



Telephone: 209 558-7830

CONSOLIDATED PLANNING COMMITTEE

10th Street Place, 1010 Tenth Street
Room 2005, Second Floor
Modesto, CA
January 30, 2007 – 10:00 A. M.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CERES CITY HALL
Council Chambers, 2210 Magnolia Street
Ceres, CA
February 1, 2007 – 2:00 P. M.

California Brown Act Requires:

This Agenda shall be made available upon request in alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. § 12132) and the Ralph M. Brown Act (California Government Code § 54954.2). Persons requesting a disability related modification or accommodation in order to participate in the meeting should contact CJ Johnson, at (209) 558-7830, during regular business hours, at least twenty-four hours prior to the time of the meeting.

Notice Regarding Non-English Speakers:

Pursuant to California Constitution Article III, Section IV, establishing English as the official language for the State of California, and in accordance with California Code of Civil Procedures Section 185, which requires proceedings before any State Court to be in English, notice is hereby given that all proceedings before the StanCOG Policy Board shall be in English and anyone wishing to address the Board is advised to have an interpreter or give StanCOG a 48 hour notice so that StanCOG can provide an interpreter from any language not English into the English language.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Matters not on the posted agenda may be addressed by the general public at the beginning of the regular agenda and any off-agenda matters before the Committee for consideration. However, California law prohibits taking action on any matter which is not on the posted agenda unless it is determined to be an emergency by the Committee. Any member of the public wishing to address the Committee will be limited to five minutes or the discretion of the Chair.

Questions: Contact CJ Johnson at (209) 558-7830

AGENDA

1. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

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

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| A. Revision of the Previously Adopted Fiscal Year 2006-07 Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Non-Transit Apportionment | MOTION |
| B. Fiscal Year 2007/08 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Apportionment | MOTION |

3. PRESENTATIONS (NONE)

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS (NONE)

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| 5. ORAL REPORT ITEMS | |
| A. Regional "Use It or Lose It" Policy | MOTION |
| B. Adoption of the 2007/08 Unmet Transit Needs Report | MOTION |

- ### 6. INFORMATION ITEMS
- The following items are for information only.*
- A. Update on Blueprint Regional Planning Process
 - B. Update on 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

7. STANISLAUS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS ADVISORY COMMITTEES

(None Available)

8. CALTRANS REPORT

9. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

10. ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR

Topics may be presented, but no action may be taken except to place an item on a future agenda

ADJOURNMENT

Next regular meeting scheduled for:

Consolidated Planning Committee

February 27, 2007 10:00 AM

10th Street Place, 1010 Tenth Street

Room 2005, Second Floor

Modesto, CA

Technical Advisory Committee

March 1, 2007 2:00 PM

Ceres City Hall

Council Chambers

2210 Magnolia Street

Ceres, CA

* No Attachment


Consent Items



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

TO: Technical Advisory Committee
Consolidated Planning Committee

Staff Report
Motion

THROUGH: Vince Harris, Executive Director 

FROM: Vincent Canales, Finance Director 

DATE: January 18, 2007

RE: Revision of the previously adopted fiscal year 2006-07 LTF non-transit apportionment

Recommendation

By Motion:

Recommend that the Policy Board adopt the revised apportionment amounts, which include an additional \$2,896,652 in Transportation Development Act funds.

Background

Each year, one of StanCOG's most important administrative responsibilities is the distribution of Transportation Development Act (TDA) Funds. TDA consists of two types of funds: Local Transportation Funds (LTF) and the much smaller State Transit Assistance Funds (STA). LTF funds are primarily intended for public transit purposes; however, this money may be applied to roads and streets provided there are no unmet transit needs. LTF is a ¼ cent component of the statewide retail sales tax. State Transit Assistance Funds (STA) are derived from the statewide tax on gasoline and diesel fuel sales. STA funds may only be used for public transit purposes.

Every year the State Controller's Office provides an estimate of STA funds to all regional transportation planning agencies for the up-coming fiscal year. This year the State Controller's Office informed StanCOG of a substantial increase that has not occurred in the past. They have revised their original STA estimate of \$1,717,322 to \$4,613,974, an increase of \$2,896,652.

Discussion

Stanislaus County is unique with regard to the allocation of TDA funds. All of the member jurisdictions have formally adopted the Transit Cost Sharing Procedures. Under these procedures, larger sums of STA funds reduce the need to apply Local Transportation Funds (LTF) to transit operations. As a result, more LTF funds become available for street and road purposes.

Under this proposal, and in accordance with the spirit of Section 9 of the Transit Cost Sharing Procedures, the City of Modesto will receive \$2,874,445 of the \$2,896,652 increase in STA.

\\STANFS1\VOL1\DATA\STANCOG\canales\staff report 06-07\sta incr.com.doc

However, Modesto will relinquish \$2,874,445 in LTF funds to be redistributed and shared, in accordance with the transit cost sharing formula, among all of the member jurisdictions. Likewise, the County and the City of Turlock will receive the remaining STA of \$13,634 and \$8,573 and relinquish like amounts of LTF respectively. These relinquished LTF amounts will be allocated to the jurisdictions in accordance with the transit cost sharing procedures.

Table one illustrates the original fiscal year 2006-07 non-transit LTF apportionment as adopted by the Policy Board at the June 14th, 2006 meeting. Table two shows the proposed increases that each jurisdiction will receive as a result of the unanticipated \$2,896,652. Table three reflects the total revised apportionment available to each jurisdiction.

Table four shows the original streets and roads apportionment as calculated by the cost sharing formula. Table five distributes the revised total via the same cost sharing formula.

vcanales@stancog.org
Attachments

**STANISLAUS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
 FY 2006/07 LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUND (LTF)
 ADDITIONAL APPORTIONMENT DUE TO STA REVISION
 February 14, 2007**

TABLE #1 - ORIGINAL APPORTIONMENT (adopted by the policy board on 06-14-06)

Jurisdiction	TDA Admin	StanCOG Planning	Nonmotorized	Roads & Streets	Original Apportionment
Ceres	\$0	\$0	\$27,126	\$481,103	\$508,229
County	0	0	80,001	1,422,253	1,502,254
Hughson	0	0	4,153	82,205	86,358
Modesto	0	0	145,114	2,531,560	2,676,674
Newman	0	0	6,384	113,220	119,604
Oakdale	0	0	12,188	216,164	228,352
Patterson	0	0	11,293	200,285	211,578
Riverbank	0	0	13,970	247,759	261,729
Turlock	0	0	46,832	830,604	877,436
Waterford	0	0	5,519	128,109	133,628
StanCOG	122,000	549,000	0	0	671,000
Total	\$122,000	\$549,000	\$352,580	\$6,253,262	\$7,276,842

TABLE #2 - PROPOSED CHANGES

Jurisdiction	TDA Admin	StanCOG Planning	Nonmotorized	Roads & Streets	Additional Apportionment
Ceres	\$0	\$0	\$4,265	\$211,849	\$216,114
County	0	0	12,944	621,412	634,356
Hughson	0	0	598	23,881	24,479
Modesto	0	0	23,553	1,175,452	1,199,005
Newman	0	0	950	49,855	50,805
Oakdale	0	0	1,956	95,185	97,141
Patterson	0	0	1,618	88,193	89,811
Riverbank	0	0	2,079	109,099	111,178
Turlock	0	0	7,336	365,748	373,084
Waterford	0	0	897	12,881	13,778
StanCOG	0	86,901	0	0	86,901
Total	\$0	\$86,901	\$56,196	\$2,753,555	\$2,896,652

TABLE #3 - REVISED APPORTIONMENT

Jurisdiction	TDA Admin	StanCOG Planning	Nonmotorized	Roads & Streets	Total Revised Apportionment
Ceres	\$0	\$0	\$31,391	\$692,952	\$724,343
County	0	0	92,945	2,043,665	2,136,610
Hughson	0	0	4,751	106,086	110,837
Modesto	0	0	168,667	3,707,012	3,875,679
Newman	0	0	7,334	163,075	170,409
Oakdale	0	0	14,144	311,349	325,493
Patterson	0	0	12,911	288,478	301,389
Riverbank	0	0	16,049	356,858	372,907
Turlock	0	0	54,168	1,196,352	1,250,520
Waterford	0	0	6,416	140,990	147,406
StanCOG	122,000	635,901	0	0	757,901
Total	\$122,000	\$635,901	\$408,776	\$9,006,817	\$10,173,494

