SAN JOAQUIN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
INTERAGENCY TRANSIT COMMITTEE
555 E. Weber Avenue, Stockton, CA 95202

Monday, May 4, 2020
1:30 PM

https://sjcog.zoom.us/j/95708628209

Teleconference Number: 1-669-900-6833
Participant Code: 957-0862-8209
Attention Callers: Please mute the call unless speaking

Note: If you don't have access to a smart device or a computer with a webcam & a mic, you can dial in using the teleconference number and meeting ID above.

NOTICE
Coronavirus COVID-19

In accordance with Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-33-20, The San Joaquin Council of Governments and staff will be participating in this meeting via teleconference. In the interest of maintaining appropriate social distancing, members of the public may participate in the meeting electronically using the Zoom link, and shall have the right to observe and offer public comment at the appropriate time during this meeting.

We have also provided a call-in number, as identified on this Agenda, and encourage you to attend by telephone.

The San Joaquin Council of Governments is in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and will make all reasonable accommodations for the disabled to participate in employment, programs and facilities. Persons requiring assistance or auxiliary aid in order to participate should contact Rebecca Calija at (209) 235-0600 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order / Introductions
2. Minutes: March 2, 2020
3. Public Comment
4. CARES Act Transit Funding
   DISCUSSION

   DISCUSSION

6. Other Matters of Business

7. Meeting Adjourned to Monday, June 1, 2020 at 1:30 p.m.
AGENDA ITEM 2
1. **Call Meeting to Order/Introductions**
The ITC meeting was called to order at 1:32 p.m. by Joel Campos. Introductions were made.

### Committee Members Present
- John Andoh City of Escalon
- Jay Davidson City of Lathrop
- Georgia Graham City of Lodi
- Julia Tyack City of Lodi
- Juan Portillo City of Manteca
- Elizabeth Quilici City of Ripon
- Ed Lovell City of Tracy
- Jayne Pramod City of Tracy
- Jordan Peterson San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission
- George Lorente San Joaquin Regional Transit District

### SJCOG Staff Present
- Andrew Chesley Executive Director
- Diane Nguyen Deputy Director
- Ryan Niblock Senior Regional Planner
- Joel Campos Assistant Regional Planner
- Ashley Goldlist Assistant Regional Planner
- Melissa Ablang Administrative Clerk II

### Others Present
- Alejandro Gomez San Joaquin Regional Transit District
- Kimberly Gayle San Joaquin Regional Transit District
- Toan Tran San Joaquin Regional Transit District
- Eileen Goodwin Apex Strategies (DBA)

2. **Intercity Transit Service:**
Andrew Chesley stated the San Joaquin Regional Transit District (SJRTD) submitted the Intercity Transit Service proposal back in October that may not be relevant today. The transit district has agreed to look at their proposal in light of the proposal submitted by the small transit providers.

Ms. Gayle confirmed that the proposal submitted in October predates many of the things that have occurred since then.

Mr. Chesley announced that SJCOG has brought on board Eileen Goodwin from Apex Strategies to help facilitate an agreement on intercity service. It is important to get a consensus within the next few months since the transit district will be going through a public hearing process to consider the potential changes. The transit district is looking to respond to the joint proposal submitted by the small transit providers and SJCOG wants to weigh in as well. Further, Mr. Chesley briefly summarized Ms. Goodwin’s expertise in the planning field.
Mr. Campos summarized the comparison of proposals submitted by RTD in October 2019 and the transit operators in February 2020. There are no differences for routes 91 and 95. There is increased access for routes 90, 97, 795 and 790. There is a potential for decreased access for routes 93 and 793. Further, route 23 is removed from both proposals.

Mr. Chesley stated the differences are rather small. He is hopeful the committee can come to and consensus and determine a cost and need. Feedback was requested.

Mr. Lovell stated adding a stop in Banta is a legitimate request for the 5311 money.

Mr. Chesley indicated Mr. Andoh had a good idea about the Lodi to Delta College service but the current proposal only goes to Hammer Lane triangle for a transfer and it is fairly catcher compared to the current service. Mr. Andoh said that, at the time of discussion, it did not make since to have Route 93 following Route 40 to do the same exact thing.

Ms. Tyack asked if passengers were consulted about the proposed changes. Mr. Andoh said they were not. The routes were looked at due to a cost perspective.

