AGENDA

1. Call to Order

2. Minutes: May 21, 2020

3. Public Comments
   At this time, the public may address the SSTAC on any non-agendized item that is within the subject matter of this agency. If a member of the public wishes to speak on an agenda item he or she is invited to address the SSTAC at the time the item is up for consideration. A five-minute maximum time limit for a speaker will apply to all “items from the audience”. The determination of whether an item is within the subject matter of the Committee is a discretionary decision to be made by the SSTAC.

5. Other Matters of Business

6. Meeting Adjourned to Monday, August 3, 2020 at 3:00 p.m.

**PARKING:**

For your convenience, parking is available at the COG Regional Center. There is additional parking available at Public Parking Lot K, located on American Street, just south of Weber Avenue. Additional meter parking is available on Weber Avenue.
AGENDA ITEM 2
1. **Call Meeting to Order/Introductions**
The SSTAC meeting was called to order via teleconference at 4:02 p.m. by Ryan Niblock.

**Committee Members Present**
John Andoh                  City of Escalon  
Julia Tyack                  City of Lodi  
Juan Portillo                City of Manteca  
Joni Bauer                  Community Center for the Blind and the Visually Impaired  
Armando Valerio              Public Health Services  
Jean Foletta-Morales       San Joaquin Regional Transit District

**Alternates/Others Present**
Jayne Pramod                City of Tracy

**Committee Members Not Present**
Ed Lovell                     City of Tracy  
Deborah Gurley               Transit User 60 Years or Older  
Mary Bailey                   United Cerebral Palsy  
Wilma Murray                 Valley Mountain Regional Center  
Josh Swearingen              Caltrans District 10

**SJCOG Staff Present**
Ryan Niblock                Senior Regional Planner  
Joel Campos                  Assistant Regional Planner  
Melissa Ablang               Administrative Clerk II

2. **Minutes: February 3, 2020**
It was moved/seconded (Bauer/Valerio) to approve the minutes of February 3, 2020. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3. **Public Presentation**
None.

4. **Technical Items: A through B are available for action by the committee.**

   A. Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act Transit Funding
   Ryan Niblock announced that the CARES Act provides $2 trillion in federal funds and $25 billion for public transit. Funding will be provided at a 100% federal share with no local match required and no lapse date to obligate the funds. SJCOG staff has met with all urbanized areas (UZA). RTD and ACE identified a way to split the funds in the Stockton UZA, and Lodi, Manteca and Tracy UZAs determined they would use the entirety of those funds. ACE, RTD and City of Ripon did not request CARES funds for their services.

   Mr. Valerio said Public Health has to have 115 identified individuals to do contact tracing for
those that are COVID-19 positive. Public Health is trying to assist the two free clinics and is encouraging everyone to try to get the word out so they can get more numbers to move through the four stages.

Ms. Foletta-Morales indicated Mr. Valerio could send the request to her or Nancy Antonio. RTD is more than happy to assist with that.

Ms. Bauer stated she would be happy to support and post something on the Blind Center’s website.

Mr. Valerio told the members to take a look at the information on their website and Facebook.

This item was for discussion only.

B. Draft FY 2020-21 Unmet Transit Needs Report
Ryan Niblock announced that the draft report has been made available on the SJCOG website and staff took feedback from the Interagency Transit Committee to make corrections. This year’s UTN assessment produced a total of 107 comments with 17 unmet transit needs, which were deemed unreasonable to meet. SJCOG will be accepting public comments through June 22nd. The final report is expected to go to Board for action in June.

Ms. Foletta-Morales asked if there will be a method to address COVID-19 in the UTN process since nobody knows what transportation is going to look like. Mr. Niblock said that would fall into this year’s unmet transit needs process, but the committee should act sooner than that to identify what is needed.