TABLE 4

ROADS AND STREETS AS ORIGINALLY ADOPTED JUNE 14, 2006

Transit Cost Sharing Formula
For FY 2006/07 Local Transportation Funds

	Funding Floor	Floor % (fixed)	Population Jan-05	Pop * %	Ceiling**	Control	Step 3 Total Funds
Ceres	\$385,529	11.45%	38,813	7.6936%	\$481,103	CEILING	\$481,103
County	1,422,253	42.25%	114,468	22.6902%	1,418,878	FLOOR	1,422,253
Hughson	82,205	2.44%	5,942	1.1778%	73,654	FLOOR	82,205
Modesto	482,443	14.33%	207,634	41.1579%	2,573,709	CEILING	2,531,560
Newman	67,077	1.99%	9,134	1.8106%	113,220	CEILING	113,220
Oakdale	122,871	3.65%	17,439	3.4568%	216,164	CEILING	216,164
Patterson	102,763	3.05%	16,158	3.2029%	200,285	CEILING	200,285
Riverbank	117,803	3.50%	19,988	3.9621%	247,759	CEILING	247,759
Turlock	455,289	13.52%	67,009	13.2827%	830,604	CEILING	830,604
Waterford	128,109	3.81%	7,897	1.5654%	97,887	FLOOR	128,109
Total Other	\$3,366,342	100.00%	504,482	100.0000%	\$6,253,262		\$6,253,262

Enter Total Roads & Streets Received Here

* May 2005 population estimates from the Dept of Finance for 1/1/05.

** Population % times total Roads & Streets received.

TABLE 5

REVISED ROADS AND STREETS AS PROPOSED FEBRUARY 14, 2007

Transit Cost Sharing Formula

For FY 2006/07 Local Transportation Funds

The table below includes the following apportionments:

June 14, 2006 original apportionment \$6,253,262

Proposed February 14, 2007 revised apportionment 2,753,555

\$9,006,817

	Funding Floor	Floor % (fixed)	Population Jan-05	Pop * %	Ceiling**	Control	Step 3		Revised 2/14/07 Apportionment
							Total Funds	6/14/06 Apportionment	
Ceres	\$385,529	11.45%	38,813	7.6936%	\$692,952	CEILING	\$692,952	\$481,103	\$211,849
County	1,422,253	42.25%	114,468	22.6902%	2,043,665	CEILING	2,043,665	1,422,253	621,412
Hughson	82,205	2.44%	5,942	1.1778%	106,086	CEILING	106,086	82,205	23,881
Modesto	482,443	14.33%	207,634	41.1579%	3,707,012	CEILING	3,707,012	2,531,560	1,175,452
Newman	67,077	1.99%	9,134	1.8106%	163,075	CEILING	163,075	113,220	49,855
Oakdale	122,871	3.65%	17,439	3.4568%	311,349	CEILING	311,349	216,164	95,185
Patterson	102,763	3.05%	16,158	3.2029%	288,478	CEILING	288,478	200,285	88,193
Riverbank	117,803	3.50%	19,988	3.9621%	356,858	CEILING	356,858	247,759	109,099
Turlock	455,289	13.52%	67,009	13.2827%	1,196,352	CEILING	1,196,352	830,604	365,748
Waterford	128,109	3.81%	7,897	1.5654%	140,990	CEILING	140,990	128,109	12,881
Total Other	\$3,366,342	100.00%	504,482	100.0000%	\$9,006,817		\$9,006,817	\$6,253,262	\$2,753,555

Enter Total Roads & Streets Received Here

* May 2005 population estimates from the Dept of Finance for 1/1/05.

** Population % times total Roads & Streets received.



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

TO: Consolidated Planning Committee
Technical Advisory Committee STAFF REPORT
MOTION

THROUGH: Vince Harris, Executive Director *VH*

FROM: Vincent Canales, Finance Director *VC*
Robin Whitehead, Budget & Grants Coordinator *RW*

DATE: January 18, 2007

SUBJECT: FY 2007/08 Transportation Development Act Fund Apportionment

Recommendation

BY MOTION, recommend that the StanCOG Policy Board adopt the FY 2007/08 TDA apportionments as indicated in the Attachment, columns 4-6 and columns 8-9.

Background

Each year, one of StanCOG's most important administrative responsibilities is the distribution of over \$18 million in Transportation Development Act (TDA) Funds. TDA consists of two types of funds: Local Transportation Funds (LTF) and the much-smaller State Transit Assistance (STA). LTF is derived from 1/4 cent retail sales tax collected statewide, then returned to each county according to the amount of tax collected in that county. LTF funds are primarily intended for public transit purposes; however, in counties under 500,000 population in 1970, roads and streets are also eligible provided there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet within the affected jurisdiction. This determination is made on an annual basis by the regional transportation planning agency (StanCOG). STA is derived from the statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel. These funds may only be used for public transit purposes.

On July 7, 1997, SB 344 (Stanislaus County transit cost sharing legislation) was chaptered into law. As a result of SB 344, beginning with FY 1998/99 the annual TDA apportionment/allocation process changed.

Discussion

The 2007/08 TDA process consists of the following three steps:

- Step 1: Initial LTF and STA Apportionment
- Step 2: Determine LTF Needed for Transit
- Step 3: Determine the Distribution of the LTF Roads (Transit Cost Sharing Formula)

At this time, action is being requested on Step 1 of the process. The components of Step 1 are as follows:

Step 1: Initial LTF and STA Apportionment

1. **Estimate total LTF (furnished by County Auditor) and total STA (furnished by State Controller) to be received in the upcoming fiscal year.**

Preliminary estimates indicate that \$19,387,872 of LTF funds will be available for FY 2007/08. This is an increase of \$1,087,872 from the current year estimate of \$18,300,000. The County Auditor-Controller's Office has confirmed its support of this estimate via a letter from Stephen F. Smith, Assistant Auditor-Controller, to Vincent J. Harris, Executive Director.

The State Controller's Office has not yet released the preliminary estimate of STA Public Utilities Code (PUC) 99313 funds (which are based on population) and PUC 99314 funds (which are based primarily on qualifying revenues) that will be available for FY 2007/08. If the STA estimates become available prior to your February 1, 2007, meeting, an updated apportionment table will be distributed at the meeting.

2. **Funds are identified and deducted for StanCOG and the County Auditor for TDA administration, as needed.**

FY 2007/08 TDA administration funds being requested by StanCOG total \$122,000 (see Attachment, column #4). This is the same amount as the current fiscal year.

3. **Funds are identified and deducted by StanCOG for general transportation planning purposes.**

By state law, not more than 3% of annual revenues may be claimed for this purpose. In FY 2006/07 StanCOG received 3%. Staff recommends 3% for FY 2007/08. This totals \$581,636 (see Attachment, column #5).

4. **Not more than 2% of remaining funds are identified and deducted for pedestrian and bicycle facilities.**

Traditionally, 2% has been identified and distributed by population to each jurisdiction. For FY 2007/08, 2% nonmotorized funds are again being recommended. This totals \$373,685 (see Attachment, column #6).

5. **Determine LTF funds remaining (add parts 2, 3, and 4 and subtract from 1).**

These remaining funds will be used by our local governments for transit, roads, or other eligible transportation purposes. The total of \$18,310,551 (see Attachment, column #7) will provide the input into Step 2 of the transit cost sharing process.

At its meeting of December 22, 2004, the StanCOG Policy Board approved the use of \$194,766 of federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds and \$25,234 of matching LTF in FY 2005/06 to update the Pavement Management Program for each jurisdiction in Stanislaus County. The Policy Board also approved the use of \$214,300 of RSTP and \$27,800 of LTF in FY 2007/08 and \$235,700 of RSTP and \$30,000 of LTF in FY 2009/10 to update the Pavement Management Program (PMP) for all jurisdictions in Stanislaus County. The City of Modesto has agreed to act as the lead agency for the update. After the amount of LTF needed for transit was determined for FY 2005/06, the transit cost sharing formula for roads was applied and then each jurisdiction's population share of the LTF match for the PMP was subtracted out and claimed by Modesto for the FY 2005/06 PMP update. It is anticipated that the same practice will be followed for fiscal years 2007/08 and 2009/2010.

