

Final Short-Range Transit Plans

Responses to Comments

August 10, 2018



**PLACER COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING AGENCY**

Comment Chris DeArmond, Comment #1
No.

- 1 Basic transportation to and from Foresthill needs to be considered even if it is just two trips a day.

Responses

The Short Range Transit Plan for Placer County Transit recommends a lifeline service be implemented on a demonstration basis between Auburn and Foresthill, consisting of a morning round-trip and an afternoon round-trip one day per week. This service would be a shoppers shuttle type of service. There is some history regarding prior bus service to the Foresthill community, which relates to why the Short-Range Transit Plan recommendation is to “provide a demonstration lifeline service to Foresthill one day a week.” Bus service was provided to Foresthill from year 2000 to 2008. The bus route operated between Auburn and Foresthill on weekdays. Buses departed Foresthill at 7:45 am, picked up passengers at five bus stops in Foresthill, and dropped off passengers at five bus stops in Auburn. In the afternoon, a similar schedule was followed, departing Auburn at 3:35 pm, and arriving in the Foresthill community at 4:25 pm. Unfortunately, the bus service never met transit productivity standards, averaging less than 1.5 persons riding daily. The service was not considered cost effective to continue to operate. After nearly eight years of operating the service it was discontinued in 2008. Because of its performance history and also recognizing that as a rural community there may be Foresthill residents in need of alternate forms of transportation, PCTPA is recommending reinstating the service on a demonstration basis. If people use the service, it is possible that additional service days could be added. Alternatively, if the service isn’t used it would probably be discontinued.

Comment Karen Eckard, Comment #2
No.

- 1 I think they need to have a new bus route in West To in Sabre City Estates. There is no public transportation here. A lot of the elderly and disabled neighbors are without any transportation and can’t make it to important doctor’s visits or get groceries to eat. Thank you

Responses

Sabre City Estates is located within the City of Roseville on the south side of PFE Road east of Walerga Road. Sabre City Estates is not currently served nor proposed to be served by Roseville Transit fixed route service. Sabre City Estates however is currently served by Roseville Transit dial-a-ride.

Comment Leslie Warren, Comment #3
No.

- 1 The Draft Short Range Plan should include an analysis of the new technologies that will be affecting public and private transportation in the near term.
- 2 In five years, Uber predicts that 50% of households will not longer own cars, depending instead on public transit and ride sharing services like Uber. Please include an analysis of private car usage in a urban/suburban landscape like Placer County and whether/when car owners will abandon cars for public transit or car services as you prepare the PCTPA draft plan.
- 3 Public abandonment of the private car is supported by research by public and academic sources. This behavior is already evident in major cities. Please describe the scope of this transition in the PCTPA plan and project the timing for adoption of these new behaviors for the Placer County region.

Responses

The Short Range Transit Plans include an evaluation of a variety of new technologies including, zero emission buses, use of Transportation Network Companies/Microtransit services, smart fare payment systems called Connect Card, automated vehicle location systems called Next Bus, among many others as ways to improve both transit service efficiencies and to increase ridership.

Ridership forecasts for the Short Range Transit Plans were prepared for both traditional transit services, commuter local bus and dial-a-ride, as well as new services such as Transportation Network Companies and Microtransit. The ridership forecasts are based on a function of service attributes, ridership surveys and existing counts, and a series of demographic variables. The commenter may want to access and review the travel model data prepared by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments. This data can be found at: <https://www.sacog.org/info-center-transportation>.

The Short Range Transit Plans use the US Census Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics (LEHD), which provides commute pattern data as of 2015. LEHD data is the best data available to review commute patterns and has been used in the planning of new and modified transit services. The nature and magnitude of the envisioned changes by public and academic sources are such that there are no readily-available analogous contexts from which one can extrapolate consequences. Exceptionally knowledgeable people have very different perceptions of timing of deployment and behavioral consequences.

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 4 | The California Economic Development Commission confirms that there is a new economy coming. There is a new vision of how people live and work. How does the PCTPA envision this new economy and how will PCTPA services adapt to meet the needs of the new economy? | The Short Range Transit Plans use demographic data prepared by the California Department of Finance and the US Census American Community Survey, and employment data from the California Employment Development Department and the US Census Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics. An analysis of travel patterns due to an ever changing economy is important for public transit planning. The US Census Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics provides commute pattern data as of 2015. LEHD data is the best data available to review commute patterns and has been used in the planning of new and modified transit services. |
| 5 | Will PCTPA employ Artificial Intelligence in new electric vehicles? | The selection of future vehicle technology by a transit operator will be dependent upon federal, state, and local policy makers, manufacturers trying to better meet the needs of their transit customers, and of course, the transit operators themselves examining the benefits and costs and available funding. Currently, the Federal Transit Administration's Office of Research, Demonstration and Innovation is exploring the use of automation technologies in bus transit operations. The Short Range Transit Plans recognize that vehicle technology will change and as such takes into account a range of generic costs for such new technologies. The Plans however are neutral regarding the exact choice of new technologies to be deployed leaving the decision to the individual transit operator. |
| 6 | What is the cost of operation with an AI vehicle as compared to the natural gas or gasoline powered vehicle (include staff costs). | This type of comparison analysis is beyond the scope of the Short Range Transit Plans and is more appropriately conducted as part of a transit operators strategic analyses regarding their selection of next generation vehicle technology. |
| 7 | With the introduction of self driving cars and the expansion of driving services like UBER and LYFT, will consumers choose public transit or will it be less costly to request a driving service? | The Short Range Transit Plans assumes that use by the public of Transportation Network Companies will continue over the Short Range Transit Plan seven year planning period. The Plans include an evaluation of new transit type services such as use of Transportation Network Companies and Microtransit, as alternatives to local bus and dial-a-ride services. |
| 8 | Please evaluate the literature to determine if there is a future for public transit in the short and long term. | The Short Range Transit Plans assume that at least for the next seven years public transit will continue to play an important role in addressing both mobility issues and traffic congestion. The Plans take into account that transit service will change and recognizes a variety of new technologies will emerge and be deployed over the planning period. |
| 9 | How is PCTPA planning for the paradigm shift that is coming? How is the PCTPA planning for the disruptive technologies that will change the way we live, work, invest personal resources? | This question is beyond the scope of preparing the Short Range Transit Plans. The Plans take into account that transit service will change and recognizes a variety of new technologies will emerge and be deployed over the planning period. |
| 10 | Major urban expansion into Western Placer Farmland by the County, Roseville and Lincoln and rapidly urbanizing Rocklin combined with congestion on 1-80 and 1-65 suggest that the PCTPA must work with cities and the county planners to establish rail corridor links to Sac Light Rail. Will the PCTPA work with Sac Light Rail to connect these new major population hubs to Sacramento and the Bay Area through AMTRAC and Sac Light Rail? | PCTPA adopted in 2007 a Transit Master Plan that addresses various approaches to coordinated transit services. A Bus Rapid Transit Service Plan for South Placer County was approved in 2008. Bus Rapid Transit is an integration of light-rail transit service ideals with the flexible operation of bus services. The Plan identifies a long-range vision for Bus Rapid Transit services and describes a potential phasing plan to incrementally implement and upgrade these services as development occurs in the southwestern portion of Placer County. The communities served by the Bus Rapid Transit includes the Sunset Industrial Area, Placer Ranch, Placer Vineyards, and new population centers proposed in Roseville, Rocklin and Lincoln. |

