



**Transportation Commission Meeting
Council Chambers
311 Vernon Street
September 21, 2010 – 7:00 p.m.
Agenda**

1. Call to Order

2. Welcome – Roll Call

- Grace Keller, *Chair*
- Rita Brohman, *Vice-Chair*
- Micky DeFiebre, *Youth Commissioner*
- Robert Fiore
- William Hoey
- Robert Lyss
- Neil Pople
- Ryan Schrader

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Meeting Minutes

- a. June 15, 2010

5. Oral Communication (Time Limitation Five (5) Minutes)

Anyone wishing to address the Commission on matters not on the Agenda please stand, come to the podium and state NAME and ADDRESS for the record.

6. Consent Calendar

None

7. Special Presentations/Reports

- a. Proposition 1B Applications and Grant Agreements for Roseville Transit
- b. Federal Transit Administration JARC/NF Grant Applications and Agreements for Roseville Transit
- c. Transit Performance Report for Fourth Quarter and Year End of FY09/10

8. Staff and/or Commission Reports/Comments

- a. Alternative Transportation Division Update

9. Pending Agenda

None

10. Adjournment

Note: If you plan to use audio/visual materials during your presentation, they must be submitted to the City of Roseville 72 hours in advance. All public meetings are broadcast live on Comcast Channel 14 or Surewest Channel 73 and replayed the following morning beginning at 9:00 a.m. Meetings are also replayed on weekends.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Commissioner Keller.

2. Roll Call

Commissioners Present

Grace Keller, *Chair*

Mickey DeFiebre, *Youth Commissioner*

Robert Fiore

Robert Lyss

Neil Pople

Ryan Schrader

Commissioners Absent

Rita Brohman, *Vice-Chair, Excused*

William Hoey, *Excused*

Staff Present

Michael Dour, *Alternative Transportation Analyst II*

Lupe Nelson, *Recording Secretary*

3. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Keller led those in attendance in the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Lyss made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Schrader, to approve the minutes of May 18, 2010.

Motion was approved unanimously.

5. Oral Communication

Commissioner Keller opened the Public Comment period.

Michael Barnbaum, 89-B Dean Road, Sacramento, 95815

Mr. Barnbaum informed the Commission of the upcoming Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority meeting.

Commissioner Keller closed the Public Comment period.

6. Consent Calendar

None

7. Special Presentation/Reports

a. Trail Etiquette Guidelines

Mr. Dour gave background on the need for trail etiquette guidelines as user conflicts common to more heavily used trails are occurring. The guidelines are a detailed list of recommendations for trail users.

Commissioner Keller opened the Public Comment period.

Colette Bailey, Hartwick Road, Rocklin, CA

Ms. Bailey asked if the City of Roseville has laws that prohibit a bicyclist from travelling with a dog on a leash.

Allen Heffner, 7834 Saybrook Drive, Citrus Heights, CA

Mr. Heffner stated that bicyclist and walkers should face opposite of each other when using the trail as on the American River Trail.

Patricia Heffner, 7834 Saybrook Drive, Citrus Heights, CA

Mrs. Heffner informed the Commission of the safety issue that occurs due to the lack of clarification on which side of the trail a bicyclist and/or pedestrian should travel.

Commissioner Keller closed the Public Comment period.

A question and answer session between Commissioners and staff ensued.

Staff provided this report as informational only. No action required.

b. Draft Regional Transportation Plan 2035 Update (*PCTPA Presentation*)

Mr. Dour introduced David Melko of Placer County Transportation Planning Agency. Mr. Melko gave a PowerPoint presentation of the Draft Regional Transportation Plan 2035 update.

Commissioner Keller opened the Public Comment period.

Mike Barnbaum, 89-B Dean Road, Sacramento

Mr. Barnbaum requested a hard copy of the Draft Placer County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2035. Mr. Barnbaum had questions about elements of the plan that referenced the Capitol Corridor California Zephyr. He inquired about changes to the rail development plan, if an increase in service frequency from Sacramento and Roseville would occur, if frequency trips to Auburn would be added, and if service to Colfax would be reinstated.

Commissioner Keller closed the Public Comment period.

A question and answer session between Commissioners and staff ensued.

Staff provided this report as informational only. No action required.

8. Staff and/or Commission Reports/Comments

None

9. Pending Agenda

None

10. Adjournment

MOTION

Commissioner Fiore made the motion, which was seconded by Commissioner Schrader, to adjourn the meeting.

The motion was approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.



Transportation Commission Meeting

September 21, 2010 – 7:00 p.m.

Special Presentations/Reports

Item 7a. Proposition 1B Applications and Grant Agreements for Roseville Transit

Staff Eileen Bruggeman, Administrative Analyst

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Transportation Commission take the following actions:

1. Accept public testimony regarding the use of the Proposition 1B funds for FY09/10 and FY10/11; and,
2. Recommend the City Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager or his designee to submit Proposition 1B transit-related grant applications and to execute the related grant applications, Assurances, Authorized Agent forms, Financial Management forms and funding agreements for those projects listed in Attachment 1.

Background

In November 2006 voters approved Proposition 1B on the statewide ballot, which provided \$19 billion of bond funds for a variety of transportation programs throughout the state. Two of these programs provide funding for transit-related capital projects to provide new and improved transit infrastructure. These funds are allocated to each of the counties, and the implementation measures for these programs then call for the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) to sub-allocate funds to individual jurisdictions within Placer County through funding agreements. Of note is the fact that these funds must be used for capital projects and cannot be used for operating expenses.

The two programs which allocate the funds from Proposition 1B for transit are the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) and the Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Account (TSSSDRA).

Discussion

Investment Justifications (IJ) for Roseville's use of PTMISEA and TSSSDRA funds for FY 09/10 and 10/11 have been submitted to the State Department of Transportation and approved for funding. The proposed use of these funds by each fiscal year is presented below, as well as a proposed project use for the funds by year. A more complete project description for each project is included in Attachment 1.

