

| San Joaquin County RTSP Comments and Response Summary |                 |          |   |   |
|---|-----------------|----------|---|---|
| Number  | Agency          | Location | Comment   | Response/Status   |
| 1   | City of Tracy   | Page 15  | inconsistency with pages 100-103 (service to unincorporated areas section, deleted from May Draft RTSP)           | Need for new service is addressed by the UTN process. <a href="#">UTN process is for TDA funded services; ITC may employ other processes for services provided using other funding such as Measure K.</a> Institutional arrangements for new services should be addressed by the ITC. |
| 2   | City of Tracy   | Page 20  | Does ROTA still operate?  | ROTA's trolley service eliminated, dial-a-ride service still connects with SJRTD Dial-A-Ride at Jacob Meyers Park   |
| 3   | City of Tracy   | Page 27  | Add "through an agreement with RTD" to paragraph about Tracer   | Comment noted, text changed   |
| 4   | City of Tracy   | Page 45  | Explain detail of recommendation to normalize transit performance measures  | Process will be clarified; key data and definitions to be based on TDA reporting  |
| 5   | City of Tracy   | Page 51  | Include city of Tracy's paratransit system?   | Comment noted, text added   |
| 6   | City of Tracy   | Page 97  | Why not show other options for providing service to Mountain House?   | Service beyond City boundaries to be addressed through the ITC  |
| 7   | City of Tracy   | Page 100 | Service to unincorporated areas, unmet transit needs, SJRTD's contract?   | Comment noted, Will be discussed and addressed through the ITC  |
| 8   | City of Tracy   | Overall  | Connection between Tracy and Manteca needs to be addressed  | Comment noted, Will be discussed and addressed through the ITC  |
| 9   | City of Manteca | Page 12  | Manteca SRTP has not been adopted yet, should be adopted in May   | Comment noted, text updated to note adoption in May   |
| 10  | City of Manteca | Page 14  | Manteca SRTP has not been adopted yet, should be adopted in May   | Comment noted,-- text updated   |
| 11  | City of Manteca | Page 14  | RTD no longer has stops at Union Road and Wawona in Manteca   | Comment noted, text changed   |
| 12  | City of Manteca | Page 14  | Manteca transit offers dial-a-ride service to the ACE station   | Comment noted, text added   |
| 13  | City of Manteca | Page 16  | Example committee structure too large for small agencies such as City of Manteca, which has only one staff member | Comment noted, Concerns will be addressed through ITC   |
| 14  | City of Manteca | Page 69  | "The focus is on new service from San Joaquin to". Where to?  | Typo, text updated to include "adjacent counties."  |
| 15  | City of Manteca | Page 72  | Missing words in sentence   | Typo, text updated  |
| 16  | City of Manteca | Page 83  | How to connect Manteca to Modesto, scenario given only considers Ripon and Escalon                                | To be addressed via the ITC. "Opening door" of MAX ACE bus one possibility  |