6. Calculate Maximum Possible Transit Shares

The attached table also provides population percentages that allow each local government to calculate their maximum possible transit shares. Under the approved transit cost sharing criteria, this population percentage, applied to the total of \$18,310,551 in number 5 above, is an absolute limit to the transit funds that may be received off the top by a given city or the county. This dollar figure may only be exceeded if residents of other jurisdictions are also being served; in which case the maximum transit share could increase to match the higher population level. These are theoretical limits that have never been reached in practice, even for the City of Modesto.

7. Distribute State Transit Assistance (STA) funds by jurisdiction

To facilitate transit cost sharing, all STA is credited to the City of Modesto. Modesto does not benefit financially, as this practice reduces their need for off the top LTF for transit. In fact, given the instability, which has previously characterized the STA funds, Modesto should be commended for continuing to accept this arrangement. The only STA which is not assigned to Modesto is the small amount of STA received under PUC 99314; by state law, these amounts must be returned to each transit operator in proportion to fare revenues generated.

vcanales@stancog.org

rwhitehead@stancog.org

Attachment

v:\stancog\Canales\staff report 06-07\07-08 TDA apportionment #1 to committees

STEP 1: INITIAL LTF AND STA APPORTIONMENT FOR FY 2007/08
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS APPORTIONMENT

February 14, 2007

APPORTIONMENT BASED ON \$19,387,872 OF LTF

Column #1	Column #2	Column #3	Column #4	Column #5	Column #6	Column #7	Column #8	Column #9
JURISDICTION	POPULATION	% OF POPULATION	TDA ADMIN	PLANNING	NONMOTORIZED (2% LTF)	REMAINING LTF	2007/08 STA PUC 99313	2007/08 STA PUC 99314
CERES	40,943	7.9598%			29,745			
HUGHSON	6,127	1.1912%			4,451			
MODESTO	208,107	40.4586%			151,188		?	?
NEWMAN	10,140	1.9713%			7,367			
OAKDALE	17,856	3.4714%			12,972			
PATTERSON	19,269	3.7461%			13,999			
RIVERBANK	21,215	4.1245%			15,412			
TURLOCK	67,876	13.1959%			49,311			?
WATERFORD	8,216	1.5973%			5,969			
COUNTY (UNINC.)	114,621	22.2838%			83,271			?
StanCOG			122,000	581,636				
REMAINING LTF						18,310,551		
TOTAL	514,370	100.0000%	122,000	581,636	373,685	18,310,551	0	0

Notes: May 2006 Population estimates from the Dept. of Finance for 1/1/06
 LTF estimate to be confirmed by the County Auditor-Controller's Office
 STA estimate to be obtained from the State Controller's Office
 Apportioned numbers are bolded

TDA Admin	122,000
Planning	581,636
Nonmotorized	373,685
Remaining LTF (input to Step 2)	18,310,551
Total LTF	19,387,872



Oral Reports



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

TO: Technical Advisory Committee
Citizens Advisory Committee
Consolidated Planning Committee Staff Report
MOTION

THROUGH: Vince Harris, Executive Director *[Signature]*

FROM: Bruce Abanathie *[Signature]* and Vince Angelino, Associate Planners *[Signature]*

DATE: January 22, 2007

SUBJECT: Regional "Use it or Lose it" Policy

RECOMMENDATION

By Motion: recommend that the Policy Board approve the attached draft "Regional Use it or Lose it" Policy. This policy specifies the programming and obligational responsibilities of the project sponsor agencies.

INTRODUCTION

In 1991 Congress passed the first comprehensive transportation act, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Equity Act (ISTEA). This act was renewed in 1998, as the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). The newest legislation, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act – a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), reinforces the prior acts and adds several new requirements for the programming and use of federal funds for transportation projects.

In each of the years affected by these legislative acts, specific amounts of funds were dedicated to transportation programs. These funds are referred to as "appropriated" funds.

Each year when the Congress delivers a federal budget, it mitigates the spending of (appropriated) federal funds through the "obligational authority" (OA) process. This process imposes spending limits on the funds appropriated by (particularly multi-year) legislative acts. The OA is usually eighty to ninety percent (80-90%) of the annual appropriation.

For our purposes; federal transportation funds are passed through the Federal Highways (FHWA) Division of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and finally, by state legislative action, to the Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG) as the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Stanislaus County Region. StanCOG manages these funds through the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP).

Under Senate Bill 45 (SB 45), enacted in 1998, StanCOG's responsibilities for transportation project management and monitoring were greatly expanded. In addition to becoming more involved in the allocation and management of State and Federal funds, StanCOG is now required to track and manage all phases of project delivery to ensure that funds are expended in a timely manner. Additionally, the enactment of Assembly Bill 1012 (AB 1012) in 1999 placed (more stringent) time limitations on the use of the federal funds. AB1012 requires federal funds to be obligated (authorized for a specific project) within three years of the federal fiscal year in which they are appropriated to the MPO.

StanCOG and its member agencies have identified the need to re-engineer our planning, programming, and project management procedures to better meet this challenge. The Planning and Programming Working Group has been instrumental in reviewing and formulating recommendations to resolve the project delivery barriers in Stanislaus Region.

Discussion

StanCOG and its member agencies have tried to address the project delivery portion of this equation numerous times through the Planning and Programming Working Group (PPWG):

- 1998 – Barriers to Improving Stanislaus Project Delivery;
- 1999 – SAAG – Local Partnership Program (STIP Match Reserve)
- 2000 – Project Initiation for TEA Projects, and Barriers to Project Delivery – One Year Later;
- 2001 – Survey of Local Agency Staffing Levels and Needs, and Project Initiation, Process, and Amendments;
- 2002 – Project Extensions and Amendments Policy and Procedures,
- 2004 – Review of former and recommendations of StanCOG Partners

Regardless of these efforts, there has been no significant improvement in project delivery. In Federal Fiscal Year 2004-05, StanCOG member agencies delivered only 54.4% of their programmed funds.

As shown in the table below, part of the (more than) \$19 million accumulation of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds results from the difference between the level of "appropriated" funds and the level of "Obligational authority" during the fifteen years of the two transportation programs (appropriated/OA).

The remaining amounts of these funds are the result of local agency projects that have not been delivered (unobligated funds). The unobligated funds result from Local agency projects, programmed as early as the year 2000 that have not been delivered. These funds are no longer available to the agencies or to StanCOG without the assistance of Caltrans (providing the OA).

	RSTP	CMAQ	Combined
Unobligated Funds	\$ 6,054,012	\$ 1,225,514	\$ 7,279,526
Appropriated/OA	\$ 2,363,076	\$10,317,264	\$12,680,340
TOTALS	\$ 8,417,088	\$11,542,778	\$19,959,866

In discussions with Caltrans HQ Programming staff, we have been informed that it is considered inevitable that every MPO will eventually lose funds to the rescissions required by AB1012. StanCOG has never lost funds to AB1012, and this recommendation is the best effort to stave off that inevitability as long as possible. Although Caltrans states that within the next three years we will not be able to program enough projects to avoid the loss of funds to AB1012 actions, StanCOG and its member agencies can mitigate the effect by efficient obligation/delivery of projects. The inevitable loss of funds is due to the continued difference between appropriation and OA may not be avoidable, but the historical performance of our local agencies being unable to deliver their projects as programmed can be repaired.

The recommendation to approve a Regional "Use it or Lose it" Policy will assist StanCOG in directing the limited funding to projects that are deliverable and thereby eliminating the poor project delivery portion of the above equation.

Stanislaus Council of Governments
Use It or Lose It Policy
For
Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Funding

I. Objective

To develop a project delivery and tracking system that identifies projects at risk of delayed obligation and/or delayed delivery.

