



CHAPTER 2 - CONTEXT FOR WESTERN PLACER CTSA

This chapter provides background information important to consider in planning for the future of the WPCTSA. This includes updated demographic information on the various target groups of Placer County residents who might need CTSA services. A review of selected CTSA's organizations and an assessment of recent unmet transit needs hearings was undertaken and is included as Appendix B, contributing to this analysis of context.

Update of Placer County Demographics

Identifying the target populations, their relative sizes and demographic trends informs the planning efforts of WPCTSA's programs. Growth projections will be validated by the release of the 2010 US Census data which, at the time of this writing were not yet available. However, a comparison of the data that is currently available leads to a richer understanding of the continuing need for specialized transportation in Placer County. Table 1 compares the populations of various subgroups as provided by the 2000 US Census, the 2005-2009 American Community Survey, and the 2007-2009 American Community Survey (ACS). Not all figures are available in the ACS data as these updates work only with subsets of the data and smaller sample sizes. Target populations of interest to this discussion and included in Table 1 are: low-income adults, adults with disabilities, seniors, low-income seniors and seniors with disabilities.

Table 1

Placer County Target Populations, Potential Specialized Transit Riders	2000 US Census, Placer County, Summary File 3			2005-2009 American Community Survey (5 year estimates)			2007-2009 American Community Survey (3 year estimates)		
	People by Category	% of Total Population	% of Sub Population	People by Category	% of Total Population	% of Sub Population	People by Category	% of Total Population	% of Sub Population
Placer County Total Population <i>% change over 2000</i>	248,399	100%		332,059	100%	33.7%	340,448	100%	37.1%
ADULTS									
Adults, 15-64	160,617	64.7%		215,878	65.0%		221,099	64.9%	
Adults, 18-64	150,407	60.6%			n/a			n/a	
Low-Income Adults, 18-64 [1]	8,755	3.5%	5.8% % of adult pop. 18+		n/a			n/a	
Adults with Disabilities, 16-64 [2]	34,537	13.9%			n/a			n/a	
Occupied Housing Units	93,382			125,046			126,881		
No Vehicles Available per housing units	4,621		4.9%	4,317		3.5%	4,901		3.9%
SENIORS 65+	32,043	12.9%		49,489	14.9%		51,845	15.2%	
Seniors, ages 65-74	17,458	7.0%		27,063	8.2%		28,299	8.3%	
Seniors, ages 75-84	11,408	4.6%		16,631	5.0%		16,899	5.0%	
Seniors, ages 85 +	3,177	1.3%		5,795	1.7%		6,647	2.0%	
Low-Income Seniors 65 + [1]	1,200	0.5%	3.7% % of senior pop. 65 +		n/a			n/a	
Seniors with Disabilities 65 + [2]	18,017	7.3%	56.2% % of senior pop. 65 +		n/a			n/a	

[1] This reports individuals who income in 1999 was below poverty level as defined by the Census Bureau.

[2] This count does not report the "go-outside-home" disability category as this question's wording in the 2000 census led to a over-representation of this population.



Continual overall growth in the County's population is demonstrated, given a 2000 census population of 248,399 and increasing to a total population of 340,448 persons for the 2007-2009 ACS, an increase of 37%. The 2010 decennial census validates this growth with the total county population reported as 348,432 persons.

Income and disability estimates are not available in the ACS, but one can see that the larger subpopulations are experiencing growth as well. Most notably, 15.2% of Placer County's population was 65 years or older in the 2007-2009 ACS, as compared to 12.9% of the County's 2000 population. This increase is a mix both of new seniors moving into Placer County with other residents aging-in-place. Of note, while seniors with disabilities made up 7.3% of the overall County's 2000 population, that group made up over half (56.2%) of the County's senior population. Also notable, the oldest-old, persons age 85 and older, are estimated to double in number. The 2000 census reports 3,177 persons age 85 and older. The ACS 2007-2009 estimates 6,647 persons age 85 and older. As the senior population increases, the proportion of individuals with disabilities will increase as well.

An additional variable that suggests transportation dependence is reflected in those occupied housing units without vehicles. In 2000, 4.9% of occupied housing units reported no vehicles. This percentage dropped according to the 2005-2009 ACS numbers, but rose with the 2007-2009 ACS activity, with 3.9% of the County's occupied housing units reporting no vehicle.

These population groups – seniors, persons with disabilities, those of low-income or without access to a functioning vehicle – are among those who may have need of the specialized transportation programs that the WPCTSA offers.

Annual Unmet Transit Needs Hearing Process, Prior Year Testimony



PLACER COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION
PLANNING AGENCY

Annually, the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency is required to conduct public hearings on unmet transit needs, necessary before it can approve budgeted allocations to its transportation providers. PCTPA receives testimony from Placer County constituents and determines whether these represent unmet transit needs and whether these are needs that can be reasonable to meet. Its definition of an unmet transit need, last amended September 2006 is:

An unmet transit need is an expressed or identified need which is not currently being met through the existing system of public transportation services. Unmet transit needs are also those needs required to comply with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.