- 11** Will a light rail corridor be established through the Sunset Industrial Area, Placer Ranch, Placer Vineyards, the Regional University, the SF State University and new population centers in Roseville and Lincoln? What is the total new population projected from these sources and how many of these new residents will use public transit if it is established within their communities? How many will use the public transit if they must drive to a remote hub outside of their community to access trains?
- PCTPA adopted in 2007 a Transit Master Plan that addresses various approaches to coordinated transit services. A Bus Rapid Transit Service Plan for South Placer County was approved in 2008. Bus Rapid Transit is an integration of light-rail transit service ideals with the flexible operation of bus services. The Plan identifies a long-range vision for Bus Rapid Transit services and describes a potential phasing plan to incrementally implement and upgrade these services as development occurs in the southwestern portion of Placer County. The communities served by the Bus Rapid Transit includes the Sunset Industrial Area, Placer Ranch, Placer Vineyards, and new population centers proposed in Roseville, Rocklin and Lincoln. Population projections were based on the then adopted Sacramento Area Council of Government growth forecasts. Ridership for the Bus Rapid Transit was estimated at about 2,800 daily boarding's, with range from 1,200 to 5,900 daily boarding's depending upon the phasing plan implemented.
- 12** In 10 years, 60% of cars will be using zero emission technology. How will existing gas stations and automobile centered (repair and sales) uses be adapted to other uses with this technological change?
- This question is beyond the scope of preparing the Short Range Transit Plans.
- 13** How will the transportation landscape of today look in 10 years? Will public transit use grow or will it be obsolete?
- The Short Range Transit Plans planning horizon is seven years to year 2025. The Plans take into account that transit service will change and recognizes a variety of new technologies will emerge and be deployed over the planning period.
- 14** Traffic congestion is a major factor in people's sense of a quality of life. How will PCTPA's plan reduce the number of cars on the road today? How much will car services like UBER, AI cars, and public transit reduce the volume of cars on the road in the future?
- The type of analysis needed to answer this question will be available as part of development of the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan update. An update of the Regional Transportation Plan is underway. Opportunity for public input will begin in fall 2018. The commenter is encouraged to participate in PCTPA's Regional Transportation Plan 2040 update process.
- 15** Is the investment in Placer Parkway Hwy 65 and other major road "improvements" a poor use of public funds when one considers that private vehicle ownership is projected to decline significantly in 5-10 years with a corresponding reduction of cars on the road?.
- This question is beyond the scope of preparing the Short Range Transit Plans. The question may be more appropriate as part of the Regional Transportation Plan update. An update of the Regional Transportation Plan is underway. Opportunity for public input will begin in fall 2018. The commenter is encouraged to participate in PCTPA's Regional Transportation Plan 2040 update process.
- 16** What is the cost of private vehicle ownership annually as compared to driving services?
- This question is beyond the scope of preparing the Short Range Transit Plans.
- 17** How long until the suburban public will recognize the economic opportunity of driving services/AI cars and when will they abandon their private vehicle? What will the implication be for roadway usage/traffic volumes?
- This question is beyond the scope of preparing the Short Range Transit Plans.
- 18** Please also consider the cost and benefit of a rail link to the Tahoe region.
- This question is beyond the scope of preparing the Short Range Transit Plans. For the commenters benefit, in 1995, Caltrans and Nevada Department of Transportation collaborated on a study to extend at that time the brand new Capitol Corridor service to Reno. In 2003-2005, a conceptual planning study was undertaken by several regional agencies examining rail service feasibility to Reno. According to the 2018 California State Rail Plan, "UPRR – the owner/operator of the rail ROW – declined to consider additional passenger rail operations (beyond the daily California Zephyr) in this heavily-utilized freight corridor. Securing the cooperation of the UPRR is the key challenge. UPRR has expressed concerns that adding more rail travel in this corridor may require infrastructure improvements due to the challenging alignment, steep grades, and constrained right-of-way availability through the Sierra Nevada mountains. While adding one daily train does not appear to warrant major infrastructure projects, UPRR is reluctant to open the door to passenger rail service. Increased Amtrak Thruway bus service ridership would provide a strong case for discussing future passenger rail operations with UPRR.

19 How will projected development of a car centric communities that are in development and planned in West Placer County add to the congestion on I-80 and Hwy 89 today – 2023 and how this congestion today affect tourism economy in the Sierra?

This question is beyond the scope of preparing the Short Range Transit Plans. These Plans focus on providing transit services in western Placer County, which excludes the Tahoe region. The commenter may want to review the adopted Tahoe Regional Transportation Planning Agency's 2017 Regional Transportation Plan. This Plan can be found at: <http://www.trpa.org/regional-plan/regional-transportation-plan>. Additional information and analyses may also be found in the adopted 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy can be found at: <https://www.sacog.org/2016-mtpscs>.

20 What remedies can be adopted to reduce the number of cars on the road and facilitate travel to and from the Lake Tahoe parks and resorts?

This question is beyond the scope of preparing the Short Range Transit Plans. These Plans focus on providing transit services in western Placer County, which excludes the Tahoe region. The commenter may want to review the adopted Tahoe Regional Transportation Planning Agency's 2017 Regional Transportation Plan. This Plan can be found at: <http://www.trpa.org/regional-plan/regional-transportation-plan>. Additional information and analyses may also be found in the adopted 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy can be found at: <https://www.sacog.org/2016-mtpscs>.

21 What is the near term impact to travel time from the SF Bay area to Lake Tahoe should the Sunset Industrial Area/Placer Ranch/Placer Villages/Regional University/SF State University be approved by the Board of Supervisors and if these projects build out in a conventional manner – (no public transit or rail access)?

This question is beyond the scope of preparing the Short Range Transit Plans. These Plans focus on providing transit services in western Placer County, which excludes the Tahoe region. The commenter may want to review the adopted Tahoe Regional Transportation Planning Agency's 2017 Regional Transportation Plan. This Plan can be found at: <http://www.trpa.org/regional-plan/regional-transportation-plan>. Additional information and analyses may also be found in the adopted 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy can be found at: <https://www.sacog.org/2016-mtpscs>.

22 Please provide a comparative analysis describing a 10 year vision of transit on the 1-80 corridor when AI/driving services and potentially a publicly subsidized driving service with AI cars replaces private car usage,

This type of analysis is beyond the scope of the Short Range Transit Plans. The Short Range Transit Plans planning horizon is seven years to year 2025. The Plans take into account that transit service will change and recognizes a variety of new technologies will emerge and be deployed over the planning period.

23 Please analyze the cost effectiveness of utilizing a driving service like UBER or one operated by the County, and employing electric cars to the public transit system employed currently. Include staff costs, maintenance, storage, vehicle costs, shelter and hub facilities maintenance.

The Short Range Transit Plans planning horizon is seven years to year 2025. The Plans take into account that transit service will change and recognizes a variety of new technologies will emerge and be deployed over the planning period.

Comment Steven Fultz, Comment #4
No.

1 As the cost live in the state of California (and Placer county) continue to out pace income growth, it is extremely concerning to see a program where the recovery of operating costs is pennies on the dollar spent. As a commuter from Auburn to Sacramento all too often I see PCTPA buses and vans nearly empty. With many cost effective alternatives such as Enterprise, Vride and other private van pool operators (who recoup all expenses and are profitable) the county tax payers and commuters would be better served if Placer county offered a simple subsidy (or none at all) and let the market take care of its self.

Responses

Placer County Transit (PCT) provides fixed route transit services, dial-a-ride service, commuter service to downtown Sacramento, and a vanpool program for commuters. Under the State Transportation Development Act, PCT is required to maintain a systemwide farebox ratio of 12.94 percent. For FY 2016/17, Placer Commuter Express (PCE) achieved a farebox ratio of 42.2 percent, while the vanpool program achieved a ratio of 25.3 percent. PCE service carried an average of 22.3 passenger trips per hour, while the vanpool program averaged five passenger trips per hour. Systemwide, Placer County Transit services required an operating subsidy of \$13.95 per passenger trip. The best operating subsidy per passenger trip occurred for PCE at \$7.08 per passenger trip followed by vanpools at \$8.47 per passenger trip. It should also be noted that PCE uses bus drivers contracted through MV Transportation, a private operator.

- 2 When it comes to van pools specifically, the county should not be competing with the private sector by undermining business by offering county (taxpayer money) funds to pay commuting cost of gainfully employed people. Many of these commuters are state workers who already collect a \$65 state subsidy – riding a county funded van pool is effectively “double – dipping”! PCTPA should stick to mass transit – and only if it can pay its own fare!

Placer County Transit vanpool vehicles are leased from a Enterprise, a private company. There are currently nine vanpools administered by Placer County Transit. Each vanpool relies on its participants to serve as drivers. In general, vanpool participants use the service for commuting purposes to surrounding areas such as Sacramento and Davis. Vanpools are considered cost-effective for groups of six or more commuters who travel more than 15 miles each way. The benefit of a vanpool is that the users pay a larger portion of the subsidy and therefore a vanpool is considered a less expensive service option for Placer County Transit to provide to the public. As such, the strategy of using vanpools to address commuter needs, particularly in rural communities of Placer County which are not easily served by PCE, is reflected in the Placer County Transit Short Range Transit Plan. Example communities where vanpooling could be encouraged include Alta, Auburn, Foresthill and Lincoln.

**Comment Yan Tan, Comment #5
No.**

- 1 I suggest the Roseville Transit can have a later bus in the morning at Taylor I-80 sunsplash or the Maidu park at 8:15 or 8:30am bus. We are working parents. We need to drop off kids to school and come to work. Please have the later bus in the morning as possible.
- 2 In the morning, number #4 bus is going to Maidu park and go to Taylor I-80. Can the bus go straight to freeway after Maidu park stop? We can go to work faster.
- 3 In the afternoon, bus#1 goes to Maidu does not go to Taylor-I80. We are going home faster. Also, in the afternoon, there only two buses goes to Maidu park. Please have three buses that go to Maidu park will help a lot. There are (bus no.# 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 commuter) 5 mins-10 mins apart buses that go to Taylor I -80 stop. There are too many.

Responses

The Short Range Transit Plan for Roseville Transit recommends that commuter service be expanded during the mid-term of the Plan's seven year planning period. Existing ridership data indicates the need to increase the service by two trips in each commute period per day for service between downtown Sacramento and Roseville. This will address current capacity constraints, serve the increase in ridership demand, and allow for a broader range of service times. More detailed passenger surveys would be conducted to define the new commuter schedules.

The Short Range Transit Plan for Roseville Transit recommends that the commuter service to Maidu Park be eliminated during the near term of the Plan's seven year planning period and instead serve the Louis/Orlando Park and Ride. This change will serve more riders, reduce travel times and reduce operating costs. Currently two AM runs and two PM commuter runs serve Maidu Park. A total of 10 passenger trips per day (or five round-trips) are served at this location on an average weekday. As three of the four runs serve Maidu Park between other stops, serving this stop both increases operating costs while increasing the travel time for other passengers. In addition, a new 39 space park and ride has recently opened adjacent to the Louis/Orlando Transfer Point. This location (2.8 miles from Maidu Park) is more conveniently located just off of I-80, and in a location that can also accommodate commuters driving (or taking local Roseville Transit routes) from other neighborhoods to the north. Overall commuter ridership would benefit from eliminating the service to Maidu Park and instead provide a minimum of two runs in each commute period serving the Louis/Orlando Transfer Point.