For FY 09/10 \$422,496 PTMISEA funds and \$74,686 TSSSDRA funds are available for a total of \$497,182. These funds are proposed to be used for the following projects:

- Commuter Bus Expansion – \$252,000
- Improved Corporation Yard Security – \$113,182
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Projects – \$132,000

For FY 10/11 \$355,984 PTMISEA funds are available. These funds are proposed to be used for the following projects:

- Improved Corporation Yard Security – \$50,267
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Projects – \$161,290
- Transit Arrival Information Systems (transit kiosks and on-time tracker) – \$75,741
- Transit Shelter Improvements – \$68,686

Future Proposition 1B funds through FY 16/17, estimated to be \$2,506,980, are expected to become available to the City of Roseville. The programming of these future funds to specific projects will be accomplished in the next Short Range Transit Plan update, which staff anticipates bringing to the Commission for approval in 2011.

Attachments:

1. Project Descriptions for FY09/10 and FY10/11 PTMISEA and TSSSDRA Funds

PTMISEA and TSSSDRA Project Descriptions

For FY 09/10 and 10/11

Commuter Bus Acquisition: Two commuter buses were purchased in 2009 to expand commuter service from Roseville to the Franchise Tax Board and Light Rail in Rancho Cordova. The City received \$600,000 in grant funds from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and \$3,410 in grant funds from the State as partial reimbursement for the total acquisition cost of \$864,360. This PTMISEA grant allocation will reimburse the City an additional \$252,000 for a total of 99 percent reimbursement of the acquisition cost. The remaining acquisition cost of \$8,950 was provided from Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Projects: (1) Purchase and install electronic fare boxes on transit fleet. The installation of electronic fare boxes will replace antiquated manual fare boxes, reducing boarding and fare reconciliation time and improving fare data collection accuracy. (2) Purchase and install digital reader boards, vehicle location devices, mobile data terminals, voice enunciators- announcement system and video security cameras on transit fleet. The installation of these devices will improve communications for transit riders; between bus drivers and dispatch; facilitate emergency communications with law enforcement and safety personnel; and improve the integrity of the data collected for reporting purposes. (3) Retrofit Corp Yard space into a Clean Room for mobile data collection equipment; the new electronic equipment requires dedicated clean space for data collection, cleaning and repair. Staff proposes to retrofit existing space at the Corp Yard to house the computer software, store equipment and probes, and provide space for equipment cleaning and repair. The total estimated cost for these projects is \$1,432,405. Roseville has two approved FTA grants for \$862,859 (60 percent). State funds from various Prop 1B grants, including these grant requests, total \$397,662 (28 percent) with \$171,884 (12 percent) from TDA funds required to complete the projects.

Improved Corporation Yard Security: Relocate security gate; install security cameras; purchase storage shed and parking lot improvements at the Corp Yard. The City of Roseville has a stated need to relocate the security entry gate at the southern entrance to the corporation yard along Corporation Yard Circle. The City of Roseville also has a need to monitor the use and security of the fuel island and the compressed natural gas tanks and fueling area at the same location. Investment in security projects such as these benefit both the transit fleet and City Corp Yard and are also required for continued funding from the FTA. The Corporation Yard security improvements are estimated to cost \$163,449. PTMISEA grant allocations totaling \$88,763 over two years and TSSSDRA grant funds of \$74,686 would be used to wholly fund the proposed improvements through State funds.

Transit Arrival Information Systems: On Time performance tracking software and Real Time kiosks will provide up to the minute information to passengers at major trip locations and through the internet. The total estimated cost for this project is \$80,000. PTMISEA grant allocations of \$20,741 and \$55,000 would provide 95 percent of the total project costs with \$4,259 (5 percent) required from TDA funds.

Transit Shelter Improvements: Several aging shelters are in need of replacement. Purchase and install new shelters and provide other improvements as needed on a citywide basis. The total estimated cost for these projects is \$68,686. The FY 10/11 PTMISEA grant allocation would wholly fund the proposed improvements and offset the City's use of TDA LTF funds normally programmed towards these improvements.



Transportation Commission Meeting September 21, 2010 – 7:00 p.m. Special Presentations/Reports

Item 7b. Federal Transit Administration JARC/NF Grant Applications and Agreements for Roseville Transit

Staff Eileen Bruggeman, Administrative Analyst

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Transportation Commission take the following actions:

1. Accept public testimony regarding the use of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant funds for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2009 and FFY 2010; and,
2. Recommend the City Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager or his designee to submit FTA grant applications for Section 5316 Jobs Access/Reverse Commute (JARC) for FFY 10; Section 5317 New Freedom (NF) for FFY 09 and FFY 10 and 2nd Year continued funding for Section 5317 New Freedom for FFY 11 to the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) and to execute subrecipient agreements with SACOG upon approval of the grant applications for those projects listed in Attachment 1.

Background

As the designated recipient of JARC and NF funds in the Sacramento Urbanized Area, SACOG solicits proposals for funding from both programs. The City of Roseville has four (4) projects eligible to be submitted to SACOG for inclusion in their regional FFY 09 and FFY 10 grant applications to the FTA that qualify for funding under the JARC and NF guidelines.

Discussion

Jobs Access/Reverse Commute (JARC) funds: In FFY 10 \$257,331 are available for Roseville Transit in Section 5316 JARC funds. These funds are proposed to be used for the following projects:

- Reduction of Route A Headways to increase service along core Route A
- Reduction of Route B Headways to increase service along core Route B

New Freedom (NF) funds: In FFY 09 \$11,432 are available for Roseville Transit in Section 5317 NF funds. In FFY 10 \$38,000 are available for Roseville Transit in Section 5317 NF funds. Additionally, SACOG will accept a placeholder for continued funding for Roseville Transit in FFY 11 in the amount of \$46,000. SACOG will solicit formal applications for FFY 11 Section 5317 NF grant funds at a later date. These funds are proposed to be used for the following projects:

- Mobility Management – South Placer County Call Center
- Mobility Management – Training

A more complete project description for each project is included in Attachment 1.