Ms. Foletta-Morales said she understands that but is wondering if the group has thought about that and asked if any other COGs are addressing this situation. Mr. Niblock said the Metropolitan Planning Organizations that are south of San Joaquin County are playing it by ear like COG is. Some transit agencies have shut down for the time being and a number of them are currently not taking fares to encourage people to continue to take transit safely. As far as unmet needs go, nobody in the valley seems to know what the future of UTN will look like and COG speculates that riders are going to be hesitant to come back. COG is ultimately going to lean on this committee to make judgement calls on UTN. If anything, the best thing that could happen is to continue to not have any unmet needs.

This item was for discussion only.

5. Other Matters of Business
Ryan Niblock asked if any of the transit operators have participated in workshops and if they have any idea what transit may look like 6 to 12 months from now.

Ms. Foletta-Morales stated RTD is looking at ridership data each day and watching for trends and preparing for the reopening of businesses. It is important to know what the populations, that take transit, are doing. RTD is doing their best to think ahead but they would be happy to discuss this at the next meeting.

Mr. Portillo stated Ripon has been attending CTA and CalACT webinars weekly. They are also keeping in touch with transit managers by sharing different concerns or issues and how everybody is dealing with keeping drivers and passengers safe. It is going to be hard getting people to feel safe taking transit again, so everyone is aware that ridership is going to be down for some time. Hopefully some projects will encourage people to take transit.
Ms. Pramod said it is the first week Tracy has seen an increase in fixed route and paratransit riders. They are not sure where that is going to go, but they now have 12 riders each day instead of 5.

Ms. Tyack said she could forward the links of the CalACT webinars to the committee.

Mr. Niblock asked if anyone knew whether or not any new regulations would be put in place in case this were to happen again in the future.

Ms. Foletta-Morales said a lot of transit operators are installing barriers for drivers or considering it and RTD is doing the same.

Ms. Tyack asked if Ms. Foletta-Morales could provide a number to their vendor. Ms. Foletta-Morales said she would send her the link.

Mr. Niblock said he wonders whether or not regions like ours and further down the valley, where a greater percentage of riders are captive riders, will bounce back faster, which will mean that regions like ours will have to lead the way on how we protect our drivers and passengers.

Mr. Valerio stated the SJC’s public health officer has submitted an attestation document to the state and she will find out this afternoon or tomorrow whether the state accepts that. Part of the document stipulates that the county can now have dine-in restaurants and open-air malls open, which may help transit. There may be other counties opening up faster.

**Adjournment**
There being no further business to discuss, the SSTAC meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m. The next meeting will adjourn to Monday, June 15, 2020 at 4:00 p.m.
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Final FY 2020/21 Unmet Transit Needs Report

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve Final FY 2020/21 Unmet Transit Needs Report

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](https://www.sjcog.org/UTN).

Comments on the report will be accepted through June 22, 2020. The SJCOG Board is expected to take action on the final report at its regularly scheduled June meeting.

RECOMMENDATION:

Vote to approve the Final FY 20/21 Unmet Transit Needs Report.
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).
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 of 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/Manteca</td>
<td>Route connecting Lathrop and Manteca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>Service to/from City Council meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ County</td>
<td>Service to Micke Grove Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ County</td>
<td>Transportation to Micke Grove on weekends</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/Lodi</td>
<td>Service from Feather River Drive to Pershing and Alpine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton/SJ County</td>
<td>Service connecting 711 Cross St and 1400 Tenth St in Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton/Lodi</td>
<td>Increased service connecting Stockton and Lodi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton/Lodi</td>
<td>Additional night service on Route 23, and other routes to Lodi at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton/SJ County</td>
<td>Service from Mountain House to Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy/Manteca</td>
<td>Route connecting Tracy and Manteca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy/SJ County</td>
<td>Mountain House to 11th Street Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy/SJ County</td>
<td>Service to Safeway Depo Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy/SJ County</td>
<td>Service at Morehead trailer park on Chrisman Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy/SJ County</td>
<td>Service from Mountain House to El Concilio in Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interregional</td>
<td>Service from Tracy to Blackhawk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Unmet transit needs requesting service between cities is assigned to RTD as an intercity need.*
ATTACHMENTS

None.

Report prepared by Ryan Niblock, Senior Regional Planner