The Short Range Transit Plan for Roseville Transit recommends that the commuter service to Maidu Park be eliminated during the near term of the Plan's seven year planning period and instead serve the Louis/Orlando Park and Ride. This change will serve more riders, reduce travel times and reduce operating costs. Currently two AM runs and two PM commuter runs serve Maidu Park. A total of 10 passenger trips per day (or five round-trips) are served at this location on an average weekday. As three of the four runs serve Maidu Park between other stops, serving this stop both increases operating costs while increasing the travel time for other passengers. In addition, a new 39 space park and ride has recently opened adjacent to the Louis/Orlando Transfer Point. This location (2.8 miles from Maidu Park) is more conveniently located just off of I-80, and in a location that can also accommodate commuters driving (or taking local Roseville Transit routes) from other neighborhoods to the north. Overall commuter ridership would benefit from eliminating the service to Maidu Park and instead provide a minimum of two runs in each commute period serving the Louis/Orlando Transfer Point.

Comment Stuart Mori, Comment #6
No.

- 1 I would like to provide comments on page 62, Route Observations, Roseville Short Range Transit Plan. The present bus stop at Taylor Road and Sunplash is woefully inadequate for the number of bus passengers who use this facility. I am presently a Roseville Commuter Bus passenger, and I see this situation every weekday morning. 1) The existing bus shelter only accommodates 10 people, but it is commonplace to have over 100 people in one line waiting for the Roseville Commuter bus and the Placer Commuter Express bus. The remaining people must stand in the parking lot, many times in the wind and rain during the winter. The bus stop needs two bus shelters—one for Roseville Commuter bus and Placer Commuter Express bus, not to mention a bigger concrete pad. Also, there is only a bus stop sign for Roseville Commuter Bus, but not for Placer Commuter Express Bus. 2) Currently, all transit passengers (Placer Commuter Express and Roseville Commuter Bus) must stand in one at this bus stop, which explains over 100 people at this bus stop. When Placer Commuter Express bus arrives, then transit passengers must form two lines, so one group boards the Placer Commuter Express bus, while the other group boards the Roseville Commuter Bus. The present pad needs to be expanded to accommodate both the Placer Commuter Express bus and the Roseville Commuter Bus to prevent this overcrowding. 3) The bike storage boxes need to be moved to make way for transit passengers. This change will open up the concrete pad and allow two big bus shelters for the Placer Commuter Express bus and the Roseville Commuter Bus. The bike storage boxes can be placed nearby or on an expanded concrete pad with the two

Comment Yan Tan, Comment #7
No.

- 1 For people that do not have a car, it is better to have local service buses to be connected with Roseville commuter buses. Local services buses should have a early time AM 6am, so people can be connected with Roseville Commuter buses. For example, I am living at Sierra College Blvd at Miners Ravine Drive. The bus E arrives at the Sierra Gardens Transfer point is at 8:30am. The Roseville Commuter bus has already left. There is no way to go to downtown to work for people have no car. There is only one commuter bus goes to Sierra Gardens Transfer point.
- 2 The local service bus should accept commuter buses pass, so people do not need to pay twice.
- 3 On holidays, State workers can leave early in the afternoon about 2:30pm or 3pm on thanksgiving, Christmas, New year eve, Christmas eve. Please have Roseville commuter buses operate early and pick us up on holidays. EL Dorado transit has 2:46pm bus in the afternoon at downtown Sacramento.

Responses

The Short Range Transit Plan for Roseville Transit acknowledges that improvements are needed at the Taylor Road park and ride, which is the busiest passenger location on both the Roseville Transit Commuter and Placer Commuter Express systems. Specifically, the Short Range Transit Plan recommends a minimum of two large passenger shelters be provided along with additional overhead street lighting.

Responses

Routes C/G/F/E serve southeastern Roseville and provide service to Sierra College, using one bus on a two-hour-long schedule. Ridership for Routes C/G/F/E is very low (2.9 passengers per vehicle hour, which is only half of the local route systemwide average). There does not appear to be ridership potential to warrant an earlier start time to connect to Roseville Commuter service. Rather, after a review of a wide range of alternatives, the Roseville Transit Short Range Transit Plan recommends two potential strategies to address route productivity:

1. Operate a streamlined Route C and F operating an hourly connecting South Cirby Way with Sierra College via Sierra Gardens and I-80; or
2. Establish a Transportation Network Company (Uber/Lyft) subsidy program for eastern Roseville (east of Eureka Road) to serve the area by Route C/G/F/E, which would be eliminated under this strategy.

Typically the fare paid is a contribution to the operational costs of the specific service involved, i.e. commuter vs local bus vs dial-a-ride. Roseville Transit is promoting the use of the Connect Card as the way for riders to pay its transit fares. The Connect Card consists of a “reloadable” card that is valid for transit services throughout the greater Sacramento region. It will allow you to purchase your regular pass or purchase a cash value. The cash value can be used to pay for a single ride, a daily pass, or an additional rider.

Comment noted. The Roseville Transit Short Range Transit Plan recommends that mid-day service be initiated during the plan's mid-term of the seven year planning period. The Plan further recommends that riders surveys regarding proposed mid-day commuter service be conducted in the near term to define the new commuter schedules.

Comment Bruce Castle, Comment #8
No.

- 1 Unfortunately, I cannot attend the June 27 meeting in Auburn. I looked at the Western Placer County Regional Bikeway Plan since I do a lot of bike-riding on the roads in this area. I notice a few discrepancies in the map, e.g. you have Wise Road going up to and over on Ayres Holmes Rd. This is not the case. My main concern, that I have expressed to Kevin Taber and Ken Grehm several times in the past, is the quality of the road re-surfacing projects in the County, especially from the standpoint of bike riding. You did a quality job on Virginia Town Rd., a portion of Fruitvale Rd. (from Gold Hill Rd. down to Hungry Hollow Rd), and West Wise Rd. out to the new Hwy 65. BUT, you are allowing other widely used roads to fall apart; an example is McCourtney Rd. north of Wise Rd.; other examples include the cross roads, Crosby Herold, Garden Bar, and Gold Hill. The list goes on. Somehow, the County needs to find the money to do quality road repairs. I know that this is a continuing problem given all the other priority road projects the County is doing. Best of luck to you going forward.

Comment Sara Thornburgh, Comment #9
No.

- 1 Hello, I live in Foresthill and created a petition (Re: Placer County Transit: Public Transportation for Foresthill, CA) with over 100 signatures awhile back and have sent via email couple of times trying to figure out who to talk to next with no luck, so I am glad to see this. I don't know if I can make the meeting on the 27th. How else can I share our needs and the petition? Thanks in advance?

Comment Jennifer Higgins, Comment #10
No.

- 1 I like the idea of twice hourly service on Lincoln bus.

Responses

This comment does not relate to the Short Range Transit Plans. The comment is directed toward the Western Placer County Regional Bikeway Plan. The comment has been forwarded to the team working on the Regional Bikeway Plan for a response to the commenter.

Responses

Your on-line petition regarding "Public Transportation for Foresthill, CA" with 100 signatures in support was received during the public comment period. The Short Range Transit Plan for Placer County Transit recommends a lifeline service be implemented on a demonstration basis between Auburn and Foresthill, consisting of a morning round-trip and an afternoon round-trip one day per week. This service would be a shoppers shuttle type of service. There is some history regarding prior bus service to the Foresthill community, which relates to why the Short-Range Transit Plan recommendation is to "provide a demonstration lifeline service to Foresthill one day a week." Bus service was provided to Foresthill from year to 2000 up to 2008. The bus route operated between Auburn and Foresthill on weekdays. Buses departed Foresthill at 7:45 am, picked up passengers at five bus stops in Foresthill, and dropped off passengers at five bus stops in Auburn. In the afternoon, a similar schedule was followed, departing Auburn at 3:35 pm, and arriving in the Foresthill community at 4:25 pm. Unfortunately, the bus service never met transit productivity standards, averaging less than 1.5 persons riding daily. The service was not considered cost effective to continue to operate. After nearly eight years of operating the service it was discontinued in 2008. Because of its performance history and also recognizing that as a rural community there may be Foresthill residents in need of alternate forms of transportation, PCTPA is recommending reinstating the service on a demonstration basis. If people use the service, it is possible that additional service days could be added. Alternatively, if the service isn't used it would probably be discontinued.

Responses

The Placer County Transit Short Range Transit Plan evaluated an alternative to increase the frequency of the Lincoln Sierra College Route from hourly to half-hourly. The alternative to increase service frequency is not recommended unless substantial new sources of funding are found due to the high cost to implement this service change.