Attachments:

1. Job Access/Reverse Commute and New Freedom Project Descriptions

Job Access/Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom (NF) Project Descriptions

JOB ACCESS/REVERSE COMMUTE (JARC)

Decrease Headways on core Route A: Ridership on Route A accounts for 23 percent (59,590 passengers) of Roseville Transit's total 09/10 local route ridership. Up until April 4, 2010, Route A used one (1) bus and provided hourly headways. On that date, as recommended by Roseville's SRTP and approved by the City Council, one (1) additional bus was added to Route A to decrease headways to every half hour. Adding the additional bus doubled the service to major employment stakeholders and provided greater connectivity for passengers transferring to or from Sacramento Regional Transit, Placer County Transit and Lincoln Transit.

Funding from current FTA JARC grant #37-X072-01 provides fifty-percent of the additional operating expense to increase service on Route A from every hour to every half hour from April 4, 2010 through September 30, 2010. This new grant will reimburse the City fifty-percent of the net operating expense to continue the increased service on Route A from 10/01/2010 through 06/30/2011. The estimated cost to operate one (1) additional bus each hour on Route A from 10/01/10 through 06/30/11 is \$206,234 (net of passenger fares). The grant request of \$110,617 also includes fifty-percent reimbursement of administrative costs to monitor the grant, provide marketing and outreach and to evaluate ridership and the cost-effectiveness of the service at fiscal year end.

Decrease Headways on core Route B: Ridership on Route B accounts for 19 percent (49,077 passengers) of Roseville Transit's total 09/10 local route ridership. On April 4, 2010, headways were decreased and passenger service increased on Route B from one bus every hour to one bus every half hour for the same purpose as noted above for Route A.

There is no current FTA grant funding for the increased service on Route B. This grant would reimburse the City fifty-percent of net operating costs for the additional service from 07/01/10 through 06/30/11. The estimated cost to operate one (1) additional bus each hour on Route B from 07/01/10 through 06/30/11 is \$273,428 (net of passenger fares). The grant request of \$146,714 also includes fifty-percent reimbursement of administrative costs to monitor the grant, provide marketing and outreach and to evaluate ridership and the cost-effectiveness of the service at fiscal year end.

NEW FREEDOM PROJECTS

Mobility Management - Training: Provision of mobility management services through the South Placer Regional Transportation Call Center would be a new service specifically designed to help seniors and persons with disabilities overcome obstacles towards using transit. The new mobility management services will give these passengers the knowledge and confidence to use available transit services successfully. This objective will be accomplished through features such as: customized and personal training on how to make a reservation, trip planning in greater detail than available through standard practices, practice trips to destinations with trained companions, provision of training videos, etc.

These new mobility services exceed what is currently provided through Roseville Transit and also exceed the mobility services planned to be provided through the regional transportation call center. This grant will provide reimbursement of eighty-percent of the cost to provide the new service. The estimated cost to provide this level of mobility service during the first year of the program is \$47,500. Staff anticipates an increase to \$57,500 in the second year as more passengers become aware of the service. This grant request is for \$38,000 for the first year and \$46,000 for the second year. Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds will provide the twenty-percent matching funds.

Mobility Management – Call Center Operations: Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) issued a second round call for eligible projects to fully allocate the last small portion of FFY 2009 Section 5317 New Freedom (NF) grant funds. Roseville was approved to submit an application for \$11,432 in NF grant to be used to offset the cost of implementing the South Placer Regional Transportation Call Center. The South Placer Regional Transportation Call Center project has already received State and Federal approval for \$250,000 in grant funds to upgrade the current dispatch center and a separate FTA grant for \$150,000 in operating assistance. Staff estimates an annual operating budget of \$300,000. In addition to the federal operating grants, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) has pledged CTSA funds to wholly fund the Call Center.

Item 7c. Year End Transit Performance Report and 4th Quarter Evaluation of FY09/10

Staff Michael Wixon, Alternative Transportation Manager

Recommendation

Staff requests that the Transportation Commission accept the Transit Performance Report for the Year End Performance Report and 4th quarter evaluation of FY2009/2010.

Background

The City Council adopted a series of performance standards as part of the Short Range Transit Plan adopted in February 2005. These goals and standards are a method for the Council, the Transportation Commission, and staff to evaluate the performance of the City's transit services each quarter, and at the end of each fiscal year.

Discussion

Staff has attached charts that provide details of the established transit performance criteria. Below is a brief overview of the performance criteria used to measure activity towards meeting the goals of service efficiency, service effectiveness, and service quality.

Goal 1 – Service Efficiency – Service efficiency is rated by the cost per passenger and the farebox recovery for each service and system-wide.

The farebox recovery ratio for all transit services is 18.9% in the 4th quarter of fiscal year 2009/2010 (FY09/10) (Attachment 1). This represents a 1.8% improvement over the same quarter in the previous fiscal year. The farebox recovery ratio for the year is 17.0%, which is lower than the 18.1% farebox ratio for FY 08/09, due to lower ratios of 16.4% and 16.0% during the 1st and 2nd quarters of FY09/10, respectively. The year end ratio of 17.0% exceeds the minimum standard of a 15% farebox ratio.

For all services in the 4th quarter there were improvements from the prior three (3) quarters of the year in that rising operating expenses were lowered, and total fare revenue increased. While ridership increased in commuter services and Dial-A-Ride (DAR) services in the 4th quarter, those increases were unable to fully compensate for the decrease in ridership experienced in fixed route service following service changes implemented at the beginning of the 4th quarter.

Fixed Route: Changes implement in April 2010 to fixed route services included removal of several routes (Routes E, F, H, J and K), modifications to other (Routes C, G, L and M) and increase in frequency of service for Routes A and B. It is anticipated that there will be an adjustment period as people become accustomed to the changes.

Overall in fixed route service there were significant increases in operating costs that was corrected in the 4th quarter and are anticipated to hold or decrease further in FY10/11 based on completion of the process to remove six (6) buses from the fleet. Likewise farebox revenue was decreasing in FY09/10 but experienced a course correction in the 4th quarter (an increase from \$69,848 in the 3rd quarter to \$74,911 in the 4th quarter). Purchasing patterns shifted in the 4th quarter to a higher percentage of passes being purchased, perhaps in response to the removal of free transfers, resulting in an increase

in revenue in spite of a decrease in ridership. While farebox revenue increased in the 4th quarter from the previous quarter it was lower than the 4th quarter of the previous year (up from \$69,848 in the 3rd quarter to \$74,911 in the 4th quarter FY09/10, but down from \$79,611 FY08/09).