The Policy encourages local agencies to obligate programmed federal transportation funds on schedule, and improves accountability for the timely use of funds.

It increases understanding and ability to comply with federal procedures and requirements to reduce administrative delays in project delivery. The Policy also creates a project delivery pipeline that ensures that projects are fully planned at the time they are programmed, and improves and expedites the flow of information to project sponsors and other stakeholders in the project delivery process.

II. Goal

To ensure that Regional Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds are used in a timely manner to improve the Stanislaus area transportation system for its residents and businesses.

III. Policy

StanCOG conducts Quarterly Progress Meetings with Caltrans and the local agencies, (continues existing agency practice).

StanCOG to use the multi-year programming approach, using "Lump-Sum" programming to its maximum benefit (continues existing agency practice).

Include StanCOG in the project authorization request process (notice from local agency only) and E-76 process (copy form Caltrans).

Require project sponsor agencies to submit Requests For Authorization (RFA's) to Proceed with Preliminary Engineering by November 1, of the programmed federal fiscal year; and, require sponsoring agencies submit RFA's for Construction by April 1, of the programmed federal fiscal year. Project sponsors that fail to meet these deadlines will be at risk of losing programmed funds to projects that are ready to be delivered.

There will be no payback for projects not delivered in the above timelines.



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

TO: Consolidated Planning Committee
Citizens Advisory Committee
Technical Advisory Committee Staff Report
Motion

THROUGH: Vince Harris, Executive Director *VH*

FROM: Lark Downs, Senior Regional Planner *LD*

DATE: January 19, 2007

SUBJECT: Adoption of the 2007/08 Unmet Transit Needs Report

Recommendation

By Motion, recommend that the Policy Board adopt the 2007-08 Unmet Transit Needs Report.

Background

As required by the Transportation Development Act (TDA), each regional transportation planning agency must annually complete an Unmet Transit Needs process. This process identifies and analyzes potential transit needs for reasonableness based upon adopted state and local guidelines. Prior to local TDA funds being allocated for non-transit purposes, StanCOG must adopt a resolution declaring that there are no unmet transit needs which are reasonable to meet, or that those unmet needs which have been deemed reasonable to meet will be funded in 2007/08.

Discussion

The 2007/08 Unmet Transit Needs Report documents the ongoing process of identifying significant transportation needs of the transit dependent public. The Report analyzes transit issues identified by staff, the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council, StanCOG's Citizens and Technical Advisory Committees, other public and private agencies, and the general public.

For FY 2007/08, one transit issues were identified:

1. Fixed route transit service for the Riverdale Park neighborhood

Finding: This is an Unmet Transit Need that is not reasonable to meet at this time. This issue was reviewed the previous year with the same result. Although present available transportation services to the Riverdale Park area have been expressed to be insufficient for general public transit, projected ridership would be inadequate to meet state mandated farebox ratio requirements. The City of Modesto will continue to monitor future development in the surrounding area to assess potential ridership.

Additional Unmet Transit Needs request/discussion:

- Improved transit services for transit dependent individuals with special medical needs

Finding: This was an informal request from the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC), for improved transit services for transit dependent individuals with special medical needs. All of the transit operators have emphasized their commitment to transit riders with special needs. Moreover, Stanislaus County Transit is assisting county residents with Medivan Services to not only Modesto, but Livermore and Fresno as well. This issue will continue to be discussed at the monthly SSTAC meetings.

Attachment

Larkdowns@Stancog.org

Stanislaus County, California

DRAFT FINAL REPORT

Unmet Transit Needs

Identification and Analysis
Fiscal Year 2007-2008
Transportation Development Act Funds Allocations

Prepared by the Stanislaus Council of Governments
900 H Street, Suite D
Modesto, CA 95354

Scheduled to be Adopted
February 13, 2002 Meeting

INTRODUCTION

This is the draft 2007-08 Unmet Transit Needs Report. This report has been prepared for presentation to the Policy Board at its February 14, 2007 meeting. Prior to that meeting, the draft 2007-08 Unmet Transit Needs Report will have been reviewed by the StanCOG Technical Advisory Committee, Citizens Advisory Committee, and the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC). Each of those committees makes comments regarding the draft document for the Policy Board. Based upon comments received at the committee meetings staff will update the draft report for presentation to the Policy Board at its February 14, 2007 meeting. At that meeting the Policy Board will make findings regarding potential Unmet Transit Needs for 2007-08.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

StanCOG staff would like to acknowledge the perseverance and hard work of the following members of the SSTAC involved in the development and adoption of the final Unmet Needs findings:

Greg Gaudio, Chairman
Michael Bohannon, Vice-chair
Betty Arwood
Jana Barton
Jill Erickson
Irene Lopez
Kris Rowe
Lynn Ewen

Staff would also like to acknowledge the assistance and information provided by the following individuals:

Fred Cavanah, City of Modesto
Terry Easley, City of Modesto
Donna Bridges, ROTA Transit Coordinator
Brad Christian, Stanislaus Regional Transit
Doralee Bolles, Stanislaus regional Transit
Kay Dunkel, City of Ceres
Scott Medeiros, City of Turlock

SUMMARY

This document analyzes three unmet transit needs requests, one of which recommends a finding of an Unmet Transit Need, but is not Reasonable to Meet.

BACKGROUND

Unmet transit needs became an annual focus of transportation planning agencies in 1978, when the Transportation Development Act (TDA) was changed to require a specific transit finding that there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet before local TDA funds could be allocated for other non-transit purposes.

In response to this requirement, StanCOG has conducted several hearings to identify needs, and to determine reasonableness of funding new or alternative services. On August 10, 1991, the StanCOG Policy Board adopted an annual Unmet Transit Needs Process for making the finding, and adopted definitions of "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet." The definitions were amended September 14, 1994, again on May 10, 2000, through Resolution 99-40, and most recently by Resolution 04-07. The Unmet Transit Needs process was also amended by the Policy Board on those dates, and is provided below for review.

Unmet Transit Needs Process

- A. In accordance with Public Utilities Code Section 99401.5, and as part of the transportation planning process, StanCOG must annually identify the transit needs of the jurisdictions within Stanislaus County, including:
1. An assessment of the size and location of identifiable groups likely to be transit dependent or transit disadvantaged, including but not limited to, the elderly, the handicapped (including individuals eligible for para-transit and other special transportation services pursuant to Section 12143 of Title 42 of the United States Code (the federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 12101, et seq.)), and persons of limited means, including, but not limited to, recipients under the CalWORKS program.
 2. An analysis of the adequacy of existing public transportation services and specialized transportation services, including privately and publicly provided services necessary to meet the plan prepared pursuant to Section 12143 (c) (7) of Title 42 of the United States Code, in meeting the transit demand identified pursuant to paragraph (A); and
 3. An analysis of the potential alternative public transportation services, specialized transportation services, and service improvements that would meet all or part of the transit demand.
 4. Unless additional information becomes available which supersedes the analysis in the 2003-04 Report, the information as listed in Sections 1-3 above shall be included in future reports by reference only.