Criteria for determining reasonable to meet include impacts of any new service on the State's fare box recovery requirements, level of community support, conformance with the Regional Transportation Plan and consistency with the goals of the adopted Short Range Transit Plan for the given jurisdiction.

The PCTPA Unmet Transit Needs Analysis and Recommendations Final Report for FY 2010/2011, dated February 24, 2010 reported on a total of 83 consolidated unmet needs comments. Five general categories of comments are developed to analyze comments received. These are: Service Area; Service Frequency; Service Span; New Service/ Route Extension; and Americans with Disabilities Act issues. There is an Other Requests category as well.

Summarized here are the public comments offered that are relevance to the discussion of WPCTSA functions, as well as those of the overall public transit program in relation to the target populations of older persons, persons with disabilities and those of low-income. With regard to the Tahoe and Truckee area, comments included below are only those related to connectivity with Western Placer County. Also not included are the staff responses and analysis related to these comments.

New Service/ Route Extensions (2009 Public Hearings)

- Need connectivity to achieve seamless travel across the Sacramento region.
- Sheridan needs transit or dial-a-ride service.
- Foresthill needs lifeline level of transit service.
- Transit service is needed in the SR 193 corridor.
- There needs to be connectivity from Truckee and the north shore area of Tahoe to Auburn and points west.
- Placer County unincorporated – Students (youth) with disabilities need to get to an equestrian program for persons with disabilities out by Lorensen Road.
- Rocklin – Need more routes in Rocklin for persons with disabilities, seniors and student to be able to travel independently out of the neighborhood; need cost-effective service; CTSA trips [at that time] cost \$7 a one-way trips and this is too expensive.
- Roseville – Need more bus service to get to Sutter Roseville Hospital, Douglas Boulevard and Sierra Gardens. Dial-a-ride is very limited in where it can take you and in availability.
- Rocklin – Need better services to Sierra College campus (consistent and door-to-door).

Service Area (2009 Public Hearings)

- Roseville Transit and Placer County Transit DAR services should be allowed to cross boundary lines, example Roseville to Rocklin.



Service Schedule (2009 Public Hearings)

- Placer County Transit and Roseville Transit should offer DAR service on winter holidays – Thanksgiving, Christmas and New Years.

Other (2009 Public Hearings)

- Need better PUBLICITY. Commenter was “astonished to find that all of the other attendees to a 55 Alive drivers class for seniors were unaware of the public bus systems in the area. They were eager to learn more.
- Commenter requested a “paratransit specialist” program for Roseville Transit and Placer County Transit. “I was surprised to find out that we do not have people to train those to use the bus that are disabled or elderly. The Transit Ambassador Program in Roseville is great but I think we need to pay people to do more extensive, one-to-one training for those who are confused about the bus system.”
- Need for a region-wide, centralized trip planning and coordination mechanism as a strategic tool to help build ridership.
- Develop a regional Social Service Transportation Advisory Committee (SSTAC) to address the Resort Area Triangle social service transportation issues, including out-of-the-area transportation, wheelchair capacity for ADA transportation, outreach and information sharing.

Summary

This chapter, along with the supporting information included as Appendix B, reviewed various contextual issues.

Documented available population information, showing the substantial levels of population growth which the county must continue to anticipate. Almost 100,000 new residents were added over the past nine years, according to the latest American Community Survey data. The 2010 census, not available at the time of writing, confirmed continuing growth with its enumeration of 348,432 persons.

Seniors are increasing steadily, both in total number and as a proportion of the population. Placer County is beginning to experience the front-end of the aging baby boomers, as well as receiving other retirees who wish to live in rural settings that are adjacent to major urbanized areas. It appears that they grow from the 2000 Census 12.9 percent to an estimated 15.2 percent (ACS 2008-2009), representing almost 20,000 additional persons over age 65. And the increase in the oldest-old persons over age 85 grows also, from 1.2 percent of the total population to 2 percent,



effectively doubling the size of that group. No updated information on income levels or disability status is available.

Researching CTSA experiences in other California counties, summarized in Appendix B, returned information on five programs, two operated by public transit agencies and three by non-profit, 501 (c)3 organizations. The public agencies tended to have small CTSA programs, components of their larger mission to provide public transportation in the traditional modes of fixed-route and demand responsive services. The non-profits had somewhat more entrepreneurial, multi-faceted CTSA programs and were more likely to have a broader mix of services and more diverse funding base.

Comments received during that unmet needs cycle that involve specialized transportation needs are summarized. By and large, the FY 2010/11 recommendations, related to these and similar comments, propose using this short range transit plan development process, and the parallel SRTTP effort for the County's public transit providers, to identify ways to address these needs.



THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK.