



1. EXECUTIVE  
SUMMARY

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

## CHAPTER 1.0 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) is to objectively and comprehensively evaluate the City of Roseville’s public transit program’s performance, identify and quantify transit demand, and identify strategies for enhancing community mobility.

Moore & Associates was retained by the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) in 2010 to conduct SRTPs for the western Placer County cities of Roseville and Auburn, as well as Placer County Transit. Through conducting the three SRTPs concurrently, PCTPA seeks to enhance regional coordination among the transit operators and focus transportation resources throughout the region in an efficient and effective manner.

The City of Roseville operates Roseville Transit which includes a fixed-route service, commuter service, and Dial-A-Ride program. Roseville Transit consists of 10 fixed-route alignments serving Roseville weekdays, between 6:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. and Saturday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. The City has four main transfer points (Sierra Garden, Civic Center, Louis Lane/Orlando Avenue, and Roseville Galleria Mall) which provide opportunities for connections between Roseville Transit and various transit operators (Auburn Transit, Placer County Transit, Sacramento Regional Transit, and Lincoln Transit). The Dial-A-Ride program complements the fixed-route service in coverage and service hours. Roseville’s commuter service provides nine morning and evening trips respectively to/from downtown Sacramento during peak-commute hours.

### Title VI Compliance

As part of the six-county region governed by the Sacramento Council of Governments, investments made by the City of Roseville must be consistent with federal Title VI requirements. Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, income, and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. Public outreach to and involvement of individuals in low income and minority communities covered under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and subsequent Civil Rights Restoration Act, and series federal statutes enacted pertaining to environmental justice, are critical to regional planning and programming decisions. The fundamental principles of environmental justice include:

- Avoiding, minimizing or mitigating disproportionately high and adverse health or environmental effects on minority and low-income population;
- Ensuring full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process; and
- Preventing the denial, reduction or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority populations and low-income communities.

The decision process by which new projects are selected for inclusion in the Short Range Transit Plan must consider equitable solicitation of project candidates in accordance with federal Title VI requirements.<sup>1</sup>

#### Short Range Transit Plan Process

On July 15, 2010 Moore & Associates conducted a project initiation meeting with PCTPA and representatives from each public transit operators. The kick-off meeting included review of the project schedule, discussed project expectations, defined project success, and presented schedule of deliverables.

Our project team conducted customer surveys and ride checks onboard Roseville Transit between September 28, 2010 and October 2, 2010. Community workshops were held on November 2 and 3 in 2010 in conjunction with PCTPA's "unmet transit needs" public hearings. In total, five meetings were held throughout the county; in Auburn, Lincoln, Loomis, Rocklin, and Roseville. These meetings served as an opportunity for residents to participate in the transit service planning process and to provide input.

Moore & Associates utilized demographic and population data (Census Bureau data), economic data (California Department of Finance), rider and non-rider (community) survey data, and information gathered from community meetings to identify service gaps in mobility needs, accessibility, and community perception. Our project team analyzed the existing transit system to generate recommendations which sought to find a balance of productivity and coverage. In addition, operations and performance data were provided by the City and collected through field observations to assess transit performance based on specific indicators such as operating cost per passenger.

The Short Range Transit Plan is divided into three chapters (i.e., Executive Summary; Goals, Objectives, and Performance Standards; and Service Plan) and an Appendix includes three sections (i.e., Existing Conditions, Public Input, and Peer Review) focused on presenting collected data, insightful analysis, and recommendations intended to enhance the transit services managed by the City of Roseville. The following narrative presents a brief summary and findings of each chapter or section.

The Performance Measurement System is the foundation for developing the Short Range Transit Plan. In addition to the Performance Measurement System, we developed regional and local goals for Roseville. These goals assess the actual performance of the public transit programs (i.e., fixed-route, dial-a-ride, and commuter service) provided by the City within the framework performance standards and goals.

---

<sup>1</sup>Sacramento Area Council of Governments. 2010. Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program 2011/14. (September 9, 2010).