2 I am a frequent user of Roseville DAR , Lincoln DAR , and PCT FIXED ROUTE AND Roseville fixed routes M. I work in both Lincoln and Roseville. I believe you are making a mistake in canceling early morning service on the Route M. I am legally blind and frequently use the 630am departure from the Galleria. I pick the bus up at Pleasant Grove and Woodcreek and take it to the Galleria to get to the Lincoln bus to get to work. There is also others that ride that bus including another legally blind man named Ian that depends on that route to get to Luis Orlando in time to get to work. I'd recommend you keep early morning service on the M route especially with all the new homes they are building as people will use the bus if it is there but if it is gone you will not see ridership. You need to go with the model " if you build it they will come " not wait for the ridership to come to you. You can't continue to put lanes on roads where there is no space you need more bus service and better connections. Please don't take away what we already have. I will lose the opportunity to get to work. Please seriously consider these comments before you make drastic changes to the M route. Roseville needs to stop being so dependent on their cars and used to seeing more buses in town and you will not get the ridership if you take the buses away. We deserve to get to work just as much as you who drive do and I can't get early morning trips on DAR if there isn't bus service be available because DAR is already booked up. You need to expand service not cancel it to meet the demand of housing and population. Build it and THEY WILL COME.

3 Please consider expanding Lincoln DAR service. All of the 159 trip denials even if they are not affected by the school tripper is not acceptable. Lincoln needs expanded DAR service so that there are more trips per hour and less wait time . There needs to be two vehicles servicing the city at all times.

The initial runs on Routes C, D, G and M have relatively low ridership (only one or two riders on each run) and are not considered cost-effective. The Roseville Transit Short Range Transit Plan recommends that these initial runs be eliminated to improve efficiency and provide funding for other transit improvements. A common request however is for increased frequency of service on these same routes. The alternative to increase service frequency is not recommended unless substantial new sources of funding are found due to the high cost to implement this service change.

As part of the Placer County Transit Short Range Transit Plan, the operation of the Lincoln dial-a-ride service was reviewed. Specifically, the current practice of using the dial-a-ride to provide school tripper runs was reviewed to assess whether this service strategy is impacting the ability to accommodate passenger requests. In FY 2016/17, a total of 159 trip denials were recorded. This is equal to a rate of 1.8 percent, or slightly more than one denial every other service day. Operator manifests were reviewed to identify if the single dial-a-ride vehicle available during the two daily school tripper service periods had the capacity to accommodate additional trips. The review found that in both periods there was capacity to avoid denials indicating the school tripper is not currently generating a pattern of trip denials (at least at current levels of dial-a-ride demand). In addition, development in the cities of Rocklin and Lincoln is increasing the need for trips between the existing two dial-a-ride service areas. To address both issues and provide a more seamless service to area residents, the Placer County Transit Short Range Transit Plan recommends that the two dial-a-ride areas be merged and be expanded to the west to include all areas east of a line ¾ miles west of Industrial Boulevard.

Comment Franke Terrazas, Comment #11
No.

- 1 Please consider making the weekday bus route to Grass Valley also pass through on Saturdays. There is a huge gap here. The 2 communities of Auburn and Grass Valley are linked and vital to each other. They are disconnected on Saturdays and need to be joined together just like on weekdays. Even a minimal route such as every 2 hours on the schedule would be a tremendous convenience. I'm quite certain people would use this proposed route to commute to work on weekends and also to spend a day getting out of town to go shopping or do the tourist thing and help increase the economies of both communities with great buying power. Together I have been waiting a long time for this to happen and look forward to this prospect becoming a reality.

Responses

Gold Country Stage is the transit operator for Nevada County that provides regional service between Grass Valley and Auburn. This service is known as Route 5. Route 5 passengers can transfer to and from Auburn Transit and Placer County Transit at the Auburn Station. Route 5 operates Monday through Friday with three AM runs and three PM runs. There is no Saturday or Sunday Route 5 service. Neither Auburn Transit or Placer County Transit provide regional service to Nevada County. This comment will be forwarded to the Gold Country Stage for their consideration.

Comment Marjene Streeper, Comment #12
No.

- 1 Foresthill really needs access to affordable public transportation!

Responses

The Short Range Transit Plan for Placer County Transit recommends a lifeline service be implemented on a demonstration basis between Auburn and Foresthill, consisting of a morning round-trip and an afternoon round-trip one day per week. This service would be a shoppers shuttle type of service. There is some history regarding prior bus service to the Foresthill community, which relates to why the Short-Range Transit Plan recommendation is to "provide a demonstration lifeline service to Foresthill one day a week." Bus service was provided to Foresthill from year to 2000 up to 2008. The bus route operated between Auburn and Foresthill on weekdays. Buses departed Foresthill at 7:45 am, picked up passengers at five bus stops in Foresthill, and dropped off passengers at five bus stops in Auburn. In the afternoon, a similar schedule was followed, departing Auburn at 3:35 pm, and arriving in the Foresthill community at 4:25 pm. Unfortunately, the bus service never met transit productivity standards, averaging less than 1.5 persons riding daily. The service was not considered cost effective to continue to operate. After nearly eight years of operating the service it was discontinued in 2008. Because of its performance history and also recognizing that as a rural community there may be Foresthill residents in need of alternate forms of transportation, PCTPA is recommending reinstating the service on a demonstration basis. If people use the service, it is possible that additional service days could be added. Alternatively, if the service isn't used it would probably be discontinued.

Comment Amin Pirasteh, Comment #13
No.

- 1 These comments are coming from a Roseville Transit Commuter customer for 9 years and pertain to Roseville Transit Commuter. – Added routes (both AM and PM) are needed and welcomed. These added routes should be scheduled to leave downtown between 3:30pm and 4:00pm. As a typical rider on your PM 4 Route bus (which your document rightly identified as one of the busiest routes). I often times see people having to stand. While standing might be acceptable for local routes within Roseville, for commuting routes that can sometimes take 45 minutes standing is not customer friendly. Your own analysis shows that the population of Roseville has increased significantly over the last 8+ years, and this does translate to more Commuter passengers especially since CA State employees have also increased due to larger State budgets.

Responses

Comment noted. Roseville Transit's commuter runs frequently run at or near the seating capacity. Existing ridership data indicates the need to increase the service by at least one and ultimately two trips in each commute period per day for service between downtown Sacramento and Roseville. The Roseville Transit Short Range Transit Plan recommends expansion of its commuter service during the Plan's mid-term of the seven year planning period. More detailed surveys of passengers would need to be conducted to define the service schedules.

- 2 One reason that Roseville PM buses are often filled beyond capacity has to do with the Placer Commuter Express service times. I often see Placer Commuter Express riders riding on the Roseville Commuter buses in the afternoon. The reason this is so is because the Placer Commuter service times have too much of a gap between them. For example, the first Placer Commuter bus leaves Taylor I-80 at 6:15am, but the first Placer Commuter bus in the afternoon doesn't pick up passengers until 4:17pm (a gap of over 9 hours, when State workers typically are at work 8.5 hours to 9 in a given day). Assuming it takes ½ hour to get to downtown in the morning, passengers who start work at 7am will be off of work between 3:30pm and 4pm. As mentioned above, the first Placer Commuter bus starts to pick up passengers at 4:17pm. No wonder we see these riders ride Roseville Transit in the afternoon.

- 3 Also, these Placer Commuter passengers only pay 50 cents to ride the Roseville Transit per ride. That price is significantly lower than what Roseville Transit is charging it's existing customers. So not only are these passengers taking up seats from Roseville Transit customers, they are not paying as much as they should. Talk about a lose-lose situation! Ask Placer Commuter to adjust their times to more accurately pick-up/drop-off their passengers in the AM/PM timeframe.

- 4 A Mid-day bus is welcomed; many times I had wished this option was available to us. In my opinion the mid-day bus should run 5 days a week, and pick-up riders sometime between 12-1pm from downtown Sacramento.

- 5 New buses, with more amenities are welcomed. At least phase out the older buses due to rains and water leaking in the winter, and lack of air-conditioning in the summer. I can't tell you how many times in the winter we have to physically touch the seat with our hand to see if it's wet before sitting down. In the summer, when temps go over 95 degrees the older buses AC just can't keep up, and it is not comfortable.

- 6 Why do some bus drivers not use the HOV lane to its full potential on Interstate 80? This not only delays us in getting to our destination in-time, but also costs you more since more gas is being used in stop-and-go driving. Commuter AM 5 leaves the HOV lane going into Sacramento at the Greenback exit – that's 3 miles before business 80. I hate to be a back-seat driver but it makes no sense (and the excuse of safely moving over to the right does not justify needing 3 miles to do it).

- 7 Look at running busses from I-80 to I-5 rather than I-80 to business-80 since the Over-the-Top project has now extended HOV lane. Placer County Transit uses this route and it might be more efficient/less-time commuting. I hope my estimated 4,000 individual trips on your commuter buses over the last 9 years gives you some perspective. Thank you! Amin Pirasteh California State Treasurer's Office

Comment Rene De Alba, Comment #14
No.

- 1 These comments are coming from a Roseville Transit Commuter customer who has been riding for 6 years. – I agree added routes (both AM and PM) are needed. As a regular rider on your PM 4 Route bus, I often see people having to stand. While standing might be acceptable for local routes within Roseville, for commuting routes that can sometimes take 45 minutes standing is not customer friendly. I was 6-7 months pregnant standing on the bus which was very uncomfortable!

