

**AGENDA
REGULAR MEETING
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

DATE: Thursday, November 17, 2016
3:00 P.M.

LOCATION: **Board of Supervisors Chambers**
481 Fourth Street, Hollister, CA 95023

DIRECTORS: Chair Tony Boch, Vice Chair Ignacio Velazquez,
Anthony Botelho, Victor Gomez, and Jerry Muenzer
Alternates: San Benito County: Jaime De La Cruz;
City of Hollister: Mickie Luna; San Juan Bautista: Jim West

*Persons who wish to address the Board of Directors must complete a Speaker Card and give it to the Clerk prior to addressing the Board. Those who wish to address the Board on an agenda item will be heard when the Chairperson calls for comments from the audience. Following recognition, persons desiring to speak are requested to advance to the podium and state their name and address. After hearing audience comments, the Public Comment portion of the agenda item will be closed. **The opportunity to address the Board of Directors on items of interest not appearing on the agenda will be provided during Section B. Public Comment.***

3:00 P.M. CALL TO ORDER:

- A. **ACKNOWLEDGE** Certificate of Posting
- B. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** (Opportunity to address the Board on items of interest not appearing on the agenda. No action may be taken unless provided by Govt. Code Sec. 54954.2. **Speakers are limited to 3 minutes.**)

CONSENT AGENDA:

(These matters shall be considered as a whole and without discussion unless a particular item is removed from the Consent Agenda. Members of the public who wish to speak on a Consent Agenda item must submit a Speaker Card to the Clerk and wait for recognition from the Chairperson. Approval of a consent item means approval as recommended on the Staff Report.)

1. **APPROVE** Local Transportation Authority Draft Meeting Minutes Dated October 20, 2016 – Gomez
2. **RECEIVE** Specialized Transportation/Jovenes de Antaño September 2016 Monthly Service Report – Valentine
3. **RECEIVE** County Express/MV Transportation September 2016 Monthly Operations Report – Valentine
4. **ADOPT** Resolution 16-04 Allocating Transportation Development Act Funds for Fiscal Year 2015/2016 – Postigo

REGULAR AGENDA:

5. **RECEIVE** Report on the Performance of the County Express Shuttle Service to the San Benito County Fair – Valentine
6. **RECEIVE** Presentation on County Express Commuter Rail Service to Gilroy – Valentine

Adjourn to LTA Meeting on Thursday, December 15, 2016. Agenda deadline is November 29, 2016 at 12:00 p.m.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), if requested, the Agenda can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability. If an individual wishes to request an alternative agenda format, please contact the Clerk of the Council four (4) days prior to the meeting at (831) 637-7665. The Local Transportation Authority Board of Directors meeting facility is accessible to persons with disabilities. If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Clerk of the Board's office at (831) 637-7665 at least 48 hours before the meeting to enable the Council of Governments to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility.

**San Benito County
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING**

October 20, 2016 3:00 P.M.

DRAFT MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chair Boch, Director Botelho, Director Velazquez, and Director De La Cruz

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Director Gomez

STAFF PRESENT:

Deputy County Counsel, Shirley Murphy; Executive Director, Mary Gilbert; Transportation Planner, Veronica Lezama; Transportation Planner, Regina Valentine; Secretary, Monica Gomez

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Boch called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m.

A. CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

Upon a motion duly made by Director De La Cruz, and seconded by Director Velazquez, the Directors unanimously acknowledged the Certificate of Posting. Vote: 4/0 motion passes.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT: None

CONSENT AGENDA:

- 1. Approve** Local Transportation Authority Draft Meeting Minutes Dated September 15, 2016 – Gomez
- 2. Receive** Specialized Transportation/Jovenes de Antaño August 2016 Monthly Service Report
- 3. Receive** County Express/MV Transportation August 2016 Monthly Operations Report – Valentine
- 4. Adopt** Resolution 16-03 Authorizing Executive Director to Apply for an Accept Public Transportation Modernization, Improvements, and Service Enhancement Account Funds Totaling \$160,000 for a Project Titled, “Yard Capital Improvements” – Valentine

There was no discussion or public comment on the Consent Agenda.

Upon a motion duly made by Director Velazquez, and seconded by Director De La Cruz, the Directors unanimously approved Items 1-4 from the Consent Agenda, with an abstention on Item 1 from Director Botelho. Vote: 4/0 motion passes.

REGULAR AGENDA:

- 5. APPROVE** Contract Amendment #4 to the Contract Between LTA and Jovenes de Antaño (JDA) dated December 16, 2010 – Valentine

Regina Valentine reported that the current contract between LTA and JDA was due to expire at the end of 2016. Staff proposed to exercise a contract optional year for 2017. The contract amendment would allow JDA to continue to provide Specialized Transportation Services for LTA.

The Board asked for clarification regarding the increase and breakdown of the cost. They requested that in the future staff provides all of the back-up information in their packets for review.

Pauline Valdivia with Jovenes de Antaño provided further information on the cost breakdown. She noted that she could provide additional information/documentation in needed.

There was no public comment.

Director De La Cruz made a motion to approve Item 5 and Director Botelho seconded the motion under the stipulation that on future contracts, changes should not be made at the end of the contract. Vote: 4/0 motion passes.

Upon a motion duly made by Director De La Cruz, and seconded by Director Botelho, the Directors unanimously adjourned the LTA meeting at 4:30 p.m. Vote:4/0 motion passes.

ADJOURN TO LTA MEETING NOVEMBER 17, 2016.



