.gov/grants/blockgrant/">http://www.samhsa.gov/grants/blockgrant/</a></td>
<td>$1.8b</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States receive these formula-based grants to address substance abuse prevention, treatment, recovery supports and other services (sometimes including transportation) that will supplement services covered by Medicaid, Medicare and private insurance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services Program for Children and Their Families</strong>&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt; <a href="http://www.samhsa.gov/grants/">http://www.samhsa.gov/grants/</a></td>
<td>$85m</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under this program, competitively selected communities provide coordinated mental health services to children and families through a system of care that is not limited to traditional mental health services, but may also offer services such as respite care, tutoring, vocational counseling, legal services, peer-to-peer and family-to-family support systems, and therapeutic recreation, along with the possibility of necessary transportation for these services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access To Recovery</strong>&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt; <a href="http://www.atr.samhsa.gov/">http://www.atr.samhsa.gov/</a></td>
<td>$95m&lt;br&gt;Transport: $3.0m</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access To Recovery (ATR) is a program of three-year competitive grants program funded by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Substance Abuse Treatment. ATR provides vouchers to clients for purchase of substance abuse clinical treatment and recovery support services. The goals of the program are to expand capacity, support client choice, and increase the array of faith-based and community based providers for clinical treatment and recovery support services, including transportation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.ihs.gov/MedicalPrograms/Diabetes/index.cfm?module=programsSDP](http://www.ihs.gov/MedicalPrograms/Diabetes/index.cfm?module=programsSDP)<br>Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration<br>Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services Program for Children and Their Families<br>Access To Recovery
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency &amp; Program</th>
<th>FY2010 Funding (&amp; transportation amount, if known)</th>
<th>Primary Target Population</th>
<th>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</th>
<th>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</th>
<th>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</th>
<th>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</th>
<th>Can Transit Fares/ Vouchers be Purchased?</th>
<th>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Community Planning and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Block Grant</td>
<td>$3.9b</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>States, local entities</td>
<td>State Metro</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/communitydevelopment/programs/">http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/communitydevelopment/programs/</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program supports a wide variety of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community and economic development activities, with priorities determined at the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local level. Some communities have used CDBG funds to assist in the construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of transportation facilities or for operating expenses and vehicle acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for community transportation services. Most CDBG funds are distributed on a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formula basis to entitled cities, states and urban counties, but some funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are retained for national community development initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Solutions Grants (formerly Emergency Shelter Grants)</td>
<td>$250m</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>States, local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) program is to assist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individuals and families quickly regain stability in permanent housing after</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiencing a housing crisis or homelessness. ESG funds are available for five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program components: street outreach, emergency shelter, homelessness prevention,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rapid re-housing assistance, and data collection through the Homeless Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information System. Transportation costs related to emergency shelter services are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eligible under this program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS</td>
<td>$314m</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>States, local entities</td>
<td>State Metro</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/aidshousing/index.cfm">http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/aidshousing/index.cfm</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program provides grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for housing and supportive services for low-income people with HIV/AIDS and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their families. Grants may be used to provide transportation services to assist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clients in accessing health care and other services. Most of this program’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding is awarded on a formula basis to state and city governments, who then</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may contract with local providers of transportation and other services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing and Related Programs for the Homeless</td>
<td>$1.7b</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>States, local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/homeless/programs/hp">http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/homeless/programs/hp</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through programs authorized by the McKinney-Vento Act, HUD helps local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governments and private nonprofits provide housing and supportive services to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homeless persons. Transportation is among the services many of these local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housing providers seek to furnish for their residents. Most McKinney Act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
funds are awarded by formula to states and localities, but some are available for competitive grants from HUD’s headquarters offices. Another aspect of the McKinney-Vento Act is that it requires federally owned facilities or property that no longer is needed for federal purposes to be considered first for use to serve the needs of the homeless before being considered for sale or transfer to non-federal entities.

### Office of Public and Indian Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency &amp; Program</th>
<th>FY2010 Funding (transportation amount, if known)</th>
<th>Pri-</th>
<th>Target Popu-</th>
<th>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</th>
<th>Statewide and/or Metropolitan Planning?</th>
<th>Mobi-</th>
<th>Mobility Management Eligible?</th>
<th>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</th>
<th>Can Transit Fares/ Vouchers be Purchased?</th>
<th>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Public and Indian Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPE VI (Revitalization of Severely Distressed Public Housing)</td>
<td>$120$m</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving to Work</td>
<td>$3.8b</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Opportunities and Self Sufficiency Service Coordinators (ROSS)</td>
<td>$66m</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
income, reduce or eliminate the need for welfare assistance, make progress toward achieving economic independence and housing self-sufficiency, or, in the case of elderly or disabled residents, help improve living conditions and enable residents to age-in-place.