The Placer County Transit Short Range Transit Plan recommends that Placer Commuter Express (PCE) service be initiated between Lincoln and downtown Sacramento during the Plan's mid-term of the seven year planning period. The additional PCE service would consist of two AM southwest bound runs and two PM northeast bound runs. These additional runs will provide more capacity between the Taylor Road/I-80 Park-and-Ride and downtown Sacramento, addressing the capacity problems noted by the commenter on the existing commuter services. These additional runs could be scheduled to serve new times in downtown Sacramento (in particular, earlier AM and PM service times).

Roseville Transit Commuter accepts the Placer Commuter Express monthly passes at the Taylor/I-80 Park and Ride lot and all downtown Sacramento bus stops. The \$0.50 fare noted by the commenter does not represent the total fare paid by PCE passengers. The \$0.50 is the additional fare charged to PCE passengers showing their Roseville/Rocklin zone monthly pass.

Comment noted. The Roseville Transit Short Range Transit Plan recommends that mid-day service be initiated during the plan's mid-term of the seven year planning period. The Plan further recommends that riders surveys regarding proposed mid-day commuter service be conducted in the near term.

Comment noted. The Roseville Transit Short Range Transit Plan recommends purchase of the three additional commuter buses in the near term and replacement of seven commuter buses during the Plan's mid-term of the seven year planning period.

Comment noted. Buses are permitted, but not required to use the HOV lane. The bus driver's primary job is to operate the bus safely.

Comment noted. The Roseville Transit Short Range Transit Plan recommends that Roseville Transit consider operating the commuter service similar to the PCE route via I-80 and I-5 west of Watt/I-80, rather than Capital City Freeway. With the completion of the "Across the Top" improvements on I-80 and the growth in congestion on the Capital City Freeway, drive times on the I-5 route can often be 15 minutes quicker. Caltrans plans, moreover, are more advanced to complete HOV lanes along I-80 and I-5 (including a freeway-to-freeway connection at the I-80/I-5 interchange) than they are along the Capital City Freeway. This service option would however require reconfiguration of the downtown service route.

Responses

Comment noted. Roseville Transit's commuter runs frequently run at or near the seating capacity. Existing ridership data indicates the need to increase the service by at least one and ultimately two trips in each commute period per day for service between downtown Sacramento and Roseville. The Roseville Transit Short Range Transit Plan recommends expansion of its commuter service during the Plan's mid-term of the seven year planning period. More detailed surveys of passengers would need to be conducted to define the service schedules.

- 2 A Mid-day bus is desperately needed; many times I had wished this option was available. In my opinion the mid-day bus should run 3-5 days a week, and pick-up riders sometime between 12-12:30 pm from downtown Sacramento.

- 3 New buses, with more amenities would be very welcomed. At least phase out the older buses due to rains and water leaking in the winter, and lack of air-conditioning in the summer. I can't tell you how many times in the winter we have to physically touch the seat with our hand to see if it's wet before sitting down or getting wet from the dripping roof on the way to work. In the summer, when temps go over 95 degrees the older buses AC just can't keep up, and it is not comfortable especially sitting in the direct sunlight.

**Comment Adele Wagner, Comment #15
No.**

- 1 The information about this opportunity to comment is not well publicized. Who is being recruited to comment. I am an active and interested citizen who has submitted comments in the past, but I was not informed of this opportunity to comment. I do feel that ridership is abysmally low. Marketing for public transit must be ramped up. An analysis should be done to see if an Uber/lift style public transportation system is cost effective and if it would get more private card off the road. This opportunity to comment was forwarded to me by an associate. One cannot make policy with scarce input. Therefore I feel that the system of securing public input should be revisited and another model used to get a body of input that has the weight of numbers behind it.

Comment noted. The Roseville Transit Short Range Transit Plan recommends that mid-day service be initiated during the plan's mid-term of the seven year planning period. The Plan further recommends that passenger surveys regarding proposed mid-day commuter service be conducted in the near term to define the new commuter schedules.

Comment noted. The Roseville Transit Short Range Transit Plan recommends purchase of the three additional commuter buses in the near term and replacement of seven commuter buses during the Plan's mid-term of the seven year planning period.

Responses

PCTPA staff believe that the community outreach effort for the Short Range Transit Plans was substantial. The community outreach effort began in November 2017 as part of the Unmet Transit Needs process. In November public workshops were held before the PCTPA Board of Directors and the Roseville Transportation Commission. In November and December outreach efforts focused on conducting on-board surveys of existing transit riders. 1473 riders responded to this survey. In January 2018, virtual on-line workshops were conducted, with over 436 people participating on-line. Also in January, "Pop-Up" workshops were held at major transfer point locations and Sierra College. Approximately 25 people stopped by to attend these workshops. The "Pop-Up" workshops were designed to gather input regarding transit services in Placer County. In April and May, two public workshops were held before the PCTPA Board of Directors and one public workshop was held before the Roseville Transportation Commission. These workshops provided an overview of alternative transit services under consideration and discussed key findings. Also in May, a presentation was held before the Placer Collaborative Network Resource Fair. The presentation at the Resource Fair provided an opportunity to reach out to over 60 participating social service organizations regarding transit service issues. In June a public hearing was held on the draft Short Range Transit Plans before the PCTPA Board of Directors. Notices for all of the workshops and public hearing were published in local Placer newspapers, including a legal ad for the public hearing. Announcements were also distributed by email to over 2,680 stakeholders and interested individuals. All notices and announcements were also translated into Spanish.

Comment Emily Gaber, Comment #16
No.

- 1 I would like to see an increase in public transportation that makes it possible to get somewhere in a reasonable amount of time.

Responses

Both Placer County Transit and Roseville Transit provide dial-a-ride services defined as a shared ride transit service that operates either citywide or within three-quarters of a mile of a fixed route transit service. Anyone can use dial-a-ride for traveling to medical appointments, shopping, commuting to work, meetings, parties, sports events, recreation, visiting, and more; it is not limited to seniors or persons with disabilities on Placer County Transit and Roseville Transit. Ride times are typically under 60 minutes, and provides a level of service comparable to fixed route transit service. However, customers traveling farther may experience longer travel times due to distance, traffic conditions or because sharing rides.

Comment Tink Miller, Comment #17
No.

- 1 I am very pleased with all four draft plans – WPCTSA, PCT, Auburn and Roseville. They are innovative and responsive to a wide variety issues identified by transit users, advocates and members of the public that do not have sufficient access to public transit at this time.
- 2 The expansion of Connect card to alternative means of transit such as Health Express or TNC's will expand access to public transit.
- 3 The expansion of Health Express service capacity will be critical to meet increasing need for NEMT. The addition of trips for recreation and other purposes when capacity allows is very desirable, particularly for older adults who become isolated and experience onset of depression as a spouse or other family and friends die or move away. It absolutely will contribute to their sustained well-being. The acquisition of scheduling software for Health Express is long overdue.
- 4 It is critical that the budget for WPCTSA be increased to 5%. The need for these services will grow exponentially within this 7 year cycle and there are sufficient transportation funds available to reinstate the 5% level.

Responses

Comment noted.

Use of the Connect Card for Health Express and dial-a-ride services would require installation of electronic fareboxes on these vehicles. Further study of the costs, benefits and barriers (if any) would be required prior to implementation. TNC passengers will not be available to use the Connect Card. Transit operators and TNCs would enter into an agreement for the transit operator to provide a full or partial subsidy of the TNC fare with the passenger paying the remainder. There would be no electronic farebox equipment available with the TNC to read the Connect Card. Also, the WPCTSA Short Range Transit Plan recommends the Bus Pass Subsidy Program be made available through the Connect Card program. This will make the Bus Pass Subsidy Program easier to use for social service programs as well as provide options for purchasing multi-ride passes. This strategy will increase the use of the Bus Pass Subsidy program.

Comment noted. Data and discussions with Seniors First indicate that Health Express has reached its capacity to accommodate passenger trips. Demographic projections indicate that demand for the service will grow. In order to accommodate R&R program trips as well as to accommodate future nonemergency medical ridership growth, Health Express service should be expanded. In the short term the WPCTSA Short Range Transit Plan recommends one additional bus should be operated for four hours each weekday. In addition, acquisition of scheduling software for Health Express and MyRides Program is recommended to improve customer service, decrease call wait times as well as reduce no-shows. The Plan also recommends scheduling software for the Meals on Wheels Program as a strategy to improve transportation access to food and would increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the program.

Two financial scenarios were developed for the WPCTSA Short Range Transit Plan based on the proportion of Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding historically and currently allocated to the WPCTSA. The final plan includes a policy recommending: WPCTSA annual TDA funding allocation should vary as necessary between the current four percent, not to exceed the maximum of five percent, depending on specific annual amount necessary to fund program costs. Prior to increasing the TDA allocation, WPCTSA should work with the TOWG and TAC to determine whether program costs are reasonable and review cost containment opportunities.