Jovenes de Antaño

Specialized Transportation Services

Monthly Service Report - September 2016

WEEKDAYS

Service	Passengers	Vehicle Revenue Hours	Vehicle Revenue Miles	Donations/Fares Collected	Service Days
Out-of-County	417	278.50	3,960	\$ -	21
Senior Lunch	845	119.50	1,089	\$ -	21
Medical/Shopping Assistance	132	113.75	1,151	\$ 155.00	17
Total	1,394	511.75	6,200	\$ 155.00	

WEEKENDS

Service	Passengers	Vehicle Revenue Hours	Vehicle Revenue Miles	Donations/Fares Collected	Service Days
Out-of-County	107	29.00	231	\$ -	4
Total	107	29.00	231	\$ -	

MONTH

Service	Passengers	Vehicle Revenue Hours	Vehicle Revenue Miles	Donations/Fares Collected	Service Days
Out-of-County	524	307.50	4,191	\$ -	25
Senior Lunch	845	119.50	1,089	\$ -	21
Medical/Shopping Assistance	132	113.75	1,151	\$ 155.00	17
Total	1,501	540.75	6,431	\$ 155.00	

FISCAL YEAR TO DATE

Service	Passengers	Vehicle Revenue Hours	Vehicle Revenue Miles	Donations/Fares Collected	Service Days
Out-of-County	1,526	1,098.25	14,727	\$ 305.25	72
Senior Lunch	2,768	369.00	3,360	\$ -	64
Medical/Shopping Assistance	407	336.50	3,346	\$ 468.75	54
Total	4,701	1,803.75	21,433	\$ 774.00	

VEHICLE MILEAGE INFORMATION

Vehicle Number	Ending Odometer
733	132239
734	172405
735	99237
736	86662
737	86240
738	60439

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Service	Current Month	Year To Date
Lift Assisted Trips	118	288
Unduplicated Passengers	110	355
Turn Downs		0
No Shows		0
Cancellations		0
Employee Hours		0.00
Vehicles - Midday		
Vehicles - Peak		

NOTES



Jovenes de Antaño

Specialized Transportation Services

Monthly Service Report - September 2016

OUT OF COUNTY

Week of	ONE WAY PASSENGERS					DONATIONS					REVENUE HOURS					REVENUE MILES													
	M	T	W	TH	F	S	Total	M	T	W	TH	F	S	Total	M	T	W	TH	F	S	Total	M	T	W	TH	F	S	Total	
9/1-3/2016			19	19		65	103							0	14.25	13.75	13.75	14.25	14.25	7.25	7.25	35.25	229	211					452
9/5-10/2016			23	21	21	15	93							0	13.25	17.75	14.75	7.25	7.25	60	102	211	387	148	90		938		
9/12-17/2016	21	19	22	17	19	12	110							0	12.75	14	11	12.75	8	7.25	65.75	161	150	138	157	67	64	737	
9/19-24/2016	21	20	23	16	25	15	120							0	14.75	17.25	14.25	10.75	19.75	7.25	84	231	254	221	144	221	65	1136	
9/26-30/2016	19	19	22	17	21		98							0	13	13.25	13.75	10.25	12.25	62.5	168	211	228	173	148		928		
Total	61	71	90	90	105	107	524	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40.5	51.5	52.25	65.75	66.5	29	307.5	560	717	798	1090	795	231	4191	

SENIOR LUNCH

Week of	ONE WAY PASSENGERS					DONATIONS					REVENUE HOURS					REVENUE MILES																
	M	T	W	TH	F	S	Total	M	T	W	TH	F	S	Total	M	T	W	TH	F	S	Total	M	T	W	TH	F	S	Total				
9/1-3/2016			47	35		82							0	2.75	6.25	6	6	6.25	12.25	64	50					114						
9/5-10/2016			49	40	47	46	182							0	6.25	5.75	5	5.75	6	28.75	28	73	51	50	202	59	53	49	53	45		259
9/12-17/2016	47	33	32	45	32		189							0	4.5	7	6.25	3.25	5.75	26.75	53	58	48	52	50		261					
9/19-24/2016	47	41	43	39	43		213							0	6	5.75	6.75	5.75	6.5	30.75	56	43	50	57	47		253					
9/26-30/2016	45	36	21	46	31		179							0	16.75	21.25	24.25	26.75	30.5	119.5	168	182	220	277	242		1089					
Total	139	159	136	224	187		845	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																		

MEDICAL/SHOPPING ASSISTANCE

Week of	ONE WAY PASSENGERS					FARES					REVENUE HOURS					REVENUE MILES														
	M	T	W	TH	F	S	Total	M	T	W	TH	F	S	Total	M	T	W	TH	F	S	Total	M	T	W	TH	F	S	Total		
9/1-3/2016			8	8		16							0	7.25	6.5	6.75	4.5	4.5	12.75	72	78					150				
9/5-10/2016			6	11	12	4	33							0	7.25	9	7.75			27.5	63	73	103	34	273	30	67	86	72	255
9/12-17/2016	4	6	10	10			30	5	7.5	11	11.5			35	4	6.75	9	7.75		28	101	42	54	59	256	101	42	54	59	256
9/19-24/2016	8	7	6	8			29	10	7.5	7.5	10			35	8	7	5.5	7.5		28	53	80	84		217	53	80	84		217
9/26-30/2016	6	10	8				24	7.5	10	10				27.5	8.25	6.5	5.75			20.5	184	252	297	306	112		1151			
Total	18	29	35	38	12		132	22.5	32.5	38.5	46.5	15		155	20.25	27.5	26.75	27.75	11.5	113.75										

September 2016
San Benito County Express Monthly Operations Report
 Operated by MV transportation

Year to Year comparison

	2016	2015
Passengers Per Hour		
Dial a Ride/Paratransit	4.21	4.96
Fixed Route Service	6.50	6.30
Gavilan Service	11.86	13.53
Caltrain Service	5.22	7.17
Greyhound Service	3.34	4.14
Total Passengers	12,268	13,402
Total Revenue Hours	2,023.27	1,992.02
Passengers per Hour	6.06	6.72
Lift Trips	174	184
No Shows	72	99
Cancellations	255	260