Ridership is lower in the 4th quarter FY09/10 (55,570) in comparison to the 4th quarter FY08/09 (70,423). This represents a 21.1% decrease between years. As a result, the amount of subsidy per fixed route trip increased from \$9.37 per trip in the 4th quarter of the prior year, to \$11.53 per trip in FY 09/10 4th quarter.

While ridership on fixed route is significantly lower at this time that is to be expected given the significant service changes implemented in the 4th quarter of FY09/10 and requires time to adjust. As ridership increases, so will revenue levels. The passenger trips per vehicle revenue hour (VRH) over the course of FY09/10 was dropping from 10.0 passenger trips in the 1st quarter, to 8.1 in the 2nd quarter, to 7.4 passenger trips per VRH in the 3rd quarter. The 4th quarter showed an improvement to 7.6 passengers per VRH, however, the standard we strive to meet is 8.0 passengers per VRH. It is anticipated as passengers adjust to the changes ridership will increase, resulting in increases in farebox recovery ratio and the number of passengers per VRH.

Below is a summary of how individual routes are contributing to the total ridership. There are several areas of significant improvement (for example, Routes A, B and D). However, Routes G, I and M could be doing better. Staff is planning to provide public outreach to target audiences to promote ridership on fixed routes, and implement a schedule correction to Route M.

Fixed Route	Annual FY 08/09	Average Per Month Ridership			% Change FY09/10 Q1-3 to Q4
		FY 08/09	Quarters 1-3 FY 09/10	4th Quarter FY 09/10	
A	65,292	5,441	4,838	5,349	10%
B	52,585	4,382	3,496	4,932	29%
C	9,539	795	738	755	2%
D	11,392	949	811	1,080	25%
E	10,804	900	855	0	
F	9,918	827	803	0	
G	8,486	707	639	557	-15%
H	13,088	1,091	926	0	
I	14,587	1,216	1,109	1,009	-10%
J	30,366	2,531	2,265	0	
K	13,735	1,145	1,034	0	
L	18,402	1,534	1,477	1,545	4%
M	31,474	2,623	2,406	2,043	-18%
TOTALS:		24,139	21,397	17,270	-24%

While it is worthwhile to monitor the data during this adjustment period it is programmed that we do not anticipate making any recommendations to significantly modify any of the fixed route services until we are able to collect additional data. In addition, the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) is currently updating the Short Range Transit Plan. The final report is due early next year. The updated document will provide recommendations based on surveys and data analysis conducted by an outside consultant. Those recommendations will help direct future route modifications when they are next evaluated.

Commuter Service: Operating expenses for commuter service in the 4th quarter in FY09/10 were higher than in the 4th quarter of FY08/09, but that is to be expected given the overall increase in service this fiscal year (removal of two (2) underperforming routes with implementation of two (2) routes to address overcrowding on other routes, plus start of service to the Highway 50 corridor). Revenue and ridership also increased during this period. Ridership is up 10.7% in comparison to the same quarter last year (from 26,270 in FY08/09 to 29,075 in the 4th quarter of FY09/10). As a result the amount of subsidy per commuter trip in the 4th quarter FY09/10 is \$1.80, an improvement in comparison to the prior year when the subsidy per commuter trip was at \$2.23 per trip.

Dial-A-Ride Service: Dial-A-Ride (DAR) operating expenses were increasing in FY09/10 but they were in parity with the expenses in the 4th quarter the prior fiscal year (\$295,160 in FY09/10, \$293,502 in FY08/09), and overall year to date expenses decreased in FY09/10 (total DAR expenses \$1,169,769 in FY08/09, and \$1,127,108 in FY09/10,). Initially DAR farebox revenue was decreasing however there was a significant increase during the 4th quarter in FY09/10, going from \$20,283 in the 3rd quarter to \$26,760 in the 4th quarter. Likewise there was an increase in DAR ridership from 7,498 in the 3rd quarter to 8,309 in the 4th quarter. As a result the farebox ratio for the 4th quarter was 9.1%, leading to a year end ratio of 8.0%. The year end farebox ratio of FY 09/10 is less than last year's DAR farebox ratio (9.8%). The amount of subsidy per DAR trip continues to increase from \$22.17 average last fiscal year to \$31.67 in FY09/10.

Goal 2 - Service Effectiveness – Service effectiveness is rated by total ridership and the number of passengers trips provided for each vehicle revenue hour (PTVRH).

Overall total ridership in the 4th quarter improved this year from 7.3% in FY 08/09 to 7.6% FY09/10. The overall PTVRH was 7.4 in FY09/10, in comparison to 7.8 in FY08/09. The overall standard is an average of eight (8) PTVRH.

It is anticipated eventually the implementation of the commuter and fixed route service changes will result in an increase of the PTVRH. Staff is beginning to conduct an analysis similar to one conducted of the other services to consider if similar efficiency improvement can be identified for DAR services.

Goal 3 - Service Quality – Service quality is measured by the number of preventable and non-preventable accidents per 1,000 miles traveled, on-time performance, the number of passenger complaints per trip provided, and the number of road calls per mile traveled.

The average number of preventable and all accidents for the 4th quarter was zero per 194,169 service miles (standard is less than 1 per 25,000 miles for all accidents, and less than 1 per 50,000 miles for preventable accidents). Overall for FY09/10 the average number all accidents for FY09/10 was 1 per 78,266 service miles, and 1 per 40,996 for all accidents. In both categories the system exceeds standards.

During the 4th quarter there was one road call per 27,738 miles (standard is more than 10,000 miles per road call). The year end ratio was one road call per 27,772 miles. During FY09/10 the system exceeds the standard.