- 5 The weak marketing plans continue to be a huge barrier to growing ridership. The public does not know what service is available nor how to access it. Information must be available in all formats – print and online, and disseminated by all possible means.
- 6 The plan for Roseville to expand the mobility training program is wonderful. The need for that service will grow with the aging of the population.
- 7 The implementation plan for PCT is very exciting. The impact of these changes will be monumental in expanding access to transit services.
- 8 The new routing plan for Auburn also is very exciting with the inclusion of Luther Road and Dairy Road. Both PCT and Auburn will have shorter headways on key routes, making them more useful to more people.
- 9 A unified fare system across the three operators is very desirable, meanwhile the Connect Card system with the recommended day passes will resolve many issues with using public transit for the public, while simplifying the financial structure for the operators so each system receives its proper share of farebox.
- 10 The recommendation for all operators to improve bus stop facilities on an on-going basis is very welcome. Protection from weather extremes is essential to safe travel for older adults.
- 11 The recommendations included for conducting an array of surveys and studies are very welcome as well. The more interaction with potential riders, the better. Bravo! Well done.

Comment noted. The Short Range Transit Plans recognize that an overall marketing plan, including defining and establishing a common regional transit brand, would require a specific marketing/branding study and a high level of collaboration among the individual transit operators. While this would be a substantial effort, the result would significantly enhance the public awareness of transit throughout the region.

Comment noted. The Mobility Management Program will be included in the WPCTSA Short Range Transit Plan. The Plan recognizes that a long-term funding commitment is needed to improve the mobility needs for elderly and disabled residents.

Comment noted.

Comment noted.

To clarify the comment regarding "a unified fare system," the Short Range Transit Plans recommend that each transit operator participate in a Regional Day Pass program; likewise participate in an investigation of a Sierra College Student Pass program; and continue to promote use of the Connect Card.

Comment noted. The Short Range Transit Plans recommends a continuing program of providing shelters and bus stop improvements. Attractive and comfortable passenger facilities is important in attracting and maintaining ridership and is particularly important for sensitive populations, such as seniors or persons with disabilities.

Comment noted. The Short Range Transit Plans recommend that transit operators continue to conduct focused passenger surveys and ridership counts to provide input for refining the service modifications recommended in the Plans.

Comment Robert Hylan, Comment #18
No.

- 1 It would be a good idea to provide homeless persons at The Gathering Inn in downtown Roseville free bus service/access to Placer Counties social services sites ONLY! These people really are stuck and cannot afford a bus ticket to our offices in Rocklin for example. They are mostly entitled to bus services once they get to our offices and are qualified to be supported by our social services programs. However they don't have a way to get here to get the bus passes issued to themselves because they can't afford the bus ride here, which of course only exacerbates the problem! Thanks!

Responses

The Western Placer Consolidated Transportation Services Agency(WPCTSA) introduced the South Placer Bus Pass Subsidy Program on July 1, 2015. This program is ongoing and subsidizes 75 percent of the cost of daily bus passes to non-profit, social and human service agencies with clientele participating in certain public assistance programs. WPCTSA encourages the Gathering Inn to apply.

Comment Estela Roid, Comment #19
No.

- 1 Granite Bay Alternatives Page 154 and 155 – I hope the proposal to extend the Roseville Transit to Auburn Folsom Road and the Roseville Dial-A-Ride Expansion will be approved. Residents in Granite Bay like me really needs a public mode of transportation. Thank you PCTPA for this!!!

Responses

Two strategies are recommended in the Placer County Short Range Transit Plan regarding transit service within and to/from the Granite Bay community. Implementation of these strategies is the responsibility of Placer County.

1. Negotiate with the City of Roseville regarding the Route S extension and paratransit service to Granite Bay, and implement the extension.
2. Coordinate with TNC companies (and potentially local cab companies) regarding a subsidy program in Granite Bay.

**Comment Marilyn Jasper, Comment #20
No.**

Responses

- 1** Anyone who commutes or must travel even close to commute hours knows full well that adding lanes to roadways (arterials or freeways) has never resolved transportation problems and nightmarish traffic jams. More lanes become “build it and they will come” scenarios. HOV lanes, although well intended, are also ineffective—in part because of noncompliance. The most obvious answer to address transportation problems is public transit, safe sidewalks, bike lanes, and other alternative travel modalities. We urge the County to be pro-active, rather than re-active, toward that goal. If there is a will to change for the better, then spending resources on expanded roadways for vehicle “transportation” rather than “public transit” is unacceptable.

This comment is beyond the scope of preparing Short Range Transit Plans. Short Range Transit Plans were updated to assess transit issues in the PCTPA region in order to provide a comprehensive strategy of service, capital, financial and institutional improvements to the public transit programs for implementation over the next seven years. Regional Transportation Plans however are developed to provide a clear long range vision of regional transportation goals, objectives, policies and strategies. These plans typically cover a 20+ year timeframe. The vision identified in the Regional Transportation Plans must be within fiscal constraints. PCTPA’s adopted 2036 Regional Transportation Plan considers both short-term and long-term time periods. The Plan is designed to be a blueprint for development of a balanced, comprehensive, multi-modal transportation system, including but not limited to, regional roadways, public transit, passenger rail, aviation, goods movement, active transportation facilities, transportation systems management, transportation safety and security, and intelligent transportation systems.
- 2** The June 2007 PCTPA Transit Plan appears to have underestimated population “Growth Assumptions (As of 2005).” Regardless, with population increases in the County, along with needs of ever-increasing elderly populations, young families, increased commuters, young adults who may forego the privilege of driving, and other variables, the task of meeting needs is formidable.

The commenter is referring to the Transit Master Plan prepared in 2007. The growth assumptions used in developing that Transit Master Plan were prepared by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). The SACOG growth forecasts were used to ensure consistency with regional planning efforts. The purpose of the Transit Master Plan was to provide a consistent, coordinated long range vision for Placer County transit operators that would assist both strategic policy planning and short-term decision-making. In contrast, the Short Range Transit Plans were updated to provide a comprehensive strategy of service, capital, financial and institutional improvements for the next seven years.
- 3** We acknowledge that public transit costs are a huge issue, but taxpayers may be willing to support those costs if the primary proposed use would resolve traffic issues for the long term. Increasing taxes to pay primarily for “transportation” roadway widening, additional lanes, etc., is something taxpayers know will be “too little, too late” shortly after construction is completed.

This is a subject of research beyond the scope of preparing Short Range Transit Plans.
- 4** A most important impact that needs to be considered in “roadway expansion” or freeway “lane expansion” proposals is the ever-increasing health issues that such proposals create. A recent global study linked air pollution to an increased risk for type 2 diabetes. According to the Sacramento BEE, “California’s Central Valley is notorious for its high levels of hazardous particulates.¹ Reportedly, challenges include agricultural and truck emissions, wildfire pollution, pollution that is trapped by extreme heat for days, and Sacramento’s being ranked as one of the most polluted by the American Lung Association. Vehicle travel simply adds to the challenges. Public health is impacted in numerous ways particulate matter (PM). Health issues are compromised, and problems exacerbated by air pollution and Greenhouse Gas emissions (GHG)—not to mention the mental angst of traffic jams, stress, and road rage issues. These may not be eliminated with public transit, but most likely would be greatly reduced along with the emissions of GHG. ¹ Study: polluted air raises risk for type 2 diabetes, Sacramento BEE, July 15, 2018, page 3A. ² According to Dr Jonathan Patz, in a recent interview (paraphrased), the cause of Climate Change must be targeted in order to reduce GHG that comes from burning fossil fuels. “We keep mopping up the floor, while ignoring the fact that the faucet is still running.”² He recommends going to the root of the problem and very rigorously and quickly go to a low carbon economy—get away from fossil fuels—plan communities for people, rather than automobiles. Dr Patz suggests that the health benefits of a low carbon economy is one of the largest public health opportunities in a century. He states that seven million people around the world die prematurely from air pollution annually.

SB 375 requires the 18 Metropolitan Planning Organizations in the state to identify a forecasted development pattern and transportation network that will meet greenhouse gas emission reduction targets specified by the California Air Resources Board through their Regional Transportation Plan process. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Sacramento region, including Placer County, and has the responsibility to address the state SB 375 requirements through the development of its Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. Additional information and analyses regarding the adopted 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy can be found at: <https://www.sacog.org/2016-mtpsc>.

4 Cont'd In the United State, it's estimated that more than five million people die annually from sedentary lifestyles. He states that we pay attention to highways and roads, while 60% of Americans don't meet the minimum levels of recommended exercise, which is related to obesity, diabetes, cancer, and even depression. He also states that exercise needs to be built into our daily routines—better designs of our cities and neighborhoods to promote physical fitness— safe sidewalks and bike lanes. In an upper Midwest study that included 11 largest cities, the question was asked “If we took the short car trips off of the roads in the cities, what would the air quality and physical fitness benefit be if half of those car trips turned into bicycle trips—and only in the summer time—just four months of the year?” Forty percent of the car trips in the U.S. are short car trips (2.5 miles or less). Dr. Patz found that taking short trips off the roads and turning half of them into bike trips would save 1,300 lives and 8 billion dollars every year. He states it is a huge benefit for people to have active transport through walking and cycling.³ Thus, it becomes an important issue for Planning (and the PCPTA) to design safe and fair multi-modal transportation

Refer to Response #4 to Comment #20.

5 An important goal to reduce greenhouse gases GHG is being proposed as a part of Placer County's Sustainability Plan in order to meet state mandates.