WEEKDAYS September 2016

Service	Passengers	Incidental Passengers	Vehicle Revenue Hours	Vehicle Revenue Miles	Cash Fares Collected	Token Fares Collected	Token Sales	Service Days	Invoiced
Dial-A-Ride	2,206	8	283.41		\$ 791.44	\$ 563.42	\$ 126.50	21	\$ 12,516.24
Paratransit	1,548	36	633.45	12,940	\$ 2,374.35	\$ 1,690.28	\$ 379.50	21	\$ 27,975.05
Fixed Route	3,213	21	497.03	5,594	\$ 1,645.99	\$ 372.50	\$ 25.00	21	\$ 21,950.34
Gavilan	3,765	0	317.36	6,796	\$ 3,704.48	\$ 1,236.60	\$ 60.00	21	\$ 14,015.57
Caltrain	1,136	0	217.27	5,535	\$ 1,593.84	\$ 159.70	\$ -	21	\$ 9,595.30
Total	11,868	65	1,948.52	30,865	\$ 10,110.10	\$ 4,022.50	\$ 591.00	105	\$ 86,052.49

SATURDAY

Service	Passengers	Incidental Passengers	Vehicle Revenue Hours	Vehicle Revenue Miles	Cash Fares Collected	Token Fares Collected	Token Sales	Service Days	Invoiced
Dial-A-Ride	76	0	11.48	229	\$ 98.80	\$ 16.40	\$ -	4	\$ 506.99
Greyhound	72	0	26.77	768	\$ 141.00	\$ 9.20	\$ -	4	\$ 1,182.24
Total	148	0	38.25	997	\$ 239.80	\$ 25.60	\$ -	8	\$ 1,689.23

SUNDAY

Service	Passengers	Incidental Passengers	Vehicle Revenue Hours	Vehicle Revenue Miles	Cash Fares Collected	Token Fares Collected	\$ -	Service Days	Invoiced
Dial-A-Ride	54	26	10.50	222	\$ 65.60	\$ 18.70	\$ -	4	\$ 463.71
Greyhound	107	0	26.70	758	\$ 144.10	\$ 3.60	\$ -	4	\$ 1,179.15
Total	161	26	37.20	980	\$ 209.70	\$ 22.30	\$ -	8	\$ 1,642.86

MONTH

Service	Passengers	Incidental Passengers	Vehicle Revenue Hours	Vehicle Revenue Miles	Cash Fares Collected	Token Fares Collected	Token Sales	Service Days	Invoiced
Dial-A-Ride	2,336	34	305.39	451	\$ 955.84	\$ 598.52	\$ 126.50	29	\$ 13,486.94
Paratransit	1,548	36	633.45	12,940	\$ 2,374.35	\$ 1,690.28	\$ 379.50	21	\$ 27,975.05
Fixed Route	3,213	21	497.03	5,594	\$ 1,645.99	\$ 372.50	\$ 25.00	21	\$ 21,950.34
Gavilan	3,765	0	317.36	6,796	\$ 3,704.48	\$ 1,236.60	\$ 60.00	21	\$ 14,015.57
Caltrain	1,136	0	217.27	5,535	\$ 1,593.84	\$ 159.70	\$ -	21	\$ 9,595.30
Greyhound	179	0	53.47	1,526	\$ 285.10	\$ 12.80	\$ -	8	\$ 2,361.40
Total	12,177	91	2,023.97	32,842	\$ 10,559.60	\$ 4,070.40	\$ 591.00		\$ 89,384.59

FISCAL YEAR TO DATE

Service	Passengers	Incidental Passengers	Vehicle Revenue Hours	Vehicle Revenue Miles	Cash Fares Collected	Token Fares Collected	Token Sales	Service Days	Invoiced
Dial-A-Ride	5,334	88	915.35	1,421	\$ 2,678.49	\$ 1,366.12	\$ 264.00	90	\$ 40,424.60
Paratransit	4,751	122	1,823.08	37,364	\$ 6,342.43	\$ 3,834.68	\$ 792.00	64	\$ 80,512.68
Fixed Route	6,502	66	1,307.06	14,870	\$ 3,587.61	\$ 705.50	\$ 85.00	64	\$ 57,723.70
Gavilan	6,202	0	688.57	15,267	\$ 6,310.24	\$ 2,238.90	\$ 198.00	64	\$ 30,409.32
Caltrain	3,229	0	553.73	14,498	\$ 4,908.32	\$ 401.30	\$ -	64	\$ 24,454.38
Greyhound	542	0	176.45	4,318	\$ 872.13	\$ 35.50	\$ -	26	\$ 7,792.56
Total	26,561	276	5,464.24	87,738	\$ 24,699.22	\$ 8,582.00	\$ 1,339.00	0	\$ 241,317.23

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

	Current Month	Year To Date
Lift Assisted Trips	174	509
Turn Downs	0	0
No Shows	72	222
Cancellations	255	640
Employee Hours	3,268	7,066
Vehicles - Midday	7	
Vehicles - Peak	8	