Mr. Chesley stated this is a principle issue so he wants to have one on one meetings with local operators to go over issues that are relevant in their jurisdictions so staff can find a solution. Key things that SJCOG needs to know when it comes to finance are the key data points that are important to each agency. He is aware of the indirect costs and questioned if there is anything else he should be aware of.

Mr. Andoh asked if it is agreed that the system needs a complete redesign. Mr. Chesley disagrees.

Mr. Andoh stated he asks because they have been asking for ridership data for a while now. Mr. Chesley stated the system needs some fixing, but not a complete redesign. He asked Mr. Andoh what additional data he wants to see. Mr. Andoh said he wants to see ridership data per stop.

Ms. Gayle asked him to tell RTD how to do it by stop. It is on RTD’s list as part of a system redesign but it is not enough time for staff to go out and get manual ridership data by stop.

Mr. Chesley asked when their existing data was collected. Mr. Andoh said it was done in July 2019 and September 2019.

Ms. Gayle stated RTD plans to do more counts in the future.

Mr. Chesley asked if the data that RTD has is relevant and available to the committee. Ms. Gayle confirmed the data is available and additional data requests are being looked at and responded to as they come in. It would be helpful if RTD is provided with terminology that they can be more responsive to, such as counts, trips, passengers, revenue miles, et cetera.

Mr. Chesley asked if this question was addressed when RTD met with the cities of Lodi, Manteca and Tracy. Ms. Gayle confirmed it was. Ms. Salazar will follow up when she returns.

Mr. Chesley asked the members if there is additional data needed. The members said they would like to see boardings and ridings.

Ms. Gayle stated the request is for an indirect cost allocation plan that explains overhead but is it trip data or passenger data? Mr. Lovell said he would like to see passenger data broken down per route.
Ms. Gayle said there was a data set that was sent by Ms. Salazar but will make sure that is sent out to everybody.

Mr. Portillo stated he would like to know how many passengers are taking Route 91 in Manteca.

Mr. Lovell said they would like as much detail data as possible.

Ms. Gayle asked how the jurisdictions are doing it by stop. Mr. Andoh said their driver fills out a trip sheet monthly.

Mr. Chesley indicated COG staff is happy to help process the data and put into some format.

Ms. Quilici thanked staff for taking the time to meet with individual cities.

Mr. Chesley stated staff will be meeting individually with each jurisdiction, and then staff will work with the transit district to solve the indirect costs question. Lastly, staff will work to come up with an agreement that meets everybody’s expectations.

Ms. Gayle asked for time to revisit the October 2019 proposal and report back with a response.

Mr. Chesley asked if they are still able to meet tomorrow. Ms. Gayle said yes.

Mr. Chesley said the effort made in October was an attempt to address the cities’ request although it still needs some work. Further, Mr. Chesley wants to make sure Eileen Goodwin is involved because it is important for her to understand where there are agreements and differences so an agreement can be reached by May.

This item was for discussion only.

3. **ITC Voting Structure and Voting Procedures:**

   Joel Campos stated Option 1A includes two votes from RTD and ACE and one from each city. Option 1B is the same but does not include Lathrop. Option 1A includes three votes from RTD, two from ACE and one from each city. Option 2B is the same but does not include Lathrop. In addition, members/alternates must have authority to vote, a list of members/alternates needs to be identified, and each jurisdiction’s vote will be carried by the weight in the voting structure chosen. He asked for feedback.

   Mr. Davidson indicated the City of Lathrop would like the option to vote because they have residents that use the transit system through RTD.

   Ms. Gayle asked what kind of things this committee will be voting on. Mr. Niblock said the committee wants to be able to vote on transit relevant items that are going to other committees.

   Ms. Gayle questioned what would be the next step after a committee votes. Mr. Niblock stated the votes would be included in staff’s reports to inform them how committees weighed in on a particular item.

   Ms. Graham stated that actions from other committees have not been included in the staff reports lately. Mr. Chesley stated it has not been consistent because of the timing or because staff did not update the staff report.

   Mr. Lorente asked if there would be items such as the funding allocation for LCTOP that would not go to TAC and stay within the ITC. Mr. Niblock stated that it stays within the ITC, but if there
Mr. Campos stated many of these items would go through the SSTAC/ITC but now SSTAC is only going to be looking at UTN items. ITC will continue to keep doing what they were doing in the past.

Mr. Andoh asked if the City of Lathrop is looking to contract or operate its own system. Mr. Davidson stated he is going to reach out to RTD to discuss what options there are in regard to existing services and whether there is an opportunity to expand services.