|    |                 |            |  |  |
|----|-----------------|------------|--|--|
| 17 | City of Manteca | Page 91    | \$40,000 very expensive for temporary bus stop site  | Comment noted  |
| 18 | City of Manteca | Page 92    | Coordination between transit operators is difficult when routes/times are changed  | Comment noted, SJRTD plans GIS/GPS data coordination. Coordination efforts will also be addressed through ITC  |
| 19 | City of Manteca | Page 101   | Unmet Transit Needs (UTN) process is not only path for needs to be identified  | Comment noted; <a href="#">UTN process is for TDA funded services</a> ; <a href="#">ITC may employ other processes for services provided using other funding such as Measure K</a> |
| 20 | City of Lodi    | Page 42    | Operating cost per passenger calculations discrepancy  | Process will be clarified; key data and definitions to be based on TDA reporting   |
| 21 | City of Lodi    | Page 100   | Unincorporated areas/UTN concerns  | Comment noted, This item will be discussed and addressed through the ITC   |
| 22 | City of Lodi    | overall    | Improve connection between Manteca and Tracy   | Comment noted, will be discussed and addressed through the ITC   |
| 23 | City of Lodi    | overall    | City of Lodi does not receive any LTF funding from the County to compensate for SJRTD's fixed route services using the city street facilities  | Comment noted, We will discuss this item at the future ITC meetings.   |
| 24 | City of Escalon | overall    | Operating cost per passenger calculations will need to be revised, if contract with RTD for services ends  | If the operating environment changes substantially then the ITC and SJCOG should develop new data for calculations.  |
| 25 | City of Escalon | overall    | Change ETrans to eTrans throughout the document  | Comment noted, text changed  |
| 26 | City of Escalon | overall    | Change Route 96 to Route 1   | Comment noted, text changed  |
| 27 | City of Escalon | Figure 2-1 | Change Route 96 to Route 1. Add eTrans to legend. Add Escalon Park and Ride Lot, 95 approx 180 minutes, 1 approx every 120-180 minutes. Add Jacob Meyers Park, eTrans DAR, ROTA DAR. Add MAX to Lathrop/Manteca ACE Station. Add ROTA DAR to Modesto Amtrak Station. | Comment noted, Awaiting RTD comments & route updates before updating Figure 2-1  |
| 28 | City of Escalon | Page 22    | Add RTD's intercity route 22 express to Tracy Depot as an intercity route from Tracy Depot to Stockton with two am and two pm trips, Monday through Friday   | Comment noted, text added  |
| 29 | City of Escalon | Page 24    | Move eTrans description from local services to intercity services  | Comment noted, text moved  |
| 30 | City of Escalon |            | Should add MAX service to Lathrop/Manteca ACE Station  | Comment noted, Text will be Updated  |
| 31 | City of Escalon | Page 83    | eTrans Route 1 should continue to end at McHenry & Standiford Avenues with timed connections to MAX Route 22. The City of Modesto will not support such an extension since it will duplicate service and the Modesto Transportation Center is already                | Comment noted; Figure route is now dashed s/o Standiford Avenue.   |

|    |                 |            |  |   |
|----|-----------------|------------|--|---|
|    |                 |            | maxed out of space.  |   |
| 32 | City of Escalon | Page 84    | Show connection times to MAX Route 22 on the schedule with the arrival and departure time from Modesto Transportation Center   | Comment noted; final service plan to be addressed by ITC and eTrans   |
| 33 | City of Escalon | Figure 7-2 | Remove service to MAX Transit Center and end service at McHenry Avenue & Standiford Avenue   | Comment noted; final service plan to be addressed by ITC and eTrans   |
| 34 | City of Escalon | Page 86    | Ripon service should not extend to Modesto Transportation Center   | Comment noted; final service plan to be addressed by ITC and the City of Ripon  |
| 35 | City of Escalon | Figure 7-3 | Remove service to MAX Transit Center and end service at Vintage Faire Mall. Add Stop in Salida.  | Comment noted, to be addressed; route is dashed on Figure 7-3 s/o Vintage Faire.  |
| 36 | City of Escalon | Page 88    | Use estimated costs for City of Ripon – possibly based on Manteca’s costs  | Comment noted. When costs are available for Ripon ITC and SJCOG should develop new data for calculations.   |
| 37 | City of Escalon | overall    | Possible service between Manteca and Modesto could be operated by MAX since they already provide service to Lathrop/Manteca ACE Station                              | Comment noted – MAX service would also address Comment 16   |
| 38 | City of Escalon | Page 100   | Notes, examples, opinions on unincorporated areas transit and contracts  | Comments noted. Issues should be addressed by the ITC.  |
| 39 | City of Escalon | Page 101   |  |   |
| 40 | City of Escalon | Page 102   |  |   |
| 41 | RTD             |            | RTSP will review the quantitative results provided by the COA and Equity Study to identify if the recommended service changes provided within the RTSP are justified | Comment noted, Upcoming Transit Studies or recommendations can be included as part of the future updates to the Regional Transit Systems Plan as well as can also be discussed at the ITC meetings. |
| 42 | RTD             | overall    | Change SJRTD to RTD  | Comment noted, text updated   |
| 43 | RTD             | Page 12    | Recognize Draft SRTP from RTD  | Comment noted, text changed   |
| 44 | RTD             | Chapter 2  | Operational data for RTD is out-of-date, update to reflect service changes provided in January 2009  | Comment noted, text updated   |
| 45 | RTD             | Chapter 2  | Sentence singling out RTD is inappropriate, subsequent sentences explain lack of mission for the ITC, strike sentence from document                                  | Comment noted, text changed   |
| 46 | RTD             | Chapter 3  | RTD staff does not agree that a single vote per agency is an equitable distribution of decision-making   | Comment noted. ITC should establish a voting procedure acceptable to all, recognizing the key role played by RTD and the RRC in intercity and inter-regional travel                                 |