NOTES

Greyhound Bikes = 0 Gavilan Bikes = 41 Caltrain Bikes = 6
Fixed Route = 0

FIXED ROUTE PASSENGER CT

	Business	Clockwise	Counter	Sunnyslope	Southside	Fixed Subtotal
1-Sep	26	54	59	6	17	162
2-Sep	24	67	69	2	14	176
3-Sep						
4-Sep						
5-Sep						
6-Sep	15	60	65	5	13	158
7-Sep	42	63	66	3	14	188
8-Sep	25	55	53	5	16	154
9-Sep	18	44	56	3	14	135
10-Sep						
11-Sep						
12-Sep	15	48	57	8	10	138
13-Sep	17	39	50	9	10	125
14-Sep	90	48	65	7	13	223
15-Sep	23	66	54	3	19	165
16-Sep	18	57	51	6	11	143
17-Sep						
18-Sep						
19-Sep	17	46	54	8	17	142
20-Sep	22	50	52	7	12	143
21-Sep	11	66	65	8	20	170
22-Sep	17	61	56	13	12	159
23-Sep	22	67	60	2	12	163
24-Sep						
25-Sep						
26-Sep	14	30	76	4	14	138
27-Sep	17	57	56	7	14	151
28-Sep	22	43	82	7	10	164
29-Sep	18	24	60	3	10	115
30-Sep	9	52	60	1	0	122
TOTALS DAILY	482	1097	1266	117	272	3234
AVERAG E	23	52	60	6	13	154

Staff Report

To: Local Transportation Authority
From: Kathy Postigo, Administrative Services Specialist **Telephone:** (831) 637-7665
Date: November 17, 2016
Subject: Allocation of Transportation Development Act Funds for Fiscal Year 2014/2015

Recommendation:

ADOPT Resolution 16-04 Allocating Transportation Development Act Funds for Fiscal Year 2015/2016.

Summary:

Each year the COG Board is required by the Transportation Development Act to allocate Local Transportation Funds and State Transit Assistance Funds.

Financial Considerations:

For the Fiscal Year 2015/2016 the Local Transportation Authority is requesting \$ 847,571.34 for Transit Operations under Article 4 and \$220,960 for Community Transit Services under Article 4.5. In total \$872,396.34 is allocated from FY 15/16 revenue. This amount still leaves \$700,000 which was set aside for local streets and roads in the approved Budget.

Background:

The Local Transportation Fund has been in existence since 1972 and is derived from a ¼ cent of the general sales tax collected statewide and returned to COG as Local Transportation Funds as defined under the Transportation Development Act. The State Transit Assistance Fund has been in existence since 1980 and is derived from the statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel. The State Transit Assistance Funds are monies allocated to the COG by the State Controller's Office based on the population of San Benito County and returned to COG to be used for public transit only.

Local Transportation Funds are to be used for statutory purposes in San Benito County and include (in priority order):

- TDA administration costs
- General public transit operations and capital

- Contract payments for transit services
- Transit-related research and development projects
- Administration of transit contracts
- Elderly and disabled transit
- Bicycle and pedestrian projects
- Local streets and roads (Cities & County based on population)

State Transportation Assistant Fund purposes in San Benito County include:

- Capital requirements of public transportation system
- Transit operations
- Contract payments for public transit services
- Administrative and planning cost of contracted public transportation

Staff Analysis:

Resolution 16-04 is required under the Transportation Development Act pursuant to Public Utilities Code Article 4 and Article 4.5 which are a part of the claims process. Listed below are the requirements of the claimants for the Local Transportation Funds and the State Transit Assistance Funds:

1. The Local Transportation Authority is in conformity with the Regional Transportation Plan.
2. The level of passenger fares and charges are sufficient to enable the Local Transportation Authority to meet the fare box revenue requirements of the Public Utilities Code.
3. The sum of the County of San Benito allocations from the State Transit Assistance Fund and from the Local Transportation Fund does not exceed the amount the claimant is eligible to receive during the fiscal year.
4. The Local Transportation Authority has submitted the certification required by the Department of California Highway Patrol verifying that the operator is in compliance with Section 1801.1 of the Vehicle Code.

Staff recommends that the Board APPROVE Resolution 16-04.

Executive Director Review: _____

Counsel Review: Yes

Attachment: Resolution 16-04

BEFORE THE SAN BENITO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

A RESOLUTION OF THE SAN BENITO)
COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION)
AUTHORITY AUTHORIZING THE FILING) Resolution No. 16-04
OF A CLAIM WITH THE COUNCIL)
OF SAN BENITO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS,)
ACTING AS THE REGIONAL)
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY,)
FOR ALLOCATION OF TRANSPORTATION)
DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS FOR)
FISCAL YEAR 2015/2016)

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act (TDA), as amended (California Public Utilities Code commencing with Section 99200 et seq.) provides for the allocation of funds from the Local Transportation Fund and the State Transit Assistance Fund by Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, for the use by eligible claimants for various transportation purposes; and

WHEREAS, the Council of San Benito County Governments is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency in and for the County of San Benito; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the provisions of the TDA, as amended and pursuant to the applicable rules and regulations thereunder (Title 21, Division 3, Chapter 2 (commencing with section 6600) of the California Code of Regulations) a prospective claimant wishing to receive an allocation from the Local Transportation Fund or the State Transit Assistance fund shall file its claim with the Council of San Benito County Governments.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the San Benito County Local Transportation Authority is authorized to execute and file an appropriate claim pursuant to the terms of the Transportation Development Act, as amended and pursuant to applicable rules and regulations promulgated thereunder, together with all necessary supporting documents, with the Council of San Benito County Governments for an allocation of TDA funds in Fiscal Year 2015/2016.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the authorized claim includes \$874,571.34 for transit purposes.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Council of San Benito County Governments in conjunction with the filings of the claims.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE SAN BENITO COUNTY LOCAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY THIS 17TH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2016 BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAINING:

ABSENT:

Tony Boch, Chair

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM:

SAN BENITO COUNTY COUNSEL'S OFFICE

Dated: Nov. 9, 2016

By: Shirley L. Murphy
Shirley L. Murphy, Deputy County Counsel

ATTEST:

Mary Gilbert, Executive Director

Dated: _____

By: _____

Staff Report

To: Local Transportation Authority
From: Regina Valentine, Transportation Planner Telephone: (831) 637-7665 x 205
Date: November 17, 2016
Subject: San Benito County Fair Shuttle Performance

Recommendation:

RECEIVE Report on the Performance of the County Express Shuttle Service to the San Benito County Fair.