### 3.0 Service Plan

The purpose of the Service Plan chapter is to present our recommendations based on the key finding generated from our assessment of the service as well as other performance data revealed through public involvement activities. The Service Plan chapter is divided into three sections: highlighting enhancement alternatives, capital and financial impacts with each funding scenarios, and implementation of proposed enhancement scenarios. Two scenarios were developed – a status quo scenario with minor improvements (Alternative A) and scenario including additional operational and capital improvements to the existing transit network (Alternative B). Each alternative includes some level of operational, administrative, capital, and marketing enhancements.

**Alternative A** presents a low-cost scenario recommending the implementation of minor operational and administrative enhancements to maximize the effectiveness of service within existing resources. This alternative is meant to address the customer and community input and observations made in the most cost-effective manner. Alternative A seeks to improve the experience and image of Roseville Transit for both riders and non-riders. Alternative A recommendations include:

- Adjust wait/transfer times.
- Extend hours of operation.
- Modify operating schedules.
- Enhance connections with Placer County Transit
- Introduce “new route” policy.
- Conduct Park & Ride Feasibility study.
- Conduct Transfer Point Locational study.
- Conduct Service Optimization study.
- Conduct annual Community Survey.
- Enhance Route G connection to PCT Taylor Road Shuttle extension.
- Increase farebox recovery ratio standard.

There are advantages and disadvantages to every change implemented within a transit program. Disadvantages will typically include the cost of the enhancement and increases to Vehicle Service Miles and Vehicle Service Hours. For this alternative, the disadvantages mainly include an increase in marketing and short-term administrative costs. Foreseeable advantages include:

#### Advantages

- High probability of ridership growth, especially during evening hours.
- Retain familiarity to current riders.
- Improved on-time performance.
- Increase in ridership.
- Increase in fare revenue.
- Increase in service connectivity and coordination.
- Low-cost relative to the other service scenario.
- Increased customer satisfaction.

- Increase student ridership on Roseville Transit service.

**Alternative B** incorporates the recommendations made in Alternative A plus additional capital/infrastructure and schedule improvements. This alternative seeks to enhance the existing service through expansion of existing services through introduction of new routes to provide transportation options to underserved areas, elimination and extensions of existing routes/route segments, as well as improvement of bus stop visibility through recommending the replacement of all bus stop signs with more visible and identifiable signage. The following are all the recommendations under Alternative B include:

- Establish new stops along Route S.
- Increase off-peak hour frequencies on select routes.
- Reduce Route G and I runs during the late afternoon.
- Assume operation of Placer County Transit Dial-A-Ride services.
- Expand service to new and existing developments.
- Consider Extending Service South Along the I-80 Corridor
- Include Louis Lane/Orlando Blvd stop as a West Roseville Shuttle stop.
- Modify Route M.
- Extend Route R.
- Introduce Western Roseville route.
- Enhance bus stop amenities and transfer points.

For this alternative, the disadvantages include an increase in capital, operational, and marketing costs, with possible short-term drop in farebox recovery while new services take root. Foreseeable advantages include:

#### Advantages

- Ridership and revenue growth.
- Improved on-time performance.
- Increased customer satisfaction.
- Increase service connectivity and coordination.
- Enhanced awareness and ridership in previously “underserved” areas.
- Increased customer awareness of Roseville Transit.
- Reduction in service overlap.
- Increased student ridership.
- Enhanced amenities at customer wait areas.
- Reduced transfer penalty/wait times.

#### Appendix A: Existing Conditions

The cornerstone goal of the Existing Conditions section is to assess the current climate by quantifying actual performance and analyzing recent data (i.e., on-time performance and boarding and alighting data) collected during ride checks and field observations. This chapter – presented in

as Appendix A – is divided into five sections: Demographic Analysis, Service Evaluation, Ride Check Analysis, Transfer Analysis, and Marketing Assessment. Below is a list of key findings from these sections.