Mr. Andoh indicated he struggles with the idea that City of Lathrop will be voting for funds they are not eligible to receive. Mr. Davidson said that the city would like to vote on other transportation related items not related to the funding.

Mr. Chesley stated he would be reluctant to limit items to certain jurisdictions. The City of Escalon does not have intercity service and Escalon participated in those discussions.

Ms. Gayle asked if there is a charter for the membership of the ITC. Staff confirmed there is not.

Mr. Campos asked if the committee is in favor of option 1. Ms. Gayle said the committee is looking to see whether the City of Lathrop should be eligible to vote. Ms. Gayle stated she is in favor of Lathrop voting.

Mr. Andoh indicated that he supports option 1. He can go either way.

The members expressed their support of option 1a.

Ms. Graham said she supports option 1a but wants to assure Lathrop is going to be involved on a continuous basis. Mr. Davidson said that he will be involved and will make sure to attend and participate.

It was moved/seconded (Graham/Andoh) to approve option 1a of the voting structure. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

4. **Report on Van Go! Service in Manteca and Tracy Federal Urbanized Areas (UZA):**

Joel Campos announced that COG staff is looking to see whether federal funding should continue for the second year of operations. While the data shows that service is not performing cost-effectively, RTD has proposed operational measures that may play a significant role in reducing operating costs per passenger. The ridership for the cities of Tracy and Manteca were about 9% and 7% with a total of 39,252 passenger boardings in the county. The operating costs for FY 18-19 and FY 19-20 totals to about $1.2 million for the county, which is about $60 per passenger (for the county), and operating costs as of Dec. 31, 2019 totals to $910 thousand. The money comes from 5307 funds, Measure K funds, and CTSA funds, but in addition to those funds, there is LTF funding that was dedicated to the service.

Mr. Chesley questioned how this compares to the transit district’s Dial-A-Ride service in San Joaquin County. Mr. Campos stated he did not compare that because the other counties (Merced, Stanislaus and San Luis Obispo) do not offer any other service in their county.

Mr. Chesley stated that the Dial-A-Ride service has been historically in the $55-$60 range. Mr. Toan indicated it is now in the $35-$40 range.

Ms. Gayle indicated Mr. Campos could compare Dial-A-Ride Stockton to Van Go! Stockton since
Further, Mr. Campos stated the cost per passenger for the cities of Tracy and Manteca are $101 and $123 based on the funds spent as of Dec. 31, 2019.

Mr. Chesley asked if it would be more appropriate to include the fares in the calculations. Mr. Campos stated he would update the slides to include the amounts.

Mr. Campos further stated that the total numbers of trips totals to about 36,000 as of Dec. 31, 2019. Van Go! consumed 1.2% of potential ridership in the City of Tracy.

Mr. Tran asked if this takes into account the hours of operation. Mr. Campos confirmed it does not.

Mr. Tran asked if this takes into account the potential transfers. Mr. Campos stated it only includes one-way trips.

Ms. Gayle asked if Mr. Campos could footnote the cancellations and missed trips. Mr. Campos confirmed he would include that information.

Ms. Gayle questioned whether the action is only for the federal funds and not a local match. Ms. Nguyen indicated it is only for the federal funds.

Ms. Gayle asked what are Tracy and Manteca’s preference for the match. Ms. Nguyen clarified that RTD is responsible for identifying a match due to RTD submitting the projects on their own as the lead agency.

Mr. Lovell asked what the total dollar amount is to operate Van Go! The amount RTD is asking for is too much of an ask. According to his calculations, only half of their funds were spent towards Tracy. Ms. Gayle stated Mr. Lovell has a valid concern.

Mr. Lovell stated Tracy and Manteca are being asked for 5307 funds and Lodi is not. In addition, almost half of the trips that are being paid for by Tracy were not within Tracy or Tracy’s urbanized area. When Van Go! was originally presented, its intent was to bring people from the rural area to the cities.

Ms. Gayle questioned who is asking for 5307 funds. Ms. Nguyen said RTD is asking for the funds.

Ms. Gayle asked what was the form of the ask and when was it made. Ms. Nguyen indicated it was part of the UZA programming process for Manteca and Tracy.

Ms. Gayle asked for clarification if there was programming for a match in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Ms. Nguyen said it was identified generically as a local match.

Mr. Campos explained that he heard there were concerns about Van Go! taking passengers from fixed route services so he wanted to show exactly how many potential passengers Van Go! was taking from fixed routes. Mr. Lovell suggested including the dollars that actually went to the service and were originally allocated for Tracy and Manteca.