An update of the adopted 2036 Regional Transportation Plan is underway. Coordination with other planning processes, including Placer County's Sustainability Plan, will occur during the planning and development of the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan.

6 We urge the PCTPA to compare adding highway lanes to providing public transit, and relate it to the County's Sustainability Plan, in resolving transportation issues. Consumer “demands” for convenience should not drive decisions that impact public health and safety. Rather, we urge the PCTPA to pursue what will work for future generations.

Providing this comparison is beyond the scope of developing Short Range Transit Plans and is more appropriately conduct as part of project alternatives analyses.

7 We greatly welcome and appreciate efforts to plan for public transit. Although a “short range” plan might be better than no plan at all, we strongly urge the PCTPA to plan immediately for long range, while there is still a slight window of opportunity to correct transportation/traffic environmental and human health impacts. We urge suspension of plans for additional highway lanes and instead a re-direction of funds to jump start public transit options—look at models that work elsewhere and incorporate what fits best. Thank you for considering our views.

As the State-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Placer County, PCTPA is required to prepare and adopt a Regional Transportation Plan every five years. Regional Transportation Plans are developed to provide a clear long range vision of regional transportation goals, objectives, policies and strategies. These plans typically cover a 20+ year timeframe. PCTPA's adopted 2036 Regional Transportation Plan was adopted in 2016. An update to 2040 is currently underway with adoption scheduled for February 2020. Opportunity for public input will begin in fall 2018. The commenter is encouraged to participate in PCTPA's Regional Transportation Plan 2040 update process.

**Comment Michael Garabedian, Comment #21
No.**

- 1 Our emphasis in this comment is that South Placer County area rail transit corridor planning needs to be recognized and addressed in the Short-Range Transit Plans and related planning processes.
- 2 Our local transit needs and agencies require an operations core: a Lincoln-Roseville rail transit corridor could provide this need in South Placer County Transit connections in South County are made at 10 Transfer Points. This includes the Auburn Transfer Point where Gold Country Stage from Nevada County stops and where Auburn Conheim train station is. The Roseville Intermodal Station is not a Transfer Point.
- 3 The proposed Short Range Transit Plans demonstrate that local transit in South County does not have a destination and departure transit core, facility or corridor. Without a core, without a focus, without transit-oriented reasons to address the realities of our massive growth and development, our current transit systems are rootless. The draft Short Range plans do not address this need, even though the current Transit Master Plan for Placer County does so in its "Recommendations By Mode," Regional Rail category: "Study the feasibility of adding regional rail service along the SR-65 corridor to Lincoln and Marysville." Transit Master Plan for South Placer County, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency June 2007, p. 22. The Sierra Club proposal for a fixed rail transit corridor between Lincoln and Roseville was publicly announced this week at the July 10 meeting of the Board of Supervisors.
- 4 Proceed to Phase II of the 27-page December 1995, "Draft Northern Sacramento Valley Intercity Rail Feasibility Study Interim Findings Report."
- 5 Construct under our affected local government authorities a fixed transit corridor between Roseville and Lincoln such as with Placer County, PCTPA, Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln.
- 6 Extend Sacramento Regional Transit to Lincoln, involving Sacramento Regional Transit, Sacramento County, Citrus Heights and the agencies in #2.

Responses

The Regional Transportation Plan is the appropriate planning level study to define the regional transportation system and identify large areas in terms of corridors and provide the planning guidance for developing the finer-grained multimodal network within individual corridor plans. The corridor plan typically coordinates and integrates multiple modes of transportation within the corridor and establishes the function and operation and design criteria for various individual transportation facilities in the corridor. Corridor planning applies multiple strategies to achieve specific transportation objectives along a transportation corridor, combining capital improvements and management strategies into a unified plan for the corridor. This level of planning analysis is beyond the scope of a Short Range Transit Plan, which focuses more appropriately on project or service programming and implementation.

The existing transit network is organized around transfer points where buses converge at about the same time, enabling passengers to transfer between routes, and then depart in their respective directions. This type of transit network is known as a timed transfer system. A timed transfer system represents a coordinated transit network allowing riders to travel between any two points in the service area with reasonable convenience. There are currently nine transfer points in south Placer County. The commenter is correct that the Roseville Intermodal Station is not considered a transfer point.

The existing transit network is organized around transfer points where buses converge at about the same time, enabling passengers to transfer between routes, and then depart in their respective directions. This type of transit network is known as a timed transfer system. The general concept embodied within the long range Transit Master Plan is to organize transit services by providing trunk line services on major transportation corridors, including transfer points served by local feeder bus service. The trunk line service could include regional rail or Bus Rapid Transit technology. Subsequent to the Transit Master Plan, the Bus Rapid Transit Service Plan for South Placer County identified a high-capacity, regional transit connection within and between the cities and unincorporated areas of South Placer County. The transit technology chosen for evaluation was Bus Rapid Transit and is included in the Regional Transportation Plan.

The Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) Board of Directors on March 21, 1996 approved the BCAG staff direction to delay any work on Phase II of the Northern Sacramento Valley Intercity Rail Feasibility Study until and unless substantial improvement in conditions affecting rail feasibility is identified.

Before a fixed route transit corridor project can be constructed, several implementation steps would need to be taken depending on the type of funding envisioned to construct the project. Generally, the implementation steps typically include:

1. System/Corridor Planning Study, Draft Environmental Studies and Conceptual Engineering;
2. Preferred Alternative Selection and Preliminary Engineering;
3. Final Design, Construction Documents, and Funding;
4. Right-of-Way (ROW) Acquisition;
5. Construction Contractor and Vehicle/Equipment Procurement;
6. Construction; and
7. Opening.

Depending on the sources of funding involved, project implementation can upwards to 10 to 15 years and is beyond the scope of a Short Range Transit Plan.

South Placer County is currently served by three public transit operators: Auburn Transit, Placer County Transit and Roseville Transit. At the present time, there has been no discussion regarding extending Sacramento Regional Transit service into south Placer County.

- | | | |
|----|--|--|
| 7 | Extend Capitol Corridor service with a rail transit link to Lincoln. | CCJPA's Vision Plan was adopted by the CCJPA Board of Directors in November 2016. The segment from Roseville to Lincoln was not evaluated as part of the CCJPA Vision Plan. The adopted Vision Plan notes that should extensive service expansion be contemplated east of Roseville to Auburn, various improvements would be required due to track capacity issues and freight goods movement east of the Roseville UPRR Yard. These improvements would include new passenger track, potentially along an existing alternative alignment, as well as a new station in Rocklin and relocated station in Auburn. |
| 8 | Change Caltrans State Rail Plan bus transit to Lincoln to rail transit to Lincoln. | Caltrans released the draft State Rail Plan on October 11, 2017. The public review period lasted 60 days, until December 11, 2017. The State Rail Plan was submitted to the State Legislature May 31, 2018. |
| 9 | Change Caltrans State Rail Plan rail service north of Sacramento to the Roseville-Lincoln corridor or another suitable abandoned rail corridor. | Caltrans released the draft State Rail Plan on October 11, 2017. The public review period lasted 60 days, until December 11, 2017. The State Rail Plan was submitted to the State Legislature May 31, 2018. |
| 10 | Sierra Club is reviewing these and other proposals. | The comment period for the draft Short Range Transit Plans closed on July 15, 2018. |
| 11 | The corridor needs to plan and have walking, biking, local transit and other transit and other services to feed into the Lincoln-Roseville corridor and to not compete with it. | A corridor plan typically coordinates and integrates multiple modes of transportation within the corridor and establishes the function and operation and design criteria for various individual transportation facilities in the corridor. Corridor planning applies multiple strategies to achieve specific transportation objectives along a transportation corridor, combining capital improvements and management strategies into a unified plan for the corridor. This level of planning analysis is beyond the scope of a Short Range Transit Plan, which focuses more appropriately on project or service programming and implementation. |
| 12 | The plans need to quantify existing north-south transit and related ridership South County north-south corridor public and private transit and programs need quantification for all ridership including but not limited to: Local bus transit Commuter transit buses Ride sharing Van pools Sierra College destination buses Health Express My Rides Etc. This quantification needs to include private services: Cabs Uber, Lyft and related Airport shuttles Casino buses Lodging shuttles Etc. The plans need to account for added corridor users too: This needs to include the new transit use by people who now drive their vehicles who would no longer do so. | Ridership analyses are identified in the Short Range Transit Plans and were conducted for a variety of public transit service alternatives considered, including transportation network companies, micro transit services and vanpools. |
| 13 | The Sierra Club sees potential people-moving methods from corridor transit stops to major access centers like the casino. For example, I recall my first use of the Atlanta Airport people movers some years ago. | A variety of public transit alternatives were considered, including transportation network companies, micro transit services and vanpools. |
| 14 | County, PCTPA and Caltrans lane expansion spending has discouraged needed transit planning and development | PCTPA's Regional Transportation Plan is a product of cooperative efforts by PCTPA's member jurisdictions reflecting a pro-active multimodal approach to identifying future transportation project needs divided between planning for transit, highways, rail, aviation, ITS, pedestrian facilities, and bikeways. |
| 15 | Transportation spending priorities by Placer County, the PCTPA and Caltrans have been to add highway and interchange capacity. This is a largely fruitless and misleading expenditure of public funds to reduce congestion. See the U.C. Davis National Center for Sustainable Transportation Policy Brief: "Increasing Highway Capacity Unlikely to Relieve Traffic Congestion," https://ncst.ucdavis.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/10-12-2015-NCST_Brief_InducedTravel_CS6_v3.pdf | PCTPA's Regional Transportation Plan is a product of cooperative efforts by PCTPA's member jurisdictions reflecting a pro-active multimodal approach to identifying future transportation project needs divided between planning for transit, highways, rail, aviation, ITS, pedestrian facilities, and bikeways. |