Attachment

1. FY 09/10 Performance Report Data

	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	Year To Date
Farebox Ratio for All Services					
Total Expenses - All Services	\$1,215,270	\$1,250,839	\$1,214,140	\$1,187,565	\$4,867,814
Total Fares - All Services	\$198,796	\$200,014	\$205,801	\$223,925	\$828,536
Combined Farebox Ratio for All Services	16.4%	16.0%	17.0%	18.9%	17.0%
Previous FY Combined Farebox Ratio for All Services	16.9%	16.2%	22.3%	17.1%	18.1%
Percent Difference	-0.5%	-0.2%	-5.3%	1.8%	-1.1%
Subsidy per Trip (All Services)					
Total Expenses - All Services	\$1,215,270	\$1,250,839	\$1,214,140	\$1,187,565	\$4,867,814
Less Fares (All Services)	\$198,796	\$200,014	\$205,801	\$223,925	\$828,536
Total Subsidy	\$1,016,474	\$1,050,825	\$1,008,339	\$963,640	\$4,039,278
Divided by Ridership (All Services)	104,825	103,115	99,926	92,954	400,820
Total Subsidy for All Service Trips	\$9.70	\$10.19	\$10.09	\$10.37	\$10.08
Previous FY Subsidy for All Service Trips	\$7.75	\$9.67	\$9.02	\$9.33	\$8.94
Subsidy Increase/Decrease from Previous Year	\$1.95	\$0.52	\$1.07	\$1.04	\$1.14
Total Ridership for All Services					
Current Quarter	104,825	103,115	99,926	92,954	400,820
Last Year Quarter	122,060	105,557	100,705	105,632	433,954
Total Ridership Increase/Decrease	-14.1%	-2.3%	-0.8%	-12.0%	-7.6%
Passenger Trips per VRH (All Services) Standard 8/VRH					
Total Ridership	104,825	103,115	99,926	92,954	400,820
Divided by Total Vehicle Revenue Hours (VRH)	14,446	14,054	13,759	12,237	54,495
Total Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Hour	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.6	7.4
Preventable Accident Standard <1/50,000					
Total Service Miles (All Services)	225,513	221,887	219,356	194,169	860,925
Divided by Total Preventable Accidents	4	3	4	0	11
Total Service Miles per Preventable Accident	56,378	73,962	54,839	194,169	78,266
All Accidents Standard < 1/25,000					
Total Service Miles (All Services)	225,513	221,887	219,356	194,169	860,925
Divided by Total Accidents	9	7	5	0	21
Total Service Miles per Accident	25,057	31,698	43,871	194,169	40,996
Maintenance Standard > 1/10,000 miles between Road Calls					
Total Service Miles (All Services)	225,513	221,887	219,356	194,169	860,925
Divided by All Road Calls	8	10	6	7	31
Total Service Miles per Road Calls	28,189	22,189	36,559	27,738	27,772

	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	Year To Date
Fixed Route Farebox Standard >15%					
Total Expenses - All Services	\$1,215,270	\$1,250,839	\$1,214,140	\$1,187,565	\$4,867,814
Percentage of FR Service Hours to Total Contract Service Hours	63.18%	63.87%	64.17%	58.68%	62.5%
Total Expenses - Fixed Route Services	\$767,837	\$796,383	\$788,443	\$715,804	\$3,068,467
Fixed Route Fare Revenue	\$73,563	\$72,708	\$69,848	\$74,911	\$291,030
Fixed Route Farebox Ratio	9.6%	9.1%	8.9%	10.5%	9.5%
Last Year Quarter	8.7%	9.5%	15.6%	10.8%	11.2%

Fixed Route Subsidy Standard <\$5.00 per trip					
Total Expenses - Fixed Route Services	\$767,837	\$796,383	\$788,443	\$715,804	\$3,068,467
Less Fixed Route Fare Revenue	\$73,563	\$72,708	\$69,848	\$74,911	\$291,030
Total Subsidy	\$694,274	\$723,675	\$718,595	\$640,893	\$2,777,437
Divided by Fixed Route Ridership	70,011	68,403	64,509	55,570	258,493
Subsidy per Fixed Route Trip	\$9.92	\$10.58	\$11.14	\$11.53	\$10.74
Last Year Quarter	\$7.82	\$9.70	\$9.10	\$9.37	\$9.00

Fixed Route Ridership Standard > 2% Increase					
Current Quarter	70,011	68,403	64,509	55,570	258,493
Last Year Quarter	82,245	71,163	67,436	70,423	72,817
Ridership Increase/Decrease	-14.9%	-3.9%	-4.3%	-21.1%	-11.0%

Fixed Route Passenger Trips Per VRH Standard > 8.0					
Fixed Route Ridership	70,011	68,403	64,509	55,570	258,493
Divided by FR Vehicle Revenue Hours (VRH)	9,375	9,289	9,181	7,625	35,470
FR Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Hour	7.5	7.4	7.0	7.3	7.3
Last Year Quarter	10.0	8.1	7.4	7.6	8.3

FR Ridership per FR Complaint Standard <1/5000					
Fixed Route Ridership	70,011	68,403	64,509	55,570	258,493
Number of Complaints	15	10	16	12	53
Divided by Substantiated Complaints	3	2	4	3	12
Fixed Route Ridership per Complaint	23,337	34,202	16,127	18,523	21,541
Last Year Quarter	20,561	17,816	22,479	17,606	20,285

Fixed Route On Time Performance					
1st Month of Quarter	97%	98%	99%	99%	98%
2nd Month of Quarter	97%	100%	99%	99%	99%
3rd Month of Quarter	97%	95.8%	99%	99%	98%
Avg On-Time Performance (%)	97%	98%	99%	99%	98%
Last Year Quarter	99%	100%	99%	99%	99%

	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	Year To Date
Commuter Farebox Standard >75%					
Total Expenses - All Services	\$1,215,270	\$1,250,839	\$1,214,140	\$1,187,565	\$4,867,814
Percentage of Commuter Service Hours to Total Contract Service Hours	13.48%	14.13%	14.60%	16.67%	14.72%
Total Expenses - Commuter Service	\$160,959	\$169,888	\$164,792	\$176,601	\$672,240
Commuter Fare Revenue	\$102,425	\$107,570	\$115,669	\$122,811	\$448,475
Commuter Farebox Ratio	63.6%	63.3%	70.2%	69.5%	66.7%
Last Year Quarter	69.8%	64.5%	71.9%	63.1%	67.3%