### Office of Housing

#### Supportive Housing for the Elderly


Also known as Section 202, this program helps expand the supply of affordable housing with supportive services for the elderly. It provides very low-income elderly with options that allow them to live independently but in an environment that provides support activities such as cleaning, cooking, transportation, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency &amp; Program</th>
<th>FY2010 Funding</th>
<th>Primary Target Population</th>
<th>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</th>
<th>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</th>
<th>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</th>
<th>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</th>
<th>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</th>
<th>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice Neighborhoods</td>
<td>$122m</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities</td>
<td>$115m</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Office of Sustainable Housing and Communities

#### Sustainable Communities Initiative


The objective of the Sustainable Communities Initiative is to stimulate more integrated and sophisticated regional planning and outcomes that guide state, metropolitan and local investments in land use, transportation and house, as well as challenging localities to undertake zoning and land use reforms. This

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency &amp; Program</th>
<th>FY2010 Funding</th>
<th>Primary Target Population</th>
<th>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</th>
<th>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</th>
<th>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</th>
<th>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</th>
<th>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</th>
<th>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Initiative</td>
<td>$102m</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>States, local entities</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency &amp; Program</td>
<td>FY2010 Funding</td>
<td>Primary Target Population</td>
<td>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</td>
<td>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</td>
<td>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</td>
<td>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</td>
<td>Can Transit Fares/ Vouchers be Purchased?</td>
<td>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative has undertaken national competitive challenge grants, competitive regional planning grants, and competitive capacity building grants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bureau of Indian Affairs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Human Services</td>
<td>$118m</td>
<td>Other Tribes, Individuals</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/BIA/OIS/HumanServices/index.htm">http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/BIA/OIS/HumanServices/index.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bureau of Indian Affairs’ Division of Human Services provides direct funding to individuals and activities related to social services, welfare assistance, Indian child welfare and tribes’ human services program administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Community, Economic &amp; Workforce Development</td>
<td>$42m</td>
<td>Tribes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/AS-IANED/DWD/index.htm">http://www.bia.gov/WhoWeAre/AS-IANED/DWD/index.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bureau of Indian Affairs’ Division of Workforce Development manages a wide variety of job placement and training activities to promote job training and employment opportunities. These include coordination of federal employment and training resources for tribes, providing training for economic development opportunities towards job creation, and administering other tribal job training programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bureau of Indian Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Schools Student Transportation Assistance for Indian Children with Severe Disabilities</td>
<td>$147m</td>
<td>Tribes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Cost Grants for Indian Schools</td>
<td>$147m Trans- por: $50.5m夸大文本。 Textbook.</td>
<td>Tribes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Education Assistance to Schools</td>
<td>$147m</td>
<td>Tribes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.bie.edu/Schools/PrimarySecondary/index.htm">http://www.bie.edu/Schools/PrimarySecondary/index.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bureau of Indian Education oversees a total of 183 elementary and secondary schools, located on 64 reservations in 23 states. Of these, 59 are BIE-operated and 124 are Tribally-operated under BIE contracts or grants. The Bureau also funds or operates off-reservation boarding schools and peripheral dormitories near reservations for students attending public schools. BIE provides for school bus transportation of children to and from its schools. Furthermore, BIE provides for the educational needs of Indian children with disabilities, including their necessary transportation, in compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Child Education</td>
<td>$11m</td>
<td>Tribes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.bie.edu/Programs/FACE/index.htm">http://www.bie.edu/Programs/FACE/index.htm</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known by its acronym as FACE, this program was initiated in 1990, and currently has programs in 44 Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) funded schools. It was designed as a family literacy program, and has become an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency &amp; Program</td>
<td>FY2010 Funding (4 transportation amount, if known)</td>
<td>Primary Target Population</td>
<td>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</td>
<td>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</td>
<td>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</td>
<td>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</td>
<td>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</td>
<td>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>integrated model for an early childhood/parental involvement program for American Indian families in BIE-funded schools. The goals of the FACE program are: to support parents/primary caregivers in their role as their child's first and most influential teacher; to increase family literacy; to strengthen family-school-community connections; to promote the early identification and services to children with special needs; to increase parent participation in their child's learning; to support and celebrate the unique cultural and linguistic diversity of each American Indian community served by the program; and to promote lifelong learning. Transportation in support of these goals may be provided.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF LABOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment and Training Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trade Adjustment Assistance Training Grants</strong> <a href="http://www.doleta.gov/tradeact/">http://www.doleta.gov/tradeact/</a></td>
<td>$685m</td>
<td>Other States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program is a federal program that provides a path for employment growth and opportunity through aid to US workers who have lost their jobs as a result of foreign trade. The TAA program seeks to provide these workers with opportunities to obtain the skills, resources and support they need to become reemployed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welfare to Work Grants for Tribes</strong> [identified in 2003, but since discontinued]</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welfare to Work for States and Local Governments</strong> [identified in 2003, but since discontinued]</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Incentive Grants</strong> [identified in 2003, but since discontinued]</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workforce Investment Act Adult &amp; Dislocated Worker Programs</strong> <a href="http://www.doleta.gov/programs/general_info.cfm">http://www.doleta.gov/programs/general_info.cfm</a></td>
<td>$3.5b</td>
<td>Other States</td>
<td>State Metro</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youthbuild</strong> <a href="http://www.doleta.gov/youth_services/youthbuild.cfm">http://www.doleta.gov/youth_services/youthbuild.cfm</a></td>
<td>$116m</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Agency & Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency &amp; Program</th>
<th>FY2010 Funding</th>
<th>Primary Target Population</th>
<th>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</th>
<th>Statewide and/or Metropolitan Planning?</th>
<th>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</th>
<th>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</th>
<th>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</th>
<th>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youthbuild</strong> is an alternative education program that assists youth who are often significantly behind in basic skills with obtaining the education and employment skills necessary to achieve economic self-sufficiency, while also providing these disadvantaged youth with opportunities for meaningful work, fostering a commitment to community development among youth in low-income communities, and expanding the supply of permanent affordable housing by utilizing the energies and talents of disadvantaged youth.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Community Service Employment Program</strong> [identified in 2003, but since discontinued]</td>
<td>$820m</td>
<td>E States</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment Standards Administration