Summary:

The Local Transportation Authority has provided an annual shuttle service to the County Fair since 2013. The shuttle service to the 2016 County Fair, held September 29 through October 2, had a total of 66 passengers.

Financial Considerations:

The cost of providing the 2016 shuttle service was approximately \$1,400.

Background:

With the Board's authorization in August 2016, County Express offered shuttle service to the 2016 San Benito County Fair from September 29 through October 2. Staff worked with the San Benito County Fair Staff to promote the service, and select an appropriate schedule and stop locations.

Staff Analysis:

The Local Transportation Authority has provided a shuttle service to the County Fair in 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016. The additional shuttle service has allowed the Local Transportation Authority to market its services to residents who are not familiar with County Express to try transit. In addition to the marketing potential, the shuttle service has had a positive impact on the County Fair. The shuttle service has brought attendees who may not have access to personal vehicles and has helped reduce demand on the often crowded parking lot at the fairgrounds.

As directed by the Board at the August 2016 meeting, staff has reviewed the historic ridership data for the County Fair shuttle service in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016. With this information, staff can analyze the performance of the service and receive direction from the Board regarding the possibility of continuing it in the upcoming year.

In the table below, the ridership numbers of the County Fair shuttle service is provided by year. It should be noted that each year staff has made adjustments to the service in attempts to better serve the community or at the request of the County Fair, which impacts ridership. For example, in 2014 shuttle stops were added in San Juan Bautista, which may have contributed to a lower number due to the increased length of the trip. Additionally, variations in the overall attendance of the County Fair year-to-year could affect shuttle performance.

Year	Ridership
2013	231
2014	71
2015	26
2016	66

As in years past, a brief County Fair shuttle service survey was provided to the passengers. This year out of the 66 riders 13 completed the survey providing valuable feedback. One question asked participants how they would have attended the County Fair if the shuttle was not provided. Twenty-three percent (23%) marked that they would have driven themselves, 31% would have asked a friend or family member for a ride, and 46% would not have gone at all. Also, all 13 respondents indicated they would ride again next year if the service was provided.

Executive Director Review: _____

Counsel Review: N/A

Staff Report

To: Local Transportation Authority
From: Regina Valentine, Transportation Planner Telephone: (831) 637-7665 x 205
Date: November 17, 2016
Subject: County Express Commuter Rail Service to Gilroy

Recommendation:

RECEIVE Presentation on County Express Commuter Rail Service to Gilroy

Summary:

In response to a request from the Board, staff has conducted preliminary research on the possibility of creating a commuter rail service from San Benito County to the Gilroy CalTrain station.

Financial Considerations:

The financial impact at this time is unknown.

Background:

Census information indicates that 48.9% of employed San Benito County residents commute outside of the county for employment. As the population of the county continues to increase at a rate higher than the employment opportunities, current congestion issues for personal automobiles will continue to increase, including along Highway 25. During the August meeting, the LTA Board requested that staff conduct preliminary research on the possibility of creating a County Express commuter rail service to Gilroy to relieve congestion. Staff provided a related report to the Board in October 2015 regarding possible County Express commuter services to the Silicon Valley.

Staff Analysis:

Existing Conditions

Currently, 48.9% of the employed population of San Benito County commutes outside of the county for employment, with much of these commuters traveling to points north. County Express currently operates 10 intercounty transit routes during the A.M. commute period, with four offering direct service to the Gilroy Transit Center. Annually, the intercounty service transports 42,097 passengers (FY15/16) with 13,042 accessing the Gilroy Transit Center.

The Gilroy Transit Center is the southernmost transit center in Santa Clara County. This transit center provides a location for operations of four different transit agencies: San Benito County Express, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Monterey Salinas Transit (MST), and CalTrain.

VTA currently operates seven different bus routes that service the Gilroy Transit Center. Three of these bus routes have service into Silicon Valley: #68 with service to Diridon Station, #168 (Express) with service to Diridon Station, #121 (Express) with service to Lockheed Martin Transit Center. All of these northbound services provide southbound services in the P.M. commute period.

Monterey Salinas Transit (MST) currently operates two bus lines that stop at the Gilroy Transit Center, with service into Silicon Valley. The San Jose Express (#55) operates from Monterey to Diridon Station getting a passenger to Diridon by 12 noon. The King City – San Jose Route (#86) can get a passenger to Diridon Station by 8:03 am via the San Jose International Airport (SJC).

CalTrain currently operates three northbound trains during the A.M. commute period from Gilroy. However, there are no southbound trains that make it all the way to Gilroy during the morning. Also, there is some uncertainty as to what will happen to CalTrain services, south of San Jose, once the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project is complete.

Preliminary Research

In June 2000, the San Benito Council of Governments (San Benito COG) had a report prepared to look at the feasibility of extending the CalTrain line from Gilroy to Hollister (4th and Sally). The annual operating costs associated with this extension (in FY2000 Dollars) would have been \$638,000 and \$941,000, for two and three train scenarios respectively. The initial capital investment for this project (in FY2000 Dollars) would have been between \$19.6 and \$27.1 million dollars, depending on the level of safety and the desired speed of the trains. Although this report still provides valuable information, a significant amount of time has passed since its preparation and some project assumptions must be reconsidered.