Commuter Subsidy Standard <\$3.00 per trip					
Total Cost - Commuter Service	\$160,959	\$169,888	\$164,792	\$176,601	\$672,240
Less Commuter Fare Revenue	\$102,425	\$107,570	\$115,669	\$122,811	\$448,475
Divided by Commuter Ridership	\$58,534	\$62,318	\$49,123	\$53,790	\$223,765
	25,787	26,784	27,909	29,075	109,555
Subsidy per Commuter Trip	\$2.27	\$2.33	\$1.76	\$1.85	\$2.04
Last Year Quarter	\$1.45	\$2.13	\$1.74	\$2.23	\$1.89

Commuter Ridership Standard > 2% Increase					
Current Quarter	25,787	26,784	27,909	29,075	109,555
Last Year Quarter	30,638	25,480	24,700	26,270	107,088
Ridership Increase/Decrease	-15.8%	5.1%	13.0%	10.7%	2.3%

Commuter Passenger Trips per VRH Standard > 8.0					
Commuter Ridership	25,787	26,784	27,909	29,075	109,555
Divided by Commuter Vehicle Revenue Hours (VRH)	1,781	1,772	1,693	1,799	7,045
Commuter Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Hour	14.5	15.1	16.5	16.2	15.5
Last Year Quarter	17.7	15.6	15.0	14.8	15.8

Comm. Ridership per Comm. Complaint Standard <1/5000					
Commuter Ridership	25,787	26,784	27,909	29,075	109,555
Number of Complaints	6	11	2	11	30
Divided by Substantiated Complaints	1	5	2	1	9
Commuter Ridership per Complaint	25,787	5,357	13,955	29,075	12,173
Last Year Quarter	30,638	25,480	12,350	26,270	23,685

Commuter On Time Performance					
1st Month of Quarter	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%
2nd Month of Quarter	100.0%	96.3%	100.0%	100%	99%
3rd Month of Quarter	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%	100%
Avg On-Time Performance (%)	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%
Last Year Quarter	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter	Year To Date
DAR Farebox >15%					
Total Expenses - All Services	\$1,215,270	\$1,250,839	\$1,214,140	\$1,187,565	\$4,867,814
Percentage of DAR Service Hours to Total Contract Service Hours	23.34%	22.00%	21.23%	24.65%	22.81%
Total Expenses - DAR Service	\$286,474	\$284,569	\$260,905	\$295,160	\$1,127,108
DAR Fare Revenue	\$22,823	\$19,748	\$20,283	\$26,760	\$89,614
DAR Farebox Ratio	8.0%	6.9%	7.8%	9.1%	8.0%
Last Year Quarter	10.1%	8.6%	12.8%	7.9%	9.8%

DAR Subsidy					
Total Expenses - DAR Service	\$286,474	\$284,569	\$260,905	\$295,160	\$1,127,108
Less DAR Fare Revenue	\$22,823	\$19,748	\$20,283	\$26,760	\$89,614
Total Subsidy	\$263,651	\$264,821	\$240,622	\$268,400	\$1,037,494
Divided by DAR Ridership	9,027	7,928	7,498	8,309	32,762
Subsidy per DAR Passenger	\$29.21	\$33.40	\$32.09	\$32.30	\$31.67
Last Year Quarter	\$28.16	\$31.18	\$29.32	\$30.24	\$22.17

DAR Ridership					
Current Quarter	9,027	7,928	7,498	8,309	32,762
Last Year Quarter	9,177	8,814	8,569	8,939	35,499
Ridership % Increase/Decrease	-1.6%	-10.1%	-12.5%	-7.0%	-7.7%

DAR Passenger Trips per VRH Standard >3.0					
DAR Ridership	9,027	7,928	7,498	8,309	32,762
Divided by DAR Vehicle Revenue Hours (VRH)	3,290	2,992	2,885	3,113	12,279
DAR Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Hour	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.7
Last Year Quarter	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.0

DAR Ridership per DAR Complaint Standard <1/3000					
DAR Ridership	9,027	7,928	7,498	8,309	32,762
Number of Complaints	6	7	3	5	21
Divided by Substantiated Complaints	1	4	0	1	6
DAR Ridership per Complaint	9,027	1,982	7,498	8,309	5,460
Last Year Quarter	9,177	4,407	8,569	2,980	5,538

DAR On Time Performance					
1st Month of Quarter	96.6%	97.0%	98.2%	97.4%	97%
2nd Month of Quarter	97.9%	98.1%	98.6%	98.2%	98%
3rd Month of Quarter	97.9%	98.6%	99.2%	97.9%	98%
Avg On-Time Performance (%)	97%	98%	99%	98%	98%
Last Year Quarter	97%	96%	97%	97%	97%



Transportation Commission Meeting September 21, 2010 – 7:00 p.m. Reports and Updates

Item 8a. Alternative Transportation Division Update

Staff Michael Wixon, Alternative Transportation Manager

Recommendation

This item is provided to update the Transportation Commission on the activities of the Alternative Transportation Division and other transportation related items of the region, no action is needed.

Call Center Program

Staff is continuing to work with PCTPA to finalize an agreement for the operation of the South Placer Call Center. A second working draft is nearing completion and it will hopefully be ready as a final draft by the end of September. Staff expects to bring a final draft agreement to the Transportation Commission in October or November 2010, and to the City Council immediately thereafter.

GFI-Electronic Fareboxes

The City Council recently approved the project to install electronic fareboxes on all remaining Roseville Transit fleet used in service. The full-sized electronic fareboxes will be installed on all remaining local and commuter buses, while smaller versions of the fareboxes will be installed on the DAR buses and three (3) vans which may be employed in DAR service. By the time the agenda packet is delivered, staff expects all components to be delivered to the City of Roseville. Installation of the equipment on the buses will begin in August/September, and all additional software and hardware necessary to support the new fareboxes will also be installed shortly thereafter. Roseville Transit drivers are already trained on the basic use of the fareboxes, but additional on-site mechanic and software training will be provided by GFI. Following the complete installation of the electronic fareboxes, staff will begin the process of modifying the fares to more appropriately reflect ways in which the new fareboxes can improve customer features, such as modifying monthly passes to 30-day passes (which begin after the first use).