- **Black Lung Benefits Program**
  - Coal industry workers who have been disabled from pneumoconiosis, or “Black Lung Disease,” and the widow(er)s and surviving dependents of these workers, receive monthly cash payments and other benefits from the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund. In addition to the cash payments, which carry no restriction on their use, persons disabled due to pneumoconiosis are reimbursed for their travel to and from necessary medical care; these reimbursements can be for payments to transportation providers.
  - $596m
  - Other
  - Eligible individuals:
    - N
    - Y
    - N
    - Y
    - N

### Office of Job Corps

- **Job Corps**
  - [http://www.jobcorps.gov/home.aspx](http://www.jobcorps.gov/home.aspx)
  - Job Corps is an alternative education and training program that helps young people from low-income households earn a high school diploma or GED, and find and keep a good job.
  - $1.7b
  - Y
  - N
  - N
  - N
  - Y
  - Y
  - N

### Veterans’ Employment and Training Service

- **Veterans Workforce Investment Program** (Veterans’ Employment Program)
  - The Labor Department’s Veterans’ Employment and Training Service addresses the specific needs of veterans, including veterans with disabilities, as they transition from military service to non-military employment. Working
  - $43m
  - V
  - State
  - State
  - Y
  - Y
  - Y
  - Y
  - N
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency &amp; Program</th>
<th>FY2010 Funding (transportation amount, if known)</th>
<th>Primary Target Population</th>
<th>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</th>
<th>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</th>
<th>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</th>
<th>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</th>
<th>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</th>
<th>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>through state and local workforce agencies, veterans groups, and One-Stop Career Centers, a variety of job search, training, transitional assistance and necessary supportive services, occasionally including transportation, are provided to veterans, with particular emphasis paid to addressing the needs of veterans with disabilities and homeless veterans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

#### Federal Transit Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Over-the-Road Bus Accessibility Grants</th>
<th>$6m</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Private bus companies</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/grants/financing_11856.html">http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/grants/financing_11856.html</a></td>
<td>This is a program of grants to help private operators of over-the-road buses finance a portion of their costs in complying with unique aspects of the Americans with Disabilities Act that pertain to these vehicles and their operations. <strong>NOTE: This program discontinued as of FY 2013, per MAP-21.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Capital Assistance for Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities</th>
<th>$176m</th>
<th>E. D</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/grants/financing_3556.html">http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/grants/financing_3556.html</a></td>
<td>Known by its authorizing legislation as Section 5310, this program provides formula funding to state for the purpose of assisting private nonprofit groups and certain public bodies in meeting the transportation needs of elders and persons with disabilities. With a limited number of exceptions, funds may be used only for capital expenses or purchase-of-service agreements. States receive these funds on a formula basis. <strong>NOTE: This program revised significantly in FY 2013, per MAP-21.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Access and Reverse Commute Program</th>
<th>$163m</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>States, local entities</th>
<th>State Metro</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/grants/financing_3550.html">http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/grants/financing_3550.html</a></td>
<td>The Job Access and Reverse Commute program (JARC) promotes transportation services in urban and rural areas that assist welfare recipients and low-income individuals in accessing employment opportunities. Funding is distributed by formula to urbanized areas over 200,000 population, and to states for projects in rural areas and in urbanized areas of less than 200,000 population. <strong>NOTE: This program discontinued as of FY 2013, per MAP-21.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Transit Formula Grants – Nonurbanized (“rural”) Areas</th>
<th>$633m</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/grants/financing_3555.html">http://www.fta.dot.gov/funding/grants/financing_3555.html</a></td>
<td>Commonly known by its authorizing legislation as Section 5311, this is a program of formula funding to states for the purpose of supporting public transportation in areas with populations of less than 50,000. Funds may be used to support administrative, capital or operating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency &amp; Program</td>
<td>FY2010 Funding (Funding amount, if known)</td>
<td>Primary Target Population</td>
<td>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</td>
<td>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</td>
<td>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</td>
<td>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</td>
<td>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</td>
<td>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Formula Grants – Urbanized Areas</td>
<td>$4.9b</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>States, local entities</td>
<td>State Metro</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freedom Program</td>
<td>$90m</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>States, local entities</td>
<td>State Metro</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Capital Investment Grants</td>
<td>$3.3b</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>States, local entities</td>
<td>State Metro</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs of local transportation providers. States are to spend 15 percent of their funding allocations on rural intercity bus needs, unless their governor certifies these needs already are adequately met. States may distribute funding to public, private non-profit, or tribal organizations.