Mr. Niblock asked if TRACER experienced a 1.2% decrease in ridership attributed to Van Go! Mr. Lovell confirmed they have had a decrease in ridership over the last year but cannot say whether its related to Van Go!.

Mr. Niblock stated that would be good to know so staff is aware the system was not designed for
those trips. Further, isn’t it a good thing if the trips are brand new trips? Mr. Lovell stated that he understands his point.

Mr. Lovell stated the City of Tracy will be implementing an on-demand service, as part of their Short-Range Transit Plan, a soon as May or as late as July or August using this money so it will essentially be the same service in Tracy.

Mr. Niblock stated that part of this was because of the large balances in Tracy and Manteca, but at these meetings, wasn’t there a consensus that Tracy services first and then there would be a group discussion? Ms. Nguyen confirmed. Mr. Niblock indicated staff will continue to honor that.

Mr. Lovell indicated he wished SJCOG had a discussion with transit operators before this item was brought to the committee. There were discussions stating there would be a follow up.

Mr. Andoh expressed his concerns regarding the dollars spent and the potential for duplicate trips and requested that staff be mindful of that.

Mr. Niblock said he does not want a report to suggest the trips are duplicate trips when some are not.

Mr. Andoh stated he is concerned about the sustainability and suggested rescoping Van Go! to its original intent to get rural residents to the cities.

Ms. Gayle said she does not want to be in a position to ask for funds so they can continue discussions this week before it goes to the Board.

It was moved/seconded (Andoh/Graham) to table this item. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Portillo stated the City of Manteca could use those funds and requested to have more discussions with RTD and SJCOG.

5. **Low Carbon Transit Operations Program FY 19/20 Funding Distribution:**
Ryan Niblock stated there is about $1.4 million in LCTOP funds. Staff requests a discussion of project and funding possibilities so a funding recommendation can be formed based on those results. He asked the committee if they wanted to disperse the funds based on ridership.

Ms. Graham and Mr. Andoh preferred dispersing the funds based on ridership.

Mr. Andoh asked if LCTOP is on the table for intercity service. Mr. Niblock confirmed it could be. There is an April 8 deadline.

Ms. Graham asked if the PUC 99314 funds will be combined. Mr. Niblock stated the funds assigned directly to jurisdictions are theirs.

This item was for discussion only.

6. **Masabi Contract:**
Joel Campos announced there is a draft contract for Masabi for review while SJCOG is developing an umbrella contract to identify exhibits. He requested that the committee review the contract and provide feedback.

Mr. Lovell asked what is the timeline? Ms. Nguyen stated there is a constraint because Masabi was
awarded the proposal in January and the proposal is only good for ninety days. Staff will circle back with Masabi to see if they will make good on that proposal and give everyone a little bit more time.

Mr. Lovell requested a draft contract in Word format. Mr. Campos stated he would email it.

Ms. Graham questioned how much the cost proposal was and whether it was determined that all cities would be partially responsible for paying and how it was agreed upon. Further, does the Board say they are willing to support this? Mr. Campos confirmed that each jurisdiction would be responsible for 5% of fares and a maintenance fee of $950 would be split between the six jurisdictions every month.

Ms. Graham asked how the study will be funded. Mr. Campos said the fees are waived.

Ms. Nguyen said SJCOG has a master contract with Masabi stating SJCOG will pay for the Vamos integration fee of $350 per month. Further, Mr. Campos stated SJCOG will be paying the $350 fee and $950 fee for eighteen months. After the eighteen months, there is potential for two one-year extensions but the local jurisdictions would be responsible for paying for the $950 fee. SJCOG would still cover the $350 fee.

Ms. Nguyen stated SJCOG will use the comments the jurisdictions submit to create the final exhibit that will hopefully be used for all jurisdictions.

Ms. Tyack asked for clarification whether the 5% of fares is the only cost. Ms. Nguyen confirmed there are no other hidden costs.

Mr. Toan questioned if the 5% is based on ticket sales. Staff confirmed it is based on the ticket sales from the Masabi app.

Mr. Niblock indicated that if the cities were to use LCTOP money, it would wipe out the 5%.

Mr. Tran asked what the timeline is for implementation. Mr. Campos said Masabi will integrate the mobile app into the Vamos app. The cities would need to promote the Vamos app.

Ms. Nguyen stated the jurisdictions should be able to execute a contract in about a month (hitting high) so Masabi can do the work and make the app live in about sixty days. Mr. Campos stated the proposal outlines the timeline.