Roseville Bikefest

Roseville Bikefest will be on Saturday, October 2 from 9 a.m. to noon at Heritage Oak School, 2271 Americana Drive. Roseville Bikefest is the city's premier annual bike safety event. Families get a chance to learn about important bicycling techniques while participating in fun activities, including bicycle skills courses, riding demonstrations, helmet fittings, bike safety inspections and a free bike giveaway. Bicycle helmets are given free to participants who have damaged, unsafe, or improperly fitting helmets. See www.roseville.ca.us/bikefest for more information.

International Walk or Bike to School Day

October 6 is International Walk or Bike to School Day. The City of Roseville's Safe Routes to School program will be assisting local schools in their celebrations. Participating schools are Coyote Ridge, Heritage Oak, Quail Glen, and Silverado Schools of the Dry Creek School District. See www.roseville.ca.us/WalkToSchoolDay for more information.

Transit Ambassador Program

During the fourth quarter of FY09/10, six people applied to be volunteer Transit Ambassadors. Two of those applicants found out about the program from marketing flyers provided on Roseville Transit. The remaining four applicants applied for the program after learning about it through the volunteer link provided on the City of Roseville's website. One of the six applicants interviewed successfully, passed

the background check, was trained and joined the ranks of active volunteers. There are currently five, active volunteers, since one volunteer took a leave of absence during the summer.

By the end of the fourth quarter of FY09/10, a total of 69 people have applied to be volunteer Transit Ambassadors since the beginning of the program. Of those, 37 have been interviewed resulting in 16 candidates for the program. All 16 candidates were trained and have served as volunteers for at least a six month period. Only one volunteer has been dismissed due to lack of participation in the program.

The current group of five, trained, active, Transit Ambassadors contribute an average of 43 hours per month to helping passengers at transit transfer point, on board the buses, or at scheduled community outreaches. In April, at Roseville's annual Volunteer Appreciation Lunch, Sarah Wong, a Transit Ambassador for almost 3 years, was presented the Presidential Service Award for volunteering more than 100 hours in 2009.

In May, revised recruitment flyers were made available to all transit providers in the south Placer region in an effort to recruit volunteers from Lincoln, Auburn, and unincorporated Placer County. To date no new volunteers from areas outside of Roseville have resulted. Additional marketing efforts are being planned to focus recruitment efforts at Sierra College when classes resume in the fall.

Since May, Transit Ambassadors have begun to travel on Placer County Transit and Lincoln Transit in addition to travel on Roseville Transit and helping passengers primarily at the Galleria Transit Transfer point. No volunteers have traveled on Auburn Transit to date, however, training will be offered to volunteers during the month of August to encourage volunteer time on all south Placer transit routes.

New passengers most frequently ask Transit Ambassadors about travel to Auburn for medical appointments, the Santucci Justice Center, Sierra College, both Roseville Walmart stores, and Kaiser Permanente. College students frequently inquire about a reduced fare. Passengers continue to express their desire to see service reinstated on Roseville Transit Routes C and F as soon as funding is available. Passengers also express their confusion about the current configuration of and headways on Routes I, D and L.

Fourth Quarter Outreach Events

Wednesday, April 21, 2010, Sun City Roseville – Sunshine Club Expo – very well attended event at Sun City – great venue for recruiting volunteers and to educate seniors about the availability of public transportation and the Transit Ambassador Program.

Wednesday, April 28, 2010, Annual Volunteer Appreciation Lunch – approximately 200 people in attendance – great venue for recruiting volunteers and to educate seniors about the availability of public transportation and the Transit Ambassador Program.

Thursday, April 29, 2010, Parks and Recreation Adventure Club Program – assisted staff with trip planning for summer outings for approximately 60 children.

Wednesday, May 12, 2010, Roseville Senior Commission – South Placer Transit Ambassador Program presentation

Friday, May 14, 2010, Annual Adelante High School Career Fair – conducted 4 workshops for approximately 50 high school students.

Tuesday, May 25, 2010 – Downtown Tuesday Nights – Rained out.

Tuesday, June 15, 2010 – Downtown Tuesday Nights – Directly assisted 33 people with trip planning, public transportation information, and the Transit Ambassador program; helped with many inquiries about bus travel to Sierra College.

Transit Ambassador Volunteer Hours FY09/10 4th Quarter

<i>Transit Ambassador</i>	<i>Start Date</i>	<i>April Volunteer Hrs/# assisted</i>	<i>May Volunteer Hrs/# assisted</i>	<i>June Volunteer Hrs/# assisted</i>	<i>Total Volunteer Hours/# Assisted</i>
Grajo, Katherine	5/13/10	N/A	4.5 hours/ paperwork and training – rode routes A, M, I.	4 hours/3 assisted	8.5 hours/3 assisted
Hazen, Laura	9/10/10	Nothing reported	16 hours/13 assisted	Nothing reported	16 hours/13 assisted
Hetzer, Lois	3/12/10	8 hours/16 assisted	8 hours/ 4 assisted	7 hours/8 assisted	23 hours/28 assisted
Hudson, Bernadette	10/15/09	Voluntary Leave of Absence			
Lewis, Craig	9/11/09	6 hours/9 assisted	5 hours/9 assisted	9 hours/13 assisted	20 hours/30 assisted
Wong, Sarah	10/24/07	5 hours/4 assisted	12 hours/13 assisted	5 hours/9 assisted	22 hours/26 assisted
Total hours & assists		<i>19 hours/29 assists</i>	<i>45.5 hours/39 assists</i>	<i>25 hours/33 assisted</i>	<i>89.5 hours/100 assisted</i>

Saugstad Park to Darling Way Trail Project



Construction is underway on this 180-foot long Class 1 paved multi-use trail project. The project will extend the existing trail in Saugstad Park to Darling Way, on the east side of Dry Creek. Construction is expected to continue through October. The goal of the project is to close a gap in the trail system and in doing so facilitate access from the Riverside Gateway area to Saugstad Park. The Dry Creek Greenway Trail that was the subject of a planning and feasibility study earlier this year is a separate project that may, in the future, connect to the Saugstad Park Trail. Funding for the Saugstad Park to Darling Way Trail is made available through a grant from the Federal Transit Administration’s Capital Investment Program. If, as anticipated, there are additional funds available after construction of the trail, these additional funds may be

used to install bike lockers at Saugstad Park and other nearby transit transfer stations.