Federal Transit Formula Grants – Urbanized Areas
Commonly known by its authorizing legislation as Section 5307, this program provides formula-based funding for transit projects in urbanized areas with populations greater than 50,000. In areas with populations greater than 200,000, funds are apportioned directly to designated recipients in the urbanized area, and may be used almost solely for capital expenses, although both preventive maintenance and mobility management activities are considered eligible capital expenses (these urbanized areas also may spend up to 10 percent of their Section 5307 allocations on the costs of their ADA complementary paratransit operations, and are required to spend 1 percent of their allocations on safety and security, and 1 percent on transit enhancements). In urbanized areas with populations between 50,000 and 200,000, Section 5307 funds may be used either for capital or operating costs, and typically are allocated to states for distribution among the smaller urbanized areas within the state.

New Freedom Program
The New Freedom formula grant program aims to reduce barriers to transportation services and expand the transportation mobility options available to persons with disabilities act beyond the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). Funds are available to provide both capital and operating assistance to projects that provide accessible transportation services beyond the accessible transportation requirements of the ADA. Projects must be derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan. **NOTE: This program discontinued as of FY 2013, per MAP-21.**

Federal Transit Capital Investment Grants
Commonly known by its authorizing legislation as Section 5309, this is a program of capital assistance grants for (a) new rail and other fixed-guideway transit systems, (b) modernization of existing rail and other fixed-guideway systems, and (c) buses and bus facilities. **NOTE: This program revised significantly in FY 2013, per MAP-21.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency &amp; Program</th>
<th>FY2010 Funding</th>
<th>Primary Target Population</th>
<th>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</th>
<th>Statewide and/or Metropolitan Planning?</th>
<th>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</th>
<th>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</th>
<th>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</th>
<th>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Highway Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Reservation Roads <a href="http://flh.fhwa.dot.gov/programs/ir/">http://flh.fhwa.dot.gov/programs/ir/</a></td>
<td>$450m</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Tribes</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Indian Reservation Roads Program addresses transportation needs of tribes by providing funds for planning, designing, construction and maintenance activities. These funds may be used for the capital and operating costs of tribal transit programs, as based on plans that assess the condition and relative need of all transportation infrastructure on Indian reservations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veterans Health Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Medical Care Benefits <a href="http://www.va.gov/health/MedicalCenters.asp">http://www.va.gov/health/MedicalCenters.asp</a></td>
<td>$36.1b</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans are eligible for a wide range of hospital-based and outpatient medical services. The Dept of Veterans Affairs (VA) will reimburse eligible veterans for some transportation to covered medical care. In addition, many VA Medical Centers work with volunteer networks to provide transportation for veterans seeking health care, and there occasionally are opportunities for transportation providers to contract directly with VA Medical Centers to provide some services. A growing number of VA Medical Centers have transportation mobility managers, and those VA Medical Centers participating in VA’s Veterans Transportation Service provide transportation services above and beyond volunteer networks and individual reimbursements. VA also has specific funding opportunities for organizations serving homeless veterans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Providers Grant and Per Diem Program <a href="http://www.va.gov/homeless/gpd.asp">http://www.va.gov/homeless/gpd.asp</a></td>
<td>$122m</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Local entities</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a program of annual discretionary grants to community agencies that provide services to homeless veterans. The purpose is to promote the development and provision of supportive housing and/or supportive services with the goal of helping veterans achieve residential stability, increase their occupational skills and income, and obtain greater self-determination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Veterans Benefits Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobiles and Adaptive Equipment <a href="http://www.vba.va.gov/VBAbenefits/factsheets/index.asp">http://www.vba.va.gov/VBAbenefits/factsheets/index.asp</a></td>
<td>$75m</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dept of Veterans Affairs (VA) will pay for the acquisition of an accessible personal vehicle, or for the adaptation of a personal vehicle, to accommodate a veteran or service member with certain disabilities that resulted from an injury or disease incurred or aggravated during active military service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency &amp; Program</td>
<td>FY2010 Funding (per transportation amount, if known)</td>
<td>Primary Target Population</td>
<td>Who are the main direct recipients of Federal funds?</td>
<td>Statewide and/or Metropolitan (or equiv) Planning?</td>
<td>Is Mobility Management Eligible?</td>
<td>Can One-Call Services be Funded?</td>
<td>Can Transit Fares/Vouchers be Purchased?</td>
<td>Can Vehicles be Purchased?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| National Senior Service Corps  
http://www.seniorcorps.gov  
Senior Corps connects volunteers age 55+ with community service opportunities where they are needed most, and provides limited stipends and transportation reimbursements when needed for successful program participation. 
The three components of the Senior Corps are the Foster Grandparent Program, the Senior Companion Program, and RSVP (the Retired Senior Volunteer Program) | $205m | E | Local entities, individuals | N | N | N | Y | N |
| Ticket to Work Program  
http://www.ssa.gov/work/aboutticket.html  
Under the Ticket to Work program, Social Security beneficiaries may receive “tickets” that help connect them with designated employment networks, where they can obtain employment services vocational rehabilitation services, or other support services necessary to achieve a vocational goal. | $84m | D | Individuals | N | Y | Y | Y | N |
Appendix B
Tables
Severely Disabled Population in 2010 with projections to 2040