#### A.1 Demographic Analysis

- Residents living within the more densely populated areas are served by Roseville Transit Lines R, S, M, D, and I; while communities located further north of these lines – Blue Oaks, Quail Glen, and Sun City – are beyond reasonable walking distance of Roseville Transit alignments (Exhibit A.1.8).
- The greatest concentration of youth resides within the highest populated area north of Junction Blvd, east of Washington Street, west of Fiddymment Road, and north of Baseline Road (Exhibit A.1.10).
- The highest concentration of seniors resides in Sun City near the Sun City Roseville Golf Course and alongside Del Webb Blvd, also known as an “active adult community (55+)” specifically tailored to the senior population (Exhibit A.1.12)
- Similar to the senior population, the highest concentration of persons with disabilities reside in Sun City developments parallel to Baseline Road extending eastward to Washington Blvd and northward to Pleasant Grove Blvd (Exhibit A.1.14)
- The City’s low-income population grew 82.3 percent between 2000 and 2009, likely influenced by to the economic downturn experienced across the past two years (A.1.15).
- The highest concentrations of households lacking access to a personal vehicle (351 or more) are located in the communities of Maidu and Enwood, parallel to Interstate 80 (A.1.18).

#### A.2 Service Evaluation

- The City continues to meet the TDA farebox recovery ratio of 15 percent.
- Despite the economic recession, ridership has remained relatively stable.
- Fixed-route service dropped by 11.3 percent in FY 2009/10, the greatest decline across the evaluation period.
- The City should consider reallocating Vehicle Service Hours to more productive lines to improve cost-effectiveness.
- Commuter Service had excellent farebox recovery throughout the evaluation period, but was below the farebox recovery ratios observed in the prior Short Range Transit Plan.
- Performance metrics point to the Commuter Service reaching market saturation in FY 2007/08. The City may wish to consider assigning resources to other programs or reducing fares to attract additional riders.
- High operating costs are the greatest threat to cost-effectiveness for the Commuter Service.
- The Dial-A-Ride Service has a much higher farebox recovery rate than other providers in Placer County.
- In spite of lower ridership across the system, operating costs which are a primary concern of the City of Roseville stayed relatively stable. Such may point to administrative costs being the main cause of rising system costs.

- The variety of fare options as well as the unrestricted use of the Dial-A-Ride Service provide great flexibility and should be the focus of marketing campaigns supporting the Dial-A-Ride service.

### A.3 Ride Check Analysis

- *Early* departures or arrivals occurred approximately 12 percent of the time, rising to 13 percent during the *late afternoon*.
- Roseville Transit was on-time 81.1 percent of the time during ride checks.
- Route M had the best on-time performance compared to other Roseville routes, exceeding the 90 percent on-time performance standard across all day-parts.
- Route M achieved 100 percent on-time performance during *early morning*, *late morning*, and *late afternoon* trips.
- The highest system averages of *early* departures or arrivals occurred during the *late morning* and *late afternoon* day-parts.
- Overall on-time performance was highest during the beginning of each trip gradually decreasing in reliability as the trip approached its end (Exhibit A.3.4).
- Late departures occurred on Route D during 50 percent of trips in the *early afternoon* (A.3.6).
- Routes A, G, and S had more *early* arrivals than other Roseville routes. Boarding averages dropped during the *late afternoon*.
- Route B had the highest boarding average (13 boardings per trip) compared with all other Roseville Transit routes.
- The second-highest boarding activity occurred on Route R (Exhibit A.3.7)
- The service experienced a gradual increase in system alighting activity between *late morning* and *early afternoon* day-parts, dropping to about four alightings per trip during the *late afternoon* day-part (Exhibit A.3.8).
- Routes G, I, and S produced the fewest number of boardings and alightings.
- Routes A and B were the next highest in alighting activity, considerably more productive during the *late morning* and *early afternoon* than any other day part.
- Routes A, B, C, D, G, I, and L had higher alighting averages during the *late morning* and *early afternoon (off-peak hours)*, with the exception of routes C, L, M, R, and S; which experienced high alighting averages during other day-parts.
- The highest boarding average (11.1 boardings per trip) on Route A occurred during the *early afternoon*, while the highest alighting (11.0 alightings per trip) occurred between 9:31 a.m. and 12:30 p.m.
- Route B experienced the greatest activity during the *late afternoon* and *early morning* trips.
- Route C's boarding and alighting trends differed from overall system trends as the busiest day-parts were in the *late afternoon* in addition to the *late morning* day-part.
- Route D experienced more boardings during all day-parts than alightings.
- Route G's stop activity (1.6 boardings per trip and 2.5 alightings per trip) was far less than the system's average for boardings and alightings.