- B. As part of the ongoing planning process, StanCOG will continue to consult with and consider the recommendations from the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) satisfying the requirement of Public Utilities Code Section 99238.5. StanCOG staff will continue to provide support and technical assistance to the SSTAC. That technical assistance will include proposals from the transit operators, as are offered, to deal with the transit complaints received by the SSTAC, prior to the public hearing. Prior to the statutorily required public hearing, the SSTAC should make a written report to the StanCOG Policy Board containing a summary of its recommendations, including a list of identified needs and those that the SSTAC considers reasonable to meet.
- C. The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) are also encouraged to submit comments and recommendations to the StanCOG Policy Board regarding how identified needs can be met, whether it is reasonable to do so, and what steps are already being taken. At their own discretion, the CAC and TAC may comment on the Unmet Needs report or may make separate recommendations to the StanCOG Policy Board.
- D. The StanCOG Policy Board shall hold at least one public hearing to receive testimony regarding potential unmet needs. This public hearing shall be held no later than December 31st of each year. This shall not be at the same meeting at which the unmet needs finding is made. StanCOG may conduct a second public hearing, following staff analysis, before making its final determinations with respect to unmet transit needs and reasonable to meet. Potential unmet transit needs heard for the first time at the second public hearing need not be analyzed or acted upon the same year, though, if not acted upon, they shall be acted upon in the subsequent year. Notice of each hearing, including the date, place, and specific purpose of the hearing shall be given at least 30 days in advance through publication in one or more newspapers of general circulation, including in Spanish. StanCOG shall also send written notification to those persons and organizations that have indicated, through the StanCOG citizen participation process or any other source of information, an interest in the subject of the hearing.
- E. All Unmet Transit Needs complaints received either through the year or at the public hearings shall be documented on the Unmet Transit Need "Request for Transit Service" form. The person making the request may ask that the form be mailed to him/her, or the required information may be received via phone conversation. If the "Request for Service" is mailed, StanCOG staff will follow up by phone to assure accuracy of information received. The "Request for Service" will be available to the public on the StanCOG web site at StanCOG.org.
- F. StanCOG recognizes that not all transit desires can or should be met. Issues that are deemed to be minor operational issues rather than unmet transit needs shall be referred to the appropriate transit operator for further investigation or action as warranted. A minor operational issue is defined as any transit comment, complaint, or issue which may have merit but does not rise to the level of (meet the definition of) an unmet transit need.
- G. The list of all transit issues identified at the Unmet Transit Needs public hearing shall be presented to the SSTAC at its September meeting. As part of that presentation, staff shall identify those issues that in staff's opinion are minor operational issues believed not to merit further review. The SSTAC shall be asked to render its own opinion on the same subject to determine which complaints are worthy of further review".
- H. The remaining proposals shall be discussed before the SSTAC, including a brief analysis. This analysis shall be the foundation for the analysis within the draft Unmet Transit Needs Report. The Policy Board shall be provided recommendations of Unmet Transit Needs from the SSTAC and

staff.

- I. Public testimony received at the first hearing shall be compiled and evaluated by staff, based upon recommendations received from the SSTAC. StanCOG staff shall prepare a written analysis of potential unmet needs which have been identified and shall then recommend to the Policy Board whether or not each issue raised is an "unmet transit need" in accordance with the adopted definition. The Policy Board shall then determine whether or not unmet transit needs exist based on the adopted definition and specifically identify such needs if they are determined to exist.
- J. Once StanCOG has determined that a request is an "unmet transit need," it shall determine whether it is "reasonable to meet." For each unmet need identified staff shall recommend, based on the adopted definition and comments received, if it is reasonable to meet, identify reasons why it is reasonable to meet or not, and identify any steps that are already being taken to meet the need. The StanCOG Policy Board may make its determination regarding "reasonable to meet" at the same meeting at which the finding of specific unmet needs is made or may make this determination at a subsequent meeting.
- K. If an unmet transit need is determined by StanCOG to be reasonable to meet, then the unmet transit need shall be funded before any allocation is made for streets and roads within the County. Accordingly, the Transit Cost Sharing committee shall recommend to the Policy Board which transit operator should provide the service, as a part of the Transit Cost Sharing process. The operator's Transportation Development Act claim shall document how the unmet transit need is to be funded.
- L. Where an unmet transit need is found to be reasonable to meet, the operator responsible to meet that need may track the productivity of the new service for a six month period after it is initiated to determine whether the identified need appears reasonable to meet. If the ridership during the first six months is too low to indicate that it is meeting a reasonable transit need, the operator may request that it begin the process of overturning the Reasonable to Meet finding. The operator shall document to the SSTAC both that the service is not receiving acceptable levels of ridership and that it has acceptably marketed the service. If the SSTAC agrees with the request of the operator, the operator may request the Policy Board to reverse its reasonable to meet findings.
- M. As with any planning process, the Unmet Needs process should evolve over time in response to changing local conditions, including growth. This Unmet Needs process and associated definitions shall be reviewed comprehensively by StanCOG, the SSTAC, and other interested parties at least once every five years or more frequently if appropriate.

Definition of Unmet Transit Need

The StanCOG Policy Board adopted the current definitions of "Unmet Transit Need" and "Reasonable to Meet" on September 8, 2004.

An "unmet transit need" is any inadequacy in the system of public transit services, specialized transit/paratransit service, or private transportation service within the jurisdictions of Stanislaus County process which has not been funded and implemented and which has been accurately documented on the Unmet Transit Need "Request for Transit Service" form. Potential transit needs may be identified by community members or through a local or regional planning process. Although some services may be restricted or give priority to traditionally transit-dependent populations (such as elderly, youths, persons

with disabilities, or low-income persons), all eligible users should have equivalent access or opportunity to use the service. At a minimum, this may include requests for transportation services which are identified through the annual TDA Unmet Transit Needs hearings, by the SSTAC, in the Regional Transportation Plan, in the Short-Range Transit Plan of any transit operator, or in the compliance plan for the Americans with Disabilities Act as prepared by any public or private entity. Unmet transit needs are not:

1. Trips, which would duplicate transportation services
2. A need for transportation service beyond the fiscal year under consideration
3. Provision of escorts or attendants

Definition of Reasonable to Meet

An identified unmet transit need will be determined to be "reasonable to meet" if it is demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the StanCOG Policy Board, that the transit need can be met within the following performance and financial standards:

1. A potential unmet transit need shall achieve at least 50% the system-wide performance standards, except in the case of an extension of service determined to be a necessary lifeline* service for transit dependent populations.

Lifeline Service: A service necessary to access community services within Stanislaus County that are needed to sustain an individual's physical and mental health.

2. A potential unmet transit need shall not cause the system of which it is a part to fail to meet the systemwide performance standards.
3. The unmet transit need will not require the expenditure of more Local Transportation Funds than are available to the jurisdiction for transit.

The determination of whether an unmet transit need is "reasonable to meet" shall take into account as appropriate:

1. If the time period needed to implement the required corrective action (e.g. major purchases, planning requirements) is greater than one year, an unmet transit need may be declared not reasonable to meet. An unmet transit need shall not be determined unreasonable to meet more than once on these grounds.
2. The fact that an identified transit need cannot be fully met based on available resources shall not be the sole reason for a finding that a transit need is not reasonable to meet.
3. An agency's determination of needs that are reasonable to meet shall not be made by comparing unmet transit needs with the need for streets and roads.

General Remarks Regarding Summary of Recommendations

According to Transportation Development Act Regulations, prior to StanCOG making any allocation of funds under TDA not directly related to public transportation services or facilities provided for the exclusive use of pedestrians and bicycles, StanCOG as the Transportation Planning Agency, shall annually consult with the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council and identify the transit needs of the jurisdiction which have been considered as part of the transportation planning process.

According to Transportation Development Act Statutes and the California Code of Regulations for 2000, Section 99238 (c) 1-3:

- (c) The social service transportation advisory council shall have the following responsibilities:
 - (1) Annually participate in the identification of transit needs in the jurisdiction, including unmet transit needs that may exist within the jurisdiction of the council and that may be reasonable to meet by establishing or contracting for new public transportation or specialized transportation services or by expanding existing services.
 - (2) Annually review and recommend action by the transportation planning agency for the area within the jurisdiction of the council which finds by resolution, that (A) there are no unmet transit needs, (B) there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet, or (c) there are unmet transit needs, including needs that are reasonable to meet.
 - (3) Advise the transportation planning agency on any other major transit issues, including the coordination and consolidation of specialized transportation services.

According to the approved StanCOG process, staff is to analyze potential unmet transit needs against the adopted definitions of "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet", and to recommend a finding that: 1) there are no unmet transit needs; 2) there are no unmet transit needs which are reasonable to meet; or, 3) there are unmet transit needs, including needs which are reasonable to meet.

If an unmet transit need is determined by StanCOG to be reasonable to meet, then the unmet transit need shall be funded before any allocation is made for streets and roads within the County. Where an unmet transit need is found to be reasonable to meet, the Transit Cost Sharing committee shall recommend to the Policy Board which transit operator should provide the service, as a part of the Transit Cost Sharing process. The operator's Transportation Development Act claim shall document how the unmet transit need will be funded.