Berry Street Repaving

Residents around Roseville High school have expressed growing concern about parking in their neighborhood. Over the past few years the student population has increased, which has led to more students parking in the surrounding neighborhood, creating a parking shortage. The most recent concerns expressed have been from residents related to students parking on Manzanita Avenue.

Berry Street is designated a collector roadway that begins at Tiger Way, runs north along the east edge of Roseville High School to Roseville Cemetery, then turns east along the cemetery boundary to Galleria Boulevard, where it terminates at the entrance to the Antelope Creek Bike Trail. Aside from the high school and cemetery, Berry Street provides access to several homes and industrial uses.

Berry Street originally had a narrow pavement section without bike lanes or sidewalks. Adjacent to the high school, Berry Street had a bus drop-off lane and an on-street perpendicular parking area. In 2008, Berry Street was widened and striped with two 10' travel lanes, a center left turn lane and bike lanes consistent with City standards for collector roadways. The center left turn lane is necessary to provide access to the existing businesses along the street. The Berry Street project removed the on-street parking adjacent to the high school, but retained a bus drop-off lane. The high school built a new off-street parking lot southeast of Berry Street prior to completion of the Berry Street widening project.

Berry Street is currently shown as a proposed Class III bike route in the Bicycle Master Plan (BMP). The BMP does not designate Class II bike lanes for Berry Street because at the time of the 2008 BMP update City staff did not expect the Berry Street widening to accommodate bike lanes. However, the proposed Class III designation was provided because the BMP identified Berry Street as a potentially important connection between the Antelope Creek Trail and Downtown/Old Town Roseville. This is consistent with BMP policy which states that Class II bike lanes should be provided on new collector streets, but there may be instances when a Class III route will be substituted.

When allocating space in the public right-of-way, it is the City's responsibility to evaluate resident and business needs and develop a plan that best uses the limited space. Often, City staff has to balance the demand for parking with that of bike lanes. The BMP provides guidance for the review of changes to existing bikeway designations. Staff has evaluated the proposed removal of bike lanes on Berry Street in consideration of this guidance. In particular, the following were considered:

- Traffic counts were conducted in June 2010. Approximately 5 bicycles were counted during a 2-hour time frame in the morning, and an additional 5 bicycles were counted during a 2-hour time frame in the pm peak time. This indicates that bicycle travel on Berry Street is limited.
- Although Berry Street ties into the Antelope Creek Trail, the bike counts show that this connection is not resulting in significant trips between the trail and Downtown Roseville. This could, in part, be due to the presence of bike lanes on Atlantic Street or the new extension of the Miners Ravine Trail to Folsom Road, both of which provide direct access into Downtown Roseville.
- Based upon a review of the attendance boundaries for Roseville High School and current street configurations, Berry Street (and the connecting trail system) is not a likely bicycle route for high school students. When the Reserve Drive Extension Project is completed, more students may choose to bicycle on Berry Street.
- Collector roads typically range from 2,000 to 15,000 Average Daily Traffic (ADT). The most recent traffic counts for Berry Street show 2,550 ADT. The projected volume in year 2020 is 8,400 ADT.
- The speed limit on Berry Street is 35 miles per hour.
- There have been no reported bicycle collisions on Berry Street within the past 10 years.

In consideration of the above, Staff has removed the bike lane designation along the full length of Berry Street. The result is that parallel parking is allowed on both sides of Berry Street from west edge of the cemetery to Galleria Boulevard. The "No Parking" restriction will remain in effect between Tiger Way and west edge of the cemetery (where Berry Street directly abuts the high school) because curvature of

the road, presence of driveways and turn lanes, and presence of homes make parking undesirable on this road segment. Attachment 1 shows the segments where parking is allowed and disallowed.

The segment of Berry Street where parking is allowed is about 400 feet from the nearest high school building and 850 feet from the heart of the campus. Staff anticipates that students will take advantage of at least some of the new on-street parking. However, the distance to classrooms may, to some degree, limit use of Berry Street for school parking. Staff expects that employees of some businesses along Galleria Boulevard may choose to park on the east end of Berry Street (since one undeveloped lot along Berry Street is currently used for auxiliary parking by a Galleria Boulevard business. In the future, staff will monitor the use and effectiveness of the on-street parking. If students choose not to use the new on-street parking, staff may consider re-designation of the bike lane.

The proposed re-striping plan would retain an edge line, resulting in a striped shoulder. The striped shoulder will still be available for cyclists when not used for parking. To advise motorists that there is a potential for bikes using the travel lane to get around parked vehicles, "Share the Road" signs will be installed on each end of Berry Street.

In recent years, City staff has used this approach at two separate locations: Hallissy Drive in front of Buljan Middle School and Trehowell Drive in front of Catheryn Gates Elementary School. In both cases, the bike lane designation was eliminated and the parking restrictions were lifted, but an edge line was left to create a shoulder that could be used by bicyclists when not used for parking. In both cases, the results have been positive without any reported safety issues or reported concerns from the bicycling community.

Legislative Update

A recent report prepared by PCTPA regarding Proposition 22 is attached herein explaining its purposes. Proposition 22 has qualified for the upcoming elections and will certainly be discussed more as the election nears.

Recent Media Coverage

- *City conducts two major street improvement projects, 7/26/10*, Roseville Press-Tribune
- *Sutter Pediatrics hosts safety fair, 8/14/10*, Roseville Press-Tribune (helmet fitting, Bikefest mentioned)
- Upcoming: Roseville Bikefest will be the topic of the City View column in the Press-Tribune

Attachments:

1. Berry Street Aerial Photo of High School Area
2. Berry Street Improvement Plans
3. Berry Street - BMP Figure 4, Recommended Bicycle Network
4. September 8, 2010 PCTPA Report RE: Proposition 22

Attachments for Item 8a. are available by contacting Alternative Transportation at transportation@roseville.ca.us or (916) 774-5293.