- As illustrated in Exhibits A.3.37 and A.3.38, the greatest stop activity occurred at the Civic Center transfer point.
- Route L had a similar route average as the system boarding and alighting average (5.5 boardings per trip and 5.3 alightings per trip).
- Route M as one of the more productive routes.
- Ridership remains relatively low on Route R.
- Ride check data show Route S had higher boardings in the morning than any other day-part.

#### A.4 Transfer Analysis

- The highest transfer activity occurred during midday or off-peak hours (between 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m.).
- The majority of riders prefer to use Roseville Routes A, B, and D and Placer County Transit for their regional connections.
- Route A and PCT connections vary from five minutes at the Roseville Galleria to 37 minutes at the Louis/Orlando transfer point.
- PCT to Roseville Transit connections averaged 7.6 transfers, while connections from Roseville Transit to PCT averaged 5.8 transfers.
- Transfer data reveal no activity on Routes G, I, L, and the Commuter Service.
- The greatest percentage of transfers at the Civic Center transfer point occurred between routes A and D (28.6 percent). Transfer data reveal more than 50 percent of riders transferred from another Roseville route, namely Route D.
- SacRT to Roseville Transit route connections comprised more than 35 percent of transfers at the Louis Lane/Orlando Blvd transfer point.
- Nearly 60 percent of transfers at the Sierra Gardens transfer point occurred on Route C as the origin route. Interestingly, Route L and Route B were used more often as destination routes than other Roseville routes.
- Transfers with PCT as the origin route comprised more than 41 percent of Roseville Galleria transfers, while connections between Roseville Transit and PCT (as destination trips) comprised 48 percent of transfers.

#### Appendix B: Public Input

The Public Input chapter presents the analysis and findings collected from a variety of public involvement activities conducted across a three-month period. These activities garnered input from both the general community at-large and the current riders. The ultimate goal is community-driven recommendations for Roseville Transit. The following is a list of findings revealed from our community outreach activities.

#### B.1 Onboard Survey Analysis

- The *17 to 25 years* and *26 to 44 years* categories had the highest share of survey respondents at approximately 32 percent each.

- Approximately 36 percent of Roseville Transit riders were employed, either full-time or part-time, while nearly 24 percent indicated being a *full-time student*.
- A relatively large portion of Roseville Transit riders indicated they were *not currently employed*, yet seeking work.
- Nearly 79 percent indicated not having ready access to a private automobile.
- Those earning *less than \$20,000* make up the majority of patrons for both frequent and non-frequent riders. This is a reflection of low-income individuals being a dominant rider group for Roseville Transit.
- The majority of Roseville Transit riders, more specifically everyday riders, use the service for commuter-related trips (i.e., home-to-work and home-to-school).
- Nearly 44 percent of respondents indicated they used the service for their trip due to a *lack of other travel options*, while approximately 30 percent indicated they used the service out of *convenience*.
- More than 80 percent of riders indicated using Roseville Transit at least twice a week.
- Approximately 67 percent of the respondents have patronized Roseville Transit for at least one year.
- More than 40 percent of transfers were cited occurring between Roseville Transit and Placer County Transit.
- Nearly 70 percent stated their trip would require at least two buses to complete, meaning they would need to transfer either to another Roseville Transit bus or another service.
- The most frequent travel alternative was to *walk or bicycle* if Roseville Transit was not available.
- Approximately 64 percent of all respondents fell within the *general public* fare category.
- More than half (58 percent) of the riders surveyed stated they paid for their trip using a *single cash fare*.
- Frequency of use corresponded with type of fare used. Frequent riders were more likely to use the *monthly pass* than *cash fare* and the *daily pass* when riding Roseville Transit.
- When aggregated, 85 percent of respondents held a positive view of Roseville Transit.
- The top-ranked service changes were *later evening service* (33 percent) and *more frequent service* (26 percent). Two other service enhancements drew considerable interest: *Sunday service* (16 percent) and *more routes/extended service area* (14 percent).
- Among “frequent riders,” Sunday service is the most preferred enhancement while “less frequent riders” desire additional Saturday service.
- If the City implemented *later evening service*, (see Exhibit 2.1.20), approximately 4 percent of respondents who cited this improvement would make at least three additional trips per week.
- Forty-four percent of respondents indicated a willingness to pay an additional *twenty-five cents*. However, 38 percent indicated they *wouldn’t support any fare increase*.
- The two most popular information sources were *bus drivers* and information at the *bus stop*.