TRANSIT COST SHARING

The Transportation Development Act was amended through SB 344 in 1997 by the creation of Section 99233.11 of the Public Utilities Code, approving the StanCOG Transit Cost Sharing concept. Based upon this Section, all transit needs countywide will be funded first of all by the Local Transportation Funds available in Stanislaus County, then funds can be made available for the improvement of streets and roads in each of the jurisdictions. The impact of the new law on the Unmet Transit Needs process is that a proposed unmet transit need is no longer presumed to be the responsibility of a jurisdiction simply because the territory affected by the need is within a specific jurisdiction. An unmet transit need which is found to be reasonable to meet will be the responsibility of the transit operator which can most economically meet the need. This will have minor impacts on the analysis.

SOURCES

The following provides a listing of the documents utilized in this report and a short synopsis of what each document covers:

- 2000 Census Used to evaluate the size & location of transit dependent populations.
- 1994 Nelson/Nygaard Transit Survey Study Referenced as past transit dependency tool.
- 2002-2003 Transit Systems Management Report (TSMR)
- 2004 StanCOG Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- 2003 Transportation Development Act (TDA)
- 2004-05 Unmet Transit Needs Report
- 2004 Unmet Transit Needs and Reasonable to Meet Definitions, and Unmet Transit Needs Process
- "Critical Links: Employment Growth, Unemployment, and Welfare-to-Work in Stanislaus County" November 1998
- City of Modesto Long Range Transit Plan, January 2000
- Stanislaus Regional Transit Long range Transit Plan Final Report, October 2000
- Final 2003-04 Unmet Transit Needs Report

A "Transit Survey Study" was conducted by Nelson/Nygaard in 1994. The 1994 study included a matrix identifying the neediest Census Tracts, based upon seven factors documented in the 1990 Census. For the 2003-04 Unmet Needs Report the analysis of transit dependent populations included available data from the 2000 Census. The analysis of neediest Census Tracts for the 2003-04 Unmet Transit Needs Report was based entirely on 2000 Census data. The Census Tract data for the 2005-06 Unmet Transit Needs Report has not changes since the writing of the 2003-04 Report. Though there has clearly been growth since the writing of that Report, the location of most of the growth has been in Census Tracts ranked low in the list of "needy Tracts".

The goal of the required transit dependent populations report is to document the locations of transit dependent populations, and review the available transit to those locations. If and where inadequate transit service is offered or available to those locations, this report is to be used as the basis of an unmet transit needs recommendation.

The City of Modesto and Stanislaus Regional Transit both adopted transit plans in 2000. These documents are useful in the analysis of specific transit issues identified at the first Unmet Transit Needs public hearing before the Policy Board.

The Transit Systems Management Report is an adopted document which annually compiles information about transit operations in Stanislaus County. Information is organized by fiscal years. The 2002-03 Transit Systems Management Report (the most recent) analyzes existing public transportation services. It provides a source of reference for the Unmet Transit Needs Analysis, acting as an additional resource in response to the requirements of the Transportation Development Act regarding existing services.

The purpose of the Regional Transportation Plan (2004) is to define the course of action which governmental agencies within Stanislaus County should take to achieve a balanced transportation system for both people and goods. The plan provides for both countywide transit standards and for a rural and urban transit service. The transit standards are used as measures of progress toward meeting the transit objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan.

The Transportation Development Act statutes and regulations provide information regarding the funding of public transportation through regional planning and programming agencies.

DISCUSSION

Size and Location of Groups Likely to be Dependent on Transit

As noted in the adopted Unmet Transit Needs Process: Unless additional information becomes available which supersedes the analysis in the 2003-04 Report, the information as listed in Sections 1-3 above (referring to the analysis of the size & location of groups likely to be dependent on transit) shall be included in future reports by reference only.

As the Census agency for Stanislaus County, StanCOG staff has reviewed patterns of growth within Stanislaus County and all of its jurisdictions on a regular basis since the 2000 Census, which was the basis of the findings of the 2003-04 study. Staff recommends a conclusion that no significant changes are present in the location or size of transit dependent populations. Based on this recommendation, staff further recommends the use of the 2003-04 analysis to satisfy the statutory requirements for the 2005-06 Unmet Transit Needs Report, as included in Public Utilities Code Section 99401.5.

Results of the 2006-07 Unmet Transit Needs Findings

On February 8, 2006, the StanCOG Policy Board found for 2006-07 that there was one Unmet Transit Need that but it has determined not to be Reasonable to Meet.

Adequacy of Existing Services

The "adequacy" of existing transit is a subjective term, not addressed in the adopted definition of unmet transit needs. In practice, adequacy becomes an issue arising from the public comments received, provided the public comment is supported by knowledge of existing transit services and information available at the time. Documents useful in analyzing the proposed unmet transit needs include:

- 1) the 2000 Census;
- 2) the 1991 Transit Needs Study;
- 3) the 1994 Nelson/Nygaard Transit Service Study;
- 4) the Transit Systems Management Report;
- 5) the Regional Transportation Plan;
- 6) the Transportation Development Act statutes and regulations;
- 7) the City of Modesto Short and Long Range Transit Plans;
- 8) the Stanislaus Regional Transit Short and Long Range Transit Plans;
- 9) local transit brochures and websites, which include maps, schedules, and specific policies; and
- 10) monthly reports prepared by the transit operators.

Listening and talking with the public at the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council public meetings provides helpful insights. Local Transit Managers provide a wealth of information. Where inadequate public comment is received, a transit "needs" finding may be premature and could result in an underutilized or even an unwanted transit service.

Current Transit Operations in Stanislaus County

City of Ceres Transit System

The City contracts with Storer Transit Systems, Inc., to operate its Ceres Area Transit (CAT) fixed route and Ceres Dial-A-Ride (CDAR) systems. CDAR Weekday service has two buses from 6:00 a.m. to 6:30 a.m., four or five buses from 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., and two buses from 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Saturday service has two buses from 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Sunday service has one bus from 8:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m., two buses from 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., and one bus from 3:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. The CAT operates two buses on two one-hour loops from six a.m. to eight p.m., Monday through Friday.

The City has expanded its transfer arrangements. Transfers are offered to MAX and Modesto Dial-A-Ride at the corner of Hatch and Herndon Roads. Transfers are offered at five locations in Ceres to Stanislaus Regional Transit's Modesto-Turlock Route 15, and to Stanislaus Regional Transit's Route 40 at the Social Services Center, at the corner of Hackett and Crows Landing Roads.

City of Modesto Transit System (MAX & Modesto DAR)

The City of Modesto operates both a fixed route system, known as the Modesto Area Express (MAX), and a demand responsive system known as Modesto Dial-A-Ride.

The MAX system serves the City of Modesto and portions of the City of Ceres and Stanislaus County. It operates 18 regular routes and the Empire route. MAX routes begin at 6:15 a.m., and their last routes begin at 7:15 p.m., Monday through Friday, ending between 7:30 and 8:00 p.m. for most routes. Thirteen of those routes operate on 30-minute headways, while the others operate on one hour headways. The Empire Route operates five times Monday through Friday, without a set headway. On Saturdays, MAX operates 18 routes, six of which operate on 30-minute headways, while the others operate on one-hour headways. On Sundays MAX operates ten routes, which all operate on one hour headways.

MAX operates two morning commuter routes to and two afternoon commuter routes from the Dublin BART Station. In addition, MAX operates three morning buses to, and three afternoon buses from, the Manteca/ Lathrop Station of the Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) Train, which operates between Stockton and San Jose.

The Modesto Dial-A-Ride system operates for most of the week as an Elderly/Disabled - paratransit service, to satisfy the Americans with Disabilities Act for Modesto. Before 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, that is the exclusive function of Modesto Dial-A-Ride. After 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and all day Sunday, Modesto Dial-A-Ride functions as a general public transit service. Modesto DAR functions with as many as nine dial-a-ride vehicles.