Table A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Population 2010</th>
<th>&quot;severely disabled&quot; 18 to 64 yrs</th>
<th>% of total population that is &quot;severely disabled&quot; 18 to 64 yrs</th>
<th>% of total population that is &quot;severely disabled&quot; 65-74 yrs</th>
<th>% of total population that is &quot;severely disabled&quot; 75+ yrs</th>
<th>% of total population that is &quot;severely disabled&quot; 75+ yrs</th>
<th>Number of &quot;severely disabled&quot; persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>180,921</td>
<td>5371</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>350,275</td>
<td>8044</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2746</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>7,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>1,420,434</td>
<td>54,367</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>16114</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>34,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>94,669</td>
<td>3604</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>201,311</td>
<td>4523</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>72,329</td>
<td>3770</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1,857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: American Community Survey ACS) 2008-2010
DOF Population Projections

"severely disabled" - this is the percentage of the population that has "independent living" and "self care" disabilities according to Census 2010.
The % of 'severely disabled' persons was held constant at the year 2010 level and was used to project the 'severely disabled' population out to 2040.
Table B  
LI = Low Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total # of Households headed by someone 65+</th>
<th>65+ &amp; Low Income</th>
<th>% of Senior HH LDS 65+ &amp; LI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>16,640</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>33,696</td>
<td>3945</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>98,843</td>
<td>11,438</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County</td>
<td>7,123</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td>12,471</td>
<td>1797</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba County</td>
<td>4,618</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census ACS 2008-2010

** The terms poverty and low-income are used
### Low-income population with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Total Pop 65+</th>
<th>Total Pop In Poverty*</th>
<th>Population in Poverty with a Disability</th>
<th>Of Total Pop in Poverty % w/ a Disability</th>
<th>Under 18</th>
<th>18 to 64 years</th>
<th>65 years and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>180,921</td>
<td>24,499</td>
<td>14,035</td>
<td>4,792</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>360,275</td>
<td>49,765</td>
<td>22,091</td>
<td>7,834</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3132</td>
<td>1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>1,420,434</td>
<td>152,525</td>
<td>190,248</td>
<td>69,293</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>25864</td>
<td>6,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County</td>
<td>94,689</td>
<td>11,399</td>
<td>13,224</td>
<td>4,623</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td>201,311</td>
<td>18,747</td>
<td>31,942</td>
<td>7,296</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>2117</td>
<td>871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba County</td>
<td>72,329</td>
<td>7,074</td>
<td>14,246</td>
<td>5,009</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2010, ACS 2008-2010 and ACS 2006-2010

*Poverty is defined by the Census Bureau as when the total income for a family or unrelated individual falls below the federal poverty threshold - then the family or unrelated individual is classified as being "below the poverty level" or "in poverty."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Family</th>
<th>Federal Poverty Level 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$14,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$18,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$22,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$25,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$29,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$33,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$37,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for each add'l</td>
<td>$3,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Status</th>
<th>El Dorado County, California</th>
<th>Placer County, California</th>
<th>Sacramento County, California</th>
<th>Sutter County, California</th>
<th>Yolo County, California</th>
<th>Yuba County, California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>180,921</td>
<td>350,275</td>
<td>1,420,434</td>
<td>94,669</td>
<td>201,311</td>
<td>72,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income below poverty level</td>
<td>14,035</td>
<td>22,091</td>
<td>190,248</td>
<td>13,224</td>
<td>31,942</td>
<td>14,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child population (under 18)</td>
<td>8,196</td>
<td>10,990</td>
<td>138,514</td>
<td>10,245</td>
<td>14,811</td>
<td>11,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working age pop (18-64) below the poverty level</td>
<td>9,039</td>
<td>13,836</td>
<td>116,915</td>
<td>7,535</td>
<td>23,619</td>
<td>8,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors (65 and over)</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>3,149</td>
<td>11,201</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working age below the poverty level as % of the total population</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child population below the poverty level as % of the total population</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors below the poverty level as % of the total population</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the population in poverty that is children (under 15)</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the population in poverty that are working age</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of the population in poverty that are seniors</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U.S. Census Bureau - ACS 2006-2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SACOG Region</th>
<th>Sutter/Yuba</th>
<th>Yolo</th>
<th>Sacramento</th>
<th>Placer</th>
<th>El Dorado</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56903</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>4020</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$10,000</td>
<td>18431</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>9515</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $19,999</td>
<td>6739</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>5076</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>3142</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $44,999</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $59,999</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $124,999</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 to $999,999</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PUMS Census 2000 - No vehicle households by income range
### DMV Licensing by Age

#### Table F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total Licensees</th>
<th>Total Population 2005</th>
<th>Licensees</th>
<th>Percentage licensed within Total age group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%55+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>130070</td>
<td>45,105 22,915 9,540</td>
<td>39408 18830 7453</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>216973</td>
<td>75,322 41,864 19,723</td>
<td>65448 33733 13554</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>857685</td>
<td>279,157 190,745 71,072</td>
<td>213019 105385 43599</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>55159</td>
<td>19,291 10,761 4,846</td>
<td>15141 7812 3058</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>113932</td>
<td>34,847 17,958 8,088</td>
<td>28664 12764 5388</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>38213</td>
<td>13,210 7,376 3,414</td>
<td>10562 5280 1973</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: DOF 2005 Population Estimates
DMV data January 1, 2004