Mr. Tran questioned whom the passenger calls if they have fare disputes and if the jurisdictions will have access to the platform. Staff said that refunds could be handled at the customer service level. The intent is to route passengers back to local operators for questions.

Ms. Tyack said that, ideally, the city wants the exhibits to be identical but they have to consult with their attorney, so they will do their best not to submit so many changes.

Mr. Andoh asked if the committee could receive an actual copy of SJRRC’s completed contract. Mr. Peterson said he would check with Sarah Rasheed.

This item was for information only.

7. **Other Matters of Business**

Mr. Andoh asked for an update on PTMISEA. Mr. Niblock said agreements will be routed internally for approval and once signed they will be mailed out to the agencies.
**Adjournment**
There being no further business to discuss, the ITC meeting was adjourned at 3:34 p.m. The next meeting will adjourn to Monday, May 4, 2020 at 1:30 p.m.
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act Transit Funding

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion

SUMMARY:

The Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, signed on March 27, 2020, provides $2 trillion in federal funding through a number of programs to address issues as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Public transit will receive $25 billion through the CARES Act. Specifically, within San Joaquin County, the following has been made available:

- Stockton UZA – $33,734,638
- Lodi UZA – $5,532,640
- Manteca UZA – $6,830,739
- Tracy UZA – $7,101,511
- California has been apportioned $94,976,667 for rural transit providers. Caltrans is responsible for distributing these funds to regions. This is triple the standard amount that was received for the 2019/20 fiscal year ($31,720,947). It is uncertain as to whether Caltrans will use the exact same formula to distribute rural transit funds from the CARES Act as it does for the regular transit funds (called 5311), but transit providers and SJCOG will be involved in this process and assist Caltrans with any information needed.

Funding will be provided at a 100-percent federal share, with no local match required – to support capital, operating, and other expenses generally eligible under those programs to prevent, prepare for, and respond to COVID-19. FTA will permit Urbanized Area Formula Program or Formula Grants for Rural Areas Program funding to be used for COVID-19-related public transportation capital or operating expenses at an 80 percent federal share, regardless of whether operating expenses generally are an eligible expense for a recipient. Eligible activities include emergency protective measures to eliminate or lessen threats to public health and safety, such as performing enhanced cleaning/sanitizing of rolling stock, stations, bus shelters, etc.; placing hand sanitizer dispensers in high traffic areas; and providing personal protective equipment as appropriate. Operating expenses incurred beginning on January 20, 2020 for all rural and urban recipients, even those in large urban areas, are also eligible, including operating expenses to maintain transit services as well as paying for administrative leave for transit personnel due to reduced operations during an emergency. Funds are available until expended. There is no lapse date to obligate funds available under the CARES Act.

Split and/or sub allocation letters must be updated to include funds made available under the CARES Act. SJCOG staff intends to organize meetings with designated recipients and affected
transit agencies to work together to discuss needs and priority criteria, and to seek agreement on strategy to split funds. Thus far, SJCOG staff has worked with RTD and ACE to develop a split of Stockton UZA funds.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Discuss CARES Act funding split possibilities, process for UZAs, project needs, and overall impacts to transit as a result of COVID-19.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

None at this time.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

None.

Prepared by Ryan Niblock, Senior Regional Planner
AGENDA ITEM 5
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Draft FY 20/21 Unmet Transit Needs Report

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion

SUMMARY:

Each year, pursuant to state law, the Transportation Development Act (TDA), as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) must identify any unmet transit needs that may exist in San Joaquin County. If needs are found, SJCOG must determine whether those needs are reasonable to meet. SJCOG must ensure that reasonable needs are met before TDA funds are allocated to local jurisdictions for non-transit purposes.

The unmet transit needs assessment requires SJCOG to meet the following requirements:
- Ensure that several factors have been considered in the planning process, including:
  1. Size and location of groups likely to be dependent on transit,
  2. Adequacy of existing services and potential alternative services
  3. Service improvements that could meet all or part of the travel demand.
- Hold a public hearing to receive testimony on unmet needs.
- Determine definitions for "unmet transit needs" and "reasonable to meet."
- Adopt a finding regarding unmet transit needs and allocate funds to address those needs, if necessary, before street and road TDA allocations.

This year’s assessment included nine public hearings, an online survey posted on SJCOG’s website, and paper submissions, producing a total of 107 comments on transit service from specific individuals.