CalTrain's Participation

In projecting costs, the 2000 report relied heavily upon the assumption that CalTrain would be the operating partner of the commuter rail service. Cost savings were anticipated with the use of existing Caltrain crews, cars, and locomotives operating to and from Gilroy, requiring no additional equipment. It was found in the report that it would not be practical for new commuter rail service to Gilroy to be operated by any provider other than CalTrain. Since the preparation of the report, CalTrain has indicated no interest in extending their operation of commuter rail into San Benito and Monterey counties. In fact, CalTrain has since reduced their Gilroy service from four northbound trains during the A.M. commute period to three in 2005.

Ridership Projections

In the 2000 report, it was projected that in 2003 weekday daily ridership would range between 218 and 250 passengers, and in 2020 would range between 350 and 402 passengers. Due to the nature of commuter rail, riders would be expected to travel north in the A.M. to attend work and south in the P.M. to return home. Since each person would typically ride twice a day, to determine the total number of commuters served the projected ridership should be divided in half.

For that reason, the projected number of weekday commuters served in 2003 ranges between 109 and 125, and in 2020 between 175 and 201, according to the 2000 report.

As quite some time has passed since the report was prepared, staff reviewed the average weekday passenger boardings for the Gilroy CalTrain service for a comparison. In March 2016, CalTrain experienced an average of 179 passengers boarding in Gilroy during weekdays. It should be noted that CalTrain's ridership is boosted by connecting transit services from VTA and MST, as well as, County Express' 26 average weekday round-trip riders to the Gilroy Transit Center.

Hollister Branch Line Ownership

During the preparation of the 2000 report, Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) was in ownership of the track that runs between Hollister and Gilroy, also known as the Hollister Branch Line. In 2013, UPRR sold the line to a private firm, San Benito Railroad LLC, so LTA must anticipate negotiating use of the track if a commuter rail is considered. Additionally as part of the purchase, UPRR retained an exclusive easement to provide freight rail service on the line where freight has service priority over commuter rail, which would impact service planning.

Funding Considerations

As reported above, in the 2000 report with CalTrain's project management the annual operating costs (in FY2000 Dollars) was projected to be between \$638,000 and \$941,000, with an initial capital investment between \$19.6 and \$27.1 million dollars. Although CalTrain is no longer interested in pursuing the project, staff reviewed potential funding sources.

Operations

The major source of funding used by LTA to operate transportation services is the Transportation Development Act (TDA). During the FY 2013 – 2015 period, on average San Benito COG was allocated \$1,349,753 in TDA funds. As per state legislature, TDA funds are used to financially support the following in order of priority:

- TDA fund administration
- Regional transportation planning
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Public transit
- Streets and roads

When passenger rail services are provided in a region, per state legislature the operating costs for the service must take priority above public transit services. For this reason, County Express would be competing for limited TDA funds to continue to provide Fixed Route, Paratransit, General Public Dial-a-Ride, and Specialized Transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities. Some potential ways to reduce the amount of TDA funds needed to operate commuter rail may include a local transportation sales tax measure or private sector contributions.

Capital

Potential funding for the required capital purchases for the commuter rail service to Gilroy could include federal, state, and local sources. As authorized by the five-year federal transportation funding bill, Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) offers a competitive Fixed Guideway Capital Investment Grant to fund investments such as new and expanded rapid rail, commuter rail, light rail, streetcars, bus rapid transit, and ferries. Further research would need to be conducted to determine which category the project could be eligible under: New Starts for projects with a total estimated capital cost of \$300 million+ or that are seeking \$100 million+ in funds, or Small Starts with a total estimated capital cost of less than \$300 million and that are seeking less than \$100 million in funds. Additionally, before applications could be submitted LTA must ensure that the project has cleared FTA grant requirements such as design and environmental review.

At the state level, the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) offers a competitive Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) grant to fund transformative capital improvements that modernize California's intercity, commuter, and urban rail systems to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by reducing congestion and vehicle miles traveled. With funds generated from the state's Cap and Trade auction proceeds, in August 2016 CalSTA awarded \$390 million statewide to fund 14 projects with award amounts ranging between \$5 million to \$82 million. As described for the FTA funding source, before applications could be submitted LTA must ensure that the project has cleared CalSTA grant requirements such as design and environmental review.

To fund capital purchases locally, as with the funding for operations, they could be provided with a local transportation sales tax measure or from private sector contributions.

Next Steps

The County Express commuter rail service to Gilroy project has been included in the adopted 2035 San Benito Regional Transportation Plan as an unconstrained project as funding has not been identified. Staff will bring this item to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which includes City of Hollister and San Benito County staff, for project input and to establish a work plan. Next steps could include applying for a Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant to prepare an updated project study.

Executive Director Review: _____

Counsel Review: N/A

Attachment: Hollister/Gilroy CalTrain Extension Final Report Executive Summary

HOLLISTER/GILROY CALTRAIN EXTENSION

FINAL REPORT

FOR THE

COUNCIL OF SAN BENITO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS

June 8, 2000



PREPARED BY

R.L. Banks and Associates, Inc.
Washington, DC and San Francisco, CA

HDR Engineering, Inc.
Oakland, CA

DKS Associates
Oakland, CA

Nelson/Nygaard Consulting Associates
San Francisco, CA

Business Plan Hollister/Gilroy Caltrain Extension

Final Report

For The

San Benito County Council Of Governments

Prepared By

R.L. Banks & Associates, Inc. 
Washington, DC and San Francisco, CA

HDR Engineering, Inc.
Oakland, CA

DKS Associates
Oakland, CA

Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates
San Francisco, CA

June 8, 2000

Hollister/Gilroy Caltrain Extension

Final Report

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-1
RIDERSHIP	1
OPERATING PLAN AND OPERATING COSTS	17
SHORT LINE EVALUATION	27
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND COSTS	33
TRACK ACCESS ISSUES	45
FINANCIAL PLAN	54
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	65
REMAINING MILESTONES	99

Tables

1	Caltrain Activity: 1999	4
2	Gilroy Station Ridership Survey: November 1999 Results	6
3	Summary of San Benito County Employed Resident Projections	9
4	Summary of Ridership Projection Calculations	13
5	Hollister Branch Operating Costs as a Short Line Freight Railroad	32
6	Capital Cost Estimates	35
7	Possible Cost Savings	44
8	Operating and Capital Cost Summary	54
9	Total and Net Operating Cost	56
10	Operating Cost Sharing Strategies	56

Appendix

A	Format For Integration of Facilities Into Caltrain's Capital Improvement Program	
---	--	--

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is intended to provide the Council of San Benito County Governments (SBtCOG) with necessary information and documentation to move forward to establish passenger train service between Gilroy and Hollister.