|      |     |           |   |   |
|------|-----|-----------|---|---|
| 47   | RTD | Chapter 3 | RTD recommends removal of the "Solano County Transit Funding Agreement", as San Joaquin County has established Measure K specifically to facilitate Intercity transit service funding within San Joaquin County | Solano County Agreement provides examples of the other fund sources and options that can be used to provide Inter-City Transit. SJCOG believe that it is a good source for discussions through the ITC  |
| 48   | RTD | Chapter 4 | RTD Equity Study for operating cost per passenger   | Comment noted, Future transit Studies will be incorporated into the RTSP through future updates.  |
| 49   | RTD | Chapter 5 | RTD recommends that timed transfers should be prioritized based upon the destinations, keeping the customers' needs in mind   | Comment noted, Recommendations are based on Interviews with Transit Operators, Transit Surveys, Public Outreach efforts and transportation Demand Model Analysis.   |
| 51   | RTD | Chapter 6 | Charter/Martin Luther King and Arch/Sperry corridors have potential for BRT and TOD   | Comment noted. Parts of these corridors are covered by TOD sites number 12 and 15 in Chapter 6. Text will be amended to note that TODs should be added as they are identified   |
| 50   | RTD | Chapter 7 | Cost estimates use fully allocated hourly costs to estimate RTD services and direct Service Costs per Hour for the City Agency services. This provides a poor comparison in estimated cost.                     | Comment noted; final report will note the basis the hourly costs differ between RTD and the contract operators  |
| 51nn | RTD | Chapter 7 | RTD requests clarification about any demand that warrants a non-commute train service to the Livermore valley at a cost at over \$14 million to start   | Comment Noted Plans for a fifth train are under way; text will note that buses may provide service if such plans falter   |
| 52   | RTD | overall   | RTD feels the UTN process should be followed in the planning of new services  | New service recommendations in the RTSP were based on several sources: interviews with operators, the three public workshops and associated public surveys and analysis of current and future travel demand using the SJOCG model. New service proposals are conceptual, not definitive, and should be refined by the ITC and the individual operators. |

|   |   |           |  |   |
|---|---|-----------|--|---|
| 53  | RTD   | overall   | RTD feels financial and jurisdictional regulatory requirements are not appropriately regarded                                  | <p>SJCOG and the ITC will observe all regulatory requirements in planning and implementing new services.</p> <p>Reasonably foreseeable capital funding sources for new services include Measure K and federal sources such as FTA Urban Formula Program (§5307), Rural Formula Program (§5311), and Growing States High Density Formula Program (§5340).</p> <p>Potential funds for operating new services include Measure K and TDA Local Transportation Fund and State Transit Assistance Fund (to be restored in 2012.).</p> <p>Other possible sources of funding include farebox revenues and partnerships with employers and institutions.</p> |
| <b>Comments Received From Other Persons and Agencies through June 1, 2009</b> |   |           |  |   |
| 54  | Mr. Gary Giovanetti<br>SJCOG ex officio member representing RTD | Chapter 7 | Note that RTD has a one-stop transit information page on its website.  | This will be acknowledged;  |
| 55  | Tracy Tracer<br>(via S. Kaur, SJCOG)                            | Table 4-2 | Provide numbers for Tracy  | Data is being compiled and will be included.  |
| 56  | Raul Sanchez, member San Joaquin County Mental Health Board     | Various   | Commenter seeks to know more concerning current ridership for current operators. Suggests that Greyhound service be discussed. | Website for operators will be listed to provide links to most recent ridership information. Greyhound operations, though not truly transit, will be acknowledged.   |

(June 2, 2009 updated)