After review of all comments with the Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee, SJCOG found no unmet transit needs recommended be found reasonable to meet. The report is available on SJCOG’s website: https://www.sjcog.org/UTN.

RECOMMENDATION:

BACKGROUND:

At the request of the SSTAC, SJCOG formed a subcommittee to review the adopted definitions of “unmet transit need” and “reasonable to meet”. The updated definitions as proposed by the subcommittee and adopted by the Board in February 2018, are as follows:

Unmet Transit Needs are defined as transportation services not currently provided to those residents who use or would use public transportation regularly, if available, to meet their life expectations.
An unmet transit need that meets the definition above and meets all the following criteria shall be considered **reasonable to meet**:

**Community Acceptance**

There should be a demonstrated interest of citizens in the new or additional transit service (i.e. multiple comments, petitions, etc.).

**Equity**

The proposed new or additional service will benefit the general public, residents who use or would use public transportation regularly, the senior population, and persons with disabilities; including assessments based on Title VI or other similar information where available.

**Potential Ridership**

The proposed transit service will meet new service ridership performance measures of the implementing agency or agencies, as defined by the implementing agency or agencies in concurrence with the Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee (SSTAC).
Cost Effectiveness
The proposed transit service will not affect the ability of the overall system of the implementing agency or agencies to meet the applicable Transit Systems Performance Objectives or the state farebox ratio requirement after exemption period, if the service is eligible for the exemption.

Operational Feasibility
The system can be implemented safely and in accordance with local, state, and federal laws and regulations.

Funding
The imposed service would not cause the claimant to incur expenses in excess of the maximum allocation of TDA funds.

Within the definition, an unmet transit need cannot be found unreasonable solely based upon economic feasibility.
Operational, Educational, and Non-Specific Comments on Transit Service

The annual Unmet Transit Needs process provides a broad opportunity for the public to provide input on transit services in San Joaquin County. As a result, comments are often submitted that do not meet the definition of unmet transit needs provided above. These comments generally fall in the following categories:

- **Operational Comments**: Request an improvement to an existing transit service, such as increased frequencies, additional stops.
- **Educational Comments**: Request transit service that already exists.
- **Non-Specific Comments**: Do not provide enough information to identify an unmet transit need. Examples include comments that only describe the commenter's desired destination in general terms (e.g., “school” or “work”) without providing a location.

Although these comments cannot be considered unmet transit needs and thus are not evaluated as to whether they are “reasonable to meet,” they still provide valuable input on transit service. SJCOG forwards all comments to the relevant transit operators, who consider them when developing service improvements or providing educational materials to the public.
DISCUSSION:

Public Input

This year’s Unmet Transit Needs process included an extended public outreach process using new techniques to gain public input. These efforts were intended to promote multiple opportunities for members of the public to communicate their unmet transit needs (e.g., SJCOG website, survey, social media, phone.). Examples of this effort include:

- Nine public hearings held throughout San Joaquin County, including at least one hearing in each jurisdiction
- Attending community events and reaching out to local organizations
- An online survey was posted on the SJCOG website and e-blasted to interested parties

The various community outreach efforts produced a total 107 comments on transit service.

Analysis of Comments Received

SJCOG convened a UTN Review Subcommittee consisting of seven members of the SSTAC (including RTD, other transit operators, and social service providers). Most comments were deemed to fall into the Operational, Educational, or Non-Specific categories defined above, and as such were not considered unmet transit needs. These comments will be forwarded to the appropriate transit operators for consideration in service planning.

Findings

Based on the analysis described above, SJCOG recommends the following Unmet Transit Needs Findings for FY 20/21:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Unmet Need, determined Not Reasonable to Meet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Loop route from Generations Center to City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop</td>
<td>Route connecting Lathrop and Manteca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>Service to/from City Council meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>Service to Micke Grove Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>Increased service connecting Stockton and Lodi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>Service connecting 711 Cross St and 1400 Tenth St in Lodi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Connect Bear Creek High School with Hammer Triangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Increased weekend service to San Joaquin RTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Increased weekend service to Sherwood Mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Service from Feather River Drive to Pacific and Alpine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Service from Feather River Drive to Pershing and Alpine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>Additional night service on Route 23, and other routes to Lodi at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Service at Morehead trailer park on Chrisman Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Service from Mountain House to Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Service from Mountain House to El Concilio in Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Service to Safeway Depo Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Route connecting Tracy and Manteca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENTS:

None.

Report prepared by Ryan Niblock, Senior Regional Planner