RIDERSHIP

Existing ridership data from Caltrain/Joint Powers Board (Caltrain, or JPB), Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Caltrans were reviewed to provide a baseline for estimation of the demand for extension of passenger rail service to Hollister.

Population and employment projections were identified for San Benito County in order to understand the impacts of growth, and to be able to estimate demand beyond start-up. These data were obtained from MTC and the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG).

The resulting forecasts are based upon scenarios in which existing passenger service to Gilroy is extended to one station in Hollister, opening in 2003. In Scenario 1, two trains operate northbound in the morning commute, and two trains operate southbound in the evening. In Scenario 2, the number of trains is increased to three. The station is assumed to have ample parking and adequate highway access.

Following are the resulting estimates of demand, expressed in terms of daily weekday riders with regard to the two trains and three trains scenarios:

	<u>Two trains</u>	<u>Three trains</u>
Year 2003	218	250
Year 2020	350	402

The report contains a complete elaboration of these figures and a discussion of their sensitivity to various conditions.

OPERATING PLAN AND OPERATING COSTS

Stations, Layover Facility

Three station site options were evaluated, and it was concluded that service should be implemented using a single station, located in downtown Hollister, at or near the former station located near Sally and Fourth Streets. The Wright Road location would be a second choice. A station that would take advantage of commuters on Route 101, located near Carnadero, is an optional addition to

the project, but is no substitute for the Hollister station. It may become attractive if Santa Clara County or Monterey County would substantially participate in its costs, both capital and operating.

With a downtown Hollister station, the train storage or layover facility could be at that location. Alternatively, the layover facility could be located at Wright Road. Another possibility would be to continue storing trains at Gilroy. This would reduce capital costs, but increase operating costs. A Hollister layover site would benefit Santa Clara County by alleviating the cost of expanding the existing Gilroy facility as enhanced Gilroy Caltrain service is implemented.

Service Plan

Three potential developments, now being planned, must be considered in the plan to extend passenger rail service between Gilroy and Hollister. One of these is VTA's proposed increased level of Caltrain service between Gilroy and points north. Another is Monterey County's plan to extend Caltrain service to Salinas. A third initiative is Amtrak's Coast Corridor study, which will consider service levels and infrastructure needs of all users of the Coast Line.

A logical means of initiating service to Hollister would be to extend existing Gilroy-San Francisco trips to serve Hollister. Also extending that service to Salinas suggests that there could be conflicting desires between San Benito and Monterey counties. Nevertheless, in order to show all options available to San Benito County, this report assumes all four existing Gilroy trains are available for service to Hollister.

As indicated above, two service scenarios are proposed, Scenario 1 consisting of two daily round trips between Hollister and San Francisco, and Scenario 2, three round trips. These scenarios were developed based upon existing trains with the highest percentage of San Benito county riders.

The report contains illustrative service schedules for both scenarios.

Both service scenarios assume use of existing Caltrain crews, cars and locomotives now operating to and from Gilroy. Thus, in these scenarios, no additional equipment is required (and therefore no funding is required for additional equipment). Additional equipment and crews would be required if both San Benito and Monterey Counties are unable to agree on dividing the current Caltrain trains between them.

Economic and public policy considerations indicate that it would not be practicable to assume new commuter rail service to Hollister by any provider other than Caltrain.

Operating Costs

Service to Hollister is likely to be funded in a manner similar to the Tamien-Gilroy service supported by VTA, and operating costs are projected on this basis. San Benito County should expect to pay the net cost of Hollister service, and perhaps some charge for JPB administrative expenses.

The largest single component of the Hollister operating cost would be the "Cost Allocation", which is an allocation of Caltrain annual operating costs north of Tamien based on the ratio of Hollister-Gilroy train-miles to total Caltrain train-miles north of Tamien. Other cost items would include maintenance, security and utilities directly related to facilities or service between Hollister and Gilroy. It is anticipated that Hollister operating revenues will offset operating cost of the service to the extent of about 33 to 39 percent. Net annual operating deficits of Hollister service would be about \$638,000 for the two-train scenario, and \$941,000 for the three-train scenario.

SHORT LINE EVALUATION

A hypothetical scenario was evaluated in which Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) sells the Hollister Branch to a short line railroad or to a public agency that operates, or contracts with an operator, to fulfill the common carrier freight obligation transferred with the sale of the line. Currently UPRR operates a train on the branch that services shippers three days a week: Tuesday, Thursday and Sunday.

Examination of current freight volume as well as future prospects, estimated revenues therefrom, and estimated operating costs, reveals that the Hollister Branch revenues fall short of the operating costs a short line operator would incur.

The prospects of a rail-truck transfer (intermodal facility) located on the Hollister Branch were evaluated. In RLBA's judgment, this would not be a productive investment.

Thus reasonable prospects for independent short line operation do not exist, and the recommended direction to be taken by San Benito County is an agreement with UPRR for continued freight service by UPRR as long as it may be required.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS AND COSTS

Improvements are required to upgrade a low-speed low-density freight branch line so that it is capable of safely accommodating passenger trains at passenger train speeds.