The downtown Modesto Transportation Center has been operational since 1994. The center is the start and/or end point for most of the MAX routes and four of the five Stanislaus Regional Transit (StaRT) fixed routes and functions as the primary transfer point between those systems and the routes of each system. In addition to the MAX and StaRT buses, Greyhound, a private interregional carrier also uses the Transportation Center. The center houses 27 buses and two Dial-A Ride vans. It also provides offices and the waiting room needs for the operators. The center is also designed to accommodate a potential future passenger rail stop in Modesto.

In the 1999-2000 fiscal year the City of Modesto mounted bicycle racks on their MAX buses, in response to the unmet transit needs finding of the StanCOG Policy Board in February 1999.

In November 1999, the Amtrak station for the north portion of Stanislaus County was opened at the intersection of Parker Road and the Burlington Northern/Santa Fe Railroad Tracks. Bus service is provided by MAX route 25. It stops at the station every hour in both directions, from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., inbound and 7:14 a.m. to 7:14 p.m. outbound. After that time, Modesto serves the station Dial-A-Ride until 11:00 p.m. The station is also served by the StaRT Eastside and Waterford/Modesto Runabout services.

MAX offers transfers to Ceres DAR (see above), StaRT (see below) to the Riverbank-Oakdale Transit Authority (ROTA, see below), and to the Stockton Metro Area Regional Transit (SMART) Escalon bus at McHenry and Standiford Avenues.

Riverbank-Oakdale Transit Authority (ROTA)

The Cities of Oakdale and Riverbank have formed the Riverbank-Oakdale Transit Authority. The transit authority operates with eight vans and began operation in June of 1995. The transit authority provides curb-to-curb, immediate response service to the Cities of Oakdale and Riverbank, as well as to the unincorporated territory between and closely surrounding the

Cities, east to the Orange Blossom Bridge and part of Lancaster Road. The service operates Monday through Friday from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., and on Saturday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. The weekday service includes transit of passengers to the MAX transfer point at Sylvan and Oakdale Roads in Modesto. Transfers are also available to the StaRT Route 60.

Effective June 2004 ROTA operates a fixed route service. Its "ROTA Trolley" operates with two buses, traveling in opposite directions on the same route. The buses operate between K-Mart in Oakdale and O'Brians in Riverbank. The full circuit requires an hour. The route is designed to serve a maximum number of passengers formerly using the ROTA DAR service. ROTA has added 18 additional stops to accommodate the new Commercial Center. These stops are on Squire Wells Street that runs between Home depot and Target. Stops have also been added on Claribel Avenue and on Patterson Road to Riverbank.

Stanislaus Regional Transit System (StaRT)

The Stanislaus County Public Transit Division oversees administration of Stanislaus Regional Transit. StaRT operates fixed route, deviated fixed route, dial-a-ride and non-emergency medical transportation services.

StaRT operates six fixed routes:

- 1) Route 10, Modesto/Turlock, a commuter route along Hwy 99 between Modesto and Turlock;
- 2) Route 15, Modesto/Turlock, serving Ceres and Keyes along the frontage roads;
- 3) Route 60, Modesto/Riverbank/Oakdale, serves Hwy 108 through most of those cities.
- 4) Route 40, Westside Stage, serves Patterson, Westley, and Grayson on the west side of the San Joaquin River, and the County Complex at Hackett and Crows Landing Roads.
- 5) Route 45 provides fixed route service between Gustine, Newman, Crows Landing, Patterson, and Turlock.
- 6) Waterford/Modesto Runabout, a "deviated fixed-route" serves the County east to Waterford, with two scheduled stops in Waterford, one in Hughson, one in Empire, and one at in Downtown Modesto. The Waterford/Modesto Runabout also offers curb-to-curb demand response transportation between scheduled stops.

The Eastside and Turlock/Modesto Runabouts provide demand response curb-to-curb service. They provide the following services:

- a) Eastside Runabout provides transportation for the elderly and persons with disabilities between Oakdale, Riverbank and Modesto.
- b) Turlock/Modesto Runabout provides transportation between Modesto and Turlock.

Under Memorandum of Understandings, StaRT also operates three dial-a-ride services for the following respective cities:

- a) Patterson Dial-A-Ride operates within the City of Patterson, west to the development at the Sperry Road Interchange, and east into small areas of the Patterson Colony
- b) Newman Dial-A-Ride, which operates in Newman, Gustine, and Crows Landing, with two daily trips to Patterson.
- c) Waterford Dial-A-Ride operates in Waterford and Hickman, as well as about a one-mile radius around those areas. It also provides transportation between Oakdale and the Waterford service area.

All StaRT Runabout and Dial-a-Ride services, on a space and time available basis, will provide service outside their designated service areas for a premium out-of-area fare.

StaRT also operates the Medivan, which provides non-emergency medical transportation for passengers needing service to Bay Area medical facilities.

City of Turlock Transit System

The City of Turlock operates two transit services. The fixed route, known as the Bus Line Service of Turlock (BLAST), operates on four routes – each with 40 minute headways. Each route begins and ends at Central Park. The service area covers about 80% of Turlock's transit service area. The standard fare is \$.75.

Dial-A-Ride Turlock (DART) has provided service to both the City of Turlock and the community of Denair for many years. It primarily operates as an elderly/handicapped service. The weekday hours of operation are 6:00 a.m. to 6:15 p.m. Saturday operations are from 8:50 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. The standard Dial-A-Ride fare is \$1.70.

Transfers are available to StaRT at many locations. The Amtrak Station in Denair is served by DART, as well as by the StaRT Turlock Runabout.

Public Comment and Hearings

Public hearings and comment periods are advertised and conducted by the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) and StanCOG. Testimony is accepted either orally or in writing.

The SSTAC is an advisory committee to StanCOG. The SSTAC holds meetings to receive public input regarding potential unmet transit needs in Stanislaus County. The SSTAC has held monthly public comment meetings for the 2007-08 TDA Unmet Needs Process.

The Policy Board Public Hearing on December 13, 2006 was advertised by public hearing notices published 30 days in advance of the scheduled meetings.

Social Services Transportation Advisory Council Recommendations

The Social Services Transportation Advisory Council is scheduled to review the 2007/08 Unmet Transit Needs Report at its January 24, 2007 meeting. SSTAC recommendations will be included in the final report.

Recommendations Received at the December 13, 2006 Public Hearing

There were no additional comments received during the December 13, 2006 Public Hearing.

Committee Comments Received Prior to the February 14, 2007 Policy Board Meeting

Social Services Transportation Advisory Council

SSTAC comments will be included in final 2007/08 Unmet Needs Report.

Citizens Advisory Committee

Citizens Advisory Committee comments will be included in final 2007/08 Unmet Needs Report.

Technical Advisory Committee

Technical Advisory Committee comments will be included in final 2007/08 Unmet Needs Report.

Additional Comments Received from the Public

All additional comments received from the public will be included in the final 2007/08 Unmet Needs Report.

ANALYSIS

As per the amended Unmet Needs Process, the following proposal was submitted to StanCOG by the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council for a recommended draft analysis. To be considered an Unmet Transit Need, all of the definition points must be satisfied. To be considered Reasonable to Meet, all of those definition points must be met. Where a proposal is found to be an Unmet Transit Need which is Reasonable to Meet, it must be funded with Transportation Development Act funds, where those funds are available.

Definition: Paragraph one of the Unmet Transit Needs definition says, An “unmet transit need” is any inadequacy in the system of public transit services, specialized transit/paratransit service, or private transportation service within the jurisdictions of Stanislaus County process which has not been funded and implemented and which has been accurately documented on the Unmet Transit Need “Request for Transit Service” form. Potential transit needs may be identified by community members or through a local or regional planning process. Although some services may be restricted or give priority to traditionally transit-dependent populations (such as elderly, youths, persons with disabilities, or low-income persons), all eligible users should have equivalent access or opportunity to use the service. At a minimum, this may include requests for transportation services which are identified through the annual TDA Unmet Transit Needs hearings, by the SSTAC, in the Regional Transportation Plan, in the Short-Range Transit Plan of any transit operator, or in the compliance plan for the Americans with Disabilities Act as prepared by any public or private entity.