Placer and El Dorado Counties have the highest proportions of senior drivers in the SACOG region.
Placer County has the highest proportion out of all the counties of its female population 55+ that is licensed to drive.
### Vehicle Availability by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total # of Households</th>
<th>HH LDS w/ No Vehicle</th>
<th>HH LDR 65 years and older</th>
<th>% of the Households with No Vehicle Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>66,394</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>129,153</td>
<td>4,881</td>
<td>2787</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>508,499</td>
<td>36,761</td>
<td>13,402</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County</td>
<td>31,373</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td>69,386</td>
<td>4,944</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba County</td>
<td>23,750</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ACS 2006-2010
Appendix C
Maps

Maps 1-4 are available for viewing at http://www.sacog.org/transit/seniormobility.cfm
Maps 5-9 are available for viewing at http://www.sacog.org/transit/lifelinetransitstudy.cfm
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SACOG Board of Directors
October 9, 2014

Approve Submission of Grant Application for FTA Pilot Program for TOD Planning

Issue: Should SACOG submit an application to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for the Pilot Program for Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Planning?

Recommendation: The Transportation Committee unanimously recommends that the Board approve a resolution that authorizes SACOG to submit an application to FTA for funding from the Pilot Program for TOD Planning if staff determines a competitive application can be prepared, and authorize the Chief Executive Officer to execute the funding agreement associated with this grant, if awarded.

Committee Action/Discussion: On September 3, 2014, the FTA issued a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) announcing the availability of $19.98 million in Pilot Program for TOD Planning funding. The pilot program is designed to support comprehensive planning work, including TOD, which is conducted in conjunction with the development of a New Starts, Core Capacity, or fixed-guideway Small Starts project that is or will soon be in the project development or engineering phase. The program is intended to fund land use-related planning covering an entire transit capital project corridor, and that supports economic development, ridership, multimodal connectivity and accessibility, increased transit access for pedestrian and bicycle traffic, and mixed-use development near transit stations. The program encourages identification of infrastructure needs; engagement with the private sector; strategies to address potential residential and commercial displacement from TOD; and support for “ladders of opportunity,” through planning for improving residents’ access to employment, health care, education, and housing.

In the Sacramento region, the only transit project with eligibility for these funds is the Downtown Riverfront Streetcar (Streetcar) which is being planned between the cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento. As the current project sponsor and existing direct recipient of FTA grants, SACOG would be the eligible applicant. Since the publication of the NOFA, SACOG staff has been in discussions with staff of the cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento to assess their interests, potential project components of a grant application, and potential sources of the 20 percent required non-federal match. Staff of the two cities have identified interests in planning to support transit-oriented development in the areas surrounding the Streetcar that could include technical work on zoning codes, infrastructure assessment and financing, development standards, density feasibility, gentrification/displacement issues, parking issues, pedestrian safety, and intersection engineering.

SACOG staff will continue to work with the cities to determine if a competitive grant application can be prepared. If the decision is made to move forward, staff from the involved agencies will hone a project scope and budget, and submit the application by the deadline of November 3, 2014. A more detailed description of the application will be provided to the Board at its October 16 meeting, if available by then.

The attachment contains the resolution authorizing the Chief Executive Officer to submit the grant application.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:SS:gg
Attachment
Key Staff: Kirk Trost, Chief Operating Officer/General Counsel, (916) 340-6210
Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
Sharon Sprowls, Senior Program Specialist, (916) 340-6235
Joe Concannon, Data Services Manager, (916) 340-6234
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

RESOLUTION NO. 52 – 2014

APPROVING FTA GRANT APPLICATION FOR PILOT PROGRAM FOR TOD PLANNING AND AUTHORIZING THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO EXECUTE THE FUNDING AGREEMENT FOR AN AWARDED GRANT

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization and one of the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies responsible for transportation planning in the Sacramento region; and

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is the current project sponsor for the Streetcar planned between the cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Transit Administration is offering an opportunity for SACOG and its partners in the Streetcar to apply for a grant for comprehensive planning under the Pilot Program for TOD Planning; and

WHEREAS, approval is requested for a grant application to be submitted by November 3, 2014, and for the Chief Executive Officer to execute a funding agreement between SACOG and the FTA if the grant is awarded;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the SACOG Board of Directors authorizes the Chief Executive Officer to submit to FTA a grant application for the Pilot Program for TOD Planning, and authorizes the Chief Executive Officer to execute any grant agreements necessary to receive grant funds, or other funds that may be available, for the purpose of carrying out the grant application project with the cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 16th day of October 2014, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

______________________________  ______________________________
Steve Cohn                   Mike McKeever
Chair                       Chief Executive Officer
Submission of Applications for FY 2015-16 Caltrans Transportation Planning Discretionary Grants

**Issue:** Should SACOG submit applications to Caltrans for available Transportation Planning Discretionary Grants?

**Recommendation:** The Transportation Committee unanimously recommends that the Board approve a resolution for projects to be submitted to Caltrans for discretionary funding and authorize the Chief Executive Officer to execute any funding agreements associated with these grants.