The initial capital cost estimate of \$27,100,000 provided for upgrade of the 12.3-mile line to Caltrain standards and allow for a maximum passenger train speed of 79 miles per hour (mph). This cost was deemed high, and RLBA was asked to look for ways to reduce cost.

By accepting a maximum speed of 59 mph on an unsignalled line, not replacing all bridges, rail and ties, and using lower cost materials, initial improvements may be reduced by almost \$7.5 million, to \$19.6 million. The line would remain in compliance with Federal Railroad Administration minimum safety standards for passenger train operations at the lower speed, but with a lower margin of safety, and would require more frequent and more expensive maintenance although Caltrain has indicated this plan would be acceptable. RLBA continues to recommend automatic block signaling (ABS) as a minimum for commuter rail service, and advises San Benito County to seek funding for it. ABS shows the presence or absence of a train, rail car, open switch or broken rail in the next "block", or section of track, and therefore tends to prevent accidents. The cost of including ABS is about \$700,000.

The reduced capital cost estimate of \$19,630,000 includes right of way improvements, a station and a layover facility. It substitutes less than optimum materials (which will not hold up as well or for as long), for example, wood crossties instead of concrete, and soft local stone ballast rather than harder rock from a more distant source. In the lower estimate, all existing rail is replaced, but only two-thirds of the crossties are replaced, rather than all of them.

TRACK ACCESS ISSUES

From a practical point of view, there really are no alternatives to operation of the Hollister commuter rail service by Caltrain.

It is highly desirable, therefore, that:

- (1) Hollister service and SBtCOG participation be on the agenda of current Caltrain and VTA negotiations with UPRR concerning enhanced service levels from/to Gilroy and
- (2) Hollister service and equipment requirements be included in Caltrain's equipment procurement/assignment efforts initiated following the passage of Measures A and B in Santa Clara County.

On April 13, at a meeting with Caltrain and VTA, VTA advised SBtCOG that it has added potential Caltrain commuter service extension to Hollister (as well as to Salinas) to its current negotiations with UPRR concerning enhanced service between Gilroy and Tamien. UPRR has not yet responded to VTA's proposals.

Caltrain and VTA have indicated general support for an extension of commuter service to Hollister (as well as to Salinas) with only two significant concerns. The first concern is that San Benito County must be able to obtain significant funding for necessary capital improvements and expected operating revenue shortfalls to facilitate a Hollister service extension. The second concern is that extension of commuter service to both Hollister and Salinas from Gilroy will require additional crews, passenger cars and motive power, unless San Benito and Monterey counties can agree on which of the current four (and possibly five future) peak morning and evening weekday trains serving Gilroy will be extended to Hollister and which to Salinas. The Caltrain Extension Task Force formed by JPB and VTA with representatives from both counties is attempting to work through this problem.

Access to the Hollister Branch may be obtained by outright purchase from UPRR, or through a "trackage rights" agreement. The report describes pros and cons of each option. Access to the UPRR mainline between Gilroy and the branch will require extending VTA's current trackage rights agreement between Gilroy and Tamien. No costs have been estimated for track access.

FINANCIAL PLAN

This section of the report identifies all potential funding sources and discusses strategies for cooperative funding.

In accord with the Joint Powers Agreement of 1991, it is assumed that the proposed Gilroy-Hollister extension would be considered an expansion project, as was the extension of service to Gilroy, and that San Benito County would be responsible for the capital costs. It may be possible for Santa Clara County to assume some of the capital costs; for example, a station and layover facility in San Benito County benefits Santa Clara County by enabling Caltrain to increase service frequency to/from Gilroy with reduced capital outlays.

Four cost sharing strategies--modeled on formulas used in the Gilroy extension, Caltrain mainline service, and Altamont Commuter Express service--are proposed for cooperatively funding the day-to-day operation. Advantages and disadvantages are discussed. Obviously the sharing of operating costs outside San Benito County would have to be negotiated.

Federal, state and local funding sources are described. Although there are at present no funds committed to extending passenger rail service to Hollister, there are several potential funding sources. There is considerable competition for those sources. It is recommended that San Benito County work through appropriate elected officials to secure funding, including its TEA-21 earmark,

the Governor's Traffic Congestion Relief Plan, and consider a sales tax for transportation, Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds and private sector contributions.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The purpose of this section of the report is to identify potential adverse environmental effects associated with the project, and, where feasible, identify mitigation measures intended to lessen impacts. The assessment describes the project, lists the environmental factors potentially affected, and evaluates each factor. Several potential adverse impacts are identified and mitigation measures are described. None of the impacts appear to be critical issues, considering the environmental benefits of the project. If it is decided to use only the existing station site, and not construct any additional station, then SBtCOG may be able to make a Negative Declaration.

MILESTONES FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

The report describes the key remaining steps necessary to implement passenger train service from Hollister:

- Public outreach and approvals
- Secure funding commitments, obtain environmental clearance
- Negotiate service and equipment requirements with VTA and JPB
- Negotiate access with UPRR
- Design/construct facilities, stations, improvements and procure equipment (if necessary)
- Demonstrate service and market it
- Refine service plan

In summary, the following are key unresolved issues:

- (1) Expansion of passenger service on UPRR track (Gilroy-Hollister, Gilroy-Salinas, and Amtrak's Coast Line initiative).
- (2) Extension of four Gilroy trains to Hollister and Salinas: potential conflict between San Benito and Monterey Counties.
- (3) Access for operation of passenger trains on the Hollister Branch.
- (4) San Benito institutional issues vis-à-vis Santa Clara County, as well as cost-sharing with VTA and Caltrain.
- (5) Funding.