1. The Riverdale Park Neighborhood should receive Fixed Route Transit service.

Discussion: This issue is being carried forward from the 2006/07 Unmet Transit Needs Report. Originally discussed at the October 10, 2004 SSTAC meeting, the request was submitted on written surveys completed separately by the residents of nineteen households. StaRT Modesto/Turlock Runabout service is available to this neighborhood of approximately 575 residents. The StaRT Eastside Runabout and the Modesto Dial-A-Ride serve this neighborhood, but only for persons with disabilities and elderly passengers. The two services do not satisfy the expressed need. As the request included both the element of service in the neighborhood and regular scheduling, the Modesto/Turlock Runabout also appears to fall short of the expressed need.

The request was made by residents of the Riverdale Park Neighborhood on survey forms submitted to the StanCOG staff, and forwarded to the SSTAC during a public meeting. The “Request for Transit Service” form was submitted to the SSTAC and to the staffs of Modesto Transit and StaRT, all of whom were satisfied with its contents.

1. Trips, which would duplicate transportation services.
 2. A need for transportation service beyond the fiscal year under consideration.
 3. Provision of escorts or attendants.
-
- 1) As described above, this proposal would not duplicate transportation services presently available.
 - 2) The request is not for service at some future date, beyond the 2006-07 fiscal year.
 - 3) The request makes no reference to escort or attendant service.

FINDING: This is an unmet transit need

An identified unmet transit need will be determined to be "reasonable to meet" if it is demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the StanCOG Policy Board, that the transit need can be met within the following performance and financial standards:

- 1) A potential unmet transit need shall achieve at least half the system-wide performance standards, except in the case of an extension of service determined to be a necessary lifeline* service for transit dependent populations.

Lifeline Service: A service necessary to access community services within Stanislaus County that are needed to sustain an individual's physical and mental health.

This proposal is not a lifeline service. This neighborhood already receives Modesto DAR as a lifeline service. It is a proposal to reduce the required walk for the residents of the neighborhood to MAX service.

The minimal system-wide performance standard for MAX is to operate at a 20% fare revenue ratio. This means it must be reasonable to expect the proposed service to operate with not less than a 10% fare revenue ratio within a twelve month period to be considered reasonable to meet the identified need.

It is often possible to predict the fare revenue ratio based upon the passengers-per-vehicle-service-hour. In 2002-03 (the last year for which we have complete data) MAX operated with a 30.4% fare revenue ratio and carried 27.0 passengers-per-vehicle-service-hour. For this project to operate with a fare revenue ratio of 10% it must average not less than 8.9 passengers-per-vehicle-service-hour.

The best tool staff has to project the success of the proposed service is to review the success of a comparable service. The Empire service, MAX Route 39 is probably the most comparable local service. The Community of Empire has a population of about 3,900. The Route also serves Johansen High School twice daily, which is a major generator of passengers. By comparison, the Riverdale Park Neighborhood has a population of approximately 575 and no schools.

During 2003-04 the Empire Route carried between 6.1 and 10.7 passengers-per vehicle service hour. The average for the year was 8.6 passengers-per-vehicle-service-hour. This argues that the Empire Route did not operate at a 10% fare revenue ratio. Staff recommends a finding that fixed route service to the Riverdale Park Neighborhood also would not operate at a 10% fare revenue ratio.

FINDING: This is not reasonable to meet

Additional Unmet Needs Discussion

The StanCOG Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) discusses potential unmet transit needs at its monthly meetings. This open dialogue with the private and larger public transit operators provides a forum for discussing and solving possible unmet transit needs of the region. A few examples of these discussions are highlighted below:

- Coordination of Services

As new commercial employment centers develop in the region, the need for transit services increases. However, until the demand (need) for such transit services becomes large enough to justify additional fixed route changes, the developing areas will be serviced by one or more transit systems. The SSTAC openly discusses the need for better coordination/coverage for these developing areas, to allow better access for the transit dependent population of Stanislaus County.

- **Specialized Needs**

Of particular interest to the SSTAC members is the transit needs of those individuals with special needs, primarily medical in nature. The social service providers on the SSTAC work with the private and public transit operators to plan for and implement transit services for those individuals with exceptional medical needs. Many of those solutions identified are not restricted to county boundaries. Stanislaus County Transit has identified the need to provide special services to individuals needing medical assistance in the greater Bay Area as well as Merced and Fresno counties.

- **Open Line of Communication**

Each month, the issue of identification of unmet transit needs is agendaized and discussed by the SSTAC and the major transit operators in Stanislaus County. This "Open Line of Communication" provides both social service assistance and transportation providers and public transit providers a forum to identify specific transit issues, exchange alternative ideas and points of view, and seek potential answers to the transit issues being discussed.



Information Items



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

TO: Policy Board

Staff Report
Information

THROUGH: Vince Harris, Executive Director *VH*

FROM: Vince Angelino, Associate Planner *VA*

DATE: January 22, 2007

RE: Update – Blueprint Regional Planning Process – Minor Update

Background

The goal of the two-year (2005/06 and 2006/07) Blueprint Process is to develop a 2050 vision for the San Joaquin Valley that is created and shared by its residents. The San Joaquin Valley Regional Blueprint will formulate an approach to long-term regional planning that addresses land use, housing, transportation, environmental issues, and economic development interests in the San Joaquin Valley. This approach will develop and examine alternative scenarios and identify a "preferred scenario".

Discussion

Recent Local and Regional Blueprint Activities:

- StanCOG staff is working with the consulting firm of Moore Iacofano Goltsman (MIG) to accomplish several tasks:
 1. Outreach Workshops – staff is presently scheduling a series of six Blueprint Outreach Workshops for March, 2007 through mid-April. Five of the workshops will be geographically distributed throughout the County to fully provide input from all areas of the County:
 - a. South Modesto, Ceres, Keyes
 - b. Oakdale, Riverbank, Waterford
 - c. Turlock, Hughson
 - d. Patterson, Newman, Crows Landing
 - e. North Modesto, Salida

StanCOG is also working with the Hispanic community to develop a Spanish language Outreach Workshop.

2. Facilitator Training – At each Outreach Workshop, several volunteer “assistant” facilitators will be utilized to aid the general public attendees. One assistant will be at each table to further help the attendees clarify issues. MIG has requested that the volunteers come from the respective jurisdictions, and will provide facilitator training to the potential assistants. StanCOG staff will be contacting each jurisdiction for volunteers. The training will be scheduled for mid-February. Interested individuals should contact Vince Angelino or Lark Downs at the StanCOG offices at 558-7830.
3. Outreach Workshop Brochure - A Stanislaus County Blueprint Outreach Workshop brochure is being produced. A draft was included in last month’s update. The brochure provides an overview of the Blueprint Regional Planning Process and announces the details on the upcoming outreach workshops. MIG has worked with StanCOG and other agencies to construct an extensive e-mail and traditional mail data base. Utility bill inserts will also be utilized as advertisement.
4. San Joaquin Valley Blueprint Professional Review Panel – The Blueprint Coordinating Committee has created a panel of regional, county, and local planners to review and comment on recommendation emerging from the Public Outreach Workshops. The initial meeting of the Review Panel is scheduled for January 26, 2007. The Stanislaus region will be represented by:

Ron Frietas, Stanislaus County
Brent Sinclair, City of Modesto
Charlie Woods, City of Turlock
J.D. Hightower, City of Riverbank
5. Second-year Blueprint Funding - The eight San Joaquin Valley COGs have been successful in obtaining \$1,950,000 in state funding for the second-year of Blueprint activities. The grant requires a 20% local match (\$487,500). The Coordinating Committee is discussing potential local match options; Air District, Caltrans Partnership Grant, and/or COG funding.
6. “Building a Livable Future for the San Joaquin Valley” – A book produced in cooperation with the Great Valley Center of Modesto, has been created to support the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint. StanCOG has a limited number of the books available, and copies can be obtained from the Great Valley Center.
7. Blueprint and the County Planning Commissioners – A Blueprint visioning panel/question-and-answers type workshop is planned for the Annual County Planning Commissioners Workshop scheduled for January 27, 2007.

Item 6B

*This Agenda Item
was not available at
mail out. It will be distributed
at the meeting.*