**Committee Action/Discussion:** Caltrans issued a call on September 2, 2014, for projects for its discretionary transportation planning grant programs. A summary of the FY 2015-16 grant program is shown in Attachment A. There are several notable changes to the grant program this year:

- The deadline is far earlier than in the last cycle – October 2014 instead of February 2015 – with project starts as early as July 2015.
- The FY 2015-16 cycle includes only two grant categories: Strategic Partnerships and Sustainable Communities.
- Only Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies are allowed to submit applications in the Strategic Partnership category, with cities, counties, transit agencies, and others eligible as subrecipients.
- MPOs, cities, counties, and transit agencies are all eligible to apply directly for Sustainable Communities grants.

On September 2, 2014, SACOG issued guidance to member agencies and transit agencies requesting information on any projects for which they might want SACOG to submit a Caltrans grant application on their behalf. Because local agencies are now allowed to submit applications for the Sustainable Communities program directly to Caltrans, SACOG only received one pass-through request from the City of Elk Grove for a Strategic Partnership grant application.

In the weeks since the guidance was issued, staff has also been assessing potential SACOG-led projects for grant applications. Attachment B includes the initial list of potential SACOG applications that was provided to the Transportation Committee at its October 2 meeting which has been updated to reflect current discussions. A further update on grant applications that SACOG wishes to move forward will be provided to the Board at its October 16 meeting.

Attachment C contains the resolution authorizing the Chief Executive Officer to submit final grant applications.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:SS:gg

Attachments

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
Sharon Sprowls, Senior Program Specialist, (916) 340-6235
Barbara VaughanBechtold, Associate Planner, (916) 340-6226
## Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Summary Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Grant</strong></th>
<th><strong>Fund Source</strong></th>
<th><strong>Purpose</strong></th>
<th><strong>Who May Apply</strong></th>
<th><strong>Local Match</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td><a href="#">Federal Highway Administration—State Planning and Research, Part 1</a></td>
<td>Funds transportation planning studies of interregional and statewide significance, in partnership with Caltrans.</td>
<td>The following are eligible to apply as a primary applicant:</td>
<td>20% minimum (in non-federal funds or an in-kind* contribution). The entire minimum 20% local match may be in the form of an in-kind contribution. Additional local funds above the minimum local match are desired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>Federal funds $1,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant Min</strong></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Transit Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant Max</strong></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Universities and Community Colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Native American Tribal Governments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cities and Counties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community-Based Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Other Public Entities**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities</td>
<td><a href="#">Federal Transit Administration, Section 5304 &amp; State Highway Account</a></td>
<td>Funds studies of multimodal transportation issues having statewide, interregional, regional or local significance to assist in achieving the Caltrans Mission and overarching objectives.</td>
<td>The following are eligible to apply as a primary applicant:</td>
<td>11.47% minimum (in cash or an in-kind* contribution). The entire minimum 11.47% local match may be in the form of an in-kind contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>Federal/State funds $8,300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant Min</strong></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Transit Agencies; Cities and Counties; Native American Tribal Governments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant Max</strong></td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Transit Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Universities and Community Colleges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Native American Tribal Governments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cities and Counties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community-Based Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Other Public Entities**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For in-kind contribution requirements, refer to Page 10 of this Guide.

** Public entities include state agencies, the Regents of the University of California, district, public authority, public agency, and any other political subdivision or public corporation in the State (Government Code Section 811.2).
### Potential SACOG-Led FY 2015/16 Caltrans Transportation Planning Grant Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Summary of Project Concept</th>
<th>Est. Grant Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>Household Travel Survey Design</td>
<td>This potential project would enable SACOG to work with the other large MPOs in the state to design a household travel survey that would fit the needs of both the other MPOs and the Sacramento region, including our more rural areas. The resulting survey design could help take advantage of economies of scale through collaborating with other MPOs on potential survey implementation in 2016. A current household travel survey would help SACOG update its travel model to support local jurisdictions’ transportation planning and SACOG modeling and analysis for the update of the MTP/SCS in 2020.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities</td>
<td>Connect Card Marketing Phase II: Reaching Harder-to-Reach Markets</td>
<td>This potential project could plan for development of additional multilingual instructional and marketing materials and outreach strategies to reach harder-to-reach audiences after the first rollout of the Connect Card; and for extension of the Connect Card sales network to more local, independent retailers, particularly those serving ethnic and low-income populations in areas served by transit agencies in the Connect Card Consortium. The concept is being discussed with the Conncrt Card Consortium.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities</td>
<td>Safe, Connected Routes to Transit</td>
<td>This concept is a potential partnership with transit agencies and local nonprofits to pilot a methodology to identify where and what type of bicycle and pedestrian connectivity, safety, and amenity improvements could best support multimodal connections to key transit stops/stations and enhance transit ridership, with findings shared with local government planners to help inform local capital/infrastructure planning. This concept is still under discussion.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities</td>
<td>SACOG Internship</td>
<td>SACOG is verifying whether under the new Caltrans program rules SACOG can still apply for internship support and continue its very successful transit planning internship program to help with rural transit/transportation planning efforts.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pass-Through Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Subrecipient/Project Title</th>
<th>Project Summary</th>
<th>Est. Grant Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>City of Elk Grove</td>
<td>This project is a feasibility study to assess alternative locations for a multimodal transit station in Elk Grove with connections to Amtrak, etran, and RT services. The study would help quantify potential reductions to commuter traffic traveling in and out of the Sacramento region via the State Route 99 corridor, and help inform and support future city planning and funding efforts for a multimodal station.</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO. 51 – 2014