- 16 The SACOG board recently acted to recommend to the state which corridors in its territory should be considered for the SB1 Congested Corridor funding. Though Placer County has 23% of the SACOG board membership, the Board did not recommend consideration of Placer County for this funding.
- On January 21, 2018, the SACOG Board endorsed PCTPA's SB 1 TCEP funding nomination request of the I-80 Freight Throughput Improvement Project in Placer County. In early February Caltrans subsequently withdrew this project nomination considering it a lower priority among competing statewide TCEP project nominations. Caltrans encouraged PCTPA to resubmit the project for SB 1 SCCP funding, recast as the I-80 Auxiliary Lanes Project. This resubmission occurred after the January 21 SACOG Board meeting. Unfortunately, the project was not awarded funding by the California Transportation Commission due to a lack of local funding match.
- 17 Figures are needed comparing the cost of different transit corridor and highway expenditures and job creation.
- Providing this comparison is beyond the scope of developing Short Range Transit Plans and is more appropriately conduct as part of project alternatives analyses.
- 18 SR 65 widening and from SR 65 to Sutter County Placer Parkway construction cost estimates are needed. A guesstimate of this might be in the range of a billion dollars. The costs and job creation of transit and highway development and operation need to be calculated and compared.
- Providing this comparison is beyond the scope of developing Short Range Transit Plans. Construction costs for SR 65 projects and Placer Parkway can be found in the adopted 2036 RTP, Table 6.1-7 "Highway and Roadway Network Project List." Employment impacts attributable to highway and roadway projects may be found in individual project analyses.
- 19 A significant share of developer fees should go to transit infrastructure. Transit infrastructure needs to be built into new development.
- Under state law, jurisdictions may impose fees on development that mitigate their impacts on local services. One common impact fee is for traffic generated by the new development on the road system. Fees must be backed by a traffic study that provides a nexus of the improvements to the traffic generated by the development, as required by AB 1600. Each jurisdiction in Placer County has imposed a traffic impact fee of some type; several include transit as an eligible use. In addition, in 2002, Lincoln, Roseville, Rocklin, and Placer County formed the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority Joint Powers Authority to develop a regional traffic impact fee. This fee, known as the Regional Transportation and Air Quality Mitigation Fee Program, is set to generate \$195 million for specified transportation projects, including transit.
- 20 Programs to develop transit for existing development are needed: Citrus Heights is working on this.
- Short Range Transit Plans were updated to assess transit issues in the PCTPA region in order to provide a comprehensive strategy of service, capital, financial and institutional improvements to the public transit programs for implementation over the next seven years. Both existing demographic and development conditions and proposed development were reviewed to determine the need for new and/or modified transit services.
- 21 Was the public asked its opinion about rail transit and a Lincoln-Roseville rail transit corridor? We haven't located Short Range Transit Plan inquiry to the public asking about rail transit in the corridor.
- Community outreach for the Short Range Transit Plans began in December with on-board rider surveys. In January 2018 PCTPA held a two week on-line virtual community workshop and also conducted "Pop-Up" workshops at local transfer centers. PCTPA received 1,473 completed on-board surveys and 436 people participated in the virtual community workshop as a result of these outreach efforts. Eleven questions were asked during this community outreach. One of the questions asked respondents to identify potential improvements to public transit. Several respondents identified light rail should be extended in the Interstate 80 corridor to Auburn; or identified more Capitol Corridor service to Roseville and to Auburn.
- 22 Transit Operator Working Group meetings need to be open to the public Current coordination among our local transit operators may need to be formalized. TOWG meetings should have e-mail notice to the public and public input.
- PCTPA's Transit Operator Working Group is comprised of local government and regional agency staff responsible for transportation planning, programming and project administration. While the Transit Operator Working Group meetings are not open to the public, the PCTPA Board meetings address the topics discussed at these meetings and the PCTPA Board meetings are open to the public. That said, the opportunity always exists to set up a meeting with the commenter and local transit operators.

23 PCTPA Technical Advisory Committee meetings need to be open to the public. The public seems largely absent from PCTPA meetings. Public attendance at the TAC should lead to more public involvement in PCTPA.

PCTPA's Technical Advisory Committee is comprised of local government and regional agency staff responsible for transportation planning, programming and project administration. While the Technical Advisory Committee meetings are not open to the public, the PCTPA Board meetings address the topics discussed at these meetings and the PCTPA Board meetings are open to the public. That said, the opportunity always exists to set up a meeting with the commenter and local agency jurisdictions.

24 PCTPA board membership a transit advocate on the board. PCTPA board membership expansion could include transit expertise, user group and other representation. A survey could be made of regional transit and transportation board membership around the county. If a change in the law would be required for this, having an advisory group of this nature should be considered.

PCTPA's governance structure already provides effective representation of public transit operators. There are three public transit operators in the PCTPA region. All are governed by a City Council or Board of Supervisors and a representative of each also serves on the PCTPA Board of Directors and qualify as representing public transit.

Comment Jake McDermott, Comment #22
No.

Responses

1 Why is the "Western Placer" area not being represented in Western Placer County? I have NO faith this meeting will help the Placer Piggy Bank that is Tahoe.

Comment noted.

Comment Steve Borroum, Comment #23
No.

Responses

1 If you don't already, there should be a fare box minimum recovery of at least 20%. Plus, there probably should be a minimum density of people per sq. mile for there to be a fixed route transit system. Please know that for every million dollars or so, if spent on a traffic safety project, a serious injury or a life can be saved over approximately a 3 year period. In the long run, options for connecting to "light rail" should continue to be explored. And, Placer County should seek a jobs / housing balance to minimize commuting.

On June 26, 2013, the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency Board of Directors adopted systemwide fare revenue ratios for public transit operators serving western Placer County as required by the Transportation Development Act. Auburn Transit is required to maintain a farebox ratio of 10 percent because the City of Auburn is located within the non-urbanized area of western Placer County. Roseville Transit is required to maintain a farebox ratio of 15 percent due to the City of Roseville being located within the Sacramento urbanized area. Placer County Transit (PCT) farebox ratio is 12.94 percent reflecting a blended ratio since PCT serves both the urbanized and non-urbanized areas of western Placer County. WPCTSA is required to maintain a farebox ratio of 10 percent as a provider of specialized transportation services.

Comment Jody Hohman, Comment #24
No.

Responses

1 I do not understand why all of this Placer County planning is completely ignoring transit for the senior citizens who live in the two Del Webb communities that are both inside this county's lines. Your bus services seem to circumvent both of these communities. These communities both contain senior adults who currently or will eventually need public transit options as they can no longer drive their own cars to do errands and attend events within the county. Originally coming from the San Francisco Bay Area, I have seen how much senior citizens rely on good public transportation. In addition, it would be better for the health of all of us who live in Placer County to get as many privately owned cars off of our roads and more people into public transit clean air vehicles. Please take senior citizens into public transit plans either now or very soon in the future.

Public transit services are currently available to both Del Webb communities in Placer County. Roseville Transit provides dial-a-ride to Sun City Roseville, and Placer County Transit provides dial-ride service to Sun City Lincoln Hills.

Comment Jennifer Higgins, Comment #25
No.

Responses

- 1 Ms. Higgins noted it is very difficult to purchase the 21 discounted rides passbook on the Lincoln DAR. She says Lincoln DAR drivers are only allocated 3 passbooks a day to sell to the public. Ms. Higgins said these regularly sellout and unfortunately it can take 1 to 2 weeks before the drivers are allocated more passbooks to sell to the public. Ms. Higgins wanted this comment included in the SRTP record and asked that I intervene with PCT management to see if drivers could be allocated more passbooks to sell to the public and to have them available to sell on a more regular basis. Ms. Higgins said this is a customer service issue and that if we want better ridership we should be providing passbooks for sale. Ms. Higgins says she has talked with PCT dispatch but this has not lead to any improvement. Ms. Higgins can be reached at 603.498.3278.

On July 18, 2018, MV Transportation, contractor for Placer County Transit dial-a-ride, contacted Ms. Higgins to let her know that her bus driver would have ticket books available for purchase and apologized for the lack of ticket books. Ms. Higgins was also told that her ride on July 18 would be free due to the inconvenience placed on her.

**Comment Carol Morse, Comment #26
No.**

- 1 Consider a Dial-A-Ride Bus Pilot Program to serve the residents at McAuley Meadows

Responses

McAuley Meadows is a senior housing community located in the City of Auburn. Auburn Transit's Blue Route serves this location Monday through Friday, and the Green Route serves this location on Saturdays. Unfortunately, Placer County Transit (PCT) dial-a-ride does not serve McAuley Meadows. McAuley Meadows is located about one mile beyond the 3/4 mile service area for PCT dial-a-ride service.