## B.2 Community Survey Analysis

- While more than 98 percent of the respondents indicated an unaided awareness of the City’s public transit service, only 16 percent cited riding Roseville Transit within the 90 days prior to survey contact.
- Roseville and Sacramento are the two primary work sites for the residents of Roseville. As such, Roseville Transit’s service (fixed-route and commuter service) is appropriate in meeting potential travel demand.
- Survey results reveal the majority of respondents did not utilize Roseville Transit to access their destination.
- The majority of respondents indicated preferring *to drive themselves* to their prospective destinations (50 percent to 100 percent).
- Over 62 percent of survey respondents had an *excellent experience* on Roseville Transit with more than 37 percent citing a *good experience*. No respondent held unfavorable views of Roseville Transit.
- The primary motivation to of those who frequently use (defined as four or more times per week) Roseville Transit is *save money*.
- The primary barrier to using the service is a preference for *driving their own car* (74 percent).
- Over half of *non-riders* stated *nothing would change their minds* with regard to service improvements. This suggests Roseville Transit will have great difficulty attracting “choice riders.”
- The high proportion of *non-riders* who would not switch modes no matter the service improvement suggests Roseville Transit would be better served focusing on improving service for *existing riders*.
- The most frequent riders (*four or more times per week*) cited *more weekend service* as the preferred service improvement.
- Only the 95747 ZIP had an equal number of respondents stating *no service improvement would change their mind* and *more frequent service*.
- Based on survey findings, implementation of the preferred service improvement by those residing 95747 zip code could yield between *two or three* additional trips per week.
- The *17 to 24 years old* cohort represents a potentially receptive market to Roseville Transit especially for commuting to school and/or work.
- Based on Exhibits B.2.15 and B.2.16, Roseville Transit should consider *more frequent service* on key routes to boost ridership.
- In terms of those *employed outside the home* (i.e., commuters), *more frequent service* and *more service on weekends* were the most favored service improvements.

## B.3 Public Workshop

- There is a desire for Dial-A-Ride service to go to Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) or Health & Human Services in Rocklin.

- Concern arose regarding Dial-A-Ride driver wait times – a patron was left at their doctor’s appointment by Dial-A-Ride driver.
- There is a desire to expand Roseville Transit service to Eskaton Village, a 48-unit affordable senior (ages 62 and older) housing community located in Roseville. It was noted that Route M used to service this area but has since been re-routed to service Fairway. With respect to the Lassen County example mentioned by a public workshop attendee, the request was for a service which served this area one to three times per week.
- Review bus stop placement to ensure customers are able to access transit within a walkable distance.

#### Appendix E: Peer Review and Fare Analysis

In this section we compared Roseville Transit’s performance with selected transit operators (i.e., Thousand Oaks Transit, City of Folsom, and Fairfield and Suisun Transit) through a performance peer review. In most categories, Roseville Transit performed relatively well, nearly matching each indicator (of the peer average) with often lower operating cost per performance indicator reflecting the service efficiency.

Lastly, we analyzed Roseville Transit’s existing fare structure and compared it with other transit operators located within northern California. The fare analysis concludes Roseville Transit’s fares are competitive with its peers, providing categories and pricing similar to other northern California providers, yet higher than the County’s and Auburn’s public transit programs.