APPROVING CALTRANS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING GRANT APPLICATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015-16 AND AUTHORIZING THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO EXECUTE THE FUNDING AGREEMENTS FOR AWARDED GRANTS

WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization and one of the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies responsible for transportation planning in the Sacramento region; and

WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is offering an opportunity for SACOG and sub-applicants through SACOG to apply for the FY 2015-16 cycle of Caltrans Transportation Planning Grants; and

WHEREAS, approval is requested for grant applications to be submitted by October 31, 2014, and for the Chief Executive Officer to execute funding agreements between SACOG and the State of California Department of Transportation;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the SACOG Board of Directors authorizes the Chief Executive Officer to submit Caltrans Transportation Planning Grant applications for FY 2015-16, and authorizes the Chief Executive Officer to execute any grant agreements necessary to receive grant funds, or other funds that may be available, for the purpose of developing and implementing the grant application projects in the Sacramento Region.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 16th day of October 2014, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Steve Cohn
Chair

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer
Special Presentations from the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority, the San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority, and the High Speed Rail Authority

Issue: What is the status of passenger rail in the SACOG Region?

Recommendation: None. This item is for information and discussion

Committee Action/Discussion: The Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority (CCJPA) will present an update on the Vision Plan for the Capitol Corridor Inter-city Rail Service. SACOG staff has invited Mr. James Allison of the CCJPA to provide a briefing to the Board on this topic.

The San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority (SJJPA) will present its 2014 Business Plan, which includes an overall operating plan, short-term and long-term capital improvement programs, and an action plan with specific performance goals and objectives for the SJJPA service. SACOG staff has invited Mr. Dan Leavitt of the SJJPA to provide a briefing to the Board on this plan.

The High Speed Rail Authority will present an update on the status of planning, designing, and building the high speed rail system in California. SACOG staff has invited Mr. Ben Tripousis to provide a briefing to the Board on this project.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:AD:gg

Key Staff: Azadeh Doherty, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6221
SACOG Board of Directors

October 9, 2014

Chair’s Report

Chair Cohn will brief the Board members on current issues.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer
SACOG Board of Directors

October 9, 2014

Board Members’ Reports

Board members will provide updates on local issues.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer
Chief Executive Officer's Report

The following is a brief status report on some of the major issues and projects currently being advanced by SACOG.

Note: The consent and action calendars are light this month, but include several time sensitive items for which we will need a Board quorum to move forward. And in addition to an interesting Board workshop on rail issues, we will have opportunity to hear reports from an excellent Metro Chamber Study Mission to Nashville and Board leadership meeting with Metropolitan Transportation Committee Board leadership. SO….see you at the meeting!

CONSENT ITEMS: All items on the consent calendar received unanimous support in committee.

ACTION ITEM #1: While authority to submit grant applications, especially to a longstanding program, does not usually warrant full Board discussion, this Caltrans program is on a very tight schedule, and we wanted to give the Board full opportunity to ask any questions or express any concerns.

LAND USE ACTIVITIES:

During the month of September, SACOG staff conducted the following work:

- Using grant funds from Strategic Growth Council Round 3 (SGC-3), staff continues to work with Portland State University on creating a version of the program that extends technical planning assistance to more member agencies. The cities of Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, and the County of Sacramento participated in the first round of this program. Staff contacted all 28 member cities and counties about these upcoming technical assistance opportunities and discussed specific project ideas with many.

- Attended the Code for America Summit where it was announced that the West Sacramento/SACOG application was selected for its yearlong Fellowship program that will start in 2015. This is related to SACOG’s Rural-Urban Connections Strategy.

- Submitted comments in response to a notice of availability on the City of Sacramento’s Draft 2035 General Plan.
MTP/SCS WORKSHOPS:

In October and November, staff will conduct eight public workshops in the six-county region as part of the update to the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. The workshops are open house format allowing for participants to drop in. In addition to public workshops, residents can give input on transportation priorities via an online survey, which is open until November 5. The remaining public workshops are on October 23 and November 5. For questions or more information, contact Monica Hernández (916) 340-6237 or mhernandez@sacog.org.

CALENDAR:

October 16 – 9:30 a.m.  SACOG Board Meeting

October 16 – 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.  SACOG Board Lunch Discussion to include Special Presentation on Commuter and High Speed Rail with guest speakers from Capitol, San Joaquin and ACE (Altamont Corridor Express) Corridors, and the High Speed Rail Authority. All Board members are encouraged to attend. Lunch will be provided.

October 30 – 10:00 a.m.  Transportation Committee

October 30 – 1:00 p.m.  Land Use & Natural Resources Committee

November 3 – 10:00 a.m.  Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee

November 13 – 9:30 a.m.  SACOG Board Meeting

November 13 – 11:00 a.m.  Innovation Task Force Meeting